

PD-ABB-830

68402

Indefinite Quantity Contract  
PDC-5517-I-00-7137-00, D.O. #20

**MID-TERM EVALUATION OF  
THE NATURAL RESOURCE  
MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROJECT**

February 1990

A.I.D. Project No. 698-0467

Prepared for:

**AFR/TR/ANR**

United States Agency for International Development  
Washington, D.C.

**Evaluation Team:**

**Bob J. Walter, Team Leader  
and Regional Land Use Specialist**

**J. Kathy Parker, Natural Resource Planner**

**John Lichte, Socioeconomic Specialist**



---

**Tropical Research and Development, Inc.**  
519 N.W. 60th St., Gainesville, FL 32607  
Tel: 904-331-1886; Fax: 904-331-3284; Telex: 955439 INTL TLX Attn: TR&D

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*We would like to acknowledge the assistance, support, and encouragement which numerous people offered in conducting this evaluation. To all those persons listed in Appendix 2, we are grateful for your open responses to our questions, for your willingness to endure our queries, and for your enthusiasm for natural resources management issues. We want to acknowledge the following for special recognition:*

*AFR/TR/ANR, Abdul Wahab*

*for his drive and enthusiasm in getting NRMS underway*

*AFR/TR/ANR, Dwight Walker*

*for his persistence with NRMS and guidance to us*

*AFR/TR/ANR, Ben Stoner*

*for his openness and willingness to give time to us at the beginning*

*We are especially grateful to Tropical Research and Development, Inc. Sally Dickinson was immensely helpful, always supportive, and unfailingly encouraging. Cynthia Ballou provided tremendous back-up and logistical assistance, nearly always under short time frames. To them, and the other supportive staff of TR&D, we say thanks.*

*We received numerous comments, suggestions, and recommendations. Although we considered all seriously, in the end the ones we made are ours alone. We can credit others, but we are responsible for the report.*

**BJ.W.**

**J.K.P.**

**J.L.**

**February, 1990**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	ii
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
1.1 Major Findings and Recommendations .....	1
2.0 PROJECT SUMMARY .....	4
3.0 EVALUATION FINDINGS .....	8
3.1 Project Design .....	8
3.2 Project Management .....	9
3.2.1 Communications .....	9
3.2.2 RSSA STAFF .....	10
3.2.3 Interactions With Missions .....	10
3.2.4 Input From Others .....	11
3.3 Project Activities .....	11
3.3.1 Natural Resource Assessments, Action Programs, and Action Plans .....	11
3.3.2 Technical Assistance .....	14
3.3.3 Donor Coordination .....	16
3.3.4 PVO and NGO Activities .....	17
3.3.5 Indicators .....	18
3.4 Project Effectiveness and Relevance .....	18
4.0 THE FUTURE .....	21
4.1 Short-term (0-6 months) .....	21
4.2 Medium-term (6-18 months) .....	23
4.3 Long-term (end of project and thereafter) .....	25
4.3.1 Recommendations/Options for Future .....	25
4.3.2 Concerns for Missions .....	27
4.3.3 General Concerns for The Bureau and The Agency .....	27
5.0 METHODOLOGICAL NOTE .....	30
APPENDIX 1: SCOPE OF WORK .....	31
APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEWEES .....	32
APPENDIX 3: COUNTRY PROFILES .....	35
APPENDIX 4: PROJECT HISTORY .....	53
APPENDIX 5: BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	55

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADO	Agriculture Development Officer
AFR	Africa Bureau, A.I.D.
AFR/DP	Africa Bureau, Office of Development Planning
AFR/DP/PPE	Africa Bureau, Office of Development Planning, Policy Planning and Evaluation Division
AFR/SWA	Africa Bureau, Office of Sahel and West Africa Affairs
AFR/TR	Africa Bureau, Office of Technical Resources
AFR/TR/ANR	Africa Bureau, Office of Technical Resources, Agriculture and Natural Resources Division
AFR/TR/PRO	Africa Bureau, Office of Technical Resources, Program and Regional Operations Staff
A.I.D.	Agency For International Development
AID/W	Agency For International Development, Washington
ANR	Agriculture and Natural Resources
ARD	Associates in Rural Development, Inc.
ARDN	Agriculture, Rural Development, and Nutrition
ARDO	Agriculture and Rural Development Officer
ASAL	Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
ASDG	Agricultural Sector Development Grant
AWF	African Wildlife Foundation
BOSTID	Board of Science and Technology for International Development
CA	Cooperative Agreement
CARE	Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere
CCA/ONG	Comite de Coordination des Actions des Organisations Non Gouvernementales au Mali
CDIE	Center for Development Information and Evaluation, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, A.I.D.
CDSS	Country Development Strategy Statement
CIDE	Center for International Development and Environment
CILSS	Comite Permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Secheresse dans le Sahel
CP	Congressional Presentation
DAI	Development Alternatives, Inc.
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DEFIL	Development Strategies For Fragile Lands Project
DFA	Development Fund For Africa
DHV	Development of the Haute Valley Project
E/DI	Energy/Development International
EIA	Energy Initiatives for Africa Project
EIL	Experiment in International Living
EOPS	End of Project Status
EPM	Environmental Planning and Management Project
ESA	East and Southern Africa
ETMA	Environmental Training and Management for Africa Project
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization, United Nations

<b>FINIDA</b>	<b>Finnish International Development Agency</b>
<b>FLUP</b>	<b>Forestry and Land Use Planning Project</b>
<b>FRM</b>	<b>Forest Resources Management</b>
<b>FSP</b>	<b>Forestry Support Program</b>
<b>FY</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>
<b>GARD</b>	<b>Gambian Agricultural Research and Diversification Project</b>
<b>GDP</b>	<b>Gross Domestic Product</b>
<b>GIS</b>	<b>Geographic Information System</b>
<b>GOB</b>	<b>Government of Botswana</b>
<b>GOK</b>	<b>Government of Kenya</b>
<b>GON</b>	<b>Government of Niger</b>
<b>GOR</b>	<b>Government of Rwanda</b>
<b>GRM</b>	<b>Government of The Republic of Mali</b>
<b>GTZ</b>	<b>German Development Agency</b>
<b>IIED</b>	<b>International Institute For Environment and Development</b>
<b>IQC</b>	<b>Indefinite Quantity Contract</b>
<b>IUCN</b>	<b>International Union For The Conservation of Nature</b>
<b>KCS</b>	<b>Kalahari Conservation Society</b>
<b>LOE</b>	<b>Level of Effort</b>
<b>LOP</b>	<b>Life of Project</b>
<b>M/FM/PAFD</b>	<b>Bureau For Management, Office of Financial Management, Program Accounting and Finance Division, A.I.D.</b>
<b>MGP</b>	<b>Mountain Gorilla Project</b>
<b>MOA</b>	<b>Ministry of Agriculture</b>
<b>M/SER/OP/OS/ AFR</b>	<b>Bureau For Management, Directorate For Program and Management Services, Office of Procurement, Overseas Division, Africa, A.I.D.</b>
<b>NCS</b>	<b>National Conservation Strategy</b>
<b>NGO</b>	<b>Non-Governmental Organization</b>
<b>NORAD</b>	<b>Norwegian Development Agency</b>
<b>NPS</b>	<b>National Park Service</b>
<b>NR</b>	<b>Natural Resources</b>
<b>NRM</b>	<b>Natural Resources Management</b>
<b>NRMP</b>	<b>Natural Resources Management Project</b>
<b>NRMS</b>	<b>Natural Resources Management Support Project</b>
<b>ODA</b>	<b>Overseas Development Authority</b>
<b>PAAD</b>	<b>Project Amendment Authorization Document</b>
<b>PACD</b>	<b>Project Activity Completion Date</b>
<b>PAD</b>	<b>Project Authorization Document</b>
<b>PASA</b>	<b>Participating Agency Support Agreement</b>
<b>PD&amp;S</b>	<b>Project Development &amp; Support</b>
<b>PID</b>	<b>Project Identification Document</b>
<b>PIO/T</b>	<b>Project Implementation Order/Technical Services</b>
<b>PNRM</b>	<b>Plan for Supporting Natural Resources Management in Sub-Saharan Africa</b>
<b>PP</b>	<b>Project Paper</b>
<b>PPC</b>	<b>Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, A.I.D.</b>

PVO	Private Voluntary Organization
REDSO	Regional Economic Development Services Office, A.I.D.
RRAM	Ruhengeri Resources Analysis and Management Project
RSSA	Resource Support Services Agreement
S&T	Bureau for Science & Technology, A.I.D.
S&T/AGR	Bureau for Science & Technology, Office of Agriculture
S&T/FENR	Bureau for Science & Technology, Office of Forestry, Environment, and Natural Resources
S&T/RD	Bureau for Science & Technology, Office of Rural & Institutional Development
SADCC	Southern African Development Coordinating Conference
SCS	Soil Conservation Service
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SMSS	Soil Management Support Services Project
SOW	Scope of Work
TA	Technical Assistance
TDY	Temporary Duty
TFAP	Tropical Forestry Action Plan
TSSM	Technologies for Soil Moisture Management Project
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
USAID	United States Agency For International Development Field Mission
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
WCA	West and Central Africa
WCI	Wildlife Conservation International
WID	Women In Development
WRI	World Resources Institute
WWF	World Wildlife Fund
WWFN	World Wildlife Fund, Netherlands

Note: The text may contain some of the above abbreviations in combination; e.g., WRI/CIDE or REDSO/ESA.

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Natural Resources Management Support (NRMS) project was initiated in August, 1987. Using a variety of mechanisms, its purpose was to increase the quality and level of natural resources management activity in the Agency for International Development's (A.I.D.) Africa Bureau (AFR) country and related regional programs, and in private voluntary programs (PVOs) supported by AID/AFR's Office of Technical Resources (TR) funds the NRMS project. It is the primary mechanism for implementing the Plan for Supporting Natural Resources Management (PNRM) in Sub-Saharan Africa and provides a variety of services (see Project Summary in Section 2.0 and Appendix 4).

This evaluation examines a broad spectrum of issues. The first concerns the project and its performance, including design, management, activities, products, and impact. Secondly, it considers the effectiveness of the AFR/TR strategy for implementing natural resources management programming (i.e., the process). Third is consideration of how effectively NRMS contributed to Agency objectives in the PNRM. The primary purpose of the evaluation is to provide recommendations concerning the future of NRMS and the PNRM. A detailed account of the team's full findings and recommendations is contained in the body of the evaluation report.

### 1.1 Major Findings and Recommendations

The following major findings and recommendations, drawn from the body of the evaluation report, are those of primary significance. For more specific ones, please refer to the full document.

#### Major Findings

- NRMS succeeded in attracting the Missions' attention with the Plan, the mandate, the priority countries, and the need to insure that the Agency design and/or implement NRM activities to meet Congressional mandates. It did increase the overall level of activities focused on natural resource management in the Africa region.
- NRMS also accelerated natural resources programming in USAIDs, although the Missions evaluated many of the products of the project as being of mixed quality and overall not very useful.
- The feeling of Mission ownership of natural resource management issues, priorities, and concerns will be critical to implementation of both the word and the spirit of the Agency's mandate over the long term.
- The PNRM and NRMS definition of natural resource management appears to have been too narrow to encompass the range of NRM activities undertaken by Missions in their past and current portfolios. This may explain some of the

discrepancies between AID/W's and the Missions' understanding of what qualifies as a NRM activity.

- The contractor has performed credibly and professionally. Contractor staff members worked under tight time schedules, with urgency being the primary criterion imposed on their efforts by AFR/TR. Time limitations recognized that interventions be focused and specific. Teams had little time to collect relevant information outside of the specific focus or talk to host government personnel as they did their work in the field. Problems, however, arose with the approach used, the lack of expertise in biodiversity issues in some cases, and a lack of gender analysis with regard to NRM activities (as well as the inclusion of women professionals on teams).

- A number of the Missions felt that many of the specific products of the project (e.g., the Sahel sub-regional and other assessments, action programs, and action plans) were not based on problem assessments and seem to be of little relevance or direct use to them. This reflects differing priorities, perspectives, and agendas. In contrast, the Missions generally valued highly the technical assistance (TA) provided by NRMS.

### **Major Recommendations**

- Management should be tightened during the last phase of the project.
- Primary considerations for the future of the project:
  1. Biodiversity grants should definitely continue with a focus on discrete activities of PVOs who have a continuing program and commitment in a specific geographic area. These grants should be designed not to be beyond the absorptive capacity of PVOs.
  2. AFR should re-evaluate the PNRM within the next six to eighteen months to consider means to build on the base that has been established in the first years. Missions suggested that this may mean emphasizing more activities that have regional implications (e.g., river basins, river blindness issues, Afromontane forests, and geographic information systems (GIS) and other technologies for wider regional analysis). These are activities that no one Mission alone could adequately address even if they were interested in them.
  3. AFR/TR/ANR needs to strengthen the institutional memory of NRMS, especially by developing stronger links with ongoing S&T projects. This might involve the expanding and strengthening of the existing NRMS Advisory Group with additional and appropriate institutional representatives (e.g., AFR/TR, AFR/DP, S&T/FENR, S&T/RD, S&T/AGR).
  4. Natural resource management needs to be integrated into Mission portfolios and priorities as a normal programming activity. This requires an Agency

**commitment to ensure that performance evaluations of staff include natural resource management concerns and that existing staff with natural resource background or additional staff members be made available to address NRM issues.**

- 5. TA should be available to Missions in all future projects to assist in research for, planning of, and design of natural resources projects and activities. A primary and specific TA task and objective should be facilitating discussion within the Mission and among the Mission, the host country government, and other donors. Most of this TA needs to be in Africa rather than Washington.**
- 6. Missions should provide substantial input into the re-design of the PNRM, and any follow-on project, to insure it reflects their NRM concerns. In general, AFR/TR should seek every appropriate means for Missions to receive support to increase the sense of USAID ownership of and ability to address NRM issues over the long term. Specifically, Missions should have greater control over the final design of the scope of work (SOW) for future NR activities funded by NRMS or its successor.**

## 2.0 PROJECT SUMMARY

The Natural Resources Management Support (NRMS) project began in August, 1987 as the Africa Bureau's mechanism for implementing the Plan for Supporting Natural Resources Management (PNRM) in Sub-Saharan Africa. The project was to serve as a catalyst to encourage Missions, other donors, and PVO/NGOs to initiate or expand their natural resources activities and/or portfolios. The project was to provide a variety of services (outlined below) using a number of contractual arrangements. It is funded by the Agriculture & Natural Resources (ANR) Division of the Technical Resources (TR) Office of the Africa Bureau (AFR), with additional funds provided through Mission buy-ins, from other offices in AFR (e.g., the Office of Sahel and West Africa Affairs [SWA] for the initial assessment of successful activities in the Sahel) and/or from bureaus in A.I.D. (e.g., the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination [PPC] for biodiversity activities) (see Appendix 4).

For the first year of the project, AFR/TR/ANR managed and implemented activities using Resource Support Services Agreement (RSSA) personnel from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the United States National Park Service (NPS). In August, 1988, Energy/Development International (E/DI) won the twenty-four month level-of-effort (LOE) contract as the prime contractor (hereafter, called the contractor, meaning E/DI and subcontractors). Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI) is the principal subcontractor. Four other organizations participate as additional subcontractors under the LOE contract: Associates in Rural Development, Inc. (ARD), Labat-Anderson Incorporated, the University of Arizona, and Dames & Moore International. The contract provides for a core staff of three full-time professionals, a full-time administrative assistant, and forty-five person-months of short-term, technical consultant assistance. In August, 1989, a PVO consortium of Experiment in International Living (EIL), Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere (CARE), and World Wildlife Fund (WWF) signed a twenty-four month cooperative agreement (CA) with the NRMS project (hereafter, called the cooperators).

The original authorization level was \$8.5 million with a project activity completion date (PACD) of 30 September, 1990. This made the project a four year one. It was amended in June, 1989 to a funding level of \$13.16 million with a PACD of 30 September, 1993. This was to allow the PVO CA sufficient time to complete its tasks.

### Background

Environmental problems threaten Africa's present and future. In recent years, the continent has experienced widespread drought and desertification. This, combined with social, economic, and political forces resulted in large scale famine, most prominently in Ethiopia. While these events are highly visible, others--slower, less dramatic, more widespread, and more pervasive--are at work inexorably tearing away at the fabric of the ecologic systems in Africa and disrupting their balance. Growing populations lead to smaller and smaller farms, reducing fallow and increasing erosion as the vegetative cover is lost. Loss of soil fertility follows, along with declines in biological diversity. The ecological system becomes simpler and more susceptible to being disturbed. These changes produce a downward spiral which continues to undermine environmental stability.

The problems resulting from the changes in physical and population dimensions are compounded and sometimes reinforced by governments. Inappropriate policies, inadequate institutions, lack of planning capability, and absence of environmental expertise limit the positive effect which governments might have.

Such severe conditions require urgent actions. Improvements in natural resources management are essential to maintain the continent's ecological base upon which agricultural productivity depends and ultimately the well-being of African peoples. The framework and driving force for action by The Agency For International Development (A.I.D.) is the Plan for Supporting Natural Resources Management (PNRM) in Sub-Saharan Africa. The Plan, initiated by Congressional concern and mandate, pressure from special interest groups, and A.I.D. concern about the severe threats to the fragile ecology and agricultural productivity capacity of the continent, developed from a series of analyses, recorded in a technical volume by Freeman (1986) (see Appendix 5). The Plan's intent was to build on existing efforts to integrate natural resources management into A.I.D. programs.

It established three sets of criteria for establishing priorities. The set of criteria for examining environmental issues identified five broad problem areas:

- soil erosion and soil fertility decline
- loss of vegetative cover
- surface and groundwater degradation
- failure to manage coastal resources
- loss of biological diversity

In addition, to provide a geographic screen for analyzing these technical problems, the Plan identified a number of agro-ecological zones; they are:

- arid and semi-arid tropics
- sub-humid tropical uplands
- humid equatorial lowlands
- humid coastal lowlands
- tropical and subtropical highlands
- Madagascar and Indian Ocean islands

Finally, the Plan divided the countries into three groups, based upon need and level of United States assistance effort. Group I countries have urgent needs for natural resource intervention; they are:

- |              |           |
|--------------|-----------|
| ● Gambia     | ● Niger   |
| ● Guinea     | ● Rwanda  |
| ● Madagascar | ● Senegal |
| ● Mali       | ● Sudan   |

**Group II countries have more specific needs; these are, with their needs:**

- **Botswana (soil erosion, biological diversity)**
- **Burundi (soil erosion, soil fertility, biological diversity)**
- **Cameroon (soil erosion, loss of vegetation, biological diversity)**
- **Ghana (loss of vegetation, biological diversity)**
- **Kenya (soil erosion, biological diversity)**
- **Malawi (biological diversity--Lake Malawi, soil erosion)**
- **Somalia (loss of vegetation)**
- **Tanzania (loss of vegetation, biological diversity)**
- **Uganda (soil erosion, biological diversity)**

**Finally, Group III countries are the rest of those in Africa (total of twenty-five) receiving A.I.D. assistance. With these, the Plan's objective was to assist with developing the human resource base to support natural resource management (NRM) activities. Recognizing that A.I.D. cannot operate in all these categories equally, the Plan established priorities for problem areas, agro-ecologic zone, and countries. These are implemented in the Natural Resources Management Support (NRMS) project (see Project Design section which follows).**

### **Services**

**The NRMS project is the Africa (AFR) Bureau's vehicle for systematic support to Missions and cooperating PVOs to help them strengthen their NRM programs and projects, within the Plan's guidelines, priorities, and criteria. The goal of the NRMS project is to improve policies and programs, to restore and maintain environmental stability and the natural resource base in Sub-Saharan Africa, especially in support of agriculture. The purpose is to increase the quality and level of natural resources management activity in A.I.D.'s country and related regional programs and in PVO programs supported by A.I.D. The project is to provide the following services:**

- 1) assist Missions to conduct NRM program assessments;**
- 2) provide consulting assistance (technical assistance--TA) in designing, implementing, and evaluating NRM projects;**
- 3) sponsor and fund special studies to assist the Bureau, regional programs, and Missions in NRM programming;**
- 4) publish a newsletter and examine Bureau and Regional Economic Development Service Offices (REDSOs) information needs in NRM;**
- 5) help PVOs strengthen their capabilities in NRM through training, technical assistance, and information support;**
- 6) provide support for biological diversity; and**

- 7) provide remote sensing equipment to the Ivory Coast for NRM purposes, on a one-time basis.

These services have been available to USAIDs, REDSOs, and PVOs through the implementing mechanisms mentioned above. For the first year of the project, and before a contract existed, Indefinite Quantity Contract (IQC) contractors, buy-ins to existing Bureau of Science & Technology (S&T) projects, and grants to PVOs constituted the major mechanisms for service provision (see Appendix 4--Project History). Some of these mechanisms were (and are) still available, especially grants, after the LOE contract was signed. The contractor is to provide the following:

- 1) technical assistance for programming support and scope of work (SOW) preparation;
- 2) natural resource assessments which includes mission dialogue, natural resource analysis, intervention assessment, policy incentives analysis, country strategy review, USAID implementation strategy, biological diversity and tropical forest assessment, and special concern analysis (i.e., action program and action plan documents);
- 3) training support which includes training needs identification, training plan, and training;
- 4) special studies and events which includes identification and research as well as workshops; and
- 5) information support which includes assessment of information needs, project tracking, a newsletter, and information support for PVO/NGOs.

The PVO CA, only now getting started, is to strengthen the operational and organizational capabilities of international PVO and local NGOs to support actions that will reverse environmental degradation of Sub-Saharan Africa. Working in four countries (Cameroon, Madagascar, Mali, and Uganda), it will conduct workshops and training for PVO and NGOs to create a broader awareness of NRM needs and priorities to increase commitment to effective NRM action, enhance the technical capabilities of PVO and NGOs in NRM, and strengthen the organizational capacities of these organizations for NRM with respect to program/project management, project design, monitoring and evaluation, and financial management.

Finally, NRMS has provided a number of biodiversity grants to PVOs for discrete activities (e.g., the environmental education program of the Mountain Gorilla Project). These are intended to serve as catalysts. RSSA staff in AID/W manage this activity.

### **3.0 EVALUATION FINDINGS**

#### **3.1 Project Design**

In designing the NRMS project, AFR narrowed the problem areas and agro-ecological zones from the larger list established in the PNRM. The Bureau's priority technical areas were three: loss of vegetative cover, soil erosion and soil fertility decline, and biological diversity. Its immediate target areas in agro-ecological zones were arid and semi-arid tropics, tropical highlands, and the island of Madagascar. For priority countries, it kept the same list as established in the PNRM.

The PNRM's and NRMS's set of priority countries was a source of confusion to field personnel. The priority list in the PNRM and NRMS differs from that in the Development Fund for Africa (DFA) Action Plan. Mission personnel were unclear why there was a difference with the DFA, as well as the specific criteria which established the priorities for the PNRM and project. When asked about their specific country, their answers indicated they were unsure in which priority category (PNRM or DFA) they fit. Because the category in NRMS determines the range of services on technical areas available to USAIDs as well as the sequencing of these services, understanding where they fit was important.

The project's intent was to implement a wide range of activities in three technical areas over three agro-ecologic zones and do so speedily. During the design phase, AFR/TR solicited Mission input. Some was provided but the evaluation team found that some Missions and REDSO/ESA felt the input was overlooked in the haste to get NRMS underway. The project was therefore a short-term one, limited originally to three years. It was to serve as a catalyst to increase NRM programming in Missions and regional programs in order to respond to the Congressional mandate as described in the DFA Action Plan. Additionally, it was to guide A.I.D. efforts to improve NRM in Africa using the priorities of the PNRM as a way to facilitate the best use of limited resources. To date, it has served to increase NRM activities and to create NR projects where none had existed previously, although some Missions regard these latter as 'targets of opportunity' rather than the result of incorporating NRM issues into normal Mission programming.

The latter fact, plus the short-term nature of the project, raises the question of whether the project is long enough to institutionalize NRM issues into Missions, regional programs, and PVOs and NGOs. In other words, can the goal and purpose of the project be achieved in a sustainable way? (See additional discussion under Project Impact section). This question becomes especially critical if Missions were unsure of the priority categories, or differed about them, or felt that NRMS did not facilitate the best use of limited resources. Admittedly, the project is not over, but our conclusion is that the effort as designed in NRMS is not sustainable in a follow-up project, in large part because of the short-term nature of the project.

While this evaluation found that NRMS project increased some programming, there was inconsistency in application of criteria. For instance, the project has not applied the technical areas uniformly. Botswana and Kenya (Priority II countries) have serious problems in soil erosion but biological diversity is the only issue addressed to date.

Cameroon (Priority II country) has tropical highland agro-ecologic zone and biodiversity questions but neither are included in completed activities (See Appendix 4, Project History).

The final design issue is the adequacy of the technical areas, agro-ecological zones, and priority countries for capturing critical NRM issues. While the ones in the NRMS project were adequate as a beginning point, in the long term, they are inadequate. The evaluation team found significant NRM activity in Missions which are not captured by the project. If these NRM activities exist, they should be represented in any larger regional project and used to fulfill the DFA Congressional mandate. Any new project should be designed to acknowledge and incorporate them as appropriate (e.g., using the buy-in mechanism to access relevant S&T projects). Priorities are needed in any regional project but it should also provide an overall strategy, as well as mechanism, to access other Agency projects which can provide valuable TA and support.

## 3.2 Project Management

AFR/TR/ANR is managing a wide range of activities under NRMS, including a RSSA, a contract, biodiversity grants, a cooperative agreement, and related buy-ins with other A.I.D. projects. The clear message from interviews with the various actors in—and observers of—NRMS, is that project management must be tightened over the remainder of the life of project (LOP).

The major problem areas involve:

- communications;
- inexperienced, unsupervised staff;
- interactions with the Missions; and
- input from others.

### 3.2.1 Communications

Communications covers a range of issues relevant to this evaluation which may go beyond the borders of the NRMS project. A number of Missions complained that contact with NRMS project staff has been difficult. Cables from the field apparently have been lost or logged in improperly. Additionally, Missions never (or in some cases, only belatedly) received notification of the arrival of some temporary duty (TDY) personnel. This problem was highlighted when one evaluation team member arrived in several countries where the Missions had not received notification of his pending arrival. The evaluation team understands that this problem has been particularly chronic and widespread since AFR/TR moved its offices to Rosslyn, Virginia. While it may not be specific to the NRMS project, AFR/TR must address the issue of improved communications in order to make it more efficient and effective in its support to the Missions. This is especially critical in AID/W managed projects.

### **3.2.2 RSSA STAFF**

Field Mission personnel criticized what they described as inexperienced, unsupervised RSSA staff, and said this was a particular problem when dealing with biodiversity issues. The inexperience involved both lack of familiarity with A.I.D. procedures and insufficient breadth in technical areas. The criticism then shifted to AFR/TR direct-hire staff, who have approved poorly written cables drafted by the RSSA personnel.

The feeling was that RSSA staff should receive adequate training in A.I.D. project implementation procedures. AFR/TR direct hire staff should more carefully review cables to ensure accuracy, brevity, and clarity.

### **3.2.3 Interactions With Missions**

Interactions with Missions have also been problematical. Individuals at a number of Missions and REDSO/ESA felt that AFR/TR did not heed their early input into the design and implementation of NRMS. One Mission stated that it had not been notified of biodiversity grant awards to PVOs nor NGOs in its country and stressed that lack of advance notification could adversely affect the relationships between Missions and their host country governments. A number of Missions also complained of receiving inadequate information on the nature of the NRMS project and its full range of support services, including funding and technical assistance.

Several Missions, particularly in the Sahel, believe that AFR/TR modified the intent of the Scopes of Work (SOWs) of contractor staff to accept the report, Opportunities for Sustainable Development as a substitute for country assessments. Staff members in those Missions said that, while the report served an important function, it should not replace the assessments.

This introduces the broader issue of AID/W-developed SOWs that do not always meet Mission needs. Finally, some USAIDs have used NRMS funds in ways that do not meet direct NRMS objectives. The point raised here relates more to the lack of AFR/TR monitoring of the funding once it goes to the field than it does to specific past abuses.

The evaluation team feels that future interactions with the Missions should reflect more of their input into the implementation of existing and future activities. This will ensure greater field "ownership" of natural resource management-related activities, as the Missions take more responsibility at the field-level to implement Congressional and Agency mandates and priorities. In addition, there is a critical need to maintain an efficient and effective documentation and cable clearinghouse to ensure that Missions, PVOs, and other donors are kept apprised of AFR/TR and related Agency programs and activities related to NRMS. This will assist in the development of a mutual learning curve and to communicate lessons learned.

Some Missions recommend an internal document "news brief" to keep them abreast of NRMS-related activities. This should be broader than just the contractor's newsletter, which serves only one set of objectives. The internal document would notify Missions of

NRMS activities and include a roster of the personnel used to accomplish the activity, the names of reports that have been written as part of the activity, and sources of other funding within A.I.D. that might help the Missions meet their natural resource management goals and targets of opportunity (e.g., biodiversity and soil moisture management). AFR/TR representatives could supplement this kind of document by presentations at ADO regional meetings on NRMS activities.

There is a clear need, indeed demand, to re-evaluate the type of assessments undertaken during the project in specific countries, especially those in Category I and II. While some Missions consider this activity to be a mere formality in meeting Congressional requirements, others feel that the exercise can provide them with useful information for program and project planning in natural resource management. This may require AFR/TR to shift priorities and resources during the final phase of the project; however, a shift of priorities would be much better than asking contractor staff to fit more work into their already tight schedules and nearly exhausted short-term TA budget.

There is also a need to establish a mechanism for monitoring NRMS funding. An important element of this would include yearly TDYs by the project manager to project sites, discussions with Mission Directors when they are in the United States about both technical and management issues, discussions with ADOs at their regional meetings, and other activities.

#### 3.2.4 Input From Others

Input from external sources would, perhaps, help AFR/TR set priorities for biodiversity grants. Several PVOs receiving grants were curious about the grant-giving process. They felt that more PVO input might be useful as part of an external advisory group that could meet periodically to discuss biodiversity issues, ensure a mutual learning curve where all can share new lessons learned, and attempt to define sub-regional priorities that might assist A.I.D. in its biodiversity activities.

### 3.3 Project Activities

#### 3.3.1 Natural Resource Assessments, Action Programs, and Action Plans

The evaluation team found that USAIDs are concerned with natural resource management issues and are happy to have access to the TA and funding provided by the NRMS project. They expressed a full range of feelings about NRMS itself, however, ranging from positive to negative. On the one hand, most Missions were complimentary of the contractor's professionalism and attempts to fulfill Mission needs. Several Missions (Botswana, The Gambia, and Rwanda) expressed generally positive feelings about the contribution of NRMS support to their individual programs. USAID/Botswana felt that NRMS technical assistance provided a useful catalyst, and the country's leading natural resource NGO was supportive of NRMS objectives. In The Gambia, the government is using both the Action Program and Action Plan. In Rwanda, the Mission observed that management of NRMS could be improved but felt that it provided (a) critical and substantial support for the

development of the Mission's new Natural Resource Management Project (NRMP), and (b) positive contributions to the conservation of biodiversity through two biodiversity grants to the Mountain Gorilla Project and the Nyungwe Forest Reserve.

On the other hand, a number of Missions visited by the Evaluation Team (i.e, Mali, Niger, Senegal, and Kenya) have been dissatisfied with the NRMS project--both its process and its results. The NRMS Project Paper (PP) proposes a sequence of three iterative activities that starts with a natural resource management assessment, then leads to a NRM Action Program, and ends with a NRM Action Plan for the country Mission. Sahelian Missions do not believe that this logical sequence of activities in the project design has been respected.

Mali, Niger, and Senegal--the three countries visited by an evaluation team member in West Africa/Sahel--all participated in the Sahel sub-regional assessment from which the Opportunities for Sustainable Development report was produced. The Missions recognize that this study covers cross-cutting technical issues and provides exactly the kind of information they would like produced by centrally funded programs, such as NRMS. However, all three Missions question whether this inventory of promising technologies can substitute for the function of a NRM assessment. Therefore, all three Missions feel that the NRMS project failed to deliver the NRM assessment which was a core component of both the PNRM and the proposed NRMS project process.

The "Opportunities" study has even less credibility as an assessment outside the Sahel, because no countries outside the Sahel were included in the study. Eastern and Southern African Missions question whether technologies deemed promising in the Sahel are necessarily appropriate in their countries or in different ecological zones. Also, most of the promising technologies inventoried in the "Opportunities" study deal with forestry/agroforestry, soil and water conservation, and improved soil fertility. But these are not the major focus of NRM activity in Eastern and Southern Africa USAID portfolios. In these regions, NRM activity has focused predominantly on biodiversity--particularly wildlife--and to some extent, parks. Additionally, livestock issues, and particularly the interaction between livestock and wildlife, are major concerns in Eastern and Southern Africa. However, the "Opportunities" team did not find any promising livestock technologies in the Sahel and did not deal with the livestock sector in the report. The Sahelian countries noted this serious shortcoming of the "Opportunities" study as an assessment. In the opinion of some interviewees, the biodiversity volume was the weakest of the four volume set.

In the absence of a true NRM assessment, Sahelian Missions feel that they still do not have concrete information about the scope and magnitude of natural resource management problems in their respective countries. Identifying informational gaps, collecting the necessary data, and assessing problems and priorities has traditionally been one of the recognized strengths of A.I.D. It is unfortunate not to capitalize on this ability with regard to natural resource management. Sahelian Missions cite this lack of information as a major obstacle to programming NRM activities. Such information (perhaps a minimum data set) would also contribute to monitoring and impact evaluation of NRM activities which are implemented.

**An Action Program and Action Plan (like the ones created for Mali) does not resolve these problems in the opinion of most of the Missions contacted. USAID/Mali has not really used the Action Program and Action Plan and the Mission judges them to be of little value for the future. The Niger and Senegal Missions rendered a similar judgement when, after reviewing the Mali Action Program and Action Plan, both Missions determined that they would produce such documents internally. Kenya and Botswana expressed dissatisfaction-more with the products than process.**

**On the other hand, the Gambia Mission reports that the Action Program and Action Plans were useful and effective as a catalyst for promoting increased dialogue. In Gambia, the process was influenced by the personal participation of the country's Vice-President, who accompanied the NRMS team during part of their travel.**

**The core of the typical NRMS Action Program consists of a list of Local Resource Management Strategies which itself is based on a menu of promising technologies deemed appropriate for specific ecological zones. Most Sahelian Missions found the list and menu difficult to use or understand in the absence of a specific process which enables them to determine priority components and strategies from the menu. In most cases, the Action Plan and the Action Program have been drafted simultaneously, and thus priorities have not been identified from the alternatives suggested in the Action Program. Occasionally, the Action Plan is only an executive summary of the Action Program. In some instances, the NRMS team ignored the Local Resource Management Strategies and focused the Action Plan entirely on adjustments which could be made to activities already in the existing Mission portfolio. Under such circumstances, it is often difficult to perceive a relationship between the Action Program and Action Plan. Whatever the situation, most Missions feel that the Action Plan has not served to establish priorities or refine the menu of alternatives proposed in the Action Program.**

**A more useful Action Program would provide a basis for discussion within the Mission, and between the Mission, the government, and other donors. Development of Action Plans need to be delayed until such discussions are held, additional inputs are made, and priorities are established.**

**AFR/TR's need to implement NRMS quickly to meet Congressional mandates has produced some inefficiencies and problems in effectiveness. This urgency has also emphasized the different perspectives between AID/W and USAIDs, as well as among AID/W offices. A Congressional earmark required that ten percent of African Bureau funding be spent on natural resource management. AFR administrators pressured Missions to increase obligations for natural resource projects to at least ten percent of funding. At the same time, AFR administrators (through AFR/DP) are requiring more focus and consistency on Mission portfolios which have typically not included much natural resource programming as defined in NRMS. Most Missions are willing to include natural resource management in their country program, but need time to negotiate and change funding priorities with the host governments, and to develop sound natural resource management activities.**

The desire for speed and funding limits in the NRMS project did not allow the contractor time to do a problem assessment and inventory of existing activities in each country. This would have required that a team spend long periods in each country before beginning the Action Program and Action Plan. But Missions complain that without a problem assessment and inventory of existing activities, there is no basis for rational programming. They would have preferred Action programs to be based on this assessment, and the Action Plan to be refined and to establish priorities among alternatives identified in the Action Program, following discussion and negotiation with the government and other donors. This would have required teams to make three or more trips to each country over a period of several months. Such a process could not be completed in eight Priority 1 countries and nine Priority 2 countries in an eighteen month project with limited personnel and funding. Therefore, while Missions acknowledge that NRMS and the contractor aided the development of NR programming, the process was less effective than it might have been under less urgent conditions and the Action Program and Action Plan products have not been useful programming documents.

### 3.3.2 Technical Assistance

Sahelian Missions have generally appreciated the E/DI contract teams. All of the Sahelian Missions commended E/DI for the experience and professionalism of the teams fielded. These Missions all regretted that the AID/W agenda and the specific SOW of a TDY as well as the general SOW of NRMS did not allow the teams time to be more helpful to the Missions.

Eastern and Southern African Missions encountered more problems with the E/DI teams, but these did not focus on the teams' competence. These Missions were concerned that the team had based their work on the Sahel sub-regional assessment, and noted with some apprehension that the team members' experience related primarily to the Sahel. In the case of Kenya, a question arose about whether the composition of expertise of the team was appropriate once the Mission had changed the SOW to focus specifically on parks and biodiversity. A personality conflict also affected the E/DI team's acceptance in Kenya, although it had no impact on the reports. More importantly, some Missions questioned the subject areas covered by the teams as insufficient to deal with NR issues, because NRMS would not field personnel in the areas of water management, watershed management, and tropical forestry. REDSO/WCA also remarked that the NRMS concept should be expanded to deal with industrial waste and urban environmental problems.

The evaluation team observed that more care should have been taken in the production of some of the E/DI team reports. Most of the reports had numerous spelling errors. Evaluation members read one report that included different versions of a particular section and another report had two sections by two different authors, but the title and author listed only one. Also, while the Mali Biological Diversity Assessment was very well received in English, the French translation is reported to be of poor quality. The Mali Mission reports current difficulty in dealing with the Government of the Republic of Mali (GRM) on biodiversity issues as a result of this translation problem. This is unfortunate because the English version is universally complimented for its quality.

The evaluation team found that the manner in which the E/DI teams have performed economic analyses of Local Resource Management Strategies in the Action Programs created some misunderstanding. These analyses are based on a format derived from the strategies evaluated for different ecological zones identified during the "Opportunities" study. To look at potential costs and returns, the teams had to hypothesize the scale affected by the strategy in terms of the number of hectares influenced. They present fairly detailed spreadsheets summarizing the economic analysis of a particular strategy and specifying a target zone in hectares (e.g., 4,300, 13,000, 100,000, 500,000 hectares). The manner in which these were specified resembles a project objective and project description. Particularly in the case of the Mali Action Program, which specifies 500,000 hectares for each of four ecological zones, these targets seem to be far larger than anything which the Mission or government could practically hope to implement, even if they had far more resources. In addition, the analyses assume that the entire target zone will be affected (planted, in production, and treated) from the first year. From the typical Mission project perspective, this is impossible because one does not start a project with the entire 500,000 hectares target area affected by the introduced technology.

The E/DI team perspective was an attempt to demonstrate the important economic effects and returns to long-term natural resource management. Because previous activities have typically made little effort to analyze the economics of natural resource management, the effort is significant and a contribution to NRM concepts. Apparently, more time and effort was needed to identify these hypothetical cases which could determine potential long-term resource flows and returns. They were not intended to be projects per se, nor to identify the returns which would accrue to a project attempting to introduce the technology to the target zone.

In Rwanda, NRMS support provided an unusually high level of effort in the development of the USAID's Natural Resource Management Project (NRMP) PP. NRMS actually provided support to send two teams at different times to work on PP design. The quality of all participants in the design process was good. This included several experts provided by The International Institute of Environment and Development (IIED)--and now known as The Center for International Development and Environment (CIDE) of The World Resources Institute (WRI)--the regional forester provided by REDSO/ESA, and one staff person provided by E/DI.

If any one fact concerning the overall level of effort of NRMS stands out, it is that the resources available to the contractor in the NRMS project were not sufficient to undertake true NRM problem assessments, nor to develop an iterative process and facilitate dialogue which would have allowed the Missions and Governments to participate more fully in the NRMS process. In the absence of such participation, most Missions have not accepted ownership of the NRMS project process, products, and results.

### 3.3.3 Donor Coordination

The NRMS project seems to have a very mixed track record with regard to donor coordination (see Appendix 4). In some cases, there has been considerable donor coordination with regard to NRM activities, but frequently, this coordination cannot be attributed to the NRMS project. NRMS personnel recognize that the Agency does not have the financial clout to take the leading role in financing NRM activities in many African countries. The World Bank assumes this role in many countries, and therefore it is a primary target for coordination activities.

AFR/TR has designated a staff member to be responsible for donor coordination related to NRMS, but this coordination seems to be primarily with the World Bank, and mostly concerns Madagascar. WRI/CIDE, with USAID funding as in Rwanda, has been involved in working on World Bank sponsored Environmental Action Plans in several African countries. This type of activity normally comes under the Environmental Planning and Management (EPM) cooperative agreement, a project in the Bureau for Science & Technology (S&T) where NRMS has limited links. The S&T project officer is expected only to ensure that the PIO/Ts are processed. AFR/TR apparently does not seek out technical input except through the contractor. NRMS also has weak links with the Tropical Forestry Action Plan (TFAP) process, perhaps because of the character of the TFAP process.

The NRMS project and project personnel do not have a strong liaison with the Comité Permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Sécheresse dans le Sahel (CILSS) anti-desertification program. AFR/TR did not send NRMS representatives nor anyone else to the Segou Roundtable on local level natural resources management in the Sahel. Asif Shaikh of E/DI did attend and present a paper which was well received, but the Sahel/West Africa (SWA) Office of AFR, not NRMS, financed his trip. This lack of participation by NRMS is questionable in light of the subject matter of the Roundtable, and its declared objective of bringing together government representatives, donors, PVOs, and farmer representatives. NRMS missed an opportunity for dialogue and coordination with donors and other organizations. The CILSS process is a major force behind NRM activity in the Sahel. In some countries, this CILSS-engendered process is ahead of A.I.D., including NRMS, in providing leadership for dealing with NRM issues. Working through the CILSS process may have a distinct advantage when dealing with sensitive political issues like land tenure. CILSS may be able to negotiate with host country governments concerning such issues where it might be inappropriate for a bilateral donor to do so. For the future, NRMS should re-evaluate its role relative to the CILSS process.

Recent reports indicate that the World Bank is disenchanted with the CILSS anti-desertification program, or at least with some parts of it. It is not clear what the effect will be or what the Agency response should be if the World Bank refuses to support this program.

### 3.3.4 PVO and NGO Activities

PVOs and NGOs are extremely heterogeneous with regard to their NRM experience and capacity at the present time. This experience and capacity also varies greatly from country to country. Yet most PVOs and NGOs are responding very positively to the training program for which discussion was being initiated at the time the evaluation team was in the field.

E/DI is just beginning preparations for a series of ten training-of-trainer NRM courses. They will start with a regional course and plan to use those interested in attending the regional course as trainers in similar future courses at the national level. E/DI will invite trainers from government agencies as well as PVOs and NGOs to attend. In Senegal, USAID was receiving requests for information on how to enroll people wanting to attend the course, after the visit by a core member of the contractor.

Mike Brown, Director of the NRMS cooperative agreement, visited Mali in November, 1989, prior to field evaluation of the project, to discuss the startup of that component of NRMS. The very limited sample of PVO personnel interviewed was quite pleased with his proposals. They report that Brown established a relationship with the NGO umbrella organization in Mali, (the CCA/ONG: *Comite de Coordination des Actions des Organisations Non Gouvernementales au Mali*) as the lead agency for the training and other activities. The PVO personnel viewed this, and the discussions which emerged from the workshop, as positive developments. They stated that most PVOs and NGOs are interested in the proposed training and the potential to access technical assistance in subjects related to NRM. While a few of the larger PVOs may have access to this type of expertise, most PVOs and NGOs do not.

The PVOs indicate that considerable competition for funding in the PVO and NGO community exists and therefore, direct collaboration between a PVO and one or more NGOs has become a somewhat delicate matter. In this situation, most PVO field offices are not willing to take on the role of supervising (i.e., auditing) a number of NGOs unless the NGOs are serving as sub-contractors to the PVOs. The PVOs are also hesitant to develop a large administrative staff necessary for such activities. This type of function and staff would require much larger overheads than USAID is presently willing to pay PVOs. PVOs believe that operating on small overheads is one of their chief attributes in attracting funding and in distinguishing their activities from other contractors.

In Eastern and Southern Africa, the PVO and NGO community representatives contacted by the evaluation team also had generally favorable comments about NRMS. A New York representative of Wildlife Conservation International (WCI) felt that the biodiversity grants under NRMS had provided catalytic support. He noted that the support should continue but that selection of grantees should be based on how the proposed activities contributed to ongoing activities of the PVO and NGO rather than as the primary or sole source of funding. He also suggested that more support should be given to tropical forests.

In Kenya, the PVO and NGO community felt that USAID support for conservation education programs at wildlife reserves was a good contribution. PVO and NGO

representatives are eager to support the new Director of the Kenya Wildlife Service, and hopes that USAID will make an appropriate contribution.

In Rwanda, the Mountain Gorilla Project and the Nyungwe Forest Reserve have both been recipients of NRMS biodiversity grants. The Mountain Gorilla Project field officer thought, however, that the funds might have come directly from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service because the funds were negotiated from the U.S. office of the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF). Both projects have been able to use grant funds for research and conservation education activities and feel that the support has made a contribution to nature education. This is especially the case in the Nyungwe Reserve where the field officer characterized the funds as a springboard for future Reserve activities.

### 3.3.5 Indicators

Practically every group or organization working in conjunction with NRMS has to develop indicators, benchmarks, and criteria as part of their SOW. This is true of the prime contractor, for the cooperator group, the direct hire and RSSA staff, and for any projects developed by the Missions. Yet, it is not evident that anyone is very satisfied with the indicators currently being used or that much sharing of ideas concerning these indicators is being facilitated or required by NRMS. The preliminary set of indicators developed by the RSSA staff of AFR/TR represents a good start in the right direction. They have given concentrated and in-depth thought to the range of technical indicators that might be useful. They need additional support in their efforts. Some of the PVOs contacted during the course of this evaluation indicated their interest in working with others to develop a minimum set of indicators that would help them monitor and evaluate biophysical and socioeconomic factors that seem critical for the success of their efforts in conservation of biodiversity. AFR/TR should provide leadership, encouragement, and funding to facilitate discussion of indicators across these different actors in the NRMS process.

### 3.4 Project Effectiveness and Relevance

Measuring the impact of the NRMS project is problematical for at least three reasons. First, no common definition of success prevails. This is especially difficult for a project like NRMS which arose out of a mandate from Congress. Second, measurement of NRM activities under NRMS suggests that there was little or no natural resources management activity (programs/projects) existent in current Mission portfolios. Based upon the evaluation team's limited review, this was and is a false assumption. Missions--such as Senegal, Rwanda, or Botswana--are carrying out considerable activity, but it is not reflected adequately because of Mission structure or because of differing definitions of what constitutes natural resources. Third, and perhaps most importantly for NRMS, there are many interested groups: Congress, special interests (especially PVOs), AID/W, Missions, and NGOs. Each will judge the project and its activities differently. Therefore, success will, quite likely, depend on the assumptions, expectations and perspective of the interested party.

Given the origin and history of the project, however, we conclude that NRMS has been largely successful for most of the interested groups. It generally has satisfied the Congressional mandate and has increased the natural resource programming within the Africa Bureau. It has provided PVOs with funds to enable them to conduct NRM activities and increase their role in sustaining the resource base in Africa. NGOs are only now beginning to interact significantly with NRMS, but indications are that they will participate actively. AID/W has largely met its goals of providing NRM assistance and products (assessments, action programs, action plans) to those Missions in priority 1 and 2 categories of the PNRM, with a few exceptions (see Appendix 4). For example, Sudan, a priority 1 country, has had no NRMS involvement because of political conditions there. Senegal has had limited activity, even though it has in its current portfolio many activities focused on natural resources. These particular natural resources, however, are largely outside the technical areas of the PNRM and are therefore not covered by NRMS. NRMS plans to incorporate a number of priority 2 countries (e.g., Cameroon, Ghana, Tanzania) prior to project completion. Somalia will not be included because of political difficulties. Therefore, at the time of this mid-term evaluation, AID/W has met its goals of initiating a natural resource program for Sub-Saharan Africa and for providing an increase in the level of NRM activity.

The project has been less successful from the Missions' perspective. They perceive that it has met more fully an AID/W agenda, rather than their own needs. They feel the approach used for the process is incorrect and thus creates products of limited value. They believe it defines natural resources too narrowly and excludes significant issues. Some Missions are not clear about potential project resources and activities conducted by NRMS. Many Missions have increased the visibility of natural resources issues in their portfolios (e.g., Kenya and Botswana), either because of AID/W pressure or because the opportunity presented itself. Additionally, they have used the technical assistance of NRMS, perhaps seeing this as the project's greatest benefit. It is ultimately the Missions which may have the most significant role to play in improving the Agency's long-term role in NRM. That NRMS has been least successful in the eyes of this group should be of a concern to AFR/TR and should be a priority consideration in any future NRMS activity. Given the short time frame of the project (basically, 25 months at the start of the evaluation), perhaps it is too early to judge conclusively. Nonetheless, the evaluation team feels it merits increased attention.

Judgement on the adequacy of the PNRM, as executed by NRMS, would be similar to that of NRMS--each group would evaluate it differently and come to similar conclusions. The evaluation team's review of the PNRM's adequacy identified several concerns. For example, the technical areas (soil erosion and loss of fertility, loss of vegetative cover, and biological diversity) are not adequate to capture the range of natural resources issues which confront Missions, nor are they always the most critical issues at stake. This is not to say that these three are not significant and of widespread concern, as they most certainly are. Nonetheless, other issues are also crucial: water management/watersheds in Senegal; river basins/riverine ecosystems in Southern Africa (Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Botswana); montane tropical forests in Eastern Africa (Zaire, Rwanda, Burundi, and Uganda); and grasslands/livestock-wildlife interaction. The first-phase implementation of the PNRM correctly needed a select list of priorities to initiate activities, and biological diversity was

obviously the most important, but later stages of implementation should carefully broaden the scope of technical concerns. These concerns should especially incorporate Mission interests and needs where there is a logical, rational, and broadly defined need (i.e., at least a sub-regional interest).

The priority countries provide a rationale for beginning with a select group, but the evaluation team, along with some Missions, does not understand why some countries were judged to be priority 1 and others priority 2. The fact that priority countries under NRMS differ from those of the DFA adds a second layer of confusion to these priorities. The seriousness of certain NRM issues is surely as critical in some priority 3 countries as it is in certain priority 1 countries. For example, Lesotho has an extraordinarily severe soil erosion problem. The next phase of any NRM activity should incorporate countries/Missions based on actual need per technical concern rather than a separate country classification.

The agro-ecologic zones categories do not seem especially useful. They have not been applied consistently and provide little guidance in developing and evaluating activities. Furthermore, they may be too crude and broadly defined to have significant meaning in a national context. Finally, they do not seem to be the significant ecological frameworks with which Missions must grapple in confronting natural resources issues. More commonly, it is a river basin, a watershed, a vegetation type, or a soil/slope category. There is a need to make these ecologic categories more realistic and compatible with Mission programming.

Within a short time frame, NRMS has created significant activity. It has provided funds/grants for specific activities, assisted Missions with technical assistance, and produced an impressive list (at least, by number) of documents. What is less clear is whether or not it has created a process which will last past the life of the project. Clearly, while NRMS exists, priority 1 and 2 countries will be conscious of natural resources issues and may add NRM activities to their portfolios, if only as targets of opportunity. Given the limited resources in NRMS, priority 3 countries and their need for developing the human resource base to support NRM activities will be all but ignored. If any follow-on project is to succeed NRMS, it must work closely with Missions to develop NRM priorities and must incorporate design elements to ensure institutionalization of the process within Missions. NRMS currently will not accomplish that.

## **4.0 THE FUTURE**

This section attempts to outline a set of recommendations that may help improve internal functioning and potential impact of the NRMS project as well as insure greater sustainability of NRM programming within the Agency through the use of the PNRM. It is divided into three major subsections to indicate the time period in which actions should begin.

### **4.1 Short-term (0-6 months)**

- **Tighten AFR/TR management of the project.**
  - \* Ensure that RSSA staff receive adequate training in A.I.D. project implementation procedures.
  - \* AFR/TR should more carefully review cables to ensure accuracy, brevity and clarity.
  - \* Ensure, to the extent possible, that future interaction with Missions reflect more of their input.
  - \* Maintain an efficient and adequate documentation and cable clearinghouse .
  - \* Initiate and maintain an internal (A.I.D.) newsbrief.
  - \* Re-evaluate carefully the need to undertake assessments over the LOP in specific countries.
  - \* AFR/TR should establish a mechanism to monitor NRMS funding.
  
- **Focus contractor workplan to ensure that its work continues to be professional and credible and so that the work better meets Mission needs.**
  
- **Re-evaluate whether the contractor is best capable of meeting objectives outlined for it relative to PVO activities. At the least, clarify these objectives and activities and ensure that there is no overlap with other ongoing PVO activities, especially the cooperator.**
  
- **Ensure that the contractor increases its biodiversity expertise. We found this a weakness in its ability to perform, especially in Southern and Eastern Africa, and it is reflected in the weakness of that portion of the "Opportunities" report.**
  
- **AFR/TR should encourage the contractor to include more women and minority professionals on its teams. One staff person in USAID/Botswana was particularly concerned that this was an obvious oversight of contractor and AFR/TR responsibility. While some perceive difficulties in accessing and contracting women professionals in natural resource fields, they are likely to be surprised by the increasing number of highly qualified women with field experience in various parts of the developing world, including Africa. The requirement to include more women and minorities obviously has broader implications for the Bureau and USAIDs than for just the NRMS project. Guidance for the Agency should be reflected in contractor SOWs in all sectors. Project management should also be held**

accountable for seeing that Agency requirements related to gender and minority concerns are met.

- AFR/TR should require the contractor to place more emphasis on gender analysis in natural resource management issues. A recent evaluation shows that gender consideration is a major factor in ensuring the success of Agency strategies, programs, and projects in environmental and natural resource related activities. The nature and magnitude of women's roles in African agriculture and natural resource management suggest that one can no longer assume male dominance or gender-neutrality in agriculture and natural resource management in Africa, and this should be reflected in analysis, designs, implementation actions, and monitoring and evaluations of A.I.D. projects, programs, and strategies.

- AFR/TR should require the contractor and/or find mechanisms (e.g., assistance from the Office of Women in Development in PPC) to identify and address key gender concerns and to assist Missions, as appropriate, in ensuring that issues related to women (as beneficiaries and contributors to development) are addressed and incorporated in Mission natural resource strategies, Action programs, Action plans, and project designs. The contractor should also be expected to collect or include existing gender-disaggregated data (or where difficult to obtain will provide analysis about obstacles that prevent collection and ways to overcome them in future natural resource programming and planning). AFR/TR should look to PPC's Office of Women in Development and its own Bureau's WID Officer for information and support. (See Appendix 5--Bibliography, A.I.D. Documents, 1989 and Other Reports, Russo, et al for guidance)

- Encourage Missions to identify existing staff members who have natural resource management background and experience. Missions should use this as an important criterion for selecting personnel who will be assigned natural resource management tasks. Use of existing resources is critical during a time of limited funds, personnel, and other resources. Training of Agricultural Development Officers, Program Officers, Private Sector Development Officers, Project Development Officers, and others in issues related to natural resource management would enhance the overall ability to each Mission to identify and address natural resource related issues in its host country and in its Agency portfolio.

- Build closer links between AFR/TR and interested Missions to ensure that the support the project is intended to provide serves Mission needs, as well as AID/W's purposes. This would fit more closely the title of the project (i.e., Support) and would mean more input from the Missions on the design and final approval of SOWs. Additionally, they should be involved on the development of indicators.

- Encourage and support coordination between the contractor and the cooperator over the short- and medium-term in their efforts to develop and implement an effective set of PVO and NGO training activities. Over the long-term, this strategy should be re-evaluated (see last sub-section).

## 4.2 **Medium-term (6-18 months)**

- **Review and revise the PNRM.** The major considerations here should include:
  - \* Update the PNRM by including activities completed in relationship to preliminary benchmarks.
  - \* Introduce new, more appropriate indicators. While the existing indicators serve as a useful base, NRMS should provide additional leadership and funding to facilitate more concentrated discussion and decision making among the different shareholders in the NRMS process. This might be best done by funding a small workshop for a number of key players to work with the set of draft indicators already developed. A networking and indicator development workshop of this sort should include representatives of the different groups and organizations working in the project and most specifically on indicators. The focus of the workshop should be to produce considerably more consensus than is evident at this point and to identify points of divergence that can be investigated and developed further once the workshop has ended. The workshop should be geared to focus on discussions of minimum data sets including biological, physical, social, economic, financial, and political indicators. The outputs of the workshop would be a plan of action with a set of activities to implement it through testing, further refinement, and application of these indicators over time in the field. A major concern should be the standardization of data sets so that they provide comparable data which will help ensure a more rapid and systematic learning curve of all actors in the process and increase the capability of NRMS, the Bureau, and the Agency as a whole in their efforts to monitor natural resource-related programming.
  - \* Consider changing the scope of the PNRM to cover issues with more regional implications that individual Missions might not be able to cover alone. The PNRM should continue to provide guidance for more strategic and longer term programming related to the Agency's natural resource-related issues. Even if the priority areas of the PNRM remained the same, AFR/TR might want to consider rethinking how to best implement activities that address these priorities. For example, as the Missions in these priority categories assume more responsibility for NRM activities through their portfolios, AFR/TR might want to provide more support to focus on some cross-cutting concerns such as natural resource economics, policy analysis, and regional common themes (e.g., Afromontane forest management), and application of GIS and other appropriate technologies that individual Missions might find extremely useful but not be able to address on their own.

The evaluation team agrees with the early conceptualizers and designers of the PNRM and NRMS that priorities must be established and maintained. Not every environmental or natural resource management problem (e.g., industrial waste) can be addressed by the Agency. Our intent is to suggest

**that the PNRM should be evaluated, in the medium term, for its potential to provide continued guidance to the Bureau and the Missions and to ensure that, as progress is made in addressing natural resource problems, the Agency stays out in front of evolving resource management issues and technologies.**

### **4.3 Long-term (end of project and thereafter)**

The evaluation team provides a number of recommendations below. The first set provides AFR/TR with some recommendations and/or options for the future of natural resource management support after NRMS ends. The second set addresses some concerns about NRM at the Mission level. The third set addresses some general concerns for the Bureau and Agency relative to natural resource programming in the Africa region.

#### **4.3.1. Recommendations/Options for Future**

- There is a clear need for a follow-on project, to consolidate the gains of NRMS, to continue to increase NRM programming, and to expand the scope of NRM activities.
- Future project design should also consider the potential of redesign and implementation of a project that works more collaboratively with USAIDs and ARDOs in setting agenda and developing strategies as well as working with S&T projects. One potential model, recommended by a staffer in REDSO/ESA, is the S&T/RD Development Strategies for Fragile Lands (DESFIL) Project which currently is being implemented in the Latin America region. NRMS should remain flexible in its ability to respond from Washington to field and regional office requests for assistance.
- Future project design should not include a contract with the SOW that currently exists. Future activities should focus on providing more useful products to the Missions (e.g., standard assessments in the countries that prefer them in addition to the information in the "Opportunities" report and/or a roster of personnel in a range of natural resource fields who can provide technical assistance). These activities should be designed with increased Mission input in the next phase of project planning.
- Future project design should include an overall strategy for tapping Agency resources and developing better linkage, stronger input, and perhaps financial commitment by other projects in the Agency, especially in the S&T Bureau. Greater intra-Agency collaboration needs to be built into the next phase of NRMS. Existing projects (e.g., Environmental Planning and Management [EPM] and Forest Resources Management [FRM] in S&T/FENR; Soils Management Support Services [SMSS] and Technologies for Soil Moisture Management [TSMM] in S&T/AGR; and DESFIL, Settlement and Natural Resource Systems Analysis [SARSA], and the Land Tenure Project in S&T/RD) should continue to be tapped, while other projects must be more systematically linked in the future. Creation of a working group with representatives from these offices to facilitate cooperation and improve coordination would be a viable option.
- If the Africa Bureau decides to design a succeeding NRMS type project, it should re-evaluate the goal and purpose statements found in NRMS. These statements

currently give little acknowledgement to the role of biodiversity. Project documentation should be more explicit if biodiversity continues to be a major component of future NRM programming.

- Institutional memory, or lack of it, under the current project design is a broadly expressed concern. If AFR/TR designs a follow-on activity, it should ensure that:

- \* Its RSSA arrangement provides for enhanced coordination and communication among biodiversity grantees; that reports and workshop results are disseminated broadly; and that such materials are housed together in an institution that can provide the public with easy access to the information gained through the life of the project. This will require an institutional commitment on the part of the RSSA agency to provide this kind of longer-term support as part of the agreement, and not just serve as a source of personnel for project activities.

- \* AFR/TR must ensure that any future contractors have a long-term commitment to making information available through an information services activity of its own. A plan for long-term access to information must be included in future project activities. This might include dissemination through reports, workshops, conferences, etc., as well as through facilities for researchers to access the information on site in one form or another.

- A future NRMS type project should more specifically address gender issues in the analyses of NRM concerns. Contractors, cooperators, and grantees should be provided with guidance on Agency requirements related to gender issue in agriculture and natural resources. All personnel should be evaluated for performance related to these issues. Project staff should work with the Bureau WID Officer and/or PPC/WID to identify opportunities for collaboration.

- Political realities and reasonable levels of success to date suggest that continuing the PVO biodiversity grants component is both advisable and feasible, with selection of grants based on the criteria of priority, need, feasibility, long-term commitment of the PVO to a project area, and a contribution to the PVO's ongoing activities or priorities. The biodiversity grant activity can continue to be supported through a RSSA arrangement. However, AFR/TR management of the RSSA should be strengthened, and efforts should be established to ensure that a set of additional activities (e.g., reports, workshops, conferences) are supported which will encourage more of a mutual learning curve about successful and unsuccessful approaches to conservation and management of biodiversity.

- Over the long term, continue to work on PVO training where there is a comparative advantage. In any follow-on NRMS activities, consider working only through the Cooperative Agreement in order to reduce potential redundancy and to utilize the learning in the PVO community. This would mean that the existing Cooperative Agreement would have to be expanded in the future to include more countries to provide more coverage, but perhaps in less depth than in the pilot

countries currently being served. In summary, the strategy would be to continue in-depth training in a few countries, expand to other countries to ensure some lesser intensity of training, and work through one mechanism instead of the two existing ones.

- We recommend that the future project locate more technical assistance resources in Africa.
- Whether a NRM<sup>c</sup> type project continues or not, the indicators should be further refined, tested, and applied in the field. The Bureau should make a long-term commitment to provide support to Missions who will still be required to monitor natural resource impacts in their own projects.
- Donor coordination should continue as a part of any future NRM project. Existing examples of assistance to the development of Environmental Strategies (e.g., Rwanda) should continue. The experience in Rwanda might serve as a model for this kind of activity. Donor coordination should remain an A.I.D. direct-hire responsibility. More support for travel for direct-hire personnel is critical.
- The next phase should also include funding for additional regional or sub-regional workshops, project designs, and NRM strategies.

#### 4.3.2. Concerns for Missions

- As new NRM projects are developed at the country level, USAIDs should be expected to develop and apply indicators in their projects. The Missions should provide input into the current development of indicators.
- Missions should also draw on existing NRMS and other Agency resources to establish longer-term, baseline data collection, focusing on natural resources.
- While turnover of Mission staff is a chronic problem, increasing the awareness and training of Mission Directors, Deputy Directors, ADOs, and program staff members about natural resource-related issues can reduce the impact. The intent is to increase the overall level of understanding, through time, so that changes of individuals in Missions will not greatly reduce the ability of a USAID to address natural resource issues.

#### 4.3.3 General Concerns for The Bureau and The Agency

- A.I.D. should continue supporting natural resource management activities at all levels (AFR/TR, REDSO, and the Missions), but perhaps in different and expanded ways from those in the first phase.

- **Funding of natural resource management activities should be re-evaluated within the Agency. More funding should be given directly to Missions to design and implement programs and projects that address natural resource management issues in African countries.**
- **The Agency should also consider providing additional PD&S funds, targeted to natural resource issues so that Missions can have greater flexibility in responding to individual country needs and priorities.**
- **Staff to address natural resources management should be increased in the Agency. This might include:**
  - \* **Using existing staff with natural resource background, training, and/or interest in more efficient ways to increase coverage of NRM issues in the Missions.**
  - \* **More direct-hire staff in Washington, in the REDSOs, and in the field.**
  - \* **Hiring one or more biodiversity specialists (not Environmental Officers) to work in the field. They will serve as field-based personnel who can more easily provide the iterative process of input and feedback for field mission support.**
  - \* **More RSSA staff (with A.I.D. experience) to assist in providing field support out of the Washington office.**
- **While a NRMS type project should play an active role in supporting donor coordination, the Agency should continue to ensure that overall dialogue focuses some attention on the role of natural resources in longer-term, broad-based economic growth and sustainable development. This is beyond the scope of a single project.**
- **The Agency should take stronger steps to integrate natural resource management concepts and techniques in policy dialogue and in Mission, Bureau, and Agency portfolios. Natural resources are the foundation on which almost all development is based. While it is easiest perhaps to see the relationship between agriculture and natural resources, it is nonetheless relevant to look at the relationship with other development activities, including private sector activities, that can have positive or negative impacts on natural resources. Integration is not an easy task. It requires both technical knowledge and the methods of integrating natural resource concerns with any development activity. It also needs political and institutional knowledge and the commitment to ensure that the Agency integrates natural resource management concerns. Political will--more than just to fulfill Congressional mandates--is needed to ensure that the Agency takes appropriate steps to fulfill the spirit of those mandates. Multiple mechanisms exist institutionally to do this. They include reallocating resources (recognizing that cuts will have to occur elsewhere in this time of Gramm-Rudman); hiring more staff; training staff; revising performance**

**evaluations to ensure that all levels of staff have responsibility for the integration of natural resource concerns in policies, programs, and projects; designing projects for ten or more years; and providing incentives to establish sustainable natural resource conservation and management as a basic goal of A.I.D. programming.**

## 5.0 METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

The three-person team fielded by Tropical Research and Development, Inc. conducted this evaluation on an intermittent basis between October and December 1989. For a portion of this time frame all individuals were involved in some other activity. J. Kathy Parker, consultant, taught part-time in the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies and served on a two-week project design consultancy in Belize during this period. John Lichte, a consultant who manages training programs for the University of Florida, participated in a separate four-week evaluation in Mali in October and November. Bob J. Walter, Professor of Geography and Director of Development Studies at Ohio University, maintained a regular schedule of classes. Much of the team's work, both in the field and in the initial drafting of the report, took place during the winter holiday season.

The evaluation started in Washington with interviews, the assembling of documents, and reading during the first week in October, 1989 (see Appendices 2 and 5). The interviews mostly consisted of the three team members interviewing one individual at a time, although occasionally more than one person would be interviewed simultaneously. Following the Washington visit, Walter prepared a work plan, developed a set of issues, drafted cables, and scheduled interviews for the field visits. During the period between the Washington visit and prior to the field visits, each team member read available and appropriate NRMS documents as time permitted. Given the limited amount of time in Washington, a few additional interviews were conducted over the telephone.

The team then traveled as a unit to Kenya and conducted interviews there as in Washington. For the other countries, the team separated--Parker to Rwanda; Lichte to Niger, Mali, and Senegal; and Walter to Botswana. Parker was originally scheduled to travel to Madagascar and Walter to Uganda, but the Missions requested that the consultants not come because of the timing of the field visit and the work load in the USAIDs. Field interviews were based upon the set of issues developed in October and refined by the team in Kenya in November.

Upon returning from the field in mid-December, the team undertook a variety of activities. They presented a preliminary briefing in AID/W on the results of the TDY. Each consultant prepared a profile of their respective countries visited (see Appendix 3). Team members completed the reading of all the relevant project documents of her/his country. To capture project activity, a history of the project (with pertinent financial and other documentation) represents our summation attempt, using documents provided by AFR/TR/ANR and the LOE contractor (see Appendix 4). The team divided the writing of the report, with each member responsible for a particular section in the first draft. All members read and edited the complete draft, adding additional comments and/or detail.

The findings stated in this evaluation and the recommendations made are based on the methodology outlined. They represent the opinions of the team and not necessarily the contractor for this evaluation. All team members concurred with the evaluation findings and recommendations.

SCOPE OF WORK

FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE NATURAL RESOURCES

MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROJECT

I. BACKGROUND

A.I.D. regional project No. 698-0467, Natural Resources Management Support (NRMS) is designed to strengthen the ability of USAID field Missions and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) to design and implement activities supporting improved natural resources management. The project is designed to serve as a catalyst in increasing the natural resource management portfolio in the Africa Bureau, and to improve the planning and execution of the program. The project also expects to achieve parallel improvement in NGO programs and activities. Finally, it is designed to improve funding levels and planning of activities supporting conservation of biological diversity.

II. OBJECTIVE

The objective of the evaluation is to examine the range of activities conducted under this project to date, assess the extent to which they have contributed to achieving the objectives of the NRMS project, and provide recommendations for action that remain. Given Agency and Bureau commitment to support for improved natural resources management, it is essential that the evaluation also take into account the objectives of the Agency Policy Paper on Environment and Natural Resources, and the Bureau Plan for Supporting Natural Resources Management in Sub-Saharan Africa PNRM and describe the contribution of the NRMS Project to achieving the objectives of these policies.

Within the broad objective setting, the evaluation will also consider the effectiveness of the AFR/TR/ANR strategy and the NRMS Project in using natural resource assessments, and special events and studies to generate A.I.D. and other donor involvement and support for natural resources management. It will also examine the effectiveness of NRMS support for NGOs and information dissemination as a means of generating stronger interest and institutional capacities outside of A.I.D. The evaluation will assess the cost effectiveness of the mechanisms used to implement PNRM in comparison with other alternatives. Finally, and possibly most importantly the evaluation will make specific recommendations on the future of the NRMS Project in the context of the overall NRM program direction.

### III. STATEMENT OF WORK

#### A. General Approach

The contractor shall carry out an evaluation of the NRMS project considering both the short and the longer term impacts of project activities. Through review of project documents, interviews with key personnel, and other appropriate means, the contractor shall develop a comprehensive description of how the project has functioned from its start in August 1987 to the present.

Project activities, accomplishments and shortcomings shall be evaluated in terms of the;

1. stated A.I.D. general guidelines and goals and specific objectives outlined in the Project Paper;
2. context in which the activities were carried out (i.e., the economic, social/political, and environmental setting);
3. apparent immediate/near-term impacts and expected longer term consequences of project activities;
4. and implications of project activities for on-going NRMS natural resource support and other Africa Bureau programs.

In conducting the evaluation, the contractor shall interact with current and former Africa Bureau staff, other A.I.D. staff, NRMS contractor staff, and other project participants. Also, the contractor will conduct a thorough review of project management/correspondence with a view to obtaining as much information as possible relating to the effectiveness of project management and implementation. The contractor is charged with developing an independent assessment of NRMS, and not simply reporting the views of others. It is expected that one or more trips to Africa will be undertaken as part of the evaluation.

The contractor shall follow relevant A.I.D. evaluation reporting guidelines. Specifically, the evaluation shall be carried out in a manner consistent with the following A.I.D. documents:

1. A.I.D. Evaluation handbook, April 1987 (A.I.D. Program Design and Evaluation Methodology Report No. 7, PN-AAL-89)
2. Guidelines for Data Collection, Monitoring, and Evaluation Plans for A.I.D. Assisted Projects, April 1987 (A.I.D. Program Designs and Evaluations Methodology Report No. 9, PN-AAL-86).

38

**B. Task Description**

**Task 1. Collect and review relevant NRMS documents, including Africa Bureau program descriptions and plans, the NRMS contractor proposal, NRMS in-house and contractor reports on project activities, and reports, special events proceedings, and trip reports of NRMS-funded activities.**

In addition, it is essential that the contractor review any REDSO or country commentaries on NRMS activities. The findings of any such documents which assess all or part of NRMS effectiveness should be addressed explicitly in this evaluation.

It is expected that the primary sources of documents will be the NRMS level-of-effort contractor -- Energy/Development International (E/DI), the A.I.D. Africa Bureau (AFR/TR/ANR), REDSO/ESA and /WCA offices respectively, and USAID African Missions.

The contractor shall review the documents and note such factors as:

- o project goals and approaches -- how these were initially described and how they are evolving through the course of the project;
- o the various types of activities (assessments, training, special activities, technical assistance) planned, versus those actually implemented;
- o how the approaches to and relative roles of each of the activities is evolving;
- o the outcomes of project activities, both in terms of immediate and expected near term impacts and long term potential impact;

To help ensure completeness, the contractor should list all sources collected as of the end of the first four weeks of the evaluation and submit this list to the Project Office A.I.D. and others as appropriate for comments on any missing relevant documents.

**Task 2.** The contractor shall develop and submit to A.I.D. for review and approval, no later than three weeks after the start of the evaluation, a workplan for carrying out Tasks 3 through 7. The workplan should include an approximate schedule for activities of each of the evaluation team members and any supporting staff.

**Task 3.** Within three weeks from the start of the evaluation the contractor shall develop and provide to A.I.D. for review and comment an interview instrument to be used in a relatively unstructured interview setting for soliciting information and views on NRMS from participants and others familiar with the project. The contractor shall also submit to A.I.D. for review and comment the proposed list of interviewees, within three weeks of the start of the evaluation.

The contractor shall then interview persons knowledgeable about NRMS activities, including current and former A.I.D. direct hires, RSSA staff, contract staff and others (e.g., other donor personnel) in Washington and elsewhere. It is expected that these interviews will take place in various locations in the United States and Africa.

The contractor shall utilize the interviews to extend and verify the information presented in project documents. To the extent that contradictory views are expressed through the interview process, these differences should be explored in follow-up interviews and noted.

**Task 4.** In light of the information developed through work in Tasks 1 and 3, the contractor shall develop a comprehensive overview history of the NRMS project to date, including a description of the following:

a. planned versus actual activity implementation schedules and budgets.

b. overview of specific activities including project management, assessments, contracts and sub-contracts, special studies, special events, technical assistance and other project activities, and the relative share of the different types of activities in receiving project funding, and manpower allocations.

c. the overall context in which the project operated, highlighting relevant developments with regard to: U.S.A.I.D. Mission attitudes towards natural resources, donor and public dialogue about important natural resources policies and issues; NGO and PVO natural resources activities; the activities of other donors; and general Agency and Bureau funding trends and priorities. The extent to which the project responded to and/or influenced these factors should be described. To the extent that exogenous factors had an identifiable impact on the ability of NRMS to successfully carry out project activity, these should be noted.

The report resulting from this task is to be primarily descriptive, rather than evaluative, and is intended to serve as a concise, up-to-date record of project activities and the broader context in which they occurred. This description is expected to be at least five, but probably no more than fifteen, pages in length.

**Task 5.** Proceeding from the project overview developed in Task 4, the contractor shall examine and evaluate specific major NRMS activities, to determine if the NRMS mechanism has been cost effective and/or unique in its ability to meet natural resources programming objectives. The contractor shall determine how successful the NRMS project is in providing "a natural resources management road map" for USAID Missions and the international community. The contractor shall develop a report based on this evaluation, which will serve as the basis for general conclusions about project effectiveness and potential extension and/or modification. Specifically, this evaluation will include, but not be limited to, examination of the following major NRMS activities.

(i) Special studies, including studies focusing on structural adjustment implications for natural resources management, remote sensing analysis of deforestation in central Africa, and carbon dioxide and Global warming.

(ii) Indicators were developed for NRMS activities. Have they been validated? Are they practical at the implementation level? Are they effective?

(iii) Country natural resources management assessments and action plans/programs. Determine the degree of usefulness that each subject document would be to donors who are looking for opportunities to finance natural resources activities in a country. To what extent are these documents presently being used by USAID Missions or the international community?

(iv) biological diversity is one the three priority natural resources technical concerns within the NRMS project. How effective is the Bureau's strategy for biological diversity strategy as presented in State 101683 dated April 1, 1989? How effective is the Bureau in its efforts to coordinate with and provide leadership to PVOs who have an interest in implementing biological diversity activities within the focus of the Bureau's strategy? What is the potential for biological diversity activities to promote rational management of important natural resources while providing opportunities for rural development?

The following biological diversity activities are recommended for review by the NRMS evaluation team: (1) 1987 Madagascar Beza Mahafaly project (World Wildlife Fund); (2) 1988 Uganda Development Through Conservation (World Wildlife Fund/CARE); (3) 1988 Rwanda Nyungwe Forest Management (Wildlife Conservation International); (4) 1988 Rwanda Mountain Gorilla Project (African Wildlife Foundation); and (5) 1987 Mali Inner Niger Delta (International Union For Conservation of Nature).

(v) Buy-ins to Science and Technology Bureau projects (Environmental Policy and Management, Forestry Support Program, others), with particular reference to the efficacy of using the buy-in mode, whether the existence of these S&T Projects facilitated NRMS operations, and whether greater or lesser use of buy-in opportunities is advisable. Of special interest are the buy-ins to support World Resources Institute (CDIE) and their support to World Bank actions.

(vi) Land tenure studies in Uganda - the evaluation should discuss the utility of this effort in fostering natural resources management and protection.

(vii) NRMS coordination with other donors and Tropical Forest Action Plans (TFAP), with specific reference to whether NRMS is an effective mechanism for coordination with other donors and multi-donor action plans (TFAP, World Bank Environmental Action Plans).

3/6

(viii) Funding and strategy for PNRM priority technical concerns: biological diversity, loss of vegetation; and soil fertility/soil loss activities.

(ix) The use of RSSAs (USDA, NPS) and PASAs (Oak Ridge Associated Universities) to provide technical assistance and training to AID/W and the field.

(x) The use of PVOs, such as the African Caribbean Institute, to carry out African Fellows Program as a means of advanced training in natural resources and biodiversity.

(xi) The award of Grants to various conservation groups.

**Task 6.** Based on the work in the preceding tasks, the contractor shall draw conclusions regarding the impacts of the NRMS project to date. This report shall identify problems and recommend solutions. The evaluative report should address, at minimum, the following:

1. How effective NRMS has been in addressing its principle stated purpose of increasing the quality and level of natural resources management activity in Focuc countries and related regional programs, and in PVO programs supported by AID.

2. How effective NRMS has been to date in realizing its expected achievements of incorporating natural resources into Country Development Strategy Statements (CDSSs); planning and preparing the activities described in the CDSSs; planning and funding activities aimed at conservation of biological diversity; and improved planning and execution of natural resources activities by AID Mission, host country, and PVO personnel.

3. The outcomes (immediate, near-term and expected long-term) of each of the general types of activities (e.g., assessments, special studies) undertaken under NRMS and how these outcomes compare to stated project goals (EOPS).

4. The perceptions on the part of respondents (Task 2) regarding the usefulness/success of the various project activities.

5. The effectiveness of the NRMS contractor in management of the project, in reporting and information tracking, and in providing overall technical direction.

6. The effectiveness and appropriateness of the project's managerial structure, particularly the individual roles of AID/W, regional offices, and field-Mission oriented activities.

7. The effectiveness of the working relationships between NRMS contractor personnel, contractor and AID/W staff, contractor and AID/W staff and regional and Mission staff, and general project relationships of the project with the private sector, the NGO community, and other donors.

**Task 7.** Drawing on the preceding tasks, the contractor shall consider the lessons learned from the implementation of the PNRM, NRMS Projects and related activities activities to date in developing recommendations for project modification or extension, with particular focus on funding levels, activity mechanisms, and types of activities.

Finally, the contractor shall submit a Draft Final Report at the end of the third month of the evaluation. This report should include:

1. Executive Summary of the findings and recommendations.
2. Description of the methodology used in the evaluation.
3. A brief overview of NRMS project history and operation.
4. The findings with regard to NRMS project effectiveness, as noted in Task 5.
5. Lessons learned and recommendations for modification or extension.
6. A list of documents reviewed and persons interviewed.

Based on inputs from AID/Washington, the contractor shall produce a final version of the NRMS Mid-Term Evaluation Report by the end of the fourth month.

#### **IV. REPORTING/DELIVERABLES**

The contractor shall submit brief monthly reports to AID/Washington (AFR/TR/ANR with copy to AFR/TR/PRO) on the Evaluation Team's activities. In addition, the contractor shall submit the following reports relating to specific Tasks:

JP

**(Report #)**

- 1. A list of documents collected and reviewed by the contractor at the end of the first four weeks of the evaluation - this shall also be submitted to the project manager for comments on completeness.**
- 2. The evaluation Workplan. To be submitted in four copies by the end of three weeks. The Workplan should describe the approximate schedule, along with the level-of-effort for each team member and support staff. It should also include a statement on the proposed methodology for the interviews and a draft set of questions for use in the interviews. Finally, the work plan should include a proposed set of interviewee. The contractor shall modify the Workplan based on AID/Washington comments.**
- 3. A Draft Final Report shall be submitted to A.I.D. for review and comment in 8 copies by the end of the third month of the evaluation. This should include, in draft format, an Executive Summary. It should also include:  
a) a final, annotated list of all documents reviewed;  
b) the list of persons actually interviewed, the date of the interview, their connection with NRMS, current address, date of re-interview if needed to resolve major issues or conflicting comments, and any other information pertinent to understanding their contribution to the evaluation; c) a concise description of how the NRMS program functioned (see Task 4) and d) an evaluation of project effectiveness with recommendations for improvement.**
- 4. A final report, including an Executive Summary, reflecting AID/Washington comments and revisions within two weeks of receiving A.I.D.'s comments on the Draft Final Report (40 copies).**
- 5. The contractor shall provide a French translation of the Executive Summary of the NRMS Mid-Term Evaluation final report (20 copies).**

## V. TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation will be carried out through an IQC contract. The contractor's team should include the following:

**Team Leader** A senior expert knowledgeable about AID development assistance programs and the design and implementation of multi-sectoral technical assistance and institution-building programs. African experience is essential, natural resources background and the capacity to communicate in French are desirable. Of special importance will be the demonstrable ability of the Team Leader as a forward planner.

The Team Leader will be responsible for overall quality of the evaluation and its individual components. In addition, it is expected that the Team Leader will take responsibility for the development of the workplan, for identifying persons to be interviewed, for assessing the NRMS project outcome relative to goals and NRMS project management. The Team Leader will have primary responsibility for formulating conclusions, generating suggestions for project improvement, and outlining suggested future directions.

**Natural Resource Specialist** The Natural Resource Specialist should be a person with extensive experience in African natural resources planning economics and project implementation with little or no previous connection with the NRMS Project. French language ability highly desirable.

The Natural Resource Specialist will be responsible for technical review of NRMS activities and products. He or she will evaluate the effectiveness of assessments and other project activities in meeting their technical goals and the cumulative effectiveness of these activities in reaching project natural resources goals.

**Social Scientist** This specialist should be familiar with: the socio-economic milieu of SSA and the problems associated with environmental degradation. A.I.D. programs and field operations and be able to critically evaluate the impact of project activities on A.I.D. programming. In addition, the specialist should have experience in Africa with policy and program development and project design, including project tracking and evaluation. The candidate should also have extensive experience working for, or with, NGOs in Africa, preferably in natural resources.

Will also be responsible for evaluating project components dealing with PVOs and information tracking and dissemination. The specialist will also be responsible for sharing interview responsibilities with the Team Leader and Natural Resource Specialist. French speaking capability is essential.

#### VI SCHEDULE

The evaluation will be carried out over a three month period starting with the issuing of the evaluation contract. The submission of the finished version of the NRMS Mid-Term Evaluation Report will be due by the end of the fourth month.

0066a

## **APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEWEES**

### **I. Washington**

- A. U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)**
  - 1. Bureau for Africa (AFR)**
    - a. Office of the Assistant Administrator (AA)-Larry Saiers**
    - b. Office of Technical Resources (TR)-Brian Kline, Lance Jepson, Abdul Wahab, Ben Stoner, Dwight Walker, Bessie Boyd, John Gaudet, Mike McGahuey, Greg Booth, Don MacKensie, Randy Roeser**
    - c. Office of Development Planning (DP)-Emmy Simmons, Cindy Clapp-Wincek**
    - d. Office of the Sahel & West Africa (SWA)-John Lewis**
  - 2. Bureau for Science & Technology (S&T)**
    - a. Office of Rural Development (RD)-Gloria Steele**
    - b. Office of Forestry, Environment, & Natural Resources (FENR)-Carl Gallegos**
    - c. Office of Agriculture (AGR)-Ray Meyer**
- B. Energy/Development International (E/DI)-Kjell Christophersen, Asif Shaikh, Bruce Ross**
- C. Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI)-Chris Seubert, Chris Brown, Karen McKay, Robert Otto**
- D. World Wildlife Fund (WWF)-Mike Wright, and Experiment in International Living (EIL)-Mike Brown, Kathryn Razi**
- F. World Resources Institute-Robert Winterbottom**
- G. Forestry Support Program (FSP)-Julia Morris**

### **II. Kenya**

- A. REDSO/East-Robert McColaugh, Richard Edwards, David Gibson**
- B. USAID/Kenya-Eric Zollman, Jim Dunn, Carol Steele, Enid Speilman**
- C. African Wildlife Foundation (AWF)-Deborah Snelson, Gary Tabor**
- D. World Wildlife Fund (WWF)-Hugh Lamprey, Ed Wilson**

- E. **Wildlife Conservation International (WCI)-David Western, Christopher Gakahu**

**III. Botswana**

- A. **USAID/Eotswana-John Hummon, John Roberts, C.J. Rushin-Bell, Barbara Belding**
- B. **Kalahari Conservation Society-Peter Hancock**
- C. **GOB, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Wildlife Utilization Unit-David Lawson**

**IV. Rwanda**

- A. **USAID/Rwanda-Jim Graham, Paul Crawford, Antoine Ruzigamanzi, Roloeff Sikkens (contractor)**
- B. **World Bank-Djibril Aw**
- C. **Peace Corps-Dave Vekasy, Katie Offut**
- D. **Wildlife Conservation International (WCI)-Rob Clausen**
- E. **GOR, Ministry of Planning-Andre Rwamakuba**
- F. **Mountain Gorilla Project-Craig Sholley**
- G. **Fishculture Project-Pelagie Nyirahabimana**

**V. Ivory Coast**

- A. **REDSO/West-Robert Hanchett, Charles Moseley**

**VI. Niger**

- A. **USAID/Niger-George Eaton, George Taylor, John Mitchell, Mike Kerst, Erna Kerst, Roger Bloom, Commandant Moussa Saley**
- B. **Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere (CARE)-Joe Kessler, Marshall Burk, James Sumberg**
- C. **Lutheran World Relief-Lou Beers**
- D. **Consultants-Fred Sowers, Tom Price, Steve Dennison**

**VII. Mali**

- A. USAID/Mali-Jon Bressler, David Atwood, Tracy Atwood, Wayne McDonald, Modibo Traore, Tadisse Kibreab
- B. Peace Corps-Julie Morris
- C. CARE-Lisa Nichols
- D. International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)-Mamadou Cisse
- E. E/DI & DAI-Ken Cohen, Chris Seubert

**VIII. Senegal**

- A. USAID/Senegal-James Bonner, Phil Jones, Gil Haycock, Charles Shorter, Bob Gilson, Bob Hammink

**IX. Gambia**

- A. USAID/Gambia-Don Drga

**X. Others**

- A. Bill Weber (Wildlife Conservation International), Alison Richards and Russell Barbour (Yale University), Amy Vedder (Fordham University), and Fred Weber (consultant).

## APPENDIX 3: COUNTRY PROFILES

### NRMS Country Profile: BOTSWANA

#### Products Completed

- a. "Biological Diversity Assessment," 9/88 by Lee Hannah, A.I.D.; Gary Wetterberg, FSP; and Leroy Duval, FSP.
- b. "Action Program and Plan," 2/89 by Kjell Christophersen, E/DI; Peter Warshall, Arizona; Scott McCormick, ARD; and Lee Hannah, A.I.D.
- c. "Natural Resources Management Project" (No. 690-0251), 8/89, Robert Otto, DAI; Lee Hannah, A.I.D.; and others.

#### Context and Activities Prior to NRMS Project

Botswana is a small, landlocked country about the size of Texas, with a population of 1.3 million. It is largely an arid to semi-arid land, which undergoes periodic droughts. Rainfed agriculture occurs in a narrow strip along the southeast edge of the country, although it is at risk during periods of drought. The major contributor to the gross domestic product (GDP) is diamond mining, but the majority of the population is rural and dependent on cattle. The most important natural resources are grasses and water, but management of grasses and rangeland are very sensitive political issues and thus not a part of the USAID portfolio. Nonetheless, there exists large quantities of information on natural resources and the issues surrounding them; consequently natural resource management (NRM) issues are well established in the country.

The Government of Botswana (GOB) has a well developed set of natural resource objectives and policies. In the National Development Plan VI, a major GOB policy is the initiation of "further planning of the management of natural resources." Well managed natural resources are seen as contributing significantly to the national objectives of rapid economic growth, social justice, economic independence, and sustained development. Finally, the GOB has several specific policies and strategies concerning natural resources, the most relevant being the National Wildlife Conservation Policy (approved in 1986) and the National Conservation Strategy (NCS) (now under Cabinet consideration). As a consequence of government interest and concern, the country has one of the best systems of environmental baseline information in Africa.

The USAID strategy in Botswana has recently focused on three initiatives: (a) education/skills training, (b) work force training, and (c) employment generation (see Congressional Presentation (CP) FY 87 and 88). For FY 89, emphasis on the private sector for employment generation and policy dialogue were added (CP FY 89). In the Limited Country Development Strategy Statement (CDSS) for FY 91, USAID added a natural resources management (NRM) project component which is part of a regional project involving Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Malawi and coordinated with the Southern Africa

Development Coordinating Conference (SADCC). This NRM activity has become a "target of opportunity" in the mission's program objective tree. In Botswana it is apparent from the project paper, other Mission documents, and interviews that for USAID, "natural resources" (in NRMS terms) have been defined primarily in terms of biological diversity and wildlife, with a special concern for the future of elephants.

### NRMS Project Activities

NRMS has provided two kinds of assistance to USAID. First is technical assistance in the form of a RSSA, Lee Hannah. Hannah has traveled to the Mission several times, holding numerous talks with Mission personnel, GOB representatives, and individuals from the PVO/NGO community. He has participated in all the documents produced by the NRMS project in Botswana. His contribution was praised, called indispensable, and highly valued. Not only was his contribution one of substance in terms of ideas and dialogue presented, but Hannah also provided technical assistance when the Mission had no source of funds to access such help. Similar comments (in terms of quality of personnel, background, and skills) were forthcoming about the E/DI Action Program/Plan team; however, this team was in-country once and then on a very tight time frame. From the Mission's perspective, their contribution was far less significant than Hannah's under the RSSA.

Unfortunately, the Mission did not believe the products of NRMS were particularly useful. USAID felt that the biodiversity study was not needed, given the wealth of environmental/ecological information available in Botswana. Likewise, the Mission did not feel that the Action Program and Action Plan were useful and thus USAID effectively dismissed them, even though the process of producing the Program and Plan (albeit in a short period) was valuable and contributed to planning for Botswana's part in the regional NRM project. Mission staff reported that the E/DI team was effective in coordinating and conducting meetings with the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), and credited them with reversing the initially negative tone and outcome to a positive situation.

In many respects, the USAID was "ahead of the curve" on natural resources issues. They had begun discussions on these issues three years ago and contributed, as possible, to the development of NCS and to the country's leading natural resources NGO, The Kalahari Conservation Society (KCS). NRMS TA (in the form of Hannah) was critical in crystallizing Mission ideas. These will be implemented in the NRM project, which for Botswana emphasizes community-based natural resources management. It possesses numerous innovative features and has the potential for groundbreaking in the community-based resources management area.

## **NRMS Country Profile: GAMBIA**

(Note: This profile results from a limited interview done by telephone. There was insufficient time and funds for the evaluation team to visit.)

### Products Completed

- a. "Opportunities for Sustained Development: Successful Natural Resources Management in the Sahel," 10/88, by Asif Shaikh, E/DI; Eric Arnould, ARD; Kjell Christophersen, E/DI; Roy Hagen, E/DI; Joseph Tabor, E/DI; Peter Warshall, Arizona.
  - Volume I, Main Report
  - Volume II, Case Descriptions
  - Volume III, Financial Analysis
  - Volume IV, Biodiversity
- b. "The Gambia Natural Resource Management Action Program," 4/89, by G. Edward Karch, E/DI; Eric Arnould, ARD; and Chris Seubert, DAI.
- c. "The Gambia Natural Resource Management Action Plan," 4/89, by G. Edward Karch, Eric Arnould, and Chris Seubert

### NRMS Project Activities

In contrast to the other three Sahelian Missions, the Mission in The Gambia was delighted with the NRMS project and the in-country activities which it has sponsored. This includes the "Opportunities" study, the Action Program, and the Action Plan. The Mission was pleased with the mix of disciplines and with the experience and professionalism of the team. The ministries involved in natural resource issues are using the Action Program/Action Plans even though it is not clear that they will have the means to incorporate the results into a program for The Gambia.

Prior to the arrival of the Action Program/Action Plan team, USAID/Gambia had received a proposal from the government to fund a National Park. The Mission did not fund the proposal, and after discussion the government asked that the Park be included in topics considered during the visit of the NRMS team. The Vice-President went even further and joined the NRMS team during part of its travel in The Gambia. The Action Program/Action Plans were thus developed through a combination of Gambian and NRMS team contributions. This element makes it different from the process in most other countries.

The Mission commented that the institutional structure of NRM in The Gambia is very complex, being spread over five different ministries. The result of the NRMS process might have been much less positive without the personal participation of the Vice-President.

**The Gambia has two projects with NRM components. The Gambian Agricultural Research and Diversification (GARD) project is trying to incorporate natural resource considerations into agricultural production. The Mission also has a Soil and Water Management project staffed by personnel from the Soil Conservation Service (SCS). The Mission indicated that the visit of a high-level delegation including several ministers and directors to Soil Conservation Service (SCS) activities in the United States was stimulated by the NRMS activities.**

## **NRMS Country Profile: KENYA**

### **Products Completed**

- a. Report to USAID/Kenya: Natural Resources Management Support Project by Louis Berger International, Inc.
  - Working Paper No. 1--"The Status of Natural Resources in Kenya," 9/88, by Theuri Njoka, William Gibbons, Peter Dewees, and David Kamweti.
  - Working Paper No. 2--"Policies, Legislation, Institutions, and Activities in Natural Resource Sectors in Kenya," 9/88.
  - Working Paper No. 3--"Opportunities and Recommendations for USAID Support for Natural Resources Protection, Management, and Development in Kenya," 9/88.
- d. "Natural Resources/Biological Diversity/Forestry Sector Assessment," 9/88, by Peter Dewees, Theuri Njoka, Wm. Gibbons, and David Kamweti--all of Louis Berger International, Inc.
- c. "Kenya Action Program," 6/89, by Kjell Christophersen E/DI; Thomas Catterson, ARD; Ernest Ables, DAI; and Ratemo Michieka, University of Nairobi.
- d. "Alternatives to Natural Resources Programming: USAID/Kenya," 6/89, by Kjell Christophersen, E/DI; Thomas Catterson, ARD; Ernest Ables, DAI; and Ratemo Michieka, University of Nairobi.

### **Context and Activities Prior to NRMS Project**

Kenya is a country slightly larger than Texas with a current population estimated at twenty-four million (pending announcement of the census taken in August, 1989). This population is growing rapidly, estimated at 4.1 percent in 1989, and has had the highest rate of crude natural increase in the world in the 1980s. The impact of this growth is compounded by two facts. First, approximately eighty-two percent of Kenya's area is considered arid and semi-arid and not productive agriculturally; and second, approximately eighty-one percent of Kenya's population is rural and agricultural. This results in ninety-five percent of the population living on less than twenty percent of the land area which has a medium-to-high potential for agriculture.

There is obviously very great pressure, but this should not necessarily be viewed in the conventional Malthusian way--agricultural land is most productive and best utilized, for example, where population pressures are highest. The major contributor to the GDP is tourism; agriculture (primarily coffee and tea) is second. As tourism is focused mostly on Kenya's wildlife and scenic areas (beaches), biodiversity (i.e., elephant, rhino, and wildlife management in general) is a key natural resource issue. Most of the population engaged

in agriculture sees little direct benefit from tourism (except service jobs)--for this majority, the most critical natural resources are soil and water, with soil erosion and water management comprising the two key management issues.

The Government of Kenya (GOK) has a high level of commitment to natural resources and to improving the management policies. The most recent development plan (1989-1993) reflects this trend as does the creation of a new ministry to deal specifically with the arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL). Certain donors have long-established and good records of working in specific areas--e.g., Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) with soil erosion/conservation; the World Bank with forestry, etc. Finally, a plethora of PVOs/NGOs exists in Kenya, many of which are involved in some dimension of natural resources. The Berger Natural Resources/Biological Diversity/Forestry Sector Assessment estimates that there are 400 such organizations.

The USAID strategy in Kenya has focused on three or four primary areas (see CP FY 87, 88, and 89). These include family planning (or reducing high fertility and dependency ratios), private sector initiatives, policy dialogue, and agricultural research aimed at increasing food production per capita. USAID has had past projects which address natural resources (renewable energy, agroforestry, and land use planning) and has provided grants for specific natural resources activities but currently has no directly focused bilateral effort. A PVO Co-Financing project has earmarked one million dollars (out of twelve million LOP funding) for NGO implementation in natural resources. The Mission is currently preparing a new, five year CDSS and intends to include a "target of opportunity" (in program objective tree terms) NRM project. This proposed project is just now beginning. It appears that for USAID, natural resources in Kenya will mean biodiversity, specifically wildlife conservation and national parks. This will become the donor "niche" available to the Mission, with specific focus on environmental education and planning.

### NRMS Project Activities

NRMS has provided assistance to USAID in a variety of ways. It assisted with the funding for the natural resources assessment study and the biological diversity report, produced the Action Program/Plan documents, and provided funding for grants to natural resources institutions for agroforestry related work. There has been relatively minor amounts of general TA (of the RSSA type).

The products of the NRMS project has been of variable utility to the Mission. The Berger study, while covering the broad range of natural resources issues in Kenya, was of limited use for two primary reasons. First, it gave emphasis to areas where the Mission had no comparative advantage and further where other donors were well established (e.g., commercial forestry and the World Bank). Second, the study was unclear on ideas about where the Mission could go with a natural resource project or activity. USAID indicated that it needed such direction and would not have expanded beyond its current natural resource-related portfolio of agricultural production, research and training without AID/W pressure. Their initial response to this pressure was to highlight the natural resource management aspects of the existing portfolio. USAID then decided to focus on issues of

tourism, parks, and poaching via the NRMS biological diversity component. E/DI, the NRMS contractor, was to produce an Action Program/Plan to assist the mission develop this idea.

The final result was less than a success for a number of reasons. The process of producing the program/plan was problematic. USAID wanted the contractor to provide a plan based on the Berger study background and the biodiversity issue. The NRMS approach, developed in Sahelian studies and focused on successful activities, did not seem applicable. Therefore, the Mission expressed concerns about the contractor team's scope of work (SOW). The issue was largely between USAID and AID/W. A second problem was in the timeliness of the study. USAID put pressure on E/DI and perhaps rushed the study too much. The technical areas of the team, while composed of competent individuals, were not entirely appropriate for biodiversity/parks focus. Also, a personality conflict arose between USAID and team. Finally, and most importantly, the Mission did not see the product (Program/Plan) as useful because it presented alternatives rather than a plan, and appeared to satisfy a Washington need rather than the Mission's.

Nonetheless, the Mission is continuing to plan a natural resources project and the NRMS activity hastened this process. They have added this possibility to their portfolio as a "target of opportunity." This clearly would not have been done without NRMS, although the potential contribution of NRMS seems less than it should have been.



## **NRMS Country Profile: MALI**

### **Products Completed**

- a. "Opportunities for Sustained Development" (see Gambia for full citation)
- b. "Biological Diversity Assessment," 4/89, by Peter Warshall, University of Arizona.
- c. "Mali Action Program," 1/88, by Donald Humpal, DAI; Eric Arnould, University of Arizona; Robert Hanchett, REDSO/WCA; Edward Karch, E/DI; and Mike McGahuey, AFR/TR/ANR.
- d. "Mali Draft Action Plan," 1/88, by Donald Humpal, DAI; Eric Arnould, University of Arizona; Robert Hanchett, REDSO/WCA; and Edward Karch, E/DI.
- e. NRMS supported the evaluation, and particularly the economic analysis, of the Village Reforestation Project, 1988.

### **Context and Activities Prior to NRMS Project**

The focus of NRM in a country and a Mission's propensity to address NRM issues (but not necessarily participate in NRMS) seem to be related to the current environmental situation as well as to historical factors. In Mali, NRM activities have a very strong sustainable agriculture focus, because even with the reduced rainfall over the last 15 years the country still has a productive agricultural sector. USAID/Mali has a small forestry project, but lack of fuelwood is not nearly the crisis it is in some Sahelian countries. An important part of the Mission portfolio is concentrated on agricultural and livestock production and agricultural research. USAID/Mali did develop (PID and PP) a substantial forestry project in 1984-85. For reasons unknown to current Mission staff, USAID never obligated the project. The limited programming in forestry and other areas of NRM, at least in part, relate to the trauma which must have accompanied the failure to obligate funds for this forestry project.

### **NRMS Project Activities**

USAID/Mali was the first of the Sahelian Missions to participate in the Action Program/Action Plan process. USAID/Mali originally rejected the idea of participating in the "Opportunities for Sustainable Development" study, but AFR/TR pressured the Mission to cooperate. The Mission now accepts that the "Opportunities" study provides useful information, even though it does not feel that the study substituted for a NRM assessment. The Mission believes that the original SOW for the "Opportunities" team, to which the Mission agreed, called for a NRM assessment, not the inventory of promising solutions which AID/W calls the Sahel Sub-Regional Assessment.

The Mission does not believe that the Action Program and Action Plan has been very useful nor that it has served Mission objectives. The Mission liked the experience and professionalism of the team members, but not the Washington agenda with which the team worked nor the paper products which they produced. The Mission agreed to the exercise primarily to avoid potential conflict with, and to reduce pressure from, AID/W. Because the Mission was not very involved in the Action Program/Action Plan and the results did not respond to Mission needs, the paper product has not served as a catalyst for dialogue and has not lead to NRM programming within the Mission. Neither the "Opportunities" study nor the Action Program address what is presently being done in Mali with regard to NRM, the scope of NRM problems, nor priorities among those problems based on the Mali situation. The four 500,000 ha Local Resource Management Strategies in the Action Program, on which the team performed economic analyses, would require project activity beyond the scope of anything which the GRM and combined donors could possibly envision, much less plan for and implement. Given the vast scope of these strategies and the lack of priorities among the four strategies, the Mission does not consider them (nor the Action Program) relevant to Mission programming. In what appears to be tacit recognition of this problem, the Mali Draft Action Plan does not even address these Local Resource Management Strategies. The Action Plan is not a refinement of the Action Program; in fact, there appears to be little relationship between the two documents. It is also not clear that it was necessary to do the "Opportunities" study or the Mali Action Program in order to produce the content of the Mali Draft Action Plan. It is not obvious that the Action Plan draws directly on ideas, concepts, or the results of the alleged "assessment" and the Action Program.

The NRMS process still has not provided any assessment of the scope and magnitude of NRM problems in Mali. The NRMS PP suggested a very logical sequence of activity:

1. Choice of priorities based on a problem assessment (Assessment)
2. Identification of proposed solutions to priority problems (Action Program)
3. Choice of activities which the Mission could realistically undertake to implement proposed solutions to one or more priority problems (Action Plan)

However, this logical sequence has not been applied in Mali.

Mali was the first country to complete the NRMS process of Assessment, Action Program, and Action Plan. The process established the model which other Missions reviewed in determining whether they wanted to participate in NRMS. USAID/Mali and other Missions judged that: 1) there had been no true assessment in Mali, 2) there was little relationship between the Action Program and Action Plan, 3) the logical sequence of activities had not been respected, and 4) the results did not respond to Mission needs and therefore were not particularly useful. These conclusions had a very negative impact on the desire of other Missions to participate in the same process.

**Mike McGahuey (NRMS RSSA) visited the Mali Mission in November, 1989, and took the time to discuss NRM issues within the Mission and with GRM officials. Mission personnel report that this visit had a more positive impact on the Mission, and its interest in programming activities to address NRM issues, than the Action Program/Action Plan. USAID values project TA (as did Botswana), who have time and opportunity to act as catalyst.**

## **NRMS Country Profile: NIGER**

### **Products Completed**

- a. "Opportunities for Sustained Development" (see Gambia for full citation)
- b. "Natural Resources Management Action Program," 9/88, by Francois Vezina, USAID/Niger.
- c. NRMS supported (before contractor selected) the evaluation of the Niger Forestry and Land Use Planning (FLUP) Project, December, 1987.
- d. NRMS supported the Natural Resources Management Amendment (PAD Amendment No. III) to the Niger Agricultural Sector Development Grant, June, 1989.

### **Context and Activities Prior to NRMS Project**

Niger and USAID/Niger have a long history of programs in NRM. In contrast to Mali, Niger has only a narrow rim of land along its southern edge where, over the last fifteen years, the land has been consistently productive. Even before the present decrease in rainfall began, Niger faced a serious fuelwood shortage. USAID/Niger became involved in reforestation activities around Niamey during the mid-1960s. The Peace Corps has also had important forestry activities in Niger since that time. The CARE and Peace Corps Maggia Valley windbreak activity dates from 1975. Over time observers agree that reforestation efforts were not sufficient to address fuelwood problems and that natural forestry management activities would also be necessary. Based on this history, USAID/Niger designed the Forestry Land Use Planning (FLUP) project which was authorized in 1979. Continued until 1988, this project had a stormy history and was threatened with termination following a mid-term evaluation. The project was unsuccessful in institutionalizing the planning capacity developed by the project. However, several "model sites" were developed in the project based on the Peace Corps experience in Niger, including one at the Guesselbodi National Forest outside Niamey. Although not apparent until near the end of the project, the final evaluation considers the model sites as technical successes. The Guesselbodi experience is the first known example of joint stewardship/management between the government and a farmers cooperative. The success of, and lessons learned, from Guesselbodi are that benefits from wood sales, hay sales, and pasture permits are sufficient to cover the recurring costs of managing the forest. While the FLUP PP states that any benefits accruing from the model sites would be "incidental," its reputation for success is based on direct benefits that the project provided. This contradiction helps explain why the FLUP project was terminated while others are attempting to replicate the Guesselbodi experience across the Sahel.

This history also helps explain why, when NRM is mentioned in Niger, people respond by talking about agro-forestry and forestry activities. Soil and water conservation are

extremely important in Niger and there is much activity in the area of erosion control and water harvesting. The "Opportunities" study recognizes a number of promising techniques in this area developed in Niger. USAID projects, among many others, use such techniques in both agricultural and forestry management activities. But the Mission, and Niger in general, take soil and water conservation issues for granted, while they pay more attention to natural forestry management and agro-forestry. This is because soil and water conservation are subsumed under the other two topics.

Over the last few years, the Mission has concentrated many of its agriculturally related activities in the Agricultural Sector Development Grant (ASDG I). Following the final evaluation of FLUP, the Mission attempted to design a follow-up project but was not satisfied with the results. Instead it chose to channel funding and effort available for a follow-up project into a NRM amendment to ASDG I. This provides bridge-funding to continue some of the existing NRM activities until ASDG II is developed. The ASDG approach allows the Mission to support promising PVO NRM activities without having to authorize a separate project for each one. Although the Mission expects GON agencies such as the Direction of Environment (the location of the past FLUP activity) to submit proposals for funding, it has earmarked thirty percent of ASDG II counterpart funds for PVO/NGOs. This keeps pressure on the GON to be more accepting of PVO/NGO NRM related efforts, in spite of its historical reticence to deal with them. The ASDG approach also allows USAID/Niger to keep pressure on the GON with respect to land and tree tenure, taxes, permit fees, and other NRM policy issues.

### NRMS Project Activities

After reviewing the Mali experience and the Mali Action Program and Action Plan, the Mission rejected the AFR/TR-driven NRMS process as inappropriate, of limited utility, and as not responding to Mission needs. Instead, the Mission began a dialogue among Senior Staff and hired consultants (mostly local) to contribute to an Action Program/Action Plan. The Niger action program included an inventory of all Donor and GON activities related to NRM. It reviewed the Mission portfolio and natural resource management-related activities or components already under way. A final section proposed local resource management strategies in much the same target format as used in the Mali Action Plan (i.e., 500,000 ha of one activity, and 500,000 ha of another, over a 20-year period). The Mission rejected this as inappropriate for programming and planning activities. The Mission will do a new NRM Action Plan during the design of the new ASDG II. This plan will specifically take into account the objectives of the Mission as well as the financial and institutional constraints of both the Mission and Niger.

## **NRMS Country Profile: RWANDA**

### **Products Completed**

(Note: Because of a lost suitcase, we lack full citation and a complete list of products completed.)

- a. Regional Workshop on Afromontane Forests
- b. Natural Resources Management Issues in Rwanda, by Bob Winterbottom, IIED; Greg Booth, NRMS/RSSA; Amy Vedder, Fordham; Roloeff Sikkens, USAID; Paul Hanagreefs; Susan Huke.
- c. Natural Resources Management Project Paper

### **Context and Activities Prior to NRMS Project**

Rwanda faces a range of environmental and natural resource management problems. These include decreasing soil fertility, increasing soil erosion, unsound development of wetlands (marais), increasing population, scarce arable resource base, destruction of natural forests and biological diversity, inadequate natural resource policies, and weak institutions.

USAID/Rwanda has a good record within the Africa Bureau for its support of natural resource management activities. The Mission has funded a number of natural resource management-related activities over the past few years which address some of these issues. Mission funds have supported family planning efforts that include institutional strengthening, fish culture, and farming systems research. Forestry, agroforestry, and soil conservation issues have been addressed through the recently completed Ruhengeri Resources Analysis and Management (RRAM) Project. While a number of these projects will terminate during the next few years, some of their activities will be incorporated into the Natural Resource Management Project (NRMP), described below.

Current Mission strategic objectives (as defined in February 1989 and reflected in the FY 1990-1991 Action Plan) suggest a strong link between natural resources and development. These objectives are: sustained broad-based increase in rural per capita income, reduced rates of fertility, and sustained increases in agricultural production. Also, the Mission acknowledges its record in natural resource management by stating that:

In addition to several projects supporting sustainable agriculture, the Mission has directly fostered natural resource development in agroforestry, soil conservation and wetland management. Because of Rwanda's environmental importance, it has become a Group I emphasis country under AID/W's Natural Resources Management strategy (Action Plan, p. 23).

**These mission activities have generated and/or supported a number of other donor activities, including Canadian funding of an agricultural improvement project and Dutch funding for the second phase of the co-funded USAID/Netherlands CARE-Gituzo Forestry Project.**

### **NRMS Project Activities**

**The Natural Resource Management Support Project funded by AFR/TR has supported a variety of NRM-related activities in Rwanda. These include:**

- **Support for the design of the USAID Natural Resource Management Project (NRMP), including support for two different design teams, a resident advisor for a period of time, and for a conference to coordinate project development with Government of Rwanda (GOR) interests and abilities.**
- **A biodiversity grant to the Mountain Gorilla Project for its Conservation Education Program (Interpretive Center, resources, and research library, gift shop)-\$88,000 total but with some overhead removed for WWF.**
- **A biodiversity grant to Nyungwe Forest Reserve for research and conservation education--approximately \$127,000 over two years.**
- **Support for a regional workshop on Afromontane Forests.**
- **Support for a TDY by Bob Winterbottom (WRI) to work on the development of the World Bank's Environmental Strategy in conjunction with the GOR.**

**The Mission has now approved a Natural Resource Management Project with five major components:**

1. **Training and research in the marais (research on water management, land tenure, problems of land improvement, markets and socioeconomics, etc. with the general purpose of improving wetland management for agriculture).**
2. **Integrated fish culture in the marais (continued support for research, training, and extension on fish culture).**
3. **Agroforestry and soil conservation (focused on conserving natural resources while increasing agricultural production).**
4. **Natural forest management/biodiversity (which directly responds to Congressional mandates for sustained development, including support for: The Conservation Education program of the Mountain Gorilla Project, with the condition that the African Wildlife Foundation be the implementing agency; the Digit Fund's research program; and the research and conservation education programs of the Nyungwe Forest Reserve.**

5. **Environmental planning (to support the GOR in its efforts to implement recommendations in the Environmental Strategy).**

### **Response to NRMS Support**

USAID/Rwanda has generally expressed positive feelings about NRMS support. The Mission continues to be interested in NRMS support for its natural resource management activities. NRMS support was critical for the development of the NRMP and was very helpful on supporting work in the Environmental Strategy. The Mission will work to meet new targets of opportunity for natural resources management, and will tie funding into a close manageable package. The Mission would like to be able to continue to tap resources from NRMS or a natural resources targeted PD&S source of funds.

The Mission, however, expressed several concerns, principally about the management and focus of NRMS. Concerns related to AFR/TR management of NRMS include, but are not limited to:

- a. poor cable writing skills;
- b. loss or misplacement of cables;
- c. unresponsiveness to Mission input on a proposal for a study of constraints to tourism;
- d. lack of information about who is among the broad cast of actors implementing NRMS activities under the Project's contract, cooperative agreement, and biodiversity grants;
- e. lack of notification that the biodiversity grants had been approved (the implications of Mission surprise and/or potential embarrassment if, confronted by the GOR, are obvious);
- f. lack of information from AFR/TR about other projects in the Agency that might support natural resource management activities (e.g., the S&T biodiversity project); and
- g. lack of AFR/TR monitoring of the use of NRMS funds given to the Mission.

Concerns related to the focus of NRMS include the need to re-evaluate the Bureau's Natural Resource Management Plan (NRMP) and to focus scarce funds on topics that are of more regional, rather than single, Mission concern. These consist of broader issues in which more than one country and Mission might have an interest and an individual Missions might not be able to fund adequately alone. They would include such topics as afro-montane forest management, the environmental implications of the cure for river blindness, and natural resource economics theory.

The Government of Rwanda's response (as reflected in discussions with Dr. Andre Rwamakuba of the Ministry of Planning's Direction of Environment) to NRMS support was generally positive. Rwamakuba felt that Winterbottom's participation in the World Bank-supported Environmental Strategy was extremely helpful. The World Bank coordinator for

**the Environmental Strategy (Djibril Aw) seconded this opinion. He looks forward to future AID support for natural resource activities in Rwanda.**

**Craig Sholley (field officer at the Mt. Gorilla Project) applauded USAID/Rwanda's approach to address biodiversity issues in Rwanda; i.e., in terms of learning the technical issues, recognizing that the Mission personnel do not have expertise in biodiversity issues, and in attempting to identify and work with experts who do know what to do. Sholley was not sure of the nature of NRMS support to the Mt. Gorilla Project because it had been negotiated by the African Wildlife Foundation offices in the US; he originally thought that the funds had come from the US Fish and Wildlife Service through the World Wildlife Fund. In general, NRMS support to the park's conservation education program has contributed to its better management.**

**Rob Clausen (Wildlife Conservation International, Nyungwe) noted that the NRMS biodiversity grant has served as a significant springboard for the Reserve's future planned activities. He feels that the Reserve has generally favorable potential, but does not want to see blank checks come into the Reserve. USAID/Rwanda will continue to support Nyungwe activities through a grant under the Natural Resource Management Project.**

## **NRMS Country Profile: SENEGAL**

### **Products Completed**

- a. "Opportunities for Sustained Development" (see Gambia for full citation)

### **Context and Activities Prior to NRMS Project**

There has been a serious disagreement between the Senegal Mission and AID/W regarding the definition of NRM and how one counts the percentage of Mission funding devoted to NRM. In the USAID/Senegal NRM Action Plan, the Mission reports the following "NRM projects as a percentage of total obligations":

<u>FY 88</u>	<u>FY 89</u>	<u>FY 90</u>
33	50	58

During interviews in Washington in October, the evaluation team heard the figure range between two and three percent.

The evaluation team does not understand entirely what these differences represent. A serious disagreement and a lack of communication between the Mission and Washington does exist. Some members of the Senegal Mission were not aware that water/watershed management were not considered NRM priorities by Washington. The NRM coordinator also claimed that the Mission had never received copies of the "Opportunities" study, even though Senegal was one of the countries covered in the study. (The evaluation team member visiting Senegal left a copy of all four volumes of the "Opportunities" study with the NRM coordinator.) Hopefully, the new USAID Director in Senegal will be able to resolve some of these communication/relationship problems.

Even without considering water/watershed management, the Senegal Mission has several important NRM related projects in its portfolio. These include an agroforestry and soil conservation project in the groundnut basin, a reforestation project, and several specific NRM components in the agricultural research project presently being designed.

Senegal seems to be disadvantaged by the narrow definition of priorities in the PNRM. Much of Senegal is quite dry, particularly since the drought, and this has emphasized the importance of its river resources. Over the last 20 years, Senegal and USAID/Senegal have been involved in a number of national and regional irrigation, water management and watershed management projects. While such activities would normally be included in any broad definition of NRM, they are not priority areas within the PNRM. Yet looking at the Senegal situation, it seems obvious why the river resources were deemed important and why their development attract funding from USAID/Senegal and other donors. This situation in Senegal underlines the need for AFR/TR to review the PNRM with significant input from the Missions, to determine what definition of NRM is appropriate.

## NRMS Project Activities

Like Niger, the Senegal Mission reviewed the Action Program/Action Plan done in Mali and considered both the product and the process inappropriate, not useful, and not responsive to Mission needs. Likewise, USAID/Senegal also produced its own NRM Action Plan based on a process of dialogue within the Mission. The NRM Action Plan lays out a process to be followed by the Mission. The Mission will do a NRM assessment in early 1990, using a combination of IQC contractors and Washington (NRMS) support. This will follow an agricultural sector assessment. The Mission believes that an assessment of existing problems and potentials is critical to appropriate NRM programming. The Mission does not believe that this was done by the "Opportunities" study nor by the Action Program/Action Plan process used in Mali, nor by the NRMS process in general. By using an IQC contractor, the Mission plans to access expertise in subjects like water quality and quantity which are not provided by NRMS. Using a contractor also helps the Mission maintain control over the team's SOW, rather than losing that control to Washington as appears to have happened in many of the NRMS activities.

## APPENDIX 4: PROJECT HISTORY

The background to the Natural Resources Management Support (NRMS) Project involves a series of forces and actions which derive from the early and mid-1980s. About 1985, three things came together. 1) The Worldwatch Institute published a document on the African environmental situation, which drew wide attention to the issue. Nearly simultaneously, the Ethiopian famine, as well as the larger one in Africa generally, gained great publicity through the television media and fundraising efforts. 2) As a consequence, Congress and relief organizations got interested in the African situation. The Office of Technology Assessment conducted a study, at Congress's request. 3) A group of individuals in A.I.D. grew increasingly concerned about natural resource issues in Africa and the lack of an Africa Bureau program on natural resources management.

As a consequence of these activities, AFR commissioned an analysis in 1985-86, supervised and edited by Freeman. As this technical analysis was being done, environmental groups became alarmed by A.I.D.'s near absence of support for biodiversity issues. In late 1986 and early 1987, representatives of the Sierra Club and the Environmental Defense Fund toured Africa to talk to field representatives and to observe USAIDs' portfolios. They were interested to see if biodiversity could be made a part of them.

In 1986, AFR completed the first versions of the PNRM. The critical chapter on implementation (chapter IX) was not added until 1987. Congress created the Development Fund for Africa (DFA) in FY 87 and established an earmark of ten percent of the DFA total of 500 million for natural resources programming. Congress reinforced this mandate with continued inquiries, even to the present although the volume has diminished. The DFA and its mandate of ten percent for natural resources were all done in the context of Gramm-Rudman. There was no increase in Agency funding, even for biodiversity.

In retrospect, the Africa Bureau's lack of a natural resource program seems inexplicable. However, in the context of the times, Africa, as a region, seemed different from Asia, Near East, the Caribbean, and Latin America. There were a series of problems which demanded immediate attention and assumed crisis situations: explosive population growth, invading locusts, widening drought, persistent famine, falling food production. Missions seemed driven to short-term objectives; natural resources seemed remote and of little immediate help in the face of urgent problems. In contrast, the other regions did not generally have such severe food problems and could focus on less immediate issues, such as natural resources.

AFR/TR/ANR created NRMS both to respond to Congressional and special interest group concerns and to execute the PNRM. The general goals were to initiate natural resource activities where none existed before, to increase those that were present, and to do this quickly for the Bureau's Sub-Saharan region. The initial product (the "Opportunities" study) was deliberately different and high profile. AFR wanted to get it to PVOs, NGOs, donors, government officials, and interested persons to demonstrate their initiative. The project established a process for natural resource programming, based in part on the "Opportunities" study, and pressed it forcefully with the Missions. The assessments, the first step in the process, were neither standard nor comprehensive, but AFR saw them as useful for raising Mission consciousness. Now, after nearly two and one-half years into the

project, Missions (with some NRMS assistance) are initiating the more standard assessments. Senegal, Niger, and Guinea are examples.

Since the project began, AFR/TR/ANR has pushed Mission directors, ADOs, ARDOs, and Project Officers to broaden their view, to incorporate natural resource issues, and to add them to their portfolio. Sometimes, this has caused resistance, but the issue is clear. As the Deputy Assistant Administrator for AFR, Larry Saiers, indicated: If the ADOs and ARDOs don't understand natural resource and environmental issues, they are in deep trouble.

As the following documents indicate, NRMS has been active. As of June, 1989 (the latest available data at the time of this evaluation and after almost two years), it is largely on target with its purpose and output indicators. Two low indicators are number four of purpose indicators (only twelve percent completed) and number three of output indicators (only twenty-one percent completed). Similarly, the LOE contractor is mostly on target with its tasks. The technical assistance category, containing programming support and SOW assistance, has a low completion, but several activities are in the planning stage. Finally, the Africa Bureau needs to attain a ten percent level of overall funding in FY 1990 for natural resources. While NRMS has raised the level since its inception, current data suggest it is just barely that and that it may fall to eight percent in FY 1991 (see tables on Natural Resources Obligations, 22-Dec-89 for Group I and Group II countries). AFR and NRMS are developing strategies to increase the level of natural resources programming, but it is apparent that the effort will need a follow-on project to sustain it.

**AFRICA REGIONAL: NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SUPPORT (NRMS)**

Period: 01-Jan-89 to 30-Jun-89 PD Backstop: D.Mackell, AFR/PD/EAP  
 Responsible Office: AFR/TR/ANR Contracts: J.Hacken, M/SER/OP/OS/AFR  
 Project Officer: D.Walker, AFR/TR/ANR

**A. PROJECT DATA**

DATES:	FUNDING ('000): DFA	MONITORING
Authorized: 11-Aug-87	Core LOP = \$10,080	Last Evaluation: n/a
PACD (orig): 30-Sep-90	Buy-In LOP = \$3,080	Next Evaluation: Oct. 1989
PACD (rev): 30-Sep-93		Last Audit: n/a

**B. PROJECT STATUS**

TIME ELAPSED	FUNDS OBLIGATED	ACCRUED EXPENDITURES	TIME REMAINING
31%	60%	33%	52 months

**C. FINANCIAL STATUS (\$000) as of 30-Jun-89**

CATEGORY	CORE	BUY-INS	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE
Authorized LOP Funding	10,080	3,080	13,160	100%
Cumulative Obligations to Date	6,085	1,795	7,880	60%
Cumulative Expenditures	-	-	3,800	29%
Planned FY 1989 Obligations	1,800	1,500	3,300	
Actual FY 1989 Obligations	2,274	500	2,774	84%
Planned FY 1990 Obligations	1,900	1,000	2,900	
Actual FY 1990 Obligations	0	0	0	0%
Balance to be Obligated	3,995	1,285	5,280	40%

**D. PROJECT PURPOSE**

To increase the quality and level of natural resources management activity in AID's country and related regional programs in sub-Saharan Africa and in PVO programs supported by AID.

**E. KEY IMPLEMENTING AGENTS:**

TYPE	IMPLEMENTOR	DOC. NO.	AMOUNT	START DATE:	END DATE:
1. Coop Agmt WRI		LAC/5517-A-00507700	\$500	19-Mar-88	30-Sep-90
2. Contract	E/DI	AFR-0467-C-00805400	\$2,500	31-Aug-88	31-Aug-90

-6-

**F. PROJECT PERFORMANCE**

COMPONENT/ ACTIVITY	TARGET	IN PROGRESS	COMPLETE THIS PERIOD	COMPLETED	%
<b>PURPOSE INDICATORS</b>					
1. USAID's incorporating NRM in CDSS (Action Plans)	16 countries	5	7	7	44%
2. Planning and prep of NRM projects as per CDSSs.	8 countries	7	3	3	38%
3. Planning and funding of bio-diversity activities	5 countries	5	3	3	60%
4. Improved planning and execution of NRM activities by AID, host country and PVO personnel.	42 countries	12	5	5	12%

**OUTPUT INDICATORS****A. Mission Support**

1. Revised CDSSs	16 countries	5	7	7	44%
2. CDSS background document (Assessments, Action Programs and Plans)	16 countries	3	3	9	56%
3. Policy dialogues defined in NRM.	16 countries	3	3	9	56%
4. Definition of training and other institutional development needs.	42 countries	3	3	9	21%
5. Revised or new projects	8 projects	7	3	3	38%
6. Improved basis for planning, programming and implementing NRM in Missions and in AID/Washington.	16 countries	12	5	5	31%

<b>B. Sub-Saharan Africa PVO Capability Strengthening</b>	10 US PVOs	3	0	0	30%
	40 Local NGO	0	0	0	

<b>C. Biological Diversity Africa Bureau plan for supporting biological diversity</b>	10 activities	22	6	6	60%
---	---------------	----	---	---	-----

**G. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS**

1. The assessment process is going well with, in most cases, the active participation of the host governments, USAID's and other donors. The overall evaluation of the assessment process is very positive as evidenced by:
  - a. the generally positive response from mission and host country personnel
  - b. the excellent response from the PVO/NGO community
  - c. the planning and execution of new and revised projects
  - d. the acceptance of the assessments and action programs by the donor community
  - e. generally good collaboration with the World Bank
2. Demand for project design services is strong and likely to meet the project target before the extended PACD.
3. The principal TA contractor, EDI, in association with three other consulting firms and the University of Arizona, has developed an effective system of delivering technical services. Considering the importance of providing NRM technical services in a timely manner to conduct assessment Action Programs and plans, it is essential to have an experienced contractor handling this work.
4. Eleven (11) Biodiversity proposals have been received and processed (FY89) Grants for bio-diversity activities represent a very cost-effective way of achieving results by tapping the resources of professional, fully operational organizations.
5. A major PVO/NGO cooperative agreement (\$1,800,000) was signed mid-August. Delivering services to African natural resource PVOs/NGOs under a major umbrella agreement appears to be an effective means of providing tailored services to meet specific PVO/NGO needs. In addition, the administrative burden of setting up a cooperative agreement of this type is substantially less than that of a competitive contract.
6. The project has been very responsive in meeting a variety of training and TA requests and in providing information and planning services. The project should now continue to provide limited, carefully targeted special services to missions.

**H1. IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES PENDING**

SCHEDULED DATE	ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	ACTIVITY STATUS	RESCHEDULED DATE
1. May 89	Uganda assessment	In Progress	Jul-Oct 89
2. Mar 89	Biodiv oblig:\$500,000 in ARDN fnds.	In Progress	Sept. 89
3. June 88	FSP services in Cameroon.	Postponed indefinitely	

**H2. IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETED DURING PERIOD:**

SCHEDULED DATE	ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	ACTIVITY STATUS	COMPLETION DATE
1. 20-Oct-88	Follow-up recommendations of Environmental Action Plans (Madagascar)	Final action compl. at Donor's Conference	30-Jun-89
2. 30-Jun-88	Guinea Nat'l Res. Assesmnt	Limited activity compl.	31-Jan-89
3. 31-May-89	Afro-Montane Bio-div. Wrkshp	Held as scheduled	30-Jun-89
5. 31-May-88	Kenya Action Program/Plan	Completed	31-May-89
6. 31-Mar-89	Program Design - Niger	Completed	31-May-89
7. 30-Jun-89	Incr. E/DI contr. fndng level	Increased	30-Jun-89
8. 28-Feb-89	PVO/NGO coop. agrmnt	Agreement executed	31-Aug-89
9. 31-Jan-89	Deforestation/carbon bal. study contract	Contract executed	31-Mar-89
10. 31-Jan-89	Extend PACD&incr. LOP fndng	Complete	17-Mar-89
	Extend PACD&incr. LOP fndng	Complete	19-Jun-89
11. 31-May-89	plan for participant training workshops/seminars	Complete	31-May-89

**I. EVALUATION:**

Scheduled for October 1989

**J. AUDIT:**

None Scheduled

**K. WAIVERS PROCESSED:**

None

**L1. OUTSTANDING PROJECT ISSUES**

ISSUE/PROBLEM	CURRENT STATUS	DATE
1. The future role of the project in the implementation of the Plan for Supporting Natural Resources Management in Sub-saharan Africa (PNRM)	Mid-term eval. will assist Bureau in conceptualizing future of the project.	31-Mar-90

**L2. PROJECT ISSUES RESOLVED THIS PERIOD:**

ISSUE/PROBLEM	CURRENT STATUS	DATE
1. The PVO/NGO cooperative grant agreement required PACD exten.	PACD extended	17-Mar-89
2. Project had insufficient funds for interim and final evaluations.	\$150,000 added for evaluations.	17-Mar-89

62

**M1. OUTSTANDING PORTFOLIO ISSUES**

ISSUE/PROBLEM	CURRENT STATUS	DATE
1. Although good progress has been made in conducting assessments and substantial NR project design/redesign work has been done, we are still some distance from achieving an adequate increase in the Bureau NR obligations.	Missions have been basically responsive to N.R. initiatives but total obligations fall short of target.	

**M2. PORTFOLIO ISSUES RESOLVED THIS PERIOD:**

None

**N. ACTIVITIES FOR THE NEXT 180 DAYS**

SCHEDULED	ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	ACTION AGENT
1. 01-Oct-89	Initiate project mid-term evaluation	IQC
2. 30-Sep-89	Complete Malawi Assessment/Plan	E/DI
3. 30-Sep-89	Complete Uganda Assessment/Plan	E/DI
4. 30-Sep-89	Finalize all FY89 obligations	SER/M/OP
5. 01-Oct-89	Initiate N.R. training component	E/DI
6. 31-Dec-89	Increase ED/I contract funding level	Proj. Mgr.
7. 31-Dec-89	Increase RASA contract funding level	Proj. Mgr.
8. 30-Nov-89	Provide Project Design Services (Guinea)	E/DI
9. 30-Sep-89	Initiate Special Studies	E/DI
10. 30-Dec-89	Review final global warning study	Oakridge Nat'l. Laboratory
11. 30-Sep-89	Initiate PVO/NGO forestry/agroforestry trng.	E/DI
12. 19-Sep-89	Hold major PVO/NGO planning workshop	EIL/CARE/WWF
13. 30-Oct-89	Initiate delivery of PVO/NGO strengthening services under cooperative agreement	EIL/CARE/WWF
14. 30-Oct-89	Draft project data base	E/DI
15. 15-Dec-89	Bio-diversity evaluation	Bio-Div. Adv.

PNRM: Original Date - February 1987

## PROJECT DATA

Project Authorized: 11 August 1987

PACD(Original): 30 September 1990

PACD (Amend): 30 September 1993

Orig. Funding :\$8.5 million

Amend.Funding:\$13.16 million

## PRIORITY AREAS OF PNRM

a. Agro-ecological Areas : (i) Arid/Semi-arid Region

(ii) Tropical Highlands

(iii) Indian Ocean Islands

b. Technical Areas

(i) Soil Fertility

(ii) Loss of Vegetation

(iii) Bio-diversity

## NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROJECT

COUNTRIES	ACTIVITIES									
	NR Assessm'ts	Bio-diversity Assess/Evals	Action Programs	Action Plans	PVO/NGO Activities	Donor Coordn.	Training	PP Design	Project	
<b>Priority Countries</b>										
<b>GROUP I</b>										
Senegal	Complete									
Gambia	Complete						Agroforestry			
Niger	Complete		Complete	Complete		Ongoing		Planned		Ag. Sector Dev Grant
Mali	Complete	Complete	Complete	Complete	Ongoing	Ongoing	Agroforestry	Complete		Ag. Sector Dev Grant
			Complete	Complete			Agroforestry	Complete		Village Reforestation
							NR Economics			
Guinea	Limited	Planned	Planned	Planned			PVO Streng			
Sudan				Planned		Ongoing	Agroforestry	Planned(Sep/Oct)		NRM Project
Burundi	Complete	Complete	Complete			Ongoing	Agroforestry	Complete		NRM Project
Madagascar	Complete	Complete	Complete	Complete	Ongoing	Ongoing	Agroforestry	In Process		NRM Proj. (Bio-div.)
							PVO Streng			
<b>GROUP II</b>										
Uganda	Complete	Complete	Complete	Complete	Ongoing	Ongoing	Agroforestry	Complete		Bio-diversity, PVO Streng.
Burundi	Limited	Complete	Planned	Planned	Ongoing	Ongoing	PVO Streng			
Botswana	Limited	Complete	Complete				Agroforestry		Complete	US Peace Corps Wildlife Prot. Mgt. SARP
Somalia										
Kenya	Complete	Complete	Complete	Complete	Ongoing	Ongoing	Agroforestry	Planned		NRM Project
Tanzania	Planned	Planned			Ongoing	Ongoing				
Cameroon	Planned				Ongoing	Ongoing				
Ghana	Planned		Planned	Planned	Ongoing		PVO Streng			
Malawi	Complete	Complete				Planned				
<b>GROUP III</b>										
Lesotho		Complete						Complete		Wildlife Prot. Mgt.
Zimbabwe										
Zambia								Complete		Wildlife Prot. Mgt.
								Complete		Wildlife Prot. Mgt.

1. Policy Reform
2. Smithsonian Conference
3. Land Use Planning - Botswana
4. Global Warming
5. Land Tenure Planning
6. Indicators

7. Newsletter
8. Donor Secretariat
9. PVO-NR Tropical Forest Manual
10. Dev. of NR Indicators
11. NR Incentives, PVO Study, Nat. For. Mgt. Study
12. PVO Strengthening

13. NR Workshop
14. Agroforestry Training
15. Newsletter
16. Support to UN/NGLS - Sahel Info. Netwrk.
17. PVO strengthening
18. Biodiversity grants

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROJECT (698-0467)  
CONTRACT NO. AFR-0467-C-00-8054-00  
FACT SHEET

PERIOD OF CONTRACT: September 1, 1988 - August 31, 1990

CONTRACT AMOUNT: \$2,579,964.00

PRIME CONTRACTOR: Energy/Development International

PRINCIPAL SUBCONTRACTOR: Development Alternatives, Inc.

SUBCONTRACTORS: Associates in Rural Development  
The University of Arizona  
Labat-Anderson Inc.  
Dames & Moore International

CORE STAFF COMPOSITION: Senior Program Manager, Kjell Christophersen  
Technical Coordinator, Chris Seubert  
Management Coordinator, John Michael Kramer  
Information Support Specialist, Karen McKay  
Administrative Assistant, Christine Brown

COUNTRIES WORKED IN DURING YEAR I: 5 of 8 Group I Countries  
(plus 1 planned & 1 on hold);  
6 of 9 Group II Countries

TEAMS FIELDDED IN YEAR I: 15 teams typically comprised of 3 people  
(first team fielded 3 weeks after project start-up)

NEWSLETTER RECIPIENTS: 320

## ACTIVITY SUMMARY SHEET

<u>TASKS</u>	<u>COMPLETED</u>	<u>SCHEDULED</u>	<u>PROGRAMMED</u>
<u>Programming Support</u>	Rwanda (PP) Niger (PAAD)		Guinea PP
<u>SOW Assistance</u>	Uganda Guinea		Burkina Faso Gambia
<u>NR Assessment</u>	Malawi		Cameroon
<u>Action Program</u>	Mali Botswana Gambia Kenya Uganda		Burkina Faso
<u>Action Plans</u>	Mali Botswana Gambia Kenya Uganda		
<u>Bio Diversity Assess</u>	Burundi Mali Malawi		Guinea
<u>Training</u>			
1). Agroforestry Wkshps		Botswana Kenya Uganda Niger	Guinea Mali Niger Senegal Madagascar Rwanda
2) Forest Econ. Wkshp			To be decided

## ACTIVITY SUMMARY SHEET (CONT)

<u>TASKS</u>	<u>COMPLETED</u>	<u>SCHEDULED</u>	<u>PROGRAMMED</u>
--------------	------------------	------------------	-------------------

### Special Studies

1) Enhancing Effect of  
Gov't & Non-Gov't  
Partnership in NR  
Management

Uganda  
Cameroon  
Madagascar  
Mali

2) Natural Forest Mngt

July-Nov 1989

3) NRMS Ec & Fin Analysis:  
Incentives, Subsidies &  
Policy Implications

Sept 89-Feb 1990

### Special Event

1) NRMS/AID Workshop

Togo (May 90)

### Project Tracking

On-going data  
collection

### Newsletter

3 English  
2 French

3 English  
3 French

### Info Support to PVOs

1) Mali Bio Diversity  
(English & French)

2) Opportunities for  
Sustained Development

3) An Economic Approach  
to Arid Forest Project  
Design

4) The Casamance Kiln  
(English)

5) The Casamance  
Kiln (French)

6) Action Program Summaries

7) Nat For Mngt Guidebook

8) PVO Study

## ACTIVITY SUMMARY SHEET (CONT)

<u>TASKS</u>	<u>COMPLETED</u>	<u>SCHEDULED</u>	<u>PROGRAMMED</u>
<u>Donor Collaboration</u>	FAO UNSO Commonwealth World Bank ODA		NORAD SIDA DANIDA FINIDA GTZ Others
<u>Other</u>			
Village Dev Wkshp Seminar on the Envir. Sahel NRMS Strategy Budget Commonwealth Conf. Sahel Donors Conf. UNNGLS Advisory Mtg. Work. Party on Wildlife & Nat Park Mngt UN Forum on NGOs & Environment	Burkina Faso Guinea  AFR/TR Gambia Arizona New York  Malawi  New York		

**CONTRACT NO. AFR-0467-C-00-8054-00**  
**SCOPE OF WORK**

<u>TASKS</u>	<u>ORIG SOW</u>	<u>REQUESTS TO DATE COMPLETED/PLANNED</u>	<u>PROP SOW</u>
<u>Technical Assistance</u>			
Programming Support	15-20	3	9
SOW Assistance	15-20	4	9
<u>NR Assessments</u>			
Mission Needs Dial			
NR Analysis		2 (Assess)	
Intervention Assess			
Policy/Incentives Anal	10-15	6 (Act Progs)	No Change
Country Strat Review	Total		
USAID Imp Strategy		5 (Act Plans)	
Bio Diversity Assess		4	
Special Concern Analysis			
<u>Training Support</u>			
Training Needs Ident			
Training Plan	1	1	No Change
Training	30-50 in US	0	
	300-500 in Afr	300 in Afr	300 Af only
<u>Special Studies/Events</u>			
Spec Studies/Events Ident			
Special Studies	10-15	3	3
Special Events	6	1	1
<u>Information Support</u>			
Assess of Info Needs	Unspec		Incor into assess
Project Tracking	Track System	Track Sys/Compnd	No change
Newsletter	4/Yr-Eng	6 Eng; 5 Fr	6 Eng; 5 Fr
Info Supp to PVOs/NGOs	Unspec	8	No Change
Donor Collaboration	-	On-going	-

# NATURAL RESOURCES OBLIGATIONS - Africa

22-Dec-89

Annex 2 (90)

COUNTRY	PROJECT TITLE	(Pr.No)	NRMS RES.	N-PRJ. ASSIST.	PROJ NRM	FY90 OYB	TOTAL NRM	NRM % of TOT.OYB	NPA % of TOT.OYB
---------	---------------	---------	-----------	----------------	----------	----------	-----------	------------------	------------------

\* = Tot.NRM%OYB  
\*\* = Tot.NPA%OYB

## GROUP I NRMS Countries [FY 1990]

GAMBIA (635-)	Total Mission OYB	\$5,000						21% *	0% **
	Ag. Res. & Diversif.	(0219)	\$1,050	\$0	\$0	\$3,500	\$1,050	21%	0%

GUINEA (675-)	Total Mission OYB	\$15,000						17% *	7% **
	Economic Policy Reform	(0218)		\$100		\$1,000	\$100	1%	1%
	Ag Infrastructure Dev.	(0213)		\$350		\$3,500	\$350	2%	2%
	Rural Enterprise Dev.	(0215)		\$100		\$1,000	\$100	1%	1%
	Ag Sector Restr.	(0216)		\$450		\$4,500	\$450	3%	3%
Natural Resource Mgmt.	(0219)		\$400		\$1,200	\$2,500	\$1,600	11%	0%

MADAGASCAR (687-)	Total Mission OYB	\$18,150						19% *	6% **
	Ec. Policy Reform Prg.	(0102)			\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%
	Int'l Rice Research Inst.	(0105)			\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%
	So. Madag. Conser.&Devip	(0107)			\$460	\$500	\$460	3%	0%
	Amber Mt. Conserv. & Dev	(0103)			\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%
	Masoala Conser. & Dev II	(0104)			\$150	\$300	\$150	1%	0%
	Environment. Prot. & Mgt.	(0110)			\$1,000	\$5,000	\$1,000	6%	0%
	Ag. Policy Reform	(0603C)		\$1,160		\$11,600	\$1,160	6%	6%
Madagascar Debt for Nat.	(0112)			\$600	\$1,000	\$600	3%	0%	

MALI (688-)	Total Mission OYB	\$22,630						11% *	2% **
	Small Project Assist.	(0234)			\$40	\$40	\$40	0%	0%
	Ec. Policy Ref. Progr. II	(0245)		\$400		\$4,000	\$400	2%	2%
	Agriculture Research	(0250)	\$900			\$3,000	\$900	4%	0%
	Farming Syst. Res.	(0232)	\$225			\$2,280	\$225	1%	0%
	Dev Haute Val.	(0233)		\$125		\$3,600	\$125	1%	1%
	Livestock Sectr. II	(0218)			\$80	\$1,000	\$80	0%	0%
PVO Cofinancing	(0247)			\$650	\$1,195	\$650	3%	0%	

NIGER (683-)	Total Mission OYB	\$18,000						43% *	1% **
	Small Proj. Assist./AFSI	(0249)			\$133	\$140	\$133	1%	0%
	Applied Ag. Research	(0256)			\$1,960	\$3,920	\$1,960	11%	0%
	Ag. Sector Dev. Grant II	(0265)		\$150		\$1,500	\$150	1%	1%
Ag. Sector Dev. Grant	(0257)			\$5,500	\$5,500	\$5,500	31%	0%	

RWANDA (696-)	Total Mission OYB	\$7,500						29% *	1% **
	Farming System Research	(0110)			\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%
	Nat'l. Resource Mgt.	(0129)			\$2,064	\$2,400	\$2,064	28%	0%
	Rural Enterprise Dev.	(0131)			\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%
Private Enterprise Dev.	(0121)		\$100		\$1,000	\$100	1%	1%	

SENEGAL (685-)	Total Mission OYB	\$32,000						8% *	5% **
	Ag. Prod. Support	(0269)		\$300		\$3,000	\$300	1%	1%
	Transfer of Technology	(0281)			\$100	\$1,000	\$100	0%	0%
	Strengthening Ag. Res.	(0285)	\$900			\$3,000	\$900	3%	0%
	Ag. Sector Grant	(0297)		\$900		\$9,000	\$900	3%	3%
	Community & Enter. Dev.	(0260)		\$150		\$1,500	\$150	0%	0%
Ag. Sector Grant	(0301)		\$100		\$1,000	\$100	0%	0%	

JUDAN (550-)	Total Mission OYB	\$42,000						1% *	0% **
	Reforest/Antidesert	(0082)			\$236	\$947	\$236	1%	0%

FILENAME:ABS90\_AN

# NATURAL RESOURCES OBLIGATIONS - Africa

22-Dec-89

Annex 2 (90)

COUNTRY	PROJECT TITLE	(Pr.No)	NRMS RES.	N-PRJ. ASSIST.	PROJ NRM	FY90 OYB	TOTAL NRM	NRM % of TOT.OYB	NPA % of TOT.OYB
---------	---------------	---------	-----------	----------------	----------	----------	-----------	------------------	------------------

\* = Tot.NRM%OYB  
\*\* = Tot.NPA%OYB

## GROUP II NRMS Countries

BOTSWANA (633-)	Total Mission OYB	\$7,000						1% *	0% **
	Prog.Dev.&Sup.	(0250)	\$0	\$0	\$96	\$240	\$96	1%	0%
BURUNDI (695-)	Total Mission OYB	\$6,000						12% *	0% **
	Small Farmers Res.	(0106)	\$748	\$		\$2,494	\$748	12%	0%
	AEPRP Proj. Supp.	(0124)	\$0	\$0		\$2,000	\$0	0%	0%
CAMEROON (631-)	Total Mission OYB	\$20,000						15% *	2% **
	Ag. Policy & Planning	(0059)		\$450		\$3,000	\$450	15%	2%
GHANA (641-)	Total Mission OYB	\$7,660						0% *	10% **
	Ag. Prod. Promotion Pr.	(0117)		\$756		\$7,560	\$756	10%	10%
KENYA (615-)	Total Mission OYB	\$40,000						9% *	3% **
	Natural Resources Mgt	(0247)			\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%
	Center for Excell.Ag.Dev.	(0248)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%
	PVO Co-financing	(0236)			\$2,425	\$2,500	\$2,425	6%	0%
	Private Enterprise Dev.	(0238)		\$400		\$4,000	\$400	1%	1%
	Structural Adjustment Pr.	(0240)		\$200		\$2,000	\$200	1%	1%
Rural/Urban Mrkt. Dev.	(0242)		\$500		\$5,000	\$500	1%	1%	
MALAWI (612-)	Total Mission OYB	\$20,000						3% *	0% **
	PVO Umbrella	(0235)			\$600	\$3,000	\$600	3%	0%
	Ag.Sector Pol. Prgm	(0232)			\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%
SOMALIA (649-)	Total Mission OYB	\$30,000						7% *	0% **
	Shebelli Water Mgt.	(0129)				\$2,000	\$0	7%	0%
TANZANIA (621-)	Total Mission OYB	\$14,000						9% *	0% **
	Wildlife Mgt.	(0171)			\$1,200	\$1,800	\$1,200	9%	0%
UGANDA (617-)	Total Mission OYB	\$19,400						11% *	2% **
	Manpower for Ag. Dev.	(0103)	\$1,110	\$0	\$700	\$3,700	\$1,810	9%	0%
	Coop. Agr. & Agribusiness	(0111)		\$420		\$4,200	\$420	2%	2%
	Dev. Through Conser.	(0117)			\$50	\$100	\$50	0%	0%
Biodiver. in Kibale For.	(----				\$200	\$0	0%	0%	

ILENAME:ABS90\_AN

ILENAME:ABS90\_AN

## APPENDIX 5: BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Administrative Papers

- A.I.D. 1987. Plan for Supporting Natural Resources Management in Africa. Bureau for Africa, Office of Technical Resources.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987. Natural Resources Management Support (NRMS) Project Paper; Vol. I and Vol. II. Bureau for Africa, Office of Technical Resources.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Award/Contract for NRMS to Energy/Development International (E/DI). AID/M/FM/PAFD.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. PIO/T Scope of Work: Sahel Assessment. AID/AFR/SWA.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Natural Resources Management Action Program. Washington: AID/AFR/TR/ANR. (Cable: 12/23/88, #413954).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Scope of Work: Action Program and Action Plan Formulations in Mali: Washington: AID/AFR/TR/ANR. (Draft cable: 10/7/88).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Briefing Paper: Africa Bureau, Office of Technical Resources, Agricultural and Natural Resources Division.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Terms of Reference: Subsaharan Region Natural Resources Management Workshop.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Terms of Reference: A Guide to the Conservation and Management of Natural Forests in Subsaharan Africa.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Terms of Reference: Economic Policy Reform and Natural Resources Management in Africa.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Cost Proposal: Natural Resources Management Support Project. RFA No. OS/AFR-89-001. Brattleboro,, VT.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Scope of Work: Action Program and Action Plan Formulations in the Gambia. Washington: AID/AFR/TR/ANR. (Draft cable: 1/31/89).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Terms of Reference: Enhancing the Effectiveness of Governmental and Non-governmental Partnership in Natural Resources Management.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. The Structure of Mission Action Plans: Strategic Objectives, Targets, and Benchmarks. Washington: AID/AFR/DP/PPE. (Cable: 9/2/89, #283555).

**The Experiment in International Living, et al. 1989. Technical Proposal: Natural Resources Management Support Project. RFA No. OS/AFR-89-001. Brattleboro, VT.**

**The Experiment in International Living, et al. 1989. Natural Resources Management Support (NRMS) Project Support to PVO/NGOs in Natural Resource Management in Sub-Saharan Africa, Cooperative Agreement.**

### **Work Plans and Anticipated Activities**

**E/DI. 1988. Life of Project (LOP) Implementation Plan.**

**NRMS Core Staff. 1988. Retreat Report. (10/13/88).**

**\_\_\_\_. 1988. Workplan. (10/12/88).**

**\_\_\_\_. 1988. Anticipated Activities Under NRMS, Updated. (12/88).**

**\_\_\_\_. 1989. Anticipated Activities Under NRMS, Updated. (3/89).**

**\_\_\_\_. 1989. Anticipated Activities under NRMS, Updated. (8/89).**

### **A.I.D. Documents**

**A.I.D. 1982. A.I.D. Policy Paper: Private and Voluntary Organizations. PPC.**

**\_\_\_\_. 1984. A.I.D. Policy Paper: Energy. PPC.**

**\_\_\_\_. 1986. A.I.D. Policy Paper: Environment and Natural Resources. PPC.**

**\_\_\_\_. 1986. Congressional Presentation: Fiscal Year, 1987. Annex 1. Africa.**

**\_\_\_\_. 1987. Congressional Presentation: Fiscal Year, 1988. Annex 1. Africa.**

**\_\_\_\_. 1989. U.S. Assistance for Africa: The Development Fund for Africa (DFA). An Action Plan.**

**\_\_\_\_. 1989. Congressional Presentation: Fiscal Year, 1990. Annex 1. Africa.**

**\_\_\_\_. 1989. Assessing the Potential Contribution of Activities in Africa for the Control of Carbon Dioxide. AFR/TR/ANR.**

**\_\_\_\_. 1989. A.I.D. Program for Women in Development: A User Guide to the Office of Women in Development, Fiscal 1990. PPC/WID.**

USAID/Kampala. 1989. Action Plan: FY 1989-1990. Uganda.

### **Botswana**

Christophersen, Kjell, Peter Warshall, Scott McCormick, & Lee Hannah. 1989. Botswana Action Program and Plan. Washington: E/DI.

Government of Botswana. 1986. Wildlife Conservation Policy. Gaborone: GOB.

Hannah, Lee, Gary Wetterberg, & Leroy Duvall. 1988. Botswana Biological Diversity Assessment. Washington: A.I.D.

Kalahari Conservation Society. 1987. Natural Resources Expertise Profile. Gaborone: KCS.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Sustainable Wildlife Utilisation: The Role of Wildlife Management Areas. Gaborone: KCS.

USAID. 1989. Limited Country Development Strategy Statement: FY 1991. Botswana.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Natural Resources Management Project: Volume 1-Regional Overview. Harare: USAID.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Natural Resources Management Project: Volume 2-Country Specific Project Descriptions. Harare: USAID.

### **Gambia**

Karch, G. Edward, et. al. 1989. The Gambia Natural Resources Management Action Program: Executive Summary. Washington: E/DI.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1989. The Gambia Natural Resources Management Action Program. Washington: E/DI.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1989. The Gambia Natural Resources Management Action Plan. Washington: E/DI.

### **Kenya**

Carter, Michael R., Keita W. Wiebe & Benoit Blarel. 1989. Tenure Security For Whom? An Econometric Analysis of The Differential Impacts of Land Policy in Kenya. Madison, WI: Land Tenure Center.

**Christophersen, Kjell, et al. 1989. Kenya Action Program. Washington: E/DI.**

**\_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Alternatives to Natural Resources Programming: USAID/Kenya. Washington: E/DI.**

**Deweese, Peter, et al. 1988. Natural Resources/Biological Diversity/Forestry Sector Assessment: A Report to USAID/Kenya, Natural Resources Management Support Project. Nairobi: Louis Berger International, Inc.**

**\_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Summary Report. Natural Resources Management and Development Assistance in Kenya. A Report for USAID Kenya. Nairobi: Louis Berger International, Inc.**

**Njoka, Theuri, et al. 1988. The Status of Natural Resources in Kenya: A Report to USAID/Kenya, Natural Resources Management Support Project. Working Paper 1. Nairobi: Louis Berger International, Inc.**

**\_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Policies and Legislation, Institutions, and Activities in Natural Resources Sectors in Kenya: A Report to USAID/Kenya, Natural Resources Management Support Project. Working Paper 2. Nairobi: Louis Berger International, Inc.**

**Njoka, Theuri, et al. 1988. Opportunities and Recommendations for USAID Support for Natural Resources Protection, Management, and Development in Kenya: A Report to USAID/Kenya, Natural Resources Management Support Project. Working Paper 3. Louis Berger International, Inc.**

## **Mali**

**Atwood, David. 1988. Information Needs Concerning Natural Resources and Environment in Mali. Memo of 2/26/88.**

**\_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Draft Report on Sustainable Development Through Better Natural Resources Management. Memo of 11/2/89.**

**Humpal, Donald, et al. 1988. Mali Action Program. Washington: E/DI.**

**\_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Mali Draft Action Plan. Washington: E/DI.**

**\_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Programme D'Action Pour le Mali. Washington: E/DI.**

**McGahuey, Mike. 1989. Sustainable Agricultural Development Through Better Management of Natural Resources. (Draft)**

**Ministere de L'Environnement et de L'Elevage. 1988. Programme Barriere Verte de Mali, Etude de Factibilite, Rapport Final. Societe Chinoise de Cooperation Internationale.**

OAPF. 1989. Proposition pour des inventaires de la Faune et de la Composition Floristique des Forets Classees des Monts Mandingues et Sounsan.

USAID. 1988. Country Development Strategy Statement, FY 1990-1994. Mali.

\_\_\_\_. 1988. Cooperative Agreement with the GRM: Village Forestry Project. Mali.

\_\_\_\_. 1988. Development of the Haute Vallee (DHV) Project Paper. Mali.

\_\_\_\_. 1988. Village Reforestation Project Paper, Amendment No. 1. Mali.

\_\_\_\_. 1989. Action Plan: FY 1990-1991. Mali.

Warshall, Peter. 1989. Mali: Biological Diversity Assessment. Washington: E/DI.

\_\_\_\_. 1989. Mali: Evaluation de la Diversite Biologique. Washington: E/DI.

### Niger

Heermans, John & Greg Minnick. 1987. Guide to Forest Restoration and Management in the Sahel Based on Case Studies at the National Forests of Guesselbodi and Gorou-Bassounga, Niger. Niamey: Forestry Land Use and Planning Project, Department of the Environment, Ministry of Agriculture and the Environment.

Heermans, John G. 1987. The Guesslebodi Experiment: Bushland Management in Niger. Niamey: Forestry Land Use and Planning Project.

Ministry of Plan. 1987. Five Year and Economic and Social Development Plan, 1987-1991. Niamey: GRM.

USAID. 1979. Forestry and Land Use Planning Project (FLUP) Project Paper. Niger.

\_\_\_\_. 1984. Agricultural Sector Development Grant (ASDG I) PAAD. Niger.

\_\_\_\_. 1986. CDSS FY 1988 Annex D: Perspective on Niger's Natural Resources. Niger.

\_\_\_\_. 1987. Final Evaluation: Niger Forestry and Land Use Planning Project. Niger.

\_\_\_\_. 1989. Action Plan FY 1989-1990. Niger.

\_\_\_\_. 1989. Agricultural Sector Development Grant: PAAD Amendment No. III (Natural Resources Management Amendment). Niger.

Vezina, Francois. 1988. Natural Resources Management Action Program. USAID/Niger.

## **Rwanda**

ETMA. 1987. Ruhengeri and Its Resources: An Environmental Profile of the Ruhengeri Prefecture, Rwanda. Ruhengeri Resource Analysis and Management Project (RRAM). Kigali: ETMA and USAID.

International Institute for Environment and Development/North America. 1988. Natural Resources Management Issues in Rwanda. Washington: IIED.

USAID. 1989. Action Plan FY 1990-1991. Rwanda.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Natural Resource Management Project: Project Paper. Rwanda.

## **Senegal**

Rodale Institute. 1989. Soil Degradation and Prospects for Sustainable Agriculture in the Peanut Basin of Senegal. Erasmus, PA: Rodale Institute. (Working Draft).

USAID. 1986. Project Paper: Senegal Reforestation Project. Senegal.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1987. Country Development Strategy Statement FY 1989. Senegal.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Action Plan FY 1990. Senegal.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Annual Budget Submission FY 1991. Senegal.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Natural Resources Management Action Plan. Senegal.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1989. Strengthening Agricultural Research: Draft Project Paper. Senegal.

## **Additional Contractor/Subcontractor Documents**

Kramer, John Michael & Kjell Christophersen. 1989. Scope of Work: Uganda Action Program and Plan. Washington: E/DI.

McKay, Karen LeAnn & Christine Brown. (Eds.) 1989. NRMS Newsletter. (Spring, 1989) and (Summer, 1989). Washington: E/DI and DAI.

Raundal, Virginia. 1989. An Overview of Issues Pertaining to Biological Diversity and Conservation in Malawi. Washington: E/DI.

Seubert, Chris & Karen LeAnn McKay. 1989. Malawi Natural Resources Management Assessment. Washington: E/DI.

**Shaikh, Asif, et al. 1988. Opportunities for Sustained Development: Successful Natural Resources Management in the Sahel: Washington: E/DI.**  
Volume 1: Main Report  
Volume 2: Case Description  
Volume 3: Financial Analysis  
Volume 4: Biodiversity

### **Other Reports**

**Aluma, John, et al. 1989. Settlement in Forest Reserves, Game Reserves, and National Parks in Uganda. Madison, WI: Land Tenure Center.**

**Bruce, John W. & Louise F. Fortmann. 1989. AgroForestry: Tenure and Incentives. Madison, WI: Land Tenure Center.**

**CENTED, Clark University. \_\_\_\_\_. The Environmental Context of Development: An Analysis of National Environmental Situations and Persistent Problems in Eastern and Southern African Nations. Worcester, MA: Clark University.**

**Christophersen, Kjell A. 1988. An Economic Approach to Arid Forest Project Design: Experience from Sahelian Countries. Washington: E/DI. (EIA project).**

**DeLucia and Associates. 1988. Energy Initiatives for Africa: Final Evaluation Report. Cambridge, MA: DeLucia and Associates, Inc.**

**Freeman, Peter, et al. 1987. Natural Resources in Sub-Saharan Africa: Review of Problems and Management Needs. Washington: AID/AFR/TR.**

**Freeman, Peter & J.K. Rennie. 1985. Desertification in the Sahel: Diagnosis and Proposals for IUCN's Response. Gland, Switzerland: International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.**

**Heermans, John & Paula J. Williams. 1988. Natural Resource Management in the Fouta Djallon Watershed, Guinea: A Pre-Feasibility Study Conducted For The U.S. Agency for International Development. Washington: WRI.**

**Kisamba-Mugerwa, E.B., et al. 1989. Land Tenure and Agricultural Development in Uganda. Madison, WI: Land Tenure Center.**

**Lassoie, James P. & Steven Kyle. 1989. Policy Reform and Natural Resources Management in Sub-Saharan Africa. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University. (Draft).**

**Lawry, Steven W. 1989. Tenure Policy and Natural Resource Management in Sahelian West Africa. Madison, WI: Land Tenure Center.**

- Lawry, Steven W. 1989. Tenure Policy Toward Common Property Natural Resources. Madison, WI: Land Tenure Center.**
- Livingston, Geoffrey & Timothy M. Resch. 1987. Senegal PL 480 Title III Food for Development: USAID/Senegal Final Evaluation Lessons Learned. Dakar: USAID/Senegal.**
- National Academy of Science. 1984. Environmental Change in the West African Sahel. Washington: National Academy of Sciences, Board of Science and Technology for International Development (BOSTID).**
- Otto, Jonathan, et al. 1988. Natural Resource Management (NRMS) Project: Final Report on Support to PVO/NGOs in Natural Resource Management in Sub-Saharan Africa. Washington: IIED/WRI. (With Appendices).**
- Russo, Sandra, et al. 1989. Gender Issues in Agriculture and Natural Resource Management. The Gender Manual Series. Washington: Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc. (prepared for AID/WID).**
- Sedjo, Roger A. 1989. Managing Genetic Resources in Sub-Saharan Africa: Policy and Institutional Options. Washington: Resources for the Future.**
- Shafer, Kurt. 1989. Uganda Restoring Ecological Diversity. Front Lines, December, 1989:13.**
- Stryker, J. Dirck, et al. 1989. Linkages Between Policy Reform and Natural Resource Management in Sub-Saharan Africa. \_\_\_\_: Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University in Association with Associates for International Resources and Development. (Draft of 5/89).**
- \_\_\_\_. 1989. Linkages Between Policy Reform and Natural Resource Management in Sub-Saharan Africa. \_\_\_\_: Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University in Association with Associates for International Resources and Development (Draft of 6/89) (With Annexes).**
- U.S. NGO Steering Committee on Development, Environment, and Population. 1988. Making Common Cause: A Statement and Action Plan by U.S. Based Development, Environment, and Population NGOs. Washington: World Resources Institute.**
- Wilson, E.O. 1988. Biodiversity. Washington: National Academy Press.**
- World Bank. 1981. Accelerated Development in Sub-Saharan Africa. Washington: World Bank.**
- \_\_\_\_. 1988. Mauritius: Environmental Investment Program for Sustainable Development. Washington: World Bank.**

**World Bank, AID, UNESCO, UNDP, & WWFN. 1988. Madagascar: Plan D'Action Environmental. Vol. 1 Document de Synthese Generale et Propositions D'Orientations. Washington: World Bank.**

**World Wildlife Fund. 1987. Proposal for a Matching Grant from the United States Agency for International Development. Washington: WWF, Program in Wildlands and Human Needs.**