

**COMMUNITY BASED MONITORING AND  
EVALUATION:AN APPLICATION OF CGMETT TOOL IN  
ASSESSING CBNRM PROJECT IN TANZANIA**

**Dr Isaack Michael Mchumi Nguliki, PhD. \***

---

**Abstract**

---

***Keywords:***

Monitoring;

Evaluation;

Communitybased natural  
resources management

---

This paper presents experience in community based monitoring and evaluation using Community Governance and Management Effectiveness Tracking Toolin community based natural resources management project in Tanzania.The CGMETT tool was administered in year 2016 through focus goup discussion among eight CBOs namely WMAs (3), CBFMs (3) and BMUs (2) in three districts for 110 total participantsof whom 24% were female. Accordingly, survey shows slightly satisfactory results in CBNRM effectiveness, compliance with by-laws; andless womenin decision making management levels in community based natural resources.

---

---

**\*Dr Isaack is Monitoring & Evaluation Expert in Donor Funded Development Projects and Programmes with ten years working experience in International Organizations including United Nations.**

## 1. Introduction

Monitoring and evaluation is endowed with various approaches. IFAD (2002); IFRC (2011); UNEG (2005); UNDP (2002); WB (2004) and WB (2010) maintain that methodologies in monitoring and evaluation are dependant on various factors such as type and nature of project, resources, skills and knowledge, technology on the shelf. As such there are dominant methods though there is no one method fits all except that mixed methods have the advantage adding value through complementary and supplementary effects. For example, a community based project would typically require community approach to undertake monitoring and evaluation of an intervention deemed of community nature. In essence some methodologies are rarely used thus few monitoring and evaluation experts may have applied these methods whereas large share of monitoring and practitioners lack knowledge, skills and experience on these rare approaches to monitoring and evaluation.

Therefore this paper aims to present experience in monitoring and evaluation of community based natural resources management (CBNRM) using Community Governance and Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (CGMETT) adapted from Frankfurt Zoological Society. The CGMETT tool was used to assess governance and management effectiveness of community based organisations (CBOs) in wildlife management areas (WMAs); beach management units (BMUs) and community based forestry management (CBFM) in three districts of Rufiji, Ulunga, and Kilombero in Morogoro and coastal regions in Tanzania.

## 2. Method

This paper presents cross-sectional data collected using Community Governance & Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (CGMETT). Given that CGMETT tool assign scores/values to responses versus questions, therefore this tool it is by nature a quantitative tool (Adato, 2011; Bamberger, et al, 2010; Kusek, and Rist, 2004 and Place, et al, 2007). A typical CGMETT tool is made of five categories of issues namely Context, Planning, Input, Governance, and Outcome. Context category comprises of issues like: Purpose of natural resources management (NRM) defined, User group members known, Boundary of the NRM area; planning category consists of following issues: NRM rules or bylaws, Management plan; Participatory monitoring and adaptive management, and Enforcement system; input category has following issues: Compliance, Enforcement, Infrastructure and equipment, Capacity of the executive body, Current budget, Financial sustainability / revenue; governance category has issues on Legitimacy, Participation in management decisions, Transparency, Accountability, Adaptive governance, Cooperation with government, Cooperation with civil society and NGOs; and outcome

categories issues:Equitability of cost and benefit sharing; Status of natural resources and environmental services,Empowerment , and Livelihoods and well-being of users.

The CGMETT tool had a total of 24 questions with overall total score 72. The lowest score and maximum score for each question was 0 and 3 respectively. The average time to run a focus group discussion was two hours per CBO. Therefore researcher facilitated group discussions of 8 CBOs which are 3 WMAs, 3 CBFMs and 2 BMUs for 110 total participants of whom 24% were female. The low participation of women is due to the fact that conventionally male dominance is pronounced in natural resources management in Tanzania. With general consensus by majority, the focus group discussion assigns score against each issue in categories of the CGMETT tool. Then average score is computed for each category with general comment provided against each category. The researcher needs to manage well discussion especially shy participants versus talkative participants so that the latter do not dominate discussion while the former are given opportunity to contribute to the discussion. Results accurate is dependant on skills of researcher to manage discussion such that participants provide honest feedback.

### 3. Results and Analysis

The community based monitoring and evaluation using CGMETT survey tool provided key results of project indicators: Indicator number 1: Effectiveness of established WMA, CBFM, BMU, LUPs was found to be slightly low at 56%; indicator number 2: Compliance with CBNRM bylaws (LUP, CBFM, WMA, BMU) was rated 42%. This means that there was lower compliance with established community based natural resources management by laws to govern community natural resources; indicator number 3: Gender ratio in directory/ board of each CBO/Village committee supported was rated 31% which means that women did not have equal powers in managing community natural resources compared their counterparts (men) ; and indicator 4: Project District budget allocation for the NRM processes increased the survey report that participants were not sure whether local or /and central governments were injecting funds to strengthen community based natural resources in the districts. Detailed results specific to categories and issues are presented table 1; table 2; and table 3 hereof.

Table 1: Results by issue

| Category | Issue                    | Average score |
|----------|--------------------------|---------------|
| CONTEXT  | Purpose of NRM defined   | 2             |
|          | User group members known | 2             |
|          | Boundary of the NRM area | 2             |

|            |  |   |
|------------|--|---|
|            | Average  | 2 |
| PLANNING   | NRM rules or bylaws                                    | 2 |
|            | Management plan  | 2 |
|            | Participatory monitoring and adaptive management       | 2 |
|            | Average  | 2 |
| INPUT      | Enforcement system                                     | 2 |
|            | Compliance   | 1 |
|            | Enforcement.   | 2 |
|            | Infrastructure and equipment                           | 1 |
|            | Capacity of the executive body                         | 1 |
|            | Current budget   | 1 |
|            | Financial sustainability / revenue                     | 1 |
|            | Average  | 1 |
| GOVERNANCE | Legitimacy   | 3 |
|            | Participation in management decisions                  | 2 |
|            | Transparency   | 2 |
|            | Accountability   | 2 |
|            | Adaptive governance                                    | 0 |
|            | Cooperation with government                            | 2 |
|            | Cooperation with civil society and NGOs                | 0 |
|            | Average  | 2 |
| OUTCOME    | Equitability of cost and benefit sharing               | 2 |
|            | Status of natural resources and environmental services | 2 |
|            | Empowerment  | 2 |
|            | Livelihoods and well-being of users                    | 2 |
|            | Average  | 2 |

Table 2: Results by category

| Category | Average score |
|----------|---------------|
| CONTEX   | 2             |
| PLANNING | 2             |

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| INPUT      | 1 |
| GOVERNANCE | 2 |
| OUTCOME    | 2 |

Table 3: General comments against each category

| Category   | Issue  | Comments   |
|------------|--|--|
| CONTEXT    | Purpose of NRM defined                           | Majority of the CBOs interviewed seem to be very much aware of the purpose, members and boundary of their NRM area   |
|            | User group members known                         |  |
|            | Boundary of the NRM area                         |  |
| PLANNING   | NRM rules or bylaws                              | CBOs foresee effectiveness of CBNRM subject to achievement of user rights  |
|            | Management plan                                  |  |
|            | Participatory monitoring and adaptive management |  |
| INPUT      | Enforcement system                               | CBOs were working towards receiving user rights, CBOs strongly believe that user rights will empower them to effectively and efficiently undertake issues under the INPUT category.  |
|            | Compliance                                       |  |
|            | Enforcement.                                     |  |
|            | Infrastructure and equipment                     |  |
|            | Capacity of the executive body                   |  |
|            | Current budget                                   |  |
|            | Financial sustainability / revenue               |  |
| GOVERNANCE | Legitimacy                                       | CBOs agree on legitimacy and participation in decision making though there were issues related to transparency and accountability of the CBOs leaders. The study found good cooperation between CBOs and government however there was little cooperation with civil societies thus CBOs were to work towards strengthening linkages with relevant Civil Societies (CS) and |
|            | Participation in management decisions            |  |
|            | Transparency                                     |  |
|            | Accountability                                   |  |
|            | Adaptive governance                              |  |
|            | Cooperation with government                      |  |
|            | Cooperation with civil society and NGOs          |  |

|         |  | Non Government Organisations (NGOs)   |
|---------|--|---|
| OUTCOME | Equitability of cost and benefit sharing               | Though there was a system for equitable cost and benefits sharing, CBOs however report no benefits had been realized yet. This situation necessitated project continue addressing the need for conserve and utilize the natural resources |
|         | Status of natural resources and environmental services |   |
|         | Empowerment  |   |
|         | Livelihoods and well-being of users                    |   |

#### 4. Conclusion

Conclusion drawn from results of the CGMETT exercise involving self-assessment of Community Based Organisations is that there was significant improvement implying that the project was contributing to the development of the CBNRM. The project could use monitoring and evaluation information gathered to enhance project implementation by addressing specific issues and gaps in order to achieve project overall goal to sustainably manage the wetlands Ecosystem of the Kilombero Valley and Lower Rufiji so that its ecological balance is conserved, the local communities' livelihoods are improved and economic development is sustained. Key lessons from focus group discussion are information asymmetry whereby there was imminent gap in information from CBO leaders' versus CBO members and use of non project staff helped to avoid biasness and possible influence of results since community members felt comfortable discussing in the absence of field project staff.

#### References

- [1] Adato, M., Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methods for Program Monitoring and Evaluation: Why Are Mixed-Method Designs Best?, 2011,
- [2] ASARECA, Monitoring and Evaluating Series: Guidelines for Project Baseline studies, 2010
- [3] Bamberger, M., Rao, V., and Woolcock, M.. "Using Mixed Methods in Monitoring and Evaluation: Experiences from International Development." *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 5245, Washington, DC.* 2010.
- [4] IFAD, Managing for Impact in Rural Development: A Guide for Project Monitoring and Evaluation, 2002
- [5] IFRC, Project and Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Guide, 2011,
- [6] Kusek, J. Z. and Rist, R. C., A Handbook for Development Practitioners: Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System, 2004,

- [7] Place, F., M. Adato, and P. Hebinck.. “Understanding Rural Poverty and Investment in Agriculture: An Assessment of Integrated Quantitative and Qualitative Research in Western Kenya.” *World Development* 35 (2) 312–25. 2007
- [8] UNDP, Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results, 2002
- [9] UNEG, Standards for Evaluation in the UN System. United Nations Evaluation Group, 2005
- [10] WB, Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Tools, Methods & Approaches, 2004
- [11] WB, Monitoring and Information Management, 2010

### Abbreviations

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| ASARECA | The Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa |
| BMU     | Beach Management Units  |
| CBFM    | Community based Forrest managment   |
| CBNRM   | Community Natural Resources Management  |
| CBO     | Community Based Organisation  |
| CGMETT  | Community Governance and Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool                       |
| CS      | Civil Societies   |
| IFAD    | International Fund for Agricultural Development                                       |
| IFRC    | International Federation of Red Crossand Red Crescent Societies                       |
| LUPs    | Land Use Plans  |
| M&E     | Monitoring and Evaluation   |
| NGOs    | non governmentorganisations   |
| NRM     | natural resources management  |
| PHM     | Post Harvemest Management   |
| UN      | United Nations  |
| UNDP    | United NationsDevelopment Programme   |
| UNEG    | United Nations Evaluation Group   |
| WB      | The World Bank  |
| WMA     | Wild Life Management Areas  |

### Funding

This paper is sole funded by the author. The author hereby declares that this paper is free from conflict of interest construed by external parties to influence the results or /and interpretation of the manuscript. Further, views expressed herein are those of the researcher and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of any of the organisations mentioned herein.