



for a living planet[®]

**BAZARUTO ARCHIPELAGO NATIONAL
PARK, MOZAMBIQUE**

MID-TERM INTERNAL REVIEW OF

**BAZARUTO MULTIPLE RESOURCE
USE PROJECT, 2001-2005**

AND

**BAZARUTO COMMUNITY BASED NATURAL
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROJECT, 2003-2005**

**MRUP Project No. MZ 000601,
Funded by WWF Switzerland and WWF Sweden
and
CBNRM Project No. MZ 001001 / Contract No. GLO-02/467-2,
Funded by NORAD and WWF Norway;
through
WWF Southern African Regional Office (SARPO)
and WWF Mozambique Country Office (MCO)**

May 2005

**Report compiled
by
Rob Cunliffe (Independent Reviewer)
and
Russell Taylor (WWF SARPO),
Helena Motta (WWF MCO),
Monica Borner (WWF Switzerland) and
Anne Martinussen (WWF Norway)**

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1. BACKGROUND	6
1.1 General Background	6
1.2 The Bazaruto Multiple Resource Use Project (MRUP)	6
1.3 The Bazaruto CBNRM Project	7
1.4 Context for the Review	7
2. REVIEW PROCESS	7
3. REVIEW RESULTS - MRUP PROJECT	10
3.1 Project Goal	10
3.2 Assessment Against Objectives and Activities	10
OBJECTIVE 1: Implement Park Rules and Park Management Plan for Bazaruto Archipelago National Park	10
OBJECTIVE 2: Lobby for Securement of Donor Funding for the Next Project Phase	14
OBJECTIVE 3: Co-Manage Bazaruto Archipelago in Partnership With Relevant Agencies	15
OBJECTIVE 4: Manage Local Resources in Partnership With Local Communities	20
OBJECTIVE 5: Resource Monitoring	23
OBJECTIVE 6: Administration and Logistic Aspects	25
4. REVIEW RESULTS – CBNRM PROJECT	28
4.1 General Context and Project Objectives	28
4.2 Assessment Against Project Outputs and Activities	29
OUTPUT 1: Local Community Institutions Established and Operational in Accordance With the Management Plan	29
OUTPUT 2: Conditions and Possibilities for Greater Income Generation Activities at the Local Level	31
OUTPUT 3: Communities Capable of Monitoring and Evaluating Their Own Use, and Making Decisions Towards Sustainability of Natural Resources	33
OUTPUT 4: Appropriate and Effective Mechanisms for Revenue Sharing Functioning	36
OUTPUT 5: Better Functionality of CBNRM Project	38
4.3 Indicators for the CBNRM Project	39
5. CONCLUSIONS	39
5.1 Project Achievements	39
5.1.1 Conservation Benefits	39
5.1.2 Socio-economic Benefits	40
5.1.3 Broader Achievements	40
5.2 Key Issues	40
5.2.1 Uncontrolled Tourism Development	40
5.2.2 Impacts to Resources by Island Communities	42
5.3 Issues to be Followed Up	43
5.4 Way Forward	45
6. APPENDICES	46
Appendix 1 Terms of Reference	46
Appendix 2 List of Documentation Made Available to the Independent Reviewer	51
Appendix 3 Lists of Participants Consulted During the Review Process	52
Appendix 4 MRUP Original Project Log-frame Matrix	55
Appendix 5 List of Scientists and Other Important Visitors to the BANP 2001-2005	59
Appendix 6 List of Main Documentation/Reports Produced 2001-2005	59
Appendix 7 Collection and Transfer of Fees and Fines by the BANP	60
Appendix 8 CBNRM Log-frame Matrix	61

ACRONYMS

ADMAR	Maritime Authority (Administração Marítima)
BAIC	Bazaruto Archipelago Islands Committee
BANP	Bazaruto Archipelago National Park
CAMPFIRE	Communal Areas Management Programme For Indigenous Resources
CARE	Cooperative Assistance and Relief Everywhere
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resource Management
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CCMP	Conservation and Collaborative Management Program
CHF	Swiss Franc
CORDIO	Coral Reef Degradation in the Indian Ocean
DDS	District Directorate of Health
DINAGECA	National Directorate for land registration and mapping
DNAC	National Directorate for Conservation Areas (Ministry of Tourism)
DNFFB	National Directorate for Forestry and Wildlife (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development)
EAME	East African Marine Ecosystem
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EWT	Endangered Wildlife Trust
FFP	Fisheries Development Fund (Fundo de Fomento Pesqueiro)
FNP	Forum Natureza em Perigo
FUTUR	National Fund for Tourism
IDPPE	Institute for the Development of Small Scale Fisheries
IIP	Institute for Fisheries Research
KK	Kanhi Kwedhu
LIFE	Living in a Finite Environment
MICOA	Ministry for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs
MITUR	Ministry of Tourism
MOMS	Management Orientated Monitoring System
MRUP	Multiple Resource Use Project
MZM	Mozambique Meticais
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
NOK	Norwegian Kroner
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
PA	Park Administrator
PRA	Participatory Rapid Appraisal
UEM	Eduardo Mondlane University
USD	United States Dollar
WIOMSA	Western Indian Ocean Marine Scientists Association
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
WWF MCO	WWF Mozambique Coordination Office
WWF SARPO	WWF Southern African Regional Programme Office

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of an internal progress review of two projects being implemented within the Bazaruto Archipelago National Park (BANP): the Multiple Resource Use Project (MRUP) 2001-2005, and the Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) project 2003-2007 (funding secured for 2003-2005). The review was carried out between the 8th and 21st of April 2005 by a team of four WWF staff and one external consultant.

The aim of review was to assess the progress of the two projects towards their stated objectives and outputs, to document what has been done, to identify any constraints hindering progress, and to provide recommendations to guide the future implementation of both projects.

The MRUP Project got off to a strongly positive start in 2001. The Park was extended to its current limits, the management plan was finally adopted, a new Park administration was put in place, and a larger project proposal (the BANP Conservation and Collaborative Management Programme or CCMP) was developed and circulated to donors for funding.

The CBNRM project was initiated in 2003. In effect, this covers the community component of the original CCMP proposal, but which under the CBNRM project was developed into a stand-alone and considerably more substantial project.

From 2003, relationships between key stakeholders within the BANP started to deteriorate. This was primarily due to a spate of development activities by existing hotel operators that were in apparent contravention of the limitations and procedures as stipulated within the management plan. A second key issue was a marked reduction in the flow of revenues to communities within the BANP. This resulted from the introduction of new national legislation, but was compounded by the unilateral withholding of tourism fees by some private sector operators. These two issues have yet to be satisfactorily resolved.

Collectively, the two projects have made an essential contribution to the continued conservation of the biological resources of the BANP. Principal achievements include: the extension of the Park to its current limits, the adoption of the management plan (for the period 2002-2006), and providing essential support to enable continued management of the Park, including improved monitoring and protection of biological resources and increased involvement of communities with the management of these resources. Specific examples of conservation successes include: enhanced protection for species of special conservation interest such as dugongs and turtles, a drastic reduction in long-line commercial fishing by foreign registered vessels, and a similar decline in gill netting by local fishermen.

Project support has also resulted in significant improvements to the socioeconomic conditions of communities living within the BANP. Specific achievements in this respect include improved schools; access to scholarships; adult literacy courses; the provision of identification papers thus facilitating access to education, employment opportunities and rights to the use of natural resources in the BANP; the training of selected islanders (for example as community scouts and in producing honey); the establishment of community centers; the facilitation of a soccer tournament for the purpose of environmental education; the formation of cultural groups; and the establishment of and support to community based groups such as associations and natural resource user groups.

Of particular note, is the fact that the project has been at the forefront of developing novel approaches to CBNRM within Mozambique. Key innovations include the establishment of community

associations, the development of systems for the transfer of revenues from tourists to communities, and the recent adaptation and introduction of the Management Oriented Monitoring System (MOMS).

Despite these significant conservation successes, the review also identified a number of key concerns. One of these is the apparent continued decline in marine resources such as coral reefs, fish and mapalo (sand oysters), on which local livelihoods are directly dependent. The key challenge here is to develop alternative livelihood options, including increasing the benefits from tourism to communities both through direct employment and an increased transfer of revenues, as the CBNRM project is actively seeking to do.

Potentially unsustainable tourism development is another key threat to the resource base of the BANP. The management plan is seen as being a key instrument in this respect. The main requirements here are to ensure strict compliance with the management plan, and to ensure that the forthcoming revision is done in a sound manner. The new management plan must deliver a suitable mechanism to control future developments, such that these are limited to the capacity of the system to support such activities on a sustainable basis.

A fundamental requirement to addressing concerns about both community livelihoods and future developments will be to improve trust and understanding, and thus ensure the development and maintenance of better relationships, among key stakeholders.

Additional specific recommendations are provided for both projects, concerning their future structure and implementation.

In particular, it is suggested that, drawing on the findings of this review, new log-frames should be developed for both projects and submitted to the current donors - WWF Switzerland and WWF Norway. The new proposals should be harmonized with one another in terms of content and timing. The suggested period for the next phase is 2006-2008, as this fits in with both the pledged support by WWF Switzerland for three more years and the three-year planning cycle used by WWF Norway. Both donors, however, have made it clear that continued support will be dependent on implementation of the management plan, including the prevention of any new developments not authorized under the management plan.

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 General Background

The Bazaruto National Park was created in 1971 but it was only after 1989 that an administration was put in place, nominated by DNFFB, at that time the authority for parks in Mozambique. The area of the Park only included the Islands of Benguerra, Magaruque and Bangue plus five nautical miles surrounding them (c. 600 km²). The largest Island of Bazaruto and the much smaller Santa Carolina were classified as “areas of vigilance”. The principal objective of this Park was to protect the endangered dugong and marine turtles. Placing a Park Warden in Bazaruto was made possible due to support from WWF South Africa and EWT (Endangered Wildlife Trust, now FNP, Forum Natureza em Perigo, a national NGO) which financed the establishment of the current camp-site in Sitone, developed a number of studies and implemented a community rangers programme.

From 1994-1998 the Park received project funding from the European Union through WWF International and WWF SARPO. This was a very ambitious project with several objectives and represented the first large funding support to Bazaruto. One of the most important out-puts of the project was the intended approval of the then drafted Management Plan and the extension of the Park to reflect a more coherent ecosystem approach. This was never implemented by the Government of the day and thus the EU support was not renewed. In 1998 WWF Switzerland initiated support to the Park, through funding the Multiple Resource Use Project (MRUP).

In 2001, WWF Switzerland extended their support to the Park under a second phase of the Multiple Resource Use Project designed for 2001-2005. Several other significant developments also occurred. The authority for protected areas was transferred from the Ministry of Agriculture to the Ministry of Tourism (MITUR) and its National Directorate for Conservation Areas (DNAC). The Park was finally extended to include all five islands in the Archipelago and surrounding waters – now called the Bazaruto Archipelago National Park (BANP), and covering an area of 1,430 km². In 2002 the management plan was approved (for the period 2002-2006), a new park administration was put in place and a larger project proposal was developed, approved by DNAC and circulated to donors for funding (the “Bazaruto Archipelago National Park Conservation and Collaborative Management Program,” or CCMP).

The goal of the CCMP proposal was “conservation of biodiversity and improvement of social well-being in the Bazaruto Archipelago, through sustainable management systems”. This was to be achieved through three objectives, concerning support to Park management, support to communities and the sustainable use of natural resources, and the development of management and protection programmes for key ecosystems and species. Implementation of the MRUP covered much of what was envisaged under the CCMP support to Park management component. In 2003 WWF Norway provided support for the community component of the CCMP project in the form of a Bazaruto Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) Project, 2003-2007.

Implementation of activities related to both projects has been carried out by means of a tripartite partnership between the Park, WWF and FNP.

1.2 The Bazaruto Multiple Resource Use Project (MRUP)

The 2001-2005 MRUP has the following goals and objectives:

Goals

- Ensure Government commitment in the approval of the proposal for extension of new national park limits, park rules and park management plan for Greater Bazaruto National Park.
- Follow on donors comments to the submitted new project phase proposal for “Bazaruto Archipelago Conservation and Collaborative Management Programme” for the next five years.
- Continue to implement Bazaruto National Park Management Plan.

Objectives

- Objective 1. Implement park rules and park management plan for Bazaruto Archipelago National Park.
- Objective 2. Lobby for securement of donor funding for the next project phase.
- Objective 3. Co-manage Bazaruto Archipelago in partnership with relevant agents.
- Objective 4. Manage local resources in partnership with local communities.
- Objective 5. Resource monitoring.
- Objective 6. Administration and logistic aspects.

1.3 The Bazaruto CBNRM Project

The 2003-2007 Bazaruto CBNRM project is structured in the form of the following overall development goal, project purpose and outputs (through which the purpose and goal is to be achieved).

Development Goal. Local communities benefit from and contribute to the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity in the Bazaruto Archipelago National Park, Mozambique.

Purpose (target). Community-based organizations are actively participating in the protection, management and sustainable use of the Bazaruto Archipelago National Park and its natural resources together with the management authority and private sector partners.

Outputs

- Output 1. Local community institutions established and operational in accordance with the BANP management plan.
- Output 2. Enabling environment and mechanisms promoted and created for local community income generation activities.
- Output 3. Communities capable of monitoring, evaluating and making decisions regarding sustainable use of natural resources.
- Output 4. Appropriate and effective mechanisms for revenue sharing developed and functioning.

Initial funding was provided for the period 2003-2005.

1.4 Context for the Review

The MRUP reaches the end of its current phase in 2005. The first phase of the CBNRM project lasts until December 2007, but with funding from NORAD being secured until December 2005. Due to the slow start to the CBNRM project the mid-term review, which was scheduled for April 2004, has not yet taken place. Thus, this seemed an appropriate time to review the two projects in terms of progress towards their stated goals and the identification of constraints to such progress.

Another key consideration was that over the last two years the BANP has experienced considerable development pressures. A number of inappropriate infrastructure developments have been implemented or are planned, and the management plan has not been adhered to as required. There is a high level of concern that such developments might have negative impacts on conservation goals in the long term. This has contributed to strained relationships between key stakeholders including Government agencies, including the BANP administration, WWF, FNP, private sector and community participants.

The need to revise the management plan is also recognized by all stakeholders. However, different interest groups have different motivations in this respect, such that this is another source of potential conflict.

2. REVIEW PROCESS

The purpose of the review was to provide an objective assessment of the progress of the two projects towards their stated goals, and to identify any constraints hindering such progress. Although there are a number of complementarities and areas of overlap between the two projects, during the review process it was attempted to

separate these out and provide independent assessments for the two projects. It must be emphasized that the review relates only to the two projects rather than the overall development and management of the BANP.

A secondary objective of the review process was to build hands-on skills in project assessment for the review participants and to contribute towards the development of WWF's own internal monitoring and evaluation process.

The review aimed to focus on the following aspects of the two projects (see Appendix 1 - Terms of Reference):

- Measure the performance of the two projects to date with respect to stated goals and objectives by identifying specific accomplishments and/or failures attributable to them.
- Review the activities that have taken place and the resulting outputs to date, and determine the quality and impact of these.
- Review the project implementation strategy with particular reference to the relationship between the Park Administration, DNAC, FNP and WWF in both Bazaruto and Maputo.
- Review the biological, sociological, legal and administrative indicators for the Projects, as reflected in the Project log frames.
- Outline the lessons learned from experience to date and provide recommendations that can be used in the continuation or reorientation of the project.
- Identify efforts by other agencies contributing to implementation of sound natural resource management and community capacity building in the BANP (i.e. cross-cutting initiatives, political issues, conservation incentives, bilateral assistance, and the role of other NGOs).

The evaluation was carried out by a team consisting of:

- Rob Cunliffe (independent review consultant)
- Russell Taylor (Conservation Director, WWF SARPO)
- Helena Motta (Programme Coordinator WWF MCO)
- Monica Borner (Manager International Conservation, WWF Switzerland)
- Anne Martinussen (Environment and Development Officer, WWF Norway)

The role of the independent consultant was to provide an external and objective insight during the assessment, and to take the lead in producing the review report.

The review was carried out in two parts: separate discussions by the independent reviewer with key stakeholders, and joint assessments by the full review team in the form detailed discussions of the two projects, plus two workshops: one with local stakeholders and the other in Maputo with invited Government participants. The itinerary followed is shown in Table 1.

Prior to the field assessments, the independent reviewer was given a detailed briefing by Helena Motta (WWF MCO) in order to clarify expectations of the review, to provide background documentation and explanations of the two projects and to register specific concerns held by WWF MCO. Appendix 2 shows the list of documents provided to the independent reviewer.

The independent reviewer spent five days in the field during which time meetings were held with a wide range of stakeholders in Vilankulo, Inhassoro and on the Islands of Benguerra and Bazaruto (Table 1). This included meetings with local communities, community based organizations, private sector representatives, Park Administration and rangers, Government representatives and NGOs. The schedule of meetings was organized and arranged by Eduardo Videira (FNP, Project Executant for the CBNRM project). Mr. Videira also assisted, where necessary, with translations to and from Portuguese to English. For some of the meetings with community members and community associations it was sometimes necessary to provide additional translations to and from local languages, which was done by community members or Park staff.

Thereafter, the remainder of the review team arrived in Bazaruto. Following a report back on initial findings by the independent reviewer, the review team spent a further four days methodically going through the log frames

for the two projects and in holding a report back workshop and discussion with local stakeholders. The BANP Park Administrator (Rafael Funzana) and Community Officer (Rodrigo Muchine) plus the two FNP project executants (Antonio Reina – MRUP project and Eduardo Videira CBNRM project) worked together with the review team in carrying out these activities. Findings were recorded on flip charts and electronically (by Anne Martinussen).

The final activity was a feed back workshop in Maputo, during which the main findings of the review were presented and discussed with invited Government representatives.

The full list of people consulted plus workshop participants is shown in Appendix 3.

Table 1. Itinerary for the review process.

Date	Activity
Thursday 07 April	Arrival of independent consultant (RC) in Maputo
Friday 08 April	Meeting with WWF MCO (Helena Motta)
Monday 11 April	Travel from Maputo to Vilankulo Meeting with Vilankulo private sector tourism operators (n = 5) *
Tuesday 12 April	Meeting with Vilankulo Fishermen's Association (n = 6) * Meeting with Inhassoro Fishermen's Association (n = 1) and IDPPE at Inhassoro (n = 4) *
Wednesday 13 April	Travel to Benguerra and then to Bazaruto Meeting with Kanhi Kwedhu Association (n = 9) * Meeting with Benguerra Lodge (Trevor Landry)
Thursday 14 April	Meeting with Indigo Bay (Karl Snater) Meeting with Bazaruto Lodge (Louis Erasmus) *
Friday 15 April	Meeting with Thomba Yedhu Association (n = 2) * Meeting with Zenguelemo community (n = 55 members) * Meeting with BANP rangers at Zenguelemo Posto (n = 7) * Meeting with Sitone community (n = 30 members) *
Saturday 16 April	Meeting with BANP Park Administrator (Rafael Funzana) Arrival of remainder of review team in Bazaruto Report back by independent reviewer (RC) to review team
Sunday 17 April	Critical examination and assessment of the CBNRM log frame
Monday 18 April	Critical examination and assessment of the MRUP log frame
Tuesday 19 April	Workshop with Bazaruto stakeholders (n = 19 participants) Meeting with FNP (Antonio Reina) Continue discussing MRUP log frame
Wednesday 20 April	Continue discussing MRUP log frame Presentation by Eduardo Videira on monitoring activities within BANP Travel from Bazaruto to Maputo
Thursday 21 April	Report back workshop with DNAC, IDPPE, IIP (n = 12 participants) Meeting with WWF Norway (Anne Martinussen) Wrap up discussions with review team
Friday 22 April	Sorting out logistical arrangements etc in Maputo
Saturday 23 April	Departure from Maputo
Tuesday 26 April to Tuesday 10 May	Production of first draft of review report by Rob Cunliffe
Tuesday 31 May	Feedback on first draft by review participants
Friday 10 June	Final version of draft review report by Rob Cunliffe
* Meetings attended by Eduardo Videira	

3. REVIEW RESULTS - MRUP PROJECT

The MRUP project was initiated in 1998, with the first phase extending to 2000. The current (second) phase concerns the five year period 2001-2005. The review specifically focuses on the 2001-2005 period rather than the entire lifespan of the project.

Various positive developments occurred at the start of the period. The Park was extended, the management plan was adopted, a new Park Administration was put in place, and a larger project proposal was developed, approved by DNAC, and circulated to donors for funding. And, in 2003, additional support was obtained from WWF Norway to implement the community component of the larger project in the form of the CBNRM project.

More recently certain frustrations have arisen, particularly concerning disruptions to the flow of tourism revenues to communities and apparent violations of the management plan by some investors. This has resulted in the deterioration of relationships between the principal stakeholders as manifested in a general breakdown of communications and trust.

The following detailed assessment of the MRUP goal, objectives and activities is structured in accordance with the log frame for the project, as stated in the initial project documents in 2001 (Appendix 4). The results shown are based on specific discussions around each objective and activity (by the review team plus the PA and FNP personnel); perspectives obtained by the independent reviewer during his individual meetings with key stakeholders; findings of the two report back workshops held at Bazaruto and in Maputo, plus data from the most recent progress report for the period July-December 2004.

3.1 Project Goal

The 2001-2005 MRUP has the following goals:

Goals

- Ensure Government commitment in the approval of the proposal for extension of new national park limits, park rules and park management plan for Greater Bazaruto National Park.
- Follow on donors comments to the submitted new project phase proposal for “Bazaruto Archipelago Conservation and Collaborative Management Programme” for the next five years.
- Continue to implement Bazaruto National Park Management Plan.

General Assessment

- November 2001 the Council of Ministers approved the extension of the Park to include all five islands, and renamed it as the BANP.
- March 2002 the management plan was officially approved and adopted by the Minister of Tourism for the period 2002-2006.
- Funding from donors was secured for the period 2001-2005, with possibilities of further extension.
- The implementation of the BANP management plan and park rules are now the main focus for the project, and has developed into an issue of major concern for donor agencies, WWF SARPO, WWF MCO and FNP.
- Park rules have not yet been produced.
- The log frame for the MRUP has remained unchanged since 1998, except that the enlargement of the Park and approval of the management plan have been achieved.

3.2 Assessment Against Objectives and Activities

OBJECTIVE 1: Implement Park Rules and Park Management Plan for Bazaruto Archipelago National Park

Donor agencies, WWF SARPO, WWF MCO and FNP have raised serious concerns regarding the apparent lack of implementation of some aspects of the management plan. These concerns are highlighted in recent project

documentation and were emphasized during the initial briefing by WWF MCO to the independent consultant at the outset of the review process. The concerns centre on the manner in which some of the existing private sector investors have been carrying out unauthorized reconstruction and development works, whilst high level (central government) approval appears to have been given to certain new tourism investments within the BANP, despite the fact that this is in direct contravention of the management plan.

During the review process it became apparent that there was considerable confusion as to the interpretation of “park rules”. Some members took this to mean a set of regulations outlining what is or is not permitted within the BANP, or within different zones of the BANP, i.e. a set of rules to govern the activities of users (including managers) of the park (such as communities, tourism operators, visitors and management personnel). Other members conceptualised park rules as a set of legal guidelines, or statutes, outlining how the Park should be administered, for example detailing the structure of the park administration, providing terms of reference for different positions within the administration and describing how reporting structures should work.

Following long discussion it was concluded that the management plan provides sufficient detail to determine what can or cannot be done in the park, although these details have never been extracted and presented in the form of a set of “Park rules”. Regulations prescribing the structure and functioning of the Park Administration have not been developed.

For the purpose of this review “Park rules” in Activity 1.1 are assumed to refer to management rules that derive from the management plan, and “Internal Regulations” in Activities 1.2 and 1.3 are assumed to refer to regulations governing the structure and functioning of the Park Administration.

Activity 1.1 Implement National Park rules and management plan
Indicator: National Park rules and management plan implemented

Assessment

Management Plan

- The management plan was officially adopted by MITUR in 2002 for the period 2002-2006.
- Park rules flow from framework laws and accompanying regulations. The rules and regulations used for law enforcement in the Park stem from (and need to be consistent with) the various laws, such as Forestry and Wildlife Law, Fisheries Law, Environmental Law, Tourism Law etc., in addition to stipulations detailed in the management plan.
- There appear to be varying degrees of implementing the plan and regulations.
- Hotel owners raised concerns that Park rules are being applied selectively, in the sense that they feel that they are specifically targeted whilst there is a lack of enforcement of regulations relating, for example, to fishing activities by community members or the abuse of coral reefs by day visitors. The Park Administrator refuted this. Given that enforcement activities are largely confined to the land areas of the islands, and that the hotels present discrete and highly visible entities, there is likely to be an unintentional bias towards the day-to-day policing of their operations.
- A key concern is that existing hotel operators are not complying with procedures and requirements as stipulated in the management plan, especially with regard to development of infrastructure. According to the management plan new developments cannot be carried out without prior authorization and proper documentation (such as environmental impact assessments). Examples of such unauthorized developments include: opening new roads and closing other ones, bringing additional vehicles onto the islands, developing new water sources/pumping systems, carrying out reconstruction works, carrying out new construction works, and modifying or relocating air strips. During an inspection carried out in 2004 one hotel was said to have 11 cases of unauthorised/illegal activities.
- Some of the above examples represent violations of procedures rather than outright contravention of the management plan. For example, the management plan does allow for bringing new vehicles onto the islands, but requires that authorization should first be obtained from the Park Administrator. However, some operators have gone ahead and brought in their vehicles without seeking prior permission from the PA, and either informed him after the vehicle was already on the island or else not at all. Other developments are in direct contravention of the management plan.

- This situation of non-compliance by existing hotels with the management plan was reported to have deteriorated markedly over the last 12-18 months.
- During interview with hotel representatives, some respondents professed ignorance of the management plan while others described it as being irrelevant. Most appeared to be well aware of not following stipulated procedures. There appeared to be a feeling that if other operators were “allowed” to carry out illegal activities, then they would follow suit and do the same themselves, and that they were unlikely to face serious sanctions for doing so.
- There appeared to be a lack of clarity concerning the process of authorization of new developments. For example, one hotel claimed to have obtained the necessary authorization for extension of their airstrip from the Department of Civil Aviation, without consulting the Park Administrator. Another example was given whereby the Ministry of the Environment approved an EIA without any consultation with the Park Administrator. And regarding new investments, the Park Administrator stated that he could only give advice and opinions, but that the decisions on this are taken at a higher level within the Ministry (MITUR).
- Some cases of non-compliance with the management plan appear to result through a lack of coordination and communication between state institutions. For example, DINAGECA continue to demarcate and allocate land on the islands, although being a National Park they lack the authority to do so.
- More seriously there appears to be a lack of will and commitment to implementation of the management plan at the higher ministerial/central government level. This is manifested in the apparent approval of new development projects that are in direct contravention to the management plan.
- The lack of support from DNAC and MITUR appears to be a strong contributing factor to the limited success of the PA in enforcing compliance by existing operators with the management plan.
- In December 2004 the President of WWF sent a letter to the President of Mozambique, requesting confirmation of continued commitment to adherence to the management plan. The new government acknowledged receipt of the letter and promised a response, but at the time of the review (April 2005) this had not yet been received.

Revision of the Management Plan

- During review discussions it was acknowledged that the management plan has a number of flaws, for example it doesn't place any limitations on the number of airstrips to be built on the islands. It was explained that the process of approval was a long and drawn out procedure, and entailed achieving compromise positions on a number of issues, for example permitting a degree of industrial fishing within the Park.
- The need for revision of the management plan is recognised by all stakeholders, including the state, the Park Administration and NGO's. However, it appears that different stakeholders may have very different expectations. In particular, it seems that the state may see this as a way to authorise further developments within the BANP (for example, the Ministry of the Environment has recently authorized the construction of an additional 28 chalets out of a total of 50 requested by Indigo Bay, with permission for the remaining 22 being dependent on the “revised management plan”). On the other hand the NGO's anticipate that the revision of the management plan should be based on the actual status of natural resources and ecological conditions within the BANP, such that there are likely to be stricter controls, for example, on both new development works and also fisheries (which appear to be declining).
- The current management plan was approved for the period of 2002-2006. However, the Government (MITUR/DNAC) is pressing for the review to be done immediately such that it can be completed by June 2005 (and regardless of the fact that the review has yet to be started).
- WWF, in principle, offered to provide financial support to MITUR for revision of the management plan (provided that the current management plan was complied with), but as yet this offer has not been taken up. It is possible that MITUR has sourced alternative funding as they are now proceeding to identify the review team, although actual work on the review has not yet started.
- WWF MCO/ FNP have given written suggestions to DNAC as to how the review process should be conducted, including participation, the overall process, surveys that need to be done etc. DNAC has accepted most of these suggestions, but is still insisting that the review should be completed by June 2005.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1.1. MITUR / DNAC should be requested to urge compliance with the existing management plan amongst stakeholders at all levels, from the Park to central Government, including themselves.
- 1.2. The management plan needs to be revised.
- 1.3. No further developments should be authorised until the revised management plan is in place.
- 1.4. The MRUP project should proactively consider and formulate its policies as regards inputs into the revision of the management plan.

Activity 1.2 Lobby at National Directorate for Conservation Areas (DNAC) for approval of internal regulation of BANP**Indicator: Meeting with DNAC has been done****Assessment**

- The Park does not have any internal regulations as to how the Park should be run or managed. This appears to be the same for all protected areas throughout Mozambique.
- The intention of MITUR appears to be that each Park should have its own regulations, but that these should flow from and be consistent with a set of generic regulations applying to all parks.
- A proposal for Park regulations for the BANP has already been developed, discussed with local stakeholders, and submitted to DNAC/MITUR for approval.
- However, MITUR are still going through the process of developing the generic regulations applying to all parks, and appear to be delaying consideration of the proposed BANP regulations until such time as they have made further progress in this respect.
- Since the draft BANP regulations were developed there have been changes in terms of relevant legislation, such that the draft regulations will need to be checked again to make sure that they are consistent with all recent laws and regulations.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1.5. Continue to lobby MITUR to finalize and approve internal Park regulations for BANP.

Activity 1.3 Information on the internal regulation of BANP**Indicator: Information supplied****Assessment**

- Not possible until Park regulations have been approved (see Activity 1.2).

Activity 1.4 Promote and publicise National Park image through the media**Indicator: At least one visit of journalist****Assessment**

- This is an ongoing activity, and the BANP continues to receive a relatively high level of publicity in the national media.
- Estimated at least five visits by national or international journalists during 2004.
- An awareness raising concert was held in Maputo during December 2004, based on which a promotional DVD is in the process of being developed and should soon be ready for release.
- Fliers, leaflets and maps have been produced.
- Merchandise (T-shirts, caps etc.) has been produced.
- Mainland operators requested that simple educational/promotional material for BANP and the WWF project should be developed and made available at the WWF office in Vilankulo.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1.6. A 12-15 minute documentary of BANP should be produced.
- 1.7. A simple cheap flier/leaflet should be produced for visitors to the BANP. This should include a map, clearly outline the *do's & don'ts* and *where & where not to go* within the Park, and detail how much the *fees* are, and how these are utilized.

OBJECTIVE 2: Lobby for Securement of Donor Funding for the Next Project Phase

The assessment refers to the period 2001-2005, rather than the forthcoming period (2006 onwards). At the outset of this phase of the MRUP project, a new project proposal had been developed and submitted to certain donors. Based on comments from donors the proposal was subsequently rewritten, with greater emphasis on support to the running of the Park and reduced emphasis on technical support and scientific studies. The new proposal, known as the “Bazaruto Archipelago National Park Conservation and Collaborative Management Program”, comprised three principal elements: core support in terms of running the Park, working with communities, and biodiversity and monitoring activities. The total support requested was for USD 2.5 million over five years.

The proposal never received blanket funding. Continuing support from WWF Switzerland to the MRUP project, and to a lesser extent from WWF Sweden, covered much of the component concerning support to running of the Park. The community component was subsequently developed into a discrete and larger five year proposal. This was submitted to WWF Norway, and funding was secured for an initial three year period 2003-2005, with a possible continuation to 2007. Direct support was never obtained for the biodiversity component. However, the MRUP includes a strong component on monitoring (see Objective 5), and additional support for other monitoring activities has been secured from a variety of other sources as detailed below (Activity 2.1). In the event, the total support achieved for BANP for the period 2003-2007 amounted to just under the envisaged total of USD 2.5 million.

Activity 2.1 Approach donors to get feedback on submitted proposal for new project phase
Indicator: Letters submitted to potential donors

Assessment

- The DNAC/WWF CCMP proposal aimed for USD 2.5 million over five years.
- WWF Switzerland provided consistent support of 150,000 CHF per annum for the period 2001-2005, plus additional support for equipment such as a vehicle and boats, and has pledged to provide the same level of support for three more years.
- WWF Sweden provided support amounting to USD 67,999 for the period 2001-2005.
- WWF Norway/NORAD has provided funding of USD 288,048 for the CBNRM project for the period 2003-2005 (about NOK 2,000,000 out of the pledged amount of NOK 4,848,000), and it is anticipated that the remaining NOK 3,152,000 will be provided over the next two years.
- Support for monitoring activities has been obtained from a number of sources. Implementation of the Management Oriented Monitoring System (or MOMS) has been supported by the LIFE project, the WWF Regional CBNRM project and EAME project. Monitoring of coral reefs has been possible due to support from the National Coral Reef Monitoring Programme (WWF MCO, MICOA and CORDIO - a regional programme for monitoring the degradation of coral reefs). The Museum of Natural History / Eduardo Mondlane University have assisted with monitoring of dugongs. The monetary value of these various contributions has not been calculated.
- Total support to the BANP for the five year period 2001-2005, including the above mentioned projects, is estimated by WWF MCO to be just under USD 2.5 million. (For the purpose of this calculation it has been assumed that the WWF Norway/NORAD project is to be a five year project and that the amount of money provided is the same as that which has been pledged).

Activity 2.2 **Submit proposal for new project phase to other potential donors**

Indicator: **New project phase proposal submitted to potential donors**

Activity 2.3 **Co-ordinate with DNAC and WWF in negotiations with donors for the new project phase**

Indicator: **At least one meeting held with DNAC and WWF**

Assessment (Activities 2.2 and 2.3)

- This was done but with mixed results as detailed above.
- The BANP does now receive some support from Government (see Activity 3.7) but is still far from being self-sufficient, such that the need to pursue continued donor support still remains.
- WWF Switzerland has pledged to continue supporting the MRUP for a further three years (up to 2008), whilst the CBNRM project is to last until the end of 2007, pending approval from the donor. Plans exist to revise the frameworks for both projects to produce the necessary proposals for the next phases of both projects.
- Existing donors have made it clear that their continued support to the BANP will depend on effective implementation of the management plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS ACTIVITIES 2.1 – 2.3:

- 2.1. Seek to develop alternative and sustainable sources of funding for BANP.
- 2.2. Develop proposals for the next phases of both MRUP and CBNRM projects for the period beyond 2007 and submit these to potential donors.
- 2.3. Continue to develop partnerships to carry out monitoring and research activities.

OBJECTIVE 3: Co-Manage Bazaruto Archipelago in Partnership With Relevant Agencies

Key stakeholders as regards co-management of the BANP are the Park Administration, tourism operators, communities, other Government representatives (e.g. DNAC, MITUR, Fisheries) and NGOs (including FNP and WWF MCO).

Activity 3.1 **Establish Bazaruto Archipelago Islands Committee (BAIC)**

Indicator: **At least one meeting for definition of ideas for the establishment of BAIC held**

The management plan provides for the development of island co-management committees and an overall Bazaruto Archipelago Islands Committee. This would include representatives of all key stakeholders (BANP, private sector, communities, NGO's including donor organizations), and would deal with issues relating to the management of natural resources. A proposal for this was developed and circulated amongst stakeholders, but has not been followed up on. More recently, there has been discussion concerning the possible formation of a Management Council (Conselho de Gestão), a kind of Park Board and which would serve a similar function.

Assessment

- The island co-management committees and overall BAIC committee have not been established.
- Before pursuing this further an assessment should be carried out as to the need for such bodies and the roles that they might play.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 3.1. Establishment of the BAIC should be pursued subject to the need for such an organization.

Activity 3.2 Hold meetings with local and regional partners (ADMAR, Inhassoro, Vilankulo District Administrators, Hoteliers, Local Authorities, Administrative Posts, NGOs, Education and Health District Authorities)

Indicator: At least one meeting held with local and regional partners

Assessment

- The PA reported holding regular meetings, at least two per year with all the above stakeholders.
- Records are kept of all meetings, including names of participants.
- Discussions with mainland fishermen, mainland tourism operators and island hotel operators suggest some slippage in terms of frequency of meetings.
- A calendar of bi-monthly meetings with island stakeholders is developed at the start of each year and circulated to all island stakeholders.
- Topics of discussions during regular meetings with hotel operators include: implementation of the management plan, information on new regulations, points of concern such as local fishermen fishing in front of hotels, management of wastes etc.
- Some hotel operators are no longer coming to these meetings. Stated reasons for not participating were that meetings were not productive (i.e. no follow up on issues raised) and that they were limited to the delivery of information rather than providing a platform for discussion of issues of mutual concern (i.e. information meetings and not co-management meetings).
- Reduced participation by hotel operators is also likely to be linked to the recent deterioration in relationships resulting from their general disregard for and transgressions of the management plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 3.2. Park Administration needs to maintain a high level of communication and interaction with stakeholders.
- 3.3. The response time to queries and problems needs to be shortened, even if the response may be a negative one.
- 3.4. Encourage DNAC to provide more responsive and proactive support to the Park Administration.

Activity 3.3 Sign protocols for Park levy transfer and staff settlements with Hoteliers

Indicator: Protocols signed

The transfer of Park levies relates to the tourist fee paid by all visitors to the BANP (currently USD 10 per person for foreigners). At the start of this phase of MRUP (2001), some hotels were transferring tourist fees to communities and to the BANP, but on an informal basis. The aim of this activity was to produce a written protocol that would serve to formalise the collection and transfer of these fees. During the course of the project central Government introduced new legislation stipulating that that 20% of tourist fees should be allocated to communities and the remaining 80% to the state (FUTUR). This is discussed in greater detail under Activity 3.7.

The majority of employees at all hotels within the BANP come from outside the Park as opposed to being residents of the islands. The management plan seeks to limit the number of employees from outside the islands, and stipulates that each hotel should accommodate all “external” workers within the confines of their concession area; and also that workers should be accommodated in single quarters rather than bringing their families to live with them on the islands (so as to limit population growth within the BANP).

Assessment

- The transfer of fees is based on agreement reached in meetings between the Park Administration and hotel operators. This is recorded within the minutes of these meetings, but has never been developed into a formal protocol.
- No written agreement has been made with respect to hotel staff settlements.

- Variable compliance shown by different hotels concerning requirements for “external” workers to be housed within concession areas, and without their families.
- Some hotels have shown commitment to tackling the issue of informal staff settlements, and have made some progress towards constructing suitable alternative facilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 3.5. The Park Administration should actively pursue and obtain signed protocols with hotels regarding the transfer of Park levies.
- 3.6. The Park Administration should work together with hotel operators to develop and sign a protocol on staff settlements, and which should be consistent with the requirements of the management plan.

Activity 3.4 Patrol the National Park in partnership with local police and local communities

Indicator: Patrols by Park staff

Assessment

- Successes of enforcement activities include:
 - A drastic reduction in industrial long line fishing by foreign vessels.
 - National vessels now seek permission to enter the Park.
 - Reduced incidence of gill netting by local fishermen.
- Five marine rangers (ex Navy personnel) were assigned to the Park in 2003 when problems were being faced with foreign vessels carrying out illegal commercial fishing activities within the park. Now that this problem has diminished the number of Navy rangers has been reduced to three.
- BANP currently has 17 Park rangers who are responsible for patrolling (both land and marine).
- There is a need to employ a chief law enforcement officer to oversee patrol activities.
- Foot patrols are carried out daily, covering every island every day, particularly hotspots.
- Tents and camping equipment are needed in order to enable overnight patrols, which would increase the effectiveness of land patrols.
- Marine patrols were formerly undertaken with support from hoteliers and their boats until the Park acquired its own two boats. These are still serviced by one of the hotel operators.
- The frequency of marine patrols is very low (roughly once per month) due to resource constraints (particularly the limited budget for fuel). Emphasis is instead placed on reacting to information. Response time to intelligence is roughly 30 minutes.
- Fourteen fines were issued last year for marine offences.
- Tourist operators feel that the Park is not doing enough marine patrols and that these are not being effective, particularly as regards protection of coral reefs from inappropriate use both by tourists and local fishermen.
- Tourist operators sometimes but not always pass on information concerning illegal activities to the Park Administration. Some operators have been discouraged by an apparent lack of follow up on information previously supplied.
- Some hotel operators would like to play a more active role in enforcement. BANP are concerned that this might compromise the independence of the Park administration from these operators and might also lead to increased conflict amongst the various operators.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 3.7. A request should be made to DNAC to provide a chief law enforcement officer for the BANP.
- 3.8. Camping equipment should be provided to enable the implementation of mobile patrols.
- 3.9. Budget for fuel for marine patrolling should be increased.
- 3.10. Systems for the collection and communication of information and intelligence between stakeholders, especially hotel operators and the Park Administration, should be improved.
- 3.11. Law enforcement monitoring protocols should be developed and implemented (as part of the MOMS) in order to detect trends in both enforcement effort and illegal activities.
- 3.12. Feedback of law enforcement results to operators and the general public should be improved.
- 3.13. Independence in law enforcement is very important and should be worked towards.

Activity 3.5 Co-operate with fellow scientists and visitors**Indicator: Visits****Assessment**

- BANP has hosted a variety of scientists (Appendix 5), for example in the fields of archaeology (UEM, Ministry of Culture and British Museum), geology (National Directorate for Geology and Mines), and biological studies such as the tagging and monitoring of turtles (Marine Turtle Group), dugongs (Natural History Museum) and coral reefs (CORDIO).
- A total of around 15 scientific studies have been carried out regarding archaeology, corals, sea grass beds, fisheries, dugongs, turtles, geology etc. Some researchers have never provided reports on their studies. The list of scientific reports obtained is shown in Appendix 6.
- A large number of visitors have been received within BANP. These include VIPs, President, Ministers, Governors, donor representatives, NGO workers etc. A list of important visitors is shown in Appendix 5.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 3.14. Park Administration needs to implement a systematic approach to the collection, collation and storage of data, reports, publications, visitor statistics, etc.
- 3.15. All scientists doing work in the BANP should be required to deliver copies of their reports to the Park Administration, and these should be systematically collated and stored (as in 3.14 above).

Activity 3.6 Continue to provide training for National Park personnel (literacy, English, computing)**Indicator: At least one training course held****Assessment**

- Park Administrator did an English course in Harare.
- Park rangers are requesting training in English in order to facilitate interactions with tourist operators and tourists.
- Park rangers are requesting that one or more of them should be taught to drive in order to facilitate their transport on the islands.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 3.16. Park rangers should receive training in English.
- 3.17. Two Park rangers should undergo driving courses that should include training in defensive driving and off-road driving.
- 3.18. Support staff in Park Administration should be provided with basic computer training regarding data entry, storage and retrieval procedures.

Activity 3.7 Identify and put in place alternative National Park financial sustainability options (National Park levy, concessions fees, tourism fees, water sport fees, camping fees, boats vehicles and planes fees)

Indicator: Assessment report produced

Until 2004 the only support provided by DNAC to the BANP was for two salaries (Park Administrator and one ranger) and some fuel (MZM 20 million per month or roughly USD 12,000 per year). This year (2005), in addition to salary support, MITUR has pledged to provide around USD 16,000 for the current costs for the Park from its own budget. This will be received once the national budget has been approved. Now that funds collected at the level of the Park (see Appendix 7) are being submitted to FUTUR, for the near future, it is anticipated that each year the Park will submit an annual budget to FUTUR, with the limitation that the total budget figure should not exceed the amount of revenues paid by the BANP to FUTUR during the previous year. For 2004 this amounted to roughly 15,000 USD. This is still far short of the operational costs for the BANP. Continued donor support cannot be guaranteed, such that there is a need to explore other possibilities. One option is to increase revenues through the introduction and collection of additional taxes (as is provided for under the new regulations). Another possibility is to seek to retain revenues at the Park level rather than passing these on to FUTUR and then requesting for budgetary support from them. Again this is provided for under the new regulations, but only on condition that the Park can demonstrate that the revenues generated will be adequate to cover two thirds of their operational costs. This has not yet been implemented for any national park in the country.

Assessment

Tourist Fees

- Prior to 2001, an informal system was already in place whereby some island hotel operators were collecting fees from tourists and transferring these to the BANP and communities.
- Regulations concerning the collection of tourist fees were passed by central Government in 2003. According to these regulations MITUR / DNAC are now responsible for the collection of tourist fees, and 20% of the fees should be allocated to communities and 80% to the state (to FUTUR).
- The MRUP project has played a key role in setting up systems for the collection and transfer of tourist fees.
- A ticket system was introduced under which tourist operators sold tickets to visitors, but at one price for foreign visitors and a lower price for Mozambiquan nationals. There were problems with this system with operators claiming that a high proportion of tickets were being sold at local prices. Now two types of tickets are sold, one for Mozambicans and another for foreign tourists.
- Problems were also experienced with the selling of tickets by Park rangers. Now the only sales of tickets are outside of the Park and by mainland tourist operators. Hotel operators have assumed responsibility for the collection of fees from tourists on the islands.
- The system of collection of tourist fees is now working reasonably well. However, serious problems are being experienced with the transfers of monies to the BANP and communities (see CBNRM project, Output 4).

Concession Fees, Sporting Fees and Vehicle Fees

- National regulations provide for the collection of a variety of other fees by the Park, such as concession fees, sporting fees (for snorkelling, diving and fishing) and vehicle fees.
- Systems for collecting these fees have not yet been put in place.
- Some fees such as land taxes and boat fees are still being collected by other Government agencies and are not being handed over to DNAC / MITUR.
- Tourist operators have raised a number of concerns as to the proposed introduction of these new fees. For example, mainland operators already have to pay boat and entry fees in order to be able to operate within the park, and are concerned that the introduction of additional sporting and transport fees will negate the viability of their operations. On the islands, hotel operators are concerned about the introduction of aircraft landing fees, pointing out that no service is provided for this, that they have borne the full costs of developing the airstrips and are responsible for all maintenance works.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 3.19. A new staff position needs to be created by DNAC/MITUR within the BANP administration specifically to deal with issues concerning the collection and management of revenues.
- 3.20. A study to investigate and hopefully demonstrate the financial viability of the BANP should be undertaken, resulting in the production of a business plan for the BANP and paving the way for retention of revenues by the BANP.
- 3.21. Working in conjunction with all stakeholders, systems for the introduction of additional fees should be developed.

Activity 3.8 Look for alternative financial sources for scholarships and training courses for National Park personnel and community members**Indicator: Contacts held with different sources of financial support****Assessment**

- Alternative funding has been obtained to support a number of exchange visits and training courses for Park personnel and project participants. This is an ongoing activity.
- Park Administrator (Rafael Funzana) and Community Officer (Rodrigo Muchine) undertook an exchange visit to the Namibian LIFE project, funded by the WWF LIFE project of Namibia.
- Sixteen Park rangers underwent a training course at the Gorongosa Wildlife Training School under funding provided by the CBNRM Project (funded by WWF Norway).
- CBNRM Project Executant (Eduardo Videira) underwent a Marine Protected Area training course in Kenya, under funding provided by WIOMSA.
- Park Community Officer (Rodrigo Muchine) and MRUP Project Executant (Antonio Reina) underwent a training course in Harare concerning mainstreaming HIV/AIDS into project activities, under funding provided through the WWF regional CBNRM project.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 3.22. Training for Park and project personnel remains an ongoing requirement and this activity should be continued.

OBJECTIVE 4: Manage Local Resources in Partnership With Local Communities**Overall assessment**

- In 2003 funding was sourced from WWF Norway/NORAD enabling the expansion of this activity into a separate project, the BANP CBNRM project, which is reported on separately under Section 4 of this report.
- The following assessment of Objective 4 of the MRUP project is primarily based on activities from 2001-2003, prior to initiation of the CBNRM project.

Activity 4.1 Involve local community committees in activities related to conservation and environment education**Indicator: Communities involved****Assessment**

- The creation of community committees by zones, as envisaged in the management plan, has been done. These formed the basis for the subsequent formation of associations on Benguerra and Bazaruto Islands.
- The KK Association on Benguerra Island was the first to be established and, as such, was a long and time-consuming process.

- Potential natural resource user groups were identified, although it was only later under the CBNRM project that these were formally established.
- Contacts were made with the Inhassoro Fishermen's Association. The objective was to reduce conflicts regarding restrictions on fishing by outsiders within the BANP, but the environment was not conducive and this initiative did not come to anything.
- Land was secured in Inhassoro for island residents to grow crops, in an attempt to reduce agricultural activities on the islands. This was not successful as it is the women who are mainly responsible for the production of crops, and the men were not happy for their wives to go and stay on the mainland without them.
- An agricultural project seeking to explore sustainable approaches to cropping was implemented. Suitable areas, crops and production techniques were identified. A report was produced but there was no real follow up due to a lack of markets for the crops.
- The Park Administrator and rangers have given environmental education presentations at schools in order to raise awareness of environmental issues.
- These activities have been transferred to and are being continued under the CBNRM project (Outputs 1 – 3).

Activity 4.2 Involve local community committees in activities related to control of Archipelago's resources

Indicator: Communities involved

Assessment

- Prior to 2003 little was accomplished in this respect.
- This is now being pursued under Output 3 of the CBNRM project.

Activity 4.3 Re-activate committees of tourism operations workers

Indicator: Meetings held with tourism operations workers for exchange of points of view

Assessment

- The idea was to provide a forum to discuss issues relating to tourism workers, such as staff settlements etc.
- This is not a project responsibility and the activity is now considered to be redundant.
- Issues relating to hotel workers are now addressed under meetings with hotel operators.

Activity 4.4 Establish partnership and co-ordinate activities for improvement of processing systems for fish and other resources

Indicator: Meetings held with resource user groups

Assessment

- Island (and mainland) fishermen expressed concern as to small and/or declining fish catches. In this respect it would seem to make sense to try and make the most of the limited resources that are available, such as through improving the processing and marketing of fish and other resources.
- IIP (Fisheries Research Institute) in September 2004 developed a proposal concerning the monitoring of fish resources, and the development of better ways of fishing. This is still awaiting approval by MITUR. If accepted it is planned to include this project as an activity under the CBNRM project and to work together with the natural resource user groups that have already been established on the islands.
- Harvested fish are reported to be mainly of small size and poor quality, such that it can be expected to be difficult to market them to any better advantage than at present.

RECOMMENDATION:

4.1. Continue to pursue the development of better ways of processing and marketing fish.

Activity 4.5 Publicise National Park rules and the management plan
Indicator: Seminars held and leaflets produced with community management committees and community in general

Assessment

- More than 100 copies of the management plan were made and distributed to all stakeholders.
- There was never any production of written material targeted specifically at communities (on the management plan and park rules).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 4.2. This activity should be included under Output 1 rather than Output 4.
 4.3. Information should be tailored to specific needs of different target groups.

Activity 4.6 Make a list and hold meetings with resource user groups for the improvement of sustainable resource use

Indicator: Nil

Assessment

- Potential resource user groups were identified.
- This activity has been continued under Output 3 of the CBNRM project.

Activity 4.7 Establish micro-credit initiatives by resource user groups

Indicator: Money saved

Assessment

- The project facilitated contact with CARE who picked up on this component.
- A number of micro-credit groups have been set up, mainly of women, and appear to be functioning sustainably.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 4.4. This activity should be pursued under the CBNRM project.
 4.5. The CBNRM project should ask CARE for reports of activities carried out in this respect.
 4.6. The CBNRM project should continue to monitor the progress of the micro-credit groups.

Activity 4.8 Maintain contacts and working relationships with relevant District Authorities (Agriculture, Health and Education)

Indicator: Contacts made

Assessment

- This should be an ongoing activity forming an integral part of the management of the project.
- This is very similar to Activity 3.2 (Hold meetings with co-management partners).

RECOMMENDATION:

- 4.7. This activity should be transferred to Output 6 (Project management).

Activity 4.9 Based on National Park zoning plan and PRA methodologies produce maps that identify resources within the Bazaruto Archipelago

Indicator: Maps produced

Assessment

- No progress to date (under either project).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 4.8. This activity should be transferred to the CBNRM project, Output 3 (Communities managing natural resources)
- 4.9. This would best be done using PRA techniques and working together with the natural resource groups that have already been established.

Activity 4.10 In partnership with local communities, hold exchange visits with other community projects

Indicator: Visits made

Assessment

- No community exchange visits were carried out prior to initiation of the CBNRM project.
- This is now being pursued under Output 1 of the CBNRM project (developing community institutions).

RECOMMENDATION:

- 4.10. Community exchange visits should be continued but under the CBNRM project.

OBJECTIVE 5: Resource Monitoring

Activity 5.1 Continue to hold ecological and social monitoring programmes for the establishment of a data base system for local resources

Indicator: Monitoring data regularly collected

Assessment

- Collection of monitoring data on turtle and crocodile nests goes back to before 1999.
- From 1999 the monitoring system was extended to include dugongs and dolphins (opportunistic sightings only), fish, mapalo, numbers of tourists, coral reefs, livestock, palm wine and shops. The Park rangers collected this data.
- Incentives were introduced for finding and protecting turtle nests (T shirt and 6 USD, paid after eggs have hatched). Most turtle nests (c. 70%) are found and reported by community members.
- In 2003 an attempt was made to assemble and analyse all monitoring data. Numerous problems were encountered in terms of how the data had been collected and also incomplete or missing records.
- A report was produced of the turtle, crocodile, dugong, dolphin, mapalo and tourism data.
- Data on numbers of tourists provides an estimate of the income that should have been allocated to communities. However during recent years data has not been consistently supplied.
- A programme of tagging turtles was initiated in October 2004, under support provided by WWF International to the Mozambique Marine Turtle Working Group. Seventeen turtles have been tagged to date and some have already been recaptured.
- Working together with the Namibian LIFE project, the Event Book System, also known as MOMS, has been adapted to marine conditions for use within the BANP.
- Implementation of the MOMS was started in April 2005. Park rangers and tourist operators are now collecting the necessary data.

- Introduction of MOMS represents pioneering work in Mozambique, this being the first area to adopt this system in the country.
- Aerial surveys are being carried out every two months in order to monitor dugong populations. This is done by the Natural History Museum with the aircraft being provided by and paid for by one of the hotels.
- Monitoring of the condition of coral reefs is being carried out under the auspices of the larger CORDIO project.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 5.1. Analysis and reporting of other existing socio economic data should be completed.
- 5.2. Data and a report should be obtained from the Natural History Museum concerning their ongoing aerial monitoring of dugongs.
- 5.3. Results from monitoring data should be used to inform management decisions, and should be communicated to stakeholders.
- 5.4. Possibilities for counting crocodiles should be investigated.
- 5.5. The collection of the MOMS data should gradually or incrementally be extended/transferred to natural resource user groups (under the CBNRM project).

Activity 5.2 Continue to negotiate with local communities the establishment of closure seasons for fisheries within the Archipelago

Indicator: Meetings held with local committees and local community level

Assessment

- This activity is being pursued under Output 2 of the CBNRM project.

Activity 5.3 Publicise at local community data on ecological and social monitoring

Indicator: Meetings held with local committees and local community level

Assessment

- This activity is being carried out with the natural resource user groups under the CBNRM project.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 5.6. This component should be strengthened to include feedback of monitoring results to all stakeholders (rather than just local communities). This would contribute to the building of better relationships and understanding amongst key stakeholders.

Activity 5.4 Continue to establish zoning and identification signs within the National Park

Indicator: Signs and plates within the Park and outside its borders

Assessment

- Signs have been placed in appropriate locations, but more are needed.
- There appears to be good compliance with those signs that have been erected.
- More information is required on signs at some locations.
- This should be treated as an ongoing activity.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 5.7. Refine signs and provide more information where needed.
- 5.8. Complete all signing needs.

Activity 5.5 Continue to involve local communities in resource monitoring**Indicator: Locals involved****Assessment**

- Communities are providing natural resource information both directly and through the Park rangers (for example on turtle nests - see 5.1 above).
- This component should be further pursued under the CBNRM project, and in conjunction with the natural resource user groups.

Activity 5.6 Hold an aerial survey for counting major National Park resources in partnership with other agents**Indicator: Aerial survey made****Assessment**

- Aerial surveys were carried out by WWF in 1999 and 2001.
- Bi-monthly aerial surveys were started in 2003 by the Museum of Natural History (Almeida Guissamulo). Support has been provided by Indigo Bay in the form of providing and covering the cost of the airplane. Species monitored include dugongs, turtles, dolphins, whale sharks and whales.
- Guissamulo has made a presentation of the dugong monitoring results at a conference in Maputo in 2004, but has not yet provided any data or reports to the BANP.
- Results appear to be consistent with the WWF 2001 aerial estimate of about 100 dugongs within the BANP, but also show that numbers fluctuate seasonally (down to a minimum of about 80 animals and up to a maximum of about 120, Almeida Guissamulo, personal communication to Helena Motta).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 5.9. Data on dugongs should be acquired from Guissamulo as a matter of urgency. It is suggested that the Park Administrator and WWF MCO should write a letter requesting this information.
- 5.10. A system need to be established to ensure that the BANP receives regular updates on the results of the dugong surveys, such that it always has to hand the latest information.

OBJECTIVE 6: Administration and Logistic Aspects**Activity 6.1 Provide uniforms and other equipment to staff****Indicator: Uniforms and badges provided****Assessment**

- Since 2001 two complete sets of uniforms have been provided to all Park staff. The project is now looking for the finance to cover a third renewal.
- Uniforms are important for image and self esteem of Park staff.
- Rangers have been provided with some field equipment. Whilst this has been a welcome contribution additional support would be appreciated, particularly in the form of camping equipment (so as to allow overnight mobile patrols).
- From 2005 the national budget now includes a specific budget for BANP. This is related to the ongoing reorganization and development of MITUR. This budget comprises an amount of roughly 16,000 USD for operational and recurrent costs for 2005, but excludes additional support provided in the form of two salaries (for the Park Administrator and one ranger).

RECOMMENDATION:

- 6.1. New uniforms should ideally be provided every 18 months. Support should be sought for this and to cover the needs for camping equipment.

- Activity 6.2** **Provide consumables to Park/camps**
Activity 6.3 **Do repairs and maintenance works to means of transport and other machinery**
Activity 6.4 **Continue to make repair works, buildings, maintenance works and furnish national Park/project camps**
Indicators: **Consumables provided and maintenance works carried out**

Assessment 6.2 - 6.4

- Budget is always stretched. Through efficient and effective use of available resources it has been possible to cover essential costs.
- Principal support has come from WWF Switzerland, plus other smaller supplementary grants to support specific activities or costs, particularly from WWF Sweden. Total support for 2005 for maintenance, repairs and consumables is 39,279 USD of which 20,420 is from WWF Switzerland and 18,859 from WWF Sweden. (The largest item is 17,760 USD for fuel).
- The Park Administrator is not authorised to use any of the income collected in the form of Park fees (see Appendix 7). These are passed to FUTUR, but should eventually be allocated back to the Park once the Park has submitted a budget and this has been approved.
- The Park Administrator has used some money from fines (see Appendix 7), 50% of which is supposed to be allocated to the BANP. All such use has been carefully recorded.
- Immediate needs include: boat repairs to be completed, Land Rover spares, a new computer (replacement of an old one), and improved email facility (currently using bushmail, cellphones are expensive).

- Activity 6.5** **Continue to hold regular planning meetings**
Indicator: **Planning meetings held**

Assessment

- Key planning meetings are field operational meetings (BANP and FNP), project implementation meetings (BANP, FNP and WWF MCO) and steering committee meetings (BANP, FNP, WWF MCO, DNAC and others as required).
- Schedules of meetings are every two weeks for operational meetings, every three months for project implementation meetings and twice per year for steering committee meetings.
- During 2004 relations between members of the project implementation unit (BANP, FNP and WWF MCO) deteriorated seriously and there was a breakdown in planning meetings at all levels.
- The root cause of these problems was the continuing violations of the management plan by hotel operators, and the apparent failure by BANP to follow up and address these issues. This was compounded by an apparent lack of higher level support by DNAC and MITUR regarding implementation of the management plan. The net result was serious frustrations at all levels.
- In the absence of regular planning meetings there was a lack of communication between project participants, such that activities and reporting were being done separately.
- During early April 2005, shortly prior to initiation of this review, a Steering Committee meeting was held and an attempt was made to straighten out this issue. A joint activity plan was prepared outlining responsibilities for BANP, FNP and WWF MCO on all planned activities within the Park for 2005. This plan has been submitted to DNAC from where it is still awaiting approval. It includes a proposed schedule for the various meetings.
- Operational meetings between BANP and FNP to discuss issues of co-management and co-implementation are still not being held.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 6.2. Operational meetings (BANP and FNP) should be held every two weeks.
- 6.3. Project implementation meetings (BANP, FNP, WWF MCO) should be held every three months.
- 6.4. Steering committee meetings (BANP, FNP, WWF MCO and DNAC) for the immediate future should be held every two months (principally to follow progress concerning the revision of the management plan).
- 6.5. Meetings with local stakeholders (community associations and private sector operators) should be held every two months (see Activity 3.2).
- 6.6. Decisions taken at planning meetings should be followed up as soon as possible, and where progress is not possible the reasons why should be identified and clearly communicated to other partners.
- 6.7. Activities for each year should be planned and reviewed on an annual basis. Plans should include clear definitions of roles and responsibilities and dates of action. The review process should identify problems experienced, reasons for difficulties, and corrective actions to be taken.

Activity 6.6 Hold an half-yearly or annual technical review to the project**Indicator: None****Assessment**

- WWF MCO holds an annual meeting for all project executants during which technical and financial reviews are carried out.
- These review meetings were previously held in January, but are now to be shifted to the middle of the year.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 6.8. Schedule for technical and financial reviews should be included as part of the annual plan of activities (see recommendation 6.7).

Activity 6.7 Continue to produce monthly financial reports**Indicator: None****Assessment**

- Monthly financial reports have been produced on a regular basis.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 6.9. An annual financial report should be prepared that shows the contributions received from all sources, including from tax revenues, donors and government.

Activity 6.8 Assist and cover demand of logistical activities**Indicator: None****Assessment To be redundant**

- This was intended to cover other logistical aspects not included under Activities 6.1-6.4.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 6.10. This activity should be made redundant and assumed under activities 6.1-6.4 as appropriate.

4. REVIEW RESULTS – CBNRM PROJECT

The CBNRM project was based on the original 2002 CCMP project, but was built into a considerably bigger and more substantial project than anticipated for the CCMP proposal. The project applied to WWF Norway for funding for the five year period 2003–2007. It was granted support for an initial three years 2003-2005 amounting to roughly 5,000,000 NOK.

Two documents were discussed for the purpose of the review process: the original project log frame and the most recent work plan (for the year 2005). The following analysis of project outputs and activities follows the structure of the original project document (Appendix 8). Considerable changes have been made to the project log frame, as revealed by comparing the 2003 document with the 2005 work plan. Such changes are noted and discussed as part of the assessment.

4.1 General Context and Project Objectives

The 2003-2007 CBNRM project has the following development goal and purpose.

Project Development Goal: Local communities benefit from and contribute to the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity in the Bazaruto Archipelago National Park, Mozambique

Purpose (target): Community based organizations are actively participating in the protection, management and sustainable use of the Bazaruto Archipelago National Park and its natural resources together with the management authority and private sector partners.

General Assessment

- The project log frame does not provide any indicators against which to assess the project goal and purpose.
- The development goal and purpose are appropriate. These are consistent with activities being carried out under the project, are consistent with the overall goals of the larger CCMP project, and are consistent with national policies to involve local communities in conservation initiatives, and to share benefits of conservation with communities.
- The overall impression is generally positive. Communities do appear to be contributing to the management and conservation of natural resources and are benefiting from this, and this is resulting in improved conservation status of natural resources. Examples of successes are:
 - Natural resource user groups established and are providing a forum for discussing natural resource management issues, making decisions and implementing these.
 - Mapalo collectors, in response to declining sizes of mapalo, have introduced exclusion zones to be rested in order to allow the regrowth of mapalo in these areas.
 - Management solutions are being sought to address the damage that is done during the harvesting of mapalo to the sea grass beds with which they are associated.
 - Fishermen in response to concerns about the sustainability of fish resources, have introduced periods (one or two months) during which seine fishing (sweep netting) is stopped.
 - Communities are cooperating with restrictions imposed by the BANP on agriculture and settlements. This is partly due to enforcement efforts, but enforcement alone would not be sufficient to ensure compliance.
 - The numbers of dugongs and turtles killed by community members, either willfully or through accidental capture in nets, appears to have been successfully reduced.
- Communities are receiving direct benefits in the form of the transfer of tourism revenues to community Associations, although the flow of benefits has recently been seriously disrupted.
- The focus of association activities currently seems to be more on the benefit side (i.e. use of monies to improve infrastructure etc) than the contribution side. The latter needs to be further developed and reinforced.
- There is a need to match and reconcile the project log frame with respect to the inclusion/exclusion of certain activities, and also the transfer of some activities from the MRUP project to this project.

4.2 Assessment Against Project Outputs and Activities

OUTPUT 1: Local Community Institutions Established and Operational in Accordance With the Management Plan

Activities:

- Activity 1.1 Continue the process of facilitating Community organisation for natural resource management**
- Activity 1.2 Establish mechanisms for the creation of Community management committees (associations)**
- Activity 1.3 Formalise and develop operational guidelines for the Community management committees (associations)**
- Activity 1.4 Capacity building for management Committee members, Community enabling them to carry out their functions**
- Activity 1.5 Promote the formation of resource use interest groups**

Work plan 2005 changed to:

- Activity 1.1 Support and train the existing community based organizations – the community committees**
- Activity 1.2 Support the creation of and provide training to new community committees where they do not exist**
- Activity 1.3 Organize meetings between committees at the Archipelago level**

Assessment (Activities 1.1 – 1.5)

Establishment of Community Organizations

- Two types of community organizations have been established: associations and natural resource user groups.
- Associations comprise elected community representatives. These are formal legal entities. Each association has a defined structure (President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, etc) and operates its own bank account.
- Two associations have been formed. The first one is the Kanhi Kwedhu (KK) Association to represent the communities of Benguerra Island (an association between the islanders of Benguerra, Benguerra Lodge, Marlin Lodge and BANP), the other is the Thomba Yedhu Association to represent the communities of Bazaruto Island (an association between the islanders of Bazaruto, Bazaruto Lodge, Indigo Bay Hotel and the BANP).
- An island committee has been established for Magaruque, but rather than forming an additional association, it has been agreed by communities that this should be represented under the existing Benguerra KK Association.
- All islanders are automatically members of their respective associations, but the right to vote is restricted to founding members (about 17 in each case, and dominated by community representatives).
- A large number of natural resource user groups have been established and are operational.
- User groups are organized according to natural resources and zones (Benguerra and Bazaruto are both divided into three geographic zones, plus Magaruque gives a total of seven zones).
- A total of 23 natural resource user groups have been established, as follows:
 - Five groups of fishermen (3 Bazaruto, 1 Benguerra, 1 Magaruque) mainly men
 - Five groups of mapalo harvester (3 Bazaruto, 1 Benguerra, 1 Magaruque), mainly women
 - Five groups of palm wine producers (3 Bazaruto, 1 Benguerra, 1 Magaruque) mainly men
 - Five groups of livestock producers (3 Bazaruto, 1 Benguerra, 1 Magaruque) mainly men
 - Three groups of crop producers (2 Bazaruto, 1 Benguerra), mainly women
- Each user group has between 20 and 50 participants whose names have been recorded on lists.

Other Management Committees

- Community members are keen to establish an overall islands fishermen's association. Discussions have been held but this has yet to be established.
- Formation of island co-management committees and an overall Bazaruto Archipelago co-management committee, as envisaged in the management plan, has not been done. A draft proposal has been developed and circulated to stakeholders for comments, but has not been followed up (see MRUP Activity 3.1).
- A new idea, a BANP Park Board is now being discussed. This would include different stakeholders including representatives of communities from all islands.

Functioning of Associations

- Previously, hotel operators headed both associations. New councils were elected in mid 2004, at which time hotel operators stepped down and handed over control to community members.
- New Councils/Presidents have lower levels of education and skills than before, such that associations have experienced a marked drop in capacity.
- Council members have not yet received any form of training.
- The President and Vice-President or Treasurer of both associations draw salaries, i.e. are full time positions. The KK Association also has a salaried community liaison officer who works half time for the association and half time for the Park.
- Creation of salaried positions has led to power struggles within community leadership, as people competed for particular positions.
- Development of associations is still an evolving process.
- Associations have a structured schedule of meetings. Executive boards should meet weekly; community meetings are held monthly and rotated among zones (three on Bazaruto and three on Benguerra plus Magaruque), and in the fourth month a general assembly (open to all association members) is held (i.e. three times per year). In addition regional meetings with associations from other islands are scheduled for every second month.
- In practice meetings are less regular and do not always happen as planned, and Councils are not always effective in following up on decisions. Inter island committees are sometimes constrained by poor communications and a lack of transport.
- Annual planning meetings are held with FNP and BANP representatives during which annual activities (consistent with BANP, CBNRM and MRUP objectives) and budgets are planned, including timing for activities and establishment of a schedule for meetings.
- Discussions with council members suggest that they are more concerned with development of infrastructure and services than management of natural resources.

Functioning of natural resource user groups:

- Resource user groups were formed during mid 2004.
- Each group has a chief and deputy plus members.
- Meetings are held as required rather than according to any formal schedule (on a need to basis with the project management).
- Not all members participate at the same level.
- The objective of user groups is to discuss management problems (such as poor harvests, zoning and exclusion zones) concerning the use of particular resources. They also provide a link between the users of resources and the BANP and NGOs (FNP and WWF). Interaction with the BANP is principally through the BANP community officer.
- Problems within groups usually relate to non-compliance by some individuals within the group. Problems outside of the group usually concern access to and control over particular resources. Problems are conveyed to the Park who works together with the user groups to develop solutions.
- Approach appears to be cost effective and sustainable.

Activities included under the 2005 work plan

- A number of activities included under Output 1 of the 2005 work plan are not consistent with the output - local community institutions established and operational. These include:

- Solid litter campaign
- Environmental education with schools
- HIV/AIDS education
- Friends of the Environment group
- Soccer tournament
- Construction of a health post
- Most of the above activities arose from the associations themselves.
- These should be transferred to a more appropriate output/activity (for example, activity 3.1 – environmental education) or developed into a new/separate output/activity.

RECOMMENDATIONS CBNRM OUTPUT 1:

- 1.1. Associations need to be strengthened through capacity building and training, so as to become more effective. For example, committee members need training in institutional and organizational techniques, including financial management.
- 1.2. Associations should be encouraged to stick to planned schedules for meetings, particularly weekly executive and monthly community meetings.
- 1.3. Committee members should be encouraged to follow up effectively on decisions taken at meetings.
- 1.4. Establishment of an umbrella fishermen's association should be pursued.
- 1.5. There is a need to harmonise scheduled activities of annual work plans with the original or amended project log frame.
- 1.6. Listed activities (solid litter etc) should be transferred from this output to existing outputs if appropriate, or else developed into a new output concerning supporting activities.
- 1.7. Idea of Park Board should be re-examined with respect to purpose, feasibility, clearly defined role, composition and representation.

OUTPUT 2: Conditions and Possibilities for Greater Income Generation Activities at the Local Level

Re-worded as:

Enabling Environment and Mechanisms Promoted and Created for Greater Income Generation Activities at the Local Level

Activities:

- Activity 2.1. Promote the development and implementation of micro-projects to enhance the sustainable use of natural resources**
- Activity 2.2. Continue assessment of possibilities for establishment of different income generation activities based on information already available**
- Activity 2.3. Establish income generation pilot projects with effective credit systems**
- Activity 2.4. Assist in improvement of resource harvesting and marketing techniques**

Work plan 2005 reoriented to (see comments below):

- Activity 2.1 Establish sanctuaries or no-take zones with the Park and private sector partners**
- Activity 2.2 Initiate alternative income generation activities**
- Activity 2.3 Provide scholarships for young students to improve chance of better education and jobs**
- Activity 2.4 Conduct studies on income generation activities and design pilot-projects**

Assessment

- Output has been re-formulated but remains focused on promoting alternative income generating activities.
- Activities have been rewritten with greater emphasis on alternative income generating activities that are not necessarily directly related to the sustainable use and management of natural resources (but indirectly are, as the idea is to find other ways of earning income rather than direct use and possible over-exploitation of natural resources).
- Investigations to date have yielded little in terms of potential natural resource based alternative incomes (hence the shift of emphasis to other options less directly linked to natural resources). This lack of possibilities was probably not recognised at the outset of the project.
- Pilot project concerning honey production has been initiated and is going into a second phase. Four community members have been trained, established first phase beehives, and one beehive has already been colonised. This activity appears to have some potential.
- Plans exist for training and the initiating pilot projects regarding a variety of alternative income generating activities not necessarily directly related to natural resource management. Most of these have not yet been done. These include:
 - Carpentry training and pilot projects.
 - Masonry training and pilot projects.
 - Crafts and curios training and pilot project (appears to be potential in that there are markets and some materials such as palms).
 - Training community members as tourist guides (for trips to land based resources such as freshwater lakes, crocodile viewing, bird watching, hiking etc., and marine based activities such as dhow trips (already initiated by some hotels) and snorkeling).
 - Support to the existing cultural group on Bazaruto (Matsakise) and establishment of a similar cultural group (music, dance theatre) on Benguerra. In this respect a cultural heritage investigation was carried out. The aim would be to both develop shows for tourists and also to develop shows about environmental issues.
- A once-off exercise to ensure that all islanders had birth certificates and identification papers was carried out. These are necessary in order to get a job, and also to establish rights to use of natural resources within the Park (use of resources is restricted to residents, and in the absence of identity papers it was difficult for rangers and scouts to distinguish between resident islanders and outsiders from the mainland). Roughly 2050 birth certificates were issued and some 1500 identification papers (only to those 10 years or older).
- A scholarship scheme has been initiated and is now in its second year. The purpose of this scheme is to provide opportunity for selected children to further their studies at school in Inhassoro on the mainland. Ten children were supported in 2004, all of who have passed and are now doing Grade 7. A further 10 pupils have been started in Grade 6 this year. One of the associations has adopted this idea and is supporting a further group of children, and even some parents have now started to send their children to school on the mainland. The idea is to produce young adults with sufficient education so as to be able to pursue alternative livelihoods/employment opportunities, although the impact of this will only be felt in the long term well after the project has been completed. Concerns were raised as to whether this activity was consistent with the objectives of the CBNRM project (more of a poverty reduction strategy rather than contributing directly to stated conservation goals), and also as to the sustainability of the exercise, given that each child is likely to be looking for support to cover up to seven years of schooling (in order to complete secondary schooling).
- CARE (Vilankulos) carried out a field review of agricultural potential and concluded that soil conditions on the islands are not conducive for agriculture.
- Further studies concerning new income generating activities still need to be done, for example examining the possibility of use waste materials to manufacture crafts, and the applicability of new techniques of agricultural production such as conservation agriculture and permaculture.

- Further studies are still required in order to identify possibilities for improving techniques of harvesting resources and marketing these to better advantage (for example of fish).

RECOMMENDATIONS CBNRM OUTPUT 2:

- 2.1. Activity 2.1 of the 2005 work plan (establishment of no-take zones) should be moved to Output 3/ Activity 3.4 of the original project log frame.
- 2.2. Actively pursue and implement the above list of planned income generating studies and pilot projects.
- 2.3. Efforts to identify other alternative livelihood options should be continued.
- 2.4. Work with hotel groups to develop a training scheme so as to enable increased local employment within hotel operations.
- 2.5. Investigations of innovative and appropriate agricultural techniques should be continued.
- 2.6. A decision should be taken on whether or not to retain the scholarship component, and to identify alternative sources of funding for this activity, such that the project can remain focused on core conservation activities.

OUTPUT 3: Communities Capable of Monitoring and Evaluating Their Own Use, and Making Decisions Towards Sustainability of Natural Resources

Activities:

- Activity 3.1 Continue to promote environmental awareness**
Activity 3.2 Capacity building for community members to carry out natural resource, social, economic and cultural monitoring
Activity 3.3 Provide opportunities for community members involved in management to exchange experiences with other projects
Activity 3.4 Assist communities to assess their own use patterns in light of resource information and plan and evaluate their future activities

Work plan 2005 changed to (see comments above):

- Activity 3.1 Adult literacy and skills training for improved chances of alternative (to the single use of natural resources) jobs**
Activity 3.2 Train three communities in monitoring methods on natural resource use to participate in the on-going monitoring of natural resources
Activity 3.3 Train community representatives in becoming community rangers
Activity 3.4 Promote and support on community centre where there is no support

The first three of the new activities within the 2005 work plan relate to capacity building for community members to carry out monitoring activities, and thus can be fitted under Activity 3.2 of the original log frame. The fourth new activity (support to community centres) fits better under Output 1 (community institutions established and operational) and should be moved to there.

The following assessment is based on the four activities of the original project log frame.

Activity 3.1. Continue to promote environmental awareness.

There are a number of planned activities under Output1/Activity 1 relating to environmental awareness that fit more comfortably under this component of the project. These include:

- Solid litter campaign
- Environmental education with schools
- HIV/AIDS education
- Friends of the Environment group
- Soccer tournament
- Feasibility study concerning construction of a health post

Assessment

- Solid litter campaign has not yet started. The idea is to work together with schools (thus linking to the planned programme of environmental education with schools), the island associations, hotel operators and FNP/WWF. The role of the project should be confined to catalysing and facilitating the process, rather than leading it.
- The proposed environmental education campaign is to start later this year. This will be supported by the ongoing WWF Marine Awareness programme, which is lead by Alice Costa.
- HIV/AIDS education is being carried out by the associations with support from CARE (Vilankulos). This activity should be handed over to CARE.
- A soccer tournament was organized during 2004 and is being continued this year. Organization was done in conjunction with the associations and hotels, with the project playing a facilitating role. The purpose of the tournament is to improve relations between stakeholders by getting them to work together, and to provide a platform for promotion of environmental issues.
- The idea of creating a Friends of the Environment group was suggested and will be overseen by the associations, with the project playing a facilitatory role. The idea is to focus on children and develop a group of participants with awareness of and interest in environmental issues.
- Project will facilitate the implementation of a feasibility study concerning the proposed construction of a new health post on Benguerra Island, to be carried out by the District Directorate of Health – Vilankulo.

Activity 3.2. Capacity building for community members to carry out natural resource, social, economic and cultural monitoring

3.2.1 Adult literacy and skills training for improved chances of alternative (to the single use of natural resources) jobs

Assessment

- 2003 - 90 people from Zenguelemo participated in an adult literacy programme (learning to read and write). This stopped last year due to lack of a teacher.
- 2004 - two schools were built, one on Benguerra (two rooms) the other on Magaruque (one room), and which doubles up as a community centre.
- 2005 - It is planned to start adult literacy classes on Benguerra, and to build four more classrooms (one on Benguerra and three on Bazaruto).
- Difficulty in finding teachers relates to the lack of suitably qualified islanders and difficulty in attracting teachers from outside (due to low government salaries and poor living conditions on the islands).
- Hotels recognise that illiteracy is a key constraint to employment of many islanders, and some are employing teachers to start their own adult literacy programmes targeted at workers and other members of the adjacent communities.

3.2.2 Train three communities in monitoring methods on natural resource use to participate in the ongoing monitoring of natural resources

Assessment

- Resource user groups are already providing monitoring data to Park rangers. This is linked to the implementation of MOMS (see Objective 5 of the MRUP project – resource monitoring). Community members provide information but due to high rates of illiteracy these data need to be recorded by Park rangers.
- The idea is to train community members to record the required MOMS data themselves.
- Associations are in the process of trying to identify suitable people for training (e.g. with literacy skills), following which training will be started.

3.2.3 Train community representatives in becoming community rangers

Assessment

- Sixteen of the 17 Park rangers have completed training courses at the Gorongosa Wildlife Training School (see Activity 3.8 of the MRUP project). The remaining one was precluded due to health problems. With 13 of the trainees being island residents, this has also yielded results in terms of localised job creation.

3.2.4 Promote and support on community centre where there is no support

Assessment

- This activity fits better under Output 1 (establishment and operation of community institutions) and should be moved to there.
- Furniture (4 tables and 30 chairs) and equipment has been provided for the Benguerra community centre, and it is planned to do the same for the Magaruque, Sitone and Pangaia community centres this year.

Activity 3.3. Provide opportunities for community members involved in management, to exchange experiences with other projects

Assessment

- One exchange visit was carried out in 2004. Community members from Bazaruto, Benguerra and Magaruque were taken to visit agricultural and micro-credit community projects being supported by CARE International on the mainland (Vilankulos and Inhassoro).

Activity 3.4. Assist communities to assess their own use patterns in light of resource information and plan and evaluate their future activities

Assessment

- As discussed under Activity 3.3.2 community members, through resource user groups, are participating in monitoring activities through providing information to Park rangers who record the data according to the newly introduced MOMS format.
- Data is being provided on turtle nests, crocodile nests, fishing, mapalo collecting, palm wine production, livestock production, trade (shops) and movement of dunes.
- Implementation of MOMS is principally being done under the MRUP project.
- MOMS has only recently been initiated, and there is a need to ensure that monitoring results are timeously and effectively fed back to natural resource user groups and community members (see Activity 5.3 of MRUP).
- Communities are already demonstrating a good capacity to evaluate their own use of resources and based on this to formulate and implement management decisions. Examples include:

- Implementation of resting periods for seine netting (in order to give fish stocks time to recover).
- Closing certain areas for the collection of mapalo (in order for them to attain sufficient size to make collecting worthwhile).
- The process of defining user areas and patterns of utilization is still in progress (for fish and mapalo) and natural resource user groups need additional support in this respect, for example in terms of training and establishing work plans.
- This is an appropriate place to include Activity 2.1 of the 2005 work plan (establishing new sanctuaries or no-take zones).

RECOMMENDATIONS CBNRM OUTPUT 3:

- 3.1. CBNRM project should play a facilitating role but hand over responsibility for many of the environmental awareness activities (to other stakeholders as indicated):
 - Solid litter campaign (associations, hotels, schools)
 - Environmental education with schools (WWF MCO campaign)
 - HIV/AIDS education (Associations and to CARE Vilankulo)
 - Friends of the Environment Group (Associations, school children)
 - Soccer tournament (Associations, hotels)
 - Feasibility study concerning construction of a health post (DDS – Vilankulo)
- 3.2. Priority should be given to training community members in resource monitoring.
- 3.3. Priority should be given to establishing work plans and providing training to natural resource user groups.
- 3.4. Community development works implemented by individual hotels, for example on adult literacy, should be integrated with CBNRM project activities, rather than being implemented independently as is the case at present.

OUTPUT 4: Appropriate and Effective Mechanisms for Revenue Sharing Functioning

Re-worded as:

Appropriate and Effective Mechanisms for Revenue Sharing Developed and Functioning

Activities:

Activity 4.1 Establish systems for transferral and effective management of revenue funds

Work plan 2005 re stated as:

Activity 4.1 Discuss existing legislation at all levels (central, local, within established committees at Park level)

Activity 4.2 Agreements between tourism operators, Park and communities

Activity 4.3 Training of committees on finance management and project definition

Assessment

- Some background is provided under MRUP Activities 3.3 (sign protocols for transfer of tourist fees) and 3.7 (alternative options for financial sustainability), and see Appendix 7.
- A system of collecting fees is in place (verbal agreements with all hotels) but the transfer of part of these fees to communities is not working smoothly.
- Previously there was an informal system in place under which tourist fees were collected by hotels and 50% of these fees were transferred directly to communities.
- New legislation concerning the collection and allocation of tourist fees was passed in 2003 and implemented in 2004.
- The new legislation stipulates that DNAC should be responsible for the collection of tourist fees, and that 80% of the fees should be transferred to the state (to FUTUR) and the remaining 20% to communities.

- Implementation of this new stipulation, from April 2004, has resulted in a marked decrease in the transfer of revenues to communities.
- Although DNAC is responsible for the collection of tourism fees, island hotels have opted to continue collection themselves on behalf of DNAC (Hotels can collect fees on behalf of DNAC).
- The subsequent transfer of fees is being done differently by different hotels. Three hotels (Benguerra Lodge, Marlin Lodge and Indigo Bay) split the fees and deposit 80% to the BANP and 20% to the relevant association account. The other two hotels (Bazaruto Lodge and Gabrielles Lodge) are transferring 100% of the fees to the BANP.
- Since mid-2004 certain hotels have been collecting tourist fees but with holding these from both the BANP and communities (Benguerra Lodge and Marlin Lodge). This appears to be in contravention of the law. Different hotels give different reasons for with holding fees such as: community members fishing directly in front of the hotel, lack of transparency as to how funds are allocated and used, the fact that other hotels do not transfer any fees to communities (i.e. relating to disputes between different operators) etc.
- Other hotels have continued to transfer fees but on an infrequent and irregular basis rather than monthly (Bazaruto Lodge).
- The with holding of tourist fees by Benguerra Lodge and Marlin Lodge has resulted in a serious disruption in the flow of revenues to communities on Benguerra island, and has led to a marked deterioration in relations between stakeholders (communities and hotels and hotels and BANP).
- Additional tourist fees are collected by the BANP from visitors from the mainland, through a ticket system. The FNP/Park office in Vilankulo issues booklets of tickets on behalf of BANP to seven operators in Vilankulo and Inhassoro. Tickets are sold to clients, and when each book is finished the money is then deposited to the BANP account.
- Since the introduction of the new legislation the BANP has not been releasing to communities any of the tourist fees deposited to its account (i.e. from mainland operators, Bazaruto Lodge and Gabrielle's Camp). Two reasons are given for this, firstly legal grounds, in particular that they lack the authority to do so until such time as new regulations are implemented and, secondly, on the basis that they lack any system as to how the revenues, particularly from mainland operators, should be allocated.
- The result is a further disruption to the flow of revenues to communities on both Benguerra and Bazaruto islands.
- The KK Association has attempted to discuss the issue of with holding tourist fees with hotel operators on the island (Marlin Lodge and Benguerra Lodge), but to no avail.
- The KK Association has also approached the BANP for assistance in resolving this issue, again with no result as yet.
- BANP has discussed the issue with hotel operators, but has not managed to convince them to release the tourist fees.
- This stance by hotel operators appears to be related to the recent slippage by the BANP in enforcing various aspects of the management plan, particularly as regards development works by hotel operators, and thus the development of an attitude of impunity by the hotel operators.
- In March 2005, the Park Administrator sent a letter to hotel operators, copied to DNAC, requesting hotel operators to deposit all outstanding fees within 15 days.
- DNAC promised to send a letter to hotel operators addressing the problem and pointing out that if necessary they might pursue legal action. At the time of this review this letter had not yet been issued.
- The reduction in transfer of tourist fees to communities from 50% to 20% has necessarily led to a decline in the revenues received by communities (Appendix 7). It is anticipated that this will be offset by the collection of new fees such as those on activities (e.g. snorkelling, diving, fishing) and transport (boats, air craft etc), and the taking over of collection of fees currently done by other departments (for example the collection of land taxes by DINAGECA).

RECOMMENDATIONS CBNRM OUTPUT 4:

- 4.1. BANP and DNAC should be actively encouraged to apply and enforce the law with respect to transfer of tourist fees by hotel operators, and equally to all operators.
- 4.2. A protocol needs to be developed outlining the procedure for collection of tourist fees and their transfer to BANP and/or communities (see MRUP recommendation 3.5). This needs to be done on a regular basis and in a transparent manner (for example deposits should be accompanied by lists of guests). This protocol needs to be developed in conjunction with and adopted by all hotel operators.
- 4.3. Development of a system for the distribution of all tourist fees, particularly those from mainland sources, should be pursued, so as to enable the release of these funds to communities. The system should be developed in a participatory manner and will need to be acceptable to communities.
- 4.4. The BANP should increase transparency as to the collection, management and use of tourism fees, for example through publication of a statement of income and expenditure.
- 4.5. The project should monitor the flow of revenues to communities in order to better assess the impact of the reduction in tourism revenues from 50% to 20%, and the extent to which these might be compensated for through the introduction of new fees.
- 4.6. The introduction of new fees needs to be pursued in order to compensate for the loss of revenues experienced by communities through reducing their proportion of tourist fees from 50% to 20%. Again this will need to be done in a participatory manner, in particular to ensure that concerns of tourism operators are addressed and that the system is workable.
- 4.7. Community associations should be trained in terms of project definition and management of finances. This can be done using existing training materials such as CAMPFIRE game etc. and could be implemented through existing initiatives such as the WWF regional CBNRM project and the Gorongosa Wildlife Training School.

OUTPUT 5: Better Functionality of CBNRM Project**Activity 5.1 Monitoring and management of the project****Assessment**

- This is a new Output, as the original CBNRM log frame does not include any output relating to project management.
- The Output could be restated along the lines of “Project management established”.

RECOMMENDATIONS CBNRM OUTPUT 5:

- 5.1. This output should be added to the project log frame.
- 5.2. Support should be brought in via the WWF MCO to establish a simple system for monitoring implementation of the project.
- 5.3. The monitoring system should include a database with baseline data against which changes in contributions to natural resource management and benefits received can be assessed.
- 5.4. A new proposal for the period 2006-2008 needs to be developed as soon as the review has been completed, for submission to WWF Norway by September 2005.

4.3 Indicators for the CBNRM Project

Output 1:

- Two associations established and operational, for example made annual work plans in log frame format with budgets with assistance from Project.
- 23 resource user groups established and making decisions with respect to natural resource management e.g. exclusion zones.

Output 2:

- 21 scholarships given to young islanders, and others inspired to follow this example.
- Training in honey production is underway.
- 13 islanders trained and employed as rangers by the Park.

Output 3:

- Resource user groups contributing to the monitoring of their natural resources.
- Making decisions with respect to natural resource management, e.g. creating exclusion zones for fishing and mapalo harvesting.
- MOMS has been adapted for marine resources and is being applied at resource user level (with assistance).

Output 4:

- Mechanism for revenue distribution developed and accepted by the state.
- Revenues accruing to communities for 2005 are anticipated to be about 13.000 USD.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this section is to highlight the achievements of the two projects and key issues that are likely to act as constraints to future progress. Summary tables are presented of other issues that although less critical do need to be followed up, plus a brief statement regarding the way ahead for the immediate future.

5.1 Project Achievements

Attention is drawn to the major achievements within the BANP, both in terms of direct conservation impacts and also indirect social benefits and broader achievements. Other stakeholders have also made important contributions towards these successes, such that these achievements are not solely attributable to implementation of the two WWF projects.

5.1.1 Conservation Benefits

- Enhanced protection for species of conservation interest, such as dugongs and turtles within the BANP and surrounds.
- Drastic reduction in commercial long-line fishing by foreign registered ships within the BANP.
- Marked decline in gill netting by local fishermen, due to a combination of increased awareness and enforcement actions.
- Apparent increases in crocodile populations on Bazaruto and Benguerra.

Despite the above successes, concerns remain as to the status of certain key resources, in particular:

- Destruction of coral reefs, through both insensitive recreational activities (tourism) and the harvesting of resources by local fishermen (such as sea cucumbers, fishes and shells).
- Apparent declines in stocks of fish and mapalo, resulting in declining yields to local users.
- The continued high incidence of fires on the islands, which is believed to be resulting in negative impacts to certain terrestrial plant and animal species.

- Unsustainable development of infrastructure by hotel operators (e.g. buildings on beaches, destructive use of sand dunes, airstrip just above the tidal zone etc.).

5.1.2 Socio-economic Benefits

During the MRUP review period of 2001-2005 (and including the CBNRM project from 2003-2005), island communities have achieved important gains in terms of social infrastructure, services and livelihoods. These include:

- Improvements to existing schools and the establishment of new ones.
- Introduction of a scholarship scheme enabling selected children to continue their studies at schools on the mainland.
- Introduction of a programme of adult literacy, providing new skills that open up possibilities of alternative livelihood options, particularly employment in hotels on the islands.
- Access to birth certificates and identity papers facilitated for all island residents. These documents are key requirements in terms of school enrollment and seeking employment, particularly outside of the islands.
- Selected island residents have benefited from various forms of training, for example as conservation rangers (13 islanders now trained and employed as rangers by the BANP), and in the production of honey.
- Community centers have been established and equipped.
- The establishment of soccer teams and an annual tournament has been facilitated.
- Support has been given to the formation of cultural groups.

5.1.3 Broader Achievements

Implementation of the MRUP and CBNRM projects have contributed towards certain broader more general achievements by the BANP. Key aspects are:

- Extension of the Park to include the Islands of Bazaruto and Santa Carolina (MRUP).
- Approval and adoption of the management plan for the period 2002-2006 (MRUP).
- The securing of donor support to facilitate the continued running and development of the Park Administration (MRUP), increased involvement of communities in management of natural resources (MRUP and CBNRM), and improved monitoring of biological and socioeconomic indicators (MRUP).
- BANP has been in the forefront of the development and implementation of new approaches to CBNRM within Mozambique. Examples include:
 - The establishment of community associations (MRUP and CBNRM).
 - Development of systems to enable the transfer of revenues from tourists to community members (MRUP and CBNRM).
 - The adaptation and implementation of the Namibian “Event Book” monitoring system to local conditions, including the marine environment (MRUP).
- Enhanced capacity of the local environmental NGO FNP, through involving it in the implementation of both the MRUP and CBNRM projects.

5.2 Key Issues

BANP faces potential threats from two different quarters: uncontrolled tourism development by private sector investors, and the loss of resources through excessive levels of utilization by island communities, both of which threaten to compromise the conservation objectives of the Park. In the longer term the BANP can also be expected to come under pressure from development works carried out by community members themselves (e.g. better houses and services, more shops and businesses, the introduction of cars etc.).

5.2.1 Uncontrolled Tourism Development

Implementation of the Management Plan

- One of the key functions of the management plan is to provide a mechanism to limit tourism development to levels that are consistent with maintenance of the resource base on which the tourism depends.

- The problem being faced at present is that existing tourism operators and central Government appear to be ignoring the management plan, and carrying out development works without the necessary authorization as required under the management plan.
- This problem is compounded both by an apparent lack of commitment by DNAC/MITUR and other Government ministries to adhere to the management plan and, in the absence of active support by DNAC/MITUR, the inability of the Park Administration to enforce compliance with the management plan by existing tourism operators within the BANP.
- The problem is further compounded by a lack of clarity as to the authorization process for development activities within the BANP, both by local stakeholders and amongst Government institutions.
- This issue is having a profound negative impact on the BANP, as manifested by a breakdown in communications, trust and respect amongst stakeholders at all levels (hotel operators, communities, BANP, FNP/WWF MCO, DNAC/MITUR and donor organizations).

Revision of the Management Plan

- The existing management plan has been adopted for the period 2002-2006.
- All stakeholders agree that the management plan now needs to be revised.
- However, different stakeholders appear to have different motivations in seeking to revise the management plan. Conservation proponents anticipate that the revised plan will provide solutions to some of the above problems being faced and provide for enhanced controls over further development, whilst central Government appear to be looking to the revision as paving the way to enable increased levels of tourism development within the BANP.
- WWF MCO offered to provide funding to support the revision process, but it seems that DNAC have obtained funding from alternative sources. They have are now seeking to start the revision process, and are insisting that this should be completed by June 2005. This is an highly unrealistic schedule assuming that this is to be done in a meaningful and responsible manner.
- Existing donor organizations are concerned that, given the apparent lack of commitment to implement the existing management plan, this situation is likely to remain the same regardless of any revision of the management plan. They have sought assurances from central Government on this issue, but to date have not received any positive response. This issue may jeopardize their continued support to the BANP, particularly with respect to continued support for future phases of both the MRUP (by WWF Switzerland) and CBNRM projects (by WWF Norway).

Relationships Among Stakeholders

- Relationships between stakeholders have been further strained through changes and disruptions to the system of transfer of tourism fees from hotel operators to BANP and communities. Following implementation of the new legislation, the proportion of fees transferred to communities declined from 50% to 20%. On Benguerra Island the system was further disrupted through unilateral decisions by hotel operators to withhold fees from both BANP and communities.
- This has contributed to deteriorations in relationships between hotel operators and communities, hotel operators and the BANP, communities and the BANP and within communities between Association leaders and community members.
- Efforts are underway to address the immediate issue of the transfer of fees, through seeking intervention by DNAC. Rebuilding strained relationships is however likely to be more difficult and to take longer to achieve, yet will be key to the future successful co-management of the BANP.

- Possibilities include reviving the schedule of planned meetings (stakeholders, operational, project management, and steering committee), improved response times particularly by the BANP to issues raised in these meetings, using monitoring results to inform management decisions, etc.

5.2.2 Impacts to Resources by Island Communities

Declining Resources

- Island residents are dependent on marine resources such as fish and mapalo.
- There are concerns that high levels of offtake of fish and mapalo are not sustainable and are resulting in declines in these resources.
- Reduced levels of fish and mapalo will translate directly into reduced incomes for local communities, manifesting in increased poverty and hunger.
- Whilst communities are seeking progressive management solutions to these problems (such as exclusion zones and no-take periods), little improvement can be expected unless there is a sustained reduction in pressure on these resources, which in turn requires the development of alternative livelihood options for these communities.

Development of Alternative Livelihood Options

- Initial efforts to identify alternative livelihoods focused on natural resource related options. This has turned out to be much more difficult than originally anticipated. Whilst these have not necessarily been exhaustively explored, nothing particularly promising has been achieved.
- More recently it has been decided to widen the search to include other income generating options that are not necessarily directly dependent on natural resources associated with the islands (such as masonry and carpentry, and for which purpose raw materials may need to be brought in from outside).
- Various barriers to the development of alternative livelihoods have been identified and addressed. In particular, the lack of identity papers and poor literacy skills previously precluded many islanders from all but the most basic of employment opportunities.
- Islanders were provided with an opportunity to obtain identity papers, whilst efforts are being made to improve literacy through adult education, support to schools on the islands and through provision of scholarships to enable some children to continue studies to a higher level than presently possible on the islands. This is a long term strategy, the results of which will probably only be felt long after the project has been completed.

Contributions from Tourism

- The CBNRM project is based on the premise that communities should contribute to the conservation of resources, and should reap tangible benefits from doing so. The most obvious way of receiving benefits is through sharing rewards from tourism.
- Such benefits come in a variety of ways such as the transfer of tourism fees, employment in hotels, selling produce to hotels (fish etc), selling artifacts to hotels or tourists, dhow trips, cultural performances etc.

- Given the recent reduction and disruption of the flow of fees to island communities it is imperative that this issue should be addressed as a matter of urgency. This includes ensuring a regular flow of revenues from hotels, the BANP developing a system for the distribution of fees generated from sales of tickets on the mainland, and seeking ways to increase the amount of fees being collected, either through introducing new types of fees or else increasing the amount paid in the form of tourism fees.
- Tourism operators have already expressed reservations concerning the planned introduction of new fees. This should be done in a participatory manner in order to develop a system that is workable and acceptable to the tour operators.
- The seven hotels on the islands (but of which only five are running at present) currently employ a total of about 568 people, of which 97 (or 17%) are islanders (there are thought to be about 700 families on the islands). Although there are clear constraints to increasing employment of islander in tourism operations, given the potential benefits of doing so, it is imperative that further efforts continue to be made in this respect.

5.3 Issues to be Followed Up

Other issues to be followed up under the MRUP and CBNRM projects are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2. Other issues to be followed up under the MRUP project**MRUP Project**

- Proactively formulate and prepare input to revision of the management plan.
- Lobby MITUR to finalize and approve internal Park regulations for BANP.
- Produce a 12-15 minute documentary of BANP.
- Produce a simple cheap tourist flier or leaflet for visitors to the BANP.
- Seek to develop alternative and sustainable sources of funding for BANP.
- Develop proposals for new phases of both MRUP and CBNRM projects.
- Continue to develop partnerships to carry out monitoring activities.
- Follow up on the possible formation of the BAIC or a Park Board.
- Develop and sign protocols with hotels concerning the transfer of tourism fees to communities.
- Develop and sign a protocol with hotels concerning staff settlements.
- Request DNAC to provide a chief law enforcement officer for the BANP.
- Provide camping equipment to BANP rangers to enable them to carry out mobile patrols.
- Increase the budget for fuel so as to allow increased levels of marine enforcement.
- Improve the system of collection and communication of information from other stakeholders.
- Develop a monitoring system for law enforcement activities (to be included under the MOMS programme).
- Improve the feedback of results of law enforcement activities to the general public.
- Develop a systematic approach to the collection, collation and storage of basic project data (reports, publications, visitor statistics, etc).
- Ensure that all scientists working in the BANP deliver copies of their findings to the BANP.
- Support staff in Park Administration should be provided with basic computer training regarding data entry, storage and retrieval procedures.
- Park rangers should receive training in English.
- Two Park rangers should undergo driving courses that should include training in defensive driving and off-road driving.
- Train admin staff in basic computer based data entry and management techniques.
- Request DNAC/MITUR to provide an administrative officer specifically to deal with issues concerning the collection and management of revenues.
- Commission a study to investigate and hopefully demonstrate the financial viability of the BANP (thus paving the way for the retention of all tourism revenues at the Park level).
- Develop systems for the collection of new types of fees.
- Continue training of Park and project personnel.
- Continue to look for better ways of processing and marketing fish.
- Complete analysis and reporting of existing socio-economic data.
- Obtain reports from ongoing dugong monitoring activities.
- Use results of monitoring programme to inform management decisions and communicate these to stakeholders.
- Investigate the feasibility of counting crocodiles.
- Gradually introduce the MOMS to natural resource user groups.
- Complete signs, and provide more information where needed.
- Seek out dugong monitoring data from the Museum of Natural History, and establish a system for the regular transfer of monitoring results.
- Provide new uniforms every 18 months.
- Include schedules for technical and financial reviews as part of the annual plan of activities.
- Prepare an annual financial report that shows the contributions received from all sources, including from collection of taxes, donors and government.

Table 3. Other issues to be followed up under the CBNRM project**CBNRM Project**

- Provide training and support to association council members.
- Encourage associations to stick to scheduled meetings and to follow up on decisions taken.
- Continue investigations to identify appropriate agricultural techniques.
- Decide whether to retain the scholarship component within the project or else to seek alternative support for this component.
- Monitor the flow of tourism revenues to communities.
- Develop a new project proposal for the period 2006-2007 and submit this to WWF Norway by 1st September 2005.
- Request CARE for reports and an update as to work with micro-credit groups.
- Continue with community exchange visits.
- Provide training for selected community members in resource monitoring.
- Provide training and support to members of natural resource user groups.
- Pursue the establishment of an umbrella fishermen's association.
- CBNRM project should play a facilitating role but hand over responsibility for environmental awareness activities such as solid litter campaign, environmental education with schools, HIV/AIDS education, Friends of the Environment Group, Soccer tournament etc.
- Work together with hotels to ensure that their community activities are better integrated with those of the projects.

5.4 Way Forward

- Both projects come to the end of their respective phases in 2005.
- Review results indicate that although both projects have made considerable progress, there are still many activities that need further follow up and development, and that to do so will require further donor support.
- In seeking further support it should be emphasized that the BANP remains in the forefront of developing new approaches to CBNRM in Mozambique. This is necessarily more complicated and resource demanding than the application of a pre-existing model.
- New proposals should thus be developed for both projects, and re-submitted to WWF Switzerland (MRUP) and WWF Norway (CBNRM). This provides a good opportunity to better harmonize the two projects, through clarifying which project activities belong best with which projects, and thus reducing areas of potential overlap and confusion.
- At the same time these existing donors have made it clear that in order for them to continue their support they will require an unambiguous commitment from central Government to adhere to and uphold the management plan. Specifically they are requesting Government not to authorize any new development activities until such time as the new management plan is in place. So far this has not been forthcoming. It appears that Government is specifically seeking to delay giving any such commitment until such time as the management plan has been revised (and which they are aiming to do as quickly as possible).
- Given that this issue may still compromise future support by WWF Switzerland and WWF Norway, it is imperative that strong effort should be put into lobbying central Government to give the necessary assurances that the donors are seeking, and to carry out revision of the management plan in a comprehensive and responsible manner.

6. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Terms of Reference

Bazaruto Archipelago National Park, Mozambique

Mid Term Internal Reviews

Bazaruto Multiple Resource Use Project, 2001-2005

&

Bazaruto CBNRM Project, 2003-2005

WWF Switzerland, WWF Norway, WWF SARPO & WWF MCO

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Background

The Bazaruto National Park was created in 1971 but it was only after 1989 that an Administration was put in place, nominated by DNFFB, at that time the authority for Parks in Mozambique. The area of the Park only included the Islands of Benguerra, Magaruque and Bangué plus five nautical miles surrounding them. The largest Island of Bazaruto and the much smaller Santa Carolina were classified as “areas of vigilance”. The objective of this Park was mostly to protect the endangered dugong and marine turtles. Placing a Park Warden in Bazaruto was made possible due to support from WWF South Africa and EWT (Endangered Wildlife Trust, (now FNP, Forum Natureza em Perigo, a national NGO)) which financed the purchase of the current camp-site in Sitone, developed a number of studies and implemented a community rangers programme.

From 1994-1998 the Park received Project funding from the European Union through WWF International and SARPO. This was a very ambitious project with several objectives and represented the first large funding support in Bazaruto. One of the most important out-puts of the Project was the intended approval of the then drafted Management Plan and the extension of the Park to reflect a more coherent ecosystem approach. This was never implemented by the Government of the day and thus the EU support was not renewed. Since 1998 WWF Switzerland has been supporting the Park, through funding the Multiple Resource Use Project (MRUP).

In 2001, when the authority for Parks was transferred to the Ministry of Tourism and its National Directorate for Conservation Areas (DNAC) from the Ministry of Agriculture, numerous changes were brought about. The Park was finally extended to include all 5 islands in the Archipelago and surrounding waters – now called the Bazaruto Archipelago National Park (BANP), covering an area of 1,430 km². The Management Plan was approved and a new Administration put in place. A second phase for the Multiple Resource Use project was designed for 2001-2005, and further support provided for the Park by WWF Switzerland. A project was developed, approved by DNAC and circulated in the network for funding.

It is in this context that WWF Norway provided in 2003, support for a Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) component of the larger MRUP Project, the Bazaruto CBNRM

Project, 2003-2005. FNP works in partnership with the Park and WWF in the implementation of activities related to both projects.

Both projects are now in need of mid-term reviews. Moreover, as nearly 14 years of WWF support has been provided to BANP, it is appropriate for these reviews to take place so as to also inform the numerous stakeholders involved in BANP of what conservation achievement there has been for the investments that have been made.

This is particularly important as Bazaruto Archipelago NP currently faces development pressures that may have negative impacts in the long term. The Management Plan has not been adhered to as required and poor Environmental Impact Assessments have not addressed adequately a number of inappropriate infrastructural developments and planned developments. There is the need to also revise the current Management Plan. This has led to strained relationships between Government agencies and both WWF and FNP.

2. The Project Log frames

The Bazaruto Multiple Resource Use Project is supported by a fixed amount of funds every year, provided for by WWF Switzerland and is based in a simple log frame that has been used for the last four years. The Bazaruto CBNRM Project is based on a larger Project developed to seek funding from other donors. So far, is the only component that has been funded. The Log frame of this project is much more detailed.

1. Bazaruto Multiple Resource Use Project

Please, see log frame..

Project Goal

Goal: Ensure Government Commitment in the approval of the proposal for extension of new national Park limits, Park rules and Park Management plan for Greater Bazaruto National Park. Follow on donors comments to the submitted new project phase proposal for ‘Bazaruto Archipelago Conservation and Collaborative management Programme’ for the next five years. Continue to implement Bazaruto National Park management Plan

Project Objectives

Objective 1: Implement Park rules and Park Management plan for Bazaruto Archipelago National Park.

Objective 2: Lobby for securement of donor funding for the next project phase

Objective 3: Co-manage Bazaruto Archipelago in Partnership with relevant Agents

Objective 4: Manage local resources in partnership with local communities

Objective 5: Resource Monitoring

Objective 6: Administration and Logistic Aspects

2. Bazaruto CBNRM Project

Project Goal

“Local communities benefit from and contribute to the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity in the Bazaruto Archipelago National Park, Mozambique”

Project Purpose

Community-based organizations are actively participating in the protection, management and sustainable use of the Bazaruto Archipelago National Park and its natural resources together with the management authority and private sector partners.

Project Outputs

- 2.1. Local community institutions established and operational in accordance with the Management Plan.
- 2.2. Conditions and possibilities for greater income generation activities at the local level promoted and created.
- 2.3. Communities capable of monitoring and evaluating their own use, and making decisions towards sustainability of natural resources.
- 2.4. Appropriate and effective mechanisms for revenue sharing functioning

3. Purpose and Objectives of the Reviews

The primary purpose of the review is to assess the progress of both projects towards their stated goals, and identification of constraints hindering such progress.

Approach & Methodology

The process of reviews and assessment will include interviews and consultations with Park Administration and Park Staff, Hotel and Tour Operators in the mainland and inside the Park, resident island communities, fishermen communities inside and out-side the Park, a development NGO, CARE and Project staff, including FNP. It is unlikely that Hoteliers and communities will be aware of the existence of two discrete projects and whilst the independent consultant should not be too concerned over this, s/he will need to tease out the separate achievements or otherwise of the projects with respect to this set of stakeholders.

The consultant will work independently with these stakeholders for the first 5 day phase of the review, to be joined thereafter by a WWF team for a further 5 day phase in Bazaruto. This team will review and analyse the project log-frames and participate in the final workshop.

At the conclusion of the field assessments, the review will examine project implementation at a workshop in Bazaruto involving the primary stakeholders i.e. representatives from DNAC, Park Administration, CARE, Hotel operators and community representatives, FNP and WWF.

There will be concluding meetings with DNAC and other relevant Government Departments in Maputo.

Scope of the Review

The review SHOULD aim to focus on the following aspects of the 2 projects:

- Measure the performance of the two projects to date with respect to stated goals and objectives by identifying specific accomplishments and/or failures attributable to them
- Review the activities that have taken place and the resulting outputs to date, and determine the quality and impact of these
- Review the project implementation strategy with particular reference to the relationship between the Park Administration Authority (DNAC), in both Bazaruto and Maputo and the WWF and FNP Project teams.
- Review the biological, sociological, legal and administrative indicators for the Projects, as reflected in the Project log frames
- Outline the lessons learned from experience to date and provide recommendations that can be used in the continuation or reorientation of the project
- Identify efforts by other agencies contributing to implementation of sound natural resource management and community capacity building in the BANP (i.e. cross-cutting initiatives, political issues, conservation incentives, bilateral assistance, and the role of other NGOs)

4. Time Frame

Please, see the schedule (annex 1).

5. Implementation and Review Team

The evaluation is to be carried out by a team consisting of:

- An independent consultant (Mr Rob Cunliffe)
- WWF SARPO (Dr Russell Taylor),
- WWF Switzerland (Monica Borner)
- WWF Norway (Anne Martinussen)
- WWF Mozambique Coordination Office (Helena Motta)

The aim of this mixed team is to contribute to WWF's own internal review and M&E process as well as building hands-on skills in project assessment. The independent consultant will undertake separate meetings and assessments where necessary.

The schedule below (see above also) provides some details on the 11 day review process, of which 1 day will be spent in the mainland (Vilankulo), 9 days in Bazaruto and at least one day meeting stakeholders in Maputo. The WWF team will spend 5 days in Bazaruto. The consultant will then spend 5 days for report writing, which gives a total of 18 days for the whole consultancy.

Both the independent consultant and the WWF team will be assisted in the field by the Project staff, FNP and the Park staff.

6. Deliverables and Reporting Requirements

The independent consultant will be responsible for undertaking separate consultations as appropriate and for producing the evaluation report, which will include inputs from the review team as a whole, commentary on the stakeholder workshop and a set of recommendations. These will reflect both the on-site findings and those arising from the workshop.

Annex 1: PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR THE MID-TERM REVIEW OF BAZARUTO CBNRM AND BACP (MRUP)

Date	Time	Activity	Comments	Responsible
11.04	08:00 16:00	Day 1: Meeting with MCO Arrival of independent consultant (RC) in Vilankulo and meeting with mainland Hotel operators	RC is joined by Eduardo Videira	António Reina
12.04 (Tuesday)	08:00 14:00	Day 2: Meeting with mainland fishermen association and IDPPE Travel to Bazaruto and introduction to local authorities and Park staff		António Reina
13.04 (Wednesday)		Day 3: Meeting Hotels operators		
14.04 (Thursday)		Day 4: Meeting Communities/interest groups		
15.04 (Friday)		Day 5: Meeting Communities/interest groups		
16.04 (Saturday)	08:00 14:00	Day 6: Meeting Park staff Rest of team arrives. Feedback presentation by RC.	Monica Borner, Anne Martinussen, Russel Taylor and Helena Motta arrive in Vilankulo and travel to Bazaruto	
17.04 (Sunday)		Day 7: Discuss logframes for CBNRM	Park Headquarters	
18.04 (Monday)		Day 8: Discuss logframes for MRUP; Presentation of data assessing the effectiveness of the protected area (biological, social and economical)	Park Headquarters	
19.04 (Tuesday)		Day 9: Workshop (presentations by team members and project staff)	Workshop to be organized in a suitable place	António Reina
20.4 (Wednesday)		Day 10: Wrap-up and departure to Maputo		
21.04 (Thursday)		Day 11: Meetings in Maputo with DNAC, IIP, IDPPE, etc.		
22.04 (Friday)		Other meetings as necessary/departure from Maputo		
23.04		Departure from Maputo		
28.04		RC hands the first draft of the report to WWF		

Appendix 2 List of Documentation Made Available to the Independent Reviewer

Background Documentation

Anon. 2002. Bazaruto Archipelago National Park Conservation and Collaborative Management Program – CCMP: A Proposal for a Five Year Programme in a Joint Activity Between National Directorate for Conservation Areas (DNAC) and WWF Mozambique. 108 pp.

DNAC. 2002. Management Plan: Bazaruto Archipelago National Park 2002-2006. DNAC/DNFFB/WWF/EWT, Maputo. 116 pp.

Engdahl, S., Bjerner, E. and Enosse, C. 2001. Review of local community participation and the economic contribution of the tourism industry: The case of Bazaruto Archipelago, Mozambique. 36 pp.

Taylor, J. 2003. A Brief Social Overview of the Island Communities in Bazaruto Archipelago National Park. Consultant report prepared for WWF Mozambique Cooperation Office, Maputo. 23 pp.

Vieira, E. J. S. and Louro, C. M. M. 2003. Análise dos Estudos Feitos no Parque Nacional do Arquipélago do Bazaruto. BICO/FNP/WWF, Maputo. 107 pp.

MRUP Project

Multiple Resource Use Project for the Bazaruto Archipelago Bi-annual Technical Progress Report (Logframe) Period: From 1st July to 30th December 2004.

Multiple Resource Use Project for the Bazaruto Archipelago: WWF Project Technical Progress Report, July to December 2004.

CBNRM Project

Project Proposal – CBNRM Bazaruto Archipelago National Park. NORAD's Form for Multiannual Plan for Organizations Party to Cooperation Agreements.

Annual Plan 2004 (Logframe) – CBNRM in Bazaruto Archipelago National Park – GLO-02/467-2.

Marine Natural Resource Management in Bazaruto Archipelago National Park, Mozambique: Annual Report 2004. WWF Project No. MZ0006.

Appendix 3 Lists of Participants Consulted During the Review Process

WWF MCO (Maputo)

Helena Motta

Vilankulo Tourism Operators (n = 5)

Ben Thompson (Odyssea Dive)

Melanie Slyn-Woods (Casa Rex Lodge)

Margie Toens (Tourist Services)

Antoine Bossel (Sailaway Dhow Safaris)

David Kimber (Sailaway Dhow Safaris)

Vilankulo Fishermen's Association (n = 6)

David Vilanculo

Fazbem Eusebio

Joao Fanzune

Pedro David

Carlos Penicela

Filipe Chivale

Inhassoro Fishermen's Association

Joao Mandigo (Committee member)

IDPPE Inhassoro (n = 4)

Veronica Francisco

Jeremias Roberto

Horacio Alfredo

Isabel Sujado

Kanhi Kwedhu Association (Benguerra Island) (n = 9)

Amelia Sainda Vilankulo

8 others

Benguerra Lodge (Benguerra Island)

Trevor Landry

Indigo Bay (Bazaruto Island)

Karl Snater

Bazaruto Lodge (Bazaruto Island)

Louis Erasmus

Tomba Yedhu Association (Bazaruto Island) (n = 2)

Paulino Albano (President)

Castigo Alberto Zivane (Secretary and Treasurer)

Zenguelemo Community (Bazaruto Island) (n = 55)

25 farmers

17 fishermen

7 students

3 traders

2 workers

1 teacher

BANP Rangers (Zenguelemo Poste Bazaruto Island) (n = 7)

Santos Abdul
 Alfonso Mandane
 Fernando Jeque
 Gemildo Alberto
 Joao Bernardo
 Alexandre Samo
 Tomas Manane (Vice-Chief)

Sitone Community (Bazaruto Island) (n = 30)

Including:
 16 mapalo collectors
 11 fishermen
 2 traders
 1 craft worker

BANP Park Administrator (Bazaruto Island)

Rafael Funzana

FNP

Antonio Reina

Bazaruto Report Back Workshop (n = 19)

Manuel Issane Fuazil (Community Leader, Benguerra Island)
 Jose Hassane Zivane (President KK Association)
 Castigo Alberto Zivane (TY Association)
 Mazelete Lassenda (Community Leader)
 Jose Sebastien Massane (Bazaruto Lodge)
 Tomas Doutor Huo (Gabriels Lodge)
 Andre Armindo Alar (Ilha Margaraque Lda)
 David Salatiah Matavel (Gone Fishing)
 Rodrigo Muchine (BANP)
 Rafael Funzana (BANP)
 Victor Vilanculo (BANP and KK Association)
 Tomas Manasse (BANP)
 Antonio Reina (FNP)
 Eduardo Videira (FNP)
 Monica Borner (WWF Switzerland)
 Anne Martinussen (WWF Norway)
 Helena Motta (WWF MCO)
 Russell Taylor (WWF SARPO)
 Rob Cunliffe (Independent Consultant)

WWF Norway

Anne Martinussen

WWF SARPO

Russell Taylor

WWF Switzerland

Monica Borner

Maputo Workshop (n = 12)

Albino Magona (FFP)

Antonio Reina (FNP)

Rafael Fanzana (BANP)

Ernesto Poiosse (IDPPE)

Simeao Lopes (IDPPE)

Julieta Lichuge (DNAC)

Sidania Muhorro (MICOA/DNGA)

Monica Borner (WWF Switzerland)

Rob Cunliffe (Independent Consultant)

Anne Martinussen (WWF Norway)

Helena Motta (WWF MCO)

Russell Taylor (WWF SARPO)

Appendix 4 MRUP Original Project Log-frame Matrix

MULTIPLE RESOURCE USE PROJECT FOR THE BAZARUTO ARCHIPELAGO BI-ANNUAL TECHNICAL PROGRESS REPORT (LOGFRAME) PERIOD: FROM 1st JULY TO 31st DECEMBER 2004

Goal: Ensure Government Commitment in the approval of the proposal for extension of new national Park limits, Park rules and Park Management plan for Greater Bazaruto National Park. Follow on donors comments to the submitted new project phase proposal for ‘Bazaruto Archipelago Conservation and Collaborative management Programme’ for the next five years. Continue to implement Bazaruto National Park management Plan.

Objective 1: Implement Park rules and Park Management plan for Bazaruto Archipelago National Park.		
Activity	Indicators	Results
1.1. Implement National Park rules and Management Plan.	National Park rules and Management Plan implemented.	Management Plan not being implemented by Ministry of Tourism and Park Administration. Conflicts deepening. The revision of the Management Plan is set as a priority.
1.2. Lobby at National Directorate for Conservation Areas (DNAC) for approval Internal Regulation of Bazaruto Archipelago National Park.	Meeting with DNAC has been done.	Meetings are being held at various levels and different Ministries, but to address the current development problems and the work of the current Administrator
1.3. Information on the Internal Regulation of Bazaruto Archipelago National Park.	Information supplied.	It depends on the implementation of 1.2.
1.4. Promote and publicise National Park image through the media.	At least one visit of journalist.	Several national and international journalists visited the Park. Some articles about BANP were published in the media. A concert with four of the most famous Moçambique artists was done in Maputo, to create the Artists Friends of Bazaruto, as a lobbying tool against the new developments.
Objective 2: Lobby for securement of donor funding for the next project phase		
Activity	Indicators	Results
2.1. Approach donors to get feedback on submitted proposal for new project phase	Letters submitted to potential donors.	No letters submitted to donors.
2.2. Submit proposal for new project phase to other potential donors	New project phase proposal submitted to potential donors	WWF Switzerland, pledged support for three more years to the Park, pending progress in the implementation of the Management Plan
2.3. Co-ordinate with DNAC and WWF in negotiations with donors for the new project phase	At least one meeting held with DNAC and WWF	Opportunities are being discussed with DNAC.

Objective 3: Co-manage Bazaruto Archipelago in Partnership with relevant Agents		
Activity	Indicators	Results
3.1. Establish Bazaruto Archipelago Islands Committee	At least one meeting for definition of ideas for the establishment of BAIC held.	Committees for Bazaruto, Benguera and Magaruque are in place and working. Meetings have been taking place, and the CBNRM component is addressing the capacity building and infrastructure needed by this Associations
3.2. Hold meetings with local and regional partners (ADMAR, Inhassoro, Vilankulo District Administrators, Hoteliers, Local Authorities, Administrative Posts, NGOs, Education and Health Districts Authorities)	At least one meeting held with local and regional partners.	Park Administrator should be doing this activity. However no information was granted, at time of this report. Due to elections and possible name changes on national and provincial structures, no activity is registered on FTA.
3.3. Sign protocols for Park levy transfer and staff settlements with Hoteliers	Protocols signed.	All hotels now declared that they will transfer funds to the Park account. No written agreements, but they will comply with the legislation regarding this issue.
3.4. Patrol the National Park in partnership with local Police and local communities	Patrols by Park Staff	Patrols by Park staff and Navy with the support of Hoteliers are taking place.
3.5. Co-operate with fellow scientists and visitors	Visits	
3.6. Continue to provide training for National Park personnel (literacy, English, Computing)	At least on training course held.	No course took place.
3.7. Identify and put in place alternative National Park financial sustainability options (National Park levy, concession fees, tourism fees, water sport fees, camping fees, boats vehicles and planes fees)	Assessment report produced.	The Park is waiting for the establishment of a tax collection system. The funds that are collected now are under complete responsibility of Ministry of Tourism and no feed back about expenses or income is provided by the Park Administrator. Also the status of the new taxes (planes, diving, etc) is not known.
3.8. Look for alternative financial sources for scholarships and training courses for National Park personnel and Community members	Contacts held with different sources of financial support	Four more rangers were trained in Gorongosa Wildlife Training School, funded by WWF Norway, which also supports 10 scholarships for children every year. Some more funding was searched through EAME programs for Bazaruto, approved by the National Committee.

Objective 4: Manage local resources in partnership with local communities		
Activity	Indicators	Results
4.1. Involve local community committees in activities related to conservation and environment education	Communities involved	Several activities are taking place in the context of the WWF Norway funded CBNRM project (economic pilot projects, scholarships, infrastructure construction, training and capacity building, creation of resource user groups). The monitoring of turtles and crocodiles nests continues to be implemented.
4.2. Involve local community committees in activities related to control of Archipelago's resources	Communities involved	Same as above
4.3. Re-activate committees of tourism operations workers	Meetings held with tourism operations workers for exchange of points of view.	Committee of Hotel Operators in place and working. Several meetings held. No direct work on hotel workers done.
4.4. Establish partnership and co-ordinate activities for improvement of processing systems for fish and other resources	Meetings held with resource user groups	Resource user groups created. A possible agreement with the Fisheries Research Institute, to develop small scale fisheries, monitoring and possibly helping to find new and better ways of fishing, is waiting green light from Ministry of Tourism since September.
4.5. Publicise National Park Rules and its management Plan	Seminars held and leaflets produced with community management communities and community in general	As the Management Plan is to be revised and the official structures don't show a lot of interest in following it, this activity is not being done.
4.6. Make a list and hold meetings with resource user groups for the improvement of sustainable resource use		Resource user groups created and a process is in place to develop their capacity and weight in the resource management
4.7. Establish micro-credit initiatives by resource user groups	Money saved	CARE International continues this program, without any integration on the Park activities, despite promises done. Talks with CARE are now being done to incorporate their activities in our CBNRM program.
4.8. Maintain contacts and working relationship with relevant District Authorities (Agriculture, Health, Education)	Contacts made	Contacts being maintained specially with Education Department, to fulfil the teachers positions opened by the schools that are being constructed.
4.9. Based on National Park zoning plan and PRA methodologies produce maps that identify resources within the Bazaruto Archipelago	Maps produced	No activities took place. This activity depends on the development of the Natural Resource User Groups.
4.10. In partnership with local communities hold exchange visits with other community projects	Visits made	No visits took place in this period.

Objective 5: Resource Monitoring		
Activity	Indicators	Results
5.1. Continue to hold ecological and social monitoring programmes for the establishment of a data base system for local resources	Monitoring data regularly collected	Introduction and training on the EBS system done, along this period.
5.2. Continue to negotiate with local communities the establishment of closure seasons for fisheries within the Archipelago	Meetings held with local committees and local community level.	This activity is done with the Natural Resource User Groups. The mapalo and fishermen groups are planning a two month closure season in 2005.
5.3. Publicise at local community data on ecological and social monitoring	Meetings held with local committees and local community level.	This activity is done with the Natural Resource User Groups
5.4. Continue to establish zoning and identification signs within the National Park	Signs and plates within the Park and outside its borders.	No activity in this period.
5.5. Continue to involve locals in resource monitoring	Local involved	This activity is done with the Natural Resource User Groups
5.6. Hold an aerial survey for counting major National Park resources in partnership with other agents	Aerial survey made	The dugong aerial survey goes on, done by Almeida Guissamulo from Museum of Natural History and some students, however no data is available till now.
Objective 6: Administration and Logistic Aspects		
Activity	Indicators	Results
6.1. Provide uniforms and other equipment to staff	Uniforms and badges	No uniforms provided this period
6.2. Provide consumables to Park/camps		See logistics activity list
6.3. Do repairs and maintenance works to means of transport and other machinery	Maintenance made	See logistics activity list
6.4. Continue to make repair works, buildings, maintenance works and furnish national Park/project camps		See logistics activity list
6.5. Continue to hold regular planning meetings	Planning meetings	FNP and the Park Administrator do not meet regularly and the steering committee that was formed by the Ministry of Tourism to coordinate developments in the Park is not working and specially not giving any answers despite all the effort done by WWF and FNP.
6.6. Hold an half-yearly or annual technical review to the project		No review took place.
6.7. Continue to produce monthly financial reports		Reports were produced and submitted to the Ministry of Tourism and copied to WWF MCO.
6.8. Assist and cover demand of logistical activities		Activities were supported. See logistics activity list

Appendix 5 List of Scientists and Other Important Visitors to the BANP 2001-2005

Scientists

Dr. Alemida Guissamulo, UEM, Museum of Natural History
 CORDIO, Regional Indian Ocean Coral Reef Monitoring Project
 Emily Sheppard, Siren Conservation
 IDPPE, Institute for the Development of Small Scale Fisheries
 IIP, Institute for Fisheries Research, Maputo
 National Directorate for Geology, Maputo
 Rudy van der Elst, Oceanographic Research Institute, Durban, South Africa
 Pauline Winter, Botswana
 WWF US

Important Visitors

Norwegian Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs
 (Additional names to be provided by FNP from the visitors book)

Appendix 6 List of Main Documentation/Reports Produced 2001-2005

(Not comprehensive, still awaiting additional information).

Engdahl, S., Bjerner, E. and Enosse, C. 2001. Review of local community participation and the economic contribution of the tourism industry: The case of Bazaruto Archipelago, Mozambique. 36 pp.

Mackie, C.S. 1999. Aerial census of dugongs, dolphins and turtles in the proposed Bazaruto National Park, Mozambique, April 1999. WWF Project Paper No xx, WWF Southern Africa Regional Programme Office, Harare.

Mackie, C.S. 2001. Aerial census of dugongs, dolphins and turtles in the proposed Bazaruto National Park, Mozambique, May 2001. WWF Project Paper No xx, WWF Southern Africa Regional Programme Office, Harare. 12pp.

Pereira, M.A.M. and Motta, H. 2002. Notas sobre as comunidades de corais e peixes da Ilha de Santa Carolina, Arquipélago do Bazaruto.

Pereira, M.A.M., Videira, E.J.S., Motta, H., Louro, C.M.M., Abrantes, K.G.S. and Schleyer, M.H. 2003. Coral reef monitoring in Mozambique, III: 2002 report. MICOA/CORDIO/WWF MCO, Mozambique Coral Reef Management Programme, Maputo.

Taylor, J. 2003. A Brief Social Overview of the Island Communities in Bazaruto Archipelago National Park. Consultant report prepared for WWF Mozambique Cooperation Office, Maputo. 23 pp.

Videira, E. J. S. and Louro, C. M. M. 2003. Análise dos Estudos Feitos no Parque Nacional do Arquipélago do Bazaruto. BICO/FNP/WWF, Maputo. 107 pp.

Appendix 7 Collection and Transfer of Fees and Fines by the BANP

The Park Administrator provided the following data concerning the collection and transfer of taxes and fines:

a). Collection of Taxes (2001-2005)

Total collected was c. USD 106,727, comprising MZM 1,195,879,729 (around USD 59,794) plus USD 46,933 paid directly to the Park.

b). Collection of Fines (2001-2005)

A total of 59 fines were handed out, of which 37 have been paid. The total amount received was MZM 131,000,000 (around USD 6,550)

c). Direct Payments to the Kanhi Kwedhu Association

2001: No information

2002: MZM 507,778,000 (around USD 25,389)

2003: MZM 212,000,000 (around USD 10,600), but transfers were disrupted in September 2003

2004: Nil

2005: Nil

d). Direct Payments to the Thomba Yedhu Association

2003: MZM 229,926,250 (around USD 11,496)

2004: MZM 404,154,416 (around USD 20,208)

2005: MZM 33,191,000 (around USD 1,660), with more still to come over the remainder of the year.

Appendix 8 CBNRM Log-frame Matrix

Development Goal: "Local communities benefit from and contribute to the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity in the Bazaruto Archipelago National Park, Mozambique"			
OUTPUTS	ACTIVITIES	INDICATORS	ASSUMPTIONS
<p>1. Local community institutions established and operational in accordance with the Management Plan.</p>	<p>1.1. Continue the process of facilitating community organization for natural resource management.</p> <p>1.2. Establish mechanisms for the creation of community management committees.</p> <p>1.3. Formalise and develop operational guidelines for the community management committees.</p> <p>1.4. Capacity building for community management committee members, enabling them to carry out their functions.</p> <p>1.5. Promote the formation of resource use interest groups.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several community meetings conducted. • Community management committees established for all islands. • Community management committees functioning and making decisions related to resource management and use. • Decisions made by community management committees notified to Park administration. • At least two capacity building modules for community management committee members. • At least one resource interest group functioning for each island. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A favourable political environment exists in Mozambique for community resource management. • Legislation already in place or underway which provides a framework for community resource management. • Communities' rights and willingness to organize themselves exist and are respected and see benefits for them to participate. • Communities understand the need for creation of their management committees and resource user groups, and willing to do so. • Community members willing to be trained on the functions of committees and to take responsibility for such functions.
<p>2. Conditions and possibilities for greater income generation activities at the local level promoted and created.</p>	<p>2.1. Promote the development and implementation of micro-projects to enhance the sustainable use of natural resources.</p> <p>2.2. Continue assessment of possibilities for establishment of different income generation activities based on information already available.</p> <p>2.3. Establish income generation pilot projects with effective credit systems.</p> <p>2.4. Assist in improvement of resource harvesting and marketing techniques.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Micro-projects implemented ranging from fishery activities, agriculture, aquaculture, up to other activities. • An analysis of further income generation activities conducted, and discussions held with communities about this. • A summary and analysis of resource harvesting and marketing techniques with concrete recommendations put forward and discussions held with communities about this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are possibilities for alternative income generation activities, resource harvesting and marketing techniques, in the Bazaruto Archipelago that alleviates pressure on the resource use.

OUTPUTS	ACTIVITIES	INDICATORS	ASSUMPTIONS
<p>3. Communities capable of monitoring and evaluating their own use, and making decisions towards sustainability of natural resources.</p>	<p>3.1. Continue to promote environmental awareness. 3.2. Capacity building for community members to carry out natural resource, social, economic and cultural monitoring. 3.3. Provide opportunities for community members involved in management to exchange experiences with other projects. 3.4. Assist communities to assess their own use patterns in light of resource information and plan and evaluate their future activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An environmental awareness program developed and implemented. • Capacity building modules at community level for monitoring undertaken for all islands. • Community members collecting monitoring information and Park headquarters staff receiving and entering this information into the database. • Community members from Bazaruto visiting and receiving visitors from other projects. • Discussions held with the communities to analyse resource use patterns in light of monitoring information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource users aware of the need to look after the environment so that use can be sustainable in the long run. • Resource users willing and sufficiently trained to participate in monitoring.
<p>4. Appropriate and effective mechanisms for revenue sharing functioning.</p>	<p>4.1. Establish systems for transferal and effective management of revenue funds.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A system for management of Park revenues established and functioning for each community. • Capacity building for fund management by the communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A legal basis approved for the transferral of funds.