

Rights Equity and Protected Areas (REPA) Programme

Final Evaluation Report

August 2008

Flemming Gjedde-Nielsen (Team Leader)
Moses Isooba

Table of Contents

List of abbreviations.....	3
Executive summary.....	4
1. Introduction.....	8
2. Background.....	10
3. Programme/project progress against stipulated targets.....	12
4. Strategic challenges and lessons	16
4.1 Relevance of REPA programme focus.....	16
4.2 Role of Pilot activities	18
4.3 Rights Based Approach (RBA) and service delivery.....	19
4.4 REPA partnership roles and relationships	21
4.5 Developing institutional interfaces.....	25
4.6 REPA’s approach to Capacity Building	27
4.7 Advocacy	28
4.8 HIV/AIDS	30
4.9 Budget analysis	30
4.10 Monitoring and Evaluation set-up.....	31
5. Ways ahead - new programme directions.....	31
5.1 General Observations	31
Annex 1	35

List of abbreviations

ACODE	Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment
AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Deficiency Syndrome
CBM	Community Based Monitors
CDRN	Community Development Resource Network
CCMB	Combating Child Mortality among Batwa
CDK	CARE Danmark
CPI	Community Protected Area Institution (CPI)
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HIV+	HIV positive
INGO	International Non Governmental Organisation
KADDENET	Kassese District Development Network
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTR	Mid Term Review
NEMA	National Environment Management Authority
NFA	National Forest Authority
NRM	Natural Resource Management
PAM	Problem Animal Management
PDCF	Programme Development and Coordination Facility
QEPA-BS	Queen Elizabeth Protected Area Benefit Sharing
RBA	Rights Based Approach
REPA	Rights Equity and Protected Areas
ROSCA	Rotating Savings and Credit Associations
SLOGIN	Strengthening Local Governance in Natural Resource Management
UOBDU	United Organisation for Batwa Development in Uganda
UFLRC	Uganda Functional Literacy Resource Centre
UWA	Uganda Wildlife Authority
VSLA	Village Savings and Loan Associations

Executive summary

The report presents the findings from the evaluation team of the Rights Equity and Protected Areas (REPA) Programme, a CARE Denmark funded programme in Uganda. The team consisted of Mr Moses Isooba and Mr. Flemming Gjedde-Nielsen both external consultants to CARE. The findings presented are based on an extensive reading of programme documents and a field study conducted 15 – 25 June 2008, in the programme area in south western Uganda. The field study included engagement with core partner and programme staff along with other main stakeholders to the sector.

The overall aim of the REPA programme as expressed in the overall goal is; *Poor natural resource-dependent households achieve sustainable livelihoods through the equitable sharing of costs and benefits and the fulfilment of rights and responsibilities from the use and management of forest and wildlife protected areas in Uganda.*

According to the strategy the overall goal will be reached by; 1. facilitating local communities and protected areas authorities to collaborate on the development of replicable solutions which increase local benefits and reduce costs of conservation, 2. Diversifying economic choices for the target communities. 3. Support the targeted communities to effectively articulate and fulfil their interests, rights and responsibilities in the use and management of natural resources.

While the programme is national in scope, it is particularly targeting park adjacent communities in South Western Uganda. A particular emphasis is on ethnic minorities.

The programme went through a Mid Term Review (MTR) in 2006, as a consequence major adjustments were made in particular to the mode of implementation. The project has subsequent to the MTR been implemented through four projects;

- The Problem Animal Management Project
- The Benefit Sharing Project
- The Empowerment of Ethnic Minorities at Queen Elizabeth National Park Project
- The Batwa Empowerment Project

While the REPA MTR recommendations in general appear to be sound and well founded it needs to be acknowledged that the implementation of the findings have been very costly to REPA in terms of staff time. This has left the programme with limited time for implementation.

The evaluation report starts by providing an overview of progress against stipulated targets, followed by an assessment of strategic lessons learned leading to a final chapter on ways ahead for a new programme.

It is noted that substantial progress has been made within the *Batwa Empowerment Project*. It is noted that the Uganda Organisation for Batwa Development in Uganda has achieved a status as the representative organisation, and the voice and bridge to the broader society. The Village Based Training developed and implemented by the Uganda Functional Literacy Resource Centre is highlighted as an empowering approach to community development likewise the work of Nature Uganda on developing a process and model for negotiating access to selected park resources. In general the project has performed according to plans; the only major underperformance is in respect of actual entered agreements on access to park resources.

The *Queen Elisabeth Protected Area Benefit Sharing* project has focused on local level advocacy on resource access and national and local level advocacy on revenue sharing. More regular resource sharing is reported, awareness has been created in park adjacent communities. However, only limited progress has been achieved in formalised agreements between Uganda Wildlife Authority and communities. Due to the institutional uncertainty and lack of resources in the Community Areas Institutions (local government level) only limited progress has been made within this field. The lack of project activities in this phase is thus fully justified due to institutional uncertainties.

The *Empowerment of Ethnic Minorities* project has provided tangible results and fulfilled targets in particular within the area of small enterprises and Village Savings and Loans Associations. It appears as a substantial level of sustainability has been reached. It is noted that unit costs however are very high. Substantial progress has also been made with regard to local advocacy.

The *Problem Animal Management* project has successfully piloted trenches and Mauritius thorn hedges. The major piloting contribution is on community involvement in managing the problem animal management initiatives. The project has successfully demonstrated the feasibility of this arrangement and other benefits to local communities. The project has had some success in promoting the approach vis-à-vis Uganda Wildlife Authority and local government, the major challenge however remains how to scale up these approaches beyond REPA funding.

Community Based Monitoring has been implemented within the REPA programme. The method which is well known in Uganda has proven to be an effective and successful method. The main challenge for the REPA programme is the sustainability of the Community Based Monitors. The evaluation team is not persuaded that there are very realistic strategies that exist for sustainability.

In the second part of the evaluation report a number of issues of a forward strategic nature are addressed. The first issue raised is a critical reflection on the *focus and scope of the programme*. It is the assessment, that while the activities of the programme all have some importance to the target communities they are not equally important for fulfilling the objectives of REPA. The implication is that the programme loses focus and consistency – it is recommended that in a future natural resource management programme attention should be on strategic focus and immediate relevance of the interventions for the programme objectives.

Pilot activities in a broad sense have been a dominant feature in the REPA programme. Reflections are made on the meaning and value of pilot activities. It is recognised that the pilot activities have provided important examples of methods, e.g. within community management of problem animal management (PAM) activities, the pilot activities have to some extent already been taken up by government institutions. In other instances the report is critical on the absence of clear and realistic strategies for up scaling outside CARE funded programmes. The review is critical of the programme largely remaining in pilot mode for five years. The implication has been very high unit costs and at the time limited level of sustainability.

The REPA programme represents a first generation of *Rights Based Approach* (RBA) programmes within CARE. The introduction of RBA has had major impact on the operation of REPA, and in the shift away from service delivery. CARE is commended for undertaking a thorough and very interesting study of the experiences from implementing RBA in Uganda and Ghana. The pragmatic approach to RBA in the study is supported by the evaluation. It is obvious from the study and the field observation that significant progress has been made, though major challenges continue to exist

in how to combine service provision in a strategic way with a RBA as well as around RBA and local conflicts.

Partnership is central to the mode of operation of CARE and the REPA programme. The evaluation appreciates the challenges in implementing a partnership approach between a resourceful International NGO such as CARE and young and resource constrained Ugandan civil society organisations. The relationships between REPA and Ugandan civil society organisations tend to be more of a contractual relationship than a full partnership. A number of factors contribute to this situation, including; short term contracts, a strong emphasis on output rather than shared values and strategies, a very hands on involvement of CARE capacity building group, limiting the scope for independent organisational growth. As a consequence of this the full potential for supporting the growth of the Ugandan civil society has not been reached.

REPA has played an important role in supporting local organisations in their work. Most of the engagement is with organisations on a bilateral basis. While this has been of benefit to the individual organisations, and the directly targeted communities the evaluation team argues that CARE/REPA is well situated to play a facilitative role with partners to strengthen horizontal and vertical relations among CSOs. This can be done through support for local and national networking activities. Further a new NRM programme could play an important role in facilitating relationships between government institutions and civil society.

Various forms of *capacity building* have been applied within the REPA programme, conventional “expert” lead training has however been dominant. The evaluation team however highlights the benefits of alternative approaches to capacity building and also highlights some of the examples from the programme including; the village based trainers programme, exchange and exposure and the advocacy clinics. There is an urge to shift the emphasis towards these forms of capacity building. Further based on a cost analysis there is a call for CARE to lessen its direct engagement in capacity building and focus more on a strategic and facilitative role in programme implementation.

Advocacy has played a prominent role in the programme, the programme has developed an advocacy strategy providing basic principles for advocacy. The strategy reflects well on the Ugandan reality. It is acknowledged that a number of gains have been made for the target groups of the programme through advocacy initiatives. REPA has in a number of instances been able to respond to emerging opportunities. Initiatives on local advocacy capacity building have been taken, including “advocacy clinics”, however only few examples exist of sufficient local capacity to undertake own advocacy. In line with general observations on partnership, there is a need to engage in long-term partnership in particular with national CSOs, such partnership should include support for the strengthening of vertical and horizontal linkages.

HIV/AIDS has not been prominent in the programme; though a few interesting mainstreaming activities have been undertaken recently. While the potential for mainstreaming should be analysed in the design of a new programme it is not recommended to further the engagement in HIV/AIDS.

The *budget* and actual expenditures in the REPA programme are biased towards spending by CARE, only 11,5% of expenditures were used for partner sub-grants in 2007, in 2008 the budget figure has gone up to 18,8% . While this is positive it is still out of proportion within a programme of the nature of REPA.

The REPA programme was assisted in the development of a *M&E system* by external consultants, however the system turned out to be very cumbersome and information heavy, after an attempt at revising the system it was finally dropped. This decision is supported – however for a coming programme it is important that a simple system supporting learning and strategic development is developed. This could include the use of principles of formative monitoring and evaluation. The present annual review is having some merits of a formative evaluation system, it is however too superficial and with too many vested interests to be strategic.

The last section of the report provides recommendations on ways ahead towards the development of a new NRM programme. This section includes recommendation on the new strategic directions of the programme and the mode of operation based on the observations provided in the previous sections. The final part provides suggestions for a two staged process of developing the programme.

1. Introduction

This Final Evaluation report for the CARE Danmark Rights Equity and Protected Areas (REPA) programme in Uganda has been elaborated by Moses Isooba and Flemming Gjedde-Nielsen (Team Leader), both external consultants to CARE.

The findings of the team are based on an extensive reading of programme/project documents, progress reports, specialised studies and written input from the REPA team. The team has further during its field visits had the opportunity to engage with selected CARE REPA staff, partners, members of the target group of REPA and other key stakeholders of relevance to the focus of the programme. The field visits were undertaken from 15 – 25 June, 2008.

It was agreed prior to the start of the evaluation that the main focus should be on reflection and learning based on previous programme performance, rather than a slavish documentation of progress vis-à-vis original targets. The weak monitoring system of REPA has hindered the compilation in particular of comprehensive quantitative data within the time span of the evaluation. The Evaluation Team acknowledges that provided the complexity and size of the intervention and the limited time spent in the field we cannot pay full justice to all aspects of the programme. We are however confident that the overall observations and strategic conclusions provided in this report are sufficiently well founded to reflect the major achievements and challenges of the Programme. It is our hope that the findings will prove to be of value in the formulation of a future CARE Danmark natural resource management programme in Uganda.

A draft version of the main findings of this report were presented in a debriefing workshop with REPA staff and REPA partners, and mistakes and inaccuracies that were pointed out then have subsequently been rectified and some of the findings further elaborated upon. The responsibility for findings and potential mistakes and interpretations however rests with the evaluation team.

The team would like to acknowledge the support rendered by the CARE REPA staff during our stay in Uganda. Further we would like to acknowledge the openness of REPA and CARE Uganda staff in engaging with the team, even when our questions or tentative conclusions were difficult or challenging.

2. Background

The REPA programme is a CARE Denmark supported programme funded by Danida. Initiated in 2003, the programme has been conceptualised based on CARE's longstanding experience in integrated conservation and development. Of particular importance are the two Danida funded CARE Denmark projects; Development through Conservation (1987 - 2002) and Queen Elizabeth Protected Areas Community Conservation Project (1996 – 2003).

While the project draws heavily on previous experiences it also represents a break with some of the approaches applied in these projects. The programme was conceptualised at a time of fundamental shifts in CARE from needs based to rights based approaches to development and a shift in the role of CARE from being an implementer of development interventions, to CARE working in partnership with national civil society organisations. These changes reflect simultaneous institutional changes within CARE Denmark and CARE Uganda, expressed in the Care Denmark *Strategic Directions of 2002* and in Uganda, *Long Range Strategic Plan 2002-2007*.

The general aim of the REPA programme is according to the overall goal of the programme to secure:

Poor natural resource-dependent households achieve sustainable livelihoods through the equitable sharing of costs and benefits and the fulfilment of rights and responsibilities from the use and management of forest and wildlife protected areas in Uganda

The overall goal has since 2006 been specified in three strategic directions:

1. *Facilitate local communities and protected area authorities to collaborate in developing and implementing replicable solutions, which increase local conservation benefits and reduce community level conservation costs*
2. *Promote expanded economic choices and diversified incomes to resource poor households living in and around protected areas.*
3. *Facilitate poor and marginalised groups and individuals living in and around protected areas to effectively articulate and fulfil their interests, rights and responsibilities with regard to the use and management of natural resources.*

The ultimate target group of the programme is poor and marginalised park adjacent households. Within this group a particular focus is on the ethnic minority groups of the Banyabutumbi, the Banyabindi, the Batwa and the Basongora, as well as the youth, women and the landless/near landless.

While the programme is national in scope and application, it develops and maintains its field activities in south western Uganda in the communities that surround important biodiversity resources such as the forest and wildlife areas of Queen Elizabeth Protected Area, Bwindi and Mgahinga Conservation Area including the adjacent forest reserve of Echuya. The Program currently operates in six rural districts.

The REPA programme has developed and adopted six “programme principles”. These are largely implementation approaches or strategies that define how specific components are implemented on the ground. They are as follows:

- CARE will support and participate in advocacy processes at local, national and international levels
- CARE will employ a rights-based approach
- CARE will target poor and marginalised groups
- CARE will work in partnership with others (primarily CSOs)
- CARE will support and build the capacity of civil society structures
- CARE will design and implement interventions in order to pilot and scale up beyond target areas.

The REPA programme went through a Mid Term Review (MTR) in January 2006 leading to significant changes in the structure and mode of implementation. The programme's mid term review observed amongst others that the programme setup with components (Conservation Costs & Benefits, advocacy, research, capacity building, Accountability & Representative Institutions, and economic empowerment) did not secure coherence and effectiveness in delivering the REPA overall goal. The MTR recommended that the results components be dissolved. As a consequence the programme has shifted from components as the operational unit, into developing projects as the main unit of programme implementation.

The programme has subsequent to the MTR been implemented through 4 projects, which are managed separately under the auspices of the Programme Development and Coordination Facility (PDCF). The PDCF is mandated with the responsibility to coordinate the projects into a coherent programme.

The projects are:

- The Problem Animal Management Project
- The Benefit Sharing Project
- The Empowerment of Ethnic Minorities at Queen Elizabeth National Park Project
- The Batwa Empowerment Project

Subsequent to the MTR the Project sites and activities were reduced to avoid spreading too thin on the ground. There was a move from issue teams to project teams led by Technical Managers. Partners were reviewed and some dropped. Staff was downsized and job descriptions revised to respond to the new model of program delivery and to improve teamwork and cost-effectiveness. These changes were partly a consequence of the MTR and partly of CARE Denmark's budget constraints. Previous components - community conservation, advocacy, research, capacity building and economic empowerment, and public accountability and representative institutions were mainstreamed in the program.

While we have no basis to dispute the validity of the MTR findings, it can be noted that the revision has been costly in respect of REPA's time and resources. In the words of a REPA staff: "most of 2006 was in reality spent on re-conceptualising the REPA projects, including drawing up the four projects which now provide the basis for implementation of the REPA programme". A consequence is that very little time was left between the MTR and the Final Evaluation to secure implementation of the programme.

All projects are being implemented in cooperation with civil society organisations in South Western Uganda and at national level. The programme currently has nine partners. In addition to the above mentioned projects, other individual projects with separate funding are being added to the portfolio and managed as an integral part of the programme. These include: Strengthening Local Governance in Natural Resource Management (SLOGIN) and Combating Child Mortality among Batwa (CCMB). The focus of the final evaluation has been on REPA and its four projects, since the MTR, i.e. the period 2006 – mid 2008.

The findings will be presented in the report, starting out in section 3. *Programme/project progress against stipulated targets*, providing an overview and discussion of progress against stipulated targets, this will be followed by section 4. *REPA strategic lessons learned* which will provide

reflections of a strategic nature on past experiences, the final section 5. *Ways ahead and new programme directions* will be based on the findings of the previous sections and provides input on potential processes for the programme formulation and general reflections on directions of the future CARE Danmark's natural resource management programme in Uganda.

3. Programme/project progress against stipulated targets.

This section will provide an outline of programme progress against stipulated targets, further this section will outline some immediate findings on progress, partner choice etc. whereby it is hoped to provide a general overview of programme/project performance. The subsequent assessment is largely based on REPA's progress reports, complemented and to the extent possible verified through field visits and interviews.

The *Batwa Empowerment Project* has shown substantial progress vis-à-vis stipulated targets this includes; support to strengthening of the United Organisation for Batwa Development in Uganda (UOBDU) as a functional and representative organization of the Batwa, the development and implementation of an empowering Village Based Training component, establishment of Village Savings and Loans Associations – the latter has been with some difficulties. The only area with substantial underperformance is in securing Batwa's access to selected park resources through negotiated agreements between the Batwa and the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA). The evaluation team got evidence of only one access agreement negotiated and signed out of the scheduled four agreements. Nature Uganda, a REPA partner has developed a system for stepwise mobilising communities and negotiating access rights and has been strengthened in its advocacy capacity. This makes Nature Uganda into a potential important resource for facilitating such agreements in the future. The evaluation team did however not see resident capacity left behind with UOBDU or the Batwa communities to negotiate access rights agreements at the time of the evaluation, nor is it likely that it will be achieved before the end of the programme by December 2008.

The partner organisations within this project in general have performed largely according to expected results. In particular two organisations hold potentials for developing into very interesting and locally strongly rooted organisations, with potentials far beyond delivering preconceived CARE programme interventions. UOBDU, is in spite of a limited paid up membership (presently 56 individual members) perceived by the Batwa communities visited as their legitimate organisation. UOBDU is also perceived as the link and voice of the Batwa communities in the wider world. UOBDU was clearly distinguished from any other organisation working with the Batwa community including CARE and the Minority Rights Group. In the view of the evaluation team UOBDU while still a young and fairly under resourced organisation holds great potential. The Uganda Functional Literacy Resource Centre (UFLRC), previously known as the Rukungiri Functional Literacy Resource Centre, RFLRC is another very interesting organisation based on a strong commitment of its members/volunteers, a strong community orientation in its methods and a fairly advanced pedagogical approach. The CARE programme has supported UFLRC in further developing the Village Based Trainers approach. From the engagement with the UFLRC and a group of Trainees it appears as if the model and the pedagogical methods hold potentials for local empowerment and could form the basis for a scaling up and replication by UFLRC and other organisations.

Queen Elizabeth Protected Area Benefit Sharing (QEPA-BS) project; the main thrust of this project has been at two fronts: advocacy at the local level for resource access and at the national and local

level (district and sub-county) for revenue sharing. This includes accountability monitoring work by Goodhope, KADDENET and KALI. According to REPA staff there is more regular implementation of the revenue sharing at park and district level to beneficiary communities, this is ascribed to local level advocacy. It is evident that awareness about benefit sharing has been created. However, not much progress has been achieved in the area of concrete formal agreements on resource access. Informal arrangements between UWA and communities show a positive trend, but more work is needed by partners and REPA staff to secure that communities are able to achieve formal agreements.

The result area of “*implementing partners, including QEPA CPI have increased organizational and technical capacity*” has only made limited progress. In an interview with the Conservation Area Manager of the Bwindi National Park, the evaluation team was informed that the Community Protected Area Institution (CPI) were not operational and that for sustainability reasons, it was more feasible to strengthen the current Environment and Natural Resource committee structure within the Ministry of Local Government. This position has subsequently been challenged by the REPA management, as they find that the CPI is the relevant forum within local government. The REPA management however acknowledge that the CPI’s is constrained by lack of funds. It is not possible within the duration of the evaluation to judge on the validity of the two positions; it is however essential that the strategies for the new NRM programme is based on a realistic assessment of institutional issues including access to resources and sustainability. Further it is important that common positions on feasible institutional frameworks are reached between key government and civil society actors. Though not a simple process it is the assessment of the evaluation team that CARE REPA has sufficient insights and legitimacy amongst government and civil society stakeholders to play a significant facilitating role in a process of developing a clear commonly accepted institutional framework. Due to institutional uncertainties the evaluation team find it fully justified that the programme has not embarked on major initiatives within this result area.

In the *Empowerment of the Ethnic Minorities project*, there are obvious gains as displayed from the different ethnic minority groups of the Basongora and Banyabindi. The partner organisations of the ethnic minorities are diverse by nature, reflecting socio economic status of the targeted ethnic minorities in society. Both the Basongora and Banyabindi groups supported appear to be legitimate organisations and with recorded success. Awareness of the risk of elite capture of the organisations and their agendas and the risk of promotion of “ethnic chauvinism” were present among REPA programme staff, and need to be taken account of in future programming.

Tangible results have been noted by the review team especially the small enterprises and VSLA that have successfully been established. The programme has amongst other things been able to meet its target of VSLA in the 3 ethnic minorities, and has even moved beyond this target by including VSL groups of poor ethnic majorities, as well as mixed groups of ethnic minorities and majority groups. These were supported to complete their savings training up to audit and sharing savings stage. Statements such as “even if CARE REPA left us, we shall never be the same again” and testimonies of the women in the ethnic minorities are a clear manifestation of increased civic consciousness and competences among this cluster of ethnic minorities. Due to the pilot nature of the intervention, the benefits are still confined to a very limited number of people, making the per capita cost comparatively speaking high. The advocacy at the local level undertaken by these groups is also evident of the substantial progress registered by the project.

The evaluation team was informed that the two implementing partners under this project; i.e. KADDNET (assisting in self reflection of the ethnic minorities) and TOERUP (facilitating the VSLA) have since been terminated from the programme, while this action appears to be justified due amongst others to problems of internal accountability, it is a major draw back. CARE REPA had invested substantially to build their capacity. CARITAS Uganda has subsequently taken on the role of TOERUP, while KALI took that of KADDNET.

REPA has, as part of the *Problem Animal Management* project successfully piloted two forms of problem animal control mechanisms, namely; trenches and the Mauritius thorn hedges. Both of these control measures have been used elsewhere (Rwanda and Kenya, and even around some other Ugandan parks) but are still not fully accepted as an effective measure for problem animal control. The project has probably been most important in respect of developing and testing models for community institution's direct involvement in managing problem animals through PAM/boundaries management committees. The project has provided evidence for the benefits of these measures at community level and the feasibility of community management. In a limited number of instances, the demonstrations in combination with local advocacy have led to the adaptation of the technique by local government. Examples of community UWA agreements on shared responsibility for maintenance are another achievement. In one community visited the trench digging had been started by the community with the exclusive use of own resources, while this appears not to be a viable model. With the present capacity and speed of digging it would take close to ten years for the community to secure the fields. This initiative is however a clear sign of the pertinence of the problem for park adjacent communities of addressing problem animals. The PAM has thus covered important ground in method development in particular in respect of community involvement, the major challenge is how to ensure up scaling outside REPA and institutionalisation of the gains.

Community Based Monitors is a known and well tested concept in Uganda, originally championed by the Uganda Debt Network; it is thus not entirely clear what exactly is the pilot character of the intervention. Nevertheless the community based monitors have also within the REPA programme proven to be an effective and relevant means for public involvement in monitoring of government service delivery. The contribution of REPA is thus to enhance and spread the concept to new areas – this is well and fine but the linkage to the overall objective of REPA on NRM in park adjacent communities appears to be weak. The community monitors have been trained according to plans and based on information from local government officials they are successfully filling an important monitoring function. The major challenge is however on sustainability, apparently there is only a vague strategy counting on that “communities now feel more empowered, they want good service delivery, and thus will continue on their own”. A total reliance on voluntarism without even compensation for expenses is hardly generally applicable - for most communities this strategy does not appear to be realistic. Further, one could question whether starting out a system with “paid” (refund of expenses) is an adequate strategy for developing a fully voluntary system totally independent of external funding. The problem of sustainability is enhanced in the areas where REPA has trained Community Based Monitors outside any Ugandan institutional framework. Some suggested strategies for sustainability could be; to integrate community based monitors into the local government system, this strategy could however easily shift the dynamic as community based monitors could easily be co-opted and as a consequence be less likely to raise critical issues. Another option is to maintain the community based monitors as a fully civil society intervention and rely on donor funding. One could question the long term financial sustainability of this solution, it is however likely that with the trends toward a strong focus on good governance that such a system could attract funding if implemented in a professional and cost effective manner. A future

CARE programme could consider supporting the development of these preconditions. However, this should only be done if it is clearly integrated into the strategic focus on natural resource management.

Under the REPA programme, the Project Development & Coordination Facility (PDCF) plays the coordination function especially creating and maintaining strategic linkages with statutory institutions such as UWA and National Forest Authority (NFA). The PDCF has also continued to manage the process activities such as gender, national & global level advocacy and reviews such as this one. While the efficiency of this facility has not been assessed in great detail, it should be noted that REPA largely through the PDCF has secured good relationship and recognition with government and other key actors. The performance in respect of strategic leadership is as will be further elaborated in subsequent sections mixed.

In conclusion it can be said that the REPA programme has largely delivered on the concrete outputs. Further less tangible achievements observed by the Evaluation Team include:

- REPA is well positioned and respected among key government and civil society stakeholders as a resource.
- REPA is well connected and trusted by government institutions (UWA, NFA, Local Government), this holds great potentials for a future facilitative role for a CARE NRM programme.
- REPA staffs have developed considerable insights into the challenges related to natural resource management in park adjacent communities.
- REPA has identified and entered into relationships with a number of partners holding great potentials.
- REPA and CARE Danmark have had the courage to address pertinent developmental issues of immediate relevance for the programme through the commissioning of critical high quality studies, including; “Find the group and you have found the poor”, “Biting the hand that Feeds You”. These were commissioned as action research studies and therefore a high premium was placed on community involvement and feedback sessions.

The major challenges in respect of programme outcome in the view of the mission relate to sustainability and replication. The evaluation team finds that sustainability for a substantial number of interventions is questionable at the present moment; this includes organisational and institutional sustainability. Exceptions to this are some of the community level achievements including problem animal live fences and VSLA groups which will most likely be able to continue irrespective of further external input. On scaling up, the REPA programme document 2003 – 2008, is providing a concise and particular understanding. Scaling up can be achieved in two ways, either when *field interventions are linked to policy change processes* or when the programme is *influencing the operations of other institutions*. Within such a definition, which excludes scaling up within the REPA programme itself only relatively few examples of successful scaling up exist, some successes of up scaling includes; local governments taking up PAM interventions, the allocation of land to the Basongora in Kasese and the likely future allocation of land for Batwa in Kisoro. The only noteworthy exceptions are measured successes in up scaling of the models for Problem Animal Management introduced by REPA, where Local Governments and UWA have taken up the model in a limited number of communities. A Draft Advocacy Strategy for Rights Equity and Protected Areas Programme 2006-2007 (December 2006) exist. This strategy amongst others addresses important issues including up scaling particularly of PAM models, the strategy however remains

very general and over ambitious (most of the targets for 2007 has thus not been achieved). However, in spite of measured up scaling successes it appears as if only very general strategies exist for further up scaling or policy change was available.

4. Strategic challenges and lessons

As has been noted above considerable progress has been made with regards to achievement of stipulated output and in positioning CARE within the NRM sector – a sound basis for further programming thus exists. This section will primarily focus on the strategic challenges in realising this potential.

This will be done by reflecting on programme strategies and praxis in light of the objectives of the REPA programme, the broader Uganda context and the relevance and effectiveness of the chosen means of interventions. The emphasis compared to the previous section has thus moved from looking at the programme in light of providing stipulated outputs to looking at relevance, of the scope, focus and methods applied in light of the Ugandan context and the strategic aims of the programme. The reflection on existing practices will primarily serve as a basis for looking ahead, and this will be done in the form of a set of recommendations on strategic adjustments in a new CARE Danmark NRM programme.

4.1 Relevance of REPA programme focus

The overall focus of the REPA programme as stated in the programme goal (development objective) of the project which reads:

Poor natural resource-dependent households achieve sustainable livelihoods through the equitable sharing of costs and benefits and the fulfilment of rights and responsibilities from the use of forest and wildlife protected areas in Uganda.

The programme goal is providing a clear focus of the programme, it is strongly influenced by the language of a Rights Based Approach (RBA) to development and governance. It is almost exclusive focus on the rights issues and challenges relating to being a park adjacent community. The strong RBA and park orientation in the programme goal is somewhat watered down in the four project goals, this is particularly the case in the Problem Animal Management (PAM) project document. A further watering down of the focus is noted when moving on to the activity level. As an example, and not withstanding that VSLA is having empowering potential one could question how the inclusion of VSLA and handicraft skills training is logically linked to the focus of the overall objective on “equitable sharing of costs and benefits and the fulfilment of rights and responsibilities from the use of forest and wildlife protected areas in Uganda”. The evaluation team find that some of the activities, while of immediate benefit to the target group are not of significant strategic importance to achievement of the overall objective. The consequence is that the programme spread too thinly.

It is questionable whether the LFA, causality chain holds. Challenging the relationships between the hierarchies of objectives and activities might seem to be a rather formalistic exercise – we would however argue that it is having a direct bearing on the effectiveness, cohesion and potentials for synergy in the REPA programme and its four projects.

The REPA programme appears to be more of a general framework covering four discrete project interventions rather than a coherent programme providing strategic¹ guidance and direction optimising the use of the limited resources available for the projects and its activities. It appears as if the programme would not lose inner consistency should one of the projects be dropped. One reason for this situation could be that the revision of the programme subsequent to the MTR was exclusively done by formulating new projects; no new overall programme was developed based on the recommendations of the MTR.

From the discussions with REPA staff, including discussions on future directions of a NRM programme it was apparent that rather than being directed by strategies, REPA staff are largely thinking in activities and responding to immediate demands. As a consequence some activities have taken upon their own life with weak obvious relationship to the programme objective. While it is important to relate to demands, it shall be done within the strategic framework of the intervention and based on the capacity and capabilities of CARE and partners.

While all the activities undertaken within the REPA programme can be said to be relevant in the Ugandan context, and broadly within the global focus of CARE Danmark on natural resource management, they do not all appear to be equally relevant for the fulfilment of the programme goal. The very broad and weak strategic approach along with the vast geographical coverage of the programme makes the intervention rather unfocused and thinly spread. This is having negative implications on synergy, CARE's oversight and in terms of costs.

It is recommended that;

- In order to ensure consistency, synergy and high professional standards, a new CARE NRM programme shall have a clear strategic focus with a clear and explicit link between overall strategy and sub-strategies/project-projects and activities.
- A revised strategy shall thus provide clear guidance and principle for how and when the programme shall respond to challenges, demands and opportunities in the context. This shall be based on an assessment of the importance of the challenge/opportunity for the fulfilment of the strategy and on whether CARE NRM can do and is the right programme to respond to the challenge (this shall be based on; values, purpose, capability of CARE NRM programme).
- That the programme performance on a recurrent basis (e.g. annually) is assessed against objectives and strategies. It should be considered to attach an external formative evaluation resource person who shall serve as a “critical friend” providing sparing for the programme

¹ Strategy is widely used within business and development activities, yet no generally accepted unambiguous definition exist. Strategy (and strategic) will be understood as; *A strategy provides the framework which guides those choices that determine the nature and direction of the organisation (programme/project)* (Benjamin Tregoe and John Zimmermann, Top Management Strategy 1980). In this definition the emphasis is on providing a framework for decisions in an ever shifting environment, a strategy is thus very different from a plan, which is a blueprint for implementation. The need for having a strategy is based on the realisation that there is not just one way of responding to challenges and opportunities in the environment and that the environment in which you are operating is ever shifting - a strategy shall thus help to decide on what response to take (if any), hereby avoiding short term opportunistic responses which is not supporting the overall objective and might distort the overall programme dynamic and logic of the intervention. The aim of a strategy is thus to enhance the capability of responding to the opportunities and challenges in the context but in a way that further the objective of the programme. For further reading reference is made to Strategic Processes and Strategy Development, IBIS southern Africa Guidance paper 2007 compiled by Flemming Gjedde-Nielsen. Available at; www.disability.dk/DPODnews/gender-strategy-1/strategy-development-final.doc

management and where needed challenge programme decisions and developments in light of the overall strategy and shift in context (this is further elaborated upon in section 5 of this document).

4.2 Role of Pilot activities

The REPA programme has had a strong emphasis on pilot activities. Pilot activities are within REPA's practice understood in fairly broad terms. A number of activities such as Community Based Monitors (CBM), Village Savings and Loans Association (VSLA) can hardly be termed pilot activities in a Ugandan context. The CBM falls under the ambit of the concept of Community Based Monitoring and Evaluation systems that has been pioneered in many districts by Uganda Debt Network for years. VSLA is a CARE developed version of ROSCA (Rotating Savings and Credit Associations). It was originally developed in Niger and has been implemented by CARE International throughout Africa, it has been taken up by other organisations including DfID in Uganda and is according to one estimate having 125,000 participants in Uganda². More genuine pilot activities can be found within the PAM project where REPA has introduced trenches and Mauritius thorns tested elsewhere in Uganda and the region but still not commonly accepted or used in Uganda, as already mentioned REPA has further been piloting community management within PAM.

According to the programme document the aim of pilot activities is to develop, test and showcase good local development initiatives and practices for replication and up-scaling. The programme document operates with two means for up-scaling; either through "policy change" or "influencing other institutions" to replicate successful pilot activities (REPA Programme Document 2003 p. 33). Within these definitions replicating pilot activities within the REPA programme does not count as replication. The project documents from 2006 written after the MTR added fundraising from international donors as a means for up scaling. While fundraising might be appropriate it is problematic to see it as the up scaling strategy as it is not a sustainable alternative to the original definition of up scaling strategies.

These intentions and definition of up-scaling provided in the programme document does not provide much strategic guidance, neither do the project documents from 2006 for how scaling up and replication can be undertaken. Apart from the Draft Advocacy Strategy, which is clear on up scaling objectives (particularly related to PAM) but rather weak on concrete analysis and strategy, no explicit and concrete strategies exist for the scaling up of the individual pilot interventions. In spite of this strategic weakness some important experiences on replication and institutionalisation of pilot activities outside CARE/REPA funded activities has been undertaken. Prominent examples include PAM activities and what looks like promising advocacy work on revision of the revenue sharing guidelines by Uganda Wildlife Authority.

In contrast to the definition in the 2003 Programme Document scaling up is often seen by REPA staff as providing "more of the same" within the framework of CARE funding. Within this broader understanding important up-scaling initiatives have been undertaken within the last year, in particular the support for the development and extension of Village Based Trainers should be highlighted.

² VSLA Associates at www.vsla.net

The evaluation team find that the strong emphasis on pilot activities is a reflection of an exaggerated trust in technocratic solutions and the benefit of the example; we would rather argue that change processes are complex human and social processes involving complex power relationships. Within such a perspective the limited success in up scaling activities are hardly surprising, as change processes only appear based on a deep long-term engagement between civil society and government officials.

A consequence for the programme of largely staying in pilot mode has been that the per capita cost for reaching the target group has been extremely high. The evaluation team find that it is difficult to justify undertaking “pilot” activities for five years within a programme of the size and scope of the REPA programme.

It is recommended that:

- Emphasis shall be on engaging in socio economic change processes with partners, rather than developing pilot interventions. Pilot interventions might play a limited part in such a strategy but can never be the hallmark of the project.
- If pilot activities will be deemed necessary in a future NRM intervention, it is important that they are only undertaken based on a thorough analysis of the broader context and the potentials for replication and scaling up prior to the start, explicit tentative strategies for how up-scaling shall be undertaken must be developed as part of the conceptualisation of the interventions.
- The original understanding of replication shall be maintained as direct funding of “more of the same” normally only have limited impact on sustainable societal change.
- In going to scale with CARE partners focus should be on developing cost effectiveness and institutional sustainability methods that can be picked up without heavy external input, this could e.g. include peer learning through local exchange. If such cost effective models are developed with partners they could be supported as a replication strategy within a CARE natural resource management programme.

4.3 Rights Based Approach (RBA) and service delivery

REPA is a first generation RBA intervention within CARE. It is therefore not surprising that the translation of the abstract RBA approach into concrete practice has been a major challenge for REPA. While it is not evident that the REPA programme fully applies RBA, it certainly appears as if the introduction of RBA has had an effect on the thinking of the REPA staff and supported a shift from CARE mainly as a service provider and implementer. When it comes to partners, the picture is mixed, some have taken on RBA and a few are certainly not RBA, but for a good number of partners it is probably not much more than a new “donor imposed” fashion which it is difficult to identify with. This should however not be a major concern for CARE as the importance of RBA is to guide approaches to development – all participants in a programme do not necessarily need to fully comprehend or adhere to RBA to be part of a programme as long as the partnerships are formed around a general RBA approach.

As part of a process of generating learning and developing CARE Denmark’s capacity within RBA, a study has been conducted on the experience from CARE Denmark’s implementation of RBA

within the Agriculture and Natural Resource Programmes in Ghana and Uganda³. Apart from analysing experiences from two CARE Danmark programme countries the study provides important insights from the current international discussions into the challenges in applying RBA within the natural resource management sector. CARE should be commended for undertaking this interesting study, which provides thorough critical insights into some of the challenges of implementing a RBA within the natural resource management sector. While such a study is an obvious way of clarifying and developing the understanding and practice of an International Non Government Organization (INGO), such thorough initiatives are fairly rare amongst INGOs. The study is very recent (April 2008) and thus can not be expected to have noteworthy impact on the implementation of RBA within REPA yet, the study however deserves to be carefully studied and discussed within CARE. Issues highlighted by the study include amongst others; individual and collective rights where the latter is often marginalised within the dominant legalistic discourse, issues relating to competing and contradictory demands deriving from e.g. international environmental conventions on biodiversity versus the rights of local communities living adjacent to parks. The study found that RBA can be helpful in beginning to unpack such competing but legitimate claims and that a RBA can open a process that empowers those with valid claims but in a weak bargaining position. The study however in line with recent international trends within the environment sector found that rather than having a strong focus on complex substantive environment rights, the focus should rather be on ensuring procedural rights; the right to participate in decision making, equality and non-discrimination and accountability.

The study is based on a fairly un-dogmatic approach to RBA, which acknowledges that RBA particularly when working with extreme poor communities such as the Batwa communities cannot stand alone. The study warns against the risk of “the pendulum swinging.... too far” in taking on RBA. The study concludes that RBA should probably be applied with other interventions including service delivery. The evaluation team would agree with this general observation, however at the same time the observations of the evaluation team are that the combination of RBA and service provision has been a major challenge in REPA, in most instances activities will tend to be either RBA or service delivery. From interviews with partners and community members it appears as if the REPA programme in the provision of services at least in some instances has shifted the focus of CSOs and communities from approaching resource trapped and probably difficult local governments to approaching what appears to be much easier resources from CARE, hereby in reality shifting the focus from holding duty bearers accountable. The REPA management is clearly aware of this dilemma, and probably only need to keep the discussion within REPA alive on a continuous basis, based on experiences from concrete interventions.

In line with the Danida Civil Society strategy, service delivery shall be applied as a strategic means for strengthening advocacy, capacity building and local empowerment. While good examples of mainly individual empowerment based on service delivery can be found within REPA, in general the team found that the strategic use of service could be strengthened. The study acknowledges this issue but is unfortunately rather silent on concrete ways whereby service delivery and RBA can be combined.

A major concern expressed by REPA programme staff is that promoting the rights through empowerment of e.g. the organisations of ethnic minorities could foster local conflicts with neighbouring communities around competing demands for natural resources. The evaluation team

³ The Application of a Rights Based Approach to CARE Danmark’s Agriculture and Natural Resource Programmes, CARE Danmark, April 2008.

concur with the concern of the REPA team. The problem however does not relate to the RBA per se but contextual factors such as increased population pressure. We would argue that the problem is probably more related to the exclusive focus on the rights of ethnic minorities in two of the REPA projects and the chosen approach, this is also acknowledge by the projects and being addressed by the promotion of cross ethnic cooperation. The field observation of the team is that there is a fine and ambiguous line between securing the rights of minority groups and the risk of promotion of ethnic exclusivity and chauvinism. From the field observations the risk seems to increase when working with minority groups who are politically but in general terms not economic terms not marginalised. An example of this is the Basongora who feel that they are marginalised as pastoralists, but can not in general be seen as particularly economically deprived. The team came across highly articulate and politicised ethnic elite positions which could spark local conflicts. The evaluation team would suggest that in the design of the future NRM programme effort should be taken to ease the focus on ethnic minorities, and work more around the general rights issues of park adjacent communities with a strong focus on building local alliance (this approach is further elaborated in section 4.5 of this report) across ethnic boundaries, within such a focus securing the specific rights of ethnic minorities and in particular the rights of the indigenous Batwa communities should remain a programme concern. CARE Uganda is having in-house capacity in conflict resolution which should be drawn upon in the design process.

It is recommended that:

- Following the recommendation from the CARE RBA study that a pragmatic approach to the implementation of RBA is applied in a new CARE programme where RBA are in a strategic way combined with e.g. needs based approaches.
- The strategic links between service delivery and the promotion of citizenship and RBA shall be strengthened and made explicit in the programme strategy for a new CARE Denmark NRM programme, service provision can and shall be used as a basis for negotiating long-term commitments from Ugandan duty bearers.
- Service delivery shall be carefully used as a means to promote sustainable local organisations of poor and marginalised communities and creating horizontal and vertical linkages.
- Great care in design and implementation should be placed on ensuring that programme interventions do not detract the attention from the role and responsibility of Ugandan duty bearers.
- Conflict analysis and mitigation, including but limited to potential inter ethnic conflicts should be a concern in the design and implementation of the new NRM programme, it should be considered to draw on the in-house CARE Uganda's competency within this field in the design and possibly implementation of the new programme.

4.4 REPA partnership roles and relationships

Civil society understood as formalised organisations (NGOs, CBOs, Think Tanks etc.) are of a recent nature in Uganda, most of them have emerged in the post 1986 dispensation. CSOs are thus in general youthful, fragile and ephemeral and fairly weak professionally, institutionally and programmatically. They are often dependant on the Founder member(s) and the charisma of the leadership. The impetuses behind formations of CSOs are complex and diverse ranging from strong social commitment to more or less employment or business oriented motives. Most CSOs beyond the community level organisations are highly dependent on external resources. A re-known

Ugandan analyst provided the following metaphor; ‘Civil Society is like boiling milk; it froths and fumes, but settles down as soon as you turn off the heat’ (Oloka Onyango, 2006). Could CARE and other donors be the heat that is keeping civil society partner organizations alive? If so, what does this mean for partnerships?

Partnership is a flagship of CARE Denmark’s interventions. It is obviously not an easy task to work in partnerships for a well resourced professional organization such as CARE in a context like the one prevailing in Uganda where partners are largely economically dependent on the flow of economic resources from the international partner. CARE should be commended for the considerable efforts, energy and resources that have been invested in developing its understanding and practice of partnership. This includes CDK development of a systematized (though fairly technocratic) understanding of diverse relationships, the “partner-meter”, further CARE Uganda with external facilitation have conducted a full workshop on partnerships in 2004 for staff, including REPA staff.

The Evaluation team is largely in line with the perception of partnership as outlined in the report from the 2004 partnership workshop. In the view of the evaluation team, partnership is a permanently negotiated relationship, constituted by:

- Shared agendas with equality of commitment.
- An acknowledgement of the mutuality in the relationship – each side brings something unique to the partnership.
- Clear division of roles and responsibilities.
- Respect for the integrity and boundaries of each partner in the partnership.
- Long-term commitments based on shared aspirations which go beyond the delivery of a concrete output.

A central aim of a developmental partnership shall be to further the development and growth of the partner organizations.

During the interviews with REPA partners it was clear that the relationships were diverse, dependant amongst others on the size and capacity of the organizations and the length of the relationship. In spite of the diversity it was observed that certain characteristics dominate the relationships.

Most prominently is that there is a strong output bias in most partnerships, they are dominated by the REPA agenda, and the very concrete activities and outputs stipulated in the REPA projects, rather than being based on genuinely shared agendas with equality of commitment and ownership. There are a number of reasons for this which include; CARE Uganda tends to emphasise poverty orientation as providing as much concrete services to the poor as possible within a given project – this is in contrast to a slower and more long term approach of supporting the development of sustainable civil society organisations of the poor, or organisations working with and articulating the needs and demands of the poor, this is certainly not an argument for working with organisations who are never going to perform but merely a shift in the emphasis. Two issues are closely linked to this, namely:

- The project design, which is having a strong emphasis on concrete output at a community level rather than seeing civil society and organisational growth as the objective.

- The dominance of short term contracts, which might be feasible for concrete delivery of services but inadequate for organisational growth and development.

While MoU have been entered into with some partners, it is obvious from the discussions with partners that even where MoU have been signed that most relationships are seen as contractual and often short term. While contractual relationships might be appropriate in a start up situation where relationships are tested out, or in the provision of very concrete input such as a training or research, it appears to be an almost generalized approach in the REPA programme. Even with a strong organization such as Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment (ACODE) subcontracting rather than true partnerships has been the case. While the evaluation team acknowledges that there are structural imbalances between a well resourced INGO such as CARE and local mainly under-resourced NGOs we find that more could have been done on the side of CARE to mitigate this by acknowledging the importance of local NGOs as resources of unique importance which can not be substituted by INGO's. In our view REPA has missed opportunities for benefiting from the capacity, energy and relationships that partner organisations are in possession of by this rigid approach to partnership.

CARE does provide support for overhead expenses (7%) and capacity building for partner organizations, which should be commended. However, there is a strong bias in the kind of capacity building provided as part of the partnerships towards the more technical side of support, including capacity building for reporting, financial management etc. There was according to the programme management substantially more focus on organizational development (OD) related issues during the period 2006-7. However, in our opinion organisational growth must be a continuous process and approach to capacity development adapted to the needs of the individual organisations and not something that can be "handled" at the outset and then left. The bulk of capacity building provided is thus primarily directed at strengthening the capacity and capabilities as implementers of concrete pre-designed REPA projects, rather than being aimed at building strong independent civil society actors. From the interaction with REPA partners it was obvious that at least some of them have major challenges on identity, strategic positioning, concrete strategies and organization relationships – as an illustration one of the organizations visited presented their focus areas in a way which looked more like a wish list with 17 items, it appears that a precondition for such an organisation to move on is a focused strategy – what is at offer is however technical support. This bias in capacity building is not only a product of the output orientation in the partner relationships but most likely also based on the tradition and prevailing capacity related to civil society capacity building. Very little capacity and tradition exist in Uganda on working with whole organizations in a process oriented manner, including working with identity, relationships and strategic processes. According to one informant, few organizations have competences within these fields, Community Development Resource Network (CDRN) a former REPA partner being one of them.

Since the MTR where the cooperation with CDRN was dropped, REPA has had a strong hands on role in capacity building, a very high proportion of capacity building is undertaken by CARE REPA staff. The evaluation team has not investigated the concrete rationale for REPA to terminate the relationship with CDRN, and thus have no reason for disputing the rationale of CARE to terminate the relationship. However, the shift from undertaking capacity building through a partner organization to one where CARE REPA staff holds the responsibility for capacity building warrants some critical reflection. Our fundamental concern is not with the quality of the provided service per se. Apart from having a technical bias as noted above we have no reason to question the quality of the REPA support, our concern is the implications of the mixture of roles as a funding and a capacity building organisation. Depending on the nature of the capacity building such a mixture

could have negative impact as it could blur boundaries and increase dependency. Further capacity building interventions could easily, and is according to some partner informants seen, at least as an indirect control mechanism. Adding to this risk is an apparently very hands on and frequent engagement between REPA staff and partner organisations, leaving little space for partner organisations to fail and learn from failure and hereby develop as self confident organisations.

Apart from the above concern, partnering/using local service providers within CSO capacity building will be a contribution to the development of a self-contained Ugandan civil society. Apart from being a broker of financial resources CARE might support the development of a civil society support sector by being a broker of methods and contacts in such a partnership. Such arrangements are not only more sustainable but most likely more cost effective at least in the long run. It is acknowledged that presently only very few specialised organisations within this field exist in Uganda, this is however not very different from the situation in most African countries until fairly recently. As an example; in Ghana until very recently the situation was very similar to the Ugandan one, however concerted efforts by a number of INGOs have turned this situation around and though still not sufficient a number of qualified organisations specialised in CSO capacity building have emerged and are able to provide quality support. A CARE NRM programme could potentially play an important role in a similar development.

The output and control focus of the REPA partnerships might in the short run be an effective way of securing concrete and tangible results, is however not effective in developing civil society organizations let alone strengthening civil society as active participants and voices in the development of the Ugandan society. To concur with the DANIDA civil society strategy, which is within a general poverty framework having an explicit focus on civil society strengthening as agents of change for the poorest sections of society there is a need to shift the emphasis in a future NRM programme further towards seeing civil society strengthening as the core of the objective.

A recent study on the impact of the aid chain, where Uganda has been used as one of the case studies revealed that the CARE/REPA praxis is more of the rule than the exception, the study thus concluded that; “all donors (including INGOs) were definitely experienced as donors and not partners in development”⁴. The review team acknowledges that shifting from subcontracting to a developmental partnership is not easy – at the same time we however find that unless a new CARE NRM programme manages to undertake such a shift the potential for strengthening CSO as independent actors with own identity rather than implementers of preconceived donor interventions is very limited.

It is recommended that a new CARE Danmark within a NRM programme:

- Revisit its understanding, purpose, practice and nature of partnerships, this shall include
 - That partnership be based on strategic dialogue and shared purposes rather than primarily being a means for delivery of concrete outputs.
 - That partnership is based on long-term mutual commitment.
 - That emphasis be on a conscious joint process of learning and adjustment of interventions rather than implementation of blueprint plans
 - That the primary aim of partnership is to strengthen independent organizational sustainable civil society organizations able to articulate and promote own agendas.

⁴ Tina Wallace, *The Aid Chain*, University of KwaZulu-Natal Press 2007, p 82.

- That CARE is having a more hands off approach to partnership, where partners are taking control of own development and determining their own destiny.
 - That CARE should be willing to include support for organisation's own development and strategic processes, this could i.e. include funding of staff retreats, support for staff development apart from and on top of what is offered by CARE as part of the NRM programme.
 - A shift in balance of CARE's role towards more of a facilitator and less of a controller⁵
 - That CARE should continue to support overhead costs of its partners, it should be considered to move one step further in the direction of organization support by opening up for payment of individually negotiated overhead cost rates rather than payment for predefined positions or costs or flat 7%, this to strengthen the room for organisations to utilise resources as a flexible instrument for organisational strengthening.
- Shift the emphasis in the role of CARE in the partnership, from being the provider of capacity building to support the development of a local civil society support sector able to provide relevant support.
 - CARE could apart from being a broker of funds continue and step-up it role as a facilitator and broker of methods and contacts to civil society support organisations in Uganda and elsewhere.

4.5 Developing institutional interfaces

REPA has directly and through partner organisations played an important role in promoting community interests vis-à-vis local Government, UWA and NFA. This has in particular been the case on issues of problem animal management, Batwa land issue and benefit sharing where examples exist of successful promotion of community interests vis-à-vis government institutions. These initiatives have been of benefit to the targeted local communities, but the lasting capacity in communities and civil society at large are still limited. Provided the relative recent nature of these ventures this is not surprising, but the evaluation team have doubt on whether the approach of working with fairly small rural community based organisations as individual partners will help building a social movement/force that can trigger sustainable social change at any scale. We would like to suggest that CARE need to work with multiple layers of civil society spanning the whole civil society spectrum with a strong emphasis on supporting horizontal and vertical civil society linkages. Further we would like to suggest that such an approach should be combined with working on strengthening transparent and democratic forms of interface primarily at a local level between Local Government and other relevant government bodies on the one side and CSOs including representative community organisations on the other.

It appears as if CARE/REPA is well situated to play an important facilitative role and hereby secure a broader impact beyond individual partner organisations and the individual partner agreements. As mentioned earlier in this report CARE/REPA is widely acknowledged as a resource in the NRM sector and in particular issues related to parks. This is based on CARE's longstanding involvement with parks and park adjacent communities and a thorough knowledge on the related environment and development issues. Further CARE due to its history of cooperation with government (UWA,

⁵ Facilitation is unlike common parlance in Uganda used in a narrow sense as a process and professional practice of reaching an agreed outcome through a communication and awareness raising process supported by a facilitator with involved stakeholders.

Local Government), civil society and community organisations is uniquely placed to play a facilitative role in developing democratic and accountable interfaces within the sector. This potential was acknowledged during discussions with a senior UWA official, the Community Area Manager for Bwindi National Park.

It thus appears as if untapped potential exist for a CARE NRM programme promoting procedural and substantive rights for park adjacent communities. CARE in partnerships with national Ugandan organisations could play a role as broker of contacts and resources for democratic interfaces between communities and civil society, and government institutions.

In concrete terms this could be done by CARE in partnership with resourceful national NGOs working on the development of local platform of community organisations and civil society able to engage with relevant local government organisations, UWA and NFA on issues of importance for park adjacent communities. Local platforms and alliances should preferably be based on existing local networks (Lessons from EMPAFORM another CARE Project could inform this strategy), and only where no such institutions exist should it be considered to directly engage in the development of new local platforms.

Working with strong national partners in the driving seat, who share a desire to develop local civil society capacity is having substantial added value in the form of;

- Strengthening local networking, and the development of locally mediated solutions.
- Strengthening vertical linkages and the development of shared agendas between national and local levels.
- Strengthening local horizontal relationships among CSOs and local communities, able to “negotiate” around natural resource issues.
- Increased likelihood of sustainability.
- Strengthening Ugandan civil society capacity, rather than CARE Uganda.

CARE should consider working in partnership with more national partners on parallel interventions in different geographical locations; this would increase the diversity in experiences and strengthen the national resource base. In such a set-up CARE could play an important role in supporting cross organisational learning and development based on collegial relationship amongst CSOs. This idea was discussed with ACODE who saw such a collaboration to be much more rewarding and interesting both to ACODE and CARE than previous working relationships.

It is recommended that;

- A new NRM programme move from working exclusively with individual CSOs, to focusing on working with development of CSO networks with an interest in NRM areas, platforms and relationships in support of fostering local social movements/forces around NRM in park adjacent communities
- A new NRM programme aims at developing partnerships with national organisations on promoting local civil society networks/platforms addressing issues of park adjacent communities.
- CARE in partnership with national NGOs serve as facilitators and brokers of contacts between local government institutions, UWA, NFA and local CSOs.

- That an objective for the local forum apart from strengthening joint civil society positions in interfacing with government institutions is to serve as a platform for resolving local inter-community disputes over natural resources.

4.6 REPA's approach to Capacity Building

The REPA programme with partners has had a rather conventional approach to capacity building with emphasis on “expert” led training and transfer of knowledge. A limited number of alternative means for capacity building has however been applied within the programme including; development of village based trainers and community level exchange and the advocacy clinics.

The conventional training can be useful in particular when transferring hard skills (computer literacy, accounting systems, legal matters etc.), to a target group with a formal education background. The fundamental assumption underpinning most training is that the trainer holds the answers, and that the knowledge has to be transferred through the training process. Conventional training can however also be disempowering in particular for groups with limited or no formal education as it tends to ignore experiences and knowledge and in particular knowledge not derived from formal training.

When dealing with complex community or organisation issues what is needed is not primarily the infusion of knowledge but rather to surface insights, knowledge, aspirations and engage potential conflicts, this can be done through a facilitated process that can form the basis for finding own solutions. Such an approach has according to REPA staff already been used within the advocacy clinics and could be built on. It is the experience of the evaluation team that systematic use of facilitated processes, building on own resources and strength is an empowering means for creating independent organisations/communities.

Apart from the advocacy clinics the evaluation team did encounter some facilitative approaches, including:

The village based trainers programme, from the interaction with trainers and trainees and based on experiences from similar ventures this approach appears to be effective, empowering and cost effective alternative. The strength in the approach includes respectful and empowering training and mentoring pedagogical methods which include community involvement and accountability.

Exchange and exposure visits have been used in a limited number of instances; they were however often highlighted in the interviews with community members as very empowering and could be further developed and systematised as a means for community empowerment. Exchange visits / exposures could also be an integral part of strengthening local cross community understanding and cooperation.

It was noted that CARE/REPA programme is undertaking a very substantial part of the training on its own; this is due to the cost structures of CARE/REPA programme - an expensive and not very sustainable way of providing capacity building. Further it is questionable whether REPA staff will always be the best positioned to provide the training due to the previously mentioned problem of mixing of roles and blurring of boundaries between CARE/REPA and partners. A more sustainable and at least in the long run cost effective way of working would be to identify Ugandan organisations that can undertake, or can be supported to undertake capacity building interventions. In such a scenario the role of a CARE NRM programme would be strategic, facilitative and monitoring/controlling. Part of a facilitator role for CARE could be to be a broker of contact and

resources for such organisations to engage with experienced and innovative capacity building organisations primarily in Uganda and elsewhere in Africa.

It is recommended that;

- A future NRM programme should shift the emphasis from conventional training towards increased emphasis of facilitating change processes aiming at surfacing knowledge, resources and aspirations in the partner organisations and target communities.
- A new programme should consciously shift from CARE implemented trainings to the use of Ugandan service providers; this will most likely include a focus on strengthening the capacity of these providers.
- CARE could play an important role as a broker of contacts and resources to facilitate contacts to innovative organisations within capacity building in Uganda and elsewhere in Africa.

4.7 Advocacy

The evaluation team acknowledges that the recent political reform programme has brought political pluralism epitomized in the adoption of a multi-party system of government in 2006. In spite of this achievement, citizens are beginning to see worrying signs of democratic reversals. This includes: a growing democracy deficit and endemic corruption. There is an increase of the citizenry being taken hostage of poverty and poor economic governance. This means that the CSOs are often being perceived by the state as being “opposition”. This is having a cardinal impact on CARE and its partners in undertaking advocacy. However, the experiences from particular advocacy around local level issues are that it can be undertaken and that significant results can be achieved, without running the risk of being seen as “oppositional”. As mentioned earlier CARE is well positioned and respected amongst relevant government institutions. REPA has paid considerable attention to advocacy at different levels, this includes CARE’s engagement in own advocacy and supporting partners. An Advocacy Advisor with the sole responsibility for coordinating the REPA advocacy is employed. An advocacy strategy has been developed for the period 2006 – 2008, it provides the general principles and concrete guidance on how advocacy can be undertaken as well as an implementation plan. The strategy is clear and consistent and adapted to the circumstances in Uganda. Emphasis is on non-confrontational and evidence based advocacy.

The evaluation team was informed of a number of advocacy initiatives undertaken by CARE and partners, national and global level undertaken by the PDCF, local level advocacy has been implemented within the framework of the four projects. The advocacy undertaken appears to address pertinent issues for the target group of the programme, and has according to the REPA staff in all cases involved at least consultations if not joint advocacy activities.

Only few examples exist of local REPA partners taking on a proactive role in advocacy. The REPA programme has provided advocacy training and on a number of occasions supported partner organisations in writing up advocacy position papers, from the interviews it appears as if this process has been satisfactory to the partners and that partner aspirations have formed the basis for the positions promoted. The REPA programme has more recently institutionalised “advocacy clinics” as a recurrent practice where potential advocacy areas are surfaced with partners and articulated into advocacy areas. While major achievements have been reached through advocacy, what can be questioned is the level of capacity for future advocacy that this approach has provided to date? The evaluation team acknowledges that developing such local capacity is a long term process, the team however got the impression that pressure for tangible results might sometime urge

CARE to play a more hands on role in advocacy hereby promoting output but also potentially limiting the long term impact on capacity development in partner organisations. This is a delicate balance, and the evaluation team would like to emphasise that building local capacity and experience from practice must have a very prominent role and that CARE should be careful not to substitute the role of weak local organisations.

The REPA programme has provided the Batwa and other ethnic minorities the opportunity to participate in spaces such as the National and World Social Forum, this is commendable as it provides partners an opportunity to network and potentially form alliances. The REPA Programme Manager rated the participation of the selected community members in the African Peer Review Mechanism stakeholders meeting in Mbarara town as positive. The REPA programme is commended for taking on such opportunities as being flexible and responsive to emerging opportunities are very important for successful advocacy. While REPA partners engaged in the APRM processes the evaluation team has some doubts on the level of follow-up with partners.

The REPA programme is maintaining links with national NGOs with experience in advocacy, however the relationships have been around concrete initiatives and were seen at least by ACODE as a purely contractual relationship. According to ACODE this had major implications on the ownership, commitment and potential for sustained engagement. It appears as if opportunities for a more substantial partnership still have to be realised. Partnerships with national organisations around advocacy should be in line with the suggested new approach in the NRM programme of having a strong focus on forging linkages, in particular vertical linkages between local CSOs and national organisations.

As noted before the REPA programme has developed an advocacy strategy, with concrete plans for 2006 – 2008, while the programme approach to advocacy is in line with the strategy the concrete plans seems to have had more limited impact on the activities. As advocacy must be responsive to challenges and opportunities, and as advocacy by nature is very unpredictable and dependent on contextual issues beyond the control of REPA this is not surprising. This situation and the need to maintain strategic direction in the advocacy pose some major challenges to planning. It is suggested that a new NRM programme should have a unified planning framework for advocacy in line with the implementation plan of the strategy, but that this document should be a living document which is revisited and revised on a recurrent basis to reflect the shifting priorities. Such a paper trail will provide a very strong basis for strategic discussions as part of the annual programme learning and strategy development process (see chapter 5)

The REPA programme has secured significant concrete gains for the target group, it however appears as if these gains are somewhat scattered and unsystematic. The very broad scope of the REPA programme, and the absence of a comprehensive planning system is most likely part of the explanation for this situation.

It is recommended that in the next programme:

- That the new NRM programme intensifies its emphasis on strengthening local sustainable voices as the core of the strategy.
- National based CSOs should be included as partners and be provided with a level of freedom within an agreed strategic framework to develop and take lead on advocacy, national partners should be encouraged as part of their roles to build collaborative

- frameworks (vertical and horizontal linkages) with groups at the district and sub county level
- CARE lessens its direct engagement in advocacy in particular at local, but also at national level and rather play a supporting role between the different parties that require a policy change.
 - That a new planning system that is comprehensive yet able to adapt to the changes in the environment and learning in the programme is developed as part of a new planning system.

4.8 HIV/AIDS

HIV/AIDS does not feature prominently in the REPA programme, however more recently based on the CARE Denmark's guidelines for HIV/AIDS as a crosscutting issue a limited number of initiatives have been taken.

The evaluation team were able to engage with a VSLA group of HIV+ people though very recent this intervention is very interesting and holds potentials, and if VSLA continues to be part of a new programme lessons learned should be included into future work or alternatively into other CARE Uganda programmes.

Provided the capacity of CARE and the need for focusing and streamlining the CARE Denmark's NRM interventions HIV/AIDS should remain as a crosscutting issue as defined in the CARE Denmark guidelines. It is not recommended to take on HIV/AIDS work; complimentary partnerships could be considered as a strategic option but not from the outset of a new programme.

- It is recommended that in the design of a new NRM programme, potentials for mainstreaming HIV/AIDS should be thoroughly analysed and integrated into the programme.

4.9 Budget analysis

It has only been possible within the timeframe of the evaluation process to make a very general budget analysis. It is however revealing to the team that in the latest financial year (2007) of REPA only 11.5% of the REPA budget spent in Uganda (excluding CARE Denmark expenditures, salaries for NRM Sector Coordinator, CARE Denmark administration, CARE Denmark professional support) was spent on partner sub-grants. The 2008 budget is operating with a substantially increased percentage for partners, with an expected expenditure of 18.8% going to partners. This distribution with some deviations cut across the four projects.

While it is not possible to give a fixed percentage for the relationship between CARE spending and partner spending the present division is out of proportion given the nature of the REPA programme and the alleged emphasis on partnerships. The comparatively speaking very high cost structure in CARE REPA compared to the cost structure in Ugandan partner organisations is a further argument to the ones presented in previous sections of this report to shifting the roles, responsibilities and emphasis in the programme towards the partners.

It is recommended that;

- The emphasis in expenditure in the new project should be substantially shifted from CARE to partners.
- That CARE's role shall remain strategic, facilitating and only where CARE holds unique capacities not available elsewhere shall they take a hands on role.

4.10 Monitoring and Evaluation set-up

Systematic and ongoing M&E has admittedly been a major challenge for the REPA programme. In 2005 a new M&E system was developed by external consultants, the system developed was initiated but very soon proved to be too complex and time consuming to implement and with limited direct benefits to REPA or CDK. The problem allegedly was that it was very data heavy, putting an un-proportionate demand on REPA staff and partners, compared to the potential benefits. After an attempt at simplifying the system, it was finally scrapped in 2006. Subsequently a simplified M&E system, primarily aimed at meeting the demands for CDK and Danida reporting has been implemented.

Based on a cursory review of the original and revised M&E system the evaluation team found that the decision to scrap the system taken by REPA and CDK was appropriate and timely. The replacement with a basic M&E system has proven to be sufficient for the donor reporting requirement, it is however not strong on strategic programme/project, reflection and learning. On top of the indicator based reporting, the REPA programme on an annual basis submits a verbatim report, the reports that are provided are very informative.

The Annual Programme Reviews are intended as a recurrent opportunity for joint reflection between REPA programme staff, partners and CDK staff on programme/project progress and strategic challenges. Due to the 2006 MTR it was decided to have a combined 2006 – 2007 programme review. The annual programme review takes place over a few days including field visits. From the 2008 report it appears as if important issues of a strategic nature are brought out and discussed, the annual review appears to be a too superficial process and with too many vested interests to provide strategic directions. The challenges highlighted in previous sections of this report clearly point to the need for strengthening of strategic leadership of the programme and for developing adequate mechanisms for strategic leadership based on experienced challenges.

It is recommended that:

- Within a new NRM project a simple monitoring system providing key management data and data for CDK/Danida reporting shall be developed
- That the annual review process is refined and strengthened to provide strategic leadership, this could be done by including an external formative monitoring resource person who prior to the annual review would have undertaken a strategic review with programme staff and partners of progress and challenges.

5. Ways ahead - new programme directions

In the previous section of this report we have based on the observations and our interpretations distilled some lessons from the implementation of the REPA programme. In this last section we will not repeat these recommendations but only elaborate on a few issues, and also provide some input to the process of programme formulation.

5.1 General Observations

The CARE Danmark/Danida framework agreement under which the REPA programme has been funded is comparatively speaking a flexible funding mechanism. This flexibility provides a conducive framework for CARE Danmark to develop a truly developmental NRM programme within which a clearly defined strategic focus to support partner organisations to grow and develop

as actors in the Ugandan society rather than being implementers of a CARE programme can be nurtured.

To be able to fully utilise these possibilities a new NRM programme needs to undertake a fundamental shift from an output to an outcome focus, and from blueprint planning oriented approach to strategic programme leadership. A strategic leadership shall be based on a continuous assessment of the context within which partners operate, accessing potentials and challenges in the promotion of the programme goals. Further more there is need for a mechanism whereby the programme on a recurrent basis can be adjusted. It is suggested that the programme is designed with a one year inception phase, followed by recurrent (annual) strategic review processes. The suggested inception phase is an integral part of the programme, and is merely intended as a start up process where strategies are tested and refined. For the sake of continuity and internal programme learning it is important that at least core staff of the programme are hired on a long term basis from the outset. The annual review could potentially benefit from having a formative monitoring and evaluation person attached on a recurrent basis to help the programme in maintaining a strategic direction. Such a person would be detached from day to day opportunistic management decision, and therefore well placed to provide strategic coaching to the day to day management team.

Long term strategic partnerships based on shared aspirations and values are central to this approach. Strategic partners shall play a central role in the continuous development of the programme, while CARE Danmark retains the ultimate responsibility for the programme continuous development as the immediate accountable organisation vis-à-vis Danida.

As outlined above a new programme needs to work with multilayered approach to civil society strengthening, aiming at building horizontal and vertical relationships. Building on existing networks and relationships rather than engaging in developing programme structures based on a social engineering concept. The focus is thus shifting from civil society organisations to civil society development – aiming at supporting social movements or forces in civil society.

Closely linked to this shift is a shift in roles and responsibilities, CARE shall be more of a facilitator for the process and less hands on, this will include an increased and independent role for Ugandan CSOs. As a consequence the development of an effective Ugandan CSO support sector is an important product of the intervention. The programme needs to invest in the support of the sector's capacity development rather than CARE developing in-house capacity for capacity development.

Service delivery might continue to be part of the programme but such interventions must be explicitly integrated into a strategy of promoting rights and empowerment.

The success criteria for the programme shall shift from predefined outputs, to sustainable change in target communities and among civil society organisations.

In short if one sees a continuum of approaches to development and programme management from a planned, controlled and inward looking approach to an exploratory and outward looking approach to development it is recommended that the emphasis shall shift towards the exploratory approach.

A new NRM programme will build on the experiences and some of the relationships from REPA, it will however in many respects be a new start in respect of strategies, focus and methods applied. It is suggested that to mark the break with the past that a name different from REPA II shall be chosen.

Process

The process of formulating a new NRM programme is critical for the future programme's success. In a situation where fairly radical shifts are to take place in respect of the programme it is important that the initial programme development is not restricted by vested interests.

We suggest that the programme development takes place in two distinct stages, the first being a general conceptualisation and programme idea development, then the programme development and formulation.

It is inevitable that some present partners will not fit into the new programme – to ease the process CARE should be willing to negotiate a phase out of these partners, if expectations or commitment require this. It is better to spend some resources on phasing out than trying to adapt the programme to fit what are inadequate partners in a new strategy.

General conceptualisation

This is an investigative phase aiming at developing a 3 – 5 pages *programme concept note* where tentative programme focus, strategy and methods are outlined – such a note should remain strategic and should not deal with activities, concrete partnerships etc – but only provide direction, clarify the role of CARE including basic mode of operation and methods to be applied. This is an internal and fairly exclusive CARE process directed and owned by a designated team of 2 – 3 people who are delegated the authority to develop the concept note.

The aim is to decide on CARE's position and strategic direction. The designated team can draw on CARE staff, resource persons or potential partners and written materials – including specialised studies, reviews and evaluations of the REPA programme. The process could even include a brainstorming workshop with resource persons. In any interaction it should however be made clear that this is a CARE strategy clarification process and not a negotiation process where different positions are reconciled.

The strategy development process should take account of:

- *CARE's identity* - what is the peculiar role that CARE is in the world to fulfil?
- *CARE's Capacity* – what are the resources, human financial and otherwise that CARE have or can realistically acquire?
- *The Ugandan context* – what are the challenges, potentials and dynamics in the Uganda context that the programme must relate to?
- The needs, problems and potentials of the *target group* – how can the programme support that the needs can be met, deal with the problems and realise the potentials of the target groups.

CARE might ask an external reviewer to provide critical comments to a draft concept note before the final concept note is developed.

Programme development and formulation

The next phase will be an open investigative process where the CARE concepts and ideas meet the world, are challenged and refined. While CARE will still play the central role during the process, this will now be a process where potential partners are invited to engage.

It might be a good idea to have external facilitation of the strategy development process, this is premised on the fact that the process of developing a programme is very time consuming and difficult to reconcile with day to day management but also as external consultants might be better placed to facilitate a process where common ground is found between strategic partners and CARE.

Ideally the programme formulation shall be finalised by the end of 2008, with the programme starting in January 2009 – however this will be a fairly tight process and will require a careful plan.

The first year shall as mentioned be an inception phase, where experiences are gained and strategies revised.

Annex 1

FINAL

Rights Equity and Protected Areas Programme (REPA)

Terms of Reference for a final programme evaluation

May 2008

1. Introduction:

These terms of reference will be the guiding tool for the final evaluation of the Rights, Equity and Protected Areas programme, which started its first phase in March 2003 and will continue through to the end of December 2008.

REPA is a CARE Danmark-supported and Danida-funded programme, which draws heavily on CARE's long experience in the integrated conservation and development (ICD) sector in South-western Uganda, and in particular the two Danida-funded/CARE Danmark-supported projects "Development Through Conservation" (1987-2002) and "Queen Elisabeth Protected Area Community Conservation Project" (1996-2003). The programme reflects the institutional change processes within CARE that have occurred both in Denmark (Strategic Directions of 2002) and in Uganda (LRSP 2002-2007). This is particularly evident in that the programme is working through civil society partners in Uganda, and that the programme is structured around a consolidated programme approach with 4 individual projects, and that the programme has moved towards a rights-based approach to development, committed to addressing the underlying causes of poverty by focussing on people's rights and responsibilities.

2. Background to the REPA programme:

2.1 Programme goal and strategic directions

Overall programme goal:

Poor natural resource-dependent households achieve sustainable livelihoods through the equitable sharing of costs and benefits and the fulfilment of rights and responsibilities from the use and management of forest and wildlife protected areas in Uganda

Strategic directions:

After programme restructuring in 2006 the programme objectives were reformulated into strategic directions:

SD #1. Community Conservation: *Facilitate local communities and protected area authorities to collaborate in developing and implementing replicable solutions, which increase local conservation benefits and reduce community level conservation costs*

SD #2. Economic Empowerment: *Promote expanded economic choices and diversified incomes to resource poor households living in and around protected areas.*

SD #3. Accountability: *Facilitate poor and marginalised groups and individuals living in and around protected areas to effectively articulate and fulfil their interests, rights and responsibilities with regard to the use and management of natural resources.*

2.2 Target group

In line with the overall mission and vision statement, CARE has made a long-term commitment to work with and support poor and marginalised households as a way of addressing poverty. Within the context of this programme, while it is true to say that protected area-adjacent communities tend, by nature, to be some of the poorest and most marginalised, there are some particularly identifiable groups within this broad category of people that were to receive special attention during the course of the six year programme. These groups include the ethnic minority groups of the Banyabutumbi, the Banyabindi, the Batwa and the Basongora, as well as the youth, women and landless/near landless. In addition, Protected Area adjacent households more broadly are targeted by the PAM and BS projects.

2.3 Target Area

While the programme is national in scope and application, it develops and maintains its field activities in south western Uganda in the communities that surround important biodiversity resources such as the forest and wildlife areas of Queen Elizabeth Protected Area, Bwindi and Mgahinga Conservation Area including the adjacent forest reserve of Echuya. The selection of these sites was based on a number of criteria including:

- previous CARE presence, and experiences in park-people issues
- presence of potential civil society partners
- presence of conflict between protected areas and local people
- diversity of condition (between sites) within which to experiment and pilot new approaches
- high levels of poverty and particular issues of marginalisation.

Hence, the Program currently operates in six rural districts, namely Kasese, Bushenyi, Rukungiri, Kanungu, Kisoro and Kabale.

2.4 Programme Strategy

The REPA programme has developed and adopted six “programme principles”. These are largely implementation approaches or strategies that define how specific components are implemented on the ground. They are as follows:

- *CARE will support and participate in advocacy processes at local, national and international levels*
- *CARE will employ a rights-based approach*
- *CARE will target poor and marginalised groups*
- *CARE will work in partnership with others (primarily CSOs)*
- *CARE will support and build the capacity of civil society structures*
- *CARE will design and implement interventions in order to pilot and scale up beyond target areas.*

Furthermore the programme has been mainstreaming cross cutting issues such as:

- Gender mainstreaming (REPA developed a gender strategy in 2006, and actual implementation started in 2007)
- HIV/AIDS mainstreaming (in response to CARE Denmark’s HIV/AIDS guidelines the programme has only recently started considering and building awareness/capacity in HIV/AIDS mainstreaming)

2.5 Programme Implementation

The programme is being implemented through 4 projects, which are managed separately but are interlinked. The Programme Development and Coordination Facility (PDCF) is mandated with the responsibility to coordinate the projects into a coherent programme. This represents a change in implementation strategy from before the mid-term review in early 2006, where the programme was implemented through programme components. The projects are:

- The Problem Animal Management Project
- The Benefit Sharing Project
- The Empowerment of Ethnic Minorities at Queen Elisabeth national Park Project
- The Batwa Empowerment Project

All projects are being implemented in cooperation with civil society organisations in South West Uganda. The programme currently has nine partners in the programme. In addition to the above mentioned projects, other individual projects with separate funding are being added to the portfolio and managed as an integral part of the programme. These include:

- Strengthening Local Governance in Natural Resource management (SLOGIN)
- Combating Child Mortality Among Batwa (CCMB)

2.6 Brief history of programme evolution

During the implementation period 2003-2005, the programme was organised in form of components as follows:

- Conservation Costs & Benefits
- Advocacy
- Accountability & Representative Institutions
- Capacity Building
- Applied Research
- Economic Empowerment
- PDCF/Learning & Documentation

The Capacity Building component was implemented by a partner, Community Development Resource Network (CDRN).

In November 2005, REPA underwent an annual review. This was followed by a mid-term review in January 2006. The two reviews led to significant changes in the structure and mode of implementation. The programme midterm review observed *interalia that* the project components were not coherent and effective in delivering to the REPA overall goal. Maintaining the overall programme goal and principles, three strategic directions (already mentioned) were adopted as REPA's core business. Therefore a number of changes were made to the programme as outlined below:

1. The mode of programme delivery changed from components to projects, each with a set of clearly defined activities to be implemented in clearly defined geographical areas.
2. Three Strategic Directions were adopted to guide the work of REPA program.

3. There was downsizing of staff and their job descriptions revised to respond to the new model of program delivery and to improve teamwork and cost-effectiveness.
4. There was mainstreaming of monitoring and evaluation in the program.
5. Gender, advocacy, research, capacity building and economic empowerment to improve cost-effectiveness, and coherence and accountability, was mainstreamed in program performance.
6. The Project sites and activities were reduced to avoid spreading too thin on the ground.
7. There was a move from issue teams to project teams led by Technical Managers.
8. Partners were reviewed and some dropped.

2.7 Overview of Programme Structure and staffing

The REPA programme is delivered through project teams consisting of technical managers, field coordinators, and advisors on selected cross-cutting themes, particularly advocacy and economic empowerment. Overall accountability for the deliverables in each of the projects rests with the technical manager while overall delivery of the programme is a responsibility of the Programme Manager. The NRM Sector Coordinator maintains a bird's view of the programme and offers strategic guidance as needed.

2.7 Important challenges for a phase 2

CARE Denmark has secured funding for a new programme phase to commence in 2009. During the fall of 2008 a new design process will be initiated to develop a new Danida-funded programme in Uganda. As specified in the following sections the final evaluation will also provide recommendations that can be taken into consideration in this design process. Some of the questions pertaining to this process are outlined below:

- Do we have too many partners in the programme and are the relationships too short and specific, for example through sub-grants? Partners can be perceived to merely implement tasks set out by CARE without bringing their own input into the agenda. How can the programme engage in more strategic and long-term partnerships and is that fruitful? Short term partnerships might be necessary in our remote areas? It will be important to evaluate the partnership strategy of the programme in a phase 2.
- Some partners are very weak and don't deliver the expected results or spend funds as agreed. It will be important to examine the nature of these shortcomings as most partners experience these problems. Another related issue is what CARE should do where there are no potential partners to implement, should we leave the area out, facilitate outside CSOs to enter the area, or implement ourselves?
- The REPA programme was a pilot programme in many ways, which was also reflected in the costs of delivering the expected results. There is a need to evaluate how the programme can be more cost effective in the second phase, and to review the geographic focus.
- We need to involve Local Government's more in the programme. So far, they have been seen more as adversaries than as partners. We should examine the shortcomings that arise from the current mode of supporting Local Governments.

- Conflict situations arose during REPA phase 1, due to the programmes explicit focus on ethnic minorities. The programme needs to evaluate how conflicts are mitigated, but also whether the programme should focus on minorities (marginalisation) or poor people (poverty). The programme would benefit from being very explicit about this, as the way you operate, specifically when using a rights based approach, could differ depending on your focus (marginalisation vs. poverty).

3. Programme final evaluation

Purpose of evaluation

The purpose of this final evaluation of REPA is to assess the progress of the programme towards stipulated goals. Further the review shall assess the relevance and costs effectiveness of the chosen strategies and activities in achieving the stipulated goals. Based on these findings and based on a dialogue with key stakeholders the team shall provide recommendations on the potential strategic direction, on a new phase, starting in 2009.

3.2 Evaluation areas

The final evaluation shall, but not be limited to assess and provide recommendations on the following areas:

1. Progress towards the achievement of programme against overall objective and stipulated targets of the programme.
2. Assessment of the relevance and cohesion of the overall strategy for the project phase one and major lessons learned.

This shall include an assessment of:

- a. Relevance of the programme in the target area and broader Ugandan context
 - b. Overall coherence in strategy and synergy between the various projects in the programme
 - c. The adherence of the programme to the Danida civil society strategy, including an assessment of the relationship between advocacy, service delivery and capacity building.
 - d. The use of partnerships, including the adequacy of relationships and roles of CARE and partners in the cooperation.
 - e. Benefits and challenges arise from the implementation of a RBA to development.
 - f. The mainstreaming of gender and HIV/AIDS.
 - g. Relevance of target group for the achievement of the programme goals.
 - h. The adequacy of the organisation set up of the programme, including systems and practices for monitoring, learning and adaptation of programme strategies.
 - i. Potentials for scaling up pilot activities.
 - j. The general efficiency and effectiveness of the programme and programme set-up in meeting the targets.
3. Recommendations on strategic direction for phase 2, this shall include:

- a. Major lessons from phase one of importance for next phase.
- b. Suggestions on general scope including:
 - Thematic focus.
 - Scope and rationale for selection of target group e.g. poverty, marginalisation, minority rights/indigenous.
 - Geographical scope.
- c. Partner choice and number of partners.
- d. Relationship with government institutions.
- e. Potential and relevance for increased focus on addressing conflicts.
- f. Suggestions for the integration of SLOGIN in the next phase of the framework programme.

4. Methodology

- a) Review programme documents, and other related documents, to fully understand the programme strategic directions, strategies and outputs/achievements. See section 8 for complete list of documents
- b) Discussion with CARE Uganda staff, specifically with the NRM Sector Coordinator, Programme Director, and REPA Programme Manager and Technical Managers
- c) Visit selected communities and partners to understand the context and reality of the projects.
- d) Gather information from a range of stakeholders within and outside the programme using varied participatory consultation tools for specific targets, with a focus on discussion workshops and meetings with key stakeholders rather than fact finding. This can include Local Government, NFA, UWA, and organisations of target groups (e.g. minorities)
- e) Analyze, reflect on and validate findings and develop recommendations with key programme actors and stakeholders
- f) Facilitate a debriefing session to present and validate findings, and present a brief 'aid memoir' or summary of findings.
- g) Facilitate strategic workshop on phase 2 and present recommendations at a debriefing session.
- h) Produce reports as detailed below.

5. Outputs

The evaluation team will produce three outputs:

- a) A brief "aide-memoir", or summary of findings and recommendations by the end of the review exercise (to be validated at a 'end of evaluation' debriefing session)
- b) A more detailed report responding to the objectives of the review. This will be available to CARE Denmark and CARE Uganda no later than 6th July 2008, in draft form for comments.
- c) The final document will be provided by 10th August 2008, following comments from CARE Uganda and CARE Denmark. Comments from CARE Uganda and CARE Denmark should be made available to the consultant no later than 30th July 2008.

6. Evaluation team composition

Evaluation team:

Flemming Gjedde Nielsen
National consultant

Evaluation Team Leader
Team member, National context

Resource persons:

Anders Aalbæk
Morten Fauerby Thomsen

NRM Sector Coordinator
CARE Denmark

The REPA programme team:

Edith Kabesiime
Patrick Ndoleriire
Annet Kandole
And others as appropriate

REPA programme manager
REPA Tech. Manager, Accountability and Empower.
REPA Tech. Manager, Community Conservation

The team leader will have the overall responsibility for planning, compiling and presenting the findings of the final evaluation.

7. Proposed itinerary

The evaluation will run from June 15th 2008 until June 25th 2008, with time prior to the evaluation for review of programme documents and time afterwards allocated for writing up. A tentative timetable is presented below:

Activity	Time/ duration	Responsible
Review relevant documents	Prior to evaluation	
Arrival Entebbe 23.15 Stay at Mosa Court	14 th June 2008	Angellah
Review work schedule Discussions at Country Office level Meetings with PD Shameem Siddiqi? Drive to Kabale. Informal evening meeting/dinner	15 th June 2008	Anders
Kabale: Visit Sub-office + partners: Nature Uganda and BMCT Drive to Kisoro at 4.00pm, spend a night	16 th June 2008	Patrick
Drive to Kisoro , visit UOBDO, Local Government?, Biraara Batwa settlement Spend a night in Kisoro	17 th June 2008	Patrick
Drive to Buhoma , visit community at Kitahurira: incl. Batwa, PAM, VLISA, goats, crafts. Visit UFLRC, Kayonza Sub-county and UWA Spend a night at Buhoma	18 th June 2008	Patrick
Drive to Bwambara/ Rukungiri , Meet District Officials (Secretary for Social services, District fisheries officer, Semakula, Sub County chief Bwambara and RUDFA. (meet all at the sub-county) Visit Kikarara on PAM: Visit Rwesigiro PAM	19 th June 2008	Patrick

groups, Guruka scaling up and advocacy on investment in PAM trenches, rice farmers. Stay over night at Savannah (Garuga's Hotel) in Kihihi (Ishasha)		
Visit Rwenshama HIV mainstreaming in VSLA, meet beneficiaries of Park Resource Access interventions Drive to Kasese Dinner with Local Government, REPA partners, staff and UWA	20 th June 2008	Annet
Kasese: Implementing partners CARITAS, (VSLA group, BDS women group) BACDET Visit Good Hope and BGJ&HR, Visit CBM in Munkunyu.	21 st June 2008	Annet
Kasese: Read, write	22 nd June 2008	Flemming
Kasese: Debriefing on evaluation followed by Strategic workshop on Phase II	23 rd June 2008	Flemming
Kasese: Debriefing on phase II recommendations Drive to Kampala , evening see PD?	24 th June 2008	Flemming
Kampala: see CD, ACODE, CDRN Departure Entebbe 22.20	25 th June 2008	Anders
Draft report submitted	6 th July 2008	Flemming
Comments by CARE Uganda and CARE DK	30 th July 2008	Morten
Final report submitted	10 th August 2008	Flemming

8. List of documents for review

The following documents will be made available to the team leader and national consultant for their review prior to the evaluation:

- REPA project documents, LFAs
- 2005 Annual Review
- 2006 Annual Progress report incl. annexes
- 2007 Annual Progress report incl. annexes
- REPA MTR Report FINAL 17-03-06
- Bite the hand Final Draft combined report
- Find the groups and you have found the poor
- CARE partnerships final report September 2004
- GOVERNANCE AND SERVICE DELIVERY final
- SLOGIN Project Document
- REPA Gender review final report 2006
- RBA paper 2008 (by Tom Blomley)
- RBA paper by Phil Franks (in IUCN Policy matters)

- Annual review report 2007
- REPA gender strategy and CDK gender guidelines
- Historicity of Ethnic Minority Groups
- Documentary on Ethnic Minority Groups (DVD, not yet ready)
- Interns: Andama, Trina, Morten and others
- 2004 Partnerships learning (by John D'Connick)

Addendum to TOR for final programme evaluation of REPA project in Uganda.

Introduction

This addendum is intended to specify the tasks of the preparatory work to be carried out as a basis for the evaluation. The addendum describes the work of the Uganda consultant to be finalised prior to the start of the main evaluation.

The aim of the preparatory work is dual, on the one hand to provide processed and systematised data on progress against stipulated targets (project indicators), on the other to establish a profile of outcomes from programme progress within a limited number of core areas

Data compilation

This will be done by systematically compiling and processing data reflecting project progress. Progress shall be assessed against existing project indicators. The reporting shall be based on systematic compilation of existing raw data provided by the project, from project progress reports, monitoring reports, programme reviews etc.

The data shall be presented in a systematic form with annual progress against targets, and a short conclusion, major deviations (more than 10% deviation) shall be highlighted and explanations provided where available from project staff.

Five working days have been set aside for the research and compilation of the study.

In depth studies

One, or a limited number, of minor studies addressing outcome and tentative impact might be undertaken prior to the arrival of the team leader. These studies will be identified in collaboration between the team leader, CARE Uganda, CARE Denmark staff and agreed with the consultant not later than 30 May.

Reporting

The reports are working documents, implying that the report might include uncertainties and issues for further investigations. The status of conclusions and assessment shall however be made explicit.

The report on progress against indicators shall not exceed 10 pages. Further background data might be presented in annexes.

The reporting on potential additional studies will be agreed when the focus and scope have been decided.

All reports shall be available at the latest at Thursday 12 June.

Annex 2

Persons met during the CARE REPA Final Evaluation

	Name	Position
1	Nis Berthelsen	REPA Intern
2	Besigye Samuel	Field coordinator, REPA
3	Bonny Tumuhaise	Project Support Officer
4	Julliet Nakato Odoi	REPA Advocacy Advisor
5	Anders Aalbaek	NRM Sector Coordinator
6	Edith Kabesiime	REPA Programme Manager
7	Patrick Ndolerire	REPA Technical Manager
8	Morten Faveby Thumsen	Project Coordinator, CDK
9	Lykke Fabriciuos Port	Journalist Intern, CDK
10	Beda Mwebesa	EEEVLA Manager
11	Maria	Peace Corp Volunteer, KBDS
12	Henery Mfitundiga	Project Manager, Nature Uganda
13	Tom Rukundo	Accountant, Nature Uganda
14	Geo Z. Dutki	Trust Administrator, Bwindi Trust
15	Charity Bwiza	Programme Manager, Bwindi Trust
16	Neza Henry	Capacity Building Officer, UOBDU
17	Zaninka Penninah	Coordinator, UOBDU
18	Musabyi Allen	Mutwa Member/ UOBDU
19	Muhimbise Asaph	Finance Administrator, UOBDU
20	Rwubaka John	Mutwa member/ UOBDU
21	Tumusiime Andrew Mary	Secretary for Education and Health, Kisoro DLG
22	Karemera Alfred	Information Officer, Kisoro DLG
23	Katebuhwete J	Culture and CDO member, BACDET
24	Kisembo Matiya	Advocacy Member, BACDET
25	Kahyana Joseph	Board Chair, Good Hope Foundation
26	Kamalha Paul	Program Officer, Good Hope Foundation (GHF)
27	Sinamakeso Nelson	Board Member, GHF
28	Timbigamba Kate	Treasurer, GHF
29	Asaba Doreen Bisika	Accountant, GHF
30	Arinaitwe Allen	Sub county Chief, Kayonza
31	Karibwende Sam	Sub County Chairperson, Kayonza
32	Basahija Joseph	General Secretary BACDET
33	Byabasaija A	Resource Mobilizer
34	Muhabwe Peninnah	Batwa Community
35	Kitamburisho Ernest	Batwa Community
36	Nyirakarasha Jessica	Batwa Community

37	Gashanga Efranse	Batwa Community
38	Mujaga Davis	Batwa Community
39	Bidagazi Yoanna	Batwa Community
40	Isingoma Peter	Member , BACDET
41	Mugisa Paul	Member, BACDET
42	Kigoma Dennis	Member, BACDET
43	Kasumba Adyeri	Member, BACDET
44	Mugisha Elisha Ateenyi	Public Secretary, BACDET
45	Agaba Paul	Youth Secretary, BACDET
46	Nyakaisiki Sandra	Member, BACDET
47	Mathew Mbehome	Member, BACDET
48	Bait Atwoki Kitakakise	Member, BACDET
49	Kamuhanda Francis	Spokesperson, BACDET
50	Kaheru Sepre	Member, BACDET
51	Monday Patrick	Education Secretary, BACDET
52	Onesmus Mugyenyi	Executive Director, ACODE
53	Bashir Twesigye	Research Fellow, ACODE
54	Achilles Byaruhanga	Director, Nature Uganda

Uganda Functional Literacy Resource Centre Persons

Serial No.	Name	Title	Organization	telephone
55	Katushabe Pamela	Staff	UFLRC	0774062164
56	Dorothy .B. Gongo	staff	UFLRC	0392820995
57	Deborah Tusiime	Trainer	UFLRC	0777670933
58	Peace Tukwasiibwe	Office attendant	“	
59	Banyangira Thadeus	Treasurer	“	0782752786
60	Kambabazi Justine	staff	“	0782169154
61	Atuheire Hosea	member	“	0775702875
62	Rafiki John	Driver	“	0775341342
63	Rwaboona Gaadi	member	“	
64	Muwhezi Benson	Project member	“	
65	Siwone January	Project member	“	
66	Habomugisha Augustine	Member	“	0775581759
67	Ndagisimaana Iddi	Trainer	“	0773465840
68	Ndyamugambiraki Ezra	Volunteer accounts assistant	“	0774361083
69	Byaruhanga Gabriel	Volunteer fundraising officer	“	0773465817
70	Kitailiko Moses	Volunteer project officer	“	0774489102
71	Rev. Gilukwayo James	UFLRC Chairperson	“	0772570807

72	Banobi Herbert	UFLRC Coordinator	“	0772930304
73	Besigye Samuel	Field coordinator	CARE kabale	0772531857
74	Mbarinda Benon	UFLRC Secretary	UFLRC	0772875164
75	Mery Twongyerwe			
76	Turyamureeta Fred Omukimba	CARE- REPA driver	CARE- kabale	077659265
77	Kyarimpa Provia	member	UFLRC	0772973883
78	Isa Ketera	member	“	

Problem Animal Management Project in Kikarara- Bwambara Sub County - Briefing meeting

79	Bananukire Lawrence	Parish chief
80	Tusiime Prossy	Secretary
81	Musinguzi Geoffrey	Vice chairman, Youth
82	Twebaze Sams	
83	Answer Fred	Youth Councilor
84	Kawayano Chris	Councilor
85	Namusoke Janat	
86	Tugumahabwe Enoch	Chairperson LC3
87	Byamuhama Henry	Sub County Chief
88	Kwoshaba Santrinah	Councillor
89	Twinamamasko Henry	ACDO
90	Kandole Annet	REPA

Anne 3

Documents consulted

To be inserted in final version