

MT. ELGON REGIONAL ECOSYSTEM CONSERVATION PROGRAMME (MERECP) APPRAISAL REPORT


By

Svein T. Båtvik (team leader), Dir. for Nature Conservation, Norway

John R.S. Kaboggoza, Makerere University

Charity Kabutha, Consultant

Paul Vedeld, Noragric



Noragric Report No. 7

May 2002

**Noragric
Agricultural University of Norway**

The Centre for International Environment and Development Studies, Noragric, is the international gateway for the Agricultural University of Norway's (NLH) twelve departments, associated research institutions and the Norwegian College of Veterinary Medicine in Oslo. Established in 1986, Noragric's contribution to international development lies in the interface between research, education (MSc and PhD programmes) and assignments.

Noragric Reports present findings from various studies and assignments, including programme appraisals and evaluations.

This Noragric Report was commissioned by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) to the Directorate for Nature Management and to Noragric.

Extracts from this publication may only be reproduced after prior consultation with the consultant team leader (S. Båtvik).

Båtvik, Svein T., Noragric Report No. 7 (May, 2002)
Noragric, Centre for International Environment and Development Studies
Agricultural University of Norway (NLH)
P.O. Box 5001
N-1432 Ås
Norway
Tel.: +47 64 94 99 50
Fax: +47 64 94 07 60
Internet: <http://www.nlh.no/noragric>

ISSN: 1502-8127

Photo credits: J.B. Aune, I. Bryceson, I. Jørgensen

Cover design: Spekter Reklamebyrå as, Ås
Printed at: Rotator, Ås.

MT. ELGON REGIONAL ECOSYSTEM CONSERVATION PROGRAMME (MERECP) – APPRAISAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
Executive summary	1
1 Introduction, background, outline, team, etc.	3
2 Assessment of relevance	4
2.1 Relevance relative to national plans and budgets	4
2.2 Coherence with Norwegian development policies and principles	5
2.3 Relevance relative to user's needs and priorities	6
3 Assessment of programme design	8
3.1 Quality of underlying analysis and planning activities	8
3.2 Information needs and knowledge gaps	8
3.3 Consistency (goal, objective, outputs, inputs, budget outline)	11
3.4 Realism (external factors, risk elements)	11
3.5 Assessment of indicators used	12
3.6 The project development process	13
4 Assessment of institutional aspects	15
4.1 Institutional and organisational structure of programme	15
4.2 Regional programme aspects versus national programme aspects	16
4.3 Assessment of involved partners and agencies	18
4.3.1 The role of EAC	18
4.3.2 The role of IUCN	19
4.3.3 The role of key central institutions	20
4.3.4 The role of local government bodies	22
4.3.5 The role of local institutions; CBOs and NGOs	24
4.4 Financial management structure and cash flows	24
4.4.1 Budget by programme items (KRA)	24
4.4.2 Budget by cost items	25
4.4.3 Budget shares by partners	26
4.5 Scope for corruption and measures to counter it, transparency/ accountability	27
5 Assessment of sustainability	29
5.1 Programme features and long term sustainability	29
5.2 Policy support measures	31
5.3 Economic and financial aspects - long term sustainability	31
5.4 Human rights aspects	33
5.5 Environmental aspects	33
5.6 Socio-cultural aspects, including gender	34
5.7 Technical and technological aspects	34
5.8 Impact of HIV/AIDS on programme	35
6 Donor co-ordination with particular reference to the Nile Equatorial Lake Subsidiary Action Programme (NELSAP)	36
6.1 Scope	36
6.2 Roles and responsibilities	36
6.3 Other donors requirements and procedures	37
7 Overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations	38
7.1 Main principles and conditions for planning and implementation	38
7.2 Financial and technical requirements with anticipated inputs from	

partners, Norad and other donors	39
7.3 Division of responsibilities between partners, Norad and other donors	40
7.4 Measures to ensure the partner's administrative capacity, quality assurance, accounting, auditing and reporting	41
7.5 Measures to address gender, human rights, and HIV/AIDS issues, and measures to prevent corruption	41
7.6 Requirements for reviews and evaluations	42
Appendix I – References	43
Appendix 2 – Travel itinerary with meetings	50
Appendix 3 – List of acronyms	53
Appendix 4 – Terms of Reference	54

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A consultancy team of four persons, contracted by Norad, made during April-May 2002 an external review of the programme proposal "Mt. Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme" (MERECP) prepared by IUCN-EARO. The proposal is partly based on two recent national projects dealing with the Mt. Elgon area in both countries.

The MTTI/UWA in Uganda, and KWS/MENR, FD and Mt. Elgon County Council in Kenya will be the main responsible national institutions involved in the MERECP. EAC will constitute the regional umbrella for the programme. National and EAC commitment to the MERECP is outlined, and relevant legislation is discussed. Issues relating to the regional approach, with needs for harmonisation of policies, field activities, research and monitoring, are discussed. Coherence with Norwegian development policies is also outlined.

The programme structure is explained, with Norad as external donor, a Programme Steering Committee led by EAC, a Programme Management Unit, and with IUCN as technical facilitator and responsible for the financial flows. IUCN will subcontract institutions at various levels, including NGOs and CBOs, to perform programme activities.

The MERECP will have an inception phase of about six months during which more detailed activity plans, budget outlines, recruitment of staff, purchase of equipment, and establishment of an agreed work plan will take place.

The general outline of the programme, as well as the participatory process behind its development, is commended. However, the budget proposal has not been developed in the same participatory manner, and it is recommended to revise the budget outline. More resources should generally be spent on field activities, and less resources should be spent on general support to EAC, to IUCN, and to salaries for recruited staff.

A major challenge will be to effectively harmonise the programme into a truly regional effort, and to avoid that the implementation phase will be split into a small regional component and two national components. It will also be a challenge to develop a regional integrated ecosystem management plan for Mt. Elgon.

It is recommended that more focus is set on the knowledge gaps and the needs for more research activities in the MERECP, both in terms of collating what has already been done, and in terms of biodiversity monitoring, ecosystem functioning, and the various interactions between the forest ecosystem and the socio-economic and socio-cultural issues. Research needs might be discussed in a workshop where relevant stakeholders and institutions are invited.

The complicated institutional set-up of the programme, as well as the significant differences between the two countries, are considered to be major risk factors for the success of the MERECP. The collaborative management component will be a particular challenge, as Kenya so far has no official provision for such schemes.

Some appropriate indicators for assessing the success of the programme are given in the proposal, but a more complete set of such indicators remains to be developed.

To foster a better sense of local responsibility and ownership to the programme, it is recommended that IUCN's prominent role is gradually phased out, and given over to local bodies over the 4-5 years' programme period. It is also recommended that the programme activities as far as possible are integrated into mainstream activities like district plans and DEAPs.

The issue of corruption is identified as a major concern to the MERECP, and various ways to curb the problem are discussed. For example, funds will basically not pass through central government agencies under the programme, but through IUCN.

The long term sustainability of MERECP will to a large extent be dependent on the ability to integrate programme activities into mainstream, national and regional activities, and the ability to find ways of future funding of successful activities. Increased revenue from tourism and from well managed forest plantations are particularly promising alternatives in this regard. It is important that local authorities are given better incentives than today, so that a major share of revenue accumulated locally also is retained locally.

Human rights aspects, including resettlement issues; socio-cultural and gender aspects, and the HIV/AIDS problem are discussed in the programme context.

It is probable that some of the projects being developed under the Nile Basin Initiative in the Mt. Elgon area will directly overlap with the MERECP. It is recommended that these efforts are co-ordinated through a continuous liaison system to avoid duplication of efforts. Also for other relevant donor-supported activities in the area it is important to develop effective collaborative routines.

Overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations are summarised in chapter 7 in the appraisal report. Three appendices give selected references, the appraisal team's itinerary during the visit to East Africa, and a list of acronyms.

Trondheim, May 28, 2002.

1. INTRODUCTION, BACKGROUND, OUTLINE, TEAM ETC.

Norad, through the Norwegian Embassy in Kampala, Uganda, has requested an external appraisal of the draft programme proposal "Mt. Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme (MERECP)", prepared by IUCN's Eastern Africa Regional Office (EARO). Terms of Reference for the appraisal, including a general document format, was approved by the Embassy on March 13, 2002.

The appraisal team included the following members:

- * Svein Terje Baatvik, Adviser, Directorate for Nature Management, Trondheim, Norway (team leader)
- * John R.S. Kaboggoza, Dean, Faculty of Forestry & Nature Conservation, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda
- * Charity Kabutha, Gender and Participatory Development Consultant, Nairobi, Kenya
- * Paul Vedeld, Associate Professor, Centre for International Environment and Development Studies (Noragric), Agricultural University of Norway, Ås, Norway

The Team visited East Africa during the period April 23 to May 7, 2002. The travel and meetings itinerary is given in Appendix 2. The consultancy was facilitated by IUCN-EARO through an agreement with the Norwegian Embassy in Kampala. On the Ugandan side the IUCN Country Office in Uganda was responsible for the facilitation, while on the Kenyan side and for the visit to the East African Community (EAC) in Arusha, Tanzania, IUCN-EARO was responsible. The team acknowledges the excellent facilitation made by the IUCN in collaboration with the Norwegian Embassy in Kampala, both in terms of general programme outline, logistics, meeting itineraries and accommodation.

2. ASSESSMENT OF RELEVANCE

2.1 Relevance relative to national plans and budgets

The regional programme is partly based on, and a continuation of, two separate projects in the area; the Mt. Elgon Conservation and Development Project (MECDP) in Uganda (1988-2001) on the Ugandan side, and the Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project (MEICDP; 1998-2001) on the Kenyan side. Both these projects have been evaluated thoroughly, and the general conclusions in all these evaluations have always been that the projects, with appropriate amendments, should continue. Also nationally, the projects have been evaluated and found relevant relative to national and local plans. Biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of natural resources and the environment are priority areas in both countries as well as for EAC. The programme document (PD) has already been approved by the two involved Governments as well as by EAC. In EAC, the Council of Ministers approved the programme proposal as a Regional Programme November 22, 2001.

In Uganda, the whole Mt. Elgon forested area is now a national park under the administration of the Min. of Tourism, Trade and Industry (MTTI), with Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) as the responsible management unit. The legal framework, through the Uganda Wildlife Statute (1996), allows for combining biodiversity and wildlife management with collaborative management, and there are thus no legal constraints for the suggested programme activities. Support to management activities inside the park will also be compatible with Uganda's international commitment to follow up various biodiversity conventions. Even the Constitution (1995) gives priority to the protection of important natural resources. The National Environment Policy (1995) and Statute provides the legal framework for the implementation of a comprehensive National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP) that has been developed through the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), and that has been followed up with District Environmental Action Plans (DEAP). The proposed programme activities are in line with these.

In a broader perspective, and particularly in Uganda, the programme is also considered to be well in line with the Local Administration Government Reform, aiming at devolving power and authority from central to local levels, as well as with the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, with support from the World Bank in both cases. The Local Government Reform is also designed to strengthen the local environmental authorities, although it was not yet very clear if this strengthening would come through NEMA, having no extension officers at the district level at present, the Min. of Lands, Water and Environment (MWLE), having i.a. District Environmental Officers in the districts although these formally are employees of the districts themselves, or the MTTI. However, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) is being set up between UWA and the Min. of Local Government under the current Local Government Reform, and with provisions for inclusion of the Forest Dept. of MWLE. A separate MoU between UWA and IUCN is also being drafted.

In Kenya, according to the project document, "government commitment to conservation and sustainable use of natural resources has been stated in all national development plans since independence. The sessional papers and development plans have also frequently emphasised proper management of natural resources". All this is in line with the overall development goal of the programme. The National Environment Management and Co-ordination Act which was passed by Parliament in 2000, will provide the legal framework for the implementation of NEAP. The Wildlife Act (1977, amended 1989) provides for the protection, management and conservation of wildlife as a vital national and global heritage. The Forest Act's § 385

regulates the management of forests and forest resources. There is, however, little provision for collaborative management in the present Wildlife Act in Kenya. In Kenya, an MoU between the Forest Dept. (FD) and the County Council to manage the Chepkitale National Reserve is being established. There is also an MoU between KWS and the FD from 1997 that KWS considers have led to fruitful collaboration between the two partners.

EAC has a stated policy on fostering co-operation in joint and efficient management and sustainable use of natural resources. Furthermore, EAC has a stated policy on the adoption of common policies for conservation of transboundary ecosystems, and for capacity building programmes.

The PD refers to all the mentioned issues and is clearly relevant to national plans and policies. The programme will act as a complementary support to budget efforts in this field. To what extent it may displace national efforts in the same field may be difficult to judge, but a substantial part of the activities may not be realised without the support of this programme.

The appraisal team was assured both by MTTI in Uganda and by the Min. of Environment and Natural Resources (MENR) in Kenya that the new, regional programme was fully welcomed, and in line with national plans and priorities.

2.2 Coherence with Norwegian development policies and principles

The overall aim for Norwegian development co-operation is to contribute to lasting improvements in economic, social and political conditions for the populations of developing countries. Development assistance should in particular benefit poor and deprived people. Least developed countries are given particular emphasis. Development assistance should be designed so that it seeks to avoid dependence on continued assistance and enhances a genuine recipient responsibility for the various activities embarked upon.

Norwegian development co-operation aims at strengthening the developing countries' own ability and willingness to reduce their poverty problems. It also aims at promoting economically and environmentally sustainable development and to enhance good governance through institutional capacity building in planning and management activities. Important target areas for Norwegian development assistance include the strengthening of sectors such as food production, health, natural resource management, education and the promotion of employment opportunities, in order to ensure that development processes also benefit poor people. Such strategies must be developed and adapted separately for the individual developing country.

General policies on development co-operation are laid down in the Government's annual budget plans and their long-term plans. In addition, the Report to the Parliament no. 19 (1995-96) is giving the present main focus for Norwegian development efforts.

General policies on the environment are laid down in the Strategy for Environment in Development Co-operation (1997-2005) from the Min. of Foreign Affairs. In these policies, four key areas are mentioned:

1. Development of sustainable production systems/management of natural resources
2. Conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity
3. Reduced pollution of soil, air and water
4. Cultural heritage preservation and management of the natural environment's cultural values

In the Agreement between Uganda and Norway for the period 2001-2005, it is a stated aim to support “sub-regional resource and environmental efforts” (Activity Plan, Norad, p. 6). As part of this Mt. Elgon is seen as one possible effort, alongside support to the restructuring of the forest sector. The sub-regional concept also allows for support to the Kenyan side of the Mt. Elgon area, as Norway at present does not have any direct bilateral government support to Kenya.

The appraisal team regards the proposed programme to be well in line with general Norwegian development and environmental specific assistance policies. It combines environment and development activities in a good and innovative way. The team would also remark that the proposed programme in fact covers all four of the environmental priority areas. The programme is well in line with the approved activity plans from the Embassy. The fact that the proposal implies the use of Norwegian development co-operation funds to Kenya has not been problematised in the PD, nor in meetings with relevant parties.

Furthermore, the general outline of the PD, as well as the participatory way it has been developed, is well in line with the ecosystem approach and with the main principles of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), to which both parties are signatories. However, in some of the central institutions that the team visited (notably the KWS), the ecosystem approach in management of reserved areas seems either to be rather unknown, or not to be followed. It will be a challenge for the programme to find good and pragmatic solutions to fulfil the main principles of the CBD and the ecosystem approach in practice, such as:

- Effective conservation of biodiversity
- Sustainable use of biodiversity resources
- Fair and equitable sharing of benefits that results from the sustainable use of the biodiversity

Lastly, it is also a part of the Norwegian development policy to try to ease political tension between neighbouring countries, and this regional programme approach is widely seen as a good way of fostering a better co-operation between Kenya and Uganda. The MERECP might even be used as a leverage to harmonise policies for all the three EAC countries, e.g. on retaining local revenue from reserved areas.

2.3 Relevance relative to user’s needs and priorities

In the PD the key users are defined as the authorities in charge of natural resource management as well as local people and local government bodies working with activities to enhance the livelihood of poor people in the two countries. The programme will clearly be relevant to these groups’ needs and priorities, although the activities to be undertaken in the outreach components should be spelt out more clearly.

There are many good reasons for dealing with Mt. Elgon as one integrated ecosystem, both in terms of National Park management, monitoring of its biodiversity, research activities, tourism activities, and in terms of activities targeting the local population surrounding the reserved areas. The programme is designed to cover all the reserved lands in the Mt. Elgon area, as well as a “buffer zone” of roughly 5-10 km below the reserves’ borders.

Some co-operation in Mt. Elgon between Uganda and Kenya has already been undertaken, i.e. on illegal tree cutting, encroachments, smuggling and poaching. There are also plans to establish the reserved areas of Mt. Elgon as a transboundary Biosphere Reserve under UNESCO’s World Heritage Sites system, and KWS has approached the FD and the County

Council for a possible inclusion of the Forest Reserves and the National Reserve in these plans.

A main problem on the Kenyan side has been that some of the illegal activities, in particular illegal logging, has been facilitated through influential politicians. The FD in Kenya also admits that the loss of forest land through excisions in the Mt. Elgon area is not so much based on the needs of poor, local people, but rather on influential people taking land.

The differences between the institutional set-up and the legislative framework between Uganda and Kenya are quite substantial. For instance, in Uganda non-consumptive uses of resources inside the National Park in a collaborative management system are encouraged, while on the Kenyan side, the Mt. Elgon National Park (MENP) will still be "strictly conserved", while the Forest Reserves and the National Reserve may be opened up for non-consumptive uses. It will therefore probably be difficult to regionally co-ordinate many of the activities among the local constituencies, and there is a clear risk that the programme will have to operate on three levels:

1. Regional programme activities that can be shared (more or less) between the two countries (e.g. biodiversity monitoring and management, patrolling, tourism)
2. Programme activities that are particularly adapted for implementation in Uganda (e.g. collaborative management with the local communities)
3. Programme activities that are particularly adapted for implementation in Kenya (e.g. collaborative management with the local communities).

This issue is discussed in more detail in section 4.2 below.

It will be a challenge for the facilitator of the programme, as well as for the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) and the Programme Management Unit (PMU), to accommodate as many as possible of the user's needs and priorities into a regional context. Even for the tourism/ecotourism sector to the Mt. Elgon area, being one of the most promising issues to consider in a regional context, there might be particular difficulties, as Uganda is promoting tourism mainly through the UWA and MTTI, while in Western Kenya tourism is promoted through a private company.

3. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMME DESIGN

A crucial part of a project design is its organisational structure. However, this issue is discussed in section 4 under institutional aspects. In the present section the underlying analysis, knowledge needs, consistency, realism, and assessment of the indicators suggested to evaluate the programme performance are discussed.

3.1 Quality of underlying analysis and planning activities

The general approach in the programme proposal is sound; to link up the idea of a holistic ecosystem approach to administrative systems in two different countries. It is assumed that over time and through dialogue it shall be possible to harmonise legal frameworks, and even to harmonise practical and economic management issues both on biodiversity management and to some extent on tourism and on local collaborative activities. How far these ambitions reach in terms of regional harmonisation are not quite clear from the proposal. Again, efforts to substantiate these ideas should be made during the initial phase of the programme.

A major problem is that many activities are planned for, but not described at all in the PD. The proposal does neither adequately address the scope for collaborative activities in terms of how many villages and people to involve, and in what kinds of activities. This makes this part of the appraisal difficult. One might argue that the proposal assumes a process-oriented approach involving relevant stakeholders in such planning as the programme moves along. However, it is recommended that during the initial period of six months, this process must have resulted in some major decisions regarding the scope and extent of these activities.

A major point relating to the underlying analysis and planning activities is still that the proposed organisational structure may not be optimally designed to cater for harmonised activities, and in particular for the more long-term capacity building of institutions and for the local ownership to the programme focal ideas.

3.2 Information needs and knowledge gaps

The proposal has as Key Result Area (KRA) 2: “Conservation status and biodiversity value better understood and improved, and awareness generated at the local and international levels to ensure the sustainability of management and conservation” (p. 22). The following topics are suggested as studies and assessments to achieve this goal (the listing has been slightly rearranged from the PD):

1. Better understanding of the biodiversity of Mt. Elgon, in its broadest sense of species, communities and ecosystems
2. Vegetation changes and land use patterns
3. Catchment protection and restoration of degraded areas
4. Better understanding of tenure status of the land and resources in and around the reserved areas, including traditional rights
5. An economic valuation of the goods and services that the ecosystem provides to rural people and also to more distant stakeholder groups
6. A study of the sustainable off-take levels for resources harvested from the forests by various communities living adjacent to the ecosystem
7. A study on the mechanisms by which policies and laws that affect the ecosystem can be harmonised

8. A comprehensive analysis of all the information collected using GIS as the basis. This will mean that specific provisions should be made in the programme design for a robust GIS capacity at field level
9. Development of criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management
10. An evaluation of how plantation forestry can contribute to the conservation of the ecosystem.

The relevant information gathered should be well integrated in planning and management activities and also lead to improved management of the biodiversity resources and to the implementation of conducive policies. The results should be made widely available.

The list of topics seems generally warranted, and they are in line with issues raised in the two national workshops and the regional meeting. However, the listing still lacks to some degree some overall analytical or thematic coherence. There is furthermore nothing said about the organisation of this work and the institutional anchoring of the efforts. Below some inputs along these lines are given.

As can be seen in Appendix 1, there are a number of technical reports and sporadic research already undertaken under the former projects in Uganda and Kenya. In addition, several national and international universities have carried out research in some relevant fields over the years. Much of this research, however, is at present not compiled systematically. The appraisal team suspects that the available studies and publications have been carried out as needs occur and have not been following any coherent information and knowledge compiling strategy.

Based on the team's rather superficial knowledge; relevant departments of Makerere University have carried out research on the Ugandan side of Mt. Elgon. On the Kenyan side; research has been noted from the National Museum and from KEFRI. Additionally, international research institutions such as the Universities of Aberdeen, Dundee, Manchester and Marburg, and the Agricultural University of Norway have all undertaken research in the Mt. Elgon area.

In the new regional programme, the team recommends an approach along the following lines:

1. Direct information and knowledge needs for the programme to carry out planned activities
2. The conscious generation of a long-term knowledge base, including basic research efforts.

1. The project will need direct information and knowledge for the management of programme activities relating to the biodiversity. The programme implementers will also need more knowledge about socio-economic, cultural, agronomic and technical issues on adjacent stakeholders' livelihoods and adaptations in order to identify well-founded strategies for the future. In the context of a regional programme, one may also consider the needs for comparative and bridging or merging research between the two countries; both on natural and social science research.

2. Concerning long-term research topics for the project, this is an issue for a separate elaboration beyond the scope of this consultancy and it is not explicitly discussed in the PD. However, some of the topics suggested in the proposal as studies and assessments will require more long-term research inputs. In our opinion, one should therefore also consider to initiate and encourage research in the Mt. Elgon area of a more long-term character. This does not

have to be financed only by the programme, but one could facilitate processes that could attract national and international research institutions to use Mt. Elgon as a case study area.

Some points for reflection along these lines might be:

A. An ecological baseline study on biodiversity resources within the natural forests and a set-up of a continuous monitoring research on the population of selected species could be considered. This could be relevant e.g. for vegetation succession studies and natural regeneration in areas where people have lived or encroached. One possibility might be to hire M.Sc. or Ph.D. students from e.g. Makerere and Moi Universities to study and to monitor the biodiversity. Also the National Museums in Kenya, with interests in long-term monitoring of selected biodiversity issues in the Mt. Elgon ecosystem, might be a relevant partner on the Kenyan side

B. A socio-economic baseline study and a set-up of a continuous monitoring research could be considered. This could be relevant e.g. for the degree of success of collaborative activities, who carries them out, who benefits from them, involvement of different stakeholders, etc.

C. The experiences from past resettlement activities relative to proposed new resettlements

D. Interdisciplinary research on the effects of in-forest activities on the natural resource base and people's livelihoods, including estimations of sustainable use and effects of bamboo harvesting, medicinal plants, grass cutting, etc., and including the local people's present degree of dependence on the biodiversity of the reserved areas. Who are the beneficiaries of the sustainable use of natural forest resources?

E. Research on the management of conserved areas and adjacent areas on issues relating to transboundary management, communication across and between administrative structures, etc. How are the current links between local incentives to promote tourism in the area and the current channelling of actual revenues from this activity?

The impression from the field visits on how records were kept and organised leaves a feeling that the new programme could benefit from improving the organisation and record-keeping of the substantial and very interesting information and knowledge gathered through the former project activities. It might be beneficial for the new programme to facilitate for involving relevant national research institutions like Makerere University and/or Moi and Egerton Universities or the National Museums of Kenya and with links to international research institutions with relevant experience from the area. This unit could systematically review the present status of knowledge and identify possible areas of research and development activities for the future. A research and education centre could possibly be placed either in a national research institution and/or be linked to a project station; preferably within the area. A broad and comprehensive documentation strategy is generally regarded as well warranted, especially if the new programme is to be seen as a pilot and demonstration activity.

The appraisal team recommends that during the inception phase of the programme, IUCN should take the responsibility to arrange a workshop where research needs within the programme are discussed. One of the challenges will be research on how to strike a balance between what can be defined as sustainable use of biodiversity resources as compared to activities that cannot be allowed. The primary contributors to this workshop would be the relevant national research institutions from both countries, as well as possible international

research structures. The workshop should also aim at developing an information strategy concerning programme-related needs:

- Information stocktaking; what is the present state of the art in the two countries?
- In what fields should more studies be undertaken?
- What should be the time plans for such studies?
- Identification and inclusion of partners in such activities.

3.3 Consistency (goal, objective, outputs, inputs, budget outline)

The proposed size of the programme will probably not be substantial enough to meet the overall goal: “Biodiversity, ecological functions and intrinsic values of the Mt. Elgon ecosystem are conserved for present and future generations of the regional and global communities”. It may be argued that “building a regional partnership between the two countries” is seen as may be an equally important goal for some of the involved stakeholders.

It is important to realise that the key to managing such ecosystems sustainably, is to manage and monitor the human activities that affects the ecosystem. In this case, such activities will to a large extent be based on sustainable use of the ecosystem resources by the local population surrounding the reserved areas. It will therefore be important to think both in terms of increasing the size of sustainable collaborative management measures at the local level in both countries, but also to establish “model” activities that can spread and promote sustainable ways of management and sustainable ways of equitable sharing of the benefits coming from these natural resources also after the external funding has been phased out. Opportunities for sharing positive experiences should be maximised between the countries as well as between different local communities within the two countries.

Consistency in terms of objectives, outputs, inputs and budget outline is discussed in detail in section 4.1 and 4.4.

3.4 Realism (external factors, risk elements)

There are many factors, internal or external, that may threaten the success of the programme.

A main internal concern is related to the organisational structure. The obvious differences between the institutional set-up of the two countries may cause difficulties in establishing a truly regional perspective on the programme activities. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that even within each of the countries there are tensions between involved institutions regarding responsibilities and different opinions towards key elements of the programme, e.g. related to ecosystem approach principles, CBD principles and collaborative management schemes. There are also substantial political, legislative and land tenure differences between the two countries that might result in many programme activities in reality having to be national in their approach. This issue is discussed further in section 4.2.

The collaborative management scheme is a central activity for the MERECP. It is important to secure that collaborative management activities do not endanger the biodiversity resources. However, it is a problem for the programme that Kenya still does not have official provisions for such collaborative management (see further discussion under 4.3.3). The problem is not addressed in the PD.

The rather complicated institutional set-up of the programme is clearly also a critical factor. It will be a challenge to achieve a smooth working relationship between the PSC, headed by EAC, the PMU, the IUCN as technical facilitator, and the external donor, as well as achieving

a smooth working relationship between these programme structures and the established official and private structures, including NGOs and CBOs, having various responsibilities and roles in the area. This issue is discussed further in section 4.3.

The appraisal team would also like to mention two external risk factors:

The role and dependence of external donors or outside funding in the future is clearly a problem if the programme ideas and activities cannot be sustained on their own.

Secondly, on both sides of the border in the Mt. Elgon area there are security problems. Some of these are based on political tension and unrest, particularly on the Kenyan side. On both sides there are additional problems of cattle rustling which are more based on local cultural "traditions" in the surrounding areas. With cattle raiders now often being equipped with modern weapons, such incidents tend to become more violent and harmful than before. The general security issues of the area are therefore still posing a significant risk element for the programme.

It is recommended that shared, transboundary patrolling to enhance security is considered as a part of the regional activities within the programme.

3.5 Assessment of indicators used

In Annex 2 of the PD, LFA tables are presented. The six Key Result Areas (KRA) are here described with the following indicators:

KRA 1. Protected and reserve area management and administrative systems strengthened.

The indicators suggested here are reasonable, but it might be added that one should start this work with the production of an institutional development and competence development plan based on an appraisal of the present state of the art. What are the key needs on competence, on-the-job training, staff upgrading, IT, GIS, and other present bottlenecks?

KRA 2. Conservation status and biodiversity value better understood and improved, and awareness generated at the local and international levels to ensure the sustainability of management and conservation.

Most of the indicators under this item are not yet developed, although the few indicators included seem relevant.

KRA 3. Effective collaboration with institutional partners and neighbouring communities established and maintained.

Most of the indicators under this item are not yet developed, although the few indicators included seem relevant. Poverty reduction and livelihood issues are not well reflected in the PD. According to IUCN, this was deliberately excluded for not pre-empting a free and open process during the inception phase of the programme.

KRA 4. Financial sustainability of the different reserved areas enhanced.

Most of the indicators under this item are not yet developed. This should have been done. Related regional harmonisation activities, such as trying to retain generated revenue shares locally to improve the incentive structure, could also have been included.

KRA 5. Transboundary systems and process for the conservation of Mt. Elgon developed.

Most of the indicators under this item are not yet developed. The few listed, may be regarded as unnecessarily weak, and probably reflect a lack of willingness or ability to be clear on this issue.

KRA 6. Programme effectively managed, monitored and evaluated.

Indicators given under this item are considered to be adequate.

It is a general problem that many of the indicators cannot be stated at the present stage because goals and activities are not yet in place, but are supposed to come as a result of the inception phase. This means that the issue of indicators should be revisited again after the initial planning period is over. The appraisal team's suggestions for activities to be added to the programme should also, to the extent they are adopted, be assigned separate indicators.

Some of the proposed indicators are easy to monitor and evaluate, while others will be more difficult. Two of the more important indicators will be the development of the number of tourists visiting the National Park, and the amount of revenue being withheld by the local administrations, and channelled to the involved communities during the lifetime of MERECP.

3.6 The project development process

The PD describes the process behind development of this programme (chapter 2.5). The former national projects have been running for 12 years in Uganda and for almost three years in Kenya. The PD has apparently been developed in a thorough participatory process involving stakeholders from parish/location levels, districts, national institutions and EAC. Because IUCN has been working in the area for a long time, it seems reasonable to assume that the goals, activities and key result areas are in line with "demand driven approaches".

These planning processes led up to draft suggestions that were finally discussed in a "High Level Consultative Meeting" in Nairobi, August 15, 2001, where the main guidelines for the final programme proposal were outlined. In this meeting six people from IUCN and five representatives from UWA, KWS, FD in Kenya, and the two main Ministries in charge in the two countries participated. The final draft was then developed further by IUCN and submitted along with a budget outline for the programme. According to the minutes, the budget was not discussed in the high level meeting.

In general, the planning process seems to have been good in the sense that most relevant stakeholders from village level to EAC have been involved. However, the appraisal team has felt that the budget outline has not been item for the same type of participatory scrutiny. This is deplorable as the budget outline has very important bearings on relative priorities within the programme.

The PD suggests that the programme is given an initial period for planning of the more detailed activities. However, at present there are no descriptions in the PD on phasing out of activities or on the devolution of responsibility from IUCN to local level bodies, and there are no clear recommendations to address these issues during the inception phase.

At the national level not all key institutions are well informed about the final programme proposal, and even less on the budget contents. This situation might become a problem at a later stage in the programme implementation process.

The appraisal team therefore recommends:

1. A revised budget must be approved by the PSC in the first annual meeting after the initial planning period. If this inception period should last for six months or more should be discussed with relevant parties.
2. The final draft proposal should be sent to all relevant stakeholders for comments before the detailed planning phase starts, including the budget.
3. A process plan should be developed in the initial planning period, whereby the future role of IUCN is gradually tuned down, and where local bodies are identified to take over further implementation, or the possible phasing out of activities by the end of the programme period. Such a mechanism would imply that more and more of the responsibilities for the financial flows are transferred from IUCN and to the involved national institutions represented by local authorities, NGOs and CBOs that actually are implementing the programme's activities during the planned 4.5 years programme duration. This might foster a better sense of local responsibility for the programme activities as well as easing the transition phase from a donor-supported scheme to a self-sustaining process.
4. Norad should take a decision if changes in the PD are desirable before it is submitted for final decision-making; in particular on budget priorities and on the inclusion of a process plan for the overall programme.

3 ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

A crucial part of a programme design is its organisational structure; what actors are selected to be involved, and what arenas are to be established where actors meet. The structure also involves the physical limitations of the problems addressed and the selected activities undertaken. Organisational structure further involves distribution of power, resources, authority, rights and duties and how processes for decision-making and for programme progress are structured.

4.1 Institutional and organisational structure of programme

According to the PD (p. 15), the institutional and organisational structure of the regional programme will be the following:

- The key partner institutions will be the EAC, UWA and the FD in Uganda, and the KWS, the FD. and Mt. Elgon County Council in Kenya
- The five involved districts (Mbale, Kapchorwa and Sironko in Uganda; Trans Nzoia and Mt. Elgon in Kenya), together with relevant institutions such as NGOs and CBOs are also planned to be included
- Programme activities will be implemented through key partner institutions and is supposed to be integrated with their work programmes and policies, through the PSC arena
- IUCN will play the co-ordination role between the partner institutions as well as providing appropriate technical support for management of the ecosystem; through the PMU. All financial resources will be routed through IUCN
- The "geographical unit" comprises the two National Parks, the two Forest Reserves and one National Reserve, together with an area within approximately 5 – 10 km from the reserved area boundaries
- The PSC, led by EAC, has the main overall strategic and guiding functions, approves plans, budgets and reports, and provides linkages to government ministries and processes
- The PMU, led by a Project Team Leader appointed by IUCN-EARO, will be responsible for the daily management and implementation of the programme and will be directly answerable to IUCN
- All actors e.g. on local (parish/location) or district level carrying out field activities will be contracted by PMU
- An ecosystem management plan will be developed within the first six months and serve as the basis for regional and national interventions.

The institutional structure of MERECp is complex and with many levels of authority and responsibility. However, the structure proposed in the PD is logical and consistent, but still there are many detailed arrangements that are not addressed. The weakest part may be the exact sharing of responsibility between the three main formal levels in the programme outline; the PSC (with representatives from EAC and all the major involved institutions at national level in both countries), the PMU, and the IUCN as the technical and financial facilitator. In addition to these three levels is Norad, represented by the Norwegian Embassy in Kampala, will be the donor institution for the whole programme, and will also have a role as external reviewer and with monitoring responsibility as related to the impact of the disbursed funds.

It is not very clear which people will be represented in the PMU, and a general recommendation from the appraisal team would be to ensure that adequate representation from local stakeholders is secured, both to achieve sustainability of activities, to build local constituencies for the future, and to make sure programme activities are embedded in the

district plans. Anyway, DEAP activities should be co-ordinated with both programme and other district level activities, preferably through some co-ordinating bodies.

4.2 Regional programme aspects versus national programme aspects

The overall goal of the regional programme is stated to be that “biodiversity, ecosystem functions and the intrinsic values of Mt. Elgon ecosystem are conserved for present and future generations of the local and global communities” and the programme’s purpose is stated to be that “regional systems and processes are developed and applied for the sustainable management and equitable sharing of the benefits of Mt. Elgon ecosystem”. It is thus possible to identify two proposed ambitions concerning activities and expected outputs. The appraisal team wants to stress that these two activity ambitions, although interlinked, assume or presuppose partly different organisational structures and processes. However, the relative priority of biodiversity versus collaborative management activities in the field is not explicitly described in the PD. Some priorities may be interpreted through the proposed budget allocations (see further discussion in section 4.4). As long as especially the collaborative management activities are not described in detail in the PD, the appraisal team will refrain from further discussions on this topic.

1. There is a regional ambition related to a harmonised management of a vulnerable resource. From this ambition, collaborative activities could be seen as necessary means to reach the overall goal. The increased benefit sharing may reduce the pressure on biodiversity resources and could thus be a cost-efficient instrument to reach the overall goal. The appraisal team sees this ambition as a critical element in view of the limited resources that apparently are planned to be earmarked for such activities.

Some of the critical issues that are not adequately addressed in the present PD include, e.g.:

- A common policy/level of co-operation between UWA and KWS on biodiversity management; on wildlife, forests/vegetation, poaching, etc.
- A common policy/level of co-operation between UWA and KWS on tourism management, border issues and economic co-operation
- A common policy/level of co-operation between UWA and KWS on collaborative activities management
- The level of co-operation and “harmonisation” between the two sets of national district and local level authorities.

2. There is also a national ambition in the two countries and for the donor to reduce poverty and to secure some level of equitable benefit sharing. Local participation is here seen more as a goal in its own right, with attempts to compensate for deprivation of previous access to certain areas in order to increase the legitimacy of exclusion of access. However, the PD is not clear on the overall spatial ambition of the outreach component. If one wants to cover all the five districts at parish/location levels in the two countries, this would involve some 1000 villages and maybe as much as 1.3 million people. This would have serious bearings, apart from the budget, on the overall institutional structure as mentioned above.

These two ambitions are to some extent linked in the PD. However, both based on the budget outline and in discussions with staff at different levels, the appraisal team has got the impression that collaborative management to some extent is seen more as an input to the overall goal more than a goal in itself. In a project like this, a basic concern is that implementing dual objectives where biodiversity conservation and local collaboration for development are merged may in one sense be seen as complementary activities, but obviously

the activities can also threaten each other. It is therefore crucial to design processes to form legitimacy for both sets of activities for the different stakeholders within the programme. In the proposal, there are no structures outlined for participatory monitoring systems of the biodiversity management resources, nor for the livelihood effects of the collaborative activities. These are crucial issues to address during the inception phase of the programme.

The ambition levels need to be clarified. An overarching ambition that would combine some of the goals would be to establish Mt. Elgon as one National Park, run by one responsible organisation and with one unified staff, and with a separate economic and legal status. Politically speaking it would most likely be difficult to formulate such a goal; but it is at least an example of a clear and explicit ambition.

This dilemma is also reflected in the choice of institutional and organisational set-up. The regional concern, with EAC's secretariat role and also the suggested location of the PMU in Tororo, away from the reserved areas of Mt. Elgon, highlights the priority of the regional ambition. If the collaborative management ambition had been ranked higher, more funds and clearer descriptions of local partners and activities would have been reflected in the PD. Probably, even the PMU location would then have been set closer to where field activities are to be undertaken.

At district and local levels, no particular organisational structure is depicted, and at this stage it is therefore quite open which local bodies will be involved in the programme. No guidelines or descriptions of control checks for who are getting contracts and how these should be implemented are given. Furthermore, the proposal does not state to what extent co-operation between local government bodies will be necessary.

Concludingly, among the many different project components; one regional biodiversity ambition and two national local participation ambitions are evident. This is also reflected in the budget proposal, analysed in section 4.4 below. Relative to institutional structure it means that there will be sets of activities and actors monitored by the PMU, but executed by quite different bodies and organisations ranging from EAC and down to local parish, location or village levels. The transaction costs incurred by this complicated structure may be so high that the value of the programme as a pilot and demonstration programme may be unnecessarily limited.

The appraisal team does not want to recommend detailed suggestions to approach this problem. A general request might be to simplify the organisational structure through consciously constraining the number of involved stakeholders and steering levels throughout the initial planning period. Additionally, clear provision for reporting frequency and contents, for auditing procedures, and for the ambitions of implementing income-generating activities and poverty alleviation activities at the local level must be established.

The appraisal team recommends that some provisions for handling of disputes or disagreements are added to the PD.

Norad's detailed responsibilities in their role as external donor must also be clarified during this inception phase of the programme. For the former MEICDP project in Kenya, the Dutch Embassy was itself a member of the PSC. In the PD, it is also recommended that Norad is given a seat in the PSC of MERECP. However, Norad very clearly opposed such a model in the debriefing meeting at the Embassy. Any donor can of course choose a participatory/

contributing function or a controlling function in collaborative efforts. Given Norad's firm position on its role, the appraisal team has chosen not to discuss merits of the different possible roles.

The geographical location of the PMU is a difficult problem. Although the appraisal team acknowledges the arguments that have been raised in favour of such a solution, it is not convinced that Tororo is the best solution. Possibly, both Kitale and Mbale, being situated inside the programme area, would be better choices. Even the former MECDP project in Uganda has been criticised for not establishing the project's offices under the same roof as the National Park administration, arguing this to be an unsustainable solution in the long term. Also the former Chief Technical Adviser for MECDP has argued strongly that an establishment of a new PMU headquarter for the regional project away from the reserved areas in both countries would be a problematic solution. It is suggested that Norad discusses this matter with the involved stakeholders.

Experience from similar programmes shows the importance of taking into account local heterogeneity. Such heterogeneity not only relates to biodiversity, to wildlife, vegetation and forests, but even more to agro-ecological diversity and to socio-economic and cultural variations, within and between villages, districts and regions. The appraisal team acknowledges that implementers seem to have a good local knowledge, but still considers that such issues should have been more explicitly treated in the PD. Some simple examples relate to the rather big differences in population densities, agro-ecological conditions, ethnic variations, and tenure systems between the two countries and also between the northern and southern parts of the area.

Much of the comments above reflect to some extent that the PD is based on activities that are already in place and on already established project routines. Some of these activities may be continued almost unaltered, but the appraisal team recommends to spend the inception phase of the programme to address the critical issues raised here into a revised project document and workplan.

4.3 Assessment of involved partners and agencies

4.3.1 The role of EAC

EAC's role is important as an umbrella structure for regional programmes. Its main role is to support the programme within a framework of building political partnership, and to promote transboundary harmonisation of sustainable collaborative management relating to Mt. Elgon. However, EAC has stressed that they will follow the "principle of subsidiarity" and give most of the responsibility for the implementation of the programme to the involved countries. Furthermore, EAC stressed that "building partnerships" also means partnerships with the local communities. EAC was concerned that adequate resources should be spent on poverty alleviation activities, and comparatively less resources should be spent on salaries, facilitation, meetings, workshops, etc.

Initially, it was thought that a separate environment/ecosystem unit would be created under the Sectoral Committee on Environment and Natural Resources to enable the EAC to handle transboundary ecosystems including Mt. Elgon. However, following the rejection of such a proposal by the EAC Council of Ministers, a small co-ordination unit of three persons from the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources was formed. This unit will be responsible for supervising and advising on the MERECP regional activities. The unit might a

Programme Officer who will be paid from the programme funds to assist in the day-to-day liaison with PMU. This Officer will also prepare documents for the PSC meetings.

The Programme Steering Committee (PSC) under the chairmanship of the EAC Sectoral Committee on Environment and Natural Resources will have the overall responsibility for the programme. It will:

- * Approve both the overall four-year work plan to be developed during the inception phase, and the annual work plans and budgets
- * Approve the semi-annual and annual reports and accounts
- * Provide strategic direction and policy guidance to the programme
- * Provide linkages to government ministries and processes in Kenya and Uganda.

However, it is a complicating factor that EAC also has established a Sectoral Committee on Tourism and Wildlife Management, provided an important part of the MERECP will deal with such issues. The appraisal team was informed that the ministries wanted this committee set up under EAC because they thought the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources might not adequately articulate the issues of managing wildlife as a source of income.

EAC will not have the power to hire and fire members of the PSC, and the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources has already delegated to the PSC the decision-making power related to the MERECP. Approvals at the PSC level will not have to be tabled for the EAC's Council of Ministers. Members of the PSC will not be there in their personal capacity, but will represent their institutions.

IUCN will be accorded an observer status within EAC's Committee on Environment and Natural Resources according to article V under the proposed MoU between EAC and IUCN.

This proposed arrangement should be acceptable to Norad because it limits EAC's role to co-ordination and policy harmonisation and not direct programme execution.

The proposed fund allocation to EAC might be reduced in view of its proposed role. The Programme Officer does not necessarily need to be a senior person, and a young dynamic person might adequately handle the job and will draw less salary compared to a senior staff. Any direct support from the programme budget to enhance or develop capacity in the EAC in general must also be very well explained in terms of tangible benefits for the Mt. Elgon regional programme before approval. Even if EAC argues that they want to build capacity to execute and facilitate regional projects for the future, to utilise limited funds from the present regional programme on such activities must be seen as rather critical.

4.3.2 The role of IUCN

IUCN's role is a comprehensive one in the programme outline. IUCN will facilitate the programme in terms of financial flow, in terms of subcontracting various institutions to perform particular activities, including NGOs and CBOs, and in terms of appointing people to work within the programme. Following the practice from the two former projects in the Mt. Elgon area, IUCN will probably hire UWA and KWS staff to perform activities both inside the National Park (e.g. law enforcement, patrolling, tourism, biodiversity surveys and conservation, boundary marking, re-forestation with native trees, monitoring, infrastructure), and in the surrounding areas (e.g. soil conservation, agroforestry, training).

Much stress is put on building partnership through an active liaison between the two countries and between institutions at all levels. IUCN's mode of work will be dominated by building networks, locally, nationally and regionally, with a large part of the activities concentrating on workshops, stakeholder meetings, training seminars and conferences.

Additionally, IUCN may arguably have a comparative advantage in managing one of the major objectives of the programme, i.e. to monitor the development of the biodiversity of the conserved areas of Mt. Elgon, and to ensure the sustainability of the use of the natural forest resources, as well as to promote and develop the basis for an increased ecotourism in the area. IUCN may have less experience in areas relating to monitoring of possible effects of a global warming, e.g. in terms of changed rainfall patterns, reduced run-off and consequent changes in soil erosion and water quality, and the following, indirect consequences on the biodiversity.

The appraisal team believes that IUCN-EARO will have adequate capacity and competence to handle the technical aspects of this complicated programme. However, with IUCN's dominating role as both the technical facilitator for the programme's activities as well as being the mechanism for managing the financial flows, there is an obvious risk that the local, national and regional institutions might not develop an adequate level of ownership to the programme's activities and progress. A related problem is the commonly voiced critique against IUCN that the organisation can do a job very well, but they are not so good at passing-on capacity. As a minimum, it is necessary that the PSC is given full responsibility to approve financial arrangements.

On the other hand, many of the visited institutions considered IUCN's role to be advantageous in such a regional scheme, both based on positive experiences in former projects, and to avoid unnecessary bureaucracy and to increase efficiency. IUCN is widely seen as giving good technical inputs, they are well organised locally, they are able to find good field officers and team leaders, and they are well trained in efficient financial handling. IUCN has generally a good reputation regarding reporting and auditing. To select IUCN as the technical facilitator for MERECP was also a decision endorsed by the MTTI in Uganda.

The appraisal team noticed that most of the visited central institutions regarded IUCN's role in the programme as purely a technical adviser and facilitator, stressing that the final responsibility and the real ownership rested with the involved national institutions and the official local structures. These perceptions are not fully in line with the PD descriptions.

4.3.3 The role of key central institutions

MTTI in Uganda and MENR and the Min. of Local Government in Kenya are the central institutions that will be involved in the programme. Because of their central nature, these institutions will not be involved in the day-to-day implementation, and their main role will be to provide resource support, policy guidance and linkage to other relevant government ministries necessary for the successful implementation of the programme. They are all represented in the PSC, and as such their role is mainly approval of annual workshops and budgets.

In Uganda, UWA, under MTTI, will be the main responsible partner in MERECP, represented by the Deputy Director of Field Operations together with the Deputy Director of Conservation. As almost all the reserved areas on the Ugandan side have been declared a National Park under the responsibility of UWA/MTTI, including most of the forest plantations, there is little formal responsibilities left for the Forest Dept. of MWLE, although

the FD still will be represented in the PSC. The official idea has been to establish a joint management system between UWA and FD in the National Park, but this has not been very efficient yet. In some cases, the management of forests inside National Parks is being given to FD, although UWA is formally responsible.

In Kenya, the responsibility will be shared mainly between KWS (the National Park), the FD (the Forest Reserves), and the Mt. Elgon County Council/District administration (the National Reserve).

The institutional set-up in Uganda, despite UWA being a part of MTTI and not a part of MWLE since 1995, is much simpler than in Kenya. UWA is organised in four departments:

- Field Operations (subdivided into a Field Operations Section to where the Chief Warden reports; and a Conservation Section)
- Planning
- Tourism Development
- Financial Services.

The appraisal team noted some tension is still evident between UWA and FD after the great shift of responsibilities for forests within National Parks that took place in the 1990s. Even concessions for issuing licenses for cutting trees for timber within National Parks has been given to UWA, a responsibility that earlier was fully under FD. For MERECP, it is particularly essential to effectively re-establish the FD as the responsible agency for management of all the forest plantations within and outside the reserved areas on the Ugandan side.

Most of the UWA staff and staff from FD in the Mt. Elgon area as well as the three involved districts have been involved in the development of MERECP.

Both the current Wildlife and Forest Acts in Kenya lack provisions for collaborative management, a key element in the proposed programme. However, the forest policy and the Forest Act in Kenya are currently being reviewed, and this will probably result in a new style of management of forestry resources where stakeholder participation and decentralised decision making will be introduced. Rules and regulations for community participation in forestry management and for implementing collaborative management systems are currently being developed. In the proposed Forest Act there is also a provision for retaining a part of the revenue from forestry activities at the local level. The process of approving the new policy and Act has so far been slow, but the appraisal team was told that the draft regulations on collaborative management would be treated by the Parliament before July 1, 2002. It is generally recommended that the central institutions on the Kenyan side take on the responsibility for review of relevant policies and mechanisms as a matter of urgency in order for Kenya to benefit from the programme resources.

The FD of Kenya has inadequate logistical and infrastructure resources for an effective management of the Mt. Elgon ecosystem under the Forest Reserves. MENR has acknowledged that the department has been underfunded for some time and has indicated that future allocations to the districts might be increased to alleviate this situation.

The policy framework in both UWA and FD in Uganda allows for community participation in resource management and benefit sharing inside MENP; which is not the case in Kenya. The current KWS policy does not allow community access to the National Park resources. An

additional problem is the fact that there are still no direct benefits for the local communities on the Kenyan side in developing tourism inside MENP, or even a proper management of plantation forests, as all revenues to KWS or FD will go back to Nairobi. However, during the last three years of the MEICDP, KWS has started working with communities neighbouring MENP, aiming at introducing a kind of collaborative management system, and this might be seen as one of the most important outputs from the past project.

Collaboration between UWA and KWS, as stipulated in MERECP, presupposes similar policies as regards community involvement and benefit sharing which is not the case now. This means that for the MERECP ecosystem approach, a broad framework for the ecosystem management has to be harmonised, although the details of implementation might be different reflecting the reality in each country. The dialogue on policy harmonisation between UWA and KWS regarding community participation in the management of the ecosystem should be initiated as soon as possible. An early enactment of the new forest policy and Forest Act in Kenya would be helpful in this regard.

Since MERECP is based on the principle of linking environmental management to livelihood security, the responsible Ministries should assist the programme in linking up the sustainable development activities to the on-going government programmes like poverty alleviation and micro-credit schemes. This will make the MERECP contribution to such activities more effective.

To secure a long-term sustainability after Norad funding, the involved districts and the central governments through the line Ministries should start allocating resources to some of the activities both in the Mt. Elgon ecosystem as well as within the surrounding communities.

4.3.4 The role of local government bodies

According to the PD the PMU is supposed to have a close collaboration with the district authorities of Mbale, Sironko and Kapchorwa Districts in Uganda, and Trans Nzoia and Mt. Elgon Districts in Kenya. It is also proposed that the MERECP will continue to work with communities and villages adjoining the National Parks and Forest Reserves. The programme will focus on the necessary trade-offs between the use of park and forest resources, and the development of alternative resources, or substitutes, on private lands and community lands. Local Environment Committees will provide entry points for project support for both collaborative management and sustainable development support.

In MERECP, the Kenya Mt. Elgon County Council will be involved because of its recently acquired responsibility for managing the Mt. Elgon (Chepkitale) National Reserve, gazetted in 2001. Effective management of this resource poses initial challenges because the Council is young, and has inadequate development resources, particularly for development of infrastructure like roads and communication. At present, the Council's technical personnel is also inadequate. As part of its commitment to the work, the Council has recently employed a wildlife officer. The officer is expected to develop fundraising proposals and liaise closely with key institutions such as FD and KWS. The Min. of Local Government should also support the Council in mobilisation of development resources. It will be essential to push for an MoU between KWS and Mt. Elgon County Council for the management of the Chepkitale National Reserve.

In order for the Council to actively participate in MERECP, it will need to move fast in a range of areas including policy, partnership development, and resource mobilisation. Key

policies will include collaborative management and partnerships with KWS and FD. To develop the tourism sector, improvement of the infrastructure and marketing of the resource are critical. It is recommended that development of a strong formal and informal partnership between the Local Government, FD and KWS is initiated as soon as possible to arrange particularly for the County Council to effectively participate in the programme.

Mt. Elgon District in Kenya has no district environment officer, and MEREC should push for the appointment of a district environment officer here. Trans Nzoia District, on the other hand, has an environment officer, but in both cases the district and sub-location environmental action plans are not in place. This is a drawback considering that these environmental action plans have been identified as good entry points for community conservation activities. With the formation of NEMA in Kenya it is expected that this problem might be solved. Anyway, MEREC should assist the districts in formulation of environmental action plans.

Under the former MEICDP project in Kenya, two pilot areas in Trans Nzoia District and two in Mt. Elgon District were identified. Community Conservation Teams (CCTs) were established, and these were given training on awareness and on technical issues. Gender equity, poverty alleviation and income-generating activities were also parts of the scheme, and some of these activities have continued after the abrupt end of the former project.

On the district level in Uganda, DEAPs are approved by NEMA, but such plans have been worked out only for some core districts so far. Mbale District has an approved DEAP. Further development of DEAPs is probably a good strategy because it will ensure some local ownership of the programme, and it will also contribute to the sustainability of the conservation efforts beyond the donor funding. During the fieldwork, the appraisal team found that many of the target parishes (neighbouring the MENP) have not yet developed their Parish Environment Action Plans (PEAPs).

On the Ugandan side, where efforts to implement collaborative management with communities have been going on for the last 10 years, it was found that only six out of 52 possible parish collaborative agreements have been signed so far. About 12 other agreements have been worked out, but were not signed yet. Many more parishes have been sensitised already, and it is necessary to push for the expansion of collaborative resource management agreements and PEAPs with the remaining parishes during the inception period. This shows how slow such processes can be, but with lessons learnt from the successful agreements, negotiations with new parishes should be easier.

The appraisal team were given some examples of these "resource agreements" on parish level in Uganda, regulating in detail issues like available and acceptable levels of exploitation of traditional forest products inside the reserved areas (like fuelwood, bamboo shoots, building poles, medicinal plants, crops in plantation forests etc.). The agreements were apparently developed through a truly participatory process, with definition of resource user groups, and the rules and regulations seemed to be well received and followed by the local communities. There are also examples of resource agreements established with women's groups as well as with village groups.

On the Kenyan side collaborative agreements with communities will be a new activity, although the lessons learnt on the Ugandan side will be very useful in their formulation. Despite a publicised decentralisation policy, local government bodies in Kenya continue to be

delinked from the activities of central ministries. Even at the local level, these ministries are directly accountable only to central ministries based in Nairobi; a significant difference from Uganda where the local government is responsible for development in their respective jurisdiction. In Uganda, the local government bodies have the power to hire, supervise, and, if necessary, fire those not meeting development expectations.

4.3.5 The role of local institutions; CBOs and NGOs

A major component of the programme will take place within communities that border the protected areas. There are numerous NGOs and CBOs, mainly focusing on livelihood security, working in the districts and communities around the reserved areas. Most of these were not involved in the previous projects. While NGOs are more conspicuous than CBOs because they have more money due to external funding, CBOs should be encouraged and helped to build capacity because of the indigenous knowledge they may have.

During the inception phase it is important to open discussions with NGOs and CBOs in the programme area on how they can participate in the activities, especially relating to livelihood security. They will be crucial in mobilising the local population and in capacity building of communities.

4.4 Financial management structure and cash flows

The appraisal team noticed a lack of enthusiasm both in the Min. of Finance and in MWLE, particularly in Uganda, related to the fact that the financial flow of MERECF is not designed to be channelled through the central ministries, but rather be trusted to IUCN as the facilitating agency. Keeping in mind the negative experiences of involving central ministries in the handling of the financial flow in the former project on the Kenyan side, as well as the discussion on establishing financial systems that are less prone to corruption (see section 4.5), the team generally supports the proposed financial set-up in the PD. However, effective provisions for the Ministries of Finance to be continuously updated about project activities and financial flows should be established.

4.4.1 Budget by programme items (KRA)

The detailed budget is found in Annex 3 in the PD. A summary budget along with the Key Result Areas (KRA) is also presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Summary of the MERECF budget (ref. PD, p.36)

Programme item	Key Result Area	Amount (USD)	% of total budget
Programme planning and EAC support costs	6.0	1,211,750	25
Ecosystem management and administrative systems strengthened	1.0	624,750	13
Conservation status and biodiversity value improved	2.0	454,750	10
Effective collaboration with institutional partners and neighbouring communities established and maintained	3.0	1,034,750	22
Financial sustainability of Mt. Elgon ecosystem enhanced	4.0	244,750	5
Transboundary conservation processes and institutional arrangements	5.0	302,250	6
Capacity building for EAC (direct costs)	6.0	215,000	5
Sub total; all activities		4,088,000	86

Contingency		102,200	2
Project management costs		586,628	12
Grand total		4,776,828	100

The team's assessment relates to two issues; the relative priorities reflected in the budget, and the suggested flows of funds. From Table 1 it can be seen that programme planning, support to EAC and project management costs absorb around 42% of total costs. Ecosystem management and biodiversity activities take 29%, whereas village level activities take 22% and tourism and forest plantation another 5%. IUCN will take 12% of the total budget in overhead according to this Table. The appraisal team will argue that the figures, to the extent they reflect the real priorities, reveal an over-emphasis on planning and initiation costs and an under-emphasis on in-field activities in local communities. The picture might be even clearer if the budget outline is decomposed along cost items and to the different recipients.

In the PD, IUCN, as the technical facilitator for the programme, is also entrusted the responsibility to handle the financial flow of the programme in line with PSC decisions. IUCN will, through the PMU, be responsible for the management and accounting of the programme through its normal financial and accounting procedures to both the EAC and to Norad. Money will flow from IUCN to PMU and on to both EAC and the local level partners according to the MoU with EAC and through agreements with local partners. This proposal will in general be a continuation of the former schemes on both the Ugandan and the Kenyan side. Anyway, all this gives IUCN an implementing role in the programme and not merely a technical backstop function.

In the former projects, IUCN chose not to enter into agreements with district level authorities basically to avoid loss or misuse of funds. This seems, based on the field visits, appropriate from a corruption reduction point of view. From an institution-building context, it is more problematic, but the appraisal team will not recommend a change in this set-up at present.

The appraisal team acknowledges that IUCN is seen as an adequate institution to be responsible for the financial flow by the involved ministries in the programme. IUCN has a long experience in the area, and an independent body like IUCN might also easier be able to facilitate a regional system between Uganda and Kenya than a bilateral body, or the EAC, might have been. The main alternative, to channel the finances through the EAC structure, is seen as a clearly less optimal solution. The main problems with the chosen solution are related to the replicability of the programme idea in other areas without external donor support, as well as to the ownership aspects.

However, as argued under section 2.1 above, the appraisal team recommends that the programme right from the start plans for a sequenced system whereby more and more of the responsibilities for activity implementation, financial flow, reporting and monitoring are taken over by local institutions, NGOs and CBOs during the lifetime of the programme. In addition to necessary approvals from PSC and the Central Ministries to endorse such a system, this will probably foster a better sense of local ownership to the programme's activities and processes, as well as easing the phasing-out of the external support to the programme. The central level must also be encouraged to support successful activities initiated under the programme in their ordinary budget outlines to secure some sustainability of the programme.

4.4.2 Budget by cost items

The PMU activities form the backbone of the expenses. Possibly, some of the salary expenses might be cut if some of the PMU staff and some of the technical experts are taken on secondment from relevant national bodies. Additionally, this might serve to improve their involvement and insight in the programme.

Table 2 below gives an outline of the budget proposal sorted along cost items.

Table 2: Budget outline along cost items

Programme item	Amount (USD)	% of total budget
Programme planning , IUCN, monitoring, reviews, evaluation	308,750	6.5
PSC meetings	45,000	1
PMU staff and support staff	1,386,000	29
PMU offices equipment and running costs	117,500	2.5
PMU vehicles & operations	282,750	6
PMU communications and travels, per diems	258,000	5.5
Capacity building and support for EAC	215,000	4.5
Capacity buildings for partners and mechanisms for co-ordination	100,000	2
Local activities, resource use agreements, sustainable development activities	700,000	15
Studies and assessments	155,000	3
Ecosystem plan, workshops and management in reserved areas, biodiversity monitoring, plantations, tourism	520,000	11
Sub total, all activities	4,088,000	86
Contingencies	102,200	2
Project management costs - IUCN	586,628	12
Grand total	4,776,828	100

The local level activities are given about 15% of the total budget. Because the scope and range of activities are not yet in place, it is difficult to judge whether this will be adequate, but given the intentions of the programme, the sum allocated seems far too low. Both the EAC and the IUCN activities seem to be allocated much funds relative to the work they are supposed to carry out.

4.4.3 Budget shares by partners

To break down the budget items into shares by partners is not an easy exercise to carry out as much of PMU staff activities of course are directly linked to district and village level partners. It is still possible to argue that it seems inadequate that only 28% of the total budget is directly spent at the various local levels. The appraisal team would recommend to increase activities and the budget share especially to the local level.

Table 3 below gives an outline of the budget sorted on partner shares.

Table 3: Budget outline by partner shares

Stakeholders	Amount (USD)	% of total budget
EAC; PSC meetings, support and capacity building for EAC	260,000	5
IUCN, administrative overhead, programme planning, monitoring, evaluation	895,320	19
PMU staff, running costs, vehicles, travels, studies and assessments	2,199,250	46
District level support, wildlife, FDs, activities plus capacity building	620,000	13
Village level support	700,000	15
Contingencies	102,200	2
Sum	4,776,828	100

It should be possible to discuss the share suggested both to IUCN and to the EAC. IUCN centrally might be given a comparatively lower share of the funds as most of the planning and administration will be carried out by a PMU, having separate budget outlines for staff and running costs. The capacity building item for EAC might also be reduced. The three staff members in EAC involved in the programme are all very well qualified, and the EAC Council of Ministers has stated that they do not wish to expand their staff in this field at present.

Based on these general recommendations, it might be possible to give higher priority to local level activities, may be in the range of 200.000 to 400.000 USD more than currently suggested.

4.5 Scope for corruption and measures to counter it, transparency/accountability

Corruption is related to unethical behaviour and may be defined according to the World Bank as "the abuse of public power for private benefit" or "corruption is any transaction between private and public sector actors through which collective goods are illegitimately converted into private-regarding payoffs". In a broader sense, corruption can take place in any system, regardless of if it is private sector, civil society or in the public sector.

Uganda and Kenya are defined as two of the most corrupt countries in the world, unfortunately. It means that MERECP must have a special focus on such issues, particularly on how funds are transferred to stakeholders, and to secure proper monitoring and controlling mechanisms.

The issue of corruption is of major concern to the Government of Uganda, and structures have been put in place to fight the problem. The Office of the Inspector General of the Government (IGG) and the Min. of Ethics and Integrity have been created and well equipped for this purpose. The law enforcement agencies and judiciary likewise have been strengthened.

Kenya also recognises the threat corruption poses to development investment and acknowledges its existence in the country. This problem has cost Kenya donor and investor confidence, both of which have reduced overall economic growth during the last decade. One of the reasons why the Dutch government withdrew their bilateral support to Kenya in 2000 was the apparent low effect of aid into Kenya and the high level of corruption. In recognition of this and in response to external pressure, the government has put in place measures with potential to curb some of the corruption problems, e.g. a new anti-corruption bill (still in Parliament), use of external expertise related to the corruption problem, and, most recently, the establishment of a Corruption Court to handle corruption cases. Although these measures are commendable, it is obvious that they will not yield immediate results and MERECOP has to develop its own internal measures.

The evaluation of the just ended MEICDP on the Kenyan side of Mt. Elgon noted a “strong need for effective and open accountability and transparency in the management of the project funds”. It also noted that funds entrusted with central ministries have failed to deliver. This notwithstanding, it still recognised the need for involvement of central ministries, but with an “overlay of cross-checks”. The team was especially warned in Kenya about routing money through national and district level institutions, even by staff within these institutions, and that one rather should spend the money directly to stakeholders at as low level as possible.

As a general recommendation, the PSC, made up of the key partners, must take on the full responsibility for transparency and accountability for programme funding. Further reference is made in KRA 5 in the PD on “developing effective and efficient administrative and financial management systems”. To realise this, the Programme Co-ordinator must take responsibility for financial planning, monitoring and administration of project finances, including the maintenance of detailed and accurate accounts. These concerns are in line with the governments’ official recognition of the problem and subsequent establishment of strategies to address it.

The programme has been designed in such a way that funds will not pass through central government agencies, but will be disbursed directly to the partners, e.g. NGOs, districts, and research agencies. The proposed agreements with the implementers on what activities to be done should also reduce the corruption problem. Funds should be released in small amounts and stringent systems for accountability should be required before new funds are released for more activities.

Funds allocated for all types of activities under MERECOP should be made public for all stakeholders, as is the current practice with grants received from the central government to district administrations in Uganda. It is recommended that Kenya adopts a similar procedure with posting of development funds and expenditures in public offices as a basis for transparency and accountability.

The issue of corruption should be discussed with the agencies that will be implementing activities before funds are disbursed. Information on consequences following misappropriation of funds must be clearly given. Levels and frequency of release of funds should be guided by individual plans. Different programme implementers should become the direct recipients and custodians of programme funds, and not the central ministries. It is, however, important to keep the central ministries fully informed of all anti-corruption measures within the MERECOP.

5 ASSESSMENT OF SUSTAINABILITY

The assessment will address the quality of the programme goals and activities in relationship to the extent it is likely they will be sustained and developed further after donor and IUCN withdrawal. Gender, HIV/AIDS, corruption and human rights are now recognised as crosscutting development themes that transcend sectors and programmes, thus making them everybody's concerns. Gender, corruption, and to some extent human rights have been addressed in the PD. The resettlement of the Benet people found on the Uganda side of Mt. Elgon is viewed as a human rights issue. There is however no reference to HIV/AIDS in the PD. In the following, various dimensions of sustainability of the MERECP, including political support and economic sustainability of programme and field activities, as well as how human rights, socio-cultural, environmental, and technical aspects, demography and HIV/AIDS may impact on the overall goals of the programme, is discussed.

5.1 Programme features and long term sustainability

The MERECP is mainly intended to be a pilot project with good demonstration properties. The programme is therefore by itself not designed to solve similar challenges in the region, and not even to deal with all people/park issues in the Mt. Elgon area. As Norad assistance is limited relative to the overall needs in the area, a point is made that the programme activities are pilot and demonstration projects, and that other donors, national or local institutions or NGOs/CBOs have to carry out such projects on a larger scale for the future. However, a main programme idea is to show how management challenges related to reserved forested areas may be handled, and positive experiences might hopefully be replicated elsewhere in the region or in developing countries in general.

One particularly promising approach would be to further develop the idea of "Resource Use Agreements" from the former MECDP in Uganda. This use of participatory approach directly with local people is an excellent way of securing rights to vulnerable target groups, and to improve legitimacy to conservation efforts. Other elements from MECDP and MEICDP well worth continuing will be the strong emphasis on participatory planning, the variety of local income-generating activities, the biodiversity management ambition, and the willingness and ambition to include both national, district and local level institutions in the programme.

There can be several reasons why pilot projects are never becoming mainstream solutions to particular environmental challenges. Such possible reasons could include

- Lack of interest for political reasons
- Lack of funds (or lack of national priority) for expensive pilot activities
- Lack of capacity for resource demanding pilot schemes
- Lack of competence and knowledge for the complicated pilot activities
- Lack of compatibility with other activities
- Lack of competent institutions for the innovative pilot scheme
- Lack of adequate local institutional anchoring of pilot activities.

In the case of MERECP, the programme has political backing at different levels. However, the proposed activities are most likely too expensive to be replicated with only national funding. Institutional capacity also needs to be developed, including the ability to integrate actions between national level institutions.

The inception phase of the programme will include appointment of staff, development of operational plans and detailed budgets, making links to involved institutions, and finally to

agree on an annual workplan. Formal approvals of the annual workplans will be handled at the PSC (under EAC chairmanship) and Embassy level.

The appraisal team recommends that the inception phase fully takes into account long-term sustainability issues for the local population surrounding the reserved areas. One important way to achieve this, would be to establish schemes where a major part of the revenue from activities related to the reserved areas (like tourism and forest plantations), is channelled back to the local communities for funding e.g. infrastructure, capacity building of and networking between local NGOs and CBOs, awareness raising, training of tourism guides, agroforestry, tree nurseries, beekeeping, terracing, contour planting, zero-grazing schemes, fuelwood plantations, improved stoves, development of better schools and education, primary health, etc.

At the same time, it is important to realise that quite much work has been put into detailed planning activities in both countries in the former projects. For the new regional approach, it will be essential to build on this information gathered, with an emphasis to implement concrete activities in the field based on the already agreed plans and initiatives. E.g. one very valuable contribution from the MECDP on the Ugandan side has been the setting up of a Conservation Training Centre in Kapkwai, Kapchorwa District. This idea should be copied on the Kenyan side. It is essential that MERECF from the very start plans for how such Training Centres can continue their activities also after the duration of the programme.

One weakness in the PD is the lack of clear provisions and plans for how the started activities and processes will be continued when the direct support from Norad is phased out, and when the role of IUCN as technical facilitator for the programme is phased out. This relates e.g. to which institutions at local, national or even at regional level will be given responsibility to continue various activities, as well as to which institutions will have the benefit of taking over physical assets that the programme has invested in. The inception phase of MERECF should in much more detail plan for a phasing-out of the external support to the activities after 4.5 years. Long-term sustainability of programme activities as well as in institutional networks and liaison mechanisms are key issues in this context.

There is a risk that setting up separate programme institutions that to a large extent are staffed and paid by IUCN, will not maximise opportunities for integration and capacity building, as this may isolate the project from national or regional policy development, and it may also inhibit the development of ownership by the managing institutions. This issue must be given serious attention, and one possible way to deal with the problem might be to integrate in the programme's workplan a mechanism whereby more and more of IUCN's responsibilities, including financial flow, physical assets and staffing, will be handed over to the involved regional (where relevant), national, local and even community structures during the lifetime of the programme.

The appraisal team noted a widespread mentality in both countries whereby officials from the main involved institutions firmly believed that resources to run effective patrolling and controlling activities inside MENP had to come from outside donors. Today, e.g. some 60% of UWA's financial resources are based on donor funds, including soft loans from World Bank programmes. Representatives both in UWA and KWS would not immediately believe that a heavier emphasis on cheaper, and probably in the long run more sustainable, collaborative management systems could replace significant parts of the traditional centralised management efforts. These opinions are arguably not well in line with current ecosystem

approach thinking, and are neither conducive to a long-term sustainability of the programme activities.

Considering the need for capacity building in the involved local administrative structures in both countries, particularly related to the management of the MENP, and the long-term institutional sustainability of the programme, the proposal of establishing the MEREC headquarter away from all existing relevant administrative structures should be evaluated thoroughly before any final decision is taken (refer also to the discussion in section 4.2).

5.2 Policy support measures

It is essential that efforts are made within the inception phase of the programme to facilitate for the involved institutions at all levels, and may be particularly at the district and the relevant community levels, to consider the success of the programme as their responsibility. Mechanisms should be built to make sure that a mentality of achieving a better management of the ecosystem, and for achieving an improved and sustainable standard of living among the communities around the reserved areas, are being promoted. Initiatives, involvement in concrete activities, and achievement of sustainable, tangible benefits should ideally be vested in the local level to a much larger degree than in the IUCN, or in the EAC, or even in the involved central ministries and institutions of both countries.

At the regional level through EAC, it should be an ambition to achieve a harmonisation of legal frameworks concerning collaborative management measures in conservation areas, concerning boundary issues, and on issues like biodiversity monitoring, tourism, poaching, patrolling, reactions against violation of park rules, etc.

5.3 Economic and financial aspects - long term sustainability

The KRA 4 in the PD deals with enhancing the financial sustainability of MENP:

- Assess the role of plantation forests in contributing to the financial viability of the Mt. Elgon ecosystem
- Support and promote cross-border tourism development
- Identify and support cost-saving management approaches and practices
- Implement effective and efficient administrative and financial management systems
- Develop and implement innovative mechanisms for raising and allocating funds to assure the integrity of the ecosystem.

These ideas are not discussed in detail in the PD, otherwise than plans to carry out studies and assessments to develop ideas along these lines.

Judging from the earlier reviews of MECDP and MEICDP and the present field visit, it does not seem likely that MENP can ever become economically self-sustained. However, as a national and international public good, this may be neither realistic nor desirable. It may still be possible to narrow the gap between total costs and total revenues in various ways, and thus reduce the dependency on resources from outside, be it national or international funds.

Concerning the protected areas and the biodiversity resources, the main long-term incomes are primarily linked to transfers from the two states, as most revenues now are directed to the central level. In addition to the need for such annual allocations, the focus should be on cost-saving activities. If policy changes could be initiated at the national level, particularly in Kenya, so that parts of the revenue from park and plantation areas are retained locally, it would be possible firstly to achieve a better incentive structure than at present. Secondly, this

would imply that economic sustainability to a larger extent would depend on efforts to increase the number of visitors, and on sound management of plantation forests. This could be an explicit aim for the regional project and an important part of the harmonisation measures.

The forest plantations, if managed properly, could serve as an important source of revenue for the reserved areas. The present system for income generation from the forest plantations does not give the local authorities much incentive to manage these in a sustainable and economically efficient way. As a result, the present management of the forest plantations is not sound, and, according to the 1999 review, there are no management plans, maps, and no replantings made since 1993. The General Management Plan from December 2000 (UWA) raises this issue and plans to improve the management, although no improvements could be traced in the field when the appraisal team visited the area.

However, the potential is there: The review team for Uganda (1999) cites an example where a plantation of some 1900 ha (less than 2% of the park area), with a rotation period of 25 years and an annual production of 20 m³/ha, the total output would be 38,000 m³ annually or a total income of some 360 mill. UGS annually with a price of 9500 UGS/m³.

Another challenge will be to promote tourism, as it is likely that a conserved area that yields high revenues to the state also will receive higher allocations from the state. On the Kenyan side, measures have been undertaken to improve tourism, and this should be followed up during the MERECP. At present the tourist visitor level is only about 2000 annually, compared to 10,000 some 10 years ago. Even here, there are potentials for improvement in the level of income, but again, the incentive structures must be changed at the policy level. However, in the long run perspective, it seems unlikely that Mt. Elgon has the potential to become economically self-sustained based on income generated from tourism.

The district and local collaborative management activities depend on the willingness from central and district level authorities to be sustained. Some of the activities are profitable in themselves, and can be made more profitable in the span of the programme. However, the present activities of tree planting plots, zero-grazing, apiculture, nurseries, etc., do not yield substantial incomes for involved parties. One strategy would be to identify more potent sources of income related to the main bottlenecks of agricultural production, such as marketing, improved inputs, improved seeds and increased extension efforts, etc. Also teaching farmers about how markets operate might be wise; for example, the price of potatoes is three times higher in April than in June in Kitale. Storing the potato harvest for 2-3 months, maybe at co-operative level, could then substantially increase farm incomes.

The concept of “equitable benefit sharing” must be addressed better by the programme. Furthermore, local people could be paid to carry out activities such as tree planting and boundary work, including demarkation planting and law enforcement and patrolling within the traditional village forest boundaries, as suggested by the review team for the project in Uganda in 1998. This could also reduce the costs for involved public bodies. Local people could also be more involved in the tourism sector, e.g. through selling handicrafts, and working with ecotourism as porters and guides.

The general system in Uganda requires the extended officer on finance in each district to send quarterly financial reports to the Min. of Finance. However, as the Ministries of Finance have no formal role in the PSC, it might be argued that the PSC itself should take on the responsibility to report back to the central level on economic and financial aspects. To foster a

better sense of national ownership to the proposed programme, it might be recommended that the financial officers of the five involved districts are given full accounts of the financial flows and budget plans in the programme throughout its lifetime, so that information from these activities can be reported back on a quarterly basis to the central level in both countries in the ordinary way.

Concerning regional commitment and the financing of some regional management unit in the future, it would imply willingness by EAC and the two involved countries in particular to follow up beyond donor support. This may not be likely given the present economic situation of EAC, and EAC's policy not to expand their activities into running programmes. However, EAC stated that the project should aim at being donor independent in the future.

5.4 Human rights aspects

The traditional concept of human rights emphasises political and civil rights with freedom of the press, speech, movement and assembly; freedom to organise for individuals and groups, the right to vote and to petition the government; and entitlement to due process of the law and other legal protections. More recent thinking emphasises fundamental right to basic necessities for an adequate standard of living, including employment, nutrition, shelter, social security, health care and education; all of which are particularly important for the poor.¹

Recently, it has also become common to include other rights relating to biodiversity management programmes. Such rights might include rights to control or access natural resources to secure a livelihood. Research indicates that poor rural people derive a relatively higher share of their income from communal areas where the rights are often rather unclear.

The PD recognises threats to the integrity of the Mt. Elgon ecosystem posed by the unresolved resettlement issue of the Benet. However, the appraisal team noted a continuing progress on this issue because the Uganda Parliament has endorsed the proposal to set aside 6000 hectares to resettle the community. The issue is complicated by the fact that there are non-Benet people currently occupying parts of the land now set aside for the purpose.

The review also recognised that implementation of collaborative management activities will improve the currently poor relationship between the authorities and local people, particularly in Kenya where the initiative is at infancy. This relationship, which occasionally turns violent, might be regarded as constituting a violation of human rights.

5.5 Environmental aspects

The PD has identified key areas that must be given attention to ensure the sustainability of the environmental aspects:

- * Securing the integrity and financial viability of the ecosystem and its reserved areas
- * Ensuring that human use of the natural resources is mediated through forms of collaborative management so that use is sustainable and contribute to livelihood security
- * Understanding the importance of environmental conservation of the ecosystem in economic and financial terms so that the environmental values are better appreciated at the local, national and regional levels
- * Ensuring that this knowledge and information is widely shared to create the necessary awareness about the values of the Mt. Elgon ecosystem
- * Where the programme works with rural people and communities in improved agriculture based on alternatives and substitutes to natural resource use, such

¹ The World Bank. 1998. Development and Human Rights

improvements must be environmentally friendly.

The programme will primarily focus on improving the management capacity of UWA and KWS to effectively and sustainably manage the two National Parks, and on the FD of Kenya to manage the Forest Reserve. The main strategy is to build staff capacity and ensuring that the basic infrastructure and resources are provided, and that effective collaborative management systems are developed and implemented.

The issue of collaborative management agreements and strict observance of their rules and regulations by the communities will be a key contribution to environmental sustainability.

Monitoring of the actual resource use inside the reserved areas by surrounding communities should be taken more seriously. In particular, the development of a biodiversity conservation monitoring system is recommended.

5.6 Socio-cultural aspects, including gender

The PD emphasises commitment to integration of gender. This is captured in KRA 4 focusing on “effective collaboration with institutional partners and neighbouring communities”. The programme plans to “integrate gender into community conservation activities”, and the programme will also have a focal person for gender issues. In addition, gender equity is specifically addressed under the section on social-cultural aspects.

The programme will benefit from the experiences of MEICDP in Kenya, which made great efforts to integrate gender into the programme activities through gender training, sensitisation of men, women and youth between 1999-2001.

Inclusion of men is considered fundamental because experience has shown that men hold the key to social change. As has occurred on the Kenya programme, the process of integration should pay special attention not just to the division of labour, but also to access to and control over productive resources and family benefits. Discussions with a number of young women in Mbale District revealed that they do most of the work but have little or no say over benefits that accrue. Experience has shown that this kind of relationship results in lowered productivity because women have no incentive to invest in work for which they are not compensated.

However, gender was not very explicit in MECDP in Uganda. It was noted that the programme document deliberately leaves out details on the process and content for gender integration, largely because these issues will be a part of the discussions during the inception period of MERECP.

5.7 Technical and technological aspects

According to the PD, the ecosystem management will be based on the mandates, policies and goals of the partner institutions, and, as far as possible, use and build on locally available expertise.

In a sustainability context, it is important that the structures and systems that are developed during the programme can be sustained upon donor withdrawal. Too heavy reliance on cars and transport, IT, good infrastructure, expensive and complex technology in the monitoring of biodiversity resources, in extension efforts and activities etc. may threaten a long-term

sustainability in this context. The programme is planning to build capacity in the use of equipment purchased for the management of the ecosystem.

5.8 Impact of HIV/AIDS on programme

The PD makes no reference to HIV/AIDS, and, due to time constraints, the team was not able to gather very comprehensive data at the field level. However, some useful information was gathered from informal discussions with local stakeholders and supplemented with reviews of relevant documents from both countries.

In Mbale District of Uganda, discussions with a resident indicated that his village records about two HIV/AIDS-related deaths every month. Similarly, the Kenyan side of Mt. Elgon acknowledged its presence but was also of the view that its magnitude was not accurately stated in official statistics. They believed that the official figures were far below the real situation.

Official sources from both Kenya and Uganda treat the scourge as a national pandemic which has brought destruction of the economies of the two countries. On levels, Uganda acknowledges that "AIDS case reporting is affected by among other factors accuracy and completeness of reporting by the various health units" and "the number of AIDS cases in a particular district or health facility does not necessarily reflect the magnitude of the AIDS situation there". In Uganda, the current statistics are based on clinical data from HIV sentinel surveillance sites and health workers and NGOs reporting AIDS cases. Sentinel site data includes infection trends obtained from pregnant mothers attending sentinel surveillance sites in various parts of the country, infection trends among patients attending one major hospital in Kampala and AIDS clinical cases among patients with AIDS (as clinically defined) reporting to health units. The Uganda Min. of Health 2000 Surveillance Report quotes 1,438,000 persons living with AIDS nationally. The report quoted a 5.5% HIV infection prevalence rate for Mbale District compared to 4.7% for Tororo and 11.8% for Nsambaya hospital. The same report cites a total of 34 clinical AIDS cases for Kapchorwa District (base population not cited)².

The Kenya 2001 edition of "AIDS in Kenya" gives a prevalence of 12% for Mt. Elgon District, with 70% of this being in rural areas. Among the eight districts that form Western Province (under which Mt. Elgon District falls), Busia has the highest level (20%) followed by Vihiga (15%) with Mt. Elgon taking the third slot (12%). In Kenya, Meru District has the highest national prevalence; - the figure currently stands at 36%.³

On the basis of the above evidence, the appraisal team considers HIV/AIDS important because of its potential to undermine performance of community initiatives. The scourge results in loss of productive labour which is necessary to improve the economic situation in both countries. It is recommended that the programme involves the Ministries of Health during the development of community level activities.

² Government of Uganda, Min. of Health, 2001. HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report. STD/AIDS Control Programme, Kampala

³ Republic of Kenya, 2001. AIDS in Kenya: Background, Projections, Impact, Interventions and Policy. 6th ed. Min. of Health, Nairobi

6 DONOR CO-ORDINATION WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE NILE EQUATORIAL LAKE SUBSIDIARY ACTION PROGRAMME (NELSAP)

6.1 Scope

The Nile Basin Initiative's Nile Equatorial Lake Subsidiary Action Programme (NBI-NELSAP) has been working out plans for watershed management for all major rivers that drain into the Nile Basin, including Lake Victoria. It has been agreed with the World Bank that activities in the major Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project (LVEMP), implemented since 1997, and now being planned as a 15 years' Lake Victoria Environmental Management Programme Phase II, will be left out from NELSAP's planning. However, there are a number of watersheds, draining to Lake Victoria or Lake Kyoga, which are not a part of the LVEMP activities. Among these, the NELSAP has made plans for establishing projects on watershed management for three transboundary watersheds; Kagera River (Uganda/Rwanda), Mara River (Kenya/Tanzania) and the Sio – Malakisi – Malaba Rivers (Uganda/Kenya).

6.2 Roles and responsibilities

The NELSAP project 3.3, under the NBI, dealing with three of the watersheds draining Mt. Elgon (Sio – Malakisi – Malaba), has now been financed, mainly from Sweden. It will be implemented as soon as the detailed planning phase has been concluded, probably already from 2003. The lead agency for the Sio – Malakisi – Malaba project will be the NBI Secretariat (co-ordination on behalf of national governments), although the implementation will be done through bilateral donor schemes co-ordinated by the World Bank.

The project will have a steering committee with representatives from the involved countries and from the involved donors, but not necessarily from local stakeholders. The steering committee will report to the NBI Secretariat in Entebbe. It is not yet decided if the Sio – Malakisi – Malaba project will work under the EAC umbrella; there is at present no written agreements between NBI and EAC, although a co-ordination structure has been established. However, there is no EAC liaison officer in the NELSAP headquarter in Entebbe. Still, EAC considers itself to have a key role in the development of NELSAP activities in the Region. The issue will be discussed during a workshop in Kisumu, May 27-28, 2002.

It is clear that apart from the NBI Secretariat in Entebbe, EAC in Arusha, and a few of the involved national institutions on both sides, the project outline of NELSAP project 3.3 is virtually unknown to all the relevant partners in the area. None of the staff from UWA, FD or the district level, including the political leaders, in the Mt. Elgon area on the Ugandan side were aware of the project, and none of them had been contacted during the process of developing the project. However, despite the NBI primarily being an instrument established to foster political goodwill and peacekeeping efforts between the 10 Nile Basin countries, such programmes as the Sio – Malakisi – Malaba scheme will probably still have to work with local institutions and local communities.

The NELSAP project 3.3 should liaise thoroughly with the MERECP to establish an efficient share of responsibilities, both to avoid overlapping activities, and to avoid “competing” for the same local resource persons and institutions in both countries. Programme infrastructures should ideally also be harmonised, and there should be established formal meeting points whereby progress, initiatives, findings and plans can be effectively shared to the mutual benefit of both parties. One possibility would be to establish co-ordinating meetings between the two programmes' Steering Committees.

Even if it may be outside the ToR for this appraisal team, it might also be recommended that the NELSAP embarks on an initiative to make their plans and programmes better known within the areas in which their activities will take place. NBI's planning cycles should also involve some kind of local participation, both for clarification of such major overlaps as may be seen between NELSAP 3.3 and the MERECP, and to instigate at least a minimum of local ownership to programmes that apparently are concentrating on important natural resources in the area.

6.3 Other donors requirements and procedures

In general, the collaboration with other relevant donor-supported activities in both countries was assessed to be fairly adequate. It will be important for the MERECP to make sure that proper liaison with other on-going donor-supported activities in the Mt. Elgon area will continue throughout the lifetime of the programme, and with provisions to extend these relationships also after the phasing-out of MERECP.

The World Bank is involved in supporting the wildlife sector in Uganda, and the MERECP should be prepared to liaise with relevant activities under this programme in the Mt. Elgon area. The World Bank has also given support to the process of planning for the resettlement of the Benet people in Kapchorwa District in Uganda. Furthermore, the World Bank together with bilateral support from Germany, are involved in capacity building of the UWA and the MTTI. The "FACE-UWA" project has been supporting tree planting in the degraded areas of Mt. Elgon. Through this project about 5000 ha of degraded areas have been replanted.

On the Kenyan side, the tourism sector has received some support on infrastructure and marketing from BBC and from the British "Born Free Foundation". Kenya has also received some support through an EU-funded Community Development Programme. In the case of Trans Nzoia District, the "Vi Agro Forestry Project", funded by SIDA and Swedish NGOs, is supporting community land management, soil conservation, agroforestry, provision of tree seeds, and community/women group tree nurseries; and should be approached. In Mt. Elgon District, the NGO "Action Aid", funded by British development aid and EU, has also been very active and has supported development and advocacy work (e.g. in water, education, health, sanitation, forest conservation, and resettlement/rehabilitation schemes, and also establishing a "Mt. Elgon Forest Advocacy Network") during the last decade. The Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI) has been supported by the "Ford Foundation" on socio-economic research, including the utilisation of forest resources by the local communities. KEFRI basically also made the inventory of the forested areas of the Kenyan side of Mt. Elgon through a subcontract with the former MEICDP project. Support to the forestry sector in Kenya from the World Bank was suspended in the early 1990s. However, Belgium is still supporting forest activities in dryland areas in Kenya, but these activities are not affecting the Mt. Elgon area.

Under MERECP the relevant institutions receiving support from other donors could be actively involved in community level mobilisation, needs assessments, planning, resource mobilisation and overall capacity building for sustainability.

Mechanisms for full and effective involvement of these organisations should be worked out during the inception phase of the programme. As much as possible, a main role for relevant NGOs should be capacity building of local CBOs who should take on certain implementation roles.

7 OVERALL ASSESSMENT, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Main principles and conditions for planning and implementation

The appraisal team acknowledges that the PD in principle satisfies national plans and policies in both countries, as well as the EAC treaty.

The appraisal team acknowledges that the rationale behind the programme's overall goal, purpose and key result areas in principle are in line with the principles of ecosystem approach, and the principles laid down under the Convention on Biological Diversity to which both countries are signatories.

The appraisal team supports that one important aim of MERECP will be to develop a unified and consolidated integrated management plan that includes all the reserved areas of Mt. Elgon in both countries during the 4.5 years' programme period. This general management plan must be harmonised with the involved Districts' EAPs as well as with their general development plans. At present, the Ugandan side of MENP has a management plan from 1996 that is not implemented, while on the Kenyan side, the working out of a management plan, including the National Reserve and the National Park, started in 1999, but is still not finalised. The Management Plan for Mt. Elgon in Uganda has been criticised by external reviewers to be too costly and in need of a continued donor support to be implemented. It will be a challenge for the new regional programme to co-operate in as many fields as possible, including the working out of a unified management plan for the National Park, harmonisation of legislation, and sharing monitoring and research activities.

The appraisal team recommends that the inception phase of the programme (six months) i.a. is spent on:

- * Clarify regional and national ambitions of the programme, describing a more detailed workplan for the programme's activities, monitoring and reporting mechanisms
- * Plan for a more detailed harmonisation strategy between the two countries
- * Simplify the organisational structure, the number of stakeholders and the number of decision-making levels
- * Clarify authority lines, tasks duties and responsibilities of EAC, PSC, PMU, IUCN, and local stakeholders
- * Norad must make a decision regarding a controlling versus a participatory role
- * The local level co-operation and management structures should be clarified, and the programme activities must reflect the needs and priorities also of the local people
- * The priority of funds and activity level for various programme activities should be explicitly discussed as it will have bearings on stakeholders and organisational structure
- * The geographical location of PMU headquarters should be further discussed
- * An organisational structure should be put in place for a participatory monitoring of activities
- * IUCN should plan for a process of withdrawal from the PMU and a phasing-out of the external support within the programme's 4.5 years period.

Research is an important part of the MERECP. The team notes the importance of including social research in the research agenda to ensure that issues relating to the social interaction with the natural ecosystem are fully documented and regularly updated. The appraisal team also recommends that during the inception phase of the programme, a workshop where all

types of research needs within the programme are discussed. The programme should aim at identifying direct knowledge needs to carry out planned activities as well as to generate a long term knowledge basis.

7.2 Financial and technical requirements with anticipated inputs from partners, Norad and other donors

The appraisal team acknowledges that the process behind the development of the PD has been participatory in nature, with the exception of the development of the detailed budget outline. The appraisal team therefore recommends that the budget outline be thoroughly looked into in a participatory manner during the inception phase of the programme, in addition to the seven activities outlined on p. 26 of the PD. This will be the same approach as the proposed development of the monitoring and evaluation part of the programme as referred to on p. 33 of the PD. A revised budget should be approved by the PSC in the first annual meeting after the inception phase. The final draft proposal should be sent to all relevant stakeholders for comments before the detailed planning phase starts, including the budget.

To achieve the project goal in 4.5 years, as it stands today, is probably much too expensive to be replicable in other similar areas without a substantial donor support. One should look for ways to reduce costs throughout the programme period in order to develop a good pilot scheme that might be replicated.

There are no descriptions of how transboundary institutions and project implementation will be financed upon donor withdrawal. This should be addressed in the workplan of MERECP. The appraisal team recommends that the inception phase fully takes into account long-term sustainability issues for the local population surrounding the reserved areas. One important way to achieve this, would be to establish schemes where a major part of the revenue from activities related to the reserved areas (like tourism and forest plantations), is channelled back to the local communities for a continuous funding of programme activities.

Norad's detailed responsibilities in their role as external donor must also be clarified during this inception phase of the programme.

The project should aim to revise and improve the district level incentive structures for increasing incomes from tourism, park and forest plantations. The appraisal team recommends that efforts are made during the lifetime of the programme to make sure that a direct link between income-generating activities related to the use of MENP and the forest plantations, and income to the local authorities and communities, is established in both countries. A defined share of the locally generated income should also be retained locally. This is important both for the motivation of the local people to support the programme's activities, it is important for securing funds for a continuous investment in the ecosystem, and as a part of the long-term sustainability of activities to increase the income levels of the people bordering the reserved areas.

The revised proposal should address benefit sharing, income-generating activities and cost reduction approaches better. A choice should be made on whether to involve income-generating activities in the area in general, or if MERECP only should be confined to "environmentally related income-generating activities", which is suggested at present. The appraisal team would recommend that more emphasis on the local people's own priorities in this respect are observed.

As long as poverty reduction is still a goal of the project, the appraisal team finds no difficulty in arguing for programme activities relating to health, education and infrastructure. The appraisal team recommends that the inception phase of the programme is partly spent on a thorough revision of the budget outline, with the aim to channel a larger share of the resources to:

- * Reforestation and landscape restoration within agreed reserved boundaries
- * Establishment of sustainable income-generating activities at the local level, including an improvement of the management of the forest plantations in the area
- * Poverty-alleviating activities at the local level, including better agricultural and further agroforestry extension activities, and including an even larger focus on collaborative forest management efforts
- * More emphasis on the section of the people that are dependent on the resources of the natural forests, including gender awareness, youth that do not attend school, and landless peasants
- * Infrastructural initiatives relating to transport, education and health at the local level
- * Continued awareness raising and sensitisation among pupils at primary, secondary and tertiary level, teachers, farmer's associations, and relevant NGOs and CBOs locally
- * Establishment of harmonising initiatives regionally towards improved management and monitoring of the ecosystem, as well as relating to the sustainable use of biodiversity resources on Mt. Elgon
- * Capacity building at local administrative levels and within relevant, local NGOs and CBOs.

The appraisal team recommends that a relatively smaller share of the budget is spent on:

- * General support to IUCN's national offices, the IUCN-EARO headquarter and project staff being hired and paid for through IUCN
- * Capacity building to the EAC
- * PMU expenses, by using more staff on secondment from collaborating partners and less specially appointed staff.

7.3 Division of responsibilities between partners, Norad and other donors

The appraisal team acknowledges that despite the complicated organisational structure of the programme, it satisfies the conditions given by Norad's policies, by the two involved countries' policies and by EAC's policy.

It is not very clear which people will be represented in the PMU, and a general recommendation from the appraisal team would be to ensure that adequate representation from local stakeholders is secured, both to achieve sustainability of activities, to build local constituencies for the future, and to make sure programme activities are embedded in the district plans. DEAP activities should be co-ordinated with both programme and other district level activities, preferably through some co-ordinating bodies.

The issue of collaborative management agreements and strict observance of their rules and regulations by the communities will be a key contribution to environmental sustainability.

Monitoring of the actual resource use inside the reserved areas by surrounding communities should be taken more seriously. In particular, the development of a biodiversity conservation monitoring system is recommended.

The NELSAP project 3.3 should liaise thoroughly with the MERECP to establish an efficient share of responsibilities. Programme infrastructures should ideally be harmonised, and there should be established formal meeting points whereby progress, initiatives, findings and plans can be effectively shared to the mutual benefit of both parties. One possibility would be to establish co-ordinating meetings between the two programmes' Steering Committees.

The appraisal team recommends that some provisions for handling of disputes or disagreements are added to the PD.

7.4 Measures to ensure the partner's administrative capacity, quality assurance, accounting, auditing and reporting

The appraisal team in principle agrees to the proposal that was raised by several of the visited institutions, i.e. to plan for a mechanism whereby IUCN's role as responsible for the technical facilitation and the financial flows of the programme step by step is transferred to the involved national institutions represented by local authorities, NGOs and CBOs that actually are implementing the programme's activities. This might foster a better sense of local responsibility for the programme activities as well as easing the transition phase from a donor-supported scheme to a self-sustaining process. However, initially, the appraisal team supports the system whereby funds are routed through IUCN as suggested in the proposal.

The appraisal team recommends that during the inception phases, clear provision for reporting frequency and contents, for auditing procedures, and for the ambitions of implementing income-generating activities and poverty alleviation activities at the local level must be established.

To foster a better sense of national ownership to MERECP, it is recommended that the financial officers of the five involved districts are given full accounts of the financial flows and budget plans of the programme throughout its lifetime, so that information from these activities can be reported back on a quarterly basis to the central level in both countries in the ordinary way.

Kenya lacks the necessary experience in collaborative management processes, but will hopefully benefit from the Uganda experience. It is generally recommended that the central participating institutions on the Kenyan side take on the responsibility for review of relevant policies and mechanisms as a matter of urgency in order for Kenya to benefit from the programme resources. It is also recommended that development of a strong formal and informal partnership between the Local Government, FD and KWS in Kenya is initiated as soon as possible to arrange particularly for the County Council to effectively participate in the programme.

The appraisal team recommends that the central level in both countries are encouraged to support successful activities initiated under the programme in their ordinary budget outlines to secure some sustainability of the programme.

7.5 Measures to address gender, human rights, and HIV/AIDS issues, and measures to prevent corruption

The appraisal team would like to give the following recommendations:

- * Regarding gender, the appraisal team commends the programme for laying emphasis on involvement of men in the process of engendering the entire programme. It is

recognised that women will only effectively participate in training and leadership activities when household roles are adequately restructured in ways that are equitable

- * The human rights issue is only mentioned in relation to the Benet people on the Ugandan side of the Mt. Elgon. Although the programme is not directly involved in the resettlement of the Benet people, it is important that the programme monitors progress on this issue because there is a clear link between a satisfactory resettlement of the Benet people and conservation
- * The human rights issue is also implicitly inferred through emphasis on collaborative management which is meant to result in a more equitable relationship between the local people and the managers of protected areas. In recognition of the fact that the local people probably pose the biggest threat to protected areas, the appraisal team recommends that this issue receives adequate attention
- * To allocate a sufficient budget for effectively addressing the high levels of poverty prevalent in the area will be essential
- * Although statistics on HIV/AIDS in both Kenya and Uganda may be an understatement of the problem, they do confirm that the pandemic is real and carries with it the potential to reverse the anticipated economic gains. The appraisal team therefore recommends that this element be built into the programme, particularly at the community level activities. It is recommended that the programme involves the Ministries of Health during the development of relevant community level activities
- * While the PD recognises that corruption poses a threat to programme performance and in addition identifies some of the potential problematic institutions, such as the central ministries, it does not provide detailed strategies to address the problem. The appraisal team recommends that development of such strategies receives attention during the inception period. The proposed strategy of using detailed contracts between IUCN and the implementers is considered imperative
- * As a general recommendation, the PSC, made up of the key partners, must take on the full responsibility for transparency and accountability for programme funding. Funds allocated for all types of activities under MERECP should be made public for all stakeholders, as is the current practice with grants received from the central government to district administrations in Uganda. It is recommended that Kenya adopts a similar procedure with posting of development funds and expenditures in public offices as a basis for transparency and accountability.

7.6 Requirements for reviews and evaluations

With the addition of more focused research and monitoring components within the programme, the appraisal team does not want to recommend other measures for reviews and evaluations than the standard procedures for such schemes referred to in Norad's Development Co-operation Manual. However, a separate requirement for reviewing the revised PD after the inception period should be included. It might also be considered necessary to extend the inception period beyond the six months indicated in the PD.

APPENDIX 1 – References

(This reference list given here is by no means intended to be an exhaustive listing of relevant literature for the MERECP. The list only includes some of the relevant material that the appraisal team has seen during the consultancy, and is mainly based on reports and documents that were worked out during the former project phases both in Uganda and in Kenya)

- Asingwire, N, Asiimwe, F. & Muhangi, D., January 1998. Baseline Study: Socio-Economic Assessment of the Benet Community. A Final Consultancy Report Prepared for Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), Min. of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities. – Faculty of Social Sciences, Makerere University (74 pp).
- Benet Resettlement Implementation Committee (BIC), July 1998. Action Plan and Strategy for Resettling the Benet Community of Mt. Elgon National Park, Kapchorwa District. Executive Summary; submitted to Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry and Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA). – Unpubl. Report, 7 pp.
- Benet Resettlement Scheme, Mt. Elgon National Park, July 1996. Report of the Inter-Ministerial Task Force on Resettlement of the Benet. Submitted to Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities. – Unpubl. report, 95 pp.
- Consultation and developing process for the Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme (MERECP). Briefing note prepared for the Second NORAD/IUCN-EARO Consultative Meeting at Wasaa Conservation Centre, October 11-12, 2001. – Unpubl. paper, 7 pp.
- Consultation and developing process for the Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme (MERECP). Prepared for the High Level Meeting, Wasaa Conservation Centre, August 15, 2001. – Unpubl. paper, 6 pp + Summary of annual operation plan for the financial year 2002/2003; 2 pp.
- Davenport, T., Howard, P. & Dickinson, C. (eds.) 1996. Mount Elgon National Park: Biodiversity Report. – Forest Dept., Kampala (112 pp).
- East African Community, October 2001. 5th Meeting of the East African Community Committee on Environment and Natural Resources. AICC, Arusha, Tanzania, October 1st – 2nd, 2001; Report of the Meeting. – Unpubl. report; EAC/SR/14/2001 (9 pp + 3 annexes). Annex III: Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme. Draft proposal to the East African Community prepared by IUCN, the World Conservation Union at its Eastern Africa Regional Office, Nairobi (12 pp).
- East African Community, November 2001. Third Meeting of the Council of Ministers. AICC, Arusha, Tanzania, November 30th, 2001. Report of the Council. – Unpubl. report; EAC/CM3/CC/01/2001.
- East African Community, 2001. The East African Community Development Strategy 2001-2005. – Arusha (68 pp).
- Field visit of the Norad Appraisal Mission, Mt. Elgon Uganda side, [2002] – Unpubl. paper, 3 pp incl. map.
- Hinchley, D. 1997. Mt. Elgon Conservation and Development Project. Training Workshop Report, Summary of Procedures and Outcomes. Participatory Fieldwork Approaches and Tools for Community Conservation. Elgon Forest Exploration Centre, Mt. Elgon National Park 11-17 May 1997. - Technical Report no. 18 (28 pp + appendices)
- Hinchley, D. 1998. Mt. Elgon Conservation and Development Project. Working Paper: Review of Collaborative Management Arrangements for Mt. Elgon National Park. – Technical Report no. 21 (31 pp).

- Hinchley, D., Turyomurugyendo, L. & Stonewall, K. 2000. IUCN Eastern Africa Programme, Forest and Social Perspectives in Conservation: Review of Collaborative Management Arrangements for Mt. Elgon National Park. – IUCN Working Paper no. 4 (33 pp).
- IUCN-EARO, August 2001. IUCN Eastern Africa Programme. The Regional Consultative Meeting. Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme, 17th – 19th July, 2001. The Windsor Lake Victoria Hotel, Entebbe, Uganda. – Nairobi (51 pp).
- IUCN-EARO, 2001. Minutes of the High Level Consultative Meeting on Mt. Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme, 15th August 2001. Wasaa Conservation Centre. – Unpubl. report, 12 pp, including 3 annexes.
- IUCN, The World Conservation Union, [2001]. Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme (MERECP). Draft Programme Proposal. – IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Office, Nairobi (65 pp; including 6 annexes).
- IUCN/Mt. Elgon Conservation and Development Project, March 2001. Sustainable Development Parish Achievement Reports Phase III (1996-2000 December). Kapchorwa District. – Compiled by Imelda Lwanga, Mbale (42 pp + 2 appendices).
- Jørgensen, I., Hofstad, O., von Mitzlaff, U., Kaboggoza, J., Musoke, R. & Trømborg, E. 1999. Review of the Forestry Sector Programme Uganda (UGA 007, funded by Norad 1996-2000). – Ås, Kampala, Kongsberg, Arusha (98 pp).
- Makerere University Forest Resources and Institutions Research Centre (UFRIC), May 2001. Kapkwai Forest and its Users. A Site Monitoring Report prepared for presentation to the local people and officials of Kapkwai Forest, Mt. Elgon National Park. – Unpubl. report, 15 pp.
- Mandate for dialog for Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme (MERECP); approved October 18, 2001. – Unpubl. paper, 6 pp; in Norwegian.
- Memorandum of Understanding between East African Community (EAC) and IUCN – the World Conservation Union, Eastern Africa Regional Office (IUCN-EARO). – Unpubl. paper, 7 pp.
- Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry & Uganda Wildlife Authority, 2001. Mt Elgon Conservation and Development Project. Bridging Phase II; 2002 Work Plan. – Unpubl. paper, 21 pp + 5 Annexes.
- Minutes of the Meeting between IUCN-EARO and Norad, Thursday 11th & Friday 12th October 2001, at IUCN-EARO, Nairobi, Kenya. – Unpubl. paper, 11 pp.
- Mt. Elgon Conservation and Development Project. Status Report, August 2001. Document 4.4 at the Annual Meeting between Norad and IUCN-EARO, Nairobi, October 2001. – Unpubl. paper, 4 pp.
- Mt. Elgon Conservation and Development Project, April 2002. Briefing note. – Unpubl. paper; The Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Industry in collaboration with IUCN, The World Conservation Union (4 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Ecosystem Conservation and Development Programme, 2001. Proceedings of the National Consultative Workshop 18th-19th June 2001. Kitale, Kenya. – Unpubl. paper, 48 pp.
- Mt. Elgon Ecosystem Conservation and Development Programme, 2001. National Consultative Workshop for the proposed MEECDP, 3rd-4th July 2001, Mount Elgon Hotel, Mbale. – Unpubl. paper, 19 pp, incl. Consultation and developing process for the Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme (MERECP), prepared for the PSC Meeting, Maji House, December 4, 2001 (6 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, n.d. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (first draft). – Unpubl. paper, 10 pp.

- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, April 1997. Formulation Document, Final Draft. – IUCN, Kenya Wildlife Service & Forestry Department, Nairobi (59 pp. + 11 appendices).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, March 1999. Report on the Participatory Rural Appraisal Completed at the Nalulingo/Chesitia Farms, Muberere Sublocation, Kaibei Location, Endebess Division, Trans Nzoia District. – Compiled by the Project Management Unit, Kitale (54 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, Phase I, April 1999. Plan of Operations (Revised). – Unpubl. paper, 44 pp.
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 1999. Trip Report – Visit to the Mt. Elgon Conservation and Development Project/Uganda, April 25-29, 1999. – The Project Management Unit & Kenya Wildlife Service, Kitale (14 pp + appendix).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, May 1999. 1999 Workplan for Mt. Elgon District. – Unpubl. paper, 16 pp.
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 1999. Workshop Report: Doing a Feasibility Study. Held in Cheptumbelio/Kalaha, Saboti Division, June 4-9, 1999. – The Project Management Unit, Kitale (34 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, July 1999. Review of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) Reports and Secondary Data for MEICDP Pilot Areas, Mt. Elgon District. – Compiled by Susan A, Wasike (60 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, August 1999. Report on the Participatory Rural Appraisal completed at the Cheptumbelio/Kalaha Farms, Kissawai Sublocation, Kissawai Location, Saboti Division, Trans Nzoia District. – Compiled by the Project Management Unit, Kitale (64 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, October 1999. Workshop Report: Integrated Natural Resources Management Planning, Mt. Elgon. 6th-10th September 1999, Kitale. – Unpubl. report, 23 pp.
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, December 1999. Annual Workplan, 2000. – Kenya Wildlife Service, IUCN & Forest Department, Nairobi (33 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, November 2000. Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan, Mt. Elgon. Workshop Proceedings, 6th-10th September 1999. – Kitale (171 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, February 2000. Report on the Participatory Rural Appraisal. Completed at Kamtyong Sub-location, Elgon Location, Kapsokwony Division, Mt. Elgon District. – Compiled by PMU/MEICDP, Kitale (70 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, February 2000. Report on the Participatory Rural Appraisal. Completed at Kongit Sublocation, Kongit Location, Kaptama Division, Mt. Elgon District. – Compiled by PMU/MEICDP, Kitale (65 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2000. Agricultural Marketing Study Tour Report 28th-31st March 2000. – Compiled by Timothy Jomo Ogwang, District Marketing Officer, Min. of Agriculture, Mt. Elgon (18 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, May 2000. A 5-Year Tourism Strategy Framework for the Western Region of Kenya with Specific Focus on Mt. Elgon National Park. Final Report. – Unpubl. Report, 61 pp.

- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, June 2000. Training Report: Doing a Feasibility Study. Kongit Sublocation, Kaptama Division, Mt. Elgon District. – Unpubl. report, 16 pp.
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, June 2000. Training Report: On-Farm Tree Planting. Training Meetings held in Kongit and Kamtyong Sub-locations, Mt. Elgon District. – Compiled by Hellen Sikuku, Forest Extension Officer, Kapsokwony Division (18 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2000. Report on Training of Community Conservation Teams. Held at the Kenya Ministry Training Institute, Kitale, 5th to 10th June 2000. – Unpubl report, 23 pp.
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2000. Training Report: Beekeeping: Module 1 for Kamtiong and Kongit Farmers 20th-21st and 27th-28th June 2000. – Compiled by D.O. Osewe, Principle Facilitator & DLEO, Kaptama (11 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, July 2000. Annex to Training Report: Course Materials for Community Conservation Teams. – Compiled by Conservation Management and Training Services, Nanyuki (63 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2000. Report: Irish Potato Seed Production. Farmer Field Days held in Kongit and Kamtyong Sublocations 4th and 11th July 2000. – Compiled by Min. of Agriculture, Mt. Elgon District (10 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2000. Retreat Report. Held in Kabarnet, Kenya, 24-27 July 2000. – Compiled and presented by Catherine Gitau, Ideal Planning and Documentation Associates, Nairobi (50 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2000. Workshop Report on Stakeholder Consultation for the Development of Mt. Elgon Ecosystem Management Plan. Held from 7th to 9th August 2000. – Prepared by Management Planning Team (35 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2000. Workshop Report: Women Groups Leadership Training for Communities in Kamtyong Sub-Location, Kapsokwony Division and Kongit Sub-Location, Kaptama Division, Mt. Elgon District. July-September 2000. – Compiled by Margaret Mulaa, Kitale (84 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, November 2000. Participatory Leadership and Group Management Workshop for Women and Community Based Development Group Leaders from Chesitia/Nalulingo Farms, Endebess Division, Trans Nzoia District. Training Report Module 1, 2 & 3. – Compiled by Dorothy M. Wanyama Masinde, Kitale (44 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2000. Training Report: Agricultural Marketing, Chesitia and Nalulingo Farms, Trans Nzoia District. Held on site 20th to 22nd November 2000. – Compiled by Frances Kimanzu, Min. of Agriculture and Livestock Development Office (16 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, November 2000. Training Report: Household Energy Conservation. Held in Kamtiong and Kongit Sub-Locations, Mt. Elgon District. – Compiled by Grace Wasike, District Home Economics Officer, Mt. Elgon District (15 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, November 2000. Workplan 2001. – Kenya Wildlife Service, IUCN & Forest Department, Nairobi (43 pp).

- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2000. Report on Zero Grazing Farmers Training, Nalulingo/Chesitia Farms. Held 13th-15th December 2000, Kimondo Secondary School. – Compiled by Peter O. Mung'ayo, Walter Akuno & Joseph Nalianya (22 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, January 2001. Monitoring and Evaluation Report: Impact of Women Group Leadership Training and Progress on Implementation of Action Plans for Communities in Kamtong Sub-Location, Kapsokwony Division and Kongit Sub-Location, Kaptama Division, Mt. Elgon District. – Compiled by Margaret Mulaa, Kitale (47 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2001. Symposium Proceedings: Soya Bean Production, Processing and Marketing. Held at KARI Conference Room, Kitale, February 13-14, 2001. – Kenya Wildlife Service, IUCN & Forest Department, Nairobi (39 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2001. Training Report: Gender Awareness Creation Skills for Community Conservation Team Members. Held at Mt. Elgon Lodge 21-24 February 2001. – Unpubl. Report, 21 pp.
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, February-March 2001. Follow-up Report: Environmental Education for Schools, Mt. Elgon District. – Compiled by Thomas Mukabi, District Education Office, Mt. Elgon District (21 pp)
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, March 2001. External evaluation, final version. – Unpubl. report, 27 pp. + 4 appendices.
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2001. Training Report: Zero Grazing Module II. Held at Chesitia Community Hall 21st -23rd March 2001. – Compiled by Peter O. Mung'ayo, Joseph Nalianya & Walter Akuno (19 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2001. Training Report: Beekeeping Module 2: Harvesting and Processing of Hive Products. Cheptumbelio/Kalaha Farms, Kissawa Location, Trans Nzoia District 26th-31st March 2001. – Compiled by Judith K. Wabwire, District Beekeeping Officer, Min. of Agriculture (7 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, March-April 2001. Technical Report: Results of Potato Marketing Survey, Mt. Elgon District. – Prepared by T.J. Ogwang, District Marketing Officer, Min. of Agriculture, Mt. Elgon District (37 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2001. Training Report: Agroforestry Module I: Seed Collection, Nursery Establishment, and Tree Planting. Held at Chesitia/Nalulingo Farms, Endebess Division, Trans Nzoia District 24th-25th April 2001. – Compiled by M.M. Muliro, Divisional Forest Extension Officer, Endebess Division (14 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2001. Training Report: Group Strengthening for Beekeepers and Potato Seed Growers held at the DIDC-Kapsokwony 24th-26th April 2001 – Compiled by Pius Maruti, District Social Development Officer, Mt. Elgon District (22 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, May 2001. Follow-up Report: Business Feasibility Study Training, Trans Nzoia District. – Presented by Benard Owuori, Min. of Agriculture, Trans Nzoia (8 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, May 2001. Technical report: Aerial Photography and Landcover mapping of Mt. Elgon. – Kenya Wildlife Service, IUCN & Forest Department, Nairobi (15 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2001. Training Report: Seed Collection. Held at Kalaha and Cheptumbelio Farms, Teldet Sub-

- Location, Kissawai Location, Saboti Division 22nd and 23rd May 2001. – Compiled by Martin Barasa, Eluid Ndole, VI Agroforestry Project & Simon Khaemba, Forest Department (16 pp).
- Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, July 2001. Monitoring Report: Zero Grazing Activity. Chesitia/Nalulingo Farms, Endebess Division, Trans Nzoia District. – Compiled by Peter O. Mung'ayo, Divisional Extension Officer, Min. of Agriculture, Endebess (9 pp).
 - Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, July 2001. Review Meeting: Community Action Plan Committee. Cheptumbelio/Kalaha Farms. – Compiled by Charles Nerimah, Assistant DSDO, Trans Nzoia District (7 pp).
 - Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2001. Training Report: On-Farm Tree Nursery Establishment. Held at Kalaha/Cheptumbelio Farms 24th-25th July 2001. – Compiled by Martin Barasa Wasabulo & S.K. Wamunyasia (12 pp).
 - Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, July 2001. Review Meeting: Community Action Plan Committee. Cheptumbelio/Kalaha Farms. – Compiled by Charles Nerimah, Assistant DSDO, Trans Nzoia District (7 pp).
 - Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, July 2001. Workplan for a Cost Neutral Extension, August to December, 2001. – Kenya Wildlife Service, IUCN & Forest Department (22 pp).
 - Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2001. Training Report: Conservation Awareness Creation for Community Conservation Teams. Held at Mt. Crest Hotel, Kimilili, 30th July-4th August 2001. – Compiled by Benard Owuori, Facilitator, Min. of Agriculture. Trans Nzoia (28 pp).
 - Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, 2001. Training Report: Poster Development for Community Conservation Teams. Held at PMU Office, 20-21 September 2001. – Compiled by S. Aversa & S. Wasike, PMU/MEICDP (27 pp).
 - Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, [2001]. Tour Report: Community Conservation Team Members' Visit to the Ugunja Community Resource Centre. – Compiled by Christiano Nyongesa, CCT member Kamtyong Sublocation, Mt. Elgon District (12 pp).
 - Mt. Elgon National Park; Elgon Forest Exploration Centre, Kapkwai (1994). [General curriculum] – Unpubl. paper, 4 pp.
 - Mt. Elgon National Park, 2001. Resource Access Agreement between Mt. Elgon National Park and the Community of Bunamulunyi Parish, Mbale District. – Unpubl. paper, 7 pp.
 - Mt. Elgon Conservation and Development Project, 2002. Mission brief about MEICDP. – Unpubl. paper, 4 pp.
 - Mt. Elgon News, No. 2, June 2001. – A newsletter issued by Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project, Kitale, Kenya (16 pp).
 - NEMA (National Environment Management Authority) Organogram, February 2002. – (1 p).
 - Nield, R., Mugo, E. & Mwathe, K., October 1999. Review of the management of the forest resources of Mt. Elgon ecosystem, Kenya. Prepared for The National Project Steering Committee of Mt. Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project. – Forest Department, Min. of Environment and Natural Resources & Kenya Wildlife Service, Nairobi (32 pp).
 - Nile Equatorial Lakes Council of Ministers. Nile Basin Initiative: Sustainable development of the River Nile for the benefit of all. Nile Equatorial Lakes

- Subsidiary Action Program (NELSAP). Project Identification Document. P 3.3: Development of a Framework for Co-operative Management of the Water Resources of the Malakisi – Malaba – Sio River Basins. – Unpubl. paper; Nile Equatorial Lakes Council of Ministers (14 pp).
- Norad's Development Co-operation Manual, - a tool for ensuring the quality of development co-operation programmes. (Version of March 6, 2002). – Norad, Oslo (44 pp).
 - Pomeroy, D. 1991. A biodiversity inventory for Mt. Elgon Forest Reserve. – Sustainable Development and Forest Conservation in Uganda, Technical Report no. 4. Kampala (26 pp).
 - Projects started by IUCN in Mt. Elgon National Park [Kenya; related to the Kenya Wildlife Service], n.d. – Unpubl. paper, 2 pp.
 - Scott, P. 1998. From Conflict to Collaboration. People and Forests at Mount Elgon, Uganda. – IUCN, Gland & Cambridge (149 pp).
 - Sjöholm, H., Arnesen, O.E. & Ddungu, B.B. 1998. Review of the Mt. Elgon Conservation and Development Project. – First draft (47 pp).
 - Terms of Reference for Appraisal of the project proposal Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme (MERECP), proposed by IUCN in co-operation with East African Community and the Governments of Uganda and Kenya (3 pp + Document Format Appraisal Report.) – Unpubl. paper, Kampala, March 13, 2002.
 - The Elgon Focus. The Newsletter of Mount Elgon Conservation and Development Project, vol. 1 no. 4. (1996) – 12 pp.
 - Uganda Wildlife Authority, n.d. Mt. Elgon National Park. The Mountain of Illusion. – Brochure, 4 pp.

APPENDIX 2 – Travel itinerary with meetings

April 23, 2002:

- Briefing at the Norwegian Embassy in Kampala; Hans Venvik and Harald Karlsnes
- Meeting with the IUCN Country Office in Uganda; Alex B. Muhweezi, Country representative

April 24, 2002:

- Meeting with Min. of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Uganda; Mr. Balinda and Rogers Enyaku, Senior Finance Officer
- Meeting with Min. of Tourism, Trade and Industry, Uganda; J. Tindigarukayo, Assistant Commissioner of Wildlife
- Meeting with Min. of Water, Lands and Environment, Uganda; Sam Bikangage, Senior Economist, Planning Dept.

April 25, 2002:

- Meeting with Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA); Maxwell E.P. Akora, Director for Financial Services, and Eunice Nyiramahoro, Deputy Director for Community Conservation
- Meeting with the National Environment Management Authority, Uganda; Festus Bagoora, Natural Resource Management Specialist
- Meeting with Min. of Water, Lands and Environment, Uganda; Deo N. Byarugaba, Acting Commissioner for Forestry, Forest Dept.
- Meeting with Nile Basin Initiative Secretariat Office in Entebbe, Uganda; Joseph Okongo, Financial Controller

April 26, 2002:

- Meeting at the Norwegian Embassy in Kampala, Uganda; Alex Muhweezi IUCN and Hans Venvik
- Meeting in Kampala with Lars Ekengren, Director for the Lake Victoria Directorate in SIDA, Stockholm
- Travel Kampala – Mbale
- Meeting with the Mt. Elgon National Park staff under UWA at their headquarter in Mbale. 12 officers present at the meeting, incl. James O. Okonya, Chief Warden, and Kato Stonewall, Warden Community Conservation. From the Mt. Elgon National Park staff: Fredrick Wanyama, Richard Muhabwe, Allen Nambozo Kutosi, Martin Masiga, Oryema Andrew Okot, Wilson Katamigwa, Natalay Bikabi (tourism), Ben Butele. From the former MECDP: John M. Ndori and Peter Ayo
- Working dinner at Sunrise Inn, Mbale, with nine District Officials from Mbale, Kapchorwa and Sironko Districts, incl. N.K. Chelimo, LC V Chairman Kapchorwa; James Onyait, Acting CAO Kapchorwa; Francis Nagimesi, LC V Chairman Sironko; Balisanyuka, CAO Sironko; Peter Ayo, Sustainable Development Officer Mbale; John Doii, Project Accountant for Mt. Elgon Conservation and Development Project (MECDP); Stephen Kigoolo, also from MECDP; and Kato Stonewall, Community Conservation Officer in Mt. Elgon National Park

April 27, 2002:

Field visit to Mt. Elgon area, Mbale District, Uganda:

- Bunamulunyi parish: Resource access agreements, forest rehabilitation, sustainable development, agroforestry

- Buwundu parish: Sustainable development, negotiations on collaborative management
- Working dinner at Sunrise Inn, Mbale, with Seàn White, Chief Technical Adviser for Mt. Elgon Conservation and Development Project

April 28, 2002:

Field visit to Mt. Elgon area, Kapchorwa District, Uganda:

- Kapkwai parish: Environmental education centre: FACE planting, collaborative management agreements, sustainable development programme, environment planning support programme
- Benet area: The Benet resettlement issue
- Travel to Kitale, Kenya. Facilitation taken over by Humphrey K. Kisioh, Co-ordinator for protected areas, IUCN-EARO, on the Kenyan side of the border
- Meeting with the Appraisal Team at Kitale Club, Kenya

April 29, 2002:

- Meeting with Kenya Wildlife Service; Anthony K. Musyoka, District Forestry Planning Officer, and Baraza Otunsah, Chief Warden of Mt. Elgon National Park
- Meeting with the District Commissioner for Trans Nzoia District, S.E. Oreta

Field visit to Mt. Elgon area, Trans Nzoia District, Kenya:

- Mt. Elgon National Park, incl. the National Park HQ
- Meeting with eight representatives from DDC and the Community Conservation Team at the National Park HQ
- Meeting with 11 local stakeholders at the National Museums of Kenya in Trans Nzoia District, Kitale: B.M. Otungah (Senior Warden, Mt. Elgon National Park), Anthony Musyoka (Forest Dept. Planning Officer), Michael Komen (environment), Charles Lagat (lands), David Lenemina (agriculture), J.C. Mieie (water), Andrew Kiptoo (roads), Gladys K.W. Kinyuah (District Development Officer), Justina N. Sitti (member of DEC), John Satya (Chamber of Commerce), Michael Kitiyo (Chamber of Commerce)

April 30, 2002:

- Meeting with the District Forestry Officer in Mt. Elgon District, Kenya, Mr. Owino
- Meeting with the Deputy District Commissioner, Mt. Elgon District
- Meeting with the staff at the County Council, Mt. Elgon District
- Meeting at the KWS Office, Kaberwa Forest Station, Mt. Elgon District; Robert Okotieno, Assistant Warden in Mt. Elgon District, and some Community Conservation Team members

Field visit to Mt. Elgon area, Mt. Elgon District, Kenya

May 1, 2002:

- Travel Kitale – Nairobi

May 2, 2002:

- Meeting at the Dutch Embassy, Nairobi; Jantinus Smullenbroek, First Secretary
- Meeting at IUCN-EARO, Nairobi; Eldad Tukahirwa, Florence Chege, Edmund Barrow, Humphrey Kisioh
- Travel Nairobi – Arusha

May 3, 2002:

- Meeting with the East African Community Secretariat in Arusha, Tanzania; Nyamajeje C. Weggro, Economist for Sectoral Policies and Programmes; Kapyas W.

Kipkore, Programme Officer for Lake Victoria Development Programme; and Tom O. Okurut, Programme Officer for Lake Victoria
- Travel Arusha – Nairobi

May 4, 2002:

- Meeting at Fairview Hotel, Nairobi, Appraisal Team

May 5, 2002:

- Writing preliminary report at Fairview Hotel, Nairobi

May 6, 2002:

- Meeting with Kenya Forestry Research Institute; Paul K. Konuche, Director, and with Min. of Environment and Natural Resources, Kinuthia Mbugua, Deputy Secretary, Nairobi, Kenya. Also present were Environmental and Forest Officers from the Ministry, the Chief Conservator of Forests and the Deputy Chief Conservator of Forests from the Forest Dept.

- Travel Nairobi – Kampala

May 7, 2002:

- Meeting with Uganda Wildlife Authority, Kampala, Uganda; Arthur Mugisha, Executive Director

- Meeting at the Norwegian Embassy in Kampala, Uganda, presenting preliminary findings and recommendations

APPENDIX 3 – List of acronyms

AIDS	Acquired Immuno-Deficiency Syndrome
CAO	Chief Administrative Officer
CBD	UN Convention on Biological Diversity
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CCT	Community Conservation Team
DEAP	District Environment Action Plan
EAC	East African Community
EARO	Eastern African Regional Office (IUCN)
EU	European Union
FACE	Forests Absorbing Carbon Emissions
FD	Forest Department
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IGG	Inspector General of the Government
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
KARI	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute
KEFRI	Kenya Forestry Research Institute
KRA	Key Result Area
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Service
LC	Local Council
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
LVEMP	Lake Victoria Environmental and Management Project
MECDP	Mount Elgon Conservation and Development Project
MEICDP	Mount Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project
MENP	Mount Elgon National Park
MENR	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
MERECP	Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTTI	Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry
MWLE	Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment
NBI	Nile Basin Initiative
NEAP	National Environment Action Plan
NELSAP	Nile Equatorial Lake Subsidiary Action Programme
NEMA	National Environment Management Authority
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
PEAP	Parish Environmental Action Plan
PD	Programme Document
PMU	Project Management Unit
PSC	Programme Steering Committee
SIDA	Swedish International Development Authority
TOR	Terms of Reference
UWA	Uganda Wildlife Authority

APPENDIX 4. - Terms of Reference

DRAFT

Terms of Reference for Appraisal of the project proposal

Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme (MERECP)

Proposed by IUCN in co-operation with East African Community and the Governments of Uganda and Kenya

1. BACKGROUND

The Mount Elgon ecosystem has provided and continues to provide a stream of services and products that have sustained the livelihood of past and present generations. It is also recognised that the ecosystem is under severe human pressure, leading to degradation and depletion of resources. The Ugandan Government and local communities, in partnership with NORAD and IUCN, have over the last 10 years been implementing the Mount Elgon Conservation and Development Project (MECDP), which has been aimed at addressing the threats to the Ugandan side of the ecosystem. Likewise, the Kenyan Government in partnership with the Royal Netherlands Government (RNG) and IUCN have, for the last three years, been implementing the Mount Elgon Integrated Conservation and Development Project (MEICDP) with the aim of improving the sustainable management of the ecosystem on the Kenyan side of the mountain.

Phase I of MECDP in Uganda concentrated on an inventory and planning for natural resource management, while Phase II emphasised a range of integrated conservation and development strategies to conserve the Mt. Elgon ecosystem and promote a sustainable development with the communities depending on its resources in the area. Phase III put greater emphasis on linking conservation and sustainable development, and supported the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) in developing collaborative management arrangements. Emphasis is placed on training local staff and on linking collaborative management arrangements with out-of-park sustainable development extension programmes aimed at providing alternatives for local people to the use of resources from the park.

The MEICDP in Kenya began in July 1998, and will end in December 2001. The Project provided support to both the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) for the management of Mount Elgon National Park (MENP), and to Forest Department for management of the Forest Reserves in the two districts. RNG funded the project.

In consultations with Uganda in December 2000 and in May 2001, support to Mt Elgon in a sub regional context was discussed. NORAD approved a Mandate for Dialogue in October 2001 for further planning of support to Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme (MERECP). East Africa Community submitted a request for support for the programme to NORAD by January 31st 2002.

NORAD emphasis the regional co-operation for improved environmental and economic development and supports the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) Shared Vision Program and preparation for the Subsidiary Action Program. A support to the Kagera River Basin Integrated Water Resources Management Project (Kagera), Mara River Basin Integrated Water Resources Management Project (Mara) and Sio-Malaba-Malakisi Integrated Water Resources Management Project (Sio) representing the fast track water management program of the NELSAP

(Nile Equatorial Lakes in the NBI), is being considered. Sio-Malaba-Malakisi Basin is a part of the Mt. Elgon watershed area.

2. PURPOSE

The purpose of the appraisal is to provide input to NORADs assessment of the proposed programme. Further assess the necessary adjustment of the proposed administrative structure for an improved dialogue between NORAD and East African Community (EAC), the Government of Uganda (GoU), the Government of Kenya (GoK) and IUCN on the design of the programme, taking into regard the partners priorities and needs.

Further, with reference to NBI/ Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Programme (NELSAP P3.3) the appraisal should provide information for the most suitable co-ordination of the two adjacent programmes to be discussed between NORAD and Sida.

3. SCOPE OF WORK

In light of the scope and achievements of the previous co-operation between GoU and IUCN, and GoK and IUCN respectively, the consultant shall assess the relevance, design and sustainability of the proposed programme. The appraisal report format in NORADs Programme and Project Cycle Manual shall be used as a checklist for identifying the most important aspects to be assessed.

Particular emphasis shall be given to the following issues:

- Assess the need for further information and data on natural resource management of the Mount Elgon ecosystem within the two countries.
- Assess and recommend on possible agreement partners and implementation agencies, given the need for a continued conservation of natural resources and a positive social and economic development in the area, post NORAD assistance.
- Assess and recommend on the institutional structure and organisational arrangements of the programme in association of a strong and enduring regional, national and local ownership of the programme.
- Assess and recommend on EAC's role and function in the programme in respect of EAC's policy on regional environmental programmes, with due respect to national and local ownership and implementing responsibility through established national structures.
- Assess and recommend on IUCN's role and function in the programme in view of their capability with respect to the long term development aspects of the programme.
- Assess and recommend on the budget allocations and disbursement arrangements of the programme in view of the programme professional and technical challenges compared with the competence and capacity in the partner institutions.
- With reference to the Lake Victoria Development Programme (EAC), and the Nile Basin Initiative (NELSAP), assess the efforts needed to co-ordinate the two proposed adjacent programmes MERECp and the NELSAP Water management Programme P3.3, and recommend how to enhance co-ordination and synergetic effects in watershed management.
- Assess how cross cutting issues such as gender, HIV/AIDS, human rights and corruption are addressed in the programme, and recommend improvement if necessary.

4. MODE OF WORK/METHODOLOGY

In addition to information contained in the programme proposal and other relevant documents and reports to be provided by NORAD Oslo and the Norwegian Embassy in Kampala, the appraisal team is expected to discuss the programme with relevant institutions in Uganda and Kenya including EAC in Arusha, Tanzania, Sida and other donors including the World Bank, and to interview key personnel in IUCN Kampala and Nairobi.

5. TIME FRAME AND REPORTING

The review shall take place during (to be negotiated) 2002, with the fieldwork completed before end of (to be negotiated) 2002.

A draft report shall be submitted to NORAD for comments within (to be negotiated). Ten copies of the final report shall be presented to NORAD.

Approved Kampala, 13.03.02

Tore Gjøs
Ambassador.