

Evaluation Abstract

Title, author and date of the evaluation report:

Kibale and Semuliki Conservation and Development Project, End-of-Phase III/End-of-Project Evaluation, prepared by Florence Chege, Gershom Onyango and Sam Mwandha, July-August 2002

Name of project, programme or organizational unit

Kibale and Semuliki Conservation and Development Project (KSCDP), IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Office (EARO)

Objectives of the project, programme or mandate of the organizational unit:

To conserve the rich biological diversity and ecological processes of the Kibale and Semuliki National Parks and associated ecosystems for present and future generations. Key result areas:

1. Strengthening the management capacity of the two parks;
2. Strengthening the capacity of district authorities to address natural resources management;
3. Reducing the negative impacts of local communities on biodiversity values;
4. Adopting an effective and adaptive management.

IUCN area of specialisation: Protected Areas

Geographical area: Uganda

Audience: Royal Netherlands Government, Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment (MWLE), Uganda; IUCN

Evaluation team: Mixed internal/external

Methodology used:

The evaluation was conducted through a series of interviews and field visits, gathering data from key institutions (including the Netherlands Embassy, the Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment (MWLE), Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), IUCN, Districts, the Kibale and Semuliki Conservation and Development Project, community representatives, and “other” partners), as well as following a review of project documents (work plans, funding agreement, publications, etc.) and field observations. Preliminary findings were shared with key partners to seek further input, and all key institutional partners were briefed on the major findings, conclusions, lessons learnt and suggestions for ensuring the sustainability of the project’s impact before the final report was written.

Questions of the evaluation:

1. The extent to which project supported activities contributed to achieving the overall project purpose
2. The extent to which project achieved:
 - Capacity and infrastructure for effective park management;
 - Capacity within the districts to plan for and manage natural resources and the environment.
 - Development of innovative approaches for sustainable natural resources conservation and management within and outside the parks.
 - Reducing negative impacts by the communities on biodiversity values in the target ecosystems.
 - Participation by the project beneficiaries in the planning and implementation of KSCDP supported activities
 - Integration of project supported activities within host organizations
3. The deployment of project resources (facilities, human power, budget) for project implementation and recommend the distribution of project equipment and property to beneficiary institutions.
4. The extent to which the project design and planning cycles and performance of key institutional partners contributed to the success of the project.
5. The application of an integrated conservation and development approach towards conservation and management of natural resources, and draw lessons learned.
6. The extent to which the phase-out strategy ensures logical close of the project.

Findings:

1. **Outcomes:**
 - Project had great influence in strengthening the management authority in the Kibale National Park. Not as much progress was made in the Semuliki National Park due to political insurgencies.
 - The project strengthened the capacity of district authorities, however, external factors that impede district capacity, such as inadequate staffing, transfers and voluntary movements of staff, inadequate equipment, and inadequate funding, which

- Despite negative externalities beyond the project's control (high level of insecurity, restructuring of government administrative structures, inadequate capacity at the district level), the project's management strategies were maintained as a result of adapting previous evaluations' recommendations to the changing conditions.

2. **Long-Term Sustainability Gaps:**

- Inadequate mechanisms for building synergy between the Parks' Long-Term Management Plans, the District planning cycles and the Environment Action Plans;
- Inadequate human resource capacity at the district level;
-

- It is more effective to use different types of awareness raising mechanisms as to reach as many different groups of people as possible , as well as because people respond differently to different methods of message delivery.
- Effective awareness campaigns require committed leadership at the district level and a budget allocation.

Sustainable Development Activities: