Meeting Report
Informal Discussion Group on Environment (IDGE)
Discussion Topics: MKUKUTA Review and IDGE Governance
16 October 2009 * IUCN Conference Room

(For additions, comments, or corrections email Doyi Mazenzele at mazenzele@gmail.com)

Meeting Details

1. Welcome, Introductions, Agenda review and IDGE background briefing

- Chairperson of the day, Abdalla Shah (IUCN Head of Office), opened the meeting at 9.15am
- Participants introduced themselves (name, position and organization). See participant list for details
- Reviewed agenda. Order of speakers was altered as some speakers had not arrived (see Agenda for details)
- Reviewed IDGE background
  – IDGE was founded as a the Informal Donor Group for the Environment in 1990s
  – Name changed to Informal Discussion Group for the Environment in Nov 2000,
  – Since 2000, IDGE has been hosted by various organizations (WCST, TRAFFIC, IUCN, etc)
  – There was an Oct 08 meeting with small number of participants to discuss whether or not/ how IDGE should continue (see Oct 08 meeting summary for details)
  – It was agreed that there is still need for IDGE and that it should be revitalized
  – 16 October 2009 marks the first full (theme-based) meeting of the "revitalized" group
  – For present, IUCN is serving as IDGE secretariat, in coordination with TNRF and other stakeholders, with the intention of sharing this role with other interested organizations.

2. Presentation: MKUKUTA Review Process
(Mr. Lelansi Mwakibibi – Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs)

- *Full PowerPoint Presentation available on IDGE webpage*
- **Why the review process?**
  – MKUKUTA Phase I ends in June 2010
  – Another phase/poverty reduction strategy is being developed
  – MKUKUTA implementation has generated a number of lessons that should be captured and used for formulation of next phase/ strategy
    o Framework envisioned for implementation only partially worked
    o Sectoral coordination and synergies were not effective
    o Several reports and analytical works are available to support the review, but need to be brought together and supplemented
- Overall plan for MKUKUTA I Review and development of next strategy
  – **Preparatory phase (January – April 2009):** Output is *GUIDELINES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEXT GENERATION OF MKUKUTA AND MKUZA.*
  – **Assessment phase (May-August 2009)**
    o Identify the issues for review
    o Lead institutions fine tune ToRs for studies to support review. ToRs were developed from technical notes. Detailed budgets were also prepared for each consultancy.
    o Consultants will submit their reports to the Secretary of the Ministerial Tender Board.
    o NB: consultancies still being finalized and studies still being completed
  – **Drafting and dialogue phase (Aug-Dec 2009)**
    o Drafting team inaugurated in Aug 31
    o Studies under the assessment phase were intended to inform this drafting. Studies are not yet completed. However, several existing studies were distributed to study teams to develop sections
    o Current annotated outline is:
      ▪ Chapter one: Introduction and Background

- Chapter two: Growth and Reduction of Poverty
- Chapter three: Framework of the strategy
- Chapter four: (Growth, Social well being & Governance)
- Chapter five: Implementation Arrangement
- Chapter six; Monitoring and Evaluation
- Chapter seven: Budget and Financing framework
  - **Approval phase (Jan-March 2010)**
    - Compile findings from lead institutions and ensure ideas from consultations are incorporated into the document
    - Planning for printing and wider dissemination of the document
    - After this phase, MDAs align their SP and MTEFs to the new strategy.
  - **3 studies for MKUKUTA Review about environment and climate change**
    - analysis of mainstreaming environment into mkukuta process
    - poverty-environment and policy analysis
    - climate change and its impacts productive sectors, particularly agriculture
    - ToRs for studies: Technical notes have already been offered to lead institutions to fill any gaps and come up with a concise ToRs
  - **Process for developing study ToRs**
    - Technical notes were developed by lead institutions and these formed the basis for ToRs and study budgets. (see ToRs for environment and climate change related studies for details)

Questions and Comments

Several participants thanked the presenter for a very informative and timely presentation.

Question: Will the study results in climate change and environment be included in MKUKUTA II?
RESPONSE: The findings from climate change and environment studies will be discussed by stakeholders prior their inclusion in the review process. The findings will be taken onboard.
Question: Will the studies include monitoring indicators for effective monitoring of MKUKUTA II?
RESPONSE: Not clear yet; though indicators are needed for the monitoring system, first we have to determine what will be included in the strategy. Currently there are few indicators that will be presented during stakeholders' workshop/meeting for discussion.
Question: Is VPO the only lead institution or there will be other institutions?
RESPONSE: No, there are several lead institutions for various studies, including the University of Dar es Salaam, specifically the Department of Economics. VPO is the lead institution for environment and climate change studies).
Question: Is the Division of Environment the coordinator or the one to undertake the study?
RESPONSE: DoE is the coordinator. They have identified a consultant to do the studies.
Question: Will there be multisectoral coordination of cross cutting issues?
RESPONSE: This is not clear yet, but during the implementation there will be guidelines to improve the situation regarding cross-cutting issues.
Question: How will the validation be managed?
RESPONSE: Lead institutions shall convene separate validations during the consultation process
Comment: It seems there is no room for people to see the MKUKUTA draft document; it is released when it is official, at a time when nothing can be done to modify it.
Response: There is vey wide consultation; the document will go through a series of consultation meetings from low to high levels and there will be opportunities to contribute. MKUKUTA is also a living document that will keep on changing.
Question: Will MKUKUTA II undergo a similar process (zonal discussions) that MKUKUTA I went through?
RESPONSE: No, this time consultation is based on studies to be undertaken by lead institutions. In July 2009, there was a six zone MKUKUTA I review.

3. Presentation: Integrating Environment into Poverty Reduction Strategy Process (Ms. Blandina Cheche – Vice President's Office)

- *Not all presentation points copied in report. Full PowerPoint Presentation available on IDGE webpage*
- Project title: Integrating Environment into Poverty Reduction Strategy Process

Phase I: 2003-2006.
- Goals and objectives: To achieve poverty reduction and sustainable development through the integration of environment and livelihoods issues into the PRS process.
- Executing agenda: VPO
- Implementing agencies: Poverty Eradication Division, Department of Environment, NEMC, Prime Ministers' Office-Regional Administration and Local Governments, Training and research institutions, NGOs, and (in Phase II) Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries
- Partners: UNDP, DANIDA, DFID,PEI, Dryland Dev. Centre (Norway)

- Role of project from MKUKUTA formulation was to mainstream environmental issues (e.g., through development of guidelines, public expenditure review, development of the Env. Management Act, development of poverty-environment indicators, providing coordination, etc)
- Some of achievements include:
  - Setting clear environmental targets (e.g., 15+ environmental indicators) that were linked to budget directly
  - Shifting the debate from "poverty as a cause of environmental problems' to 'environment as a driver of poverty reduction' and the recognition of environment as a political and economic issues, rather than just a technical issue
  - Rolling out VPO guidelines on mainstreaming environment in sectors and local government
- What worked less well…
  - Not enough focus on poor people's positive contributions to environment
  - Not enough information on distributional problems (environmental winners and losers)
  - Too little private sector engagement
  - No clear prioritization among targets
  - Weak process monitoring
  - Growth still dominates development paradigm
- Some of the challenges include
  - Implementation gap (funds, governance, monitoring)
  - Political will and commitment
  - Policy coherence between MKUKUTA and EMA
  - Supporting effective environmental rights, responsibilities, rewards, and relationships for the poor
  - Tackling under-investment in environment for poverty reduction
- Lessons include
  - National leadership is essential
  - The 'environment' must be presented as integral to poverty reduction
  - Trade-offs between development and environment are key – discuss 'bottom lines'
  - Invest in evidence, knowledge and debate on poverty-environment links
  - Enable stakeholders to explore their own links to the environment
  - The voices of poor people are central
  - The private sector needs to be involved throughout
  - Donor harmonisation and budget support need to respond to poverty-environment links
  - Technical assistance should be demand-led, and enable local capacities
  - Budgets count – use finance authorities to ask questions about env!
  - Alliances with other cross-cutting issues can be mutually rewarding
  - The timing of mainstreaming work is key

Phase II: 2007 – 2010
- Overall Objective: The support of the operationalisation of environment/livelihoods issues contained in the National Strategy for Growth and the Reduction of Poverty (MKUKUTA)
- Partners :UNDP, UNEP, UNDP DDC, GOT cost sharing (Underfunded by 1,200,000)
- Outcomes include
  - Institutional capacity further enhanced to integrate environment and livelihoods issues into sector and district level plans and to implement strategic poverty-environment interventions at local level.
  - improved access to environmental-livelihoods data
  - coordination and advocacy of poverty-environmental links
  - Promoting efficient utilization of rangelands and empowering pastoralist to improve livestock productivity through improved livestock productivity and market access.
- Achievements include
  - Integrated Ecosystem Assessment of the Livingstone Mountain Ranges was completed.
  - Poverty environment Modules for Tanzania Social Economic Database was developed
  - Guidelines to mainstream Environment into local government authorities prepared.
  - Pro poor poverty-environment training modules for LGAs were prepared
  - Study to review impact of policy/legislations on pastoral production, land tenure, water management completed.
  - Study on Impact of Production and Marketing of Dryland Products was undertaken
  - Training for Civil Society Organisations to promote engagement on environmentally sound practices
  - Various P- E awareness/advocacy materials produced and disseminated
  - Radio and Television programmes on P-E were prepared and aired
  - Support on traditional management/revival of dry season buffer areas for woodlots in Iramba District
  - Support extended to Iramba Women groups to undertake alternative income generating activities
  - National Environment Action Plan reviewed by peer group.
- Challenges include
  - Delays in disbursement of funds

- – Poor follow-ups and monitoring of small grants
- – Advocacy for Swahili publications and electronic materials

Questions and Comments
Several participants thanked the presenter for a very informative and useful presentation.
Question: To get the most tangible project results for poor people, why doesn't the project concentrate on few sites rather than having national coverage?
Response: This is a policy level / national level project. It is not limited to particular regions, and so has to be far reaching.
Question: Can the project invest in impacting people through awareness creation?
Response: Capacity building is the key output in all phases of the project.
Comment/ Question: One challenge in natural resource management is the number of separate guidelines being developed and used at the district level. We have guidelines on PFM, wetlands management, and now also one for environment in poverty reduction planning. It is good that these guidelines exist, but more coordination is needed. Also need to address role of basket funds.
Response: There is a process in place towards establishing basket funds, but there may be implementation gaps.

4. **Presentation: CSO engagement in MKUKUTA review - Open discussion on possible ways forward**
   Mr. Nestory Masswe (TANGO)

- Why engage in MKUKUTA reviews and formulation?
  - – Deepen understanding of MKUKUTA thus identify success and failures thereof
  - – Ensure people's opinions/ priorities are taken onboard and own the process
- What is the role of CSOs in the review:
  - – To create awareness of stakeholders on MKUKUTA review and formulation at national, zonal, regional and district levels.
  - – To participate effectively in the MKUKUTA review and formulation process (know the process)
  - – To effectively implement MKUKUTA
  - – To monitor and evaluate MKUKUTA implementation in our areas of focus/operations (theme and geographical location).
  - – To lobby and advocate for effective MKUKUTA implementation, monitoring and evaluation
- How to engage:
  - – Identify the existing engagement opportunities (e.g., the consultation process being coordinated by Policy Forum and TANGO, which is shortly coming to a close)
  - – Participate (research, discussion meetings, giving alternative reports and ideas/solutions, advise etc) in the present MKUKUTA review and formulation processes
  - – Networking with other stakeholders
- Challenges
  - – Failure to link environment and climate change issues in MKUKUTA clusters
  - – CSO capacity to engage is limited (know how/ skills and resources)

(NB: Discussion held until after Presentation 4 as it was related)

5. **Presentation: MKUKUTA Phases I and II - CSO Engagement and Treatment of Environment**
   Dr. George Jambiya (WWF)

- [Background: WWF coordinated environmental CSO engagement in the formulation of MKUKUTA Phase I]
- Most CSOs lacked capacity to engage during implementation/ monitoring of MKUKUTA Phase I and thought that the inclusion of environmental issues in the strategy would be sufficient for generating action and results
- To date, MKUKUTA implementation reports do not make strong mention of environmental issues and it is not clear to what degree impacts on environmental issues are being monitored or followed up. The framework for M&E on environmental components of MKUKUTA is weak.
- MKUKUTA Implementation Report on environment was based on things that happened in the course of implemetation but were not necessarily planned; the monitoring system just apprears as a chapter in the report, rather than being an actual M&E report.
- However, there have been many positive advancements on governance of natural resources, and several influential reports that have examined the economic value of natural resources and the economic losses of poor governance. This includes the report on illegal logging by TRAFFIC.
- We also have substantial new challenges to be addressed in the next phase that have arisen as more significant issues since Phase I was formulated. Key among these is climate change. Dar es Salaam is already being quoted as a place where "environmental refugees" from the rest of Tanzania are coming as natural resources are being depleted and degraded. There are some activities supporting adaptation (e.g., farmers changing crop varieties to

more drought resistant one), and activities starting around mitigation (e.g., REDD) but these activities, and particularly adaptation, need to be scaled up and better coordinated.
- Environmental CSOs need to seek/ demand a place at the table and in the Steering Committee for MKUKUTA implementation and monitoring this time around.

6. Discussion on way forward for CSO engagement in MKUKUTA Review

Summarized Questions and Comments (Presentations 3 and 4)

Comments included:
- MKUKUTA is supposed to be a living document, but the degree to which it is affecting, and being affected by, other relevant processes and strategies is not clear.
- CSOs may need to make stronger demands and arguments for being included in the drafting, implementation, and monitoring of MKUKUTA.
- Monitoring and evaluation of actual MKUKUTA impacts has been weak and needs to be better addressed. One way to do this is to review and revise indicators in this round…
- In general, the monitoring process needs to be clearer. Will there be a parallel process of monitoring by Government and other sectors? We need to think carefully about what monitoring framework will work best, and how environment and conservation sectors can really engage in and support that

Q: What are the options for engagement at this stage?
Responses:
- **CSOs can engage with Policy Forum and TANGO in a series of CSO engagement meetings** (TANGO received funds from UNDP to create awareness and stimulate NGO participation in zones). Currently there are two or three meetings left. Comments from the meetings will be fed into the government. *(For more information contact Mr. Nestory Masswe at TANGO at masswenm@yahoo.com)*
- Institing on representation in MKUKUTA Steering Committee and Monitoring Bodies through visiting officials and writing letters
- TNRF had put in some ideas on wildlife, forestry, rangelands to engage MKUKUTA process, when it was to be presented it was too late for a long, formalized process. This information can still be used, however, as part of broader inputs to the Review.
- Review and documentation of lessons learned within our own organizations, and with other organizations in Tanzania and the region.
- Engaging and sharing information with key research bodies supporting MKUKUTA review and strategy development (e.g., Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF - http://www.esrftz.org/) and Research on Poverty Alleviation (REPOA - http://www.repoa.or.tz/.)
- Environment / conservation CSOs should prepare a document to send to the Drafting Committee and other stakeholders. Individual memberes/ organizations can prepare a short report based on their experience/ evidence and send to IDGE for complication and sharing.
- Engage more regularly with VPO, DPG-E, and other potential stakeholders (e.g., inquire with Blandina Cheche if her project/ office can be an entry point for engagement)

Q: Who can coordinate this engagement? Is there a TANGO subgroup on environment?
Response: There is not a TANGO subgroup, but we can engage more with TANGO and other forums. There are also environmental CSOs and bodies that can serve coordination role. IDGE is one example. IDGE cannot submit environmental CSO responses in its own right, but can compile responses from its members and share with Policy Forum and/or directly with the Drafting Committee.

Consensus on way forward for engagement
- **IDGE to send MKUKUTA background documents and template for interested members to respond based on their experiences. IDGE can compile responses and share with Policy Forum and other relevant bodies.**
- Template for responses should cover (for each indicator and cluster)
  - Aim or objective of institution or project (with respect to MKUKUTA goals / indicators)
  - Successes (with respect to MKUKUTA goals / indicators)
  - Failures (with respect to MKUKUTA goals / indicators)
  - Challenges/ obstacles (with respect to MKUKUTA goals / indicators)
  - What are your recommendations for MKUKUTA Phase II based on these experiences? This should include cluster-specific indicators
  - What is your vision for the way forward on poverty alleviation related work within your organization?
- IDGE to continue sharing information

Discussion on MKUKUTA closed by Abdalla Shah

7. IDGE ToRs and the way forward
   Facilitated by John Balarin (Wetlands Units, Wildlife Division, MNRT)

- *IDGE profile is open to revision. A draft was presented and participants were asked to follow up via email with comments, additions, amendments.*
- Facilitator quickly review all components of the draft "revitalized" profile
  - Group name and "What is IDGE?" : "…informal, impartial, mulit-sector, multi-disciplinary, multi-organisational, broad-based "discussion group"…"
  - Mission: "To foster dialogue, communicating for better cooperation, coordination and harmony between programs, projects, institutions and networks, through individuals, aimed at synergy in synchronising efforts and sharing knowledge."
  - Membership (open to all interested organizations and individuals in relevant fields)
  - Chairperson (to be selected at start of each meeting)
  - Secretariat (to be shared between intertsed organizations, currently IUCN)
  - Meeting frequency: It was generally agreed that there should be regular meetings (e.g., once every one month on the first Wednesday of the month) but also room for special meetings as needed
  - IDGE services
  - Thematic meetings and groups (themes to be selected and groups chosen at the end of each meeting to plan the next regular meeting)
  - Fund raising
  - Links to other networks
  - Setting a regular agenda
- Participants requested to send feedback via email

8. Any other business and meeting closing

- Participants who arrived late introduced themselves and their organizations (Tanzania Centre of Sustainable Development)
- Abdalla Shah closed the meeting after thanking participants for their attendance and participation
- IDGE requested to follow up on action items and send options for next meeting dates and themes. Climate change and Decentralization by Devolution (in natural resources management) were raised as possible themes for the next meeting.

Summary of Action Items:

- IDGE and TNRF to launch website and post meeting report and presentations
- IDGE acting secretariat to share MKUKUTA background documents and template / options for CSO feedback into the MKUKUTA review process (done)
- IDGE acting secretariat to compile responses from members and share with Policy Forum
- All interested members to send comments to IDGE acting secretariat on the DRAFT IDGE Profile
- IDGE acting secretariat to send message with options for dates and themes of next regular meeting for member feedback

Annex I: Agenda

**Meeting to Revitalize the
Informal Discussion Group on Environment (IDGE)**

Discussion Topics: MKUKUTA Review and IDGE Governance

**16 October 2009
IUCN Conference Room (Dar es Salaam)**

NB: Agenda was revised from originally proposed due to changes in speaker availability.[1]

Time (estimated)	Activity / Presentation	Facilitator/ Speaker
09:15 – 09:45	Welcome Introductions IDGE background briefing Agenda review	Mr. Abdalla Shah (IUCN)
09:45 – 10:15	MKUKUTA review process Q&A	Mr. Lelansi Mwakibibi (Ministry of Finance and Econ. Affairs)
10:15 – 10:45	Environment in poverty reduction project Q&A	Ms. Blandina Cheche (Vice Pres. Office)
10:45 – 11:00	Recommendations and key questions regarding CSO engagement in MKUKUTA review	Mr. Nestory Masswe (TANGO)
11:00 – 11:15	MKUKUTA Phase I : CSO engagement and treatment of environment	Dr. George Jambiya (WWF)
11:15 – 11:45	Discussion re: way forward for CSO engagement	All
12:00 – 12:30	Tea and bites	All
12:30 – 12:45	Further discussion and closing of MKUKUTA review section of meeting	Mr. Abdalla Shah
12:45 – 1:00	IDGE ToRs and the way forward	Mr. John Balarin (Wetlands Unit)
1:00 – 1:10	AOB and close	Mr. Abdalla Shah

---

[1] Mr. Lars Mikkel Johannessen (DPG-E) had been scheduled to give presentation on DPG-E format and current topics, but was unable to attend due to scheduling conflicts. Order of presentations was also changed due to speakers' schedules.

Annex II: MKUKUTA Phase I Environment Goals and Indicators by Cluster

Cluster I: Growth and reduction of income poverty	
Goals	**Indicators**
Goal 2: Promoting Sustainable and Broad Based Growth	Proportional of enterprises undertaking Environmental Impact Assessment complying with standards
Goal 5: Reducing income Poverty of both men and women in rural and urban areas	% of households whose main income is derived from the harvesting, processing and marketing of natural resources products
Goal 6: Provision of Reliable and Affordable Energy to Consumers	% of households in rural and urban areas using alternative sources of energy to wood fuel (including charcoal) as their main sources of energy
	% increase in number of customers connected to national electricity grid and off-grid

MKUKUTA Cluster II: Improved Quality of Life and Social Well-being	
Goals	**Indicators**
Goal 3: Increased access to clean, affordable and safe water, sanitation decent shelter and a safe and sustainable environment	Proportion of population with access to piped or protected water as their main drinking water source (with the consideration of 30minutes for going, collecting and return)
	% of households with basic sanitation facilities
	% of schools having adequate sanitation facilities (as per policy ratio of toilets to pupils)
	Number of reported cholera cases(attack rate per 100,000 people)
	Total area managed by mandated local institutions for the purposes of community based natural resources management

MKUKUTA Cluster III: Governance and Accountability	
Goals	**Indicators**
Goal 1: Structure and Systems of governance as well as the rule of law are democratic, participatory, representative, accountable and inclusive	Proportion of women with secure tenure over land or property
Goal 2:Equitable allocation of public resources with corruption effectively addressed	Total value of revenue received from concessions and licences for mining, forestry, fishing and wildlife as % of their estimated economic value