



GPAF INN-007 Quality Assurance Visit Report

GPAF INN-007: Empowering Tanzanian pastoralists to secure land rights

Prepared for
Triple Line Consulting/Crown Agents and DFID

August 2014



*Photo caption: Presentation of a Land Use
Plan at a village meeting in Narakauwo,
Simanjiro District, Manyara Region,
Tanzania.
April 2014.*

Triple Line Consulting Ltd
3 Princeton Court,
55 Felsham Road
Putney, London, SW15 1AZ
www.tripleline.com

Crown Agents
St. Nicholas House,
St. Nicholas Road
Sutton, SM1 1EL
www.crownagents.com

Contents

1	Background Information	2
2	Summary of overall performance and findings	4
3	Project staff understanding of the project	5
4	Relevance	5
5	Gender mainstreaming capacity: Are gender issues being addressed adequately.....	6
6	Project performance against the outcome and outputs	7
7	Monitoring and evaluation.....	12
8	Financial management	13
9	Value for money	14
10	Specific project related issues identified in the Terms of Reference for this project....	14
11	Other issues arising from visit	14
12	Conclusion and Recommendations to the project and Fund Manager	15
13	Feedback on Reporting Template/Terms of Reference	15
14	Annex 1	15

1 Background Information

Table 1: Background information for GPAF INN-007

Name	Janet Glover
CSCF Project Reference #	GPAF INN-007
Project Title	Empowering Tanzanian pastoralists to secure land rights
Grant Holder	African Initiatives
Implementing Partners	Ujaama Community Resource Team (UCRT)
Summary of key project aims	<p>This project ultimately benefits 42,696 residents living across 10 pastoralist villages in Simanjiro and Ngorongoro Districts in Northern Tanzania. The project will secure the rights of 33,786 pastoralists (8 communities) to over 2,800km² of vital grazing land and water for their livestock. 22,958 women (across 10 villages) will have equal rights to land; 5,821 households (across 10 villages) will have the security of resources on which to build sustainable livelihoods.</p> <p>Currently 'land certificates' can only be obtained for single villages. The innovative aspect of this project is that multiple villages will hold certificates for communal grazing lands that border one another, creating a large livestock migratory route for cattle, so increasing drought resilience and strengthening traditional livelihoods. The project is in direct response to the increasing number of often violent evictions of pastoralists from land which is traditionally theirs, preventing them from practicing sustainable livelihoods. The project works through Traditional Community Forums (TCFs) that still exercise considerable political influence in Maasai society. The project also emphasises the engagement, sensitisation and empowerment of women as agents for change, and establishes women's Traditional Community Forums across target villages.</p>
Reason for the visit	To review and verify reported progress and results in the two target areas of implementation (based on the Year 1 Annual Report), and discuss problems encountered in Ngorongoro District.
Brief description of areas visited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ≡ In Arusha: UCRT office. ≡ In Simanjiro District: 2 villages (Loiboisit A and Narakauwo).
Overview of who you met (details in Annex)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ≡ UCRT - approximately 20 staff and project team members. ≡ African Initiatives – David Baines, Overseas Programmes Officer ≡ In Simanjiro District in the villages of Loiboisit A and Narakauwo: village chairpersons and sub-chairpersons, Ward Executive Officers, traditional leaders, members of the women's traditional leadership forum, and men and women community members.
Summary of key findings and	<p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ≡ The project is on track in Simanjiro District, where the project has

recommendations	<p>effectively carried out land use planning with a land certificate secured in 5 villages as of March 2014 (second annual report).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ≡ Due to contextual challenges in years 1 and 2, the project is off-track in Ngorongoro District. By April 2014 and the time of the visit the project team had confirmed that Land Use Planning would no longer be possible in Ngorongoro, and during the visit we discussed aspects for the project team to consider when proposing changes to the project for the remaining implementation period, such as project aims, capacity in Simanjiro to complete additional Land Use Plans (LUPs), beneficiary numbers, value for money and others. Following the visit, the grantholder submitted a document outlining the proposed changes, and the way forward was confirmed in emails of 13/06/2014 and 04/07/2014. In brief, 3 additional LUPs will be completed in Simanjiro (rather than in Ngorongoro as originally planned), while in Ngorongoro the project will continue to provide support to communities to maintain their land rights and capacity building with communities to enable them to engage effectively with debates on the Constitution of Tanzania. ≡ The project team proactively followed the situation in Ngorongoro over the past year, and tried to implement the LUPs as per the guidance of local officials. When it became clear it was not going to be possible, the team proposed an alternative way forward, as described above. ≡ Based on evidence from the project reporting and the Quality Assurance Visit (QAV), the approach of participatory land use planning appears to be a cost effective, scalable and sustainable model for many districts in Tanzania, as it works within the law for land use planning. The project will also generate relevant lessons for other countries, although the specific country contexts will determine the extent to which the model would need to be adapted. ≡ There is testimonial evidence from beneficiaries that a process of participatory land use planning contributes to a range of higher level outcomes, such as reduction in conflict within villages and with neighbouring areas, reduced diseases amongst livestock, and increased women's participation. More detail on this is included in section 6 below. <p><u>Recommendations for UCRT (implementing partner):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ≡ To proceed with implementation as approved in June and July 2014, and work toward returning the project to being on track in both Districts. ≡ To review plans and efforts to continue progress toward a more balanced gender breakdown amongst staff, as well as to review the gender breakdown of management staff (more in section 5). <p><u>Recommendations for African Initiatives (grant holder):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ≡ To continue to support UCRT in implementation and reporting.
-----------------	---

	<p>☰ In line with the action point included in the feedback to the year 2 annual report, to provide an update on project progress in October 2014.</p>
Acronyms	<p>AI – African Initiatives</p> <p>CCRO - Certificate of Customary Right of Occupancy</p> <p>LUP – Land Use Plans/Planning</p> <p>MLF – Male Leadership Forum</p> <p>QAV – Quality Assurance Visit</p> <p>UCRT – Ujaama Community Resource Team</p> <p>VLUM – Village Land Use Management Committee</p> <p>WRLF – Women’s Rights Leadership Forum</p>

2 Summary of overall performance and findings

Note: The quality assurance visit took place in early April 2014. The year 2 annual report was submitted as per the deadline on 30 April 2014, with a reporting logframe. Proposed project changes were discussed and approved in June and July 2014. This report, finalised in August 2014, reflects the discussions and observations during the visit, while using the April 2014 reporting logframe as the most up to date reflection of project progress (particularly for section 6). This report also refers to the approved project changes agreed since the visit.

Overall score in year 2 annual report: B.

The project overall is moderately not meeting expectations. The four project outputs reflect a range of progress – one output is on track, one is exceeding expectations, and two are moderately not meeting expectations. The challenges encountered in Ngorongoro have meant that land use planning has not been able to take place there, and led the project to be one land use plan behind those planned as of the second milestones (5 completed out of 6). As a way forward in Ngorongoro was recently agreed and the remaining land use plans will be completed in Simanjiro instead, the groundwork is in place for the project to move toward being on track overall. Despite challenges, there is significant progress against outcome indicators.

Risk rating: Green (minor issues). After a period of conflict and evictions starting in 2009 in Ngorongoro, a period of relative calm followed, and the way seemed clear to proceed with land use planning. This period of calm informed the project design. The announcement regarding the game control area in March 2013 (8 months into the project) was therefore not foreseen. However, the project has a strong risk matrix, and the project team has proactively followed the situation in Ngorongoro, proposing adjustments to the project based on the change in context. At the time of the first annual report the risk rating was higher due to the uncertainty about the ability of the project to proceed in Ngorongoro. As the project has adapted the planned activities in Ngorongoro to the changed context, there is now a lower level of concern. A project update has been requested for October 2014 to inform on progress. Given the recent changes, this will provide further assurance compared to waiting until the next annual report which will be due in April 2015, only 4 months prior to the project end date.

The project is focused on securing rights to land and natural resources through participatory Land Use Plans (LUP), by providing training on planning and generating village by-laws. The project works with Masai communities in two districts.

- In Simanjiro District, the main challenge in target villages is that land traditionally used for pastoralism is being used more extensively for agriculture, which if not well planned disrupts the continuity of access to grazing land and water resources. In general in terms of land rights, Simanjiro is more stable than Ngorongoro, and the majority of target villages have been able to proceed with the Land Use Planning as set out by Tanzanian law. However there are also some villages in the District, the target village of Kimotorok in particular, facing uncertainty and eviction.
- In Ngorongoro, the announcement in March 2013 that the land would be designated as a game control area has brought an unanticipated degree of uncertainty to five of the original target villages. In response to beneficiary feedback, the project team has proposed to continue community engagement to support them to maintain their land rights, and to build the capacity of communities to enable them to engage effectively with debates on the Constitution of Tanzania. Instead of carrying out the three planned LUPs in Ngorongoro, the project will complete an additional three LUPs in Simanjiro villages instead.

By the end of the project, 8 villages in Simanjiro will have LUPs, and 2 villages in Ngorongoro will access community engagement and capacity building activities, totalling 10 target project villages as originally foreseen.

Activities which were carried out in years 1 and 2 in Ngorongoro District include trainings of village councils and women's forums; community forums on women's rights; and participation in the constitutional review process. The trainings led to some success in Ngorongoro – for example, project structures and trainings helped strengthen the grassroots response, with women taking the lead in a land protest in the area of Ololosoqua.

The project is contributing toward a vision of pastoral corridors of connected grazing areas. All of the Simanjiro target villages border each other. Previously, LUPs were known traditionally but not written down or formalised, and this project is innovative by getting the plans written and documented. The connectivity of the LUPs is also innovative, as previously the LUPs were disperse and did not share borders. During the visit the connectivity of the LUPs stood out as a strength of the project.

3 Project staff understanding of the project

On a scale of 1 – 5 where 5 is the top score, how would you rate project staff understanding of the project?

5

Project staff at the implementing partner (UCRT) and the African Initiatives Overseas Programmes Officer demonstrated good understanding of the project's aims, scope, activities, approaches and impact. The project and the wider context regarding land issues was discussed extensively at the UCRT office and during the field visit, and was informed by a range of relevant knowledge and experience of various staff members. These discussions included an understanding of the legal framework regarding land, advocacy on land rights, gender aspects of the approach, and practicalities of working with local communities and officials. UCRT has focused on the issue of land rights since its start in 1997.

4 Relevance

This project is relevant against the GPAF objectives as it is focused on improving livelihood security for 10 pastoralist communities.

A range of changes are taking place in the project areas, ultimately restricting land mobility. These include increased agricultural use of land, land seizures, land-use restrictions and prolonged drought

and climate change. The target areas experienced a severe drought in 2009, which also informed the design of this project.

In Ngorongoro, the relevance of a project focused on securing the right to land has been underlined by the contextual challenges which have not enabled the planned land use to go ahead and which have led to target communities facing possible eviction. The project target area includes Loliondo, which has experienced four years of tension with the hunting company Ortello Business Corporation (OBC), affecting 65,000 residents, and where a major eviction took place in 2009. The conflict has been the focus of an international advocacy campaign, and the project team viewed the international media as playing a key role in stopping, or at least maintaining, the situation.

In Simanjiro, the project works in the context of complementary approaches within the District. As one example we drove through an easement, a mixed-use wildlife and livestock corridor, en route to the two villages visited in Simanjiro. The easement is beyond the scope of the project, but complements the corridor approach the project takes, and is beneficial to both the conservation of wildlife and to the pastoral system. LUPs can facilitate access to an easement, and the easement provides mobility for grazing beyond the area under the LUP.

5 Gender mainstreaming capacity: Are gender issues being addressed adequately

Based on discussions with staff and observations during the visit it is clear that the project team has an understanding of gender issues and is addressing gender discrimination through core project activities on women's participation and awareness of women's rights. It is also apparent that change in gender relations is a long-term effort and process in the target communities.

The project engages with traditional leadership fora for women and men on rights such as the right to own property (land and cattle), and widow's rights. The male leadership forum (MLF), which involves traditional leaders, and the women's rights leadership forum (WRLF) now overlap in target communities, where before they were separate or only the MLF was active.

Project workshops addressing women's rights have led to greater acceptance of women traditional leaders. A key achievement highlighted in the year 2 annual report is an historic shift in Masai customary law after the Traditional Community Forum (TCF) of Ngorongoro District agreed to enshrine women's rights in the customary Masai Constitution at a meeting facilitated by UCRT.

Regarding the gender breakdown of UCRT staff, the year 2 annual report states that 'in 2012-13 UCRT staff consisted of 23 men and 4 women. In 2013-14 UCRT staff consisted of 23 men and 6 women.' This represents a move toward a more balanced gender breakdown of staff, and it is recommended that UCRT continue to review plans and efforts to progress further in this direction, as well as to review the gender breakdown of management staff.

UCRT staff attended two Training of Trainings workshops this year related to gender, which were commissioned by African Initiatives through other project budgets. One workshop was an empowerment programme designed to give awareness and exposure to the gender limitations of society, call TUSEME, which is Swahili for "Let us Speak Out". The other was on Gender Responsive Pedagogy, and is a programme which works with partners to create positive societal attitudes, policies and practices that promote gender equity and equality in education.

6 Project performance against the outcome and outputs

NB. The logframe version of 15th October 2013 was used for reference during the quality assurance visit as the most current at that time. For this section, the reporting logframe submitted on 30 April 2014 is used as it includes the most current update on progress against indicators.

Outcome: Improved livelihood security for 8 pastoralist communities

There is significant progress against outcome indicators: out of five, one is substantially exceeding expectations, two are moderately exceeding expectations, and two are moderately not meeting expectations. Overall the progress at outcome level reflects the successful LUPs in Simanjiro, and the contextual challenges in one village in Simanjiro (Kimotorok) and more widely in Ngorongoro District.

Outcome indicator 1: *Land certificates, which include areas of common grazing land are held by elected community representatives.*

This indicator is moderately not meeting expectations overall, although there is good progress in Simanjiro District. 5 land certificates out of 6 (milestone 2) have been completed, all of them in Simanjiro, and this indicator is therefore moderately off track. Plans are in place to proceed with 3 additional LUPs in Simanjiro to reach the target of 8 by the end of the project.

Outcome indicator 2: *2800km² of land protected under land certificates*

This indicator is on track and substantially exceeding expectations, with 3552km² of land protected under land certificates, against the milestone 2 of 2100km² and a final target of 2800km². The figure is set to increase further under the remaining 3 land certificates planned within the project.

Outcome indicator 3: *Number of pastoralists whose right to access common grazing land is covered by a land certificate.*

This indicator is on track and moderately exceeding expectations. 27,222 pastoralists, of whom 13,655 are women, have their right to access common grazing land covered by a land certificate, thereby exceeding milestone 2. The project is on track to reach the target 32,000 pastoralists, 17,600 of them women.

Outcome indicator 4: *Number of evictions in the 10 target communities*

This indicator is moderately exceeding expectations overall. The second milestone had anticipated a decrease in evictions to 16 bomas in total, and the achieved figure has exceeded that with only 10 evictions taking place. All 10 of those evictions were in one village, Kimotorok in Simanjiro. There were no evictions in the other target wards.

During the visit to Narakauwo village, a village leader from relatively nearby Kimotorok said that village residents are currently waiting for a government decision regarding the land, and hoping for a LUP in future when the situation is more stable. In the meantime, UCRT and two other organisations are providing human rights defenders to train community members on organisation, defending, what to do in various situations, women and land rights.

Outcome indicator 5: *Sense of security amongst pastoralist households*

This indicator is moderately off track overall. It is on track in Simanjiro (with Kimotorok as a key exception), and off track in Ngorongoro due to the wider contextual issue described above. Against the second milestone of 'partial sense of security' in Ngorongoro, 4 communities are in constant fear of eviction, and one community has a limited sense of security. In Simanjiro the progress is more positive, with 4 communities having a strong sense of security, and 1 community having a partial sense of security.

Beneficiaries reflect on project outcomes

Loiboisit A, one of the villages visited, is 1.5 years into their engagement with the project and land use planning. Narakauwo residents, about a year into the process, were presented with their final framed LUP during the visit (see cover photo). Village residents spoke freely about concrete results of land use planning:

- **Reduced conflict and greater peace:** women highlighted that the LUP has minimised and reduced conflict, both within the community and externally because of the evidence of boundaries and by-laws. Nobody can deny that the community members have the land certificate, and this leads to less or no land-grabbing and fewer outsiders coming, and less moving of boundary beacons.
- **Better economics and environment:** sometimes due to conflict land has not been used, and the land certificate helps this land to become available. Additional individual certificates will help to access loans (more detail on p12 regarding Certificates of Customary Rights of Occupancy (CCROS).
- **Women's leadership:** women state this is strengthening, with more women elected. Village men in Narakauwo spoke of a meeting on the previous Friday between the traditional leader and women on rights and issues women are facing. The trainings helped women demand joint meetings and through discussions, issues get addressed.
- **Improved conditions for livestock:** the LUP is helping village residents to use land at the right time. It has also led to more calving, the ability to get better prices for livestock, improved food security, and reduced diseases amongst livestock.

Output 1: 8 communities coordinate efforts to gain land certificates and manage the land for equitable use.

This output is moderately off track, as 5 out of 6 LUPs were achieved by milestone 2. Plans are in place to proceed with 3 additional LUPs in Simanjiro to reach the target of 8 LUP teams established by the end of the project. This should enable the three output 1 indicators to return to being on track during the remaining implementation period.

Output indicator 1.1: *Number of Village Land Use Plan Teams established.*

While 5 out of 6 LUP teams were established as of milestone 2, a higher number of people are involved than planned, with 69 against the 48 planned, and within that, 34 women involved against 24 planned.

Output indicator 1.2: *Land Use Plans, involving multiple communities, are in place to inform land use decisions at community level*

5 LUPs out of 6 (milestone 2) have been completed, all in Simanjiro District, and this indicator is therefore moderately off track.

During the visit, I viewed one LUP in place in the village main office in Loiboisit A. In a village meeting in Narakauwo, a LUP was presented to the community. LUPs are framed and protected behind a glass covering, and are accessible at the village level.

UCRT project staff described the land use planning process as including the following steps:

- Involve district government officials in the mapping team
- The mapping team visits the village together, and meets the village council
- The village council suggests community members for the village land team, members of which are 50/50 men and women
- The proposed members are then approved by the village general assembly (the whole community)
- The Village Land Use Management Committee (VLUM) is trained in roles and responsibilities
- Mapping then proceeds. The village land team sketches a village resource map themselves, and then present it to the village general assembly, which may amend it
- The village land team then takes the GPS data together with UCRT
- The village land team refers to a 'narrative land use plan' to inform the LUP
- The LUP includes minutes of relevant meetings as annexes
- The LUP goes to the Department of Land Use for approval
- Villages can start using the plan while waiting for approval
- UCRT has a no-bribe policy, and partly due to this LUP approval can take time

Land Use Planning in Loiboisit A and Narakauwo, as summarised by community members

In Loiboisit A, prior to the project the LUP did not meet community needs, and only covered the area around the village of 5-7km². UCRT coordinated discussion with various bodies: the village general assembly, council and village land team, district government, and Tarangire National Park. The process took time, and involved the costs of travelling to the district offices. Once the overall plan was discussed and agreed, the work on the internal plans and demarcation could proceed. Village leaders met the chief warden of Tarangire and minutes of the meeting were produced, which had never happened before. This process came at a time when some land was about to be designated as a wildlife control area, and also an outsider owns some land. **Land used traditionally has now come to us, not to the national park or others.**

In Narakauwo, community members told of how in 2000 the village undertook land use planning on their own. They lost hope, due to lack of capacity and the high expense of the process. They started again with UCRT. They described involvement from the design phase, and following and attending meetings. Project trainings and the capacity building helped to understand the process, and their role in it. They described how they encountered further delays, and lost hope again - **but then received the land certificate.**

Output indicator 1.3: *Number of villages with by laws (written and agreed upon by communities) supporting the land use plans.*

5 villages out of the 6 planned by milestone 2 have by laws supporting the land use plans, and this indicator is therefore moderately off track.

The by-law documents are stored in the village office in a metal water-proof box and locked. Elected community representatives store the keys, and a spare set is also kept. At the village office in Loibosait A we viewed a land registry book, in which all plots are recorded. A watermark seal is used. Village residents expressed satisfaction that the map is in their possession, and to be able to enter names in the registry book as a step toward securing title needs.

Certificate of Customary Right of Occupancy (CCROs) are also accessible for individual community members once the community has a village land certificate. These underpin the LUPs and are good for 99 years, while the LUPs are good for 10 years. The CCROs strengthen individual as well as community land tenure.

Output 2: Pastoralists have the knowledge, skills and structures in place, to effectively lobby and hold elected officials to account.

This output is on track, and is moderately exceeding expectations.

Output indicator 2.1: *Pastoralists enabled to engage in national debates on the Constitution of Tanzania for pastoralism to be recognised as a legitimate land use system.*

Progress against this indicator has moved faster than anticipated against the milestones. A pastoralist man from Ngorongoro District was appointed to participate in the national Constitutional Assembly to debate the new draft Constitution. Only three other pastoralists were involved from the entire country. 600 people were involved in the national Constitutional Assembly at national level, and the majority were politicians. The second milestone which has been exceeded is 'pastoralists begin to be involved at a local level and lobby local government for increased involvement.'

Output indicator 2.2: *Number of Traditional Community Forum (TCF) members trained in lobbying and representing the community effectively.*

This indicator is exceeding expectations. 350 TCF members have been trained by milestone 2, against a planned 200. Of them, 161 were women, against 96 planned.

Output indicator 2.3: *Proportion of Traditional Community Forum (TCF) members who understand laws and policies governing land and natural resource management.*

Progress against this indicator is also moderately exceeding expectations. In annual questionnaires with traditional leaders, high scores demonstrated understanding of laws and policies governing land and natural resource management, particularly regarding women's right to own property, and on inheritance rights.

Output indicator 2.4: *Confidence of pastoralists in Traditional Community Forum (TCF) to represent them.*

Similarly, this indicator is moderately exceeding expectations. In a recent household survey, 92% agreed that community issues are addressed by the Traditional Community Forum.

Output 3: Women secure equitable access to land under the Land Act passed in 1999.

This output is moderately off track.

Output indicator 3.1: *Proportion of community members aware of woman's rights.*

Progress against this indicator appears mixed. While 99% of community members interviewed in the October 2013 household survey believed that women had a right to own property and livestock, only 13% believed that a woman had a right to inherit property/livestock from her husband.

Increasing awareness of community members about women's rights is a key element of project activities. The year 2 annual report notes that the degree to which these figures change in the repeat household survey planned for February 2015 will be reviewed closely, to gauge the result of the relevant activities.

During the visit, both male and female community members described training they had received on women's rights. In Narakauwo women and men communities members shared the following experiences:

- We spoke with a group of 10 women, one of whom was a ward secretary. There are 24 women in the village WRLF. The first training they received covered laws, women's rights and inheritance. They meet bimonthly in village centre to talk about women's issues, small businesses, problems encountered, and land rights. They listed the main changes which have taken place through the project: they have knowledge about land use, laws, and their rights as women. The main change is that women have applied for plots for farms, and have received confirmation letters from the Village Executive Officer. They also now know their rights on inheritance of land and livestock. Previously widows could not inherit. A big impact is for women to demand their inheritance, as this did not happen before. One woman is a member of the VLUM, and they now have women leaders. Men are now scared to beat them, as women know where to report. There have been several cases of men trying to take their plots, and they reported to village leaders. Women have kiosks and shambas (small farming plots). When asked what has not gone well, they felt it was good progress, but also would like a 'basket fund' for income generation and rotating support.
- We also spoke with about 10 men. The village chairman stated that compared to the last 30/40 years, MTFs now consider issues affecting women. Previously, widows with no children lost all property and were chased back to their fathers. This is now not accepted, decisions are made based on the widow's needs and the property remains hers. Religion has played a role with moral arguments about treatment of widows. UCRT legal training and learning through their own meetings and sharing experiences have also contributed to change in behaviour. The men also gave the example that it is not permissible to take the property of women with no children until she dies. Other customary laws were not good for women, e.g. in case of accidental death, for women fewer cattle and small items were provided as compensation. Now if accidental death occurs the same amount has to be paid as for a man.

Output indicator 3.2: *Village by-laws state women have an equitable access to land.*

This indicator is moderately off track. 5 out of 6 villages planned by milestone two have by-laws which state that women have an equitable access to land. Plans are in place to proceed with 3 additional LUPs in Simanjoro to reach the target of 8 villages with by laws by the end of the project.

Output 4: UCRT capacity is strengthened to support the sustainability of the project outcome, and to involve members of the community within the project, including issues affecting disabled people.

This output is on track.

Output indicator 4.1: *Impact of the project assessed.*

This indicator is meeting expectations. UCRT held Evidence of Change workshops and Stakeholder Review Workshops. A Household Survey was carried out in October 2013, and a repeat survey is planned for February 2015, in order to feed into the final external evaluation of the project. The survey helped to build UCRT staff capacity in designing and carrying out a large scale survey. Data and analysis from the survey were referenced in the year 2 annual report. These efforts will enable an assessment of the project impact.

Output indicator 4.2: *UCRT mainstream disability in their work with the target communities.*

This indicator is also meeting expectations. A disability mainstreaming workshop was facilitated by an organisation called the Kesho Trust. UCRT subsequently employed a member of staff with a disability, and one disabled woman is also actively involved in a women's forum in Kiteto District (which borders Simanjiro District). This represents progress toward this indicator target, which is that disabled people in 3 communities are actively involved in UCRT's programmes.

7 Monitoring and evaluation

The monitoring and evaluation framework for the project is robust.

To what extent is M&E data routinely collected by project staff?

UCRT project staff collect information during visits as they carry out activities and follow up progress in target villages, which feed into UCRT Project Reports (6 monthly narrative reports). There is emphasis on both quantitative and qualitative measures in the logframe indicators. The Household Survey mentioned above is also a routine (approximately every 18 months) means of collecting data, especially on qualitative aspects of the project impact.

UCRT and African Initiatives will be reviewing the Household Survey over the coming year with a view to refining both the wording of the questions and the explanation/context which is given to the questions, and the quality of the translation from English into Ki-Swahili and Maa.

Is sex disaggregated data collected, analysed and used to inform project approaches?

Gender disaggregated data is collected at output level (e.g. 1.1 on 'Number of village Land Use Plan teams established' includes a breakdown of the team members by men and women; and 2.2 on the 'Number of Traditional Community Forum (TCF) members trained in lobbying and representing the community effectively' includes a gender breakdown). At outcome level, outcome indicator 3 on the 'Number of pastoralists whose right to access common grazing land is covered by a land certificate' is disaggregated by gender. This information informs project approaches by allowing project staff to track women's participation and empowerment in the LUP process. Should women be under-represented in these indicators, staff respond by increasing sensitisation within that village.

How is M&E data stored, analysed, reviewed and acted upon?

African Initiatives secured voluntary professional support to analyse and represent the data collected in the household survey. This data proved useful in reviewing assumptions and project activities, as well as planning forthcoming activities.

The project holds a monitoring exercise every six months to reflect on whether the intended changes are taking place, and to then enhance programme implementation. "Evidence of change" is also used with key individuals to provide greater insight to the complexity of change and the impact. These are documented as case studies to enhance learning.

Annual stakeholder reviews and workshops are also held for reflection on the difference the project is making, and whether it is doing the right activities. Learning guides the development of future projects. Learning from this innovative method to securing land rights will be disseminated amongst

Als partners also working on these issues, as well as to other organisations AI and UCRT have links with who are working in the field of land rights.

The year 2 annual report stated that the 'evidence of change' and stakeholders workshops have been key to evaluating the impact of the project and consulting what communities' primary needs are going forward.

To what extent are the views of beneficiaries and other target groups routinely collected, analysed, reviewed and acted upon in management processes?

Project staff begin village meetings and workshops with an update on project progress. This is done to inform the village of progress and issues relating to project activities. It also provides the village members a chance to respond to the overall project, and to specific elements as they see fit. Feedback relating to the views of beneficiaries is also provided through these forums.

The strongest example of beneficiary feedback is that mentioned above in section 2 in relation to the issues encountered in Ngorongoro District, that based on beneficiary feedback the project provided ongoing support to communities regarding protection of their land rights and to engage in local and national debates on the new Constitution, rather than withdrawing when it became clear that the main project activities of LUP could not be carried out there.

During our visit to Narakauwo, community members commented consistently in the various meetings of the day that education levels there are very low, and requesting an additional programme of education. While primary and secondary education is outside of UCRT's area of work, as it is beneficiary feedback UCRT may be able to bring this request to the attention of education focused NGOs.

To what extent are verifiable sources of data (evidence) used to support progress/achievements as listed in the annual report?

Verifiable sources of data are used to support progress and achievements in the annual reporting. Examples include: the UCRT household survey, Land Registry documents at village, ward, district regional and national levels, the land certificates held by the Village Executive Officers, GPS measurements included in the LUPs, village by laws and training records, and questionnaires with traditional leaders. The GPS used to mark out the LUPs, the framed maps in villages, the land registry books and the metal secure cabinets in the village offices were all tangible evidence of the process of land use planning observed during the visit.

8 Financial management

Sufficiently robust - I met with the UCRT Finance and Administration Manager to discuss and review financial systems related to the project. Over the past two years UCRT moved from an older financial database to Quickbooks, and strengthened systems of financial management controls. Previously there had been weak systems, no bank reconciliation, and no financial manual. One example of this effort is that summary information regarding budget and expenditure is now produced regularly to inform management decision-making. Efforts to further strengthen financial management systems are on-going.

As an exercise, we followed the progress of the 2013-14 quarter 3 transfer of £5,462 from African Initiatives to UCRT in Quickbooks. I viewed the transfer request, as well as the same figure in Quickbooks and the financial report to African Initiatives for the DFID financial report. I viewed income and expenditure by activity against this figure. We also reviewed the purchase of the 2 GPS

devices in the older database, using the voucher number. I viewed the quotations, the bank payment voucher, the receipt and the tax invoice. I also saw their procurement policy which is in the finance manual, and the accounting manual was shared with me. The organisation's vehicles are managed by an administrative assistant and the director, and I reviewed the vehicle log in a random check during the Simanjiro visit.

The discussions demonstrated a good understanding of project and organisational financial management, and the documentation viewed supported an overall impression of sufficiently robust financial management.

9 Value for money

Overall rating: Good

i. Is the project effective in its approaches and in the delivery of its outputs?

This QAV confirms that this project is effective in its aims to improve livelihood security for 8 pastoralist communities. In Simanjiro district where there have been no significant changes in context, the project has proven effective, with the steps in the LUPs undertaken and completed in 5 villages to date. In Ngorongoro, the project has adapted to engage with communities as much as possible, although it has not been possible to take forward the LUPs as intended. The project as originally envisioned has been less effective in Ngorongoro due to the contextual challenges. The quality of evidence that supports project results is sufficiently robust, as described above in section 8.

ii. Is the project efficient (are the inputs and resources being used in the most cost effective way to deliver the outputs and outcome)?

Inputs and resources are well monitored and utilised. Travel policies are in place for staff, and all travel expenses must be recorded with receipts. The annual report describes the process of combining workshop topics in a single day, and involving multiple project villages in each workshop. This efficiency makes it possible to reach community members more than once during the project to reinforce key project messages.

iii. Is the project economic? Does the project have procurement policies in place and to secure inputs at the optimum price

The projects works in the context of Tanzanian law, which in the Village Land Act of 1999 requires a village to have a 'Village Land Registry' in which to keep all land records. The project provides strong metal cabinets, watermark seals and books for record keeping, as an alternative to building or renovating a secure building, and reducing potential costs considerably. A procurement policy is in place to ensure reasonable prices and quality.

NB. As at April 2014, 39,803 direct beneficiaries were reported to have been reached, against an overall project budget of £219,697 – a cost of £5.5 per beneficiary for the first 2 years of the project.

10 Specific project related issues identified in the Terms of Reference for this project

Addressed above in section 2.

11 Other issues arising from visit

None.

12 Conclusion and Recommendations to the project and Fund Manager

Conclusions and recommendations are included in the summary section on page 4-5.

13 Feedback on Reporting Template/Terms of Reference

None

14 Annex 1

Interviews and discussion:

UCRT (Arusha):

1. During a project meeting I met with the majority of UCRT staff, approximately 20 staff members, and 2 African Initiatives staff members.
2. Finance and Administration Manager - Justin Hokororo

The Simanjiro project visit:

1. UCRT Executive Director – Edward Loure
2. UCRT Programme Manager – Cara Scott
3. UCRT Simanjiro Field Officer – Paul Rokonga
4. African Initiatives Overseas Programmes Officer – David Baines
5. In the villages of Loiboisit A and Narakauwo we met with village chairpersons and sub-chairpersons, Ward Executive Officers, traditional leaders, members of the women's traditional leadership forum, and male and female community members.