

**Reporting Progress at Protected Area Sites: Data Sheet
Kimboza FR January 2005**

Name of protected area	Kimboza FR	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)	Morogoro, Tanzania 6° 59 – 7° 022 S: 37° 47 – 37° 49 E	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Gazetted 1964 GN 417 11/7/1964
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Central Government, URT	
Management Authority	FBD, MNRT	
Size of protected area (ha)	405 Ha	
Number of staff	Permanent:3 Assistant Forest (full-time) Supervisor: District Catchment Forester (Morogoro) Regional Catchment Forester	Temporary -
Budget	Tsh 11,226,457 (Approx USD 12,000) Salaries permanent staff, DCF, Operation Costs from FBD	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Category IV - equivalent	
Reasons for designation	No settlement, Some utilisation-customary, Not established for recreation but for soil and water, and Biodiversity Protection. Does have tourism actively promoted. Agreement to actively manage area of Cedrella plantation within PA.	
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA	None	
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA	None	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	Ongoing inputs from NORAD support to Catchment forests (1988-2006)	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	To ensure ecosystem stability in Uluguru Landscape	
Objective 2	To ensure conservation of Kimboza FR through effective management of Kimboza buffer zone	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Forest Fires	
Threat 2	Tree cutting for wood products	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Boundary maintenance / clearing	
Activity 2	Buffer zone tree planting	

Name/s of assessor and date assessment carried out: __CMEAMF: Uluguru; Catchment Forestry Morogoro; WCST Morogoro; DNRO Morogoro

Contact details (email etc.): _____

* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>PA gazetted – Government notice 417 of 11/7/1964</i> <i>Map JB 2073</i> <i>Top: 183/4+ 202/2</i> <i>Note: see fourth option for private reserves</i>	
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
<i>Context</i>	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	JFMA signed	Review of JFMAs planned for June 2005
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
<i>Context</i>	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: What happens if people are arrested?</i> <i>Assistant Forest Officer resident in Kimboza but responsibilities elsewhere.</i> <i>JFMAs mean that communities have partly taken on responsibilities for managing the forest; so staff numbers are sufficient for supervision – given size of the area.</i>	Review of JFMAs planned for June 2005
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
<i>Context</i>	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0		
Have objectives been agreed?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
<i>Planning</i>	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
8. Regular work plan	No regular work plan exists	0	Annual Plan of Operations is prepared for under NORAD support and found at the District Catchment Office. Everything planned is generally completed, but this does not cover everything that could be planned under management plan. The restriction is budget.	
Is there an annual work plan?	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
<i>Planning/Outputs</i>	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0	Inventory exists but not comprehensive	
Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
<i>Context</i>	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	Not comprehensive	
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		<i>Cedrella</i> invasion on West side of mountain should be assessed for active management and need for intervention
Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
<i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
12. Staff numbers	There are no staff	0	Staffing has improved – skills; FO I resident - but he has responsibilities elsewhere in the division and so more support required. Support from Morogoro centre is there. FBD has had a policy of retrenchment and not hiring in place since early 1990s.	Increase Staff
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	<u>2</u>		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0		
Are the staff managed well enough? <i>Process</i>	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	<u>2</u>		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained	0	Skills are inadequate – post held by certificate holder but should be Diploma level	Priority for training is at field level – Morogoro level skill sets are adequate.
Is there enough training for staff? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	<u>1</u>		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget	There is no budget for the protected area	0	Budget covers basic management needs	
Is the current budget sufficient? <i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	<u>2</u>		
	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0	Salaries covered by FBD, MNRT – donors support for innovations	
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	<u>2</u>		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0		Need to improve management skills of administrators
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	<u>2</u>		
	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
<i>Process</i>				
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0	2 old field staff houses need renovation and motorcycle needs replacing. Bicycles for villagers	
Is equipment adequately maintained?	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
	There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	<u>2</u>		
	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		
<i>Process</i>				
19. Maintenance of equipment	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0	Motorcycle is maintained regularly just old. Houses are not maintained regularly but inputs in 2002.	
Is equipment adequately maintained?	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	<u>2</u>		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
<i>Process</i>				

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0	Awareness raising programme is funded under CMEAMF: Uluguru and has started.	
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	<u>2</u>		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	NA – no commercial neighbours	
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	NA – indigenous not regarded as politically appropriate to Tanzania situation – preference for use of local communities – see question 23	
	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	<u>0</u>	Communities have worked with FBD on JMAs . Participated in making decision not to zone and in forest partitioning	
	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	<u>2</u>		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Additional points	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1	Not yet	
<i>Outputs</i>	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1	IGAs have been initiated	
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> Do visitors damage the protected area?	Positive steps to increase visitor numbers
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough?	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1	Limited number of visitors (< 100 per year)	
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
<i>Outputs</i>				
25. Commercial tourism	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> examples of contributions	
Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1	NA no commercial tourism operators in the area	
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
<i>Process</i>				
26. Fees	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	Very few fees are collected because visitors are few – but there is central retention fund – and funds do come from this source – very small and it is not related to level contribution.	
If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
<i>Outputs</i>				
27. Condition assessment	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural values being affected	
Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives?	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
<i>Outcomes</i>				

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1	Agro-forestry is underway for buffer zone through Project. Plans to address Cedrella	
28. Access assessment Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0	No permits available for harvesting; Permits for tourists to visit	
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1	Forest staff and communities collaborate on protection	
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities? <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> how does national or regional development impact on the protected area? Benefits from IGA – no resource harvesting allowed exception of dry wood for fuelwood – regulated to 1/ week.	
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	Monthly reports, quarterly reports prepared against AOP.	
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE		57 points out of possible 86 (10 deducted NA) = 67%		