

MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND TOURISM



KIGOMA REGIONAL SECRETARIAT

RESULTS REPORT 2015

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT FOR LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TAN 13 029 11

| A | CRONYMS | 4 |
|---|--|----|
| 1 | INTERVENTION AT A GLANCE (MAX. 2 PAGES) | 5 |
| | 1.1 INTERVENTION FORM | 5 |
| | 1.2 BUDGET EXECUTION | |
| | 1.3 SELF-ASSESSMENT PERFORMANCE | 6 |
| | 1.3.1 Relevance | 6 |
| | 1.3.2 Effectiveness | 7 |
| | 1.3.3 Efficiency | |
| | 1.3.4 Potential sustainability | 8 |
| | 1.4 CONCLUSIONS | 8 |
| 2 | RESULTS MONITORING | 10 |
| | 2.1 EVOLUTION OF THE CONTEXT | 10 |
| | 2.1.1 General context | 10 |
| | 2.1.2 Institutional context | 10 |
| | 2.1.3 Management context: execution modalities | 10 |
| | 2.1.4 Harmo context | 10 |
| | 2.2 Performance outcome | 12 |
| | 2.2.1 Progress of indicators | 12 |
| | 2.2.2 Analysis of progress made | |
| | 2.2.3 Potential Impact | |
| | 2.3 Performance output 1 | |
| | 2.3.1 Progress of indicators | |
| | 2.3.2 Progress of main activities | |
| | 2.3.3 Analysis of progress made | |
| | 2.4 PERFORMANCE OUTPUT 2 | |
| | 2.4.1 Progress of indicators | |
| | 2.4.2 Progress of main activities | |
| | 2.4.3 Analysis of progress made | |
| | 2.5 PERFORMANCE OUTPUT 3 | |
| | 2.5.1 Progress of indicators | |
| | 2.5.2 Progress of main activities | |
| | 2.5.3 Analysis of progress made | |
| | 2.6 TRANSVERSAL THEMES | |
| | 2.6.1 Gender | |
| | 2.6.3 Other Error! Bookmark no | |
| | 2.7 RISK MANAGEMENT | |
| • | | |
| 3 | STEERING AND LEARNING | |
| | 3.1 STRATEGIC RE-ORIENTATIONS | |
| | 3.2 RECOMMENDATIONS | |
| | 3.3 LESSONS LEARNED | 28 |
| 4 | ANNEXES | 29 |

| 4.1 | QUALITY CRITERIA | 29 |
|-----|---|----|
| 4.2 | DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE STEERING COMMITTEE AND FOLLOW-UP | 32 |
| 4.3 | UPDATED LOGICAL FRAMEWORK | 35 |
| 4.4 | More Results at a glance | 50 |
| 4.5 | "BUDGET VERSUS CURRENT (Y - M)" REPORT | 50 |
| 4.6 | COMMUNICATION RESOURCES | 50 |

Acronyms

<List all acronyms used in the Results Report (alphabetically; see examples below)>

| | Try the deed in the freeding freport (diphabetically, see examples below)> |
|----------|--|
| AFO | Administrative and Financial Officer |
| BTC | Belgian Development Agency |
| DTA | District Technical Advisor |
| ITA | Internationally recruited Technical Advisor |
| JGI | Jane Goodall Institute |
| JLPC | Joint Local Partner Committee |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MNRT | Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism |
| MOF | Ministry of Finance |
| NTA | Nationally recruited Technical Advisor |
| NPC | National Project Coordinator |
| PIU | Project Implementation Unit |
| PMO-RALG | Prime Minister's Office for Regional Administration and Local Government |
| RAS | Regional Administrative Secretary |
| RNRO | Regional Natural Resources Officer |
| TOC | Theory of Change |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

1 Intervention at a glance (max. 2 pages)

1.1 Intervention form

| Natural Resources Management for Local Economic | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | Development in Kigoma Region (NRM-LED) | | |
| Intervention code | TAN 13 029 11 | | |
| Location | Kigoma Region | | |
| Total budget | Belgian contribution Euro 6,000,000 Tanzanian contribution Euro 453,500 | | |
| Partner Institution | Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism Implementing institution Regional Secretariat Kigoma | | |
| Start date Specific Agreement | 13 th March 2014 | | |
| Date intervention start /Opening steering committee | September 2014 | | |
| Planned end date of execution period | August 2019 | | |
| End date Specific Agreement | 12 March 2021 | | |
| Target groups | Communities involved in natural resources management in selected landscapes in Kigoma Region, local government authorities in the selected landscapes and all 6 district councils. | | |
| Impact ¹ | To ensure that ecosystem resilience is maintained to sustainably provide socio-economic and environmental benefits to local communities in Kigoma Region | | |
| Outcome | An improved enabling environment and strengthened capacities for sustainable management of NR linked to an equitable Local Economic Development result in increased benefits for the communities of selected landscapes in Kigoma Region | | |
| | A Decision Support System on NRM for Local Government Authorities established, enabling mainstreaming in decentralized planning of key NRM issues. Improved governance and sustainable management of NR by local institutions and key resource users. Key resource users, transformers and traders of NR | | |
| Outputs | derive sustainable and equitable benefits from natural resources. 4. Strengthened institutional capacities and accountability of key stakeholders for improved gender sensitive NR governance, landscape coordination and implementation of CBNRM | | |
| Year covered by the report | 2015 | | |

 $^{^{1}}$ Impact refers to global objective, Outcome refers to specific objective, output refers to expected result

1.2 Budget execution

| Budget | | Expe | nditure | Balance | Disburse- ment rate at | |
|---------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--|
| | | Previous years | Year covered by report (n) | | the end of year n | |
| Total | 6,000,000 | 2014: 274,807 | 692,840 | 5,032,582 | 16% | |
| Output 1 | 153,600 | 0 | 47,525 | 100,075 | 31% | |
| Output 2 | 1,010,100 | 0 | 50,052 | 960,045 | 5% | |
| Output 3 | 335,000 | 0 | 3,790 | 331,210 | 1% | |
| Output 4 | 320,400 | 053 | 37,404 | 282,996 | 12% | |
| Technical Expertise | 2,589,200 | 55,069 | 372,253 | 2,216,947 | 14% | |
| General Means | 1,457,080 | 219,711 | 236,913 | 1,000,456 | 31% | |
| Budget Reserve | 134,620 | 0 | 0 | 134,620 | 0% | |

1.3 Self-assessment performance

1.3.1 Relevance

| | Performance |
|-----------|-------------|
| Relevance | Α |

The project objectives are embedded in national policies and strategies (National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty, land, wildlife, forest, and fisheries policies; National Gender Strategy) with results contributing to the implementation of related laws and guidelines, in particular, the local Government Act, Forestry, Wildlife and Fishery Acts, Land, Village Land and Land Use Planning Acts.

- The project currently builds capacity in natural resource governance at six LGAs and 19 village governments. Local government and governance is a cross cutting issue in the Belgian Development Strategy in Tanzania.
- The project is currently assisting 19 villages to establish/review Village Natural Resources Management Committees and Village Land Use Management Teams, ensuring a gender sensitive approach to selection of committee members and providing training on roles and responsibilities. On-going mentoring support is also provided for.
- The project builds on other Belgian supported interventions in the Region, such as Beekeeping Support Project for Kigoma Region and works closely with the Scholarships Project.
- The projects supports local communities to obtain equitable income from the sustainable management of community owned/managed natural resources, with implementation focused on an inclusive approach, to ensure that a broad range of community stakeholders is reached.
- The project is developing and implementing a gender strategy in order to mainstream gender issues in natural resources management for local economic development in all project activities.

1.3.2 Effectiveness

| | Performance |
|---------------|-------------|
| Effectiveness | С |

- The TFF had assumed that to a large part village land use plans were in place and this project would assist in their implementation. After the situation analysis and baseline study it has become apparent, that
 - o In most areas in Kigoma Region village land use plans are not in place; and
 - where they exist they have never been implemented
 - since the formulation of the project many villages have been divided, which renders any land use plan for the village invalid.
- An approved land use plan is a pre-requisite for the establishment of community based natural resources management activities. Thus, development of village land use plans has to be given priority in the project activities. This was not foreseen and will means that in a best case scenario at least six months have been 'lost' due to this process.
- One of the landscape selection criteria is absence of serious conflicts. However, the seriousness of conflicts only became apparent once implementation of activities had started – in some cases the reasons are politically motivated, eg new village governments not recognising what outgoing ones had implemented, or not being handed over the office, including files and documents.
- The implementation of land use plans is a problem throughout the country. In the few cases where land use plans are implemented, the activities are invariably supported by external funding and it is often the step of providing individuals with certificates of customary rights of occupancy (CCROs) that convinces villagers about the usefulness/necessity of having a village land use plan. The attraction of CCROs is that they can be used as collateral for loans.
- There is a tendency for many people to measure results in a quantitatively only, potentially to the detriment of the quality of outcomes. For example with land use planning, it is dangerous to focus on the number of land use plans achieved by rushing through the process, without paying attention to key factors such as adequate levels of participation and inclusivity during the process, which can lead to a lack of ownership of the plans.

1.3.3 Efficiency

| | Performance |
|------------|-------------|
| Efficiency | В |

- Project planning takes place in a participatory manner through stakeholder platforms at landscape, district and regional levels. This should foster ownership at all levels, and assist people at all levels to integrate project activities into their schedules. Currently planned activities are largely carried out or facilitated by district staff with little involvement from service providers.
- The baseline report established that overall the staffing level at the districts is about 50% of the level required, and the education levels of district staff are very much skewed towards vocational level training. For example at the time of the baseline, graduates made up 35% of the Department of Lands and Natural Resources staff in all six districts in Kigoma Region, with Buhigwe and Uvinza districts having 0 and 1

graduate, respectively. Kigoma is the only district in the Region with 1 staff at Master degree level (Master in Urban Planning and Management). This situation means that district staff may not be available for project activities due to other commitments. The stakeholder meetings are important events to coordinate the different activities at district and landscape levels.

- It is difficult to retain qualified technical staff at the project office in Kigoma. This has led to high staff turnover for some positions (Accountant and M&E Advisor) and a persistent gap in two technical positions: GIS and Land Use Planning Advisor and Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness Advisor).
- Corrective measures have included obtaining approval from JLPC to explore alternatives to direct employment, eg through service contracts.

1.3.4 Potential sustainability

| | Performance |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| Potential sustainability | В |

- The potential to reach a situation where sustainability is achieved at the end of the project will vary significantly according to the start-up status in each landscape, and within the landscape in each village.
- Experience from othe initiatives and also Belgian supported interventions has shown
 that Community Based Natural Resources Management activities are usually reliant
 on long term external funding. This includes activities, starting from village land use
 planning right through the implementation of management plans for the natural
 resources concerned (forestry, fisheries, wildlife, bee products). It also applies to
 micro finance.
- Within the five year time frame of the project, some sustainability maybe achieved in landscapes that have existing Village Land Forest Reserves, where the support can concentrate on the development of sustainable harvesting plans and consequently, institutional strengthening of the village natural resources committee which manages the forest.
- The current situation with the increasing population of refugees is both a threat and an opportunity. The opportunity is that vast amounts of poles and firewood are needed, which would provide an economic opportunity to earn substantial amounts for the villages. If that can be realised in a few villages it maybe an incentive to other villages to progress the establishment of village forest reserves.
- In order to achieve a degree of sustainability, it will be very important for the project
 to focus on identifying potential candidates for success, perhaps through introducing
 competitive processes, especially in Result Area 3, where the objective is to
 increase economic capacity.

1.4 Conclusions

- The objective of the project to achieve equitable economic benefits from community based natural resources management, remains very relevant to Tanzanian national strategies and policies, the Belgian Development Strategy, and in particular the target population of the communities in the selected landscapes.
- The baseline from which activities are starting is significantly below that anticipated in

- strategies and policies, the Belgian Development Strategy, and in particular the target population of the communities in the selected landscapes.
- The baseline from which activities are starting is significantly below that anticipated in the TFF, with hardly any existing/implemented village land use plans. This requires the project to be very strategic in approach, ie to prioritise activities in areas where there is the greatest potential for achieving results within the allocated time.
- Results should be measured less in terms of coverage, such as no of land use plans approved, but in terms of quality of outcomes. Where do we have the greatest chance of success because of, for example, least amount of conflict, most capable and committed village government institutions; most committed district staff, most capable, independent/pro-active CBO/SACCOS/VICOBAS, etc. It will be important to apply these merit criteria in order for the project to achieve the results in the time available. It is not a question of how many initiatives we support per village, but how many potential candidates are there wherever- who are likely to succeed.
- The above principle has already been applied in selecting the remaining landscapes: Chakulu village, which has a somewhat functioning land use plan and an approved village land forest reserve will be taken on as a demonstration village to serve as a motivation to other villages to complete their village land forest reserves.

| National execution official ² | BTC execution official ³ |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| | |
| funcion | Joseph / |

² Name and Signature ³ Name and Signature

9

2 Results Monitoring⁴

2.1 Evolution of the context

2.1.1 General context

The main events that had an influence on the implementation of project activities during the reporting period were the local government elections in December 2014 and the general election in October 2015. The former, while not occurring in the reporting period, had a profound effect at village level, with outgoing village governments refusing to hand over office and/or documents, and similarly incoming governments in some cases not recognising achievements of their predecessors. This was particularly apparent when there was also a change of party.

The general election slowed down implementation of project activities particularly during the final months of the campaign. Ward councillors were only sworn in at the end of December, so the inclusion of ward councillors in project activities will only start in 2016. The general election had been considered in activity planning, with some districts not planning any activities for the month of October, but even so the effect was greater than anticipated.

2.1.2 Institutional context

Institutional anchorage is still very relevant with the PIU situated in the Regional Secretariat, and activities implemented through district councils at the village level. The commitment and ownership of the project by the Project Manager, who is also the Regional Natural Resources Officer, has had a very positive effect on project implementation as he closely follows up on project activities and is pro-active in finding solutions for any obstacles. The project also has good cooperation from the district leadership.

At the national level, the anchorage in the Forestry and Beekeeping is also still relevant. The appointment of an assistant National Project Coordinator (NPC) has proved a very effective move as the NPC has changed twice during 2015. The first change was due to the position of NPC tranferring from Policy and Planning Division to FBD, the nominated NPC then retired at the end of 2015.

2.1.3 Management context: execution modalities

The NRM-LED project is managed through joint Belgian – Tanzanian technical and operational responsibility for the execution and achievement of the results to reach the specific objective of the project. This applies both at the level of the steering committee (MNRT, PMO-RALG, MoF, RAS and BTC Resident Representative) and the project implementation unit (RS and BTC).

The financial execution modality of the project is own-managed (Regie). To date the execution modalities have proven effective and efficient. While no project funds are channelled through district accounts, there is still joint responsibility for the efficient use of project funds to achieve the results that were mutually agreed.

Results Report 10

_

⁴ Impact refers to global objective, Outcome refers to specific objective, output refers to expected result

2.1.4 Harmo context

During the reporting period good links and collaboration have been established with other actors in the landscapes. In particular, Jane Goodall Institute who work in Uvinza and Kigoma districts. One of the selected landscapes, Lake Tanganyika in Kigoma District, is comprised of villages that are supported by JGI in forest management. NRM-LED will focus on fisheries, ie beach management units (BMUs) to complement JGI's efforts, but even with regards to forest management we have agreed to complement each other's activities wherever appropriate. In addition, a training of trainer's course for district staff on democracy and good governance in NR, will be used by NRM-LED to train staff in the other four districts of Kigoma Region. NRM-LED will complement the course modules with one on conflict resolution and one on facilitation skills.

TUUNGANE, and in particular Frankfurt Zoological Society (FZS) have done a lot of very relevant work in the Mahale Ecosytem, including land use planning, village forest management and village saving and credit schemes following the VICOBA model. NRM-LED facilitated a study tour for district land use planning teams to learn from FZS's experiences and practices in Mpanda District.

World Vision plans to build on NRM-LED facilitated in training to fishing groups on aquaculture in Buhigwe District, by supporting groups with fingerlings and other inputs.

Ownership of the project is excellent at the project manager level, and in some of the districts, especially Kitanga-Mugera landscape in Buhigwe and Kasulu districts, due to the good relationships that the District Technical Advisor has with the district leadership. Kakonko district executive director is also usually very well informed on project activities. Uvinza district shows less ownership, which may, at least in part, be due to the fact the there is little stability in the district leadership, which both District Executive and District Commissioner being replaced during the reporting period.

2.2 Performance outcome



2.2.1 Progress of indicators⁵

Outcome⁶:An improved enabling environment and strengthened capacities for sustainable management of NR linked to an equitable Local Economic Development result in increased benefits for the communities of selected landscapes in Kigoma Region

| Indicators / | Baseline value ⁸ | Value year N ⁹ | Target year N ¹⁰ | Target year N+2 | End Target ¹¹ |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Number of service providers working on NRM in the region | 38 | 38 | 38 | 48 | 48 |
| Average annual revenue generated by service providers from sustainable use of NR | 723,544 | 723,544 | 723,544 | 819,121 | 927,324 |
| Proportion of NR service providers with elaborate financial plan | 19% | 19% | 19% | 23% | 50% |
| Proportion of NRs service providers with strategic plan and functional management structure | 13% | 13% | 13% | 16% | 32% |
| Average annual household income per capita | 289,385 | 289,385 | 289,385 | 379,677 | 429,830 |
| Percentage of benefits that is shared among members within village/communities and across gender | 59% | 59% | 59% | 71% | 90% |
| Percentage of DDP budget allocated to NRM | 0.42% | 0.42% | 0.42% | 0.51% | 1.00% |

2.2.2 Analysis of progress made

The current report covers first six months of the inception phase and the first six months of implementation. Project activities are proceeding as planned. As mentioned in section one, the fact that land use planning has either not been done in the landscapes or has not been implemented will have an impact on how fast the anticipated changes can be achieved. There was so far no reason to assume that outputs will not lead to the assumed.

⁵ You can use the table provided, or you can replace it by your own monitoring matrix format. Add/delete columns according to the context (some interventions will need to add columns for previous years while other – new - interventions will not have a value for the previous year).

⁶ Use the formulation of the outcome as mentioned in the logical framework (TFF)

⁷ Use the indicators as shown in the logical framework (from TFF or last version of logical framework)

The value of the indicator at time 0. Refers to the value of the indicators at the beginning of the intervention (baseline)

The achieved value of the indicator at the end of year N. If the value has not changed since the baseline or since the previous year, this value should be repeated.

¹⁰ The planned target at the end of year N

¹¹ The target value at the end of the intervention

2.2.3 Potential Impact

The logic of the intervention is still valid, however, as explained in previous sections, the projects starts from a much lower base than anticipated in the TFF.

2.3 Performance output 1¹²



2.3.1 Progress of indicators

Output 1: Decision Support System on NRM for Local Government Authorities established, enabling mainstreaming in decentralized planning of key NRM issues

| Indicators | Baseline value | Value year N | Target year N | Target year N+2 | End Target |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| The extent to which decision makers utilize generated information at DSS during decision making processes/planning processes at all levels | 50% | 50% | 50% | 60% | 80% |
| Number of districts integrating activities related to natural resources management and coordination in their district development plan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Number of villages integrating activities related to natural resources management and coordination in their village development plan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 35 |

2.3.2 Progress of main activities

| Progress of main activities 13 | Progress: | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|---|---|--|--|
| | Α | В | С | D | | |
| Develop DSS system for NRM and build capacity in its use | | | Х | | | |
| 2 Undertake situation analysis to select prioirty NRM_LED landscapes | | Х | | | | |
| 3 Mainstreaming of key NRM issues in decentralised planning | | Х | | | | |
| 4 Regular M&E, information gathering and analysis of NRM-LED processes | | | Х | | | |

The template accommodates up to 3 Outputs (chapters 2.2, 2.3, 2.4). If the intervention has more outputs, simply copy and paste additional output chapters. If the intervention has less than 3 outputs, simply delete the unnecessary chapters). As for the outcome level, you may also replace this table by the intervention's own format (e.g. from your operational monitoring tool)

A: The activities are ahead of schedule

B The activities are on schedule

C The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.

D The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

2.3.3 Analysis of progress made

The main activities under result one are largely on track. except for the development of a GIS system, which is behind due to the resignation of the NTA GIS and Land Use Planning only 3 weeks after being recruited in August 2015. It proved very difficult to attract suitably qualified candidates to work in Kigoma. The JLPC has approved that the project pursues alternatives to direct employment.

The NTA Planning and M&E had also resigned in September, which delayed some of the planned training in reporting. However, a replacement has been recruited starting in Feb 2016 and it is anticipated that this activity will be done during the period Jan-June 2016.

The working group on adapting the AFM manual (a manual on Admisntrative and Finanacial Management for participatory forest management and sustainable wetlands management) that had been foreseen in the TFF has not yet been established. The main reason being that the manual, developed by (then) PMO-RALG in collaboration with MNRT has never been operationalised. While providing some useful tools such as standard inventory and reporting formats, it cannot be seen as a decision support system (DSS) on its own. It has therefore been decided to broaden the mandate of the working group to focus on an DSS. This will be organised early in 2016.

The situation analysis to select priority landscapes has been completed as has the baseline study.

2.4 Performance output 2

2.4.1 Progress of indicators

| Indicators | Baseline value | Value year N | Target year N | Target year N+2 | End Target |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Tender/financial reports related to NR publically shared through public notice board | 50% | 50% | 50% | 67% | 90% |
| Proportion of people perceive that election processes for NR related committee meet good governance standards (% of communities) | 50% | 50% | 50% | 61% | 86% |
| Proportion of CBOs and other institutions working on NR related activities whose annual financial reports are shared to beneficiaries/public | 24% | 24% | 24% | 50% | 80% |
| Proportion of people/NR users who perceive that corruption is reduced at all decentralized levels | 22% | 22% | 22% | 35% | 60% |
| Proportion of people/NR users who perceive that local government authorities are accountable and willing to facilitate NRM activities at all levels. | 46% | 46% | 46% | 55% | 75% |

2.4.2 Progress of main activities

| Progress of main activities 14 | Progress: | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|---|---|--|--|
| | Α | В | С | D | | |
| 1 Capacity building and implementation of VLUPs | | | Х | | | |
| 2 Capacity Building and implementation of the 6 steps of CBNRM | | Х | | | | |
| 3 Develop Capacity for improved governance and conflict management for village and user groups | | | Х | | | |

2.4.3 Analysis of progress made

The main activity foreseen in this result area is capacity building and the implementation of village land use plans. However, as mentioned earlier in this report, there are no land use plans in the implementation stage and largely the plans have to be developed first. Only 3 out of 19 villages in the three landscapes have exisiting VLUPs since 2007, but

The activities are ahead of schedule

B C D The activities are on schedule

The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.

The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

none of these have ever been implemented and even the documentation is not available at either village or district levels. Two other villages that had VLUPs have recently been divided, necessitating the exercise to be done again.

This situation was apparent after the situation analysis and baseline survey and the planning has taken this into account. The development of VLUPs is on-going and it is expected that VLUPs are approved by the villages district councils by April 2016.

Training on conflict management has been postponed to the dry season due to a very heavy workload for villagers with land use planning and also their agricultural activities.

2.5 Performance output 3¹⁵

2.5.1 Progress of indicators

| Output 3: Key resource users, transformers and traders of NR derive sustainable and equitable benefits from |
|---|
| natural resources |

| Indicators | Baseline value | Value year N | Target year N | Target year N+2 | End Target |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Average annual quantity of energy sources consumed (data disaggregated by energy source) | In various units as per section 3.6.3.3 (a) of the baseline report | In various units as per section 3.6.3.3 (a) of the baseline report | In various units as per section 3.6.3.3 (a) of the baselin e report | 7.2% higher than baselin e value for each energy source | 12% higher than baselin e value for each energy source |
| Proportion of people whose per capita income is above \$1.00 per day due to sustainable use of NR value chain | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 2% |
| Number of business coalition formed among key NR users in the region | 25 | 25 | 25 | 32 | 60 |

¹⁵ If the Logical Framework contains more than three Outputs, copy-paste the 2.4 chapter and create 2.6 for Output 4, 2.7 for Output 5, etc.

2.5.2 Progress of main activities

| Progress of main activities 16 | Progress: | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | Α | В | С | D | | | |
| Improve opportunities for generating revenue from sustainable harvesting and use of NR | | | Х | | | | |
| 2 Improve access to financial service providers through improved capacity fo NRM related SACCOS and VICOBAS | | Х | | | | | |
| 3 Support partnerships between users, transformers, traders and corporate private sector | | Х | | | | | |

2.5.3 Analysis of progress made

It was anticipated that a study on the economic valuation of natural resources and viable business opportunities for NR related businesses would have been commissioned by the end of the year. This has not yet happened and will be high priority for the PIU at the start of 2016.

Overall few activities had been planned in this result and there are only minor delays. Most of these are due to delays in reporting by DFTs, for example on the assessment of SACCOS, VICOBAs and other NR related income generating groups.

In Kitanga-Mugera landscape (Buhigwe and Kasulu District) the demand from fishing groups to be trained on pond construction and pond aquaculture management was satisfied. World Vision, one of the other players in the landscape may complement this capacity building with supply of fingerlings at least for groups in Buhigwe district.

A: The activities are ahead of schedule

B The activities are on schedule

C The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.

D The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

2.6 Performance output 4

2.6.1 Progress of indicators

Output 4: Strengthened institutional capacities and accountability of key stakeholders for improved gender sensitive NR governance, landscape coordination and implementation of CBNRM.

| Indicators | Baseline value | Value year N | Target year N | Target year N+2 | End Target |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Proportion of staff trained in conflict management with improved skills on managing NR related conflicts (% of NRM Staff) | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 5% |
| Number of landscape coordination meetings implemented | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| Number of gender and governance meeting related to NR issues implemented | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 |
| Number of villages applying by laws on gender and governance during management of NRs | 17 | 17 | 17 | 22 | 35 |

2.6.2 Progress of main activities

| Progress of main activities 17 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | Α | В | С | D | | |
| Strengthen stakeholder involvement and accountability for NR governance and CBNRM | | Х | | | | |
| 2 Increase awareness and provide information on NRM governance and mgt | | | Х | | | |

2.6.3 Analysis of progress made

The activity under this result are on track with the exception of the development of a CEPA strategy. No suitable candidate has yet been found for the NTA CEPA position, and the PIU is looking at other options including outsourcing CEPA activities to suitably qualified indiviuals or organisations.

Stakeholder platforms have been established at landscape, district and regional levels, with participation from government, NGOs, CBOs and the private sector where applicable. The meetings were conducted on schedule.

A: The activities are ahead of schedule

B The activities are on schedule

C The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.

D The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

Two JLPC meetings were also conducted in the reporting period, the first one approving the plan and budget for the inception period, and the second one approving the annual work plan for 2015/16.

2.7 Transversal Themes

2.7.1 Gender

Development of NRM4LED Gender mainstreaming Strategy

The development of NRM4LED gender mainstreaming strategy is in progress and will be finalised in the first guarter of 2016.

 Capacity development and awareness raising for staff and Regional and district facilitation teams on gender and governance related issues

The District and village teams were supported to review the participant's attendance form in order to capture the data/information regarding the gender participation in project activities. Data on age and sex are now routinely captured for all project activities.

As a result of training supervision by the NTA Gender/Governance, the project will facilitate some skills training for the DFTs on adult learning approaches, and particularly creating in enabling environment for women to participate actively in training and discussions.

 To ensure effective participation of all villagers with special attention to women and vulnerable groups in the project activities

The District teams and village governments in selected landscapes were supported to review the existing and/or to establish VNRC &VLUM Committees with equal/adequate gender participation. VNRC is the responsible committee for Village Land Forest Reserve (VLFR) management according to The Forest Act, 2002.

The findings after the identification and assessment of VICOBA and SACCOS exercise conducted in 19 villages, a total of 115 VICOBA and SACCOS were identified with 70% of women members particularly in VICOBA groups. Basically, the composition of VICOBA is made up of 15 to 30 members. The findings revealed that there are some of VICOBA which are dealing with economic activities related to natural resources management and agriculture and also some individual VICOBA Members have NR economic activities such as beekeeping and carpentry.

Conclusion

Overall, the participation of women in the project activities is about 30%. This is in line with the national laws, particularly the National Constitution. National policy is aiming at equal participation of 50%. This may be very hard to achieve within the time frame of the project.

2.7.2 Environment

As a project on sustainable natural resources management for local economic development the project is expected to have a positive influence on environmental aspects, especially climate change.

2.8 Risk management

| Risk Identification | | | Risk analy | sis | | Risk Treat | Risk Treatment | | | Follow-up of risks | | |
|---|--|------------------|-------------|---------------------|----------------|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| Description of Risk | Period of identification | Risk category | Probability | Potential Impact | Total | Action(s) | Resp. | Deadline | Progress | Status | | |
| LGAs attach low level of political priority to NRM, which translates into low level of support for project | Project formulation - confirmed by | OPS | Medium | Medium | Medium Risk | Align project activities with MTEF and mainstream project activities in the DDP and VDPs | PIU | by YR 3 | Planning in process of being aligned | In progress | | |
| interventions | Base line study | | | | | Empower the NR DFT to raise awareness of District Councilor on NR andto be able to lobby decision makers for higher prioirty and more NRM funding | DEDs and PIU | continuous | not yet started | | | |
| | | | | | | Focus awareness campaigns on economic benefits and provide information for fact based decision making to improve willingness to reinvest in NRM at source. | PIU through CEPA | continuous | not yet started | | | |
| Inadequate funding to bring about the impacts on the planned scale for all identified NRs within the project time frame | Baseline Study | FIN | Medium | High | High Risk | Prioritize the intervention based on NR focus for the specific landscape Adopt a phased implementation approach for the landscapes, starting with ones where impact can be achieved/guaranteed Communicate the prioritization plan/phasing to all | PIU, RSM, JLPC PIU,RSM, JLPC PIU through | Annual work plan approval Annual work plan approval | Three priority landscapes identified | New | | |
| Weak mobilization of communities and low ownership of project at | Project formulation | OPS | Medium | Medium | Medium Risk | landscapes/districts to avoid unmet expectations Effective participation of all relevant stakeholders at | stakeholder platforms | continuous | Inclusive planning | In progress | | |

| Risk Identification | | | Risk analy | sis | | Risk Treat | ment | | Follow-up of risks | | |
|--|---|---------------|-------------|---------------------|----------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------|--|-------------|--|
| Description of Risk | Period of identification | Risk category | Probability | Potential Impact | Total | Action(s) | Resp. | Deadline | Progress | Status | |
| community level | | | | | | community level and maximize the use of participatory planning process through application of PRA in O&OD, LUP and 6 steps to CBNRM | | | processes established at all levels | | |
| | | | | | | Start CEPA campaigns early in project implementation for community awareness and crating interest for participation | PIU | yr 1 | Preparation of communication strategy planned | | |
| Low commitment for continued DeNRM transformation in the respective sectors, eg Fisheries (BMUs), Wildlife (WMAs) and Forestry (CBFM) | Baseline Study | OPS | Medium | Medium | Medium Risk | Involvement of respectivce sectors in decision making as provided for under the institutional structures such as JLPC and RSM | JLPC, RSM | continuous | | New | |
| Delays of implementation at District level linked to administrative and technical bottlenecks (eg slow approval of VLUP, issuance of user rights, etc) | Project formulation - confirmed by Base line | OPS | Medium | Medium | Medium Risk | Provide technical and administrative assistance to Districts to influence bottlenecks, calling on their accountability and on the support through JLPC. Communicating to CG and | RSM, JLPC | continuous | | In progress | |
| Low number of existing VLUPs and functioning CBNRM activities will significantly impact the achievement of the desired impacts as the starting point for | study Situation analysis | DEV | High | High | Very High Risk | monitor their contribution to preventing delays Focus on landscapes with LUP and CBO processes already underway and support initiatives to conclude outstanding needs. | NPC, JLPC PIU, RSM, JLPC | Approval of work plans | Village land-use planning priortised in all landscapes. | New | |

| Risk Identification | | | Risk analy | sis | | Risk Treatment | | | Follow-up of risks | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|-------------|---------------------|--------------|---|---------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------|--|
| Description of Risk | Period of identification | Risk category | Probability | Potential Impact | Total | Action(s) | Resp. | Deadline | Progress | Status | |
| activities is significantly 'lower' than anticipated in the project formulation. | | | | | | Train the District and Village Council in the LUP and CBNRM process so that they are supportive and understand the process and willing to fast track approval of applications. Engage service providers to assist in the facilitation of village land use plans (during development and implementation) and the implementation of CBNRM activities Work with decision makers to raise their awareness on the economic importance of CBNRM to gain their support in the process | PIU and DFTs | YR 2 and 3 | | | |
| Low capacity of LGAs in implementing and overseeing agreed interventions | Baseline Study | OPS | High | Medium | High Risk | Encourage District Councils to place staff with the necessary skills Engage service providers, including CBOs, NGOs and NRM value chain actors Collaborate with other partners in the landscapes/region with the necessary capacity | PMO- RALG PIU | start in yrs 2 and 3 continuous | Assessment ongoing Relevant organisations involved in stakeholder platforms and continuous dialogue ongoing | New | |
| Low participation and competition | Baseline | DEV | Medium | Medium | Medium | Ensure well functioning | PIU, DEDs, | by YR 3 | First | New | |

| Risk Identification | | | Risk analysis | | | Risk Treatment | | | Follow-up of risks | | |
|---|--|---------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------|--|--------|-------------------|---|-------------|--|
| Description of Risk | Period of identification | Risk category | Probability | Potential Impact | Total | Action(s) | Resp. | Deadline | Progress | Status | |
| with other development partners/NGOs in the landscapes | Study | | | | Risk | stakeholder platforms are established and used for information exchange and coordination at all levels | RAS | | stakeholder meetings held at all levels | | |
| Low security in some landscapes, ie Kungwa in Kakonko District | Baseline Study | OPS | Medium | Medium | Medium Risk | Discuss security issues during LSM and DSM meetings Engage Regional and District leadership to ensure project can operate in a secure environment | RC,DCs | by yr2 continuous | | New | |
| Low and inadequate commitment by stakeholders to implement the M&E plan | Baseline Study | DEV | Medium | Medium | Medium Risk | Develop MOUs and implement reporting protocols with other involved stakeholders such as NGOs, Microfinance institutions and value chain actors | PIU | by yr3 | | New | |
| | | | | | | Facilitate capacity building for development of NR related businesses | PIU | | | | |
| Limited viable NR business and economic opportunities in the landscapes | Project formulation - confirmed by Baseline | DEV | Medium | Medium | Medium Risk | Implement and promote NR governance incentives such as BMUs, PFM, Producer Associations (eg beekeepers) and pastoralist groups | DFTs | | | In progress | |
| | study | | | | | Search for and develop value adding opportunities with high value chain economic potential and offer capacity building in best practice models for investment. | PIU | by end of yr 3 | | | |

| Risk Identification | | | Risk analy | /sis | | Risk Treat | ment | | Follow-up of risks | |
|---|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------|--|--|-------------------|-------------|--|-------------|
| Description of Risk | Period of identification | Risk category | Probability | Potential Impact | Total | Action(s) | Resp. | Deadline | Progress | Status |
| | | | | | | Facilitate capacity building for development of NR related businesses | PIU | | | |
| Low availability of adequate technical know-how on economic development and value chains with service providers | Project formulation | DEV | Medium | Medium | Medium Risk | Procure experienced service providers for the necessary know-how and technopackages and outreach materials. | PIU | | | In progress |
| | | | | | Where techno-economic packages do not exist, use PTT through expert work groups to develop the toolkits, manuals CEPA and training capacity in thematic areas. | PIU | | | | |
| Vested interest of local businessmen and allies for unsustainable exploitation of NR | Project formulation | DEV | High | High | Very High Risk | Focus of project on village land and facilitate the support of LGA for recognition and registration of user rights to CBOs | PIU | by yr 3 | All activities in landscapes are focused on village land as per landscape selection criteria | In progress |
| Influx of refugees in the selected landscape disrupting activities. | Project formulation | DEV | Medium | Medium | Medium Risk | Negotiate during site selection that the area is village land, and not general land and therefore free from any conflict, hindrance or potential invasion by refugees. | PIU, RSM, JLPC | by yr 3 | see above | In progress |
| Ineffective control of financial information at District level and questionable reliability and inconsistency in report data. | Project formulation | FIN | Medium | Medium | Medium Risk | Prepare PIM and AFM Manual early and provide orientation and training and hands on guidance in its use. Provide administrative backup from PIU to districts to help | PIU AFO/DTAs | end of yr 1 | PIM developed and training provided to DFTs AFO conducts visits to support | In progress |

| Risk Identification | | | Risk analysis | | | Risk Treatment | | | Follow-up of risks | |
|--|--|-------------|---------------------|-------|-----------|--|----------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Description of Risk Period of Risk identification category | | Probability | Potential Impact | Total | Action(s) | Resp. | Deadline | Progress | Status | |
| | | | | | | improve quality of financial reporting Centralize key procurement at BTC Resident Representative office | PIU | | DTAs in financial reporting | |
| | | | | | | Organize regular financial audits, both internal and external and deal with issues through management reports. | PIU | from yr 2 | | |

3 Steering and Learning

3.1 Strategic re-orientations

The main challenges that require a strategic re-orientation are

- a) The near absence of fully developed village land use plans
- b) The near absence of fully operational community based natural resources management activities;
- c) The near absence of fully functioning credit institutions, to boost investment in NRM-related business opportunities; coupled with
- d) Low absorption capacity at district level with regards to the demands of current and planned donor supported projects

Given the above situation. It will be vital for the project to consciously focus on supporting the most promising institutions/interventions, rather than aiming at area coverage.

Plans to be developed for the landscapes need to have realistic targets, for specific villages and CBNRM activities, such as village forest reserves and BMUs.

3.2 Recommendations

| Recommendations | Actor | Deadline |
|--|-------|----------|
| On the basis of current implementation experience PIU should develop criteria that will guide the selection of activities to be supported in each landscape. | JLPC | Jul 2016 |
| Where conflict situations are likely to seriously hamper project progress a decision will need to be made early not to continue with project activities. | | Jul 2016 |
| PIU to prioritise development of service and grant agreement to augment the implementation capacity of LGAs and to boost technical expertise | JLPC | Jul 2016 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3.3 Lessons Learned

| ience |
|-------|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| • |

4 Annexes

4.1 Quality criteria

| | 1. RELEVANCE: The degree to which the intervention is in line with local and national policies and priorities as well as with the expectations of the beneficiaries | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| | In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least one 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B' = B; At least one 'C', no 'D' = C; at least one 'D' = D | | | | | | | | | |
| Ass | sessm | nent RELEVANCE: total score | X | В | С | D | | | | |
| 1.1 | What | is the present level of relevanc | e of the intervent | tion? | | | | | | |
| Х | Α | Clearly still embedded in national policies and Belgian strategy, responds to aid effectiveness commitments, highly relevant to needs of target group. | | | | | | | | |
| | В | Still fits well in national policies and Belgian strategy (without always being explicit), reasonably compatible with aid effectiveness commitments, relevant to target group's needs. | | | | | | | | |
| | С | Some issues regarding consistency with national policies and Belgian strategy, aid effectiveness or relevance. | | | | | | | | |
| | D | Contradictions with national police to needs is questionable. Major a | | | ciency commitme | ents; relevance | | | | |
| 1.2 | As pr | esently designed, is the interve | ntion logic still | holding true? | | | | | | |
| Х | Α | Clear and well-structured interve adequate indicators; Risks and A place (if applicable). | | | | | | | | |
| | В | Adequate intervention logic although objectives, indicators, Risk and A | | d some improver | ments regarding | hierarchy of | | | | |
| | С | Problems with intervention logic and evaluate progress; improver | | | ention and capac | eity to monitor | | | | |
| | D | Intervention logic is faulty and re success. | quires major revi | sion for the inter | vention to have a | a chance of | | | | |

| | 2. EFFICIENCY OF IMPLEMENTATION TO DATE: Degree to which the resources of the intervention (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been converted into results in an economical way | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least two 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B', no 'C' or 'D' = B; at least one 'C', no 'D' = C; at least one 'D' = D | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assessment EFFICIENCY : total score | | | Α | В | С | D | | | | |
| 7100 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | How | well are inputs (financial, HR, go | oods & equipme | nt) managed? | | | | | | |
| | Α | All inputs are available on time a | and within budget | | | | | | | |
| Х | В | Most inputs are available in reas However there is room for impro | | do not require su | ubstantial budget | adjustments. | | | | |
| | С | Availability and usage of inputs face problems, which need to be addressed; otherwise results may be at risk. | | | | | | | | |
| | D | Availability and management of i of results. Substantial change is | • | us deficiencies, v | which threaten th | ne achievement | | | | |

| 2.2 | How | well is the implementation of activities managed? |
|-----|-----|---|
| | Α | Activities implemented on schedule |
| Х | В | Most activities are on schedule. Delays exist, but do not harm the delivery of outputs |
| | С | Activities are delayed. Corrections are necessary to deliver without too much delay. |
| | D | Serious delay. Outputs will not be delivered unless major changes in planning. |
| 2.3 | How | well are outputs achieved? |
| | Α | All outputs have been and most likely will be delivered as scheduled with good quality contributing to outcomes as planned. |
| | В | Output delivery is and will most likely be according to plan, but there is room for improvement in terms of quality, coverage and timing. |
| Х | С | Some output are/will be not delivered on time or with good quality. Adjustments are necessary. |
| | D | Quality and delivery of outputs has and most likely will have serious deficiencies. Major adjustments are needed to ensure that at least the key outputs are delivered on time. |

| | 3. EFFECTIVENESS TO DATE: Degree to which the outcome (Specific Objective) is achieved as planned at the end of year N | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| | In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least one 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B' = B; At least one 'C', no 'D' = C; at least one 'D' = D | | | | | | | | | |
| Assessment EFFECTIVENESS : total | | | A | В | С | D | | | | |
| sco | re | | | | X | | | | | |
| 3.1 | As pr | esently implemented what is the | e likelihood of t | ne outcome to b | e achieved? | | | | | |
| | Α | Full achievement of the outcome is likely in terms of quality and coverage. Negative effects (if any) have been mitigated. | | | | | | | | |
| | В | Outcome will be achieved with minor limitations; negative effects (if any) have not caused much harm. | | | | | | | | |
| Х | С | Outcome will be achieved only partially among others because of negative effects to which management was not able to fully adapt. Corrective measures have to be taken to improve ability to achieve outcome. | | | | | | | | |
| | D | The intervention will not achieve | its outcome unle | ss major, fundan | nental measures | are taken. | | | | |
| 3.2 | Are a | ctivities and outputs adapted (w | rhen needed), ir | order to achie | ve the outcome | ? | | | | |
| Х | Α | The intervention is successful in external conditions in order to ac proactive manner. | | | | | | | | |
| | В | The intervention is relatively succin order to achieve its outcome. F | | | | rnal conditions | | | | |
| | С | The intervention has not entirely succeeded in adapting its strategies to changing external conditions in a timely or adequate manner. Risk management has been rather static. An important change in strategies is necessary in order to ensure the intervention can achieve its outcome. | | | | | | | | |
| | D | The intervention has failed to res managed. Major changes are ne | | • | ions, risks were | insufficiently | | | | |

4. POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY: The degree of likelihood to maintain and reproduce the benefits of an intervention in the long run (beyond the implementation period of the intervention). In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: At least 3 'A's, no 'C' or 'D' = A; Maximum two 'C's, no 'D' = B; At least three 'C's, no 'D' = C; At least one 'D' = D C D Assessment POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY: total score X 4.1 Financial/economic viability? Financial/economic sustainability is potentially very good: costs for services and maintenance are covered or affordable: external factors will not change that. Financial/economic sustainability is likely to be good, but problems might arise namely from X B changing external economic factors. Problems need to be addressed regarding financial sustainability either in terms of institutional or C target groups costs or changing economic context. Financial/economic sustainability is very questionable unless major changes are made. 4.2 What is the level of ownership of the intervention by target groups and will it continue after the end of external support? The steering committee and other relevant local structures are strongly involved in all stages of implementation and are committed to continue producing and using results. Implementation is based in a good part on the steering committee and other relevant local В structures, which are also somewhat involved in decision-making. Likeliness of sustainability is good, but there is room for improvement. The intervention uses mainly ad-hoc arrangements and the steering committee and other relevant local structures to ensure sustainability. Continued results are not guaranteed. Corrective measures are needed. The intervention depends completely on ad-hoc structures with no prospect of sustainability. Fundamental changes are needed to enable sustainability. 4.3 What is the level of policy support provided and the degree of interaction between intervention and policy level? Policy and institutions have been highly supportive of intervention and will continue to be so. Policy and policy enforcing institutions have been generally supportive, or at least have not Χ R hindered the intervention, and are likely to continue to be so. Intervention sustainability is limited due to lack of policy support. Corrective measures are Policies have been and likely will be in contradiction with the intervention. Fundamental changes D needed to make intervention sustainable. 4.4 How well is the intervention contributing to institutional and management capacity? Intervention is embedded in institutional structures and has contributed to improve the Χ Δ institutional and management capacity (even if this is not an explicit goal). Intervention management is well embedded in institutional structures and has somewhat В contributed to capacity building. Additional expertise might be required. Improvements in order to guarantee sustainability are possible. Intervention relies too much on ad-hoc structures instead of institutions; capacity building has not C been sufficient to fully ensure sustainability. Corrective measures are needed. Intervention is relying on ad hoc and capacity transfer to existing institutions, which could

Results Report 31

guarantee sustainability, is unlikely unless fundamental changes are undertaken.

D

4.2 Decisions taken by the steering committee and follow-up

Provide an overview of the important strategic decisions taken by the steering committee and the follow-up of those decisions¹⁸.

| N° | Decision | Identification period (mmm.yy) | Source* | Actor | Action(s) | Resp. | Deadline | Progress | Status |
|----|---|--------------------------------------|--------------|-------|---|-------|-----------|---|--------|
| 1 | Min 1/04/2015 JLPC approved inception plan and budget | Feb-15 | JLPC minutes | | PIU to take into account comments and recommendations made by JLPC | PIU | not given | Requested editiorial changes made | CLOSED |
| 2 | Min 1/04/2015 JLPC approved extension of Inception period from 9 to 10 months | Feb-15 | JLPC minutes | | | | | | CLOSED |
| 3 | Min 1/06/2015 JLPC approved Project Implementation Manual | Feb-15 | JLPC minutes | | Referencing of source documents needs to follow established referencing procedures, eg title, author/organisation, year | AFO | not given | Requested editiorial changes made | CLOSED |
| 4 | Min 1/07/2015 JLPC approved TOR for baseline study | Feb-15 | JLPC minutes | | Incorporate comments from JLPC especially regarding landscape selection as part of baseline | Co-PM | | Landscape selection has been removed from the scope of services | CLOSED |

¹⁸ You can use the table of this template, or you can replace it by your own format (e.g. from your operational monitoring), as long as it provides the same information.

| N° | Decision | Identification period (mmm.yy) | Source* | Actor | Action(s) | Resp. | Deadline | Progress | Status |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|--------------|-------|--|----------|----------------------------------|---|---------|
| 1 | Min 2/02/2015 JLPC accepted change in agenda - omission of presentation of implementation plan. | Jul-15 | JLPC minutes | | Implementation plan to be presented at next JLPC meeting | PM/Co-PM | | Project Implementation plan is being developed after receiving final baseline report | ONGOING |
| 5 | Min 2/4/2015 JLPC approved Progress report January-July 2015 | Jul-15 | JLPC minutes | | PIU to share final baseline report with JLPC members | PM/Co-PM | After acceptance of final report | Final report received and accepted. Will be sent out to JLPC members prior to next meeting | ONGOING |
| 6 | Min 2/4/2015 a) JLPC approved the change from Communication Education and Public awareness NTA to Consultant | Jul-15 | JLPC minutes | | PIU to prepare TOR for consultancy | Co-PM | not given | TOR in preparation | ONGOING |

| N° | Decision | Identification period (mmm.yy) | Source* | Actor | Action(s) | Resp. | Deadline | Progress | Status |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|--------------|-------|--|-------|------------|---|---------|
| 7 | Min 2/4/2015 c) JLPC approved changes in Project Implementation Manual as a consequence of changes in government per diems | Jul-15 | JLPC minutes | | JLPC cautioned that an increase of >50%, which was not foreseeen in the TFF means that project has to be vigilant to achieve value for money and avoid double payments, eg if there is food provided in meeting/workshop, this should be deducted from per diems | AFO | continuous | `JLPC decision is being implemented and monitoring is on-going | ONGOING |
| 8 | Min 7/4/2015 JLPC approved annual workplan | Jul-15 | JLPC minutes | | JLPC recommended that project make use of service providers as much as possible in order to achieve the results timely. | PIU | not given | Assessment of service providers started during Situation analysis | ONGOING |

4.3 Updated Logical framework

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|--|----------------------|--|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| To ensure that ecosystem resilience is maintained to sustainably provide socio-economic and environmental benefits to local communities in Kigoma Region | Overall Objective | Proportion of landscapes restored to their ecological functioning | Kigoma Region Socio- economic Profile chapter on NR; District Councils' Socio- economic Profile chapter on NR; Surveys on the use of NR for economic and livelihood development. Mid Term review Report Final Evaluation Report | 0% | 21% | 100% | Political will Peace and order Market and human preference for NR product and services exists Partners to the project will continue providing funding |
| | | Average annual revenue generated by the Local authorities from sustainable use of NR (Shs) | District Council Annual Financial Reports | 45,695,359 | 64,063,656 | 89,815,51 1 | |
| | | Average annual amount of wood fuel/ | • Kigoma Region Socio- | 5,657.91 | 6,691.05 | 7,912.83 | |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|-------------|-----------------|--|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | | timber/charcoal/ harvested (tons) | economic Profile chapter on NR; • District Councils' Socio-economic Profile chapter on NR; • District Council' Annual Reports | | | | |
| | | Number of interventions signed and implemented between private and public sector working on NR | CBNRM impact studies; District situation analysis of NRM | 22 | 27 | 42 | |
| | | Number of self-initiative community groups working on NR issues in the region | Surveys on management capacity and service delivery; Monitoring reports of district, region and projects; Mid Term review Report Final Evaluation Report | 17 | 21 | 30 | |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | | Awareness of importance of sustainable use of NR for LED of key-stakeholders, political leaders and decision makers at all levels Proportion of people with proper knowledge on the values of NR (% of the population) | The integration of NRM and budget allocations to NRM in the DDPs of the districts of Kigoma Region; CEPA survey CEPA survey | 98% | 100% | 100% | |
| Improved enabling environment and strengthened capacities for sustainable management of NR and more equitable Local Economic Development for greater community benefits of selected | Specific Objective | Number of service providers working on NRM in the region Average annual revenue generated by service providers from sustainable use of NR (Tshs) | Mid Term review Report Final Evaluation Report CBNRM, CBO records Annual project implementation reports | 723,544 | 819,121 | 927,324 | Political support to NRM sector increases at all levels and leads towards increased allocation for scaling up support to CBNRM and implementation of VLUP C, R and LGA support for scaling |
| landscapes in Kigoma Region. | | Proportion of NR service providers with elaborate financial plan (% of service providers in NRM) | Mid Term review Report Final Evaluation Report | 19% | 23% | 50% | up CBNRM efforts spreads to other areas and landscapes. • LGA, NGOs and private sector |
| | | Proportion of NRs service providers with strategic plan and functional management structure (% of service providers in | Mid Term review Report Final Evaluation Report | 13% | 16% | 32% | are willing and grow in capacity, effectiveness and accountability to support sustainable use of |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|---|-----------------|---|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | | NRM) | | | | | NR; |
| | | Average annual household income per capita (Tshs) | Mid Term review Report | 289,385 | 379,677 | 429,830 | • Investment plans of private |
| | | , , | Final Evaluation Report | | | | sector and government, |
| | | Percentage of benefits that | Mid Term review Report | 59% | 71% | 90% | population growth, refugee influx, NR harvest pressures, |
| | | are shared among members within | Final Evaluation Report | | | | land grab, pastoralist issues and |
| | | village/communities and | · | | | | climate change do not outpace growth of CBNRM institutional |
| | | across gender (% of HH) | CBNRM, CBO records | | | | capacity. |
| | | Percentage of DDP budget allocated to NRM (% of | DDPs budgets | 0.42% | 0.51% | 1.00% | |
| | | Total District budget) | | | | | |
| A Decision Support System on NRM for Local | Result 1 | The extent to which decision makers utilize | Village, ward, and district Minutes, memos and report | 50% | 61% | 80% | District and Region accept phased approach for |
| Government Authorities | | generated information at | | | | | landscape selection |
| established, enabling mainstreaming in | | DSS during decision making processes/planning | | | | | Community and key |
| decentralized planning | | processes at all levels | | | | | stakeholders are willing to |
| of key NRM issues | | Number of villages/districts | Village/district development plans and | 0 | 2 | 6 | participate in jointly |
| | | integrating activities | report | | | | formulating activities for |
| | | related to natural | Тероп | 0 | 8 | 35 | more sustainable use of NR |
| | | resources management and coordination in their | Project progress reports | | | | for LED |
| | | village/district | | | | | • LGA involves representatives |
| | | development plan | | | | | of different users and women |
| | | Districts (number) | | | | | |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|---|-----------------|--|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | | Villages (Number) | | | | | of village in V&DDP • LGA responsive to CBNRM needs |
| Improved governance and sustainable management of NR by key resource users. | Result 2 | Tender/financial reports related to NR publically shared through public notice board | Project Information card reports Mid Term review Report Final Evaluation Report | 50% | 67% | 90% | No serious external forces threatening implementation of VLUP Communities are willing to participate in CBNRM |
| | | Proportion of people perceive that election processes for NR related committee meet good governance standards (% of communities) | Mid Term review ReportFinal Evaluation Report | 50% | 61% | 86% | Support of LGA for women having access to land Village government and WEO support by-law enforcement |
| | | Proportion of CBOs and other institutions working on NR related activities whose annual financial reports are shared to beneficiaries/public | Project Information card reports Mid Term review Report Final Evaluation Report | 24% | 50% | 80% | No serious invasion of pastoralist and/or refugees Village government and Ward Excecutive Officer support by-law enforcement |
| | | Proportion of people/NR users who perceive that corruption is reduced at all | Mid Term review Report | 22% | 35% | 60% | |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|---|-----------------|--|--|----------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| | | decentralized levels | Final Evaluation Report | | | | |
| | | Proportion of people/NR users who perceive that local government authorities are accountable and willing to facilitate NRM activities at all levels. | Mid Term review ReportFinal Evaluation Report | 46% | 55% | 75% | |
| Key resource users, transformers and traders of NR derive sustainable and equitable benefits from natural resources | Result 3 | Average annual quantity of energy sources consumed (data disaggregated by energy source) | Evaluation reports | indicated in section | than the baseline value for each energy source | higher than the | State of resources allows sustainable and economically viable harvest LGA supportive of business partnerships (PPP) & Private Sector Development |
| | | Proportion of people whose per capita income is above \$1.00 per day due to sustainable use of NR value chain | Mid Term review ReportFinal Evaluation Repot | 0% | 1% | 2% | CG and LGA do not raise taxation to a point that it is prohibitive for CBOs to sustain economic activities |
| | | Number of business coalition formed among key NR users in the region | Project District reports | 25 | 32 | 60 | LGA makes efforts to control illegal trade of NR Illegal and informal trade in NR does not prohibit CBO's |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|--|-----------------|---|---------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | econonmic activities Central Government and LGA are supportive to business activities linked to CBNRM |
| Strengthened institutional capacities and accountability of key stakeholders for improved gender | Result 4 | Proportion of staff trained in conflict management with improved skills on managing NR related conflicts (% of NRM Staff) | Project District reports | 0% | 2% | 5% | Stakeholder platforms functioning without necessity for financial compensation Key stakeholders of a |
| sensitive NR governance, landscape coordination and implementation of | | Number of landscape coordination meetings implemented | Project District reports | 0 | 4 | 8 | landscape are willing to cooperate for joint NRM |
| CBNRM. | | Number of gender and governance meeting related to NR issues implemented | Project District reports | 0 | 7 | 14 | related actions. Funds in District budget allocated to sustainable NRM will be also used for this |
| | | Number of villages applying by laws on gender and governance during management of NRs | Project District reports | 17 | 22 | 35 | LGAs committed to support landscape coordination Political commitment towards CBNRM has not decreased |
| Activities | | | | | | | |
| Develop DSS system for NRM and build capacity | Activity 1.1 | Number of districts with DSS in place and used | District reports on activities; | | | | • There is sufficient long term policy and political support by |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|---|-----------------|--|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| in its use. | | effectively Number of district staff and other users trained on the use of DSS | • NRM included in V/DD- Plans. | | | | C, R and LGA for D*D of CBNRM. |
| | | Number of villages in selected landscapes with NR priorities in O&OD processes | VDPs Project progress reports | | | | There is commitment, technical and financial support by key institutions (ie MNRT, PMO- |
| | | Proportion of villages use adapted PMO RALG AFM manual (disaggregated by district) | Project District reports | | | | RSALGA, R, LGA, TFS, TAWA, etc.) willing to support CBNRM. |
| Undertake situation analysis and baseline survey to select priority | Activity 1.2 | Baseline and situational analysis report available on time | Baseline and Situational Analysis Reports | | | | Decision makers at all levels, give importance to evidence based information on NRM and |
| NRM-LED Landscapes | | Proportion of landscapes selected based on established criteria for selection of priority NRM- LED | Project progress report | | | | LED and are not swayed by ulterior motives. |
| Mainstreaming of key NRM issues in decentralized planning | Activity 1.3 | Number of villages in selected landscapes using O&OD Toolkit for NRM during VDP | Adapted O&OD Toolkit, Training reports, VDPs and DDPs. Project progress report | | | | |
| | | Number of Districts in selected landscapes using O&OD Toolkit for NRM during DDP | Project progress report | | | | |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|---|-----------------|--|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | | Number of service providers trained on the use of O&OD toolkit | Training reports,Project progress report | | | | |
| | | Proportion of villages with NRM issues included in the 3 years strategic plans for VDP and DDP | Project Progress reportsVDPs/DDPs | | | | |
| Regular M&E, information gathering and analysis of evidence | Activity 1.4 | Number of districts with functional M&E system/framework | Project Progress reports | | | | |
| in NRM management is feeding planning processes | | Number of reports the R and LGA produce that relates to economic value of NRs | Regional and District progress reports | | | | |
| | | Availability of strategic economic assessment of NR focusing on CBNRM | Project Progress reports | | | | |
| | | Number of LGA whose DDP use generated factual data on NR to reflect planning process | Project Progress reports | | | | |
| | | Number of decisions in district council meetings based on factual data/information on NR. | Project Progress reports | | | | |
| Capacity building and implementation of VLUP | - | Number of service providers trained on the | VLUP NRM toolkit, VLUPs | | | | C, R, LGA and politicians support processes for approval and |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|--|---|--|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| for improved governance and sustainable management of NR including facilitation of VLUPs | | use of adapted VLUP toolkit for NRM | District reportsProject progress reports,Training reports | | | | registration of Village boundaries and LUP and for user rights of CBO's. Political agendas supportive of CBNRM and reduce potential |
| | Effectiveness of participation of village groups (including wor and vulnerable groups VLUP Proportion of women representation in deci | participation of village groups (including women and vulnerable groups) in | Project Progress reports | | | | conflict of multi-users & vested parties. More transparent governance processes allowing better dealing |
| | | Proportion of women representation in decision making on NRM | Project Progress reports | | | | with external influences. |
| | | Number of villages with VLUPs approved by Village assembly | Project Progress reports District reports | | | | |
| | | Proportion of VLUP approved at the LGA | Project Progress reports District reports | | | | |
| | | Proportion of VLUP approved at the Central level | Regional reportsProject Progress reports | | | | |
| | | | District reports | | | | |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|---|-----------------|--|--|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | | Proportion of VLUPs that are implemented | Project Progress reportsDistrict reports | | | | |
| Capacity building and implementation of 6 step process of CBNRM including facilitation of | Activity 2.2 | CBNRM sector Toolkit adapted for Kigoma | District progress reports;CBNRM progress reports | | | | |
| approval process for NRM CBOs | | Number of institutions/organizations using CBRNM toolkit in their activities | CBNRM progress reportsProject Progress reports | | | | |
| | | Number of key staff and service providers trained in the use of CBNRM toolkit | Project Progress reports | | | | |
| | | Number of CBNRM initiatives with approved user rights | Training reportsCBNRM progress reportsProject Progress reports | | | | |
| | | | CBNRM user rights certificates | | | | |
| Develop capacity for improved governance and conflict | Activity 2.3 | Number of villages/ institutions/organizations trained in governance and | Training reports | | | | |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|---|-----------------|--|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| management for village and user groups | | conflict management | CBNRM progress reportsProject Progress reports | | | | |
| | | Reviewed by laws reflecting women and vulnerable groups' rights | Project Progress reportsReviewed Village by laws | | | | |
| | | Number of villages where NR related by-laws are implemented | Project Progress reports | | | | |
| | | Proportion of NR related conflicts that have been resolved in timely manner | Project Progress reports | | | | |
| | | Recurrence of similar conflicts reduced | Project Progress reports | | | | |
| Improve opportunities for generating revenue from sustainable harvesting and use of | Activity 3.1 | Number of CBOs supported to make business plans based on identified opportunities | Business Plans of CBOs;Project progress report; | | | | Status of natural resources allows sustainable and financially viable harvesting or value added trade/business. |
| NR. | | within NR linked value chain analysis | Techno-economic Packages | | | | Taxation and fees on value chain |
| | | Number of joint ventures developed along value chain | Project Progress reports | | | | does not become excessive, affecting economic viability to marginal users. |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|---|-----------------|--|--|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | | Number of improved NRM techno-economic solutions (improved charcoal, modern beehives, timber processing etc.) used. | Project Progress reportsTechno-economic Packages | | | | Sufficient trust can be created for 'win-win' partnerships |
| | | Amount of revenue generated by CBO/CBNRM | Service providers' reportsProject progress report; | | | | |
| Improve access to financial services for NRM related enterprise activities through | Activity 3.2 | Number of CBOs/CBNRM trained in financial management | Training reportsProject Progress reports | | | | |
| improved capacity of SACCOS | | Number of service providers with appropriate financial management system for NR related activities (by districts) | Service providers' progress reportsProject Progress reports | | | | |
| | | Number of groups that obtained loans related to sustainable use of NR through supported SACCOS/VICOBA/Microfina nce | Project Progress reports Reports of the SACCOS/VICOBA/Microfina nce | | | | |
| | | Value of loans related to sustainable use of NR obtained through supported | Project Progress reports Reports of the SACCOS/VICOBA/Microfina | | | | |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|---|-----------------|---|--|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | | SACCOS/VICOBA/Microfina nce | nce | | | | |
| Support partnerships between users, transformers, traders | Activity 3.3 | Number of agreement/ contracts established between CBOs and Private | • Service providers' progress reports | | | | |
| and corporate private sector | | sector/Buyers | Project Progress reports | | | | |
| | | | Signed agreements | | | | |
| | | Financial status of CBOs improved as result of contracts | Service providers' financial reports | | | | |
| | | Livelihood of CBOs members improved as result of contracts | Mid term review Final Project Evaluation | | | | |
| Strengthen Stakeholder involvement and establish functional stakeholder platforms with capacity and accountability for NR | Activity 4.1 | Stakeholder coordination platforms and processes at LGA and user level established and operational | Project Progress reports Minutes of meetings stakeholder coordination platforms | | | | All key stakeholders can be convinced for collaboration among each other and making compromises to be respected on NRM for LED |
| governance, landscape coordination and CBNRM. | | Number of partnerships processes established between CBNRM, CBOs and NGOs and service providers | Project Progress reportsSigned agreements | | | | Central and LGA are willing to review policies and adapt regulations on the basis of relevant cases and learning lessons; |

| Description | Indicator Level | Indicators | Means of Verification | Baseline value | Intermediate Values (2016/17) | Target Values (2018/19) | Assumptions |
|--|-----------------|---|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | | Number of successful joint activities as a result of partnerships and networking | Project Progress reportsService providers' progress reports | | | | LGAs are willing and able to enforce NRM laws in support of CBNRM rights. |
| Increase awareness and provide relevant information on NRM governance and management to key | Activity 4.2 | Number of outreach materials and public awareness campaigns implemented | Project Progress reportsMaterials produced | | | | |
| stakeholders, decision makers and local residents | | Proportion of key stakeholders in target areas who are well informed on the importance and value of sustainable NR | Mid term review Final Project Evaluation | | | | |
| Support key stakeholders in dealing with NRM complaints, conflicts and legal support | Activity 4.3 | Proportion of key stakeholders with knowledge on processes and legislation regarding to NRM related issues | CEPA surveys Project Progres reports Mid term review Final Project Evaluation | | | | |

4.4 MoRe Results at a glance

| Logical framework's results or | Logframe and indicators reviewed and modified during | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| indicators modified in last 12 months? baseline study | | | | | |
| Baseline Report registered on PIT? | Not yet | | | | |
| Planning MTR (registration of report) | mm/yyyy (estimate) n/a | | | | |
| Planning ETR (registration of report) | mm/yyyy (estimate) n/a | | | | |
| Backstopping missions since 01/01/2015 | 2 | | | | |

4.5 "Budget versus current (y - m)" Report

The budget report is attached to this document.

4.6 Communication resources

At this stage the project has produced project brochures in English and Swahili (200 each) that describe the project in a nutshell and provide contact information of project management.

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month, by Quarter) of TAN1302911

Project Title: Natural Resources Management for Local Economic Development in Kigoma Region (NRM for LED)

Year to month: 31/12/2015 C01 Budget Version:

DGD Currency:

YtM: Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosed closing

| Status | Fin Mode | Amount | 2014 | 2015 | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---|-------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total Total E | Total Exp. | Balance | % Exec |
| | | 1.819.100,00 | 0,00 | 9.388,87 | 25.608,15 | 48.462,12 | 55.310,94 | 138.770,08 | 138.770,09 | 1.680.329,91 | 8% |
| | | 153.600,00 | 0,00 | 9.388,87 | 25.511,94 | 4.199,83 | 8.424,02 | 47.524,67 | 47.524,67 | 106.075,33 | 31% |
| | REGIE | 74.500,00 | 0,00 | 9.388,87 | 25.511,94 | 4.199,83 | 8.359,55 | 47.460,19 | 47.460,19 | 27.039,81 | 64% |
| | REGIE | 79.100,00 | 0,00 | | | | 64,48 | 64,48 | 64,48 | 79.035,52 | 0% |
| | | 1.010.100,00 | 0,00 | | | 13.801,49 | 36.250,06 | 50.051,55 | 50.051,55 | 960.048,45 | 5% |
| | REGIE | 184.000,00 | 0,00 | | | 10.649,25 | 35.636,03 | 46.285,28 | 46.285,28 | 137.714,72 | 25% |
| | REGIE | 740.000,00 | 0,00 | | | 3.152,23 | 614,03 | 3.766,27 | 3.766,27 | 736.233,73 | 1% |
| | REGIE | 31.500,00 | 0,00 | | | | | | 0,00 | 31.500,00 | 0% |
| | REGIE | 54.600,00 | 0,00 | | | | | | 0,00 | 54.600,00 | 0% |
| | | 335.000,00 | 0,00 | | | 2.720,83 | 1.069,28 | 3.790,11 | 3.790,11 | 331.209,89 | 1% |
| | REGIE | 49.000,00 | 0,00 | | | 1.459,67 | 1.069,28 | 2.528,95 | 2.528,95 | 46.471,05 | 5% |
| | REGIE | 81.000,00 | 0,00 | | | 1.261,16 | | 1.261,16 | 1.261,16 | 79.738,84 | 2% |
| | REGIE | 205.000,00 | 0,00 | | | | | | 0,00 | 205.000,00 | 0% |
| | | 320.400,00 | 0,00 | | 96,21 | 27.739,98 | 9.567,57 | 37.403,75 | 37.403,76 | 282.996,24 | 12% |
| | REGIE | 110.000,00 | 0,00 | | | 24.836,99 | 7.354,40 | 32.191,39 | 32.191,39 | 77.808,61 | 29% |
| | REGIE | 130.000,00 | 0,00 | | | 2.902,99 | | 2.902,99 | 2.902,99 | 127.097,01 | 2% |
| | REGIE | 80.400,00 | 0,00 | | 96,21 | | 2.213,17 | 2.309,38 | 2.309,38 | 78.090,62 | 3% |
| | | 2.589.200,00 | 55.096,33 | 56.119,67 | 95.213,52 | 96.768,76 | 69.055,18 | 317.157,14 | 372.253,46 | 2.216.946,54 | 14% |
| | REGIE | 6.000.000,00 | 274.807,36 | 103.597,91 | 175.076,19 | 211.977,89 | 202.188,32 | 692.840,30 | 967.647,65 | 5.032.352,35 | 16,00 |
| 2 | And the second national second | 6 000 000 00 | 274 807 36 | 103 597 91 | 175 076 19 | 211 977 89 | 202 188 32 | 692 840 30 | 967 647 65 | 5 032 352 35 | 16,00 |
| | Status | REGIE | 1.819.100,00 153.600,00 REGIE 74.500,00 REGIE 79.100,00 1.010.100,00 REGIE 184.000,00 REGIE 31.500,00 REGIE 31.500,00 REGIE 49.000,00 REGIE 81.000,00 REGIE 81.000,00 REGIE 110.000,00 REGIE 110.000,00 REGIE 130.000,00 REGIE 130.000,00 REGIE 6.000.000,00 REGIE 6.000.000,00 | 1.819.100,00 0,00 153.600,00 0,00 REGIE 74.500,00 0,00 REGIE 79.100,00 0,00 REGIE 184.000,00 0,00 REGIE 31.500,00 0,00 REGIE 31.500,00 0,00 REGIE 54.600,00 0,00 REGIE 49.000,00 0,00 REGIE 81.000,00 0,00 REGIE 10.000,00 0,00 REGIE 110.000,00 0,00 REGIE 10.000,00 0,00 REGIE 80.400,00 0,00 REGIE 80.400,00 0,00 REGIE 6.000.000,00 274.807,36 COGEST | 1.819.100,00 0,00 9.388,87 153.600,00 0,00 9.388,87 REGIE 74.500,00 0,00 9.388,87 REGIE 79.100,00 0,00 REGIE 184.000,00 0,00 REGIE 740.000,00 0,00 REGIE 31.500,00 0,00 REGIE 54.600,00 0,00 REGIE 49.000,00 0,00 REGIE 81.000,00 0,00 REGIE 81.000,00 0,00 REGIE 110.000,00 0,00 REGIE 110.000,00 0,00 REGIE 110.000,00 0,00 REGIE 130.000,00 0,00 REGIE 130.000,00 0,00 REGIE 130.000,00 0,00 REGIE 130.000,00 0,00 REGIE 150.000,00 0,00 0,00 REGIE 150.000,000 0,00 0,00 0,00 0,00 0,00 0,00 | Status | Status Fin Mode Amount 2014 Q1 Q2 Q3 1.819.100,00 0,00 9.388,87 25.608,15 48.462,12 153.600,00 0,00 9.388,87 25.511,94 4.199,83 REGIE 74.500,00 0,00 9.388,87 25.511,94 4.199,83 REGIE 79.100,00 0,00 13.801,49 REGIE 184.000,00 0,00 10.549,25 REGIE 740.000,00 0,00 3.152,23 REGIE 31.500,00 0,00 2.720,83 REGIE 49.000,00 0,00 1.459,67 REGIE 81.000,00 0,00 1.261,16 REGIE 205.000,00 0,00 96,21 27.739,98 REGIE 130.000,00 0,00 24.836,99 REGIE 130.000,00 0,00 96,21 27.739,98 REGIE 130.000,00 0,00 95,21 2.902,99 REGIE 80.400,00 0,00 95,21 2.902,99 | Status Fin Mode | Status Fin Mode Amount 2014 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Total 1.819.100,00 0,00 9.388,87 25.608,15 48.462,12 55.310,94 138.770,08 153.600,00 0,00 9.388,87 25.511,94 4.199,83 8.424,02 47.524,67 REGIE 74.500,00 0,00 9.388,87 25.511,94 4.199,83 8.359,55 47.460,19 REGIE 79.100,00 0,00 13.801,49 36.250,06 50.051,55 REGIE 184.000,00 0,00 10.649,25 35.636,03 46.285,28 REGIE 740.000,00 0,00 3.152,23 614,03 3.766,27 REGIE 31.500,00 0,00 2.720,83 1.069,28 3.790,11 REGIE 49.000,00 0,00 1.459,67 1.069,28 2.528,95 REGIE 81.000,00 0,00 1.261,16 1.261,16 1.261,16 REGIE 110.000,00 0,00 24.836,99 7.354,40 32.191,39 | Status Fin Mode | Status Fin Mode |

