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LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBNRM</td>
<td>Community-based natural resources management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community-based organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWNP</td>
<td>Department of Wildlife and National Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBS</td>
<td>Event Book System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDNC</td>
<td>Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVP</td>
<td>Indigenous Veld Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JV</td>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOMS</td>
<td>Management orientated monitoring system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRMC</td>
<td>Natural resources management committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA</td>
<td>Game management area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wildlife Fund / World Wide Fund for Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Delegates prepare their workplans
INTRODUCTION

These proceedings are the outcome of the first regional mini-conference on Management Orientated Monitoring Systems (MOMS) in southern Africa. This conference provided an opportunity for colleagues from across southern Africa to share their experiences and aspirations with regard to the future of MOMS in the region. Case studies from both community-managed and state protected areas were presented.

The case studies are reported here in country alphabetical order, and not necessarily in the order presented. There is considerable diversity in how MOMS has developed in each country – with some having greater representation in national protected areas, and others focusing more on community managed areas. The maturity of each site’s MOMS varies too, depending on how recently it was introduced, and the availability of support to sustain it.

An important output of the conference was the development of workplans for the immediate future for each of the areas represented. The proposed workplans are intended as working documents for immediate implementation, as well as a tool for budget preparation. The elements contained within them should be helpful to others looking for the practical next steps for MOMS in their area.

We hope that this publication will provide a useful benchmark to MOMS practitioners, and that the common threads arising in terms of challenges, lessons learned and successes will guide others as they too move MOMS forward in their area.

Figure 2: Case studies from across the region are presented  (second photo courtesy of J. Kamwendo)
WELCOMING REMARKS
Binah Seretse
Regional MOMS Coordinator

Ms Seretse welcomed all the delegates to the mini-conference, and noted that this is the first conference in the region. Although there has been a Regional MOMS Working Group meeting in Johannesburg, this is the first time that practitioners from all over the region have been brought together. Ms Seretse expressed her hope that by sharing the experiences that the different countries had had until now, and by exploring the lessons learned through the implementation of the programme, it would now be possible to pave the way forward.

MOMS HISTORY AND PRINCIPLES
Greg Stuart-Hill
WWF-LIFE Support Programme

MOMS stands for ‘management orientated monitoring system’. We can liken it to the dashboard of an aircraft or vehicle – it provides information for the person responsible for local-level management, and is not a system to collect data for outsiders.

Why Monitor? In short, if one doesn’t monitor, one isn’t managing. Monitoring allows one to assess whether one’s targets and goals are being achieved, whether one is working efficiently, whether one has the necessary information to make decisions and negotiate and communicate with stakeholders.

Traditional Monitoring Systems

Traditional monitoring systems have belonged to outsiders, who:

- Decide what to monitor,
- Design the monitoring system,
- Hand out data sheets,
- Analyse the data,
- Use the results, and
- Take all the credit.

In this system, the people on the ground are simply labour. Such monitoring systems never last. The workers (e.g.) game guards lose interest and stop collecting. The CBO committee or park wardens often do not know what is going on, and consequently make rash decisions. The community or directorate therefore also don’t know what is going on, and tensions arise. The scientist may be using a reporting format that is unfamiliar, complex and irrelevant to the situation on the ground. The scientist can be a bottleneck to the flow of information. He or she may get sidetracked, or experience computer problems. The scientist has all the knowledge and power, and when he or she leaves, so too does the information.

In contrast, a MOMS represents ‘devolved’ monitoring, where the scientist simply helps with the process. In a successfully devolved MOMS, the community (or park managers) own the data and results. They are the ones who decide what information is collected where, when, by whom, and for what purpose. By owning the data, they are the ones making the decisions. The technical people
are merely a service provider, suggesting how things could be done. A well-set up MOMS requires careful balance between the ownership needs, and a sound design. Even though a MOMS is owned by its users, because there are many people’s interests at stake, it is advisable for a regular external audit to be done.

Balance between Ownership and Rigour

On the one side, managers focus on the mind-map, which determines ‘what / why / who / when’. On the other side, the technical people focus on the modules – ‘how’ the information is collected. It is important to ensure that technical people are really just making suggestions, and not taking over the decisions. This way, managers can maintain ownership because they choose what they want to monitor. Yet modules are rigorous and standardised, so that they can be re-used in different areas.

Elements of the System

The system starts with developing the mind-maps – the posters that capture the monitoring modules that the community wants to work with (see Figure 3a), and the job description posters that show which modules the data collector is responsible for.

![Figure 3: Examples of a) monitoring modules poster, b) ‘yellow’ data capture card, c) ‘blue’ monthly/annual reporting chart, and d) ‘red’ long-term reporting chart](image-url)
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Next, there are data-flow posters that show the reporting relationships, where each stage of records is kept, and where information is passed along. The data-flow posters essentially represent the institutional ‘where’ of data collection and analysis.

The fundamental level, or first stage of the system, is the ‘yellow’ level data capture system (Figure 3b). In different areas, the set of yellow cards where specific events are recorded are variously called Event Books, Incident Books, Pocket Books, or Office Registers.

At the next level, ‘blue’ reporting cards collate the information at regular intervals – either monthly, quarterly or annually – depending on the situation (Figure 3c). This is followed by summarizing the information onto a ‘red’ card, where long-term trends over several years can be tracked (Figure 3d).

Every year, audit reports that evaluate the system should be produced, and the reporting cards need to be filed and archived into a structured filing and archiving system, and a new set of cards is opened for the coming year.

By examining how far along this list of elements – from mind-map to report-archiving – a given MOMS is, we can tell how mature the system is. It is important to see the progression from identifying modules to having several years of archived data as a process. It is not possible to reach the later levels immediately – only with time can the later stages be implemented. This means that the success of a MOMS has less to do with how many elements are in place, and more to do with how rigorously each element is carried out.

**Appropriate Technology**

A critical aspect of the MOMS approach is recognition of the conditions on the ground where the system is being implemented. There is often no electricity, nor funding for computer equipment that needs continuous upgrading. This is why MOMS are paper-based.

**MOMS History**

MOMS started as with the event books of Namibian community game guards, who first started recording specific wildlife-related events important to the community. CBOs then added event books related to craft production and sales, camp site management, and financial management – leading to a multi-sectoral, sophisticated monitoring scheme.

In Namibia, MOMS was first implemented by CBOs, and then spread to 6 National Parks as the Ministry of the Environment saw the practicality of local-level, informed management. The system later expanded to other countries: Zambia, Mozambique, Botswana, Cambodia and Tanzania, and is now being explored for Zimbabwe and Malawi. This spread has been facilitated by an approach based on sharing lessons by working with local support providers at pilot sites.

We anticipate that MOMS will continue to expand across three dimensions:

1. **Thematic** – to cover other issues besides wildlife management, such as finances, crafts, governance, business, etc.
2. **Spatial** – to other areas and countries
3. **Sectoral** – to other types of activities or aspects of society, such as protected areas, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, health, education, etc.
to get inter-level reporting systems functioning. Now that we are established, we need to start annual external audits.

Lessons Learned

Committed local champions are needed to support MOMS implementation at those sites where training has been done.

Plenary Discussions

After a brief comparison between the Mozambique and Botswana cases, discussions focused on the issue of motivation, particularly within civil service employment. It is not simply an issue of including MOMS implementation in people’s contracts, but also a question of ensuring the supervisors stay interested and so check that people carry it out.

It was pointed out that the issue of trained people being transferred out was not only an issue in Botswana, nor solely in parks. For example the conservancies in Namibia faced similar problems. It was felt that a key solution would be to train more people, and to get the training institutionalized, so that all staff had the capacity to carry it out.

It was noted that the communities had taken MOMS further, even though this was introduced as a DWNP project, and that there was a huge demand from people wanting monitoring. However, communities tended to underestimate the effort involved.

MOMS in Southern Botswana
Debbie Gibson
Independent Consultant, Windhoek, Namibia

In 2002, a 5-year project known as the Indigenous Veld Products (IVP) was started in Botswana. It was intended to encourage and facilitate the use of veld products to improve the livelihoods of rural communities in Botswana. Two areas were selected for the project: the BORAVAST Trust of Struisendam village in the southern Kgalagadi and the Lenao La Ga Kgwabe Trust further north in the Makgadikgadi area.

An additional important objective of the IVP project was to develop the capacity of users to monitor communal rangelands. MOMS was the obvious and ideal system for this. Struisendam was selected as a “pilot” area for the introduction of the MOMS. However – and this turned out to be a mistake - because of a number of delays, there were only 4 months to do the work in, and we tried to rush it through in that period.

The area is extremely arid. The only river in the area, the Molopo, dried up in the nineteenth century, and poor soils, over-grazing and droughts have impoverished both the land and the people of the area. They live right next to the transfrontier park, but are isolated from it by a game-proof fence (put up to protect stock from predators, but also to keep livestock out of the park). So, in spite of being adjacent to it, people do not benefit from the park. Wildlife densities outside the park are very low following die-offs from droughts, over-hunting and the impacts of fences.

The economy of the area is based on subsistence livestock ranching but rainfall is very low, ground water poor quality & land is becoming desertified. Farming Karakul sheep for wool was formerly
an important source of income but this too has declined through competition from neighbouring South African markets. It is in this context that the IVP project aimed to provide alternative or supplementary sources of income, the most significant of which to-date has been the establishment of a Hoodia nursery.

The Struisdam Mind-Map

As usual, the mind-mapping exercise reflects the concerns and desires of the community: water, livestock, climate, veld fires, grazing, veld products, and problem wildlife (Figure 4). However, some of their priorities were surprising: injury to humans, transport, and wildlife.

![Figure 4: The Struisdam mind-map](image)

Some Struisdam Startup Issues

The participants are largely comprised of individual farmers – not community game guards hired by the CBO board. Participants wanted to record events on their individual farms. It was necessary to ensure that one person was chosen to be the “community recorder” for each village to keep records of communal assets & activities (e.g. Hoodia plantations).

The other villages in the BORAVAST trust also wanted to be introduced to MOMS, increasing the workload, and since individual farmers all wanted their own event books – this was also a lot of books. There were varied abilities, literacy and age, and the technical support team had little experience of the home language – Afrikaans.
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Because everyone knew there was a very short time for the project startup, they wanted a large number of modules immediately.

Training Sessions

A date for training was pre-arranged with the community without checking a calendar and the first session took place immediately after a long weekend. Many of the participants from the start-up workshop were still celebrating! Other members of the community attended the training but the event books had not been designed for them and some of them hadn’t been at the start-up.

Another follow-up training session a month later was more successful. The relevant community members took part. Difficulties with the modules were clarified, and ‘blue’ level charts were described and handed out.

Although there was no time left to give further support, and it was too soon to realistically do any (blue level) analysis, the people liked the system, were enthusiastic and want to go further with it. Funds for technical support must be found. For this to succeed, the Trust will need to have support from DWNP’s MOMS Coordinating Project, and since this includes an agricultural community, possibly the Ministry of Agriculture could work with DWNP.

Lessons Learned

These reinforce all the basic rules we need to know:

- Don’t try to fit 18 months of MOMS into 4 months
- Don’t hold training workshops within a week of a public holiday!
- Be flexible – the community may want to monitor unusual subjects
- Find out about the community structure before starting
- Expect enthusiasm (and extra work) from unexpected quarters
- Don’t make too many modules be made
- Try to allocate monitoring to people of similar levels of education or literacy
- Have a good translator available if you can’t speak the language
- Continuing support over a long period must be planned for
- There MUST be a means of providing materials annually

Plenary Discussions

It was clarified that because of the short time, the community had relied on the experts to provide all of the modules. People were desperate and wanted so many, it was overwhelming. It was noted that a common mistake was to start with too many modules.

It was noted that there were 29 farming households involved, ranging from young, literate farmers, to older people with no formal education. This range slowed the process a lot. Again, the short period for introduction meant that it was a struggle to get everyone on board.

In terms of support, it was suggested that possibly the Botswana CBNRM forum could pick it up, or that WWF SARPO could support it, in collaboration with the Department of Environmental Affairs.
MOMS in Sankuyo, Botswana
Score Kasale
Sankuyo Tshwaragano Community Trust, Sankuyo, Botswana

MOMS in Sankuyo was implemented in 2005, after being introduced in 2004. The system is doing well, with a focus mainly on wild animals. The community is now ready to add new modules, such as related to some vegetation species like thatching grass that is being over-utilised and that needs to be monitored, as well as trying to monitor our finances through MOMS modules.

History of MOMS in Sankuyo Tshwaragano Community Trust

The Sankuyo concessions consist of NG34, which covers 87 000 ha, and which encloses the 60 000 ha of NG33. In NG34, the hunting concession, there are two Joint Venture (JV) hunting camps, one JV photographic camp, a JV monitoring centre where escort guides are trained and a camping site that is owned by the community. In the agreement with the JV partner, training in first aid, research, ecology, hunting evaluations, tourism operations is included.

Monitoring Staff

Community escort guides accompany hunters, and these are the MOMS data collectors, who not only monitor the hunt, but also record game on Wildlife Sighting Cards, recording GPS coordinates. Guides are expected to understand that ‘carrying the bag’ doesn’t just confer the right to get paid; it also includes the responsibility to look after the future of their concession.

Apart from the escort guides that accompany hunters, there are two that monitor activities at the community camp, and two that work in the village focusing on the following:
1) Recording problem animal incidents from households,
2) Litter picking/rubbish collection,
3) Road maintenance, cutting trees if necessary,
4) Fixed route patrol, and
5) Anti-poaching/illegal activities.

Monitoring Activities

At the end of the month all sightings are plotted on the concession map, providing a visual tool for reporting back to the community. By monitoring the hunting, the usage of the quota is always kept current. All rare and endangered species, as well as wildlife mortalities are also recorded, including the way the animal died. This is important for key species such as lion, which are not only an important trophy species, but also currently suffering from an infectious virus.

Other monitoring activities include poaching near the park, and indiscriminate and unauthorised camping. In addition, the escort guides make regular visits to households, to check if there were any incidents, such as livestock predation or crop damage.

In the photographic concession area we need to make sure activities are carried out correctly, according to the plan, and make sure they stay within our concession area, and not go into neighbouring areas and cause conflict. Scouts always go with their event books, and if the camp is not too busy, they will arrange with the camp manager to do a night patrol.
For the monthly summary, the chief escort guide collects all the data sheets, and the information is transferred to office daily event book, and then to the ‘blue’ office event book. At the end of the year, the chief escort guide records into the ‘red’ level, and at the Annual General Meeting, must close his archive box, and start the next year. When meetings are held, all people are invited, not just the escort guides, so that people get to see the information, and value it, and this encourages them call the guides when they see incidents so that these can be recorded.

All the information in the MOMS is collected with help of the community and with help of the chief. The chief is a big supporter of MOMS, as he is well informed on this. When the programme started in the community, it was through DWNP’s Community and Extension Unit. However, all this agency now does is check up, and it is encouraging to see that it is generally running well. One challenge is that there is little support and commitment from Board of Trustees, especially with regard to transport, etc. The Board of Trustees is not that interested in MOMS. But DWNP appreciates that not only is the information good for the community, but also useful DWNP decision-making.

MOMS in Chobe Enclave, Botswana
Leatile Setilo
Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Kasane, Botswana

We have just started MOMS in Chobe Enclave. We had formed a cross-border forum with Salambala Conservancy in Caprivi, and in one meeting Chobe Enclave Conservation Trust members heard about MOMS, and came back and asked our office about MOMS. Fortunately Beavan Munali and James Maiba were able to do some training for Chobe, to try and change it from how we did it in Ngamiland, where we started with the whole community, and then got down to the Board of Trustees. This time it was decided that it would be good to start with the community escort guides, and then work up to the Board of Trustees – who could then sell the idea to the whole community. This look-and-learn trip included DWNP staff, and now we are hoping to have community consultation for MOMS in Chobe East and Chobe West, and people in Kasane are excited, and want training.

As we just started in November 2007, there have been no major challenges yet. One potential issue is that the initial startup and implementation is a bit expensive. However, at least the communities understand that they are the ones bearing the cost, and they know that when they are doing their annual budget, they need to put in a line for that.

Another issue arising is the relationship between the community escort guides and the Board. Luckily most of the Boards and Trusts are now employing managers, and this means interactions between the guides and the manager are likely to be smoother.

Starting MOMS in Malawi
Jameson Kamwendo
National Herbarium and Botanic Gardens of Malawi, Zomba, Malawi

MOMS is just being started in Malawi. We were visited by a group from Zimbabwe in September 2007 to give us ideas, and get the support structure set up. As yes, the actual monitoring has yet to start. However, a MOMS Working Group in Malawi has been formed, and has undertaken some work in order to realize its goals.
Composition of the MOMS Working Group in Malawi

The working group has six members with varied and wide expertise in natural resources management, ranging from wildlife, to forestry, fisheries management and conservation. The members are drawn from various organizations and institutions that are actively involved in natural resources management both within and outside protected areas.

Work Done to Date

Meetings have been held, and exchange visits arranged. Key stakeholders and local level partners have been identified, so that they can be trained in effective data collection, documentation and management, including monitoring, of natural resources. Four pilot sites have been identified. These sites have well established associations called Natural Resource Management Committees (NRMCs) and are actively involved in natural resources management in both protected areas and non-protected areas. It was envisaged that these groups should be strengthened and supported to implement MOMS in Malawi.

Lessons Learnt from the Field

The NRMCs visited so far are doing commendable work in natural resources management and monitoring. Some NRMC members have visited sites in other countries. However, more work is being done in and around protected areas than on customary land, as is the case in some neighbouring countries. This focus on protected areas is because the communal land is so densely populated, with few resources left for communal management.

It was also learnt that the NRMCs are currently sustainably harvesting and selling some of the natural resources that they manage as one way of generating income for their families.

Next Steps

Based on our observations, we see that there is a great need to train the NRMCs in data collection, analysis and management. To do this, the NRMCs will need to be financially supported for both monitoring and implementation of resulting decisions as management. Currently, it is clear that NRMCs lack basic equipment and protective clothing. All the 4 sites have many problems. For example, they need assistance to find markets for their products, as some products are not marketable, and this might affect support for monitoring.

Plenary Discussions

Discussions centred on support. It was noted that though the technical expertise is lodged within parastatal agencies, the funding would come from donors, to be distributed by the parastatal. It was observed that involving government could be an effective way to increase support and spread. One concern was that in some instances, governments may have different priorities, and it can sometimes be difficult to secure government support for natural resource management activities. However, by having their approval and backup, this gives the project legitimacy. The mix of people from both government and NGOs makes for a healthier technical support team.
Mozambique MOMS
Alice Costa
WWF Mozambique Coordination Office, Maputo, Mozambique
Maria Cidalia
National Directorate of Conservation Areas, Maputo, Mozambique

This presentation provides an overview of where in Mozambique MOMS is being implemented. Essentially, it is largely a park-based system. Implementation is not yet standardised for all parks – game guards from some parks automatically get MOMS training as part of their overall programme, but guards from other parks only get it if they ask. Currently, MOMS activities are carried out in (from north to south) Quirimbas National Park, Niassa Reserve, Chipanje Chetu Community Conservancy, Ilhas Primeiras e Segundas (which are to be declared a Marine Protected Area), Gorongosa Training Centre, and Bazaruto Archipelago National Park.

Introduction of MOMS to Mozambique

In 2003 the Event Book System (EBS) was brought to Gorongosa for discussion of the system, and identification of modules that could be used in each of the national parks in Mozambique. Designing criteria included how to present the information, how to capture it, and how to report. However, until 2004 there was no action. At the time, the concept of MOMS was introduced, and the proposed EBS was adapted to MOMS, and that meant adapting the modules to suit the Mozambican environment – which included marine areas that were important to it. The approach was to identify a large selection of modules, so that each site could choose from those the ones which they would monitor.

MOMS in Bazaruto Archipelago National Park

This is the site where MOMS was initiated – because it had a higher profile, and was therefore more likely to get support. Park staff were already collecting data, but without any structure or pattern. This was one of the main advantages of introducing a MOMS: it brought in standardization.

The Bazaruto MOMS combines three sections (see Figure 5). The first is scientific collection done monthly for certain key species, monthly aerial counting, and yearly coral reef monitoring. The second section is done with tour operators, because they see things that game rangers cannot see (e.g. scuba divers who take tourists to see special species). Tour operators record their data daily. The third sector is more conventional, where rangers record events on a daily basis relating to special species and illegal activities, for example.

Because Bazaruto is a large, complex park, there are some sites where there are many rangers, and a patrol book had to be created for each ranger. At the end of each trip the rangers register their information into the ‘yellow’ data sheets. A workshop was carried out after some months to see how this was working, and to close gaps and correct mistakes. The first time we tried to compile information was in 2005.

In order to motivate tour operators, we designed their data sheets as checklists to make it easier, because they are so busy. However, these checklists have proved useful to them, as they can use the information to show their clients what species they can expect to see. The tour operators are also asked to complete sheets on fishing effort, diving effort, and problem species such as starfish. If it because hard to find certain species, this can be an indication that it is time to rest the reef.
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The implementation of MOMS at Bazaruto has resulted in 5 patrol outposts on 4 islands – Sitone (headquarters) and Zenguemelo on Bazaruto Island, Chizungune on Benguerta Island, Magaruque Island and Santa Carolina Island. Six tour operators on the three larger islands are assisting with data collection. However, this is not working smoothly yet, as not all tour operators give data. In part this is because of high staff turnover, so there is little continuity in collection. Similarly, some park rangers get shifted to other parks, so until data collection is standardised, this will remain a challenge.

**MOMS in Quirimbas National Park**

As with Bazaruto, there are three sections to the data collection, with one being scientific collection. However, the other two sections are not divided up on the basis of organisation – instead they are divided on the basis of ecosystem, into terrestrial and marine. The scientific data collection here comprises bi-annual monitoring of no-take zones and fish tagging, and annual SocMon and coral reef monitoring. Both the terrestrial and marine monitoring is done by park rangers on a daily basis, recording standardised data such as special species (e.g. turtles caught in nets), illegal activities and entry statistics, as well as community off-takes.

Data records for Quirimbas show that the park now has a clear idea of the number of illegal activities for each site in each month. On the terrestrial side, it is easy to see that some sites have a far greater number of illegal activities, and managers can then assess why this is. To some extent
the differences between the outpost patrol data reflects variation in the commitment of the ranger – how motivated they are to record species, for example.

Overall Lessons Learned

The problems in each area, whether terrestrial or marine, relate to the same issue – people need to be committed. Without commitment, the system will fail. We have some data gaps from early 2007 – in part this was due to the cyclone, in part it was because a key person moved away. There have also been some problems with the literacy of one of the data recorders. A key issue is that we are trying to standardise MOMS using one language system, and this requires translation from local languages, which sometimes introduces error. Now that we have seen that MOMS works in Bazaruto, Quirimbas and Niassa (see below), the Ministry of Tourism believes this is something that can be implemented throughout Mozambique’s parks, starting in all parks where there are wildlife issues, and then compiling data to the national level.

Plenary Discussions

After a brief query about monitoring the activities of people living in the park, questions turned to the use of scientific data, and whether this could also be used by tour operators, or as a way for the parks themselves to market their area. This is in fact being done by WWF that provides a summary report to the communities, park managers and communities.

In terms of the reporting structure and data flow, it was explained that reporting does not only get to the Ministry of Tourism. Workshops are held regularly where reports are also given to communities, game scouts and the communities. In addition, so visits are made specifically to communities to give them additional feedback. For monitoring in sanctuaries, for example, the ‘blue’ level is given back just to the scouts. Mostly this is very simple information that they then give back to the communities. The communities like this approach because they see it as being part of the team. It makes them have more sense of ownership, instead of feeling that it is being imposed from outside.

MOMS in Niassa Reserve, Mozambique

Agostinho Jorge
Society for the Formation and Development of Niassa Reserve, Maputo, Mozambique

Niassa Reserve is located in the extreme north of Mozambique. The park is surrounded by 6 hunting blocks in buffer zone around the core park area, and with neighbouring communities in the areas surrounding this.

Implementing MOMS in Niassa

MOMS was initially introduced in 2004/5 in an experimental stage, starting with the hunting operators in the buffer zone. In 2006, it was introduced formally into the reserve. As a result of this, 5 communities were identified, and 12 scouts were hired in concession areas, and 13 scouts for Niassa reserve management.

As with the two other parks in Mozambique where MOMS has been implemented, in Niassa the data collection has been broken down across three different sections or categories. In this case, these categories relate to the three different zones – core protected area, hunting blocks, and
community areas. Scouts in each of these three areas have different sets of data collection modules corresponding to the different types of area. During training, Niassa Reserve scouts were trained on patrol effort, special species, community fishing, and entrance statistics. Note that the community scouts work with only 3 modules – special species, problem animals and community fishing. They do not do patrol effort information, nor do they have any modules on illegal activities, as it is important that the villagers do not see them as rangers from the reserve, and so stay more open to sharing information with them. Instead, illegal activities are recorded by the reserve and hunting scouts. Four illegal activities have been identified: fishing without licenses, poaching, fishing with poison, and fire.

The scouts from the three different departments collect their data on a daily basis. This information is then collated, and put into a central database at the reserve headquarters, where management decisions are made. This information is also forward to the Ministry of Tourism, especially with regard to problem animals.

Initial Challenges

After this first year of MOMS being implemented in Niassa, some problems have been identified, as have some ways of addressing them:

- Lack of secure funding – each year money must be found again.
- Collection of data sheets – Niassa is a very large area and distances are great, so collating information at end of each month and doing follow up is difficult. Hunting operators have been submitting their information by email, which helps because then a particular operator can be visited when the need or opportunity arises.
- Scouts need additional materials beyond the event books – There is other information they need to note down, and so additional notebooks and pens are required.
- Community scouts have difficulties to cover villages within a given time – the villages are large, and so it is hard for them to collect all the information in their areas by foot. We think this issue could be solved by providing bicycles.
- There is still a low level of knowledge of MOMS in communities – this means that people are reluctant to share information. We need to involve traditional leaders to help introduce MOMS to community
- Low level of commitment by implementing team – for some periods, they simply didn’t collect information. In addition some hunting operators are absent for part of the year (outside of hunting season), so scouts in this zone lack motivation to continue with data collection.

Lessons Learned

The team must be committed and motivated. Key people must be selected carefully. Literacy levels must be evaluated before MOMS is established in any site. MOMS must be institutionalised.

Where scouts don’t have GPS instruments, they draw maps and these are put into the computer. The issue of problem animals is political, with politicians suggesting that wildlife was damaging crops. However, the exact extent of the damage could not be verified, because there was no evidence. To address this, monitoring sheets that depict field areas have been designed to record just how much damage was experienced in each case.

In order to increase motivation, community scouts have been provided with uniforms in the form of T-shirts, caps and backpacks. Now they can be identified, and have some status and respect in the
community, and village members now seek them out to give them information. They are also now given certificates to show they have completed training. As a result, community scouts are doing better than the other two scout categories.

Importantly, the reserve now has the support of a research team that can give technical assistance.

*Plenary Discussions*

It was noted that the Mozambique parks provide a good example of where it might be less necessary to collate the information monthly, but that quarterly or even annually might be more appropriate. One should demand the information less frequently, but then really demand it, because this reduces the load on local level monitoring which undermines commitment. Another reason that the community scouts might be doing better than the other sectors in Niassa could be that they are more able to compile the information at their own pace.

It was clarified that the community scouts were not employed by the community, but by the society set up for the development of the reserve – through a project specifically set up for the community. The society also trains the scouts. However, other ways of keeping scouts collecting without donor funding are already being explored. The community scouts were carefully selected to get people with the right education, but also who would be accepted in the community. Therefore when hiring, the education criteria were given to traditional leaders, who gave a list of potential applicants from whom the scouts were then selected.

**Community MOMS in Caprivi, Namibia**

Beavan Munali  
Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation, Katima Malilo, Namibia  
James Maiba  
Kasika Conservancy, Kasika, Namibia

The Event Book System started in 2000 in Caprivi in response to the communities’ need to be able to assess the impact of their conservancy activities. With all the data being taken straight to the ministry, they had now way of knowing what was happening in their own area. Seven conservancies were involved in the piloting phase. This process involved, Conservancy committees, conservancy members, game guards and staff from IRDNC and WWF.

With the monitoring system successfully implemented in the pilot sites, the next step is to try and take it to all conservancies. There are 18 conservancies in East Caprivi, 19 in Caprivi as a whole, and each conservancy now wants to start MOMS. This means exploring how they should be trained, and what they should be responsible for. The field officers from the 7 conservancies have been invited to join a natural resources management group so that they can exchange ideas and learn from each other and not make the same mistakes.

**The Event Book**

The event book consists of a series of forms or cards that record different types of information. The book and its cards are given to community game guards. The responsibilities of game guards can be presented in terms of the event cards that they keep. These include:

- Cards for meetings – no. of people, purpose of meeting
- Cards for poaching – what was shot, whether someone was arrested or not
- Cards for fishing – size of the net, types of fishes caught – information from fishermen
- Mortality cards – any species found in field, probable cause of death (shot, disease, drought)
- Cards for cyber trackers – counting the number of animals of different species.
- Rainfall cards
- Problem animal cards – filled by game guards – at end of month, they have to be compiled
- Foot patrol form – done once a month – always walking the same route.

The event book includes a list of ‘Ten Commandments’ – essentially a list of field rules to ensure successful implementation:
1. Always with its master
2. Never sleeps
3. Always neat
4. Never lies
5. Always reports monthly
6. Never works in another conservancy
7. Always changes its forms once a year
8. Never shares incidents (to avoid double reporting)
9. Always lives in its bag
10. Never works without a smile.

Figure 6: A community ranger job description poster from Caprivi, showing the related yellow cards for the event book (photo courtesy of J. Kamwendo)

From Event Book to Monitoring System
Once a month the field officers collect the daily information — information at the ‘yellow’ level — from the game guards, and compiles it to make a monthly ‘blue’ card. Once a year the manager collects the monthly summaries from the field officers and summarises the information on the ‘red’ level charts, and develops an annual report. This process is supported by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, WWF and other donors. The information is passed on to the Ministry because they are the ones that give out the hunting quota, and the annual report we provide forms the basis for decisions relating to the quota. This information is also used to inform land use — such as where people will plough fields — because with these data they can see where human-wildlife conflict might be highest.

Lessons Learned in Caprivi

To address the issue of double reporting where two game guards report the same incident that might involve livestock from one village being attacked in another area, we now use the village of origin of the livestock.

The information never leaves the conservancy. If the supporting agency wants information from the event book, they have to make a copy. The original data is always available in the conservancy.

It is important to come up with ways to keep people motivated and engaged. One thing that Caprivi has instituted is a competition with a trophy for the conservancy which best kept its books up to date. If this trophy was to be international, that would really add an incentive to do the best work. We also announce, through the conservation programme on the radio, which conservancies have the best and worst run MOMS, so that there is some accountability to the constituency of each conservancy.

Plenary Discussions

With regard to the hunting quota, it was clarified that the community data is the main source of information used to set the quota, but that there also periodic independent counts done by IRDNC, government and the communities together. Occasionally there are also aerial surveys.

In response to a query about the legal structure of the conservancies, the steps of formation and registration — in the Namibian context — were explained:

1. Communities have to first inform themselves, and show that they are interested in management.
2. Next, they must make contact with their neighbouring communities about what the boundaries for the conservancy can be — and this is often a slow and difficult process.
3. They must then develop a constitution, facilitated by an NGO or the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, which incorporates the expectations of both community members and government.
4. Once they have a legally constituted body, they then apply to the ministry, who must visit the site and verify the boundaries, membership and constitution.
5. If approved, the conservancy is gazetted and a certificate of registration is issued.
6. The conservancy will then be monitored for a couple of years, to ensure they are meeting the constitutional requirements for meetings, finances, etc.
7. Government is therefore involved in whole process.

In terms of community rights to protected areas, it was explained that in Namibia, people are only allowed to form conservancies on communal land, and not in the park — which is state land and
must be managed by the state. In the Namibian system, it is a right to manage resources on communal land that has spread to many communities in the country. There are some people, such as the Khwe, who live in parks. They have formed an association. They do not have the same right to make a conservancy, however, they are getting some rights. Since they don’t have livestock, they have a different way of relating to the park.

Turning to the issue of motivation, it was suggested that while the competition might encourage supervisors, it would have less of an impact at the game guard level. In response, it was said that in fact the game guard do respond to the pressure of publicity, and they do feel part of the responsibility. Because the community pays them, they are accountable to the community and are made to feel like they are embarrassing the community if they don’t perform. Another motivation is simply that if they don’t perform, they get fired. That is why it works in communities – they employ their own guards from money they earn from hunting quotas. Also, the event book itself is proof of how well a guard is working.

In response to a query about game guard selection, it was explained that the community elects them, and they are then monitored by the headman. If they do not perform correctly, they are fired.

Looking at the issue of record-keeping, it was confirmed that anyone could go in and look at the archives in a community. Anyone can make a copy, but no one can physically take the original records away. That is why IRDNC has its green summary book – they make copies of each conservancy’s annual data, and compare it for all the communities they support. It is a copy, and the originals are still archived in each community.

Finally, it was observed that each country has very different conditions. In Malawi the communal areas are so densely populated, there are no wilderness areas and natural resources outside of parks, whereas in Zambia, there are special land use zones – GMAs – that act as buffers between agriculture and the parks, and that is where MOMS is being introduced. In Namibia, while there are no GMA zones, even on the agricultural communal lands there seem to be some resources that people can use. The Namibian examples shots that it is possible to rehabilitate land and to put back natural resources if this is a viable option for a community.

**Enterprise Monitoring in Kasika Conservancy, Namibia**

Reuben Mafati
Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation, Katima Malilo, Namibia

With the success of wildlife monitoring, a logical next step for some conservancies was to look at their viability, and to address the issue that conservancies had to start operating like a business if they were to be successful. Therefore, it became necessary to start monitoring the performance in terms of the three aspects in which conservancies were entering into different business enterprises: JV agreements, hunting, and various community enterprises such as traditional villages, campsites and craft production. In all these areas, the conservancy must be able to come up with profit, and to distribute the profit – without that there is no reason or benefit for members to support the activity.

Before, there were existing lodges in Namibia, but people only benefited from jobs, or by selling firewood – the benefit was on an individual basis, and not as a community. As a result there was some conflict between these private lodges and local communities. Working with IRDNC, different stakeholders were brought together so that contracts and agreements between the conservancy and these external business ventures could be developed. This way, benefits could be returned to the
whole community, such as the payment of percentage of turnover. Apart from these contracts, other ways of strengthening community enterprises have included sending committees to attend training on how to negotiate with JV partners, so that mutual understanding can be reached, and that some community members understand the implications of something like a percentage of turnover – that this is not a fixed or certain amount.

**Enterprise Event Book System**

The approach was to build on and adapt the system being used for natural resources management. It is therefore also an event book system. As with the natural resource event books, there are yellow cards for data collection, and the event book has the same Ten Commandments and calendar. There are different groups of cards relating to hunting, lodges, and community activities. Some of the information captured includes:

- Meetings: records who was there, what was discussed
- JV partner: records its financial performance, turnover, occupancy, etc., and whether percent turnover was paid to the conservancy on time
- JV payments: who collected the money, where was it taken, what was done with it.
- Other JV benefits: any donation from the lodge operator – need to recognize this as well, so be able to show the true value of benefits form each JV partner
- Compliancy: whether each point in the Memorandum of Understanding between the JV partner and the conservancy is being followed
- Hunting: income, compliancy, payments

These data also get compiled onto blue summary charts, and then onto a single annual summary sheet.

**Plenary Discussions**

This innovation to MOMS was greeted with approval, as the system would help with transparency and avoid the mistrust that has undermined JVs in other areas, such as Botswana. It also prompted many detailed questions. On the payment of percentages, it was explained that this went to a single conservancy, and not to several, as each JV partner would enter into a separate agreement with each conservancy. Ideally there would be more than one JV partner in each conservancy, because it was more robust to have several income streams. Once the partner had calculated its nett income for the month, the percent fee would be paid either as a cheque or deposited directly into the bank account. At present, the communities are hiring an enterprise officer, who has a small committee to oversee the enterprise MOMS. The enterprise officer is the one who collates the data.

With regard to whether the chief in an area would benefit from the lodge, it was explained that the place for deciding the chief’s share was not with the lodge, but between the conservancy and the chief. The lodge has the agreement with the conservancy, and it is then up to the conservancy to decide whether the chief gets an extra share, and how much that share should be.

On the enterprise MOMS structure, the intention is to go to the ‘red’ level. The ‘red’ book would stay with the enterprise officer, and at the end of the year, it would be given to the overall conservancy manager – and at that point the information would be added to the chairman’s file. The summary information is used at this senior level, because it is the chairman and conservancy management that tend to be more interested in the longer term trends.
Some Results from Incident Book Monitoring in Parks in Namibia
Greg Stuart-Hill

The introduction of MOMS in the parks was built on the system that had been applied in the conservancies – but used the name Incident Book System rather than Event Book System. As with the communities, the process started with a mind-map to identify modules. The result was a very large number of modules. However, not all are applicable to each park, so each park selects those appropriate to it. The incident books, data-flow posters, registers and storage boxes are all the same as those used in the conservancies. Twelve parks have begun ‘yellow’ level data collection, and of these, ten have progressed to monthly reporting. Since it is early days, the long-term ‘red’ level has yet to be implemented.

Structure of the Incident Book System

The organisational and data flow structure in parks is more complex than in conservancies. Data is first collated at the Station level – and there may be several in one park. This information is then forwarded to the park headquarters level where the monthly charts are prepared. Note that there is therefore an office register level between the event book and the monthly charts. In addition, there are Gate Books, which are sent directly to the park headquarters.

Once the park warden has received the reporting charts from each station, he or she creates a park archive file, a game census file, and a ‘red’ long term reporting file. This information is then sent to the chief warden in Windhoek, where the data is aggregated for all participating parks.

Incident Book Database

A computer database has been set up to keep track of data-flow management and results. The data-flow management monitors which parks are on track, and can pinpoint at exactly what station or level a lagging park is slowing down. The database system automatically generates letters for the directorate to sign that can be sent as reminders or commendations on work well done. The results – which represent the incidents recorded in the park – are used for management decisions.

Examples of Outputs

The park can then use the data to show useful statistics, such as comparing the numbers and origins of tourists at each of the different parks. These statistics can be shown in map form, for a visual representation of where tourists are going, or as bar charts to see the extent to which some parks are attracting more visitors. This information can be expressed monthly, or seasonally, in terms of absolute numbers, or revenue generated. The important point is that there are many different outputs for each single piece of information collected, and the parks are collecting a lot of information.

Lessons Learned

The first lesson is that the parks are using only a fraction of the data collected – there is not need to collect more, enough is already being collected. This leads to the issue of data aggregation, and whether monthly compilation is in fact too often. Perhaps quarterly or annually might be more appropriate.
Parks have a higher failure rate of MOMS than do CBOS. There are also very different reasons why parks fail. Where CBOS fail, this is because their governance structures are not yet ready, or because they are being given the wrong ‘expert’ advice, or because technical and material support is discontinued. These factors do not apply to parks. Instead their challenges come from a structure that is much more complicated. This makes reporting both tedious and difficult. Also, parks have to deal with a high turnover – which hopefully will be less of a problem when MOMS training becomes institutionalised in training institutes.

Parks also have to deal with the ‘civil service’ mentality, in some cases even at senior levels. Some employees are interested in only doing the bare minimum to retain their positions. There is a perception that this is extra work. Also, at higher levels, some staff members find themselves too “clever” for such a simple “system”, or management may simply be negative about monitoring.

**Concerns**

The sustainability of the system relies on the annual provision of materials (books and chart templates). However, this is solvable because park authorities are in a position to take advantage of mass production of modules.

The demand for support in the field currently exceeds technical capacity – there are not enough people to advise at the moment. This means that the technical people take short cuts, and tell people what to do, instead of advising and guiding them. They may pull out their support too soon as their attention is demanded elsewhere.

There is also a related threat that the system will be hijacked by scientists, who impose their data interests on the local level managers, and mine the data for their own purposes, instead of ensuring it is relevant to park management.

At the same time as people may trivialize the MOMS approach as being unscientific or too easy, there is also a perception that MOMS is too complex. It is very important that the task is broken down into manageable chunks, and it is implemented gradually.

There is also a tendency to drift into unnecessary complexity, where data are collected because they might be interesting. As noted above, the amount of information already being collected is already overwhelming.

**The Value of MOMS**

It is important to realise that the data collected from a MOMS is only 50% of its value. The data do give improved understanding, allow local decision-making, provide transparency and improved credibility, and foster compliance, lobbying and interaction with stakeholders. However, the system also – and equally importantly – builds management systems. It provides motivation, a clear understanding of job descriptions, tools for staff to do their work, and it prompts staff to get on with their tasks (because they have to record things), and it is a great staff performance monitoring tool.

**Plenary Discussions**

It was noted that while the uninitiated may think they can take the system and apply it, it is not always an easy task. Where people don’t bother to learn it properly and it fails, this undermines the
overall success of MOMS in the region. It is important to make sure that people understand what a full-time effort this is – not only at the implementation level, but also at the national level.

**MOMS in Tanzania: Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park and Simanjiro Plains, Tarangire**

Greg Stuart-Hill on behalf of
Dave Reynolds
Marine Parks Authority, Tanzania
Charles Foley and Ismail Sadi
Wildlife Conservation Society, Tanzania

*Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park*

Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary is a national park around a river delta, just on Tanzanian border with Mozambique. It includes several different habitats – marine, estuarine, river and terrestrial. Because of its location and resources, it must accommodate issues such as community-based natural resources management, gas mining, tourism and international borders.

**Implementation of MOMS**

The process was started with a mind-map, which led to the identification of six core areas for monitoring: park development, governance, law enforcement and licensing, socio-economic development, conservation, and threats. Within each of these modules several issues were identified, leading to a need to prioritize for monitoring (see Figure 7).

![Mind-map of Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park](image)

**Figure 7:** Section of the Mnazi Bay – Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park mind-map, showing ranked prioritization for monitoring of issues under the conservation module.

*Proceedings of 1st regional MOMS mini-conference, Kasane, Botswana, 3-5 December 2007*
The next step was to identify and map the structure of data-flows. Importantly, with so many tasks in such different modules, it was necessary to identify several different categories of data, and then to allocate the twelve different modules to different stakeholder groups for monitoring.

The impact of monitoring is obvious from the fact that within 6 months of monitoring, 3 coelacanths were recorded as bycatch! Even after a short implementation period, gate statistics are beginning to show the patterns of the tourist season.

As with Namibia, this is a park with different stations, needing an intermediate stage of data aggregation for monthly park totals, so that the park warden receives compiled data from each station.

Lessons Learned

Local level monitoring captures information (e.g. the coelacanth) that scientists might otherwise miss. With proper planning and support, it is possible to implement and operationalise a complex system very quickly. By distributing at least one module to each of the sectors, it was possible to involve everyone immediately, and so build a sense of involvement.

Although it is too easy to talk in terms of success or failure, one concern is that the local MOMS ‘champion’ has left and not been replaced, which threatens the sustainability of the project. However, national interest has spread, and Marine Protection Authority is interested in extending the system to all its protected areas. Some smaller concerns involve controlling for survey effort, and simplifying the fish catch monitoring so that key species only are recorded.

Simanjiro Plains, Tarangire

Simanjiro Plains are surrounded by four major parks: Gorongoza Crater, Meru, Kilimanjaro and Tarangire. The grassy plains on are important breeding grounds for migratory herds of wildlife. However, this area is being encroached on by crop farmers who are invading Masai lands. Trophy hunters are paying the local communities compensation to farmers that limit their field area, and so create a wildlife easement.

MOMS in the Simanjiro Wildlife Easement Area

Meetings with the community in the area led to the identification of their monitoring needs, and the development of the mind-map for the wildlife easement. Community game scouts have been hired to start data collection on the different modules. One innovation was the development of an annual work plan. In this area, people were having to do different things at different times of year, which was confusing in terms of setting up schedules for monitoring. A work calendar helped clarify this.

Lessons Learned

Again, it is too early to assess successes and failures. Can the enthusiasm generated when monitoring first starts be maintained? However, so important lessons were learned. Illiteracy was overcome by using icons instead of words. Importantly, there are clear patterns throughout the region in terms of the issues that emerge from the mind-map exercise. It is very important for technical staff who have seen similar issues arise elsewhere to resist the urge to fast-track and give
the answers. The participants must identify the key issues themselves if they are to see the systems as theirs.

**Starting MOMS in Zimbabwe**

Abel Khumalo  

Currently, Zimbabwe does not yet have a MOMS. At the moment there is an existing system of collecting information, based on similar monitoring tools, that has been developed mainly for communities participating in CAMPFIRE. The aims are the same – to provide local level managers with information for decision-making. Currently monitoring is done using several forms, such as the hunting return form, and the problem animal return form.

Under the existing systems, data are being collected at the local level, but these are not consolidated. For the most part, the data focuses on the wildlife sector. For example, ground counts are transect surveys are conducted, problem animal control data are recorded, trophy quality is recorded, as is the origin of wildlife products such as ivory. There is also a fire management programme within the national parks and forestry areas. Some areas, such as Masoka in Mbire, are more committed to fulfilling their monitoring activities, in part because their trophy quality data is used to help set the hunting quota.

**Initiating MOMS**

This year, a national MOMS working group was re-constituted. The aim of the working group is to design, develop and facilitate the implementation of a monitoring approach and materials appropriate for the country. The group comprises people from a range of different government agencies and NGOs: Parks and Wildlife Management Authority, Institute of Environmental Studies, Environmental Management Agency, Rural District Councils (Nyaminamy, Beitbridge, Chiredzi, Guruve), Forestry Commission, Agricultural and Research Extension Services and WWF.

Currently, the working group has a workplan, but implementation is not yet running smoothly. Four pilot sites (Mbire, Nyaminamy, Beitbridge and Chiredzi) for switching over to MOMS have been identified, and the system should be implemented in these areas in the coming year.

The working group has attended meetings (e.g. to constitute the Regional CBNRM Working Group) and has participated in exchange visits to Caprivi. There has been an initial review of data collection tools, and some MOMS materials have been prepared for the site managers.

Because MOMS will be implemented in CAMPFIRE areas, and building on an existing monitoring system, the participants at a CAMPFIRE Coordinators Workshop identified a preliminary list of monitoring data requirements:

- CBNRM revenue
- PAC statistics
- Poaching data
- Hunting data
- Demographic data – people, households, animals
- Social benefits from CBNRM

These topics could potentially be developed into the monitoring modules. Note that these include not only natural resources use, but also some social aspects. These would need to be reviewed in
the context of each pilot site, and after three months of implementation, it would be necessary to look at refining the materials. Some funding for implementation of this pilot phase has been secured.

Challenges

One of the key challenges is that although some funding has been secured, this is inadequate for the proposed working group activities. We need to raise awareness on MOMS within the target communities to get their ‘buy-in’, yet at the same time we want to avoid a top-down approach, so that a sense of ownership amongst local level managers can be instilled.

Conclusions

There is not only the potential for establishing MOMS in Zimbabwe, but also a need, as reflected by lack of up-to-date monitoring data. A dedicated MOMS champion may be key to the whole process. For MOMS to be accepted, we need to demonstrate the link between efficient management and higher benefits for stakeholders, and that monitoring is the key to efficient management. More cooperation and commitment is needed all round – from different rural development committees and other organisations, to the MOMS working group members themselves.

Plenary Discussions

The focus of the discussion was how it appeared that the modules for monitoring were not being developed by the community as a result of a mind-mapping exercise, but were being decided by the CAMPFIRE association. There is a danger where governments and donors try to sell an idea to the community, instead of having the communities ask for it. The concern is that if the communities are the ones collecting data, but no data stays with them and goes instead to CAMPFIRE, people would have no interest in supporting it. In clarification, it was noted that in fact community members were at that moment on an exchange visit to Kasika to see what MOMS was and whether it could benefit them. In addition, the role of CAMPFIRE and the level of decision-making could itself be seen as the local level, since the association was the level at which some aspects of the monitoring would be done. Although this is perhaps too central a level, CAMPFIRE is currently experiencing a transition, whereby they are becoming the reporting agency, instead of some external donor, so the whole process is ultimately intended to be devolved.

It was noted that for both Zimbabwe and Malawi, the selected pilot sites had a high chance of success because all of the communities were at the forefront of CBNRM, and that they would be most receptive to implementing monitoring systems.

It was recommended that the development of the ‘yellow’ datasheets be done with the ‘blue’ analysis sheets in mind. These would serve as a guide for which pieces of information to collect. On the financial side, it was pointed out that it was important to consider the cash-book as the ‘yellow’ level. This means that totals of trophy fees, etc. would be summary level information. The ‘yellow’ level is the EVENT level, which is where the name Event Book comes from.
SUMMARY OF KEY POINTS - COMMON THREADS FROM ACROSS THE REGION

Key points arising from the country presentations and plenary discussions fell into three main categories – challenges to the successful implementation of MOMS, lessons learned, and successes and benefits. These are summarized below.

Challenges

One of the key threats to the sustainability of monitoring systems in almost all cases is the high mobility and consequent turnover of people filling key roles. In parks and other national protected areas, some of this turnover is involuntary, because some government agencies have a policy of transferring people from place to place. In communities, people who have received training may look for better opportunities elsewhere. In addition, in some communities, monitoring staff may also be elected, and at the end of term may have to move out of their support role.

At tourist lodges, staff members tasked with collecting data, such as guides or diver-masters, often have only short-term contracts. Even at national level, “champions” who are working to raise support for MOMS may leave to another department or agency.

If technical support ends too early, this is a high-risk moment. Funding might run out – and monitoring materials will therefore not be available. Sufficient training may not yet be in place, and funds to pay staff may not yet be available from other sources.

Because MOMS is a paper-based system where records and reports are rigorously maintained at set intervals, the continued implementation depends on the regular provision of materials. The challenge is in part financial, but in addition many of the places where MOMS are implemented are remote, and transport issues can delay the timely delivery of forms.

There is still a strong misperception of what a MOMS is – particularly on the part of outside technical people. Many people still think of natural resources monitoring as something that is done for the sake of scientific research. This leads them to question the kinds of information being collected, because they don’t have a full understanding of how each piece of information is collected in response to a specific management need.

Another challenge is selecting an appropriate number of modules for the system. This is especially difficult in the beginning where people identify things to monitor. There is a need for patience, as more modules can always be added later once the managers have a better idea of how much effort is required for each module. For example, if there are enough people or teams available, more modules can be implemented. In some cases, having different environments (e.g. terrestrial and marine) or sectors (wildlife and craft production) may need separate modules. A related issue is that there is a tendency to collect too much data in each module.

Some communities or parks starting a MOMS will have inherited a legacy of methods and approaches from a previous monitoring system, and will need to find ways of integrating the two systems.

Many parks and community resource areas often cover large areas, and the size of these areas presents a challenge. There may be several people collecting the same data at different locations, and big distances make it hard for people to meet regularly. This can cause problems where trying
to summarise information and collate it to the higher (e.g. monthly “blue” or annual “red”) levels. People become overwhelmed, and therefore demoralised, and lose motivation.

**Trying to aggregate at the higher levels too often (e.g. monthly) becomes complicated.** Monthly data aggregation and reporting is hard to keep on top of, especially if there are many modules, or where there are several locations contributing data to the same module.

**It is often hard to win the trust and support of the constituency.** In part because information has always been extracted for analysis and decision-making by outsiders (or higher echelon staff in the case of parks), people living and working in the area may not trust the motives of the MOMS team. In some instances, it is the community leaders or area managers who may not see the value of the information, and have to be convinced that it is a useful expense. However, it is also ordinary community members who may fear that the information could be used to deny them access to resources they need.

An on-going challenge is **keeping staff motivated and committed.** The first issue is the recruitment of committed staff, where a candidate might appear to exhibit the desired qualities during the job interview, but fail to live up to expectations. Even with the correct team, it is critical to build a sense of purpose, ownership, and therefore commitment and discipline. In some cases it is poor leadership that leads to field workers becoming demotivated. In park areas, an added issue is that the government system does not reward motivation. Finally, in some cases there is a lack of accountability, where staff members are not made to feel responsible to their constituency for carrying out their work correctly.

In some areas, the recording of the information may be challenged by **multiple languages and low literacy rates.**

The quality of a MOMS depends in large part on its **sampling effort.** But in large areas, the distances and time required can challenge this. Some agencies do not have the resources needed for their staff to move through the area. In certain locations, conditions are harsh or dangerous, or both.

Importantly, MOMS in parks and communities are different. **Parks are far more complicated, and it takes far more effort to implement their MOMS.** Parks require more complicated reporting, more frequent reporting, and even more reporting levels – because park authorities tend to have a more complex organizational structure. In addition, parks tend to have a high staff turnover rate, and there are difficulties associated with motivation and discipline in government staff. In some places, this latter point is because local level park staff don’t get to use the data they collect.

**Lessons Learned**

In order to secure **continuity of skills** while faced with high staff turn-over, national park authorities can institutionalise the training of MOMS for government staff. In communities, training to staff can be given on the understanding (e.g. stated in employment contract) they will commit to staying in the job for a stated period of time.

It is important – and possible – to **find ways to break up the task.** For example, this can be done by identifying zones (either by ecosystem or geographic location), specific tasks for different collectors, or sectors (crafts, tourism, wildlife, etc.). Dataflow diagrams are useful ways to identify how best to do this in each area.
Modules should be selected with a fine balance between brainstorming, community needs and wants, and technical advice. This will ensure that the community or park management team can select what is important to it, while being guided by the experience of others who may know what is practicable.

There are many innovative ways to provide motivation. For example, a sense of pride can be instilled through competition between collectors, or even between neighbouring communities or parks. Caps, T-shirts, bags, and certification give sense of identity. Job security should depend on performance. Support agencies and managers need to plan ahead and make sure materials are always there on time. Decisions must be made as a team, not only by the leader.

Having the example of a successful neighbouring community/agency can inspire team members. It is important that both the team, and the larger community, be aware of the benefits of the MOMS, whether this is the larger goal of resource sustainability, or the immediate rewards such as access to information and job creation. The provision of rewards (e.g. providing certificates, bonus system, exchange trips, public acknowledgement) will also encourage workers to remain committed and disciplined.

Some level of government involvement or support is critical. Government agencies can help spread ideas. Energetic people in government can act as “champions” who promote the idea of MOMS. Government is a potential source of reliable, ongoing technical support, and can serve as a coordinator across different areas.

The nature of the link between Research Monitoring and MOMS is critical. Researchers need to be available to provide technical support to MOMS teams, but MOMS must retain its identity as management-orientated.

**Successes and Benefits**

In communities, people are enthusiastic about taking responsibility for their resources. They like the sense of control and sense of ownership that comes from both the knowledge, and the act of monitoring itself.

MOMS has helped to build a sense of trust between communities and outside agencies. This is in part because it allows communities to feel more on an equal footing.

MOMS more clearly defines more clearly the roles of community game guards and escort guides.

People are becoming more aware of what is happening with their resources. Not only do they have increased knowledge, but the permanent records allow people to see longer-term trends for themselves. People are empowered, because they can use this knowledge to negotiate with business partners or government agencies.

Data are always easily available and are being used at different levels, from communities, to tour operators, parks managers and national agencies.

Data are secure. Because the only way the data can leave the local level community or park is by being copied, the system ensures that the information can always be located.
MOMS provides a standardised method of data collection. This makes it easier to see what is happening with long-term trends, and can allow comparison between different locations.

The system has a low cost relative to large amount of information collected. The pen-and-paper system is cost-effective, and does not require continual technological upgrading. In addition, if modules are selected for use in several areas, mass-producing standardised sheets further reduces printing expenses.

MOMS has spread throughout the region! There is a high demand for the system. Not only have communities chosen to use MOMS for ventures and activities other than wildlife, but it is now being used in different environments, such as marine and agricultural systems. Neighbouring communities hear about MOMS and want to take part. Government agencies want to increase the number of parks using MOMS. More and more countries are finding it a useful approach, introducing the potential for regional analyses and comparisons.

![MOMS Sites in southern Africa](image)

**Figure 8:** Graph showing change in the number of MOMS sites by country and sector across the region
THE WAY FORWARD – NEEDS ASSESSMENTS AND WORK PLANS

Botswana – Protected Area and Community Area Activities
Binah Seretse, Cosmos Rathipana, Malebogo Sentsho, Leatile Setilo, Justin Soopu and Score Kasale

Botswana has MOMS in both state protected areas and community managed areas, and intends to build on these by adding new sites, as well as by strengthening existing activities and increasing national level support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reporting workshop – awareness raising for Director, ADs and DWCs</td>
<td>Botswana MOMS team, Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>mid-Feb 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Obtaining equipment and materials for a MOMS coordination office</td>
<td>Botswana MOMS team</td>
<td>Mar 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Roll-out MOMS to two more protected areas and four more CBOs (2 Chobe, 2 Ngamiland)</td>
<td>Botswana MOMS team</td>
<td>Apr 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Development of national database(s) for both parks and CBOs, by modifying that in place in Namibia</td>
<td>Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Jan 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Design a system of information flow</td>
<td>Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Jan 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Training of MOMS coordination office in module design</td>
<td>Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Jan 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. National conference for MOMS coordinators</td>
<td>Botswana MOMS team</td>
<td>Oct 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Follow-up support visits to Protected areas and CBOs involved in MOMS</td>
<td>Botswana MOMS team</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Botswana – Integrated Veld Products Activities at Struisendam
Debbie Gibson

Implementation of a MOMS in the farming community at Struisendam has recently begun, and data collection is in its initial stages. Because the initial introduction happened in a very short period, immediate follow-up and support is vital to ensure that the farmers have sufficient training and resources to continue with their activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consolidation of Yellow Level training</td>
<td>Independent consultants</td>
<td>Jan 08</td>
<td>Activities 1&amp;2 to be carried out on same visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Further introduction to Blue Level</td>
<td>Independent consultants</td>
<td>Jan 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Follow-up support visit</td>
<td>Independent consultants</td>
<td>Mar 08</td>
<td>While monthly visits would be preferable, distances and costs are prohibitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Follow-up support visit</td>
<td>Independent consultants</td>
<td>May 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provision of Blue Level materials, and finalisation of training at Blue Level</td>
<td>Independent consultants? With support from Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Jul 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Renewal of all materials, and follow-up support visit</td>
<td>Independent consultants? With support from Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Nov 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Malawi – Pilot Sites with Community-Based Organizations
Jamestone Kamwendo

MOMS is only now being initiated in Malawi, and the planned activities therefore relate to implementation which will initially be done at pilot sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sensitization workshop to create MOMS awareness among stakeholders</td>
<td>Malawian MOMS technical support &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Jan 08</td>
<td>20 people from support organizations to attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Field visit and mind-mapping exercise with CBO to identify modules</td>
<td>Pilot communities, Malawian MOMS team &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Feb-Apr 08</td>
<td>Activities 2, 3 &amp; 4 to be done simultaneously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop and prepare materials for models</td>
<td>Malawian MOMS technical support &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Feb-Apr 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training of CBO members in MOMS data collection</td>
<td>Malawian MOMS technical support &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Feb-Apr 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Review modules</td>
<td>Malawian MOMS technical support &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>May 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Introduce Blue Level data collation</td>
<td>Malawian MOMS technical support &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>May 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assess and guide data collection activities</td>
<td>Malawian MOMS technical support</td>
<td>monthly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Begin introducing MOMS in other sites</td>
<td>Malawian MOMS technical support</td>
<td>Jun-Nov 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. End-of-year assessment</td>
<td>Malawian MOMS technical support &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Dec 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mozambique – National Consolidation
Alice Costa, Agostinho Jorge and Maria Cidalia

Since MOMS is already quite well-represented in the country, the focus in Mozambique over the next year is consolidation, and defining how the national structure will look. The timing of various activities is scheduled to fit in with an existing protected areas work plan, so that park representatives are most likely to be present.

| Objective 1: Technical support for institutionalization of MOMS in Mozambique |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| **Activity** | **Responsible Parties** | **Timeframe** | **Output and Results** |
| 1. Identification of the focal point at Ministry of Tourism and provincial level | Ministry of Tourism | Feb 08 | National and provincial coordinators selected. Functional reporting system. Better communication between different stakeholders |
| 2. National MOMS workshop | Ministry of Tourism, Regional CBNRM Forum, Regional MOMS Working Group | May 08 | National MOMS functional structure defined. Key stakeholders from different sites involved. |
| 3. National MOMS workshop | Ministry of Tourism, Regional CBNRM Forum, Regional MOMS Working Group | Nov 08 | Workshop to present the annual results. Results of all MOMS sites presented at national and community level |

| Objective 2. MOMS Consolidation and expanding to new areas |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| **Activity** | **Responsible Parties** | **Timeframe** | **Output and Results** |
| 4. Training of trainers in MOMS sites and new sites | Regional CBNRM Forum, Ministry of Tourism | At request of each site | At least three to four people trained on each MOMS site. One national and provincial coordinator trained. |
| 5. Introduction of MOMS in the scouts training curriculum at Gorongosa Training Centre | Ministry of Tourism, Regional CBNRM Forum, Regional MOMS Working Group | May-Sep 08 | All the scouts from Protected Areas trained in MOMS |

| Objective 3. Material Production |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| **Activity** | **Responsible Parties** | **Timeframe** | **Output and Results** |
| 6. Preparation of module materials | Ministry of Tourism, Regional CBNRM Forum, Regional MOMS Working Group | Jan-Feb 08 | MOMS books available for all sites. Data available in all sites. |
| 7. Production of the annual country report | Ministry of Tourism | Dec 08 | Annual report for country available. Dissemination of MOMS data in different stakeholders and key decision makers. |
Namibia: Kasika Conservancy
James Maiba and Beavan Munali

Since the MOMS in Kasika is already mature, and working at the Red Level, the focus is on how to sustain activities, and move them forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Training of all staff at all levels, so that cross-sector support in place and for continuity</td>
<td>Beavan Munali, James Maiba</td>
<td>Feb 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ongoing meetings with all stakeholders</td>
<td>James Maiba, Beavan Munali</td>
<td>Mar 08</td>
<td>Activities 2, 3 &amp; 4 to occur at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Financial support for consultants</td>
<td>David Ward?</td>
<td>Mar 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Auditing and materials</td>
<td>David Ward?</td>
<td>Mar 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Logistics support needed - fuel, transport, materials</td>
<td>Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Ongoing, annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Introduce Green Level books to integrate the data from the 3 different sectors: Natural Resources Management, Institutional Support and Enterprise</td>
<td>Regional MOMS Working Group, Botswana DWNP Community Extension and Outreach</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>In the same way that the IDRNC Green Book brings together data from all conservancies, data from the three sectors being monitored should be brought together annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zambia – West Zambezi Game Management Area, Sioma-Ngwezi, and Nation-wide Activities
Patricia Chihela Kalipa, James Maiba and Beavan Munali

Western Zambezi GMA: Although MOMS have been used at different sites in Zambia for a couple of years, it is only now being initiated in the West Zambezi GMA is, so this site’s planned activities for next year are related to initial implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify sites – as starting sites (pilots)</td>
<td>Patricia Chihela Kalipa, &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Feb 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Field visit &amp; mind mapping</td>
<td>Patricia Chihela Kalipa, local team, traditional leaders and CRB chairs &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>March 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop modules (balancing local needs and standardisation)</td>
<td>Patricia Chihela Kalipa, Charles Phiri &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>March 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Modules brought to community for agreement / final selection</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>April 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. raining of scouts in data collection</td>
<td>Patricia Chihela Kalipa, &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>April 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Modules brought to community for agreement / final selection</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>April 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Training of scouts in data collection</td>
<td>Patricia Chihela Kalipa, &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>April 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supporting group through monthly check up</td>
<td>Patricia Chihela Kalipa</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Annual review</td>
<td>Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Nov 08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zambian Nation-wide MOMS Activities: At a broader level, MOMS in Zambia has some experienced some challenges to its sustainability, and plans to revitalize this are therefore also envisaged. This requires input from the Regional MOMS Working Group. The addition of the Zambezi West GMA can be used as a way of rekindling activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. State of the MOMS report</td>
<td>Zambian MOMS team &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Feb 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development of action plan</td>
<td>Zambian MOMS team &amp; Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Feb 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Link Zambezi West GMA to national MOMS activities</td>
<td>Patricia Chihela Kalipa and Zambian MOMS team</td>
<td>Feb 08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zimbabwe – CAMPFIRE Program
Abel Khumalo

Because MOMS is only now being introduced in Zimbabwe, the short-term requirements represent the first steps in implementation in the four pilot study sites. Both funding and technical support are needed for the coming year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mind mapping in one selected site – Masoka: Zimbabwean MOMS team learn from exercise and will implement mind mapping in other proposed MOMS sites</td>
<td>Technical assistance from Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>By Feb 08</td>
<td>Need $ for meeting and TA travel and accommodation Combine activities 1&amp;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training of Zimbabwean MOMS team, especially full-time technical support officer</td>
<td>Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Feb 08</td>
<td>$ for training course(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop draft modules and produce materials (forms)</td>
<td>Regional MOMS Working Group / Zimbabwean MOMS team</td>
<td>By mid-March 08</td>
<td>$ for stationery. To include $ for “uniforms”/ badges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recruiting of data collectors</td>
<td>Zimbabwean MOMS team</td>
<td>By end March 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initial implementation/ yellow stage</td>
<td>Zimbabwean MOMS team, but support required from Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>May 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Review and refinement of modules</td>
<td>Zimbabwean MOMS team/ Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>June 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwork for introduction of blue level in Masoka. Stakeholders meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mind mapping in 3 other pilot sites – Chiredzi, Beitbridge, Nyaminymi</td>
<td>Zimbabwean MOMS team</td>
<td>July 08</td>
<td>$ for 3 community meetings/travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Monthly follow up visits to site(s)</td>
<td>Zimbabwean MOMS technical support officer / CAMPFIRE Programme Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. End of year review or audit</td>
<td>Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Activities

Regional support for MOMS in the different countries requires that plans be made at the regional level as well. Communication and networking to facilitate the exchange of ideas is central to the plans at this level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Next conference – sharing ideas and lessons learned</td>
<td>As for 2007</td>
<td>Nov/Dec 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outreach from existing Regional MOMS Working Group to local level participating groups. Awareness raising – opening channels for communication so that people in the field are not left behind</td>
<td>Binah Seretse, Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Early Feb 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop clearer operational strategy for Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Binah Seretse, Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Early Feb 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Formation of executive team for Regional MOMS Working Group??</td>
<td>Binah Seretse, Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>Early Feb 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identification of national contact persons</td>
<td>Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Developing a draft curriculum for integrating MOMS in courses at governments’ protected area training institutes</td>
<td>Regional Training Working Sub-Group and Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training of trainers for teaching MOMS at governments’ protected area training institutes</td>
<td>Regional Training Working Sub-Group and Regional MOMS Working Group</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Office number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Cassidy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cassidy@ufld.edu">cassidy@ufld.edu</a></td>
<td>+267 6861255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Chihela Kalipa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Cidalia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cida72cida@yahoo.com.br">cida72cida@yahoo.com.br</a></td>
<td>+258 21 303633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Costa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adabulacosta@wwf.org.mz">adabulacosta@wwf.org.mz</a></td>
<td>+258 21 483121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Gibson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:deb-col@iafrica.com.na">deb-col@iafrica.com.na</a></td>
<td>+264 61 264685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Goredema</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LGoredema@wwfsarpo.org">LGoredema@wwfsarpo.org</a></td>
<td>+263 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>252533/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agostinho Jorge</td>
<td>sgdrn.map@tv cabo.co.mz</td>
<td>+258 21 499925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestone Kamwendo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jkamwendo3@yahoo.co.uk">jkamwendo3@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>+265 1525388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score Kasale</td>
<td><a href="mailto:santawanistmt@botsnet.bw">santawanistmt@botsnet.bw</a></td>
<td>+267 6800664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel Khumalo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MKhumalo@wwfsarpo.org">MKhumalo@wwfsarpo.org</a></td>
<td>+263 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>252533/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Office number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuben Mafati</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmafati@iway.na">rmafati@iway.na</a> or c/o <a href="mailto:rwdiggle@iway.na">rwdiggle@iway.na</a></td>
<td>+264 66 252518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Maiba</td>
<td>c/o <a href="mailto:rwdiggle@iway.na">rwdiggle@iway.na</a></td>
<td>+264 66 252666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey Mitti</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GMitti@wwfcsarlo.org">GMitti@wwfcsarlo.org</a></td>
<td>+263 4 252533/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Mosugelo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmosugelo@gov.bw">dmosugelo@gov.bw</a></td>
<td>+267 6250486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaven Munali</td>
<td><a href="mailto:beavenmunali@ko.uk">beavenmunali@ko.uk</a> or c/o <a href="mailto:rwdiggle@iway.na">rwdiggle@iway.na</a></td>
<td>+264 66 252666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmos Rathipana</td>
<td><a href="mailto:crathipana@yahoo.co.uk">crathipana@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>+267 6860368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malebogo Sentsho</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m_sentsho@yahoo.com">m_sentsho@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+267 6860368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binah Seretse</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bseretse@yahoo.com">bseretse@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+267 6596323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leatile Setilo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lsetilo@gov.bw">lsetilo@gov.bw</a></td>
<td>+267 6250486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Soopu</td>
<td></td>
<td>+267 5920349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Stuart-Hill</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gstuart@wwflife.org">gstuart@wwflife.org</a></td>
<td>+264 61 239945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9: Conference participants pose for a group photograph

Figure 10: Traditional dancers welcome participants on the field visit to Kasika Conservancy