



THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA
MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND
TOURISM



BTC TANZANIA



KILORWEMP

KILOMBERO AND LOWER RUFJI WETLANDS ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT PROJECT

MISSION REPORT

CGMETT SURVEY 2015

MARCH 2015

Document Data

Project	Kilombero and Lower Rufiji Wetlands Ecosystem Management Project	
Project ID	TAN1102711	
Document	CGMETT Survey Report 2015	
Authors	KILORWEMP PIU (M&EO)	
Document owner	<p>KILORWEMP Project Implementation Unit Ph: + 255 222866375 Email: KILORWEMP2013@gmail.com Physical address: c/o MNRT, Mpingo House, Nyerere Road Dar es Salaam, Tanzania Postal address: c/o BTC PO Box 9372 Dar es Salaam</p>	
Document version	FINAL	
Document date	March 2015	
Document status	Internal	
Document history	31/3/2015	Drafted by M&EO
	16/4/2015	Reviewed by PIU and finalized
Disclaimer	<p>This document was produced as part of monitoring and evaluation activities of the KILORWEMP Project funded by the European Union and Belgian Aid. The information and views set out in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of any of the supporting organizations.</p>	

Abbreviations and Acronyms

BMU	Beach Management Unit
CBFM	Community Based Forestry Management
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resources Management
CBO	Community Based Organization
CGMETT	Community Governance & Management Tracking Tool
IS	Intermediate State
KDC	Kilombero District Council
KILORWEMP	Kilombero and Lower Rufiji Wetlands Ecosystem Management Project
LUP	Land Use Planning
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
M&EO	Monitoring & Evaluation Officer
MNRT	Ministry of Natural Resources & Tourism
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
RDC	Rufiji District Council
UDC	Ulanga District Council
VGS	Village Game Scout
VNRC	Village Natural Resources Management
WMA	Wildlife Management Area

Contents

Document Data	2
Abbreviations and acronyms	3
Contents	4
Introduction	5
A visit to Rufiji, Kilombero and Ulanga	5
CGMETT Survey Analysis and Results Summary	8
General comments against each category	9
Survey conclusion	11
Lessons learned, challenges and recommendations	11
Annex I: List of persons met.....	13
Annex II: Results Disaggregated by District	18
Annex III: Results Disaggregated by CBNRM.....	29

Introduction

This report provides feedback of CGMETT survey mission fielded by PIU-M&E team from 17-26 March 2015 in the three project districts of Kilombero, Rufiji and Ulanga, The general objective of the survey was to collect data to update indicators in the project's logical framework (logframe). Specifically, the mission aimed at gathering data required to update four indicators in the logframe namely: (i) IS 1.1: Effectiveness of established WMA, CBFM, BMU, LUPs – (from CGMETT); (ii) IS 1.2: Compliance with CBNRM bylaws (LUP, CBFM, WMA, BMU)- (from CGMETT); (iii) IS 1.2: Gender ratio in directory/ board of each CBO/Village committee supported- (from DPT); (iv) Specific Objective: Project Districts budget allocation for the NRM processes increased (from DPT). Survey participants were combination of leaders and members in sample CBOs selected as unit of inquiry¹. For WMA participants were members of CBO and VGS; BMU participants were members of the executive committees while PFM participants were members of VNRC and VGS. The mission team wishes to express appreciation for hospitalities and courtesies extended by the District staff and CBOs met in the conduct of our work. List of persons met is provided in annex I hereof.

A visit to Rufiji, Kilombero and Ulanga	
Mission dates: 17-26/03/2015	
Mission members:	Isaack Michael , M&EO (Mission Leader) Sebastian Van Hoeck, JA (Mission Assistant) Dan Hosea (Mission Driver)
Objective:	To undertake CGMETT exercise in order to collect data required to update project logical framework indicators for annual reporting and project management.
Date: 17-19/3/2015	Rufiji District

¹ Annex I provides details of persons participated in the survey

Peoples met	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CBO members of Juhiwangumwa WMA, Kipugira BMU, and Mtanzamsona CBFM 2. District Project Staff 3. District Executive Director's office staff
Notes	<p>Mission team and District project team jointly firmed up mission itinerary. The mission team paid customary courtesy call on the office of District Executive Director of Rufiji. The mission team successful facilitated three different group discussions with Juhiwangumwa WMA (15 people) in Kipo village; Kipugira BMU in Kipugira Village (28 people) and Mtanzamsona PFM in Mtanzamsona village (8 people). District staff made formal introduction of the mission team then M&EO explained purpose of the survey, methodology and logistics facilitation of the participants. Lively discussions were conducted among CBO members whom after consensus they agreed to choose the most correct answer against each question in the CGMETT tool. Time was provided for CBO members to share any salient issue related to their CBNRM. After CGMETT exercise in the district a wrap-up meeting with district project staff was held to share some feedback.</p>
Date: 20/03/2015	Travel from Rufiji to Ifakara (night in Morogoro)
Date: 21-23/03/2015	Kilombero District (Ifakara)
Peoples met	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CBO members of Iluma WMA, Mbuti BMU, and Uhanila CBFM 2. District Project Staff 3. District Executive Director's Office staff
Notes	<p>The mission team successful facilitated group discussions of Iluma WMA in Signali village (15 people); Mbuti BMU in Signali village (13 people); and Uhanila PFM in Chita village (8 people). District staff introduced the mission team, the M&EO explained purpose of the survey, methodology and logistics facilitation of the participants. There were hot discussions among CBO members who mutually agreed on the most correct answers</p>

	<p>against all questions in the CGMETT tool. The facilitator provided a space for CBO members to share salient issues related to their CBNRMs. After CGMETT exercise in the district a wrap-up meeting with district project staff was held to share some feedback.</p>
Date: 24-25/2015	Ulanga District (night in Mahenge)
Peoples met	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CBO members of Iluma WMA and Chokoachoko PFM 2. District Project Staff 3. District Executive Director
Notes	<p>In Ulanga district the mission team met only two CBOs of Iluma WMA in Mavimba village (11 people) and Chokoachoko PFM in Kichangani village (12 people). The mission team did not meet a representative CBO for BMU because of heavy rains which made the area inaccessible. As usual, the host ‘District staff’ introduced the mission team, the M&EO explained purpose of the survey, methodology and logistics facilitation of the participants. There were hot discussions among CBO members who mutually agreed on the most correct answers against all questions in the CGMETT tool. The facilitator provided a space for CBO members to share salient issues related to their CBNRMs. After CGMETT exercise in the district, separate wrap-up meetings with District Executive Director and District Project Staff were held to share some feedback.</p>
Date: 25/03/2015	Travel from Mahenge to Ifakara (night in Ifakara)
Date: 26/03/2015	Travel from Ifakara to Dar Es Salaam (end of mission)

**CGMETT Survey
Analysis and
Results
Summary²**

The CGMETT tool had a total of 24 questions with overall total score 72. The lowest score and maximum score for each question was 0 and 3 respectively with score weights more or less similar to *Likert Scale*. The average time for both session and logistics ‘payment and registration’ was three hours per CBO. The mission team facilitated group discussions of 8 CBOs (3 WMA, 3 PFM and 2 BMU) for 110 total participants (76% male and 24% female).

i. Key results (of concerned indicators):

- (a) IS 1.1: Effectiveness of established WMA, CBFM, BMU, LUPs is rated 56% (based on responses from sample 8 CBOs);
- (b) IS 1.2: Compliance with CBNRM bylaws (LUP, CBFM, WMA, BMU) is rated 42% (based on responses from sample 8 CBOs);
- (c) IS 1.2: Gender ratio in directory/ board of each CBO/Village committee supported is 31% (based on sample 35 CBOs) ; and
- (d) Specific Objective: Project District budget allocation for the NRM processes increased (data pending from the District Project Teams).

ii. Results by issue

Category	Issue	Project average score
CONTEXT	Purpose of NRM defined	2
	User group members known	2
	Boundary of the NRM area	2
	Average	2
PLANNING	NRM rules or bylaws	2
	Management plan	2
	Participatory monitoring and adaptive management	2
	Average	2
INPUT	Enforcement system	2

² Annexes II & III provide scores disaggregated by district and CBNRM respectively

	Compliance	1
	Enforcement.	2
	Infrastructure and equipment	1
	Capacity of the executive body	1
	Current budget	1
	Financial sustainability / revenue	1
	Average	1
GOVERNANCE	Legitimacy	3
	Participation in management decisions	2
	Transparency	2
	Accountability	2
	Adaptive governance	0
	Cooperation with government	2
	Cooperation with civil society and NGOs	0
	Average	2
OUTCOME	Equitability of cost and benefit sharing	2
	Status of natural resources and environmental services	2
	Empowerment	2
	Livelihoods and well-being of users	2
	Average	2

iii. Results by category

Category	Project average score
CONTEX	2
PLANNING	2
INPUT	1
GOVERNANCE	2
OUTCOME	2

Comments

General comments against each category

Category	Issue	Comments
CONTEXT	Purpose of NRM defined	Majority of the CBOs interviewed seem to be very much aware of the purpose, members and boundary of their NRM area
	User group members known	
	Boundary of the NRM area	
PLANNING	NRM rules or bylaws	CBOs foresee effectiveness of
	Management plan	

		Participatory monitoring and adaptive management	CBNRM subject to achievement of user rights
	INPUT	Enforcement system	Currently many CBOs are working towards receiving user rights, CBOs strongly believe that user rights will empower them to effectively and efficiently undertake issues under the INPUT category.
		Compliance	
		Enforcement.	
		Infrastructure and equipment	
		Capacity of the executive body	
		Current budget	
		Financial sustainability / revenue	
	GOVERNANCE	Legitimacy	CBOs agree on legitimacy and participation in decision making though there are issues related to transparency and accountability of the CBOs leaders. There is good cooperation with government however there is little cooperation with civil societies thus CBOs request project to assist linking with relevant CS and NGOs
		Participation in management decisions	
		Transparency	
		Accountability	
		Adaptive governance	
		Cooperation with government	
		Cooperation with civil society and NGOs	
	OUTCOME	Equitability of cost and benefit sharing	Though there is a system for equitable cost and benefits sharing, CBOs report no benefits realized yet. Much need to be done to conserve the natural resources
		Status of natural resources and environmental services	
		Empowerment	
		Livelihoods and well-being of users	

<p>Survey conclusion</p>	<p>Conclusion drawn from results of the CGMETT exercise of self-assessment of CBOs is that there is significant improvement implying that project is contributing to the development of the CBNRM. KILORWEMP may use information gathered by this survey to enhance further project management by addressing specific issues and gaps in order to achieve the project overall goal to sustainably manage the wetlands Ecosystem of the Kilombero Valley and Lower Rufiji so that its ecological balance is conserved, the local communities' livelihoods are improved and economic development is sustained.</p>
<p>Lessons learned, challenges and recommendations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information asymmetry: there was imminent gap in information by CBO leaders' versus CBO members. The latter seems to know little on what was going on in the CBOs. CBO leaders pointed out lack of meetings as the major factor leading to disparity of information among CBO members. Leaders of CBOs stress that meetings were not being conducted because CBOs had no cash grant to facilitate conduct of meetings (i.e. transport and lunch allowances). <i>Recommendation: since many CBOs have not obtained user rights the mission team recommends project to facilitate logistics for meetings by CBOs with gradual decrease in funding such as 100% to 75% to 50% to 25% to 0% as and when CBO is fully operational after having obtained user rights. Districts project budget needs to include cost for meetings facilitation of CBOs.</i> • Some rules governing mission management as set forth in the Project Implementation Manual (PIM) needs revision to reflect realities on the ground (refer 7.2.6 (b & c) <i>Travel and food cost for community members</i>). For example some CBO members travel 100km to attend meetings, it means that they spend hours on road while traveling to attend meetings plus hours for meeting sessions. The other point is, CBO members are farmers thus it is disincentive to members of CBOs spending hours in meetings

	<p>without allowances (lunch and transport) thus CBO members consider the meetings as burden and associated with high opportunity cost since members forego working on their own farms or/and providing wage labour to earn income for families. <i>PIM was made some years ago, considering factors like inflation and increase in cost of living, the mission team therefore recommends revision of rates of allowances of CBOs.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mission team learned that field missions provides opportunities to beneficiaries, district staff, senior district officials and PIU staff to have face on face interaction whereby challenges can easily be addressed and feasible solution found together there in the field. Further, field mission reinforces monitoring and evaluation, for example Kipugira BMU, as part of follow-up, was pleased to talk directly to the PIU-M&E team on status of patrol gears and equipment promised by JLPC (held in February 2015). In areas where there have been no official field mission by PIU to date, CBOs were happy with our mission as partners supporting their CBNRM thus renewing and invigorating morale in relation to CBNRM activities. Similarly, the mission provided impetus to the field staff. <i>The mission team recommends conduct of several field missions (general and thematic) including in areas where missions programme seems to skip.</i>
--	---

Conclusion

As the mission team was new to the project, therefore, this mission was an eye-opener exposing M&E team to the field environment of KILORWEMP. The mission was successfully accomplished.

Action Items	Person	Deadline
1. Mission report to be shared – PIU and DPTs	M&EO	20 April 2015
2. Follow up on districts data on budget allocation to NRM	M&EO	30 April 2015

Annex I: List of persons met

No	Date	Name of Participant	Gender	District	CBNRM	Committee
1	3/18/2015	Sahshe H. Suko	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
2	3/18/2015	Alli S. Amani	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
3	3/18/2015	Abbadallah A. Ngakeleka	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee- bursar
4	3/18/2015	Selemani A. Mguiami	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
5	3/18/2015	Mwanaidi S. Ngozi	F	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
6	3/18/2015	Moshi A. Lusongo	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
7	3/18/2015	Rukia S . Ngozi	F	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
8	3/18/2015	Makkao Y Magombeka	F	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
9	3/18/2015	Amiri H. Matimbwa	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
10	3/18/2015	Rashidi J. Mandandu	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
11	3/18/2015	Hidaya S. Nyanza	F	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
12	3/18/2015	Hadija M. Mkumba	F	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
13	3/18/2015	Hasani Y Suko	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
14	3/18/2015	Iddi. A Kilunai	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
15	3/18/2015	Abdallah S. Mkuti	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee- secretary
16	3/18/2015	Seif Salum Bondo	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
17	3/18/2015	Seif Salum Makuka	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee-chair
18	3/18/2015	Halfani T. Suko	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
19	3/18/2015	Saidi A. Kalungi	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
20	3/18/2015	Mwaza Y. Suko	F	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
21	3/18/2015	Sahuma Lusongo	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee

No	Date	Name of Participant	Gender	District	CBNRM	Committee
22	3/18/2015	Juma Mwegio	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
23	3/18/2015	Omaily Mussa	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
24	3/18/2015	Hassani M. Kingwande	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
25	3/18/2015	Salehe S. Ndago	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
26	3/18/2015	Moshi Mgaga	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee-stores
27	3/18/2015	Ramadhani Dikongwa	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
28	3/18/2015	Abdallaha S. Mgiwami	M	Rufiji	BMU - Kipugira	Ex-Committee
29	3/18/2015	Adiona Ali Milandu	M	Rufiji	PFM - Mtanzamsona	VNRC
30	3/18/2015	Ismail Said Lursonzo	M	Rufiji	PFM - Mtanzamsona	VNRC
31	3/18/2015	Juma Mohamedi Wadi	M	Rufiji	PFM - Mtanzamsona	VNRC
32	3/18/2015	Fitina A. Misonde	M	Rufiji	PFM - Mtanzamsona	VNRC
33	3/18/2015	Muiajuma M. Aussi	F	Rufiji	PFM - Mtanzamsona	VNRC
34	3/18/2015	Famyeje S. Mgonza	F	Rufiji	PFM - Mtanzamsona	VNRC
35	3/18/2015	Semeni J. Mbonde	F	Rufiji	PFM - Mtanzamsona	VNRC
36	3/18/2015	Kulwa A. Mbonde	F	Rufiji	PFM - Mtanzamsona	VNRC
37	3/19/2015	Rajabu M. Naeje	M	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	CBO
38	3/19/2015	Shabani A. Dihongo	M	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	CBO
39	3/19/2015	Tone H. Kuyawa	M	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	CBO
40	3/19/2015	Zaituni T. Kinjuwike	F	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	CBO
41	3/19/2015	Mohamed I. Nzawi	M	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	VGS
42	3/19/2015	Aeshi I. Mpimbita	F	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	CBO
43	3/19/2015	Yusufu M. Mpoto	M	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	CBO

No	Date	Name of Participant	Gender	District	CBNRM	Committee
44	3/19/2015	Kasimu H. Chepe	M	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	CBO
45	3/19/2015	Mussa O. Lusongo	M	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	CBO
46	3/19/2015	Hamisi H. Usindu	M	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	CBO
47	3/19/2015	Muharami Kindinda	M	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	VGS
48	3/19/2015	Fikira O. Mwegelo	F	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	CBO
49	3/19/2015	Hassani A. Mwera	M	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	VGS
50	3/19/2015	Shamte B. Nguogani	M	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	VGS
51	3/19/2015	Issa S. Mwera	M	Rufiji	WMA - Juhiwangumwa	VGS
52	3/21/2015	Rhobert Matanda	M	Kilombero	BMU - Mbuti	Ex-Committee-chair
53	3/21/2015	Ayubu Kindelule	M	Kilombero	BMU - Mbuti	Ex-Committee
54	3/21/2015	Herman Ndulu	M	Kilombero	BMU - Mbuti	Ex-Committee
55	3/21/2015	Fatuma Mlipuka	F	Kilombero	BMU - Mbuti	Ex-Committee
56	3/21/2015	Omary Namtuka	M	Kilombero	BMU - Mbuti	Ex-Committee
57	3/21/2015	Bryton Rasomana	M	Kilombero	BMU - Mbuti	Ex-Committee
58	3/21/2015	Joseph Libengu	M	Kilombero	BMU - Mbuti	Ex-Committee
59	3/21/2015	Augustine Lyanula	M	Kilombero	BMU - Mbuti	Ex-Committee
60	3/21/2015	Abdalah Mohamed	M	Kilombero	BMU - Mbuti	Ex-Committee
61	3/21/2015	Flavian Mwaiyowela	M	Kilombero	BMU - Mbuti	Ex-Committee-store
62	3/21/2015	Omaru Lyanga	M	Kilombero	BMU - Mbuti	Ex-Committee
63	3/21/2015	Abbul Kauka	M	Kilombero	BMU - Mbuti	Ex-Committee
64	3/21/2015	Jospeh Naimbo	M	Kilombero	BMU - Mbuti	Ex-Committee
65	3/21/2015	Meza Shabani	M	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO-chair
66	3/21/2015	Jacob Nassary	M	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO-secretary

No	Date	Name of Participant	Gender	District	CBNRM	Committee
67	3/21/2015	Amasha Kalimangasi	M	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO
68	3/21/2015	Rukia K. Kisweka	F	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO
69	3/21/2015	Hussein Kamagla	M	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO
70	3/21/2015	Yanisiku Utiri	F	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO
71	3/21/2015	Dotto R. Chawalla	M	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO
72	3/21/2015	Edna K. Likoko	F	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO
73	3/21/2015	Beisha Mtumbika	F	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO
74	3/21/2015	Salviha A. Lituli	F	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO
75	3/21/2015	Mauldi Kihenua	M	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO
76	3/21/2015	James Kibandike	M	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO
77	3/21/2015	Modesti Smu	M	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO
78	3/21/2015	Yohana Kiama	M	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO-bursar
79	3/21/2015	Francis Mbogozo	M	Kilombero	WMA - Iluma KDC	CBO
80	3/23/2015	Said Mnolla	M	Kilombero	CBFM - Uhanila	VNRC
81	3/23/2015	Fromenzi Chigidi	M	Kilombero	CBFM - Uhanila	VNRC
82	3/23/2015	Samweli Malino	M	Kilombero	CBFM - Uhanila	VNRC-chair
83	3/23/2015	Vicent Synga	M	Kilombero	CBFM - Uhanila	VNRC
84	3/23/2015	Talck Kinyaga	M	Kilombero	CBFM - Uhanila	VNRC-bursar
85	3/23/2015	Joisi Mpuike	F	Kilombero	CBFM - Uhanila	VNRC
86	3/23/2015	Gisbeta Chihava	F	Kilombero	CBFM - Uhanila	VGS
87	3/23/2015	Tunza Kuwasha	M	Kilombero	CBFM - Uhanila	VGS
88	3/24/2015	Eleuther Hgazada	M	Ulanga	WMA - Iluma UDC	CBO-secretary
89	3/24/2015	Omary Kitikulah	M	Ulanga	WMA - Iluma UDC	CBO

No	Date	Name of Participant	Gender	District	CBNRM	Committee
90	3/24/2015	Getruda Nakuyowa	F	Ulanga	WMA - Iluma UDC	CBO
91	3/24/2015	Morosadi H. Singaera	M	Ulanga	WMA - Iluma UDC	VGS
92	3/24/2015	Mohamedi Kuhamaba	M	Ulanga	WMA - Iluma UDC	CBO
93	3/24/2015	Atuman Hoki	M	Ulanga	WMA - Iluma UDC	VGS
94	3/24/2015	Omary Mayanga	M	Ulanga	WMA - Iluma UDC	VGS
95	3/24/2015	Nuru Ngokeli	F	Ulanga	WMA - Iluma UDC	VGS
96	3/24/2015	Rashid Kitunguu	M	Ulanga	WMA - Iluma UDC	CBO
97	3/24/2015	Hamisi Kakanga	M	Ulanga	WMA - Iluma UDC	CBO
98	3/24/2015	Ally Hassan	M	Ulanga	WMA - Iluma UDC	CBO
99	3/24/2015	Mhando Maro	M	Ulanga	PFM - Chokoachoko	VNRC
100	3/24/2015	Mussa L. Chilohga	M	Ulanga	PFM - Chokoachoko	VNRC
101	3/24/2015	Haruni S. Nyama	M	Ulanga	PFM - Chokoachoko	VNRC
102	3/24/2015	Novatus Lisembo	M	Ulanga	PFM - Chokoachoko	VNRC-chair
103	3/24/2015	Kibibi Lyana	F	Ulanga	PFM - Chokoachoko	VNRC
104	3/24/2015	Shani Kindemba	F	Ulanga	PFM - Chokoachoko	VNRC
105	3/24/2015	Tripho Njogolo	M	Ulanga	PFM - Chokoachoko	VNRC
106	3/24/2015	Zuhura Masavuanga	F	Ulanga	PFM - Chokoachoko	VNRC
107	3/24/2015	Mohamedi Mangkionza	M	Ulanga	PFM - Chokoachoko	VNRC
108	3/24/2015	Kondradi Ngumba	M	Ulanga	PFM - Chokoachoko	VNRC
109	3/24/2015	Jakobo Ngalioma	M	Ulanga	PFM - Chokoachoko	VNRC
110	3/24/2015	Awadhi Kasim	M	Ulanga	PFM - Chokoachoko	VNRC

Annex II: Results Disaggregated by District³

Assessment Form				Ulanga	Rufiji	Kilombero	Project
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Average score	Average score	Average score	overall average
Context	1. Purpose	There are no clearly defined management objectives	0				
	Is the purpose of the NRM area defined?	The management objectives are defined but not implemented	1				
		The management objectives are defined but only partially implemented	2	2	2	2	2
		The management objectives are clearly defined and implemented	3				
	2. User group	Members are not clearly defined	0				
	Are the user group members known and are they informally or formally organised?	Members are clearly defined (by geographically or social group)	1	2	2	2	2
		Members are clearly defined and internally recognize each other	2				
		Members are defined, registered and externally recognized (Association, co-operative, etc)	3				
	3. Boundary of the NRM area	The boundary is not agreed and not known by all key stakeholders	0	3	1	1	2
	Is the boundary of the NRM area agreed and well defined?	The boundary is agreed and known by the user group members but not by other stakeholders	1				
		The boundary of the area is agreed and known by key stakeholders but is not marked	2				
		The boundary of the area is agreed by key stakeholders and demarcated on the ground	3				
	Planning	4. NRM rules or byelaws	There are no rules (byelaws) to regulate use	0			

³ Number depicts score assigned by sample CBOs in the District against issue in the CGMETT tool e.g. Ulanga chose score 2 against the purpose of CBNRM area. Score 2 refers that the management objectives of CBNRM are defined but only partially implemented.

Assessment Form				Ulanga	Rufiji	Kilombero	Project
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Average score	Average score	Average score	overall average
	Are there clearly defined rules (byelaws) that govern the natural resource use?	Rules (byelaws) to regulate use exist but are not adhered to by all stakeholders	1				
		Rules (byelaws) to regulate use exist and are partially adhered to by stakeholders	2	2	2	2	2
		Rules (byelaws) to regulate use exist and are well adhered to by all stakeholders.	3				
	5. Management plan	There is no management plan (written or unwritten) for the area	0				
	Does the area have a natural resource management plan?	A management plan exists (written or unwritten) but is not being implemented	1				
		A management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented	2	3	2	2	2
		A management plan exists and is being implemented	3				
	6. Participatory monitoring and adaptive management	There is no systematic data gathering by members to support management decisions and monitor progress	0				
	Does the user group collect monitoring data to evaluate progress towards management objectives?	Members are collecting some data for progress monitoring and management decision support but the data is not used by management	1				
		Members are regularly collecting some data for progress monitoring and management decision support and the data is sometimes used	2				
Members are regularly collecting data and it is regularly used for progress monitoring and management decisions support		3	2	2	1	2	
Input	7.1 Enforcement system	There is no system of rules and byelaws on use of NRs	0				

Assessment Form				Ulanga	Rufiji	Kilombero	Project
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Average score	Average score	Average score	overall average
	Do the members have a system to set rules or byelaws?	The rules and byelaws are there but they are not very clear or relevant	1				
		The rules and byelaws are there and are mostly clear and relevant	2	2		2	2
		The rules and byelaws are very clear and relevant	3				
	7.2 Compliance	They do not pay attention to rules and bylaws	0				
		They pay very little attention to bylaws and rules	1	2	1	1	1
	Do members of the village or resource users comply with rules and byelaws	The pay sometime attention to byelaws and rules	2				
		They respect the laws and rules in most cases	3				
	7.3 Enforcement.	There is no enforcement of agreed rules and bylaws	0				
	Does management body enforce the rules and bylaws?	There is very little enforcement	1				
		There is sometime enforcement	2				
		There is enforcement in most cases	3	2	3	2	2
	8. Infrastructure and equipment	There are few or no facilities and equipment for management operations	0				
	Is there sufficient infrastructure and equipment for the natural resources management?	There are some facilities and equipment but these are inadequate	1	1	1	1	1
		There are facilities and equipment that are reasonably maintained but there are still some major gaps	2				
		There are adequate and well-maintained facilities and equipment for effective	3				

Assessment Form				Ulanga	Rufiji	Kilombero	Project
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Average score	Average score	Average score	overall average
		management					
	9. Capacity of the executive body	Executive members have no or very few management or technical skills	0				
	Does the management body have the skills and training required to manage the NRM area, relative to its needs?	Executive members have a low skill level relative to the needs of the area	1	1	1	1	1
		Executive members have an adequate skill level, but it could be further improved	2				
		Executive members skills are good and meet the area's management needs	3				
	10. Current budget	There is no budget for management of the area and it is a serious constraint for management	0	2	1	1	1
	Is the current budget sufficient relative to needs?	The available budget relative to need is inadequate for basic management and presents a serious constraint	1				
		The available budget relative to need is acceptable but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2				
		The available budget is sufficient and meets the management needs of the area	3				
	11. Financial sustainability / revenue	The area does not generate any income (e.g. from resource use, tourism or PES) and the user group do not contribute in any way to the management of the area	0				
	Is the area financially sustainable through revenue generation or	There is little income generated from the area or few contributions from members and the management body could not function adequately	1	1	1	0	1

Assessment Form				Ulanga	Rufiji	Kilombero	Project
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Average score	Average score	Average score	overall average
	through user groups members' contributions in cash or kind?	without outside support					
		There is reasonable income generated from the area or good contribution from members towards management, but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2				
		Secure and adequate financing is generated from the area or contributed by the members for both management and reasonable development needs	3				
Governance	12. Legitimacy	Management body members are self elected or assigned by an external body	0				
	Is the management body elected and representative of different social groups in the user community ?	Management body members are elected by members but different social groups are not represented	1				
		Management body members are elected from different social groups but involvement is limited	2				
		Management body members are elected, different social group members are well represented and actively involved	3	3	3	3	3
	13. Participation in management decisions	User group members have no mechanism to provide input into management decisions informally or formally	0				
	Do user group members have input into management	User group members have mechanisms to provide input into management but these are not exercised	1				

Assessment Form				Ulanga	Rufiji	Kilombero	Project
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Average score	Average score	Average score	overall average
	decisions?	There is a clear mechanism for user group members to participate in making decisions but only a few members are participating or influencing decisions	2				
		There is a clear mechanism for user group members to participate in making decisions and members are regularly participating or influencing decisions	3	3	3	1	2
	14. Transparency	There is no clear operational procedures for financial and other management decision making and this significantly undermines effectiveness	0				
	Are there transparent management procedures?	There are clear operational procedures for financial and other management decision making but implementation is not transparent and available for inspection by users	1				
		There are operational procedures for financial and other management decision making that are transparent and available for inspection by users but could still be improved	2				
		There are clear operational procedures for financial and other management decisions that are transparent and easily available for inspection by users	3	2	2	2	2
	15. Accountability	The executive body's members' roles and responsibility are not clearly defined	0				
	Are there clear mechanisms of upward and downward accountability	The executive body's members' roles and responsibility are partially or clearly defined, but there are no mechanisms to	1				

Assessment Form				Ulanga	Rufiji	Kilombero	Project
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Average score	Average score	Average score	overall average
	for members of the executive body and are these easy to invoke?	replace members who do not adhere to them					
		Executive members role and responsibility are clearly defined, there are mechanisms to replace members who do not adhere to them, but these are difficult to invoke or activate	2	2	2	2	2
		Executive members have clear roles and responsibilities are answerable to their constituency and can easily be replaced if necessary	3				
	16. Adaptive governance	The governance body has no mechanism to change its internal structure, processes and rules in response to lessons learnt and external factors	0	1	1	0	0
	Can and management body respond to lessons learnt and external factors by changing its institutional arrangements?	The governance body has some mechanisms to change its internal structure, processes and rules but these are not exercised	1				
		The governance body has clear mechanisms to change its internal structure, processes and rules and these are partially exercised	2				
		The governance body has clear mechanisms to change its internal structure, processes and rules and these have been or can be fully exercised.	3				
	17.1. Cooperation with government	The management body is not effectively connected to government bodies at different levels and thus there is no support or cooperation	0				

Assessment Form				Ulanga	Rufiji	Kilombero	Project
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Average score	Average score	Average score	overall average
	Is there cooperation support between the management body and different levels (local, regional, central) of government?	The management body is connected to some government bodies at different levels but there is limited support and cooperation	1				
		The management body is connected to different levels of government bodies and there is reasonable support and cooperation	2				
		The management body are effectively connected to government bodies at different levels and there is regular support and cooperation	3	2	3	2	2
	17.2 Cooperation with civil society and NGOs	The management body is not effectively connected to non-government bodies at different levels and thus there is no support or cooperation	0	1	0	0	0
		The management body is connected to some non-government bodies at different levels but there is limited support and cooperation	1				
	Is there cooperation with non government actors and civil society bodies?	The management body is connected to different levels of non-government bodies and there is reasonable support and cooperation	2				
		The management body are effectively connected to non-government bodies at different levels and there is regular support and cooperation	3				
Outcome	18. Equitability of cost and benefit sharing	The balance of benefit and cost sharing is very skewed within group members, such that some members bear the majority of costs, whilst others accrue the	0				

Assessment Form				Ulanga	Rufiji	Kilombero	Project
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Average score	Average score	Average score	overall average
		majority of benefits					
	Are benefit and costs shared equally among user group members?	The cost-benefit balance is skewed within user group members.	1	1	2	1	2
		The cost-benefit balance is slightly skewed within user groups members	2				
		Members are more or less equitably sharing benefits and costs of the NRM area	3				
	19. Status of natural resources and environmental services	Many natural resources and environmental services are being degraded and it is not targeted by the management to improve	0				
	What is the condition of ecological goods and services of the area?	Many natural resources and environmental services are being degraded and the management is not trying to improve their status	1				
		Some natural resources and environmental series are being degraded but the management is striving to improve their status	2	2	2	2	2
		Natural resources and environmental services are essentially intact	3				
		The assessment of the conditions of biodiversity and ecosystem good and services is based on research and/or monitoring	1				
	20. Empowerment	Management decisions are predominantly influenced by external bodies	0				
	Are the user group fully empowered to make management decisions?	User group members partly influence management decisions but there is significant external influence	1				
		User group members are influencing most decisions, but there is some external	2				

Assessment Form				Ulanga	Rufiji	Kilombero	Project
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Average score	Average score	Average score	overall average
		influence					
		User group members are fully empowered to make management decisions for the area	3	2	2	2	2
	21. Livelihoods and well-being of user groups and surrounding communities	The livelihood options and well-being of the user group and the surrounding community have reduced in the short and long term as a result of formation of the NRM area (RW note: No clear livelihood benefits being demonstrated)	0				
	Is the area providing direct and indirect benefits to livelihoods and well-being to the user groups local communities?	The livelihood options and well-being of either the user group or the community have either not been affected or are positively affected as a result of the formation of the area, even if the other group is negatively affected.	1				
		The livelihood options and well-being of both the user group and the surrounding community have at least been neutrally affected as a result of formation of the NRM area	2	2	3	1	2
		The livelihood options and well-being of the user group and the surrounding community have been positively affected in the short and long term as a result of formation of the NRM area	3				
	TOTAL SCORE		145	43	42	36	41

Annex III: Results Disaggregated by CBNRM⁴

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPUGIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHANILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZAMSONA	Average
Context	1. Purpose	There are no clearly defined management objectives	0											
	Is the purpose of the NRM area defined?	The management objectives are defined but not implemented	1											
		The management objectives are defined but only partially implemented	2	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
		The management objectives are clearly defined and implemented	3											
	2. User group	Members are not clearly defined	0											
	Are the user group members known and are	Members are clearly defined (by geographically or social group)	1	3	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2

⁴ Number depicts score assigned by sample CBOs of the CBNRM against issue in the CGMETT tool e.g. ILUMA WMA (Kilombero) chose score 1 against the purpose of CBNRM area. Score 1 refers that the management objectives of ILUMA WMA are defined but not implemented.

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM				
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	Average	
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average	
	they informally or formally organised?	Members are clearly defined and internally recognize each other	2												
		Members are defined, registered and externally recognized (Association, co-operative, etc)	3												
	3. Boundary of the NRM area	The boundary is not agreed and not known by all key stakeholders	0	3	3	2	3	1	0	1	0	3	1	1	
	Is the boundary of the NRM area agreed and well defined?	The boundary is agreed and known by the user group members but not by other stakeholders	1												
		The boundary of the area is agreed and known by key stakeholders but is not marked	2												
		The boundary of the area is agreed by key stakeholders and demarcated on the ground	3												
	Planning	4. NRM rules or byelaws	There are no rules (byelaws) to regulate use	0											

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	Average
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
	Are there clearly defined rules (byelaws) that govern the natural resource use?	Rules (byelaws) to regulate use exist but are not adhered to by all stakeholders	1											
		Rules (byelaws) to regulate use exist and are partially adhered to by stakeholders	2	0	2	2	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	2
		Rules (byelaws) to regulate use exist and are well adhered to by all stakeholders.	3											
	5. Management plan	There is no management plan (written or unwritten) for the area	0											
	Does the area have a natural resource management plan?	A management plan exists (written or unwritten) but is not being implemented	1											
		A management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2
		A management plan exists and is being implemented	3											

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	Average
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
	6. Participatory monitoring and adaptive management	There is no systematic data gathering by members to support management decisions and monitor progress	0											
	Does the user group collect monitoring data to evaluate progress towards management objectives?	Members are collecting some data for progress monitoring and management decision support but the data is not used by management	1											
		Members are regularly collecting some data for progress monitoring and management decision support and the data is sometimes used	2											
		Members are regularly collecting data and it is regularly used for progress monitoring and management decisions support	3	0	1	0	0	3	3	3	1	3	3	2

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM				
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHANILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZAMSONA	Average	
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average	
Input	7.1 Enforcement system	There is no system of rules and byelaws on use of NRs	0												
	Do the members have a system to set rules or byelaws?	The rules and byelaws are there but they are not very clear or relevant	1												
		The rules and byelaws are there and are mostly clear and relevant	2	1	1	0	1	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	
		The rules and byelaws are very clear and relevant	3												
	7.2 Compliance	They do not pay attention to rules and bylaws	0												
		They pay very little attention to bylaws and rules	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	
		Do members of the village or resource users comply with rules and byelaws	2												
		They respect the laws and rules in most cases	3												

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	Average
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
	7.3 Enforcement.	There is no enforcement of agreed rules and bylaws	0											
	Does management body enforce the rules and bylaws?	There is very little enforcement	1											
		There is sometime enforcement	2											
		There is enforcement in most cases	3	1	1	3	2	3	3	3	1	2	3	2
	8. Infrastructure and equipment	There are few or no facilities and equipment for management operations	0								0			
	Is there sufficient infrastructure and equipment for the natural resources management?	There are some facilities and equipment but these are inadequate	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1		1	1	1
		There are facilities and equipment that are reasonably maintained but there are still some major gaps	2											

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	Average
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
		There are adequate and well-maintained facilities and equipment for effective management	3											
	9. Capacity of the executive body	Executive members have no or very few management or technical skills	0											
	Does the management body have the skills and training required to manage the NRM area, relative to its needs?	Executive members have a low skill level relative to the needs of the area	1	2	1	0	1	1	2	2	0	1	2	1
		Executive members have an adequate skill level, but it could be further improved	2											
		Executive members skills are good and meet the area's management needs	3											
	10. Current budget	There is no budget for management of the area and it is a serious constraint for management	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	2	0	1	1	1

				WMA				BMU			PFM			
Assessment Form				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA		KIPU GIRA	MBUTI		UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
	Is the current budget sufficient relative to needs?	The available budget relative to need is inadequate for basic management and presents a serious constraint	1											
		The available budget relative to need is acceptable but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2											
		The available budget is sufficient and meets the management needs of the area	3											
	11. Financial sustainability / revenue	The area does not generate any income (e.g. from resource use, tourism or PES) and the user group do not contribute in any way to the management of the area	0											

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM				
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	Average	
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average	
	Is the area financially sustainable through revenue generation or through user groups members' contributions in cash or kind?	There is little income generated from the area or few contributions from members and the management body could not function adequately without outside support	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	
		There is reasonable income generated from the area or good contribution from members towards management, but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2												
		Secure and adequate financing is generated from the area or contributed by the members for both management and reasonable development needs	3												
Governance	12. Legitimacy	Management body members are self elected or assigned by	0												

				WMA				BMU			PFM			
Assessment Form				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA		KIPU GIRA	MBUTI		UHANILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZAMSONA	
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
		an external body												
	Is the management body elected and representative of different social groups in the user community?	Management body members are elected by members but different social groups are not represented	1											
		Management body members are elected from different social groups but involvement is limited	2											
		Management body members are elected, different social group members are well represented and actively involved	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	13. Participation in management decisions	User group members have no mechanism to provide input into management decisions informally or formally	0											
	Do user group members have input into management decisions?	User group members have mechanisms to provide input into management but these are not	1											

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	Average
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
		exercised												
		There is a clear mechanism for user group members to participate in making decisions but only a few members are participating or influencing decisions	2											
		There is a clear mechanism for user group members to participate in making decisions and members are regularly participating or influencing decisions	3	1	3	3	2	3	3	3	0	3	3	2
	14. Transparency	There is no clear operational procedures for financial and other management decision making and this significantly undermines effectiveness	0											

				WMA				BMU			PFM			
Assessment Form				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA		KIPU GIRA	MBUTI		UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
	Are there transparent management procedures?	There are clear operational procedures for financial and other management decision making but implementation is not transparent and available for inspection by users	1											
		There are operational procedures for financial and other management decision making that are transparent and available for inspection by users but could still be improved	2											
		There are clear operational procedures for financial and other management decisions that are transparent and easily available for inspection by users	3	1	2	1	1	3	3	3	2	2	3	2

Assessment Form				WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA		KIPU GIRA	MBUTI		UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
	15. Accountability	The executive body's members' roles and responsibility are not clearly defined	0											
	Are there clear mechanisms of upward and downward accountability for members of the executive body and are these easy to invoke?	The executive body's members' roles and responsibility are partially or clearly defined, but there are no mechanisms to replace members who do not adhere to them	1											
		Executive members role and responsibility are clearly defined, there are mechanisms to replace members who do not adhere to them, but these are difficult to invoke or activate	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
		Executive members have clear roles and responsibilities are answerable to their constituency and can easily be replaced if necessary	3											

Assessment Form				WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA		KIPU GIRA	MBUTI		UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
	16. Adaptive governance	The governance body has no mechanism to change its internal structure, processes and rules in response to lessons learnt and external factors	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Can and management body respond to lessons learnt and external factors by changing its institutional arrangements?	The governance body has some mechanisms to change its internal structure, processes and rules but these are not exercised	1											
		The governance body has clear mechanisms to change its internal structure, processes and rules and these are partially exercised	2											
		The governance body has clear mechanisms to change its internal structure, processes and rules and these have been or can be fully exercised.	3											

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	Average
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
	17.1. Cooperation with government	The management body is not effectively connected to government bodies at different levels and thus there is no support or cooperation	0											
	Is there cooperation support between the management body and different levels (local, regional, central) of government?	The management body is connected to some government bodies at different levels but there is limited support and cooperation	1											
		The management body is connected to different levels of government bodies and there is reasonable support and cooperation	2											
		The management body are effectively connected to government bodies at different levels and there is regular support and	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	2

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	Average
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
		cooperation												
	17.2 Cooperation with civil society and NGOs	The management body is not effectively connected to non-government bodies at different levels and thus there is no support or cooperation	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
		The management body is connected to some non-government bodies at different levels but there is limited support and cooperation	1											
	Is there cooperation with non-government actors and civil society bodies?	The management body is connected to different levels of non-government bodies and there is reasonable support and cooperation	2											

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	Average
		The management body are effectively connected to non-government bodies at different levels and there is regular support and cooperation	3											
Outcome	18. Equitability of cost and benefit sharing	The balance of benefit and cost sharing is very skewed within group members, such that some members bear the majority of costs, whilst others accrue the majority of benefits	0											
	Are benefit and costs shared equally among user group members?	The cost-benefit balance is skewed within user group members.	1	3	1	3	2	3	1	2	0	1	1	0.6667
		The cost-benefit balance is slightly skewed within user groups members	2											
		Members are more or less equitably sharing benefits and costs of the NRM area	3											

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	Average
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
	19. Status of natural resources and environmental services	Many natural resources and environmental services are being degraded and it is not targeted by the management to improve	0											
	What is the condition of ecological goods and services of the area?	Many natural resources and environmental services are being degraded and the management is not trying to improve their status	1											
		Some natural resources and environmental series are being degraded but the management is striving to improve their status	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2
		Natural resources and environmental services are essentially intact	3											

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	Average
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
		The assessment of the conditions of biodiversity and ecosystem good and services is based on research and/or monitoring	1											
	20. Empowerment	Management decisions are predominantly influenced by external bodies	0											
	Are the user group fully empowered to make management decisions?	User group members partly influence management decisions but there is significant external influence	1											
		User group members are influencing most decisions, but there is some external influence	2											
		User group members are fully empowered to make management decisions for the area	3	1	3	3	2	1	3	2	2	1	3	2

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHA NILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZA MSONA	Average
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
	21. Livelihoods and well-being of user groups and surrounding communities	The livelihood options and well-being of the user group and the surrounding community have reduced in the short and long term as a result of formation of the NRM area (RW note: No clear livelihood benefits being demonstrated)	0											
	Is the area providing direct and indirect benefits to livelihoods and well-being to the user groups local communities?	The livelihood options and well-being of either the user group or the community have either not been affected or are positively affected as a result of the formation of the area, even if the other group is negatively affected.	1											
		The livelihood options and well-being of both the user group and the surrounding community have at	2	1	1	2	1	3	2	3	1	2	3	2

Assessment Form	Issue	Criteria	Score	WMA				BMU			PFM			
				ILUMA-KDC	ILUMA-UDC	JUHIWAN GUMWA	Average	KIPU GIRA	MBUTI	Average	UHANILA	CHOKO A CHOKO PFM	MTANZANSONA	Average
Category	Issue	Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Average	Score	Score	Score	Average
		least been neutrally affected as a result of formation of the NRM area												
		The livelihood options and well-being of the user group and the surrounding community have been positively affected in the short and long term as a result of formation of the NRM area	3											
	TOTAL SCORE		145	30	42	38	37	46	50	48	27	43	48	39