

Final Report

External Evaluation
of the SDC Supported IUCN Nepal Programme
(2000-2002)

Peter Hilaire, Independent consultant, Mont sur Rolle, Switzerland
Lekh

Abbreviations

AGRBS	Access to genetic resources and benefit sharing
AIS	Alien and invasive species
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBO	Community based organisation(s)
COP	Conference of the parties
CRO	Country Representative's Office
DDC	District Development Committee(s)
DFO	District Forest Office
DNPWC	Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation
DSCO	District Soil Conservation Office
ET	Evaluation team
GEF	Global Environment Facility
HMG	His Majesty's Government (Nepal)
ICIMOD	International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development
ICS	Improved cooking stoves
IGA	Income generating activity
INGO	International non-governmental organisation(s)
IUCN	The World Conservation Union
KACU	Knowledge, advocacy and communications unit
MOFSC	Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation
MOPE	Ministry of Population and Environment
NCS	National Conservation Strategy
NEFEJ	Nepal Forum of Environmental Journalists
NGO	Non-governmental organisation(s)
NORAD	Norwegian Development Agency
NORM	National organisation for Rhododendron management
NRM	Natural resource management
NRMU	Natural resources management unit
NSSD	National Strategy for Sustainable Development
Nepal Rural Development Agency (NRDA)	

Executive Summary

Main findings

1. IUCN has been active in Nepal, with SDC support, since 1985. Until 1994, IUCN's presence was linked to supporting the Government of Nepal in the preparation and implementation of the National Conservation Strategy. After nine years, SDC and HMG agreed that a shift in emphasis from the development of policy and methodological tools towards the building of capacity to apply these tools in the field was appropriate. The current phase (2000 – 2002) was designed to allow IUCN and its Nepali partners to develop major field based operations where the participatory and integrated conservation approaches developed under the NCS could be applied.
- 2.

7. Identifying focus for further policy and regulatory work, with explicit linkages to field sites needs to be strengthened. The list of issues where legal and regulatory questions arise includes: tenure; securing rights to benefits from natural resource management for users groups in general, and dalit (landless) groups in particular; community forestry and forest access; NTFP commercialisation and taxation; conservation area status. The scope for creative work in the legal area is there, in particular with the readiness of the community of judges, from the Supreme Court down through the judicial system, to see the environmental law as a "right to life", or human rights issue.
8. IUCN Programme is well embodied socially, and this at several levels. At the field level, the social mobilisation has been very effective, creating a good level of understanding between IUCN and the myriad social groups with which it interacts. IUCN is perceived as trusted ally by communities and local government. At the national level, IUCN is regarded as an independent source of reliable advice and expertise on natural resource issues.
9. The community mobilisation has given rise to the formation of numerous groups at the local level. The signs are for the moment quite promising, but these groups underlined the fragility of their status, both in terms of application of knowledge and in the securing of rights to the prospective benefits. Additional consolidation of skills and rights is required.
10. Communities and local government partners of IUCN see the need for an extended period of support from IUCN in a) promoting understanding of conservation issues and their relevance to rural livelihoods, b) identifying viable alternatives to natural resource use and management adapted to the capacities of local communities, and c) supporting the development of human and institutional capabilities to implement viable alternatives.
11. The participatory planning steps taken by IUCN, and the emphasis now being put on "learning" and output based monitoring are positive in this regard. The care taken by IUCN to move at a speed, and to propose solutions, adapted to communities, are signs of a positive learning culture.
- 12.

2.

1. Introduction

IUCN has been active in Nepal, with SDC support, since 1985. Until 1994, IUCN's presence was linked to supporting the Government of Nepal in the preparation and implementation of the National Conservation Strategy. IUCN contributed to the development of policy and regulatory instruments, and education and awareness raising. During this period IUCN became a well-respected specialist institution in the field of nature conservation in Nepal.

After nine years, SDC and HMG agreed that a shift in emphasis from the development of policy and methodological tools towards the building of capacity to apply these tools in the field was appropriate. In 1997, IUCN initiated a new programme aimed at strengthening Nepali institutions through training and the development of operational partnerships aimed at achieving specific conservation objectives. SDC also agreed to provide Core support to allow IUCN to maintain its body of expertise within the IUCN Country Office, which was formally established (replacing a project-based presence) in 1994.

The current phase¹ (2000 – 2002) was designed to allow IUCN and its Nepali partners to develop major field based operations where the participatory and integrated conservation approaches developed under the NCS could be applied.

The External Evaluation of the SDC supported IUCN Programme (2000 – 2002) was originally scheduled for March 2001, as a mid-term external evaluation. Consultations between IUCN and SDC in Nepal, and with the Asia II section and the Natural Resources and Environment Division of SDC concluded that, due to the IUCN / N programme being behind schedule because of numerous staff changes, it was more realistic to organise, in early 2001, a review and planning mission², and to conduct the external evaluation one year later, in March 2002.

The purpose of the evaluation was to review progress (performance and effects) and to suggest reorientations for the future programme activities of IUCN Nepal. This will include an analysis of both sub-projects and of IUCN as an institution in Nepal. The evaluation will assess the ways by which the IUCN programme was contributing to the achievement of IUCN's goals and objectives for Nepal and identify strengths and weaknesses, gaps in the programme including potentials for expansion. The evaluation will focus primarily on SDC's contribution to the IUCN programme, although this will involve an assessment of IUCN Nepal's relationship with other (HMG/Donor) main partners. Finally the evaluation will make suggestions concerning the scope for future collaboration between SDC and IUCN in Nepal.

The complete terms of reference for the external evaluation and the composition of the external evaluation team (ET) are given in Annex 1.

¹ See Credit Proposal No. 7F-03208.04 of 24 November 1999

² See Report *Mission to Nepal Review of the Project « Support to IUCN Nepal Country Programme »*, April 2001

2. Methodology

The evaluation was mostly participatory including the following inputs:

The ET reviewed documentation generated by the IUCN Programme during the current phase³, and discussed progress and implementation issues with IUCN staff.

The ET met with a wide range of Central Government, NGO, and international partners of IUCN, as well as local authorities (District Development Committees and Villages Development Committees), local representatives of Government line agencies, community groups and individuals⁴ involved in the field activities. Meetings with beneficiaries took the form of group discussions and included oral and pictorial presentations and displays of products and documents relative to field achievements.

The ET also held informal, individual discussions with many of those involved in the above interactions.

Limitations

Due to the security situation prevailing in Nepal at the time of the evaluation mission, it was not possible to visit the field sites. The appreciation arrived at by the ET concerning field achievements in the field therefore depended upon indirect evidence. The ET relied upon cross-referencing information provided by the IUCN Nepal Progress Report 2001 with that received from the various stakeholders met, thereby assessing quantitative achievements. Qualitative achievements were assessed through discussions with partners and beneficiaries.

Comments on IUCN programme and project logical frameworks

The conceptual structure of the IUCN Nepal Programme is complicated.

Programme outputs are defined for the IUCN Country Programme as a whole. A separate set of overlapping Project outputs are defined for the five projects that were the basis for the funding provided by SDC for the current phase.

Certain Programme Outputs correspond to a single activity, while others correspond to fully-fledged projects. The quantity of outputs for the Programme (34 outputs) spreads relatively modest human and financial resources too thinly, with only anecdotal activities possible under certain of these.

The result is a confusing reporting system. This contrasts with the reality of the programme implementation that is professional and clearly focussed on tasks assigned to each of the operational units, and effective internal coordination mechanisms for collaboration amongst programme units.

³ List of documentation consulted is given in Annex 2

⁴ List of people met in Annexe 3

3. Assessment of Achievements & Challenges (CRO/PDU; NRMU; SETLPU; KACU)

The findings of the ET as to the achievements of the IUCN Programme and the challenges facing it are presented for each of the IUCN Units, indicating the most significant of these. The main body of the report contains a synthesis of achievements and challenges, highlighting the most significant of these. A more detailed account of progress is given in Annex for *Progress towards Programme Outputs* (Annex 4) and *Progress towards Project Outputs* (Annex 5).

Quantitative achievements listed in the IUCN 2001 Annual Report were verified by the ET through cross-referencing information provided with that furnished by stakeholders.

A brief outline of the IUCN Nepal Programme	
Operational Unit	Area of Responsibility
Country Representative's Office (CRO)	Assuring a robust and supportive organisational structure, management systems and procedures. Overall supervision, coordination of Programme Steering Committee. Special Projects and studies.
Programme Development Unit (PDU)	Programme development, coordination, monitoring and evaluation.
Natural Resources and Conservation Unit (NRMU)	Management and implementation of field projects. Links to and capacity building with HMG and other institutions involved in Natural Resource Management.
Social, Economic, Technical and Legal Policy Unit (SETLPU)	Policy and legal issues. Poverty, equity and gender mainstreaming in the Programme.
Knowledge, Advocacy and Communications Unit (KACU)	Information collection and dissemination. Awareness raising, formal and informal education, advocacy and communication.

3.1 Country Representative's Office / Programme Development Unit

Achievements

1. Overall management of the Programme. The implementation of the three-year Programme (2000 – 2002) was delayed at the outset by the resignation of the IUCN Country Representative (May 2000). The hiring of several key staff was delayed until the appointment of a new Country Representative (October 2000). In spite of this, the amount of work accomplished to date was found to be significant.

2. A full and competent complement of staff has been hired and is working effectively. A Poverty, Equity and Gender specialist has joined the programme and the effects of this in the field are evident. The shift to a field orientation is reflected in the recruitments, with the recruitment of field managers and community mobilisers.
3. A culture of participation, openness, exchange and horizontal collaboration within the IUCN Nepal organisations is also evident. This culture helped to mitigate the effects of the overly complicated conceptual structure of the Programme, and contributed to the quantity of work accomplished over the past 18 months.
4. IUCN continues to be regarded as a reliable partner of HMG. IUCN is recognised as a credible and professional institution in the field of conservation related research, information and purveyor of new ideas, with a particular competence in conservation related policy formulation, and this in spite of reduced inter-action between IUCN and HMG central institutions in the current phase.
5. IUCN has acquired a new reputation as a credible and trusted partner at the local level as well. Participatory planning and appropriate responses to local needs by IUCN have created a climate of trust between IUCN and CBOs and local government.
6. Donor Diversification: One of the purposes of continued SDC Core support to the IUCN Programme was to allow IUCN to diversify its funding base. While no other donor of the importance of SDC has been identified, in particular no donor accepting to

2. Planning and monitoring mechanisms have been developed by PDU for both individual units and staff, as well as for projects implemented within the Programme. IUCN has made considerable progress in developing planning and monitoring tools for use in the field. Planning processes have involved community organisations and local government. These processes have been effective in identifying priorities and in finding suitable approaches for responding to these.
3. Regular meetings between Unit heads assured good coordination between units, as evidenced by field level cooperation. At the Programme level, PDU is currently leading an effort to shift to outputs or results based monitoring, with an emphasis on learning outcomes. This shift is relevant both to improving field approaches, and in assessing the impacts of IUCN projects on natural resources, livelihoods, institutions and knowledge.

Challenges

1. The complicated nature of the conceptual framework of the IUCN Programme has already been mentioned. In addition, the structure of the IUCN Programme is confusing at a number of levels:
2. The NRMU carries an operational load far in excess of that carried by SETLPU and KACU. NRMU oversees the three field projects, with SETLPU and KACU making important contributions. The PEG officer is located within SETLPU, though her work is primarily in the field, while the Wetlands Office, established to develop the GEF Wetlands project is attached directly to the CRO, even though ongoing wetland management and conservation work in Ghodagodi and Koshi Tappu comes under the NRMU. The PDU acts as a coordinating body, but it is unclear how PDU relates structurally to the operational units. The improvements in monitoring systems are adequate to monitor activities and control outputs. Training underway to shift towards assessment of impacts will certainly improve the quality of planning and the generation of quantitative and qualitative information. With the best of tools however, there remains the indispensable analysis. This function should be assumed by PDU, with synthesis and analysis of lessons functions assigned explicitly to senior staff, who will then carry the implications forward into new programming.
3. The level of effort invested over the past 18 months has been intensive. Maintaining such a rhythm with emphasis on quality will be a challenge.
4. Funding the Programme will remain as an ongoing challenge. HMG expects that IUCN will bring into Nepal funds from global sources that are additional to bi-lateral country restricted funds. HMG welcomes the SDC Global funding made available to IUCN, and appreciates the contribution that IUCN makes to furthering conservation objectives in Nepal. SDC is still the major supporter of IUCN Nepal. IUCN has proven ability to generate funding from non-SDC sources, which now accounts for 48% of turnover. The non-SDC income is earned by IUCN through the provision of services and advice to a variety of partners (UNDP/GEF; IUCN Asia Programme; NORAD; OECD/DAC; British Embassy; Danida; SNV)). For the moment, IUCN services to HMG are funded through SDC's Core contribution.

5. In several countries IUCN has funding agreements with national governments covering

mobilisation tools used. As a result, IUCN is emerging at field level as trusted convening body and source of conservation information and capacity development assistance.

2. The large number of technical training and awareness events conducted were defined on the basis of the results of the participatory planning exercises. These have reached all key stakeholders, and the activities chosen correspond to expressed needs. The value of these exercises were underlined by CBOs and local individuals. Such events include: exposure visits to ACAP (eco-tourism), food processing, adult literacy, and "rights" awareness.
3. The ET was impressed by stakeholders' endorsement of IUCN's approach to the situation and problems of rural communities. This approach was characterised by stakeholders as follows:
 - Ø direct approach to people by “knocking on their doors”
 - Ø building trust for IUCN amongst local people and CBOs
 - Ø poverty and gender issues emphasised in awareness and training
 - Ø not emphasising subsidized incentives

Elements contributing to long-term sustainability of field efforts were thus manifested.

4. IUCN has been successful in establishing linkages amongst key stakeholders. Some examples are:
 - Ø Traders and producers of

necessary before the amounts allow significant investments. In Ilam Siwaliks, where contributions are Rs. 50 per month and the number of members is higher, potential is greater.

6. Conservation and user rights awareness and training has been extremely well received by rural communities, particularly women groups, and generated more demand for such training from nearby locations.
7. Field level Steering Committees were effective in field level planning; they have the potential to provide a bridge between progress in conservation understanding and practice and local level periodic planning and governance issues

FIELD – Common Challenges

1. Developing up-scaling and replication strategies. The IUCN field activities concern limited areas. The demand from adjacent areas for similar activities is growing. Assuming that IUCN's field work generates lessons applicable on a broader scale in Nepal or elsewhere, replication and up-scaling strategies will be needed. As IUCN is not an implementing organisation, but a "knowledge" organisation, up-scaling and replication will depend upon a clear process for managing and disseminating knowledge within IUCN and to partners. Replication should come as a result of the dissemination and transmission of this knowledge.
2. The development of partnerships with institutions capable of disseminating approaches and capacity. Primary candidates are: local government, NGOs, and INGOs.
3. Although IUCN is not an implementing organisation, the field level focus of the current programme is justified in two ways:
 - Ø It allows IUCN to apply its theoretical knowledge to the reality of rural Nepal, confronting accepted approaches and models with local circumstances.
 - Ø It will generate understanding of constraints and opportunities for sustainable natural resources management that can be used in promoting appropriate policies and norms in Nepal and elsewhere.
4. The demonstration of linkages between IUCN capacity development actions and the conditions of natural resources is the key issue for the IUCN programme. Although it is not stated as such, the field projects seem to be built on the hypothesis that *local capacity development and awareness raising + improved frame conditions + available natural resources = conservation and better livelihoods*. The initial signs are positive, though impacts on *conservation and better livelihoods* are for the moment quite modest.
5. Developing learning processes that engage local bodies. The relationship developing

- Ø Development of value adding options adapted to accessible markets.
 - Ø The impact of "rights" awareness and training activities on the situation of marginal groups (women and dalits), and their relationship to local governance structures.
6. Engaging HMG and International partners in learning from field experience. IUCN is well respected as a source of conservation policy advice, and as a convenor. This reputation is based on IUCN's international stature, and international knowledge networks. Engaging the same constituency in learning from field experiences in Nepal

Challenges

1. Community mobilisation effective on the basis of expected benefits in the future. These benefits are to come through: capacity development and self-reliance; savings & credit groups; NTFP marketing. While the benefits of capacity development are already apparent to local communities through their own initiatives such as forest patrols and improved relations with VDCs, benefits from savings and credit and NTFP marketing will only be realised in the future.
2. This presents IUCN with special challenges. The savings and credit groups need either to identify concrete benefits that can be achieved with the very modest resources available, or to obtain additional resources that would allow them to support the development of micro-enterprises at the household level. Most of the NTFPs planted by the communities have a long waiting period (up to five years) before production can be marketed.
3. An important step towards the improvement of livelihoods for marginal groups (dalits) was taken with the allocation by the community of 7 ha. dedicated to NTFP production by this group. The transfer of access rights to the land in favour of the dalit community needs to be secured to guard against the agreement being revoked once benefits start flowing.

3.2.3 Biodiversity Conservation outside Protected Area: Community Conservation of Rhododendron in East Nepal

Achievements

1. Increased awareness within communities of the potential value of Rhododendron conservation has given rise to formation of groups (NORM, Environment Action Committees, Mother's Groups) and to interest on the part of DDCs and VDCs.
2. Various trainings, exposure visits and awareness actions have given rise to spontaneous actions such as savings and credit groups, weekly clean-up programmes, toilet construction, promotion of improved cooking stoves and development of eco-tourism ideas.
3. Excellent baseline information on social, economic, legal and ecological issues being faced by TMJ has been produced by IUCN. This information and the effective mobilisation of interest within communities and local government provide a strong basis for the establishment of a discussion platform on the management of the Rhododendron forest lands.

Challenges

1. Developing broad-based consensus on land-use, access to natural resources and conservation of Rhododendron forest in TMJ. The question of the Conservation status of TMJ is of concern to the community, as they are not sure of what rights they would lose in the event the area is declared a Conservation Area by MOFSC/DNPWC. DNPWC foresees integrating TMJ with Kanchenjunga and Makalu-barun, thus creating a "corridor" for habitats and wildlife.

2. Identifying viable income-generating activities, as alternatives to existing patterns of natural resource use. Expectations are there. It is not clear in which areas lie the best potential for IGAs. Eco-tourism, apiculture, ICS production and maintenance, timber and non-timber forest products are all seen as ways to improve rural incomes. Developing this assumed potential into significant income gains will be all the more difficult because of the remoteness of TMJ, and the poverty of its inhabitants with no capital to invest, and poor access to and insufficient knowledge of markets and technologies.
3. Improve involvement of DFO and DSCO in TMJ consensus seeking and identifying benefits for people. The promotion of a working relationship between community groups, local government and line agencies is a key to arriving at a consensus management platform for TMJ.
4. Extending the reach of awareness and social mobilisation for conservation to whole of TMJ. Social mobilisation in the current phase has concentrated in one of three Districts (Terhathum). Discussion relevant to Rhododendron forest implies the involvement of three Districts, and all three DDCs. This question could be taken forward through TMJ status platform. The same platform could be used to plan further TMJ status work with local groups.
5. Reinforcing gender and dalit rights component in awareness and capacity building efforts. While women's groups have been active (savings and credit groups, plantation/protection of forest) dalits have not been apparently affected by the project.

3.2.4 Conservation of Critical Ecosystem in Siwlaik Hills through Collaborative

M 4.3015 3mc-122gii27.compoAchieth ins 4.3015 3 -444 708.75 TD /F0 12 T1 0 Tw (5.) Tj 9 0 TD /E

5. Savings & credit groups and IGAs seen promising by communities. Savings levels are reaching amounts (Rs 30,000) where meaningful investments can be envisaged.

Challenges

1. Extension and replication of Chulachuli achievements to 5 other VDCs. While there are scattered actions in all six concerned

and training. It has collaborated with the Seti Technical School in developing the format for NTFP training and provided training to 16 teachers. 19 teachers in TMJ area have received training in environmental communication. Awareness raising has been particularly effective in all three field sites.

2. Effective management of IUCN Environmental Information Resource Centre (library, database, publications) extensively used by HMG, NGOs, teachers and students. KACU oversees the publications produced by IUCN, including its regular newsletter sent to 600 recipients. The library receives some 400 visitors per month, and sells some Rs 300,000 worth of IUCN publications per year. KACU regularly produces articles for the local press and participates in radio programmes.
3. KACU provided effective facilitation to the NSSD consultation process in Nepal, provided methodological support to two NGO campaigns (Society for Population and Environment Journalists – opinion survey for WSSD; Women's Environmental Preservation Committee – Campaign to beautify the Bagmati River).

Challenges

1. Justification and funding of Environment Resource Centre. The Resource Centre is regarded as being the most comprehensive and complete in the area of natural resources in Nepal. The Centre however costs money, and sustaining it over time will be a problem without special funding, notably to place information resources "on line" to increase access. For the moment costs are covered by the SDC Core contribution.
2. KACU is essentially a service provider for the IUCN programme, and for its various partners. Costs of these services should be covered to a greater extent by the activities receiving support. As with SETLPU, KACU's workplan should be more expressly linked to issues arising from the field, and seen in conjunction with the promotion of policy and regulatory conditions that promote conservation. KACU should continue to bring relevant national, regional and global experience enrich Nepal based learning.

4. Sustainability of the Programme

ET endorses the "SDC Controlling Sheets – Sustainability" for the three field projects, and for SETLPU contained in the IUCN 2001 Annual Report. The ET recognises the subjective nature of the rankings provided, and concerning the field projects, would be a little more cautious regarding the level of sustainability achieved, and achievable in a 3 – 5 year time-frame.

As requested ET has completed a sustainability sheet for the whole programme. The ranking in the table below are an overall impression. The additional comments below help to separate sustainability issues affecting the projects from those affecting IUCN in a more general way.

Name of Programme : IUCN Country Programme – Development Goal: "To ensure that biodiversity is conserved, environment protected, and the use of natural resources made increasingly sustainable and equitable"

Name of projects: Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants and other NTFPs through Community Participation in Seti area; Conservation of Critical Ecosystem in Siwlaik Hills through Collaborative Management; Biodiversity Conservation outside Protected Area: Community Conservation of Rhododendron in East Nepal; Development of Environmental Policy, Legal and regulatory framework; Core contribution.

Author: External Evaluation Team

Specific Moment of Assessment: March 2002

Date: March 2002

well, and has the support of communities and local government. At the central level, IUCN is regarded as the main conservation policy advisor to government.

2. Economically viable: At the field level, the linkage promoted by IUCN between conservation and better livelihoods is seen with promise by communities and local government. The perspective is held out that through the promotion of NTFP production and commercialisation, the promotion of micro-enterprises (apiculture, poultry farming) and eco-tourism, real income gains can be made and better protection of common property and privately held natural resources can be achieved. Although elements of livelihood improvement measures are visible (mobilisation, training, sapling production, market investigations) these have yet to be translated into income gains. The main factors affecting economic viability are access to local and regional markets, and locally added value. These factors are being given priority attention by IUCN.

At a more general level, IUCN is and will remain donor dependent. While it has demonstrated that it can diversify its funding sources and has increased the non-SDC portion of income, SDC Core support is instrumental in maintaining a centre of excellence in natural resources in Nepal.

3. Environmentally sound: The strategies of IUCN appear to be environmentally sound. The production of NTFPs takes place in forest areas, degraded community managed lands and private lands, and there are instances of community protection of common property resources. Training emphasises sustainable harvesting methods, also from the wild. An effective ecological monitoring system is required however to substantiate the ecological impacts of IUCN strategies.

4. Institutionally independent: The community mobilisation has given rise to the formation of numerous groups at the local level. The hardiness of these groups varies. The signs are for the moment quite promising, but these groups underlined the fragility of their status, both in terms of application of knowledge and in the securing of rights to the prospective benefits. Additional consolidation of skills and rights is required.

In terms of capacities, IUCN is well able to mobilise skills from within its networks and is widely recognised as a source of independent advice and expertise on natural resources.

5. Learning oriented: The participatory planning steps taken by IUCN, and the emphasis now being put on "learning" and output based monitoring are positive in this regard. The care taken by IUCN to move at a speed, and to propose solutions, adapted to communities, are signs of a positive learning culture.

6. Frame conditions: Some positive frame conditions, such as the Local Governance Act, are in place, and the development of infrastructure and market linkages as well as a general environment supportive of community mobilisation are apparent. However, communities lack capital to invest in livelihood improvements and remain therefore highly dependent upon natural production. Market access conditions are not favourable to small producers, and tenure and natural resource access s under9o

5. Poverty, Equity, Gender orientation of the Programme

1. Poverty Fact sheets for the three field projects and SETLPU have been completed and presented in the IUCN 2001 Annual Report. The ET endorses the assessment presented.
2. The PEG orientation of the programme is marked, through the participatory planning processes poverty, gender and equity issues are raised, and some instances of specific measures for the landless (Seti) are noted.
3. Poverty issues related to the landless in all three areas are less prominent. Solutions are of course less easy to find, and these groups are less able to benefit from the solutions proposed by IUCN as, among other things, they lack land on which to produce NTFPs. An awareness of the specific needs of the landless is there.
4. Far more evident is the gender orientation, with a strong emphasis on the creation of women's groups and the strengthening of their capacities. These are most visible in Illam Siwaliks and Seti. These groups are articulate, and beginning to exercise an influence on local government.

6. Assessment of IUCN by Partners

The ET met with a broad range of IUCN partners⁸. The positive feedback received by ET on the role that IUCN plays in Nepal was impressive in its unanimous endorsement for the role that IUCN plays, and the manner in which it carries out its work. Assessment of IUCN by partners is summarised below:

His Majesty's Government (HMG)

IUCN is highly regarded by the National Planning Commission, Ministries and the judiciary as a credible and professional institution with a unique role in support of national conservation policy development and implementation. IUCN is the government's principal conservation policy advisor and continues to provide valued assistance to the government. The current phase has seen a diminishing in the intensity of IUCN / HMG cooperation, as IUCN has shifted towards a greater emphasis on the field level implementation.

In addition to its policy advisory role, IUCN is recognised as a neutral facilitator that can bring together government, civil society and academic institutions around a common discussion platform. This role was played in the current phase in connection with NSSD and wetlands and AGRBS policy development processes.

Finally, HMG perceives IUCN as a source of additional funding for Nepal.

Local Government (DDCs / VDCs)

Local government institutions in the three project sites are discovering in IUCN an organisation that "works in favour of people". The transparent and participatory planning of activities involved local government institutions, which have been impressed by the social

⁸ see list of people met in Annex 3

4. The short direct experience of IUCN in the field⁹ has already generated a number of questions/issues relevant to the achievement of sustainable livelihood and conservation gains. Some such issues are: tenure; landless access to natural resources; taxes and royalties on NTFP trade; market access and technology transfer; and recognition/registration of user groups. These are issues that are not particular to the regions and groups with which IUCN is working. They are directly relevant to many rural development efforts in Nepal. IUCN's standing allows it however to play a central role in developing adapted responses to these issues. The extent to which it will be successful will largely depend upon the degree to which it is able to engage HMG, local government and international donors / partners in developing viable responses.

7.2 Field issues

1. Finding a right balance between direct IUCN implementation and working through partners. IUCN has worked either directly with rural communities (in Seti) where there is a deficit of viable local organisations, or through community groups and NGOs in eastern Nepal. IUCN's role is not that of an implementing agency. Its focus is on knowledge building, and ensuring that conditions for participatory learning (planning, monitoring, analysis) are present.
2. Up-scaling and replication of successful field experiments is a key feature of IUCN's declared approach. Though it is too early to affirm that these experiments have yet to generate lessons and approaches that merit up-scaling and replication, there is a growing demand from adjacent areas for support to rural communities in devising income generating activities and for environmental awareness, participatory planning and rights training. In order to be in a position to effectively support dissemination of successful experiences, IUCN needs to be able to document the knowledge upon which the dissemination will be based.
3. Monitoring and Learning: Reliable monitoring systems to assess impacts on livelihoods and natural resources are needed. The first steps taken in this direction are positive. Impacts will take some time to be apparent, and analytical frameworks that can establish relations between approaches and training / natural resources and livelihoods need to be developed. It is on this basis that IUCN will be credible when promoting replication or advocating policy / regulatory adjustments.
4. Communities and local government partners of IUCN see the need for an extended period of support from IUCN in a) promoting understanding of conservation issues and their relevance to rural livelihoods, b) identifying viable alternatives to natural resource use and management adapted to the capacities of local communities, and c) supporting the development of human and institutional capabilities to implement viable alternatives.
5. IUCN's approach to awareness raising and training has been PEG sensitive. However, there has been only marginal success in addressing and responding to the specific needs of marginalized segments of the rural population, and most notably the landless. As the landless exert significant pressure on natural resources, and appear less likely to be able to take advantage of the alternatives identified (based on access to private or

⁹ It should be noted that, although IUCN's field experience in Nepal is limited, IUCN has extensive experience in field implementation in other countries in the Asia region, most notably Pakistan.

community land), particular attention needs to be given to securing access to natural resources for this category of people.

6. Savings & credit groups have been formed in all three project sites, and these are regarded by women as a significant advance in self-reliance. Now that these groups are formed, they are asking for assistance in devising a lending strategy. What to invest in?

and local government, and continue to develop participatory progress and impact assessment tools.

3. The IUCN approach to local communities has been effective. It is necessary to develop a similar level of involvement with local government (DDC / VDC) institutions. These bodies are increasingly playing a determining role in local development orientations, and are open to IUCN's message and support.

9. Nepal's changing political conditions and IUCN Nepal's activities

Communities and local governments assured ET that IUCN's activities were safe in the

sources would include bi-lateral and multi-lateral funds flowing to Nepal. Rather than agree to provide services and advice more or less on demand – as is the case during this phase with the work on the State of the Environment Report, training of the judiciary, development of a wetlands policy – IUCN should seek co-financing or joint sponsorship of its involvement with both HMG and other donors. This will in addition to reducing the exclusive call on SDC funds to subsidize desirable policy work, ensure that the areas of policy and advice worked on correspond to national priorities.

This implies that IUCN should develop a different relationship with HMG and international donors in Nepal. Indeed, it may even be that IUCN can improve the absorption capacity of bi-lateral and multi-lateral funds by working alongside HMG. An example of such a relationship is that developed by IUCN in the context of the preparation of a GEF Wetlands project for MOFSC.

11. Scope for future cooperation with SDC

Future cooperation with SDC should continue on the present basis, with the proviso that a more focussed programme is developed which reduces the spread of issues addressed with a clear focus on field work and related knowledge building.

New areas, such as clean air, clean water and clean industry have been evoked. The ET was only able to note that these are technical areas where IUCN is not a leader, but also areas where IUCN's capacity to provide a discussion platform bringing together government, industry and civil society might be extremely valuable in promoting a focus on issues currently left unattended. IUCN Nepal hosts the IUCN regional Environment Assessment Programme and may find in that connection support to develop a concept in this field.

Annex 1

Terms of References for the External Review of SDC Supported IUCN Programme (2000-2002)

1. Background

SDC's Credit Proposal for the present support (2000 – 2002) to IUCN Nepal had envisaged the organization of a mid-term evaluation in early 2001. Consultation between IUCN Nepal and SDC in Nepal and with Asia II Section and the Natural Resources and Environment Division of SDC concluded that it was more realistic to organise in early 2001 a review and planning mission and proposed that the external evaluation of the Programme to take place in February / March 2002. This was later confirmed by the mid-term planning mission which pointed out the need for a systematic monitoring framework to be in place in order to examine all the different components of the project. It was believed that such a system would be in place and field projects would be reasonably advanced by early 2002 for an external evaluation to be meaningful.

2. Objectives

The purpose of the evaluation is to review progress (performance and effects) and to suggest reorientations for the future programme activities of IUCN Nepal. This will include an analysis of both sub-projects and of IUCN as an institution in Nepal. The evaluation will assess the ways by which the IUCN programme is contributing to the achievement of IUCN's goals and objectives for Nepal and identify strengths and weaknesses, gaps in the programme including potentials for expansion. The evaluation will focus primarily on SDC's contribution to the IUCN programme, although this will involve for the core contribution, an assessment of IUCN Nepal's relationship with other (HMG/Donor) main partners. Finally the evaluation will make suggestions concerning the scope for future collaboration between SDC and IUCN in Nepal.

3. Scope of the evaluation

3.1 Programme Issues

- a). Performance/Implementation Assessment of Core and Project activities.

Assessment of IUCN Nepal's capability to implement field and other programmes in terms of plans, targets and expected and actual results, capacity to mobilize professionals, and collaborating organizations, manage the flow of resources and develop durable working relations between field and central level office.

- b). Contribution of the Programme / Project

- ✓ Assessment of results/outputs – both quantitative and qualitative - based on available documentation and discussions.
- ✓ Assessment by participating organizations and stakeholders on programmes utility, implementation, management, follow up and actual problems experienced.
- ✓ Direct and indirect influence of activities on nature conservation, people's livelihoods (especially in terms of poverty, equity and gender), policy improvements, capacity building and awareness raising.

- c). Sustainability of Programme

Using SDC's "Sustainability Controlling Sheet" format, issues of sustainability will be assessed and recommendations made on ways to enhance sustainability.

- d). Contribution of programme activities towards

- ✓ Management structures and monitoring systems are working.

3.2 Nepal's Changing Political Conditions and IUCN Nepal's Activities

The extent to which current political events have affected IUCN Nepal's programmes in the field. To what extent are field working conditions likely to improve or deteriorate? What are the risks of continuing programme activities? What are the lessons of experience from other projects (other SDC supported or non SDC ones as well) and assessments of others in this respect?

3.3 Linkages of IUCN Nepal with IUCN Asia Region and the Global Secretariat

As a country office how have operations changed with the restructuring of the HQ-Region-Country office relationship? How have the IUCN-Nepal office, Regional office and Global Secretariat each benefited? What are the outstanding challenges? How can these linkages be strengthened?

3.4 Opportunities and Linkages for Development and Funding for the Future

How do the major donors see the IUCN Nepal programme? What efforts have been made to attract donors? What should be done to further interact with donors for new programme support?

3.5 Scope for Future Cooperation with SDC

- a). Need for continuing support to build upon the initial achievements of the present programme and assure results are sustainable.
- b). New areas of priority where SDC and IUCN can work together – Nepal's priorities, SDC's priorities for Nepal in the area of natural resources, SDC's global priorities in the area of natural resources, IUCN's priorities.

4 Proposed Programme and Dates for Evaluation Mission

March 16 & 17	Programme / Workplan Review (Days 1&2) Group Sessions: Review work plan and look at expected and achieved results, monitoring systems (what was monitored, how, use of the feedback), organisation of IUCN structure, internal relationships, technical and programme committee, synergies and field policy links.
March 18 - 23	Group #1: Field visit to the East (Days 3 – 8) Group #2: Field visit to the West (Days 3 – 8)
March 24 March 25-26	Return to Kathmandu (Day 9)

Annex 2

List of Documents consulted

1. Proposition de credit No 7F-03208.04, November 1999
2. Three Year programme (2000 – 2002), IUCN Nepal, November 1999
3. Review of the project "Support to IUCN Nepal Country programme, April 2001
4. Summary report of IUCN Nepal Annual Review and Planning Workshop, December 17 – 21 2001, IUCN Nepal 2001
5. IUCN Progress Report 2000 and Annual Plan 2001
6. IUCN Progress Report 2001 and Annual Plan 2002
- 7.

Annex 3

List of people met

Kathmandu

Dr. Jagadish Chandra Pokharel	Member, National Planning Commission
Mr. Justice Laxman Aryal	Supreme Court
Hon. Justice H.P. Upadhyaya	Supreme Court
Mr. Shree Prasad Pandit	General Secretary, Judges Society, Nepal
Mr. Damodar Prasad Parajuli	Chief, Foreign Aid Co-Operation Division, MOFSC
Mr. Er. Ashok K. Saraf	Senior Divisional Engineer, MOPE
Mr. Janak Raj Joshi	Joint Secretary, MOPE
Dr	

Mr. Medini Bhandari
President

S.N	Name	Organisation	Address
30.	Ms. Puspa Sherpa	Mother Group	Tamaphok-1
31.	Ms. Durga Devi Bhattarai	Community Forest Network	Jirikhimti, Terhathum
32.	Ms. Yogmaya Timsina	Community Forest Network	Jirikhimti, Terhathum
33.	Ms. Phoolmaya Tamang	Mother Group	Jirikhimti, Terhathum
34.	Ms. Durga Devi Bhattari	Mother Group	Jirikhimti, Terhathum
35.	Ms. Krishna Kumari Lo	Mother Group	Madimulkharka, Sankhuwasabha
36.	Ms. Ganga Maya Karki	Mother Group	Madimulkharka, Sankhuwasabha
37.	Ms. Shanta Udas	Mother Group	Gupha Pokhari
38.	Mr. Bhola Karki	Gupha Pokhari Renovation Committee	Guphapokhari
39.	Mr. Sanjaya Chapagai	MEDEP	Terhathum
40.	Mr. Kehab Pokhrel	REDP	Terhathum

Ilam Siwalik Evaluation

Participants

Date: 21 March 2002 (8 Chaitra, 2058)

S.N	Name	Organisation	Address
1.	Mr. Lal Bahadur Subba	DDC Chairman	Ilam
2.	Mr. Jay Prakash Rai	DDC Vice-chairman	Ilam
3.	Mr. Kabindra Rai	DDC Member	Ilam
4.	Mr. Om Narayan Khanal	VDC Chairman	Chulachuli, Ilam
5.	Mr. Jay Kumar Giri	Flood Control Committee	Chulachuli, Ilam
6.	Mr. Khag Prasad Dhungana	Community Forestry Chairman	Chulachuli, Ilam
7.	Ms. Pabitra Bhattarai	Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
8.	Ms. Danamaya Gautam	Laligurans Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
9.	Ms. Tika Devi Nepal	Sayapatri Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
10.	Ms. Durga Devi Neupane	Namuna Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
11.	Ms. Ishwahara Niraula	Pragatishil Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
12.	Ms. Hima Bhandari	Community Forest	Chulachuli, Ilam
13.	Ms. Tara Bastola	Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
14.	Ms. Kabita Rai	Pokhari Danda Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
15.	Ms. Bishnu Kumari Bhattarai	Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
16.	Ms. Beena Limbu	Shrijanshil Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
17.	Ms. Goma Devi Adhikari	Siddhartha Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
18.	Ms. Nanda Maya Rai	Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
19.	Ms. Dhana Maya Rai	Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
20.	Ms. Tara Devi Chamling	Pragatishil Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
21.	Ms. Nirmala Dahal	Women Networking Groups	Chulachuli, Ilam
22.	Ms. Bhumika Dangal	Mother Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
23.	Ms. Rekha Rai	Pragatishil Women Saving Group	Chulachuli, Ilam
24.	Ms. Gayatri Subba	Women Networking Groups	Chulachuli, Ilam
25.	Ms. Shanta Koirala	Women Networking Groups	Chulachuli, Ilam

S.N	Name	Organisation	Address
26.	Ms. Pramod Giri	Sericulture Committee	Mahamai
27.	Mr. Janak Koirala	Flood Control Committee	Chulachuli, Ilam
28.	Ms. Durga Dhakal	Women Networking Groups	Chulachuli, Ilam
29.	Mr. Bir Bahadur Lingden	Community Forest	Mahamai
30.	Mr. Mukhraj Angdembe	Rikhuwa Khola Control Committee	Mahamai, Ilam
31.	Mr. Hom Nath Dahal	Sericulture	Chulachuli, Ilam
32.	Mr. Amrit Bahadur Rai	Churia Area Conservation Committee	Mahamai, Ilam
33.	Mr. Rajendra Korung	Sukuna Community Forest	Chulachuli, Ilam
34.	Mr. Puspa Raj Angdemba	Sukuna Community Forest	Chulachuli, Ilam
35.	Mr. Rohit Adhikari	Sericulture Committee	Chulachuli, Ilam
36.	Mr. Dil Kumar Rai	Tribeni Community Forest	Chulachuli, Ilam
37.	Mr. Ram Bahadur	Range Post	Chulachuli, Ilam
38.	Mr. Dhan Prasad Dulal	Ward Charmain	Chulachuli, Ilam
39.	Mr. Hasta Bahadur Limbu	Sericulture Committee	Chulachuli, Ilam
40.	Mr. Prem Kumar Budhathoki	Community Forest	Mahamai
41.	Mr. Bal Bahadur Angdembe	VDC Chairman	Mahamai
42.	Mr. Kiran Kumar Rai	VDC Chairman	Banjho
43.	Mr. Dhruv Shrestha	Bee Keeping Committee	Danabari
44.	Mr. Dhan Prasad Rai	Ratuwa River Committee	Banjho
45.	Mr. Sudarshan Poudel	Community Forest	Banjho
46.	Mr. Tanka Bahadur Rai	Community Forest	Sakphara
47.	Mr. Amar Rai	Community Forest	Chulachuli, Ilam
48.	Mr. Bhoj B. Thapa Magar	Community Forest	Danabari
49.	Mr. Purna Bahaudr	Community Forest	Danabari
50.	Mr. Durga Bahadur Rai	Community Forest	Chisapani
51.	Mr. Keshav Gurgai	Community Forest	Chulachuli, Ilam
52.	Mr. Santaram Rai	Community Forest	Mahamai
53.	Mr. Mani Kumar Nemwang	Sukuna Community Forest Chairman	Chulachuli, Ilam
54.	Mr. Puparamaj Angdembe	Sukuna Community Forest Treasurer	Chulachuli, Ilam
55.	Mr. Narendra Lawati	Sukuna community Forest Secretary	Chulachuli, Ilam
56.	Mr. Jay Kumar Giri	Club	Chulachuli, Ilam
57.	Mr. Rajundra Kerung	Club	Chulachuli, Ilam
58.	Mr. Brat Kumar Rai	Kanchanjanga Community Forest Chairman	Chulachuli, Ilam
59.	Mr. Dil Kumar Rai	Tribeni Community Forest	Banjho
60.	Mr. Uttam Kumar Phiyak	Hattileda Community Forest	Chulachuli, Ilam
61.	Mr. Ishwor Gajmer	Teacher	Chulachuli, Ilam
62.	Mr. Surendra Kumar Yadav	District Plant Resources Office	Ilam
63.	Mr. Binod Kumar Basnet	District Plan Resources Office	Ilam
64.	Mr. Prabin Kumar Singh	District Soil Conservation Office	Ilam
65.	Mr. Resh Bahadur Katuwal	Federation of CFUG	Ilam
66.	Mr. Man Bhadur	Hariyali Community Forest Group	Mahamai, Ilam

S.N	Name	Organisation	Address
	Pokaluhang		
67.	Mr. Ganga Chapagain	Prabhatkalin Samajik & Batabarnia Samuha	Chulachuli, Ilam
68.	Mr. Dharma P. Dhungana	Chanjo Flood Control Committee	Chulachuli, Ilam
69.	Mr. Bir Man Tamang	Nursery Management Committee	Chulachuli, Ilam
70.	Mr. Badhansi Rai	Ratuwa Flood Control Committee	Chulachuli, Ilam
71.	Mr. Ganesh Bahadur Basnet	Bukuwa Flood Control Committee	Chulachuli, Ilam
72.	Mr. Laxmi Prasad Neupane	Bukuwa Flood Control Committee	Chulachuli, Ilam

73. Mr. Naku BantawaMrCtI3D 0.16780 Tc -46Pj 15.75 0 TD /F0 9.75 Tf -0.034 Tc -0.1535 Tw (Mr.) Tj 17.25 0 TD -0.029

23. Mr. Dinesh Malla, NTFP Trader
24. Mr. Yogendra Malla, NTFP Trader

GACAF members and Representatives

25. Mr. Dipendra Shahi, Coordinator, GACAF
26. Mr. Yam Bahadur, Facilitator, GACAF
27. Mr. Nava Raj Niure, Chairman, Sandepani VDC
28. Mrs. Urmila Rai, Ward Chairman, Darakh VDC
29. Mr. Bishnu Bahadur Raut, Chairman, Ramsikharjhala VDC
30. Mrs. Amrita Rana, Representative of UG of Ghodaghodi
31. Mr. Karna Bahadur Hamal, Chairman of UG of Ghodaghodi
32. Mrs. Jamuna Devi Oli, Representative of UG of Ghodaghodi
33. Mr. Bharat G.C., Member, GACAF
34. Mr. Chula Ram, Tharu Cultural Centre
35. Ms. Sumitra Shah, Representative, Eco-Club

Annex 4

Progress towards Programme Objectives

Achievements listed in IUCN Progress Report 2001 (pages 34 – 48) verified through cross-referencing information supplied by persons contacted during evaluation mission with that contained in the Progress Report..

Objective 1 Participatory Management system and practices for conservation and sustainable use of natural resources developed.

Output	Progress and comments
Demonstration projects developed and implemented for the integrated conservation of resources ensuring socio-economic benefits to local communities	Substantial progress detailed in annex 5 below.
Field level projects developed and implemented to alleviate poverty and promote equity through conservation and sustainable use of natural resources	Substantial progress detailed in annex 5 below.
Implementation of biodiversity policies, strategies and action plans supported Regulations and practice	Good progress through support provided to the National Biodiversity Unit of the Ministry for Forests and Soil Conservation, and in preparatory seminars and workshops for Nepali delegations to CBD COPs.

Outputs

Progress and comments

Annex 5

Progress towards Project Objectives

Conservation and sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants and other NTFPs through Community Participation in Seti Area Project

Development Objective Community conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants and other NTFPs established and functioning

Immediate Objective Replicable model of community conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants and other NTFPs demonstrated

Progress towards Immediate objectives

IUCN has made excellent progress in engaging rural communities in NTFP conservation and production. Achievements listed in the 2001 Progress report (pgs 51 – 54) were confirmed by community, NGO and local government representatives met by the ERT. These achievements were made possible through a cautious and low-key process of engaging rural inhabitants in participatory planning on forest protection, the potential of NTFPs and community forestry resulting in a matching of IUCN’s biodiversity conservation objectives with development and livelihood aspirations of rural communities. Medicinal and aromatic plants are seen as a good option for income generation by rural communities.

Several key elements of a replicable model for sustainable use of medicinal and aromatic plants have been put in place. 1350 people are engaged in an NTFP conservation and management group, Chaired by a woman. 48 groups are involved in NTFP plantation (ex-situ) and conservation (in situ) in public and private lands. Training and exposure visits have been organised in nursery management and cultivation techniques, apiculture, NTFP processing, micro-enterprise creation, savings & credit and promotional management, adult literacy classes and participatory monitoring and evaluation.

The groups met by the ERT stressed however that these efforts, while they are seen as comprehensive and responsive to needs and aspirations of the rural communities, should continue into the future as the groups require continuing support and training as the initial NTFP production efforts bear fruit and processing and commercialisation aspects become prominent.

Assessment of results / outputs – quantitative and qualitative

Result / Output	Quantitative	Qualitative
Awareness level and capacity of local community/ institutions enhanced to conserve and sustainable use of medicinal plants and other NTFPs	VDC coordination Cttee established. 1350 people involved. 227 people received training 48 NTFP groups formed 2 demonstration nurseries in place 8 nurseries	

		developing responses to the processing and marketing challenges still ahead.
NTFP groups assisted on value adding/processing and marketing of medicinal plants and other NTFPs	73 people offered exposure visit to Ilam NTFP processing sites Union of NTFP traders formed and registration in process Workshop on value adding processing held for collectors and traders	Clearly the main worry of communities. Identification of markets and linking these to cultivation and processing is key challenge for the future. Coincidence of interests between communities and traders also to be developed.
Communities surrounding Ghodagodi lake assisted in conservation and sustainable use of NTFPs	Community consultation to establish action plan Nursery established 10 user groups and 5 CFUGs planted 28,000 saplings (50% survival rate) Exposure visit	IUCN working through Ghodagodi Conservation Area Conservation Forum (GACAF). “Attacks” on forests reduced. IUCN provided training to GACAF in staff skills development Lack of clarity on “Conservation area” implications in terms of rights of local inhabitants. Realisation of income benefits remains a key challenge for the future.
Efficient project management including regular monitoring and follow-up established	Field office established in Budar community motivators (3) in place Regular support from IUCN NRMU and monitoring units	Excellent quantity of work accomplished. Climate of trust established with communities, traders and local government through transparent and participatory approach

Assessment by participating organisations and stakeholders

Communities Communities were positive about the actions of the project. The approach of the IUCN Community motivators was praised for its “door-to-door” nature, and the direct contact made at the household level. The conservation message of IUCN expressed in terms of sustainable forest management based on NTFP production has received a favourable echo amongst the rural communities, and they expressed to the ERT in numerous ways their “trust” of IUCN. The establishment of the trust is the result of the engagement of the communities in participatory planning, of the formation of NTFP “learning groups” and of the provision of a range of demand driven capacity enhancement training activities.

The process begun by IUCN with the rural communities is at its infancy. Consolidation of the empowerment process begun will take some time, as will the arriving at maturity of the NTFPs planted. For these reasons the communities would hope that IUCN will continue to work with them to perfect their skills with respect to the range of technical NTFP issues (nursery management, planting, nurturing, harvesting) already addressed and with new issues which will arise in the marketing phase (harvesting, processing, commercialisation). Leadership and “rights” training was also requested, as was assistance in dealing with “tax” or “royalty” issues concerning NTFPs produced on private lands.

A general view was expressed that learning should take place in group contexts, while production and benefits realisation would be mainly on private lands.

Confidence has been built. IUCN approaches not just the community leaders, but all strata of society including women and dalits.

Direct and indirect influence of activities on nature conservation

Influence on nature conservation is as yet difficult to demonstrate. Planting is taking place in marginal lands, and in due course income generation activities may reduce pressure on forest lands.

plan as its main conservation partner, the DDCs and the VDCs have allocated substantial amount of money for the various conservation initiatives and more than 167,000 seedlings have been planted by the CFUGs.

Another noteworthy observation is the strengthening of various local bodies for the conservation of the area. The formation of women's apex body, supported by 52 women's groups was observed to be strong, articulate and respected by all the institutions. This apex women's body has a promising potential to develop into a CBO partner for IUCN to manage various conservation activities in Ilam Siwaliks.

Community Conservation of Rhododendron in East Nepal

Development Objective	Community conservation of rhododendron biodiversity in TMJ area is established and functioning
Immediate Objective	Local communities and institutions strengthened to take over the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in TMJ

Progress Towards Immediate Objective

Increased awareness of the local communities and institutions on the value of conservation was observed. The awareness programmes are effective in involving the local people, CBOs (NORM, Environment Action Committees, Forest User Groups, Mother's Groups) and the local government bodies (MDCs, VDCs) in Rhododendron conservation and discussions on development activities. The Taplejung VDC has incorporated the conservation of Rhododendron as an activity in its periodical plan. The CFUG Network and Energy Group have prepared action plans and implemented.

The various trainings, exposure visits, exhibitions and regular meetings have led to spontaneous actions, such as, weekly clean-up programmes, toilet construction, promotion of improved cooking stoves and generating ideas for tourism. The participatory management planning processes have also positively contributed to build the capacity of the local communities for conservation. During a discussion with the ERT, the stakeholders asserted that they "need laws and policies that give them clear responsibilities and authorities over the conservation of the TMJ area".

IUCN's intervention approach through small-scale community development activities (trail repair, Gufa Pokhari restoration etc) linked with conservation are effective in gaining the trust and respect of the local stakeholders. But precaution should be taken, as more demand for scaling up community development activities were observed during the discussion, which may downplay the IUCN's goal of conservation in the area.

TMJ is geographically more remote and economically poor, and will require more time and resources (manpower, finances) to achieve the same level of impacts as in Ilam Siwalik area. Relative remoteness of and resources in TMJ

biodiversity conservation		
Community institutions assisted for the preparation of a participatory conservation and sustainable use plan of TMJ	Draft management plan prepared Rhododendron conservation incorporated in Taplejung DDC's periodic plan	Local institutions, aware and actively involved in conservation activities (DDC, VDCs, CFUGs, women's apex body)

developing local resource persons is a good effort in terms of sustainability. Similarly, the potential of developing eco-tourism as IGA does not seem to be a viable sector, keeping in mind the TMJ's separation from the regular Kanchanjunga trekking route and the distance from the capital.

Policy improvements

A good baseline information (TMJ assessment report) exists, which provide basic information that can be used to build consensus for land use, access to Rhododendron forests and other issues related to natural resources management. The preparation of the legal options for the TMJ area needs to reviewed with the participation of the local stakeholders. Because, it is observed that no real discussion on the legal options with the DDCs, VDCs, CFUGs and the local communities have been undertaken. A participatory discussion with the stakeholders is necessary, as they are with the impression that the proposed legal option ensures all their rights.

It is a good indication that the local stakeholders perceive IUCN's main role is to influence the government for designing people centered rules and regulations. Thus IUCN should focus maintain this role, and avoid giving the impression of being an implementing agency.

Capacity building

Refer to the general statement.

Awareness raising

See above

Development of Environmental Policy, Legal and Regulatory Framework

Development Objective: His Majesty's Government and Judiciary assisted in building sound environmental legal regime

Progress toward immediate objective

Discussion with the IUCN staff and stakeholders and reports produced by IUCN revealed that a good progress has been made by IUCN in achieving the above objective. Main achievements listed in the 2001 Progress Report (pp 57-58) were verified by relevant staff of IUCN and the officials of MOFSC, MOPE, NPC, and other stakeholders. IUCN's facilitating role was certainly a key factor for these achievements. Moreover, IUCN has established itself as a reliable partner of HMG in collecting relevant information and making it available as per need of the agency.

IUCN has been collaborating with NPC and MOFSC since 1980s for planning and implementing NCS. IUCN is recognised a professional institution in the field of conservation related research, training, information, international exposure, having access to new technologies, and with expertise in conservation related policy formulation. Major focus of IUCN has been on environmental governance and also now on trade and environmental issues. The focus has slightly shifted from facilitating the preparation of laws to implementation. Preparation of policies and laws are conducted mostly through task forces.

As a result of IUCN initiative a Wetland Policy document has been prepared with reviews and several intergovernmental consultations. The policy has got initial approval from the cabinet and now it is with the Parliament for approval.

A Task force on TMJ Legal option at the DDC level has been working to finalise a Draft Options Report. Similarly, inter-governmental consultations were held, to prepare a policy document on Access to Genetic Resources and being finalised by the Task Force at the MOFSC. Environment Report in the transport sector (pollution) was prepared and submitted to MOPE. And now the Land Degradation has been identified as an issue for future action.

As part of capacity development 25 judges and 23 government officials were sensitised on international environmental laws including convention on bio-diversity, access to genetic resources and benefit sharing, and bio-safety with reference to Nepal.

Assessment of results/outputs, quantitative and qualitative

Result/Output	Quantitative	Qualitative
Appropriate legal instruments for conservation and sustainable use of natural resources developed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing laws and policies related to wetland reviewed - A draft policy prepared and accepted by the Task Force - TMJ Legal option being prepared by the Task Force - Two consultations held on Access to Genetic Resources, a draft bill prepared and accepted by the Task force - IUCN provided technical assistance in formulation of "Second Forestry Amendment Act" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preparation of Wetland policy in cooperation of the Gos and NGOs highly commendable - Proactive role played by IUCN in all policy and legal matters are well accepted by the GOs, NGOs, donors and other stakeholders. - Consultations on Genetic resources generated general awareness as well as prepared the judges for influencing decisions in future - Greater demand for policy and legal intervention by IUCN in many conservation areas, at times difficult to cope.
Capacity for the development and implementation of law, policies, international obligations enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Sensitisation programme on international environmental law completed for 25 judges and 23 govt. officials - Environment Report in the transport sector prepared based on a study of vehicular pollution in nine cities of Terai and submitted to MOPE - Land Degradation on identify a new area for future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a result of sensitisation about environmental issues judges accept it as part of human Greater demand for policy
Legal framework for collaborative management for conservation and sustainable use of natural resources developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key legal and policy instruments drafted and submitted to government through related Task Forces on community collaboration on Wetlands and Access to Genetic Resources. 	

which Nepal has been a signatory. It appears that IUCN has proved to be effective in identifying these legal and policy areas and lobbying with the government for necessary changes.

Impact on peoples' livelihood (in terms of poverty, equality and gender)

Environment friendly laws and policies may not appear to be directly linked to people's livelihood from a short-term perspective, but in the long run these laws have great impact on the livelihood of the people. These laws also have positive effect on poverty, equity and gender issues.

Policy improvements

There has been policy improvements in the sense that certain laws are integrated and other are being updated. At the same time new laws, such as Wetland and Access to Genetic Resources, are being formulated. All these are examples of policy improvements.

Capacity building

<p>Support and assistance provided to IUCN Nepal programmes and projects to develop and implement awareness raising components</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brochure for projects produced and news letter published - Nepali version on "Towards Eco Tourism in Everest Region" published 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness helped to save NTFP, first they only exploited the wild NTFPs and now they plant as well. - Publication of IUCN are generally seen as having professional quality and standard - Brochures and news letters are good source of communication for the literate audience both at the central and local level
--	---	--

Assessment of participating organisations and stakeholders

All the Go and international partners consider IUCN as a knowledge based organisation, which has capacity in training, research and communication in environmental conservation. All publications of IUCN are highly appreciated. Production and dissemination of environmental information to NGOs, IUCN members, GO and international partners is highly appreciated by recipients. EIA training and lobbying with the GO for policy formulation are considered important and unique contributions of IUCN. International partners would like to see IUCN work as "Think Tank" rather competing in the field with other INGOs who have a long field experience in natural conservation.

Direct and indirect influence of activities on nature conservation

Annex 6

Financial Table in CHF

Donor	Projects	2000	2001	2002	Total	%
SDC	Seti	50,000	120,000	150,000	320,000	9.72
SDC	SETLPU	30,000	60,000	90,000	180,000	5.47
SDC	Rhododendron	30,000	80,000	90,000	200,000	6.07
SDC	Sialik	30,000	80,000	90,000	200,000	6.07
SDC	Core	140,000	355,000	210,000	705,000	21.41
BKPC	Bhotekoshi	61,402		25,456	86,858	2.64
ELC Germany	Forest study	700			700	0.02
NEDA	CDEAP	150,455	23,747		174,202	5.29
NORPLAN	Melamchi	72,433		118,910	191,343	5.81
Beijer Institute	Env't assm't	9,715			9,715	0.30
DANIDA	ISO Agro	10,469			10,469	0.32
British Embassy	Ghodagodi lake	6,000			6,000	0.18
SANDEE	Secretariat	123,400	161,335	451,663	736,398	22.36
KNCF	Lumbini	27,778			27,778	0.84
IIED	NSSD	65,761	43,897		109,658	3.33
World Bank	NBTF		11,525		11,525	0.35
UNDP	Wetlands		16,804	219,914	236,718	7.19
IUCN HQ	Dolpa mission	16,727			16,727	0.51
IUCN Region	Himal		17,500		17,500	0.53
IUCN HQ	WCPA		29,995		29,995	0.91
Ramsar Bureau	Koshi Tappu		17,947	4,487	22,434	0.68
Totals		824,840	1,017,750	1,450,430	3,293,020	100

Annex 7

Project Steering Committee

PSC Members' Contact List

Name/Title	Organisation	Remarks
Dr. Jagdish C. Pokharel Hon'ble Member	National Planning Commission Singha Durbar	Chairperson
Joint Secretary	MOPE Singha Durbar	Represented by: Jay Ram Adhikari
Madhav Pd. Ghimire Joint Secretary	Foreign Aid Division Ministry of Finance	Represented by: Hari Prasad Regmi Under Secretary, MoF
Mr. Bhagbat Kumar Kafle Joint Secretary	Environment Division, National Planning Commission Secretariat	
Joint Secretary	MoFSC Singha Durbar	Represented by: Dr. Uday Raj Sharma, Chief Environment Division
Mr. Narayan Poudel Ad Hoc Chairman	Nepal National Committee IUCN	
Mr. Anton Hagen Resident Coordinator	SDC	Represented by: PSC 1/01 Karl Schuler PSC 2/02 Dibya Gurung
Dr. Chandra P. Gurung Country Representative	WWF Nepal	Represented by: PSC2/02 Ukesh Raj Bhuj

Annex 8

Task Force Members

Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing

Chairman: Dr. Uday Raj Sharma, MoFSC
Members: Dr. Madhusudan Upadhyaya, NARC
Prof. Sanudevi Joshi, Tribhuvan University
Mr. Ranjan Krishna Aryal, MoLJPA
Dr. Prahlad Kumar Thapa, MoAC
Mr. Ram Bhadur Shrestha, MoAC
Mr. Tulshi Bhakta Prajapati, MoFSc
Member-Secretary: Mr. Surendra Bhandari, IUCN Nepal.

Wetland Policy

Chairman: Dr. Tirtha Man Maskey, DNPWC
Members: Mr. Narayan Poudyel, DNPWC
Mr. Jamuna Krishna Tamrakar, DoF
Dr. Keshav Raj Kandel, MoFSC
Mr. Shree Prasad Pandit, JUS
Mr. Diwakar Chapagain, DNPWC
Member Secretary: Mr. Surendra Bhandari, IUCN Nepal

TMJ

Chariman: Dr Keshav Kandel, MoFSC (Previous)
Dr. Damst DNPWC
Member Secretary: