

Uganda: Murchison Falls Conservation Area

Ex post evaluation report (final evaluation)

OECD sector	41030 / Biodiversity	
BMZ project ID	1994 66 681	
Project executing agency	Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA)	
Consultant	Gitec Consult	
Year of ex post evaluation	2006	
	Project appraisal (planned)	Ex post evaluation (actual)
Start of implementation	Q2 1995	Q3 1995
Period of implementation	31 months	55 months
Investment costs	EUR 7.93 million ¹	EUR 14.63 million
Counterpart contribution	staff, operating costs	staff, operating costs
Financing, of which FC funds	EUR 7.93 million	EUR 7.93 million
Other institutions/donors involved	GTZ, ded	GTZ, ded
Performance rating	3	
• Relevance	3	
• Overarching developmental impacts	3	
• Effektiviness	3	
• Efficiency	4	
• Sustainability	3	

Brief description, overall objective and project objectives with indicators

The aim of the project is to provide sustainable protection for the Murchison Falls Conservation Area (MFCA) while allowing its use for tourism and to support the people living in the surrounding area by developing the park. This will ensure the long-term existence of the Murchison Falls Conservation Area (MFCA), create habitat for a variety of flora and fauna and improve the livelihoods of the adjacent population (overall objective). Important indicators for the assessment of the project success are: (i) the revenue generated by the MFCA after the completion of the investment covers the operating costs and is sufficient to pay for all required maintenance works; (ii) the number of big game has increased compared to 1993 and stabilises (depending on the species) at an ecologically sustainable level; (iii) the current size of the MFCA is preserved as a

¹ Bei PP erfolgte die Angabe der gesamten Investitionskosten ohne Berücksichtigung der Kosten für technische und personelle Zusammenarbeit.

conservation area; (iv) large fires can be avoided; (v) the infrastructure facilities are being maintained; (vi) the number of tourists increases sustainably; and (vii) the communities in the adjacent area generate income in connection with the measures in and around the MFCA. Moreover, the project is to be considered successful (overall objective) if the current variety of species of flora and fauna (measured by main species) in the MFCA has been maintained or even improved, the social and ecological development indicators (living conditions) in the region have improved substantially and the state revenue generated by the MFCA is being used to reduce poverty.

The project executing agency of the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), formerly the Uganda National Parks and Wildlife Service (UNP), which is today a para-statal authority in the Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry (MTTI, formerly the Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities MoTWA). The recipient of the FC contribution was the Republic of Uganda, represented by the Ministry of Finance and Planning.

Project design / major deviations from the original project planning and their main causes

The project is a cooperation project implemented by GTZ, DED and KfW. From 1993 to 2003 GTZ supported the MFCA administration in technical and administrative matters, among others, in the conceptual development and the build-up of a planning, monitoring and information system for the management of the resources of the conservation area, the development of sustainable operating concepts and financing models and the design of favourable conditions in the context of the sector dialogue.

In the period from 1995 to 2005 the DED provided construction experts and experts specialising in the promotion of people living in the neighbourhood of the conservation area. KfW and DED cooperated in the implementation of the FC financed measures to support the target population. These measures aimed at facilitating the difficult living conditions of the population living in the vicinity of the conservation area and, thus, to reduce the land use pressure on the park area. In addition, the population was supported for taking the responsibility for the planning and implementation of joint communal projects. Schools, wells and health stations were set up in the communities living in the neighbourhood of the conservation area. This was done with the support of an expert from the DED and with the active participation of the communities concerned. The financing of small community infrastructure measures in the neighbouring communities is being continued today by the park administration using part of the park entrance fees ("revenue sharing").

Moreover, FC funds were used between 1995 and 2002 to finance the rehabilitation of the tourist infrastructure (rehabilitation of roads, a boat and ferry wharf) and the assignment of an implementation consultant.

Key results of the impact analysis and performance rating

The indicators for the assessment of the project objective of "protection of the wildlife in the MFCA through the development of tourism and the promotion of the population living in the vicinity of the conservation area" have improved since project appraisal, though they remain below the expectations. The number of big game in the conservation area has increased, undesired large fires occur less frequently and it was possible to maintain the original size of the conservation area. Though the number of (foreign) tourists has risen, it was not possible so far to fully exploit the potential for generating income from tourism in the MF Conservation Area due to the fact that the management of tourism still needs to be improved and concession prices are

too low. As a result operating costs were not covered sufficiently and this, in turn, negatively affected wildlife protection and the maintenance of the required tourist infrastructure. The target population could benefit in certain areas. The small projects implemented with the support from the DED (schools, wells, health centres) in the peripheral areas of the conservation area have been concluded and are being operated by the communities and used by the population. The communities benefit from the controlled use of firewood from the park and beekeeping in the park. The so-called "revenue sharing" of park income (total volume disbursed in 2006 amounted to around EUR 190,000), which has become an established practice, and the development measures financed with this money in 45 communities have a limited (due to implementation deficiencies at the district and community levels) but overall positive developmental impact. The project objective was only just achieved, though it has to be added that due to the depreciation of the (then existing) DEM against the USD during the implementation of the project an increase in the unit costs per rehabilitated kilometre of road occurred, which was however still acceptable.

In the overall developmental context (overall objective) the project made a significant contribution to maintaining the flora and fauna in the MF Conservation Area. The conservation success achieved is reflected by the stable number of main wildlife species in the MFCA. Regarding the improvement of the livelihoods of the local population the programme was less successful. However, this has to be seen in the overall context of the civil war in Uganda. Overall, important and necessary conditions were created in terms of income improvements (legitimation of the participation of the target population; establishment of the "revenue sharing" system; involvement of the UWA in this area) and (limited) benefit was produced. Given the prevailing civil war situation it was not possible to achieve a broad-scale improvement of the living conditions. UWA as an institution is committed to the promotion of the local communities (target group). Provided that the use of funds at the community level is transparent this might render noticeable improvements in the village infrastructure or the economic activity. Up to now the MF Conservation Area has not produced any transfers to the state budget (except for taxes) which might be used to finance poverty-reducing developmental measures.

The project had (selected) positive impacts on gender equality and exploited its potential as much as possible by having women and men participate equally in the implementation of the project. Women benefit specifically from the permission to collect firewood in the conservation area, which makes their daily work easier.

The project aimed explicitly at protecting resources and the biodiversity and achieved positive effects in this area. The population in the region is extremely poor and the poor benefit (in specific areas) from the direct impacts of the project. The population was involved in the implementation of the measures, whereby the emphasis was put on strengthening the sense of responsibility and self-reliance. The promotion of participation was part of the project concept.

We rate the developmental effectiveness of the project "Murchison Falls Conservation Area" as follows:

- Relevance: From today's perspective, too, the objective of preserving the biodiversity and the tourist potential of the park while at the same time including the population living in the neighbourhood of the park in the protection concept as well as the different levels of intervention (provision of tourist infrastructure, promotion of the target population) can be described as reasonable and up-to-date. However, as until today the impact achieved in terms of promotion of the population in the vicinity of the park is too low whereas the "roads" as a sub-component were overdimensioned. The substance and contents of the German contri-

butions (TC, FC and personnel cooperation) were coherent and well coordinated. We classify the project's relevance as generally satisfactory (sub-rating 3).

- **Impact and effectiveness:** The aims defined at the level of the project objective and the overall objective were partly achieved, but the overall level of achievement remained below the expectations. The number of tourists visiting the park clearly increased as compared to the time of the project appraisal and the number of animals has started to rise. This helped to maintain the biodiversity in Uganda. The project contributed to the improving or facilitating the living conditions of the population in the vicinity of the park in specific areas. Given the civil war situation in which the project was implemented this is a good result. Overall, we rate the achievement of (immediate and overall) objectives of the programme as just satisfactory (each with the sub-rating 3).
- **Efficiency:** Due to the over-emphasized roads component around 25% of the FC funds hardly show any impact in terms of conservation of the park or development of tourism, or do not show any impact at all. In addition, the MFCA produces a deficit since only 75% of the operating costs (not including reinvestments) are covered and for this reason depends on external financial support. However, we expect the park to generate positive economic impulses in the region, provided that the security situation is conducive to this. It could not be ascertained in the context of the final evaluation whether the benefit of these impulses is higher than that of an alternative usage of the park area (e.g. as farmland). Due to the high ecological importance of the conservation area for the flora and fauna it is assumed that a positive macroeconomic benefit is generated, which can however not be precisely quantified. Therefore, we judge the project's efficiency to be slightly insufficient (sub-rating 4).
- **Sustainability:** Due to the fact that operating costs are not covered and due to the strong dependence of the project on donor support the MF Conservation Area will in future have to be operated at a lower level because at the time of the ex post evaluation it had not been possible to attract further donors to the project. However, since mid-2005 major management changes have been implemented by the UWA administration and efficiency gains have been achieved. Provided that the number of tourists will rise and park revenues will increase accordingly and provided that the park is managed properly we think that the operation of the conservation area can be ensured. The measures implemented under the sub-component "Support for the population living in the vicinity of the park" are being used and the revenue sharing was institutionally established and supports the population in the area. In view of the ongoing stabilisation in the region we consider the objectives to be achieved on a sustainable basis, even though at a lower level than at the time of the programme implementation. We assume that the MF Conservation Area will be maintained in the future and that the revenues from tourism will increase further or that the situation will at least not deteriorate compared to the current revenue situation. We rate the sustainability of the project as just satisfactory (sub-rating 3).

Overall rating: The MFCA continues to exist in its borders, the game populations have increased, the number of tourists visiting the park has risen and the population living in the neighbourhood of the park benefits from the park revenue. Although the impacts achieved remain below the expectations and are further reduced due to the overall low support for the target group, the lack of efficiency and the partly limited sustainability of the German contribution, the overall impact of the project is still remarkable given the conditions prevailing in the country. If the project had not been implemented the mentioned impacts would not have occurred and it can not be taken for granted that the conservation area would still exist. Overall, we rate the developmental efficacy of the programme as satisfactory (overall rating: 3).

General conclusions and recommendations

The contributions of different German implementation institutions should be based on a joint planning and have to be adjusted once new components are added to the project – as was the case here. The target systems should in this case be formulated for the project as a whole with individual contributions to be made at the level of individual project measures.

In the event of projects in regions with an unstable security situation the project concept should be designed with as much flexibility as possible in order to allow the project measures to be adjusted to current developments in the security situation.

In future projects of this kind a special focus should be given to investments in the area of promoting the population in neighbouring areas. Expert assignments in this area have to be adjusted continuously to the existing need in order to ensure a target-oriented and proper implementation. The sustainable impact of the measures can be improved if more planning and operating capacities are built up in the respective target group (for example small measures in the area of social infrastructure).

Gelöscht: -----Seitenumbruch-----

Notes on the methods used to evaluate project success (project rating)

Projects are evaluated on a six-point scale, the criteria being relevance, effectiveness, “over-arching developmental impact” and efficiency. The ratings are also used to arrive at a final assessment of a project’s overall developmental efficacy. The scale is as follows:

- 1 Very good result that clearly exceeds expectations
- 2 Good result, fully in line with expectations and without any significant shortcomings
- 3 Satisfactory result – project falls short of expectations but the positive outcomes dominate
- 4 Unsatisfactory result – significantly below expectations, with negative outcomes dominating despite discernible positive outcomes
- 5 Clearly inadequate result – despite some positive partial outcomes, the negative outcomes clearly dominate
- 6 The project has no impact or the situation has actually deteriorated

A rating of 1 to 3 is a positive assessment and indicates a successful project while a rating of 4 to 6 is a negative assessment and indicates an unsuccessful project.

Sustainability is evaluated according to the following four-point scale:

Sustainability level 1 (very good sustainability)

The developmental efficacy of the project (positive to date) is very likely to continue undiminished or even increase.

Sustainability level 2 (good sustainability)

The developmental efficacy of the project (positive to date) is very likely to decline only minimally but remain positive overall. (This is what can normally be expected.)

Sustainability level 3 (satisfactory sustainability)

The developmental efficacy of the project (positive to date) is very likely to decline significantly but remain positive overall. This rating is also assigned if the sustainability of a project is considered inadequate up to the time of the ex post evaluation but is very likely to evolve positively so that the project will ultimately achieve positive developmental efficacy.

Sustainability level 4 (inadequate sustainability)

The developmental efficacy of the project is inadequate up to the time of the ex post evaluation and an improvement is very unlikely. This rating is also assigned if the sustainability that has been positively evaluated to date is very likely to deteriorate severely and no longer meet the level 3 criteria.