



ASSESSMENT OF EXPERIENCES WITH PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES IN CBNRM

**INTERNAL REPORT 17
APRIL 2003**



Community
Partnerships for
Sustainable
Resource
Management in
Malawi

ASSESSMENT OF EXPERIENCES WITH PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES IN CBNRM

Prepared by:

C.A.P.S. Msukwa & Dian Seslar Svendsen (Consultants)

**Development Alternatives, Inc.
7250 Woodmont Ave., Suite 200
Bethesda, MD 20814
USA**

**Tel: 301-718-8699
Fax: 301-718-7968
e-mail: dai@dai.com**

**Malawi.com
*In association with:***

**Development Management Associates
Lilongwe**

**COMPASS
Phekani House
Glyn Jones Road
Private Bag 263
Blantyre
Malawi**

**Telephone & Fax: 622-800
Internet: <http://www.COMPASS->**

**USAID Contract: 690-C-00-99-00116-00
Activity: 612-0248**

Table of Contents

Acronyms.....	ii
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Purpose of Assessment.....	2
2. Process.....	2
3. Findings.....	3
3.1 Types of Participatory Approaches Used.....	3
Some observations on Terminology.....	3
3.2 Impacts of the Participatory Approaches.....	4
3.3 Advice to Practitioners of Participatory Approaches.....	5
3.4 Hopes for the Future.....	6
4. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	6
Annex 1: Interview Guidelines for COMPASS Partners.....	8
Annex II: Interview Guidelines for CBO Partners.....	9
Annex III: Persons and Groups Contacted.....	10
COMPASS Publications.....	13

Acronyms

ADP	Area Development Programme
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resource Management
CBO	Community Based Organisation
COMPASS	Community Partnership for Sustainable Resource Management in Malawi
CRECOM	Creative Centre for Community Mobilisation
CSC	Christian Service Committee
ELDP	Evangelical Lutheran Development Programme
GRAAP	Groupe de Recherche et d'Appui pour l'Autopromotion des Populations
IEF	International Eye Foundation
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NICE	National Initiative for Civic Education
NRM	Natural Resource Management
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
TSPP	Training Support Programme for Partners
WESM	Wildlife and Environmental Society of Malawi
WVI	World Vision International

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) has been widely used in Malawi by both government and non-governmental organizations for community mobilization and project identification particularly in the health, education and agriculture sectors. Within the natural resource management sector, however, it has been used to a limited extent by the NGOs like as the Wildlife and Environmental Society of Malawi (WESM), and Government Departments of Forestry, Fisheries and National Parks and Wildlife.

Whilst PRA has yielded some results in some communities such as Chiling'oma, (*COMPASS document 32: Example of CBNRM Best Practices in Malawi*), there is increasing scepticism that the approach has had some negative results in other communities.

It has been observed that sometimes PRA has been used to identify and rank community problems and needs without critically looking at existing opportunities for dealing with the problems within the community itself. This has raised community expectations and left them in despair, further strengthening the communities' dependence on donor support.

Besides, the intervening organisations have often provided support to communities to address or partially address the problems of their interest or within their sectors. This has left the communities stranded with many problems and issues that are not attended to.

PRA results have sometimes been manipulated to suit the government departments and NGOs' agenda. Some of these organisations have been concentrating on issues that are not priority to the community; as a result there has been a lack of ownership by the communities of any projects initiated thereafter. A classical example is a situation where an NGO writes a proposal and seeks donor funding. When donor funding is acquired, the NGOs goes to the target community to facilitate a PRA exercise. Regardless of the results of the PRA, all the decisions made on the utilisation of donor funds are based on the prior agreements between the donor and NGO and not on communities needs expressed in the PRA results.

While PRA as an approach is still valid, experiences from COMPASS, and partners involved in natural resource management (NRM) reveal that many items in the PRA tool kit are not being used well in Malawi particularly in the natural resources sector. For any progress to be made within this sector, there is need for communities to be encouraged to identify opportunities that exist in their village; initiated development processes that build on communities' achievements, strengths, local skills and resources. The focus of COMPASS is on encouraging communities to look at what human and natural resources they already possess and how these can be used to induce development activities that can benefit the community as a whole.

It is therefore obligatory for COMPASS and partners to revisit the PRA approaches currently being practised within the natural resource sector in Malawi by

incorporating the new participatory tool kits that are being developed elsewhere in the developing world to improve its use in NRM. It is believed that introduction of approaches such as the Appreciative Inquiry may afford the community increased awareness of their own successes, strengths, and rights. This would contribute to decreasing the current donor dependency, and encourage self-sufficiency and sustainable development.

Based on this background COMPASS commissioned a consultancy to develop and implement a training course focusing on assets-based approaches. The consultancy work had three key tasks:

- To assess the current participatory approaches being used and the capacities of key NGOs and government departments in the NRM sector to train their own staff and others in the use of community mobilisation techniques.
- To develop a curriculum for trainers in community mobilisation and materials for practitioners to use in the field.
- To facilitate a training of trainers course for representatives of the key COMPASS partner organisations.

This document presents the findings of the assessment of the participatory approaches being used by COMPASS partner organisations obtained from interviews and discussions with COMPASS partners and beneficiary communities.

1.2. Purpose of the Assessment

The assessment was organised to allow the consultants learn more about the experiences the COMPASS partners and community based organisations have had with using participatory approaches, PRA in particular. The results of this assessment would form the basis for developing and adopting more appropriate participatory tools for mobilising community to participate and take charge of their own development processes within their resource base.

2. Process

The consultants conducted discussions and interviews with a wide range of COMPASS partners. (See Annex III for a list of persons interviewed).

The consultants also conducted discussions with two communities that have benefited from the COMPASS Small Grants programme, Chiling'oma in Rumphu and Kayezi in Mzimba.

Throughout the process of interviews and discussions, the consultants used an appreciate process. (See Annex I and II). They then analysed the findings.

3. Findings

3.1 Types of Participatory Approaches Used

The COMPASS partners use a wide range of problem centred participatory tools. From the results of the interviews and discussions with both the partners and community members, it is very difficult to clearly define an approach used by a specific partner. In broad terms the participatory approaches could be categorised as follows:

- a) The majority of the NGOs indicated that they use the PRA approach, particularly tools including the transect walks problem, tree analysis, Venn diagrams, matrix scoring, pair-wise ranking, social maps, resource maps, pie charts, seasonal calendars, wealth ranking, institutional mapping and semi structured interviews. The majority of the NGOs indicated that they use this approach. The government departments on the other hand, have used PRA to a limited extent mostly focusing in areas where specific donor funded projects are being implemented.
- b) Some of the partners have used a combination of participatory approaches such participatory technical development, training for transformation, GRAAP and PRA.
- c) Others use general participatory approaches with a wide mix of tools such as brainstorming, drama and role plays, songs, case studies, demonstrations, living with the community to collect relevant issues at hand and conducting participatory drama, question and answer sessions, fact finding focusing on problem analysis.

Some Observations on Terminology

The consultants noted that there is confusion on the terminology used for participatory approaches.

- ◇ Some of the people consulted used the term 'PRA' interchangeably with 'participatory approaches'.
- ◇ The combinations of participatory tools that were termed PRA were variable; some used a wide range of tools whilst others picked a few participatory tools of their interest. In both cases the approach could be termed 'PRA'.
- ◇ It was generally observed that very few people consulted could clearly articulate the difference between 'PRA' and 'participatory approaches'.

For example, the two communities consulted had different understanding of the participatory approaches in which they were involved. One community could clearly say that they were involved with PRA and were able to recall some of the tools used such as resource mapping and historical trends. The other community had difficulties to describe the type of participatory approaches they were involved in. They described the approach as a problem analysis exercise whilst the NGO staff working in the area referred to the exercise as PRA, but what was actually happening in the community was not participatory.

3.2 Impacts of the participatory Approaches

NGOs and Government Departments noted the following impacts of participatory approaches:

- ◇ In some cases community members have been able to appreciate what they can do on their own and continue after the NGOs go.
- ◇ Some communities have used the results of the PRA to design projects that are relevant to the needs of the people. The people have consequently participated and assumed ownership of the projects.
- ◇ Some PRA tools have raised expectations of the community members of things that may never happen.
- ◇ Some villages have gone through several PRAs with different organisations. The people get impatient and do not understand what is going on. They do not even understand the purpose of the PRAs.
- ◇ Sometimes the departments of Fisheries, Forestry and Land Resources Conservation have all gone to the same people. The communities get fed up because each has its own agenda. Communities end up telling you what they think you want to hear.
- ◇ After the PRA process, the community involved have lacked the capacities and skills required in managing funds, leadership, communication and organisation.
- ◇ Some organisations report using participatory approaches with communities but when followed up it was realised that they did not.

The communities interviewed noted the following impacts, after working with participatory approaches specifically PRA:

- ◇ The village headmen and the entire community got motivated to do something about the problems identified during the PRA.
- ◇ The community members were able to clearly understand the problem situations better and come up with possible solution of their own.
- ◇ The participatory process helped the community to develop a sense of ownership over the natural resource conservation activities that were initiated.
- ◇ ‘We took a leading role during rehabilitation of our dam because everybody could see it was for the community’s benefit’. Remarked the Kayezi community.
- ◇ The Government Departments and NGOs assured community members that they were going to assist them when they participate in the problem analysis.
- ◇ ‘We are now able to critically examine any situation and decide on what to do next either on our own or with the assistance from outside. For example we have decided to plant bamboos in our catchment, and we will get the planting materials from a source we have identified’.

Some Observations on the Use of Participatory Tools

Commenting on the impacts outlined above, both the COMPASS partners and community noted that some participatory tools were more effective than others:

NGO and Government Departments:

- ◇ Social maps generate a lot of interest amongst community members since they do it themselves.
- ◇ Ranking/scoring matrices pair wise ranking are effective during identification of priorities
- ◇ Seasonal calendars are more helpful during planning particularly with gender to see when men or women are available.
- ◇ Focus group discussions promote participation of the wider community in the analysis process.
- ◇ Problem tree analysis is effective with good facilitation to ensure that real causes come out and appropriate solutions are found
- ◇ When PRA was used in combination with other tools such as Training for Transformation, Graap, it was more effective.

Community:

At Chiling'oma the communities noted that the entire PRA process with all the tools was very effective particularly after they went through the analysis all over again on their own. They however singled out the following as being more effective:

- ◇ Resource mapping - helped the community to visualise how the deforestation was able to cause drying of the stream and soil erosion in their gardens. This motivated them to find their own solutions for rehabilitating the catchment.
- ◇ The historical trend of crop production helped the village community to link land degradation to declining crop productivity.

3.3 Advice to Practitioners of Participatory Approaches

The following was the advice to practitioners of participatory approaches from NGOs, Government Departments and communities:

- ◇ Community based organisations (CBOs) need to build their capacities to identify their own priorities, develop their own proposals and do what they must to achieve sustainable development.
- ◇ There is need to democratise the development process. Communities should have the right to reject projects that do not address their needs. The NGOs should avoid dangling resources in front of the communities as baits for projects.
- ◇ NGOs and Government departments should explore whatever the communities see important, and pay attention to what communities say. Outsiders are quick to judge when actually they do not understand the situation. Avoid rushing and do not take short cuts.
- ◇ Strengthen understanding of participatory approaches. Review PRA skills and stay current.

- ◇ Avoid using PRA where either the community or donors already know the agenda.
- ◇ Do not use PRA as a blue print; modify the techniques based on the local situations.

3.4 Hopes for the Future

- ◇ Project interventions are based on community needs revealed by PRAs and not donor priorities.
- ◇ Participation would be seen as a way of life and philosophy that is applied to all circumstances in daily life. Do not say one thing and do a different thing.
- ◇ Community members become more aware of their rights to actively participate in decision-making without outside intervention; and are able to achieve sustainable development.
- ◇ Communities are in front of development processes.
- ◇ Communities practice holistic approaches to their development.
- ◇ Community development workers learn community values, and are better able to deal with diverse groups with different cultural and academic backgrounds.
- ◇ More consultations occur at different levels. More time is allowed for discussions with communities so that they come up with their own ideas.
- ◇ Better links exist between extension and education
- ◇ Communities manage grant funds on our own.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusion

The PRA tools have had different impacts when used in different communities by different practitioners. In some of the communities they have yielded positive results and in others negative ones. This inconsistency results mainly from the way they are applied. In some cases the tools have been used as a one-shot exercise while in others as part of a long-term participatory process. Furthermore, others have only used selected tools of their interest.

Recommendations

- ◇ *In order to get the best results from PRA and other participatory approaches, the practitioners need to know exactly what they would like to achieve by using a particular approach and therefore need to critically examine what combinations of the tools to use and how the tools should be applied in order to achieve the intended objectives.*
- ◇ *NGOs and departments need to explore ways of internalising participatory approaches in their day-to-day encounter with the communities.*

Conclusion

Even though PRA tools have effectively assisted communities to become more aware of their problems and see the possible solutions, they have fallen short of adequately motivating and enabling the community to deal with their situations based on their available resources.

Recommendations

- ◇ *PRA tools need to be critically examined and modified so that the process could become more empowering to the communities.*
- ◇ *Other tools that enable the communities to become more self-reliant in managing their development processes such as the Appreciative Enquiry be explored as alternatives or incorporated into the current participatory approaches.*

Conclusion

The concept of participation is understood and applied differently by different development workers. This brings inconsistencies in their behaviours as they deal with the same communities.

Recommendations

- ◇ *Guiding principles be developed to guide the development workers as they seek to achieve effective participation by the wider community in development work.*
- ◇ *Co-ordination of the development workers and communities need to be strengthened.*

Annex I: Interview Guidelines for COMPASS Partners

Explain the purpose of this COMPASS TA: 1) Brief assessment of perceived effectiveness of PRA approaches; 2) Inquiry into partner capacity to deliver participatory development approaches; 3) Strengthen partners' capacities to mobilise and build communities through the use of assets-based approaches such as appreciative enquiry.

- 1 We would like to learn more about your organisation's experience with using participatory approaches with community groups. Will you tell us about a time when you were particularly pleased with the results of using participatory approaches?
 - 1.a What made this a positive experience?
- 2 What kinds of participatory approaches does your organisation use?
 - 2.a Do you use the term 'PRA' and 'participatory approaches' interchangeably? In other words are all your participatory approaches part of what you call PRA?
- 3 What have you tried to achieve by using participatory approaches/PRA?
- 4 Of the tools in the PRA toolbox which have you found to be most effective?
- 5 How does your organisation decide which tools to use?
- 6 What have been your organisation's key learning related to PRA?
 - 6.a How have you adapted approaches based on what you have learnt?
- 7 In your opinion what have been the overall impact of PRA approaches in Malawi?
- 8 What are your hopes for participatory approaches – what would you like to see resulting in the future?
- 9 If you could give one piece of advice for the future to NGOs, extension services, projects etc. working with communities on sustainable development what would it be?
- 10 What else would you like to tell us that might be helpful to COMPASS as we develop Malawi- appropriate assets-based¹ approaches and materials and plan for this upcoming workshop?

¹ Explain that these approaches focus on the strengths rather than needs, opportunities as opposed to problems, are forward thinking, and internally focused. Give and explain the handout contrasting approaches.

Annex II: Interview Guidelines for CBO Partners

COMPASS CBO Partners

March 20-21, 2003

Explain the purpose of this COMPASS TA: 1) Brief assessment of perceived effectiveness of PRA approaches; 2) Inquiry into partner capacity to deliver participatory development approaches; 3) Strengthen partners' capacities' to mobilize and build communities through use of assets-based approaches such as appreciative inquiry.

1. We'd like to learn more about your group's experience with using participatory approaches? Will you tell us about a time when you were particularly pleased with the results of using participatory approaches?
 - 1.a. What made this a positive experience?
2. What kinds of "participatory approaches" have been used with your group?
3. Of the PRA tools that government and other organizations have used with your group, which have been most effective?
 - 3.a. In what ways has your group benefited?
 - 3.b. What have been the lasting impacts?
4. What organizations have worked with you using participatory approaches?
5. For what purpose have organizations used participatory approaches with your group or community? – What were they trying to achieve by using these approaches?
6. If you could give one piece of advice, for the future, to NGOs, extension services, projects (etc.) working with communities on sustainable development, what would it be?
7. What else would you like to tell us that might be helpful to COMPASS as we try to improve the processes government, NGO partners, and others use with community groups?

Annex III: Persons and Groups Contacted

Halex Mtegha
Evangelical Lutheran Development Programme (ELDP)

Lovemore Mvula
International Eye Foundation (IEF)

Patrick Chimutu
Jack Makoko
Diamon Kambewa (Consultant – former CSC employee)
Christian Services Committee (CSC)

Charles Chabuka
Bennet Mukiwa
Magomero College - Zomba

Moses Mpezeni
National Initiative for Civic Education (NICE)

Dr. Mary Shawa
Beatrice Kumwenda
Ministry of Gender and Community Services

Wellings Simwela
Department of Forestry

Ramosh Jiah, Deputy Director - Extension
Department of National Parks & Wildlife

Dr. Steve Donda
Department of Fisheries
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs

Simeon B. Mawindo
Creative Centre for Community Mobilisation (CRECCOM)

Roman Malumelo
Training Support for Partners (TSP)

Precious Hopkins Chizonda
World Vision

Chilingoma Community Group
17 men, 9 women, and 3 children (included 4 Village Headmen, farmers, principal & patron, secretary of Goats committee, Secretary of Steering Committee, Forest Assistant, TB worker, Guinea Fowl Committee rep, Treasurer of Steering Committee, Steering Committee members)

Kayezi Community Group

17 men and 3 women (including 3 Village Headmen, ADP Representative, and Chairman of the Dam Committee)

COMPASS Publications

Document Number	Title	Author(s)	Date
Document 1	COMPASS Year 1 Work Plan	COMPASS	Jul-99
Document 2	COMPASS Small Grants Management Manual	Umphawi, A., Clausen, R., Watson, A.	Sep-99
Document 3	Year 2 Annual Work Plan	COMPASS	Dec-99
Document 4	July 1 - September 30, 1999: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Oct-99
Document 5	Training Needs Assessment: Responsive Modules & Training Approach	Mwakanema, G.	Nov-99
Document 6	Guidelines and Tools for Community-Based Monitoring	Svensden, D.	Nov-99
Document 7	Policy Framework for CBNRM in Malawi: A Review of Laws, Policies and Practices	Trick, P.	Dec-99
Document 8	Performance Monitoring for COMPASS and for CBNRM in Malawi	Zador, M.	Feb-00
Document 9	October 1 - December 31, 1999: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Jan-00
Document 10	Workshop on Principles and Approaches for CBNRM in Malawi: An assessment of needs for effective implementation of CBNRM	Watson, A.	Mar-00
Document 11	January 1 - March 31, 2000: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Apr-00
Document 12	Thandizo la Ndalama za Kasamalidwe ka Zachilengedwe (Small Grants Manual in Chichewa)	Mphaka, P.	Apr-00
Document 13	Njira Zomwe Gulu Lingatsate Powunikira Limodzi Momwe Ntchito Ikuyendera (Guidelines and Tools for Community-based Monitoring in Chichewa)	Svensden, D. - Translated by Mphaka, P. and Umphawi, A.	May-00
Document 14	Grass-roots Advocacy for Policy Reform: The Institutional Mechanisms, Sectoral Issues and Key Agenda Items	Lowore, J. and Wilson, J.	Jun-00
Document 15	A Strategic Framework for CBNRM Media Campaigns in Malawi	Sneed, T.	Jul-00
Document 16	Training Activities for Community-based Monitoring	Svensden, D.	Jul-00
Document 17	April 1 - June 30, 2000: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Jul-00
Document 18	Crocodile and Hippopotamus Management in the Lower Shire	Kalowekamo, F.	Sep-00
Document 19	Cost-Sharing Principles and Guidelines for CBNRM Activities	Moyo, N.	Sep-00

Document 20	Workplan: 2001	COMPASS	Nov-00
Document 21	July 1 - September 30, 2000: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Oct-00
Document 22	Opportunities for Sustainable Financing of CBNRM in Malawi: A Discussion	Watson, A.	Nov-00
Document 23	Framework for Strategic Planning for CBNRM in Malawi	Simons, G.	Nov-00
Document 24	Kabuku Kakwandula Ndongomeko ya Thumba Lapadera la Wupu wa COMPASS (Chitumbuka version of the COMPASS Small-grant Manual)	Umphawi, A., Clausen, R. & Watson, A. Translated by Chirwa, T.H. & Kapila, M.	Dec-00
Document 25	COMPASS Performance and Impact: 1999/2000	COMPASS	Nov-00
Document 26	October 1 - December 31, 2000: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Jan-01
Document 27	COMPASS Grantee Performance Report	Umphawi, A.	Mar-01
Document 28	January 1 - March 31, 2001: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Apr-01
Document 29	Natural Resource Based Enterprises in Malawi: Study on the contribution of NRBEs to economic development and community-based natural resource management in Machinga District	Lowore, J.	Apr-01
Document 30	Proceedings of the First National Conference on CBNRM in Malawi	Kapila, M., Shaba, T., Chadza, W., Yassin, B. and Mikuwa, M.	Jun-01
Document 31	Natural Resource Based Enterprises in Malawi: Action Plans	Watson, A.	Jun-01
Document 32	Examples of CBNRM Best Practices in Malawi	Moyo, N. & Epulani, F.	Jun-01
Document 33	Media Training for CBNRM Public Awareness	Kapila, M.	Jun-01
Document 34	April 1 - June 30, 2001: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Jul-01
Document 35	Strategic Plan for CBNRM in Malawi	CBNRM Working Group	Sep-01
Document 36	Workplan: 2002	COMPASS	Oct-01
Document 37	July 1 - September 30, 2001: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Oct-01
Document 38	COMPASS Performance and Impact: 2000/2001	COMPASS	Dec-01
Document 39	Coordination of CBNRM in Malawi: Financing Options	Watson, A.	Jan-02
Document 40	Performance Monitoring for CBNRM in Malawi	CBNRM Working Group	Oct-02
Document 41	October 1 – December 31, 2001: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Jan-02
Document 42	COMPASS Field Level Training Impact Evaluation	Moyo, N.	Feb-02

Document 43	COMPASS Grantee Performance Report: 2001	Umphawi, U.	Apr-02
Document 44	COMPASS Assessment: 2001	Sambo, E., Carr, S., Omambia, D. & Moore, T.	Apr-02
Document 45	January 1 - March 31, 2002: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Apr-02
Document 46	Community Tourism and Enterprise Training Manual	Kacal, S.	Jun-02
Document 47	Charcoal, Chiefs and Chambo: Status of CBNRM Policies in Malawi	Trick, P. & Manning, L.	Jun-02
Document 48	April 1 - June 30, 2002: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Jul-02
Document 49	Business Development Services for Natural Resource Based Enterprises	Magai, G. & Nthambi, T.	Sep-02
Document 50	July 1 – September 30, 2002: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Oct-02
Document 51	Workplan: 2003	COMPASS	Oct-02
Document 52	COMPASS Performance and Impact: 2001/2002	COMPASS	Oct-02
Document 53	GIS for Natural Resources Managers	Craven, D.	Nov-02
Document 54	Proceedings of the Second National Conference on CBNRM in Malawi	Malembo, L., Chadza, W., Kamuloni, S. & Kanjedza, R.	Dec-02
Document 55	Impact of HIV/AIDS on Natural Resource Management in Malawi	Page, S.	Apr-03
Document 56	October 1 – December 31, 2002: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Jan-03
Document 57	The Role of the Private Sector in CBNRM in Malawi	Watson, A.	Jan-03
Document 58	COMPASS Grantee Performance: 2002	Ndovi, W. & Godfrey, G.	Apr-03
Document 59	COMPASS Gender Policy Development Workshop	Omambia, D.	Mar-03
Document 60	January 1 – March 31, 2003: Quarterly Report	COMPASS	Apr-03
Document 61	Advanced GIS for Natural Resource Managers	Craven, D.	Apr-03
Document 62	Introduction to Appreciative Inquiry	Masukwa, C.A.P.S., Svendsen, D.S. & Moyo, N.	Apr-03
Internal Report 1	Building GIS Capabilities for the COMPASS Information System	Craven, D.	Nov-99
Internal Report 2	Reference Catalogue (2nd Edition)	COMPASS	Feb-01
Internal Report 3	Workshop on Strategic Planning for the Wildlife Society of Malawi	Quinlan, K.	Apr-00
Internal Report 4	Directory of CBNRM Organizations (2nd Edition)	COMPASS	Jan-01
Internal Report 5	Proceedings of Water Hyacinth Workshop for Mthunzi wa Malawi	Kapila, M. (editor)	Jun-00
Internal Report 6	COMPASS Grantee Performance Report	Umphawi, A.	Jun-00

Internal Report 7	Examples of CBNRM Best-Practices in Malawi	Moyo, N. and Epulani, F.	Jul-00
Internal Report 8	Software Application Training for COMPASS	Di Lorenzo, N.A.	Sep-00
Internal Report 9	Directory of COMPASS ListServ Members	Watson, A.	Jan-01
Internal Report 10	Introductory Training in Applications of Geographic Information Systems and Remote Sensing	Kapila, M.	Feb-01
Internal Report 11	COMPASS TAMIS Grants Manual	Exo, S.	Mar-01
Internal Report 12	Review of Recommendations of the Lake Chilwa and Mpoto Lagoon Fisheries By-Laws Review Meeting	Nyirenda, K.	May-01
Internal Report 13	End-of-Term Evaluation of the Co-Ordination Unit for the Rehabilitation of the Environment (CURE)	Sambo, E.Y.	Sep-01
Internal Report 14	Mwabvi Wildlife Reserve Co-Management Agreement Negotiations	Betha, M.R.B.	Feb-03
Internal Report 15	Reducing Vulnerability to HIV/AIDS among COMPASS Grantees	Page, S.	Mar-03
Internal Report 16	COMPASS Gender Policy	Omambia, D.	Mar-03
Internal Report 17	Assessment of Experiences with Participatory Approaches in CBNRM	Msukwa, C.A.P.S. & Svendsen, D.S.	Apr-03