

**Swiss Development Cooperation and Conservation International Tri
Nations Namib Desert Transfrontier Conservation Area, and KAZA
Project**

END OF PROJECT EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT JULY 2011

James Medhurst



Key project data

Project title:	Kavango- Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area (KAZA) and Three Nations Namib Desert Transfrontier Conservation area (TNND)
Status:	Completed
Aid modality:	Project
Geographical zone:	Namibia
Contracted party:	Conservation International and Namibia Nature Foundation
Contract start-date:	Month? 2002
Contract end-date:	February 2011
Responsible SDC office:	Pretoria

Financial data

SDC contract value:	CHF 1,350,000
Other funding (donors, government):	Xxxxxx
Other funding	USD 180,000 from private American donor for work on elephants in KAZA TFCA SAR 30,000 received from private south African donor in support of bee-keeping
Total SDC funds spent:	xxxxxx

Evaluation data

Evaluators:	James Medhurst
Date of evaluation:	7-17 June 2011
Draft report date	15 July 2011
Final report date:	July 2011

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACCT	Aus Community Conservation Trust
CI	Conservation International
EPDP	Elephant Pepper Development Trust
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GoB	Government of Botswana
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GoN	Government of Namibia
HEC	Human Elephant Conflict
IRDNC	Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation
KAZA	Kavango-Zambezi
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NNF	Namibia Nature Foundation
SGP	Small Grants Programme
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
TNNDTFCA	Three Nations Namib Desert Transfrontier Conservation Area
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme



Project Summary

The evaluation covers a two year period (2009 and 2010) of SDC support which was intended to bridge the gap between the end of the two projects in December 2008 and the implementation of a new SDC Food Security Strategy.

TNND

Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF) was subcontracted by Conservation International (CI) through funding from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) to implement the project entitled *Three Nations Namib Desert Transfrontier Conservation Area (TNNDTCA)*. The project sought to empower local communities in southern Namibia to manage their natural resources in a sustainable way, to improve their livelihoods and become more resilient to external factors such as climate change and food insecurity. The initiative also sought to stimulate the development of income-generating activities to decrease human pressure on natural resources and, through awareness and education. The communities of Aus, Warmbad and Klein Karas were identified as the target beneficiaries of the initiative.

The overall goal of the initiative was that the livelihood level of poor rural people in southern Namibia is improved and they are better prepared to cope with global challenges such as climate change. Specific intended outcomes were:

- Local communities improve their incomes and broaden their income generating opportunities.
- Local communities decrease their pressure on the land and natural resources.
- Capacity of the communities is strengthened.
- An improved understanding amongst communities about climate change consequences and natural resource limitations.

When the agreement between SDC and CI was concluded it was anticipated that the project would be implemented by CI, however the Namibian Government proposed to CI that the project should be implemented through the Government's Small Grants Programme (SGP) mechanism which has been used successfully by other aid agencies to distribute grants. It was therefore decided to use this mechanism, to ensure alignment with other funding and initiatives and strong support and in accordance with existing Namibian Government systems. With SDC's approval CI then entered into an agreement with the agent for the SGP, the Namibian Nature Foundation (NFF) to implement the project activities. The projects grants were approved by the UNDP Small Grant Programme (SGP) steering committee. On the 5th March 2010, a meeting was convened to review the proposal and approve proposals based on their merits and objectives of the project. The following projects were approved, these were: garden project and Hoodia cultivation in Warmbad; food garden and hiking trail in Aus and Introduction of Dorper sheep and garden project in Klein Karas.

KAZA

The KAZA project had four components: i) Bee keeping; ii) Research to document traditional agriculture; iii) Support to the KAZA structures, and; iv) Human – elephant conflict mitigation.

The Swiss Agency for Development & Cooperation (SDC) has been supporting community development and natural resource management in what is now known as the Kavango-Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area (KAZA TFCA) since 2002, primarily through Conservation International (CI) and the Integrated Rural Development & Nature Conservation (IRDNC) via the KAZA Secretariat.

In 2006, SDC decided to focus its support on one specific "Ecological Corridor" which had been identified during a multi-country workshop convened by CI in Gaborone, and which was called the "Kwando Corridor".

For practical reasons it was decided to split the work mainly on geographic basis along this four-nation corridor, with IRDNC focusing on the Namibia component and CI on the Zambian component, while a number of additional transboundary activities were also undertaken by CI.

At the invitation of SDC, CI submitted a proposal for a further one-year cycle of support in Kwando Corridor to consolidate some of the achievements which had been attained in the Kwando Corridor between 2007 and 2008, by extending benefits to northern Botswana and an improved distribution of opportunities throughout Kwando Corridor in general. The cycle of support ran from 1st March 2009 to 28th February 2010. SDC agreed to extend support until August 2010 because of the seasonal nature of the activities. It was decided that the new cycle of support should be on an individual country basis rather than to work through KAZA. This was probably the right call given how long it was taking KAZA to take decisions on projects and the pressure on CI to deliver within a short time frame.

Highlights

1. The TNND project was implemented over a very short timeframe (9 months). In that time NFF were able to deliver an impressive number of activities including the installation of irrigation systems, training and installation of greenhouses and provision of equipment. The fact that the project was able to put in place all structures for the different groups has been a remarkable success which is largely down to the efficiency of NNF's delivery.
2. Both projects were successful in increasing the asset base of the target communities (tools, materials and infrastructure) and their knowledge of climate change and conservation farming methods, which will help people to diversify their livelihoods and improve their food security.
3. Capacity building and the transfer of skills was a strong theme throughout the implementation of the projects.
4. Both TNND and KAZA were highly relevant to the needs of the target beneficiaries and in the case of bee-keeping and human-elephant conflict (HEC) mitigation the project plugged a critical gap in support. The communities where the project was implemented rely on the larger towns to acquire fresh produce. Furthermore, most of the community's inhabitants depend on government social grants to meet basic needs. The introduction of food security related initiatives and the diversification of livelihoods has been, and still is, crucial to address the issue of access to fresh produce.
5. Tourism is projected to be the major GDP contributor for Namibia and as such the engagement of the Aus Community Conservation Trust has been a step forward in terms of communities moving into other markets or sectors.
6. The projects under TNND were implemented in accordance with national and regional plans such as the Lower Orange River Transfrontier Conservation Area (TFCA), and specifically within the context of the Integrated Conservation Development Plan for the Namibian component of the TFCA. The projects were also in line with the Karas Regional Council vision statement.
7. Interest and support for bee-keeping has expanded widely into neighbouring Caprivi and also northern Botswana. There is genuine interest amongst rural communities to pursue bee-keeping for income-generation and food supplementation, and is now also being supported by government departments in Caprivi and northern Botswana. Bee-keeping has been adopted as a valuable additional tool in diversifying livelihoods, and a practice which also enhances crop yields (fruit & vegetables) through improved pollination.
8. The decision by CI to fund a study of the present and historic patterns of subsistence farming could help inform transfrontier rural livelihood policies and plans. A good understanding of current and historic patterns of small-scale subsistence agriculture has been gained across the three-nation

region (Botswana, Namibia, Zambia) straddling the Kwando Corridor, and also the constraints that face rural people and the assistance they need.

9. The decision by Conservation International to provide support for HEC mitigation helped to ensure that the work of the EPDP continued. CI was able to plug a gap in funding until a US\$5m programme came on stream.

Weaknesses

1. In both cases, the TNND and KAZA timeframes were too short. Project beneficiaries and the implementing partners both reported that there was insufficient time for monitoring, lesson learning and rectifying problems. For example the evaluator saw first hand that the vegetable garden irrigation system in Warmbad installed under the project could not be used because the tower for the water tank was too high, which affected the proper functioning of the pump. As the project finished very soon after the installation there was no monitoring to check that everything was working satisfactorily.
2. The evaluator has serious concerns over the expected returns on the investments related to the Hoodia project and hiking trail in the southern Namibia town of Aus. The international market for Hoodia¹ has suffered major setbacks. In 2008 Unilever dropped their GBP 20 million Hoodia research programme after their safety and efficiency trials produced negative results. It is therefore questionable whether Hoodia cultivation was the right investment to achieve the project objective in the short – medium term.
3. The rationale for the Aus project was to help alleviate the high levels of unemployment, estimated to be over 50%. The construction of the hiking trails used local labour, but was short-term only. However the objective was to provide a long-term source of income which would benefit the community through the ACCT which has yet to be realised. At the time of the evaluator's visit the Aus Information Centre had received around 50 or 60 enquiries but no bookings for the hiking trails which were constructed under the project and it is not clear whether the local tour operators will honour their promise to support the enterprise by encouraging their guests to book a trail. The peak season for visitors coming through Aus is July to August. During this time there could be up to 90 visitors a day; either on coaches or as self-drive tourists. However, it is most likely that the majority of visitors will be passing through rather than staying in Aus and therefore are unlikely to want to spend time on the trail. Revenue can be achieved from the café and souvenir shop at the information centre but during the evaluator's visit the café had no stock and the Information Centre Manager said that no curios had been sold because the local people who made them wanted a lot of money for the products, which the tourists were unwilling to pay.
4. There was insufficient time for community support following capacity building to help ensure sustainability. For example, if the project timescale had allowed for one further growing season, the vegetable garden growers could have been supported further to solve emerging problems, for example how to avoid significant losses as a result of frost. In Warmbad the evaluator found the water pump was not working and in Aus the growers had lost the majority of their crop to the frost.
5. The Logframe in the credit agreement was never finalised between SDC and Conservation International. Implementing partners were expected to produce logframes for each component to ensure effective monitoring, but this does not appear to have been done either for KAZA and TNND. As a consequence it has been difficult to evaluate the extent of change brought about by the different project interventions.

¹ Hoodia is a small cactus that grows in the Kalahari desert and is believed to act as a appetite suppressant

6. Although anecdotal evidence from a few farmers suggests that the HEC project appears to have been a big success in terms of the reduction in the number of elephant raids since 2008, the reduction in raids is most likely attributable to a number of factors, not just the use of chilli fencing. Factors. Other factors might include rainfall patterns.
7. The biggest challenge to the sustainability of the HEC project is the farmers' access to chilli. The project supported farmers to grow their own, but this was unsuccessful.
8. Training alone was insufficient to ensure farmers fully adopted the elephant mitigation measures. On-going monitoring is required to ensure sustainability. Five local Enumerators, in each village, were employed to carry out monitoring until the end of the growing season but the timeframe was too short to really embed comprehensive community based conflict management and the Enumerators salaries were paid from Anna Songhurst's PhD grant, which has now stopped.
9. The area around Seronga is a prime for beekeeping and farmers could get up to 3 harvests per year between March and August depending on the rains. People typically throw the wax away and there are no processing facilities for turning wax into cosmetics and other products. Beekeeping is largely an untapped income stream. Demand for honey and value added products in neighbouring countries outstrip supply. However, the project was too limited in scope to exploit the potential market opportunities. This was unavoidable given the tight project timeframes. Communities or individuals in the area who want to start beekeeping are unable to get help and advice because the post of Agriculture Extension Worker in Shakawe has been vacant for sometime.
10. CI invested time in supporting a cross-regional approach through KAZA. Five governments met in 2006 to sign a MoU for KAZA TFCA. However, action was constrained by bureaucratic bottlenecks, with specific measures often requiring approval from the KAZA TFCA Secretariat, technical committee, and ministerial committee representing all five countries. It was reported that decisions could take up to two years. As a consequence, CI opted to pursue bilateral action, which given the tight timeframes for project delivery, this was the right call.
11. Conservation International worked hard to establish platforms for working through KAZA structures. However despite their best efforts, KAZA was an obstacle rather than a cooperative partner due in part to their lack of capacity, but also their reported possessiveness of KAZA platforms and wariness of NGO's convening or facilitating meetings that relate to KAZA TFCA.
12. The evaluator found little evidence of the projects addressing HIV/ AIDS issues.

Overall assessment

1. Project evaluations are obliged to determine the extent to which a project has achieved its intended objective. In this case, the findings and conclusions are constrained by the absence of an agreed final logframe and results chain for either the KAZA project or the TNND project. The absence of comprehensive baseline information in the project areas, targets and measurable indicators, directly related to the specific project interventions has made an assessment of project achievements difficult to quantify and qualify. It is too early to evaluate whether the KAZA and TNND projects have or are likely to achieve their stated overall objectives. However, the projects have been successful in building the capacity and asset base of the communities which were targeted.
2. The absence of agreed logframes for the projects should not detract from their relevance or their reasonable level of achievement at field level. Interviewees responded positively to the questions. *Did the project meet their expectations?* In the case of TNND, NNF successfully put in place the foundations for the improvement of livelihoods of the target communities, but it is too early to say whether these benefits will be realised.

3. Given the short time frame for project implementation – only 9 months in the case of TNND – the projects delivered an impressive amount of work. It is too early to say whether these projects will deliver the overall objective.
4. The vegetable garden projects were supported with appropriate, low-cost and practical technologies and appropriate training was given to the communities in their use. However continued operation and maintenance (O&M) costs, will be dependent on the communities being able to derive a sufficient income to cover these and it is too early to judge if this will be the case. The Warmbad community Dorper Sheep cooperative offers the best prospects being able to do this and for scale-up and sustainability. The vegetable gardens, chilli fencing elephant mitigation and bee-keeping will likely require continued support to reinforce and sustain the early momentum and interest, and specifically would benefit from further mentorship, capacity building, technical advice and partnership facilitation to address uncertainties and may also require further financial injections for O&M. As such, longer project duration or a narrower focus would have been advisable and would have increased prospects of lasting benefit.
5. The answer to the question, '*Are we doing things right?*' Is positive because of the good level beneficiary involvement and ownership. However, the level of participation of the district level authorities could have been greater. This would have helped ensure that the project beneficiaries were provided with ongoing support and monitoring following the completion of the project interventions. For example it was reported that people interested in starting up a bee-keeping enterprise in Seronga were unable to get advice and support because the extension officer post in Shakawe was vacant.

Disclaimers, caveats and points of note

1. The evaluators would like to place on record their gratitude for the logistical support, openness and professionalism of the CI and NFF team during the evaluation mission. Their positive engagement and critical reflection aid greatly contributed to the positive spirit of the assignment.
2. Whilst SDC's support spanned the period 2002-11. SDC agreed that the evaluation focus on the bridging period 2009-11.
3. The evaluation has been conducted using the outcomes, outputs and OVI's stipulated in the Credit Agreement signed by SDC and Conservation International in February 2009.

Case study 1



Sarah Muguanda is 50 years old and is the vice-Secretary of the Klein Karas cooperative. She is married and has 4 children, two daughters and two sons. Their ages range from 18 - 30. Her husband works on the Namibia Railway, TransNab As the Vice-chair of the cooperative she has day to day oversight of cooperative activities such as the brick making and sheep farming. She was elected as vice-chair 5 years ago. Elections take place at the Annual General Meeting of the Cooperative. Sarah says she is passionate about the cooperative and her vision is for the cooperative to grow and to bring greater benefits to the community such as solar energy. She said the project has helped a lot and that the cooperation with NFF should not stop.

Case study 2



Daniel is a farmer in Ereetsha village. He has been using Chili for three seasons now on his farm. He uses only chili because this is the most effective in keeping the elephants off his land. This year two Bull elephants did get in because the wind direction. When the elephants were regularly raiding his land he was only able to harvest less than 10 bags of millet. Since the introduction of the chilli bricks he is now harvesting around 40 bags. Daniel also keeps chickens, goats and cattle. Last year he was hoping to sell some of his millet to the Marketing Board but because of poor storage a lot was damaged by insects. He has no pesticides to use. He said most of the food he produces on his farm is consumed by his family.

1. Relevance of the project and quality of the design

Focal issue: the appropriateness of the project's objectives to the real problems, needs and priorities of its target groups/beneficiaries and the quality of the design through which these objectives were to be reached

Framing questions	Findings
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the project relevant to addressing the pre-existing problems? 2. Were the project objectives consistent with country / regional policies? 3. Was the baseline data collected as part of the project design? 4. Were the target groups clearly identified? Did the project respond to their needs? 5. Does the project logframe have clear outcome and output statements with SMART targets and measurable indicators? Does it represent a clear results chain? 6. Were the activities and outputs sufficient to achieve the project outcome? 7. Were the stakeholders actively involved in the design process? Did they support the design? 8. Were coordination, management and financing arrangements clearly identified and did they support institutional strengthening and local ownership? 9. Were partnership potentials optimised? 10. Were the project's timescale and/or range of activities realistic with regard to the stakeholders' capacities? 	<p>TNND</p> <p>The target communities where the TNND project was implemented, rely on the larger towns to acquire fresh produce and the inhabitants largely depend on government social grants to meet basic needs, therefore the project interventions related to the diversification of livelihoods and food security related initiatives were highly relevant.</p> <p>The projects were designed and implemented in accordance with the Lower Orange River Transfrontier Conservation Area (TFCA), and specifically within the context of the Integrated Conservation Development Plan for the Namibian component of the TFCA. Furthermore, the project was in line with the Karas Regional Council vision statement for the region.</p> <p>A desk study was carried out to review socio-ecological, poverty assessment and household livelihood surveys that have been undertaken in the KARAS region. However, the research studies were not carried out in the project areas of Klein Karas, Aus or Warmbad, but instead in surrounding areas with similar socio-economic conditions.</p> <p>The project logframe in the SDC Grant Agreement is a programme-level results matrix incorporating both TNND and KAZA interventions. It has four outcome statements, which are at the wrong level in the logframe and should be outputs and the outputs are completed activities. Logframes should usually contain only one outcome statement. The logframe does not contain baseline information or targets (though this is a weakness of SDC's current logframe format more broadly). It is therefore not possible to measure the project's impact on the basis of the logframe.</p> <p>The target communities were selected following visits by NNF staff to the areas during the initial stage of project formulation. Communities were asked what sort of food security intervention they wanted and project proposals were developed on the basis of these ideas.</p> <p>The project timeframe was far too short. The time available for implementation was only 7-8 months. The range of activities was broad and a great deal was delivered during the short timeframe, including training, installation of irrigation and business planning. However, there was insufficient time for follow-up monitoring, support and further capacity building to ensure sustainability.</p> <p>KAZA</p> <p>The HEC project was valid as Northern Botswana has the single biggest concentration of elephants in the world and is predicted to increase by 5% per year. Alongside this, the human population is also predicted to increase, presumably increasing competition for land and food. At the time of the project no-one else was seeking to address or mitigate HEC. The World</p>

		<p>Bank was in the process of developing a package for HEC mitigation, but negotiations for the World Bank grant were taking much longer than anticipated. To plug this gap CI were right to focus on HEC in northern Botswana.</p> <p>The beekeeping project was valid because of the decline in the number of bee colonies. Beekeeping enhances bee populations, improves crop pollination and provides a source of income and at the time no-one was supporting beekeeping.</p> <p>Again the study of traditional agriculture practices addressed something that no-one else had done (so far as the evaluator understands) and the knowledge is/was required to better understand how changing environmental and social matters, including climate change, was affecting rural livelihoods and subsistence farming.</p> <p>Baseline information was collected as part of Anna Songhurst's PhD study. The Traditional Agriculture study was a baseline study in itself and a consultant was engaged to develop a better understanding of bee densities. However, this baseline information wasn't used as part of the project logframe or results framework for setting targets and milestones. CI told the evaluator that the final stages of developing the logframe with SDC was extremely rushed and the logframe contained within the credit agreement is not what was discussed verbally with SDC, but CI accepted the version in the interests of delivering within a very short time frame.</p> <p>The areas and communities were targeted on the basis of a number of factors: 1) where CI had staff deployed, 2) the extent of the need; 3) the regional dimension.</p> <p>All project activities appear to have matched the capacity of the stakeholders and beneficiaries and local ownership appears to have been strong. However, the timeframe for implementation was too short and ongoing efforts are likely to be required to sustain the benefits.</p>						
Performance conclusion	Highly relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Largely relevant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Partly relevant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not relevant	<input type="checkbox"/>
Key lessons learned and/or actions recommended								
1.	A final project logframe or alternative results framework should always be agreed with all the partners before implementation starts. In both cases of TNND and KAZA time constraints prevented this, but without an agreed framework, it is difficult to measure what has been achieved if different partners have a different understanding of what will be delivered.							
2.	More attention could have been given to ensuring local officials and extension workers were involved in the design and so as to improve the chances of sustainability.							

2. Efficiency¹


Focal issue: how well means/inputs and activities were converted into results ("outputs").


Performance target: output-by-output

Output 1: Implementation of conservation farming techniques; Implementation of Human-wildlife conflict mitigation measures; Development of health gardens for HIV affected people

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
Number of farmers implementing CA (male / female)	No baseline available	No targets specified	Anecdotal evidence from interviews with farmers suggests that they are using different farming techniques
Number of farmers trained (male / female)	No baseline available	No targets specified	The HEC project in northern Botswana has initiated the first step in training and capacity building within communities affected by high levels of HEC and will contribute essential information on the feasibility, effectiveness and sustainability of using different community based mitigation methods in northern Botswana. There is still a need to continue training, building capacity and improving education on HEC issues and mitigation, as well as helping to devise alternative strategies to reduce HEC in northern Botswana.
Production of chilli pepper	No baseline available	No targets specified	The project provided each community member attending the chilli training workshop with a starter pack for chilli growing and chilli mitigation implementation. Some farmers started to grow chilli but none produced a harvestable crop, due to water shortages. The availability of chilli is a serious constraint to the sustainability of the use of chilli by farmers as an effective HEC mitigation measure.
Number of farmers trained in HWC (male / female)	No baseline available	No targets specified	KAZA 57 people from northern Botswana have been trained in community-based conflict mitigation methods and chilli propagation techniques. According to latest figures farmers in the five target villages use a variety of different mitigation techniques including drums, wire fences, guns, dogs and tin cans. The use of chilli is a new introduction. In 2010 10% of farmers were using the chilli mitigation method. The number of elephant raids decreased from close to 180 at its height in 2008 to 80 in 2010. Farmers interviewed by the evaluator said that chilli was very effective and was their preferred

¹ The output statements are taken from the SDC Credit Agreement for TNND and KAZA

			mitigation method. One female farmer told the evaluator that after using chilli to protect her 15 acre field her harvest of millet had increased from two bags to 25.					
Number of gardens created	No baseline available	No targets specified	<p>One garden was created in Aus and one in Warmbad. An existing garden was further developed for the Klein Karas community. The evaluator visited each of the gardens and found the gardens being used. Unfortunately the irrigation system in Warmbad was not working due to a problem with the height of the tank which had been installed by the project. Following the site visit the NNF representative visited the district agriculture and water office to inform them of the problem, who said they would investigate further. A farmer interviewed at the Aus community garden reported that he was now able to sell vegetables from the garden to a local shop in Aus and one of the hotels.</p> <p>The extreme climate in southern Namibia is, however, a considerable problem to vegetable gardening. Shortly before the evaluator's visit a cold front had destroyed many of the plants, including chilli. See picture below.</p> 					
Number of people working in the gardens (male / female)	No baseline available	No targets specified	In Warmbad the group increased from 4 women at inception to 9 individuals (7 women and two men). No reliable information is available for the other two gardens; however the evaluator was told that most of the seven individuals involved in the Aus garden had lost interest and only had limited time to spend on the garden because of other jobs. The evaluator met only one individual who appeared to dedicate time to the garden.					
Output 1: Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unachieved or unknown <input type="checkbox"/>				
Output 2: Development of small businesses; empowerment of communities to manage their natural resources								
Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments					
Number and type of businesses created	No baseline available		<p>TNND</p> <p>Several businesses were supported during the project period. The Aus hiking trail construction and a marketing and business plan were developed to boost employment in the Aus community through tourism activities for the Aus community. Ten tour guides were trained and the</p>					

			<p>facilities in the Tourism Information Centre were enhanced with a gift area and refreshments bar. The guides only work when there are bookings by tourists or tour operators. They receive 50% of the fee. ACCT gets 50%. The peak season for tourists is July-August. Ten to fifteen people per week come through Aus and visit the centre in the low season. During peak season there could be up to 90 tourists per week. Local tour operators have unwritten agreements with the Aus Community Trust to support the hiking trails. However, no bookings have been received to date although there have been enquiries.</p> <p>A website could have been useful to help with marketing. Everything is in place for the tourists but no bookings. The goods in the shop are produced by local people but they charge too much and the tourists don't buy because they are too expensive.</p> <p>The evaluator found that the refreshments bar didn't have any stock for sale. Tourists would expect to be able to find a good selection of food and beverages and if they don't then may not visit again. The centre is also losing revenue.</p>  <p>Previously the centre was leased out to a private operator who was able to make the enterprise a success and the Aus Conservation Community Trust was receiving a good income from it. It is unclear why the ACCT decided to cease this arrangement and run the Centre itself and it is questionable whether they do have the motivation and the business acumen to make it a successful enterprise.</p> <p>The second business enterprise was the Commercial Hoodia cultivation. This sought to create jobs through the establishment and enhancement of Hoodia cultivation. However, the international market for Hoodia has collapsed following Unilever's decision to cancel its research programme as their safety and efficiency trials produced negative results. The aim of the project is therefore unlikely to be realised until the market improves.</p>
--	--	--	--



The Klein Karas farmer cooperative was supported with 80 highly reproductive, fast-growing and arid-adapted dorper sheep. There are 65 members of the cooperative who were mainly farming goats before the project started. The farm is very far from the nearest town and therefore very difficult to get vegetables and other food. Maybe once a month someone will go into town to buy vegetables. People mainly consume meat.

Eight lambs were born in 2010. However, all were taken by predators. The farmers now bring the sheep closer to their homes. Lambing occurs twice a year.

The farmers prefer to farm sheep because they are less labour intensive than keeping goats. There is a market for sheep within 90 kilometers of the farm. For a Ram they can expect to get 3-400 Nam\$ and 900 for a goat, but the market for goats is much further away and goats are more difficult to keep and not the most suitable livestock for the area and the climatic conditions.

From the exchange visit to the Research Centre the farmers learnt about rotational grazing, keeping records of number of sheep, lambing etc and how to tag the sheep. The farmers can expect the sheep to produce one or two lambs a season. The cooperative could increase their sheep population significantly depending on how intensely they breed the sheep and earn a good regular income.



KAZA

The area is a prime location for beekeeping and farmers could get up to 3 harvests per year between March and August depending on the rains. In

					<p>the UK you would expect to only get one harvest per year. People typically throw the wax away and there are no processing facilities for turning wax into cosmetics and other products. Beekeeping is largely an untapped income stream. There is a high level of demand for honey, which is used as a sweetener in food and is also recognised for its health and nutritional benefits.</p> <p>The big constraints are getting hold of equipment, including hives, gloves, protective clothing etc which are expensive. A hive bought in Maun costs 7-800 Pula (87 CHF). The evaluator was informed that a local carpenter could construct a hive much cheaper. Keeping bees involves little labour until harvesting. During this busy time the beekeepers would be able to share equipment and labour rather than purchasing their own.</p>
Number of people employed (male / female)	No baseline available	No targets specified			<p>65 people are members of the Kein Karas cooperative and directly benefiting from the dorper sheep and food garden.</p> <p>The Aus Community Conservation Trust (ACCT) employs one full-time tourist information centre manager and 10 part-time Aus trail tour guides. During the construction of the hiking trails unemployed youth from Aus were employed.</p>
Output 2: Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unachieved or unknown <input type="checkbox"/>	
Output 3: Improved transboundary planning; Namibia supports TFCA issues with its peers					
Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments		
Number of plans	No baseline available	No targets specified	There is no evidence of any new trans-boundary plans being established during the period of the project.		
Number of transboundary forums	No baseline available	No targets specified	Due to the opposition of the KAZA structures to establishing formal structures to engage with communities and NGOs, no transboundary forums were established during the period of the project.		
KAZA technical committee improves and KAZA secretariat becomes operational	No baseline available	No targets specified	<p>The KAZA structure is in its infancy and capacity is said to be extremely weak. Five governments met in 2006 to sign a MoU for the KAZA TFCA. This was a positive step towards a transboundary approach. However, CI reported significant operational delays when dealing with KAZA TFCA secretariat, the technical committee, and the Ministerial Committee representing all five countries. Decisions could take up to two years, and because of this, CI decided to adopt a bilateral approach. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the KAZA structures are under-resourced with part-time officials who hold other responsibilities. The Establishment Treaty is due to be signed later this year which will enable the Secretariat to receive</p>		

					funds and will hopefully lead to strengthened capacity with KAZA structures.			
Output 3: Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved	<input type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved	<input type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unachieved or unknown	<input type="checkbox"/>
Output 4: Transboundary platforms with communities involved are functioning								
Indicator	Baseline	Target		Comments				
Number of platforms	No baseline available	No targets specified		<p>KAZA</p> <p>The initial planned approach of getting NGOs and communities to meet KAZA authorities for information exchange was not met. CI made approaches to the KAZA Secretariat to discuss platforms for NGO and communities to engage in sharing of information, but KAZA structures were said at the time to be wary of NGOs convening meetings that related to KAZA TFCA. KAZA officials apparently declined to meet formally with NGOs and communities.</p> <p>Given the difficulties of working through the KAZA structures CI decided to create transboundary information sharing through other meetings on specific themes, such as the HEC transboundary workshop held in Maun for Government, NGO and local farmer representatives, and the transboundary bee keeping workshop in Shakawe.</p>				
Frequency of meetings	No baseline available	No targets specified		Two transboundary meetings were held outside the KAZA structures as mentioned above. There is no evidence that further transboundary meeting will take place now that the project has finished.				
Active participation of communities or representatives	No baseline available	No targets specified		As mentioned above the KAZA officials declined to meet with communities or NGOs through formal platforms.				
Output 4: Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved	<input type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved	<input type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unachieved or unknown	<input type="checkbox"/>
Qualitative assessment of performance								
How well were the inputs managed?								
Framing questions				Findings				

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To what degree were inputs provided / available on time? Were inputs monitored regularly to encourage cost-effective implementation of activities? To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled? If there were delays how can they be rectified? 	<p>TNND The financing arrangements between CI and NFF appear to have worked extremely well. NNF told the evaluator that the flow of funds from CI was extremely efficient. NNF put in tremendous effort to deliver a broad range of activities across three project sites in remote areas of southern Namibia.</p> <p>NFF staff undertook on-site monitoring on a monthly basis. This was necessary given the short time available for implementation and ensured activities were delivered on time and to a good standard. The evaluator interviewed project beneficiaries in the three project sites. All of those interviewed reported that they were satisfied with the activities that were delivered and the quality.</p> <p>KAZA Monitoring was carried out regularly and all activities were delivered as planned.</p>							
Performance conclusion	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>
How well has the implementation of activities been managed?								
Framing questions					Findings			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Was the logframe or similar tool used as a management tool? If not, why not? Was an activity schedule (or work plan) and resource schedule available and used by the project management and other relevant parties? Were funds committed and spent in line with the implementation timescale? If not, why not? If appropriate, how flexible was the project in adapting to changing needs? If appropriate how did the project co-ordinate with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps? 					<p>TNND The logframe was not used as a management or monitoring tool. NNF said that they were not provided with a reporting format or any guidance on SDC's requirements for monitoring and evaluation, which they say contributed to inconsistent reporting. Monitoring was carried out on a monthly basis by NFF staff.</p> <p>NFF worked closely with the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry specifically the Directorate of Extension Services to ensure there was no overlap or duplication with other projects.</p> <p>The project implementation phase was extremely short, and NFF did exceptionally well in spend the project funds in accordance with the objectives of the project.</p> <p>KAZA The project funds were spent appropriately within the project time frame.</p> <p>As above, the logframe in the credit agreement was not used as a management or a monitoring tool.</p> <p>In 2006, SDC decided to focus its support on one specific "Ecological Corridor" which had been identified during a multi-country workshop convened by CI in Gaborone, and which was called the "Kwando Corridor". For practical reasons it was decided to split the work mainly on geographic basis along this four-nation corridor, with IRDNC focusing on the Namibia component and CI on the Zambia and Botswana component.</p> <p>The HEC intervention coordinated with the envisaged World Bank grant for HEC and as a result the CI support prevented a vacuum being left.</p>			

Performance conclusion	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>
To what extent have outputs been achieved?								
Framing questions					Findings			
1. Have all planned outputs been delivered to date? 2. What is the quality of outputs to date? 3. Are the outputs achieved likely to contribute to the intended project outcome?					Yes, both CI and NFF delivered what they understood they were contracted to deliver. However, the outputs in the logframe in the credit agreement were not delivered because agreement on a final logframe was never reached. There is also some confusion over what are outputs, outcomes and completed activities on the part of the implementing partners. For example, in the TNND progress reports the opening of a bank account and the erection of nursery houses are mentioned as an output, but in results terminology these would be completed activities.			
Performance conclusion	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>
How well did the partner contribution/involvement work?								
Framing questions					Findings			
1. Have all partners been able to provide their financial and/or HR contributions? 2. Has the communication between project stakeholders in the partner country, the donor and the project management been satisfactory?					Communication between the partners appears to have been very good. Both KAZA and TNND project stakeholders said that they would have welcomed more advice and guidance from SDC, including written feedback on progress reports.			
Performance conclusion	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conclusion								
Overall performance conclusion	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>
Key lessons learned and/or actions recommended								
1.	The training centre set up by the Pabalelo Trust in the crocodile farm could be used to train farmers as beekeepers and with an injection of funding a group of beekeepers could be established in some sort of cooperative. This could help overcome the problem of obtaining equipments and the expense.							
2.	The research into traditional and current farming techniques undertaken by the Pabalelo Trust contains valuable information for policy makers and planner and could have been disseminated more widely in communities and within KAZA.							

3. Effectiveness²

Focal issue: the contribution made by the project's results (i.e. "outcomes") to the achievement of the project purpose.

Performance target

Outcomes: 1) Poor farmers have increased and secured their food production 2) Targeted local populations have increased their incomes through sustainable use of natural resources; 3) Governments have adopted and implemented policies favouring transboundary cooperation; 4) Transboundary issues are addressed at micro level in a participatory way

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
1.1 number of farmers adopting conservation farming 1.2 increase of yields per village 1.3 number of fields raided 1.4 % of farmers using chilli pepper and other HWC techniques 1.5 Number of people benefiting from health gardens (HIV affected people)	No baseline available	No targets specified	<p>The outcomes in the credit agreement between SDC and CI are different to the outcomes in the NNF project proposal. Unfortunately, the NNF did not include a logframe in their proposal.</p> <p>Farmers in Seronga reported that their harvest of maize had increased from 10 bags to 40 bags following the use of chilli fencing.</p> <p>According to the research done by Anna Songhurst the number of crop raiding incidents fell from 175 during the month of May in 2008 down to 20 in May 2010. The level of attribution is uncertain.</p> <p>According to the research by Anna Songhurst 10% of farmers used chilli as a HEC mitigation measure in 2010.</p> <p>The evaluator was unable to find any evidence of progress towards the number of people benefiting from health gardens indicator.</p>
2.1 income generated 2.2 assessment of business sustainability 2.3 TNND: overgrazing is reduced 2.4 Number of communities managing their resources independently	Na baseline available	No targets specified	<p>There are no figures available to measure the amount of income generated through the different KAZA and TNNSD interventions. However, the introduction of dorper sheep could generate the Klein Karas farmer cooperative significant additional income depending on how intensely they breed them. The Aus hiking trails also has income generating potential if it can be marketed and managed correctly.</p> <p>There are concerns around the sustainability of the Aus hiking trails, given that to date there have not been any bookings and there are questions over the commitment and capacity of the ACCT to make the visitor centre and the hiking trails a successful.</p> <p>Farmers in Klein Karas received two training sessions focussed on heard management, grazing management, animal health and marketing. From the evaluator's interviews with the farmers, it is clear that the training was well received and appropriate, and that farmers were already changing</p>

² The outcome statements are taken from the SDC Credit Agreement for KAZA and TNND

					their practices.			
3.1 number of plans developed 3.2 number of plans implemented 3.3 stated commitments from government	No baseline available	No targets specified			The KAZA TFCA structure should be where transfrontier plans are developed and issues discussed. However, it is reported that the structures have not yet been formally established. Conservation International has been helping to facilitate the five countries reaching the point of a formal establishment of the KAZA TFCA through the signing of a treaty. Agreement was finally reached to sign a treaty later this year, on the 3 February 2011 during a ministerial meeting in Katima, which demonstrates that committed to the KAZA TFCA by the government's remains high.			
4.1 number of discussed issues being implemented 4.2 relevance of implemented solutions to address the problem 4.3 broad acceptance of implemented measures	No baseline available	No targets specified			Conservation International encountered considerable difficulties with obtaining the support of official KAZA structures for establishing platforms for issues to be discussed with NGO's and community organisations. To overcome these difficulties, With the agreement of SDC, CI created other opportunities for discussion under the banner of issues such as HEC and bee keeping, which brought together representatives from the KAZA countries and NGO's.			
Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved	<input type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved	<input type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unachieved or unknown	<input type="checkbox"/>
Qualitative assessment of performance								
Framing questions					Findings			
3. What evidence is there that achieving the project purpose can be attributed to progress made in delivering the outputs? 4. Were the OVs/targets for the Project purpose appropriate and were they reported against? 5. What is the quality of the results? 6. Are there any factors which prevented target groups from accessing the results/services? 7. To what extent did the project adapt to changing external conditions (risks and assumptions) in order to ensure benefits for the target groups? 8. If any unplanned negative effects on target groups occurred, to what extent did the project management take appropriate measures? 9. To what extent did unplanned positive effects contribute to results produced / services provided?					The logframe for both KAZA and TNND was never finalised between SDC and Conservation International. Therefore the project goal, outcome, outputs statements and Objectively Verifiable Indicators in the logframe that is in the credit agreement are different to what CI and the NNF reported against in their reports to SDC. The assessment of the evaluator is that the project outputs for TNND and KAZA is that they have laid the foundations for the achievement of the project outcomes and built the assets of target communities to cope with the challenges of climate change, and food security. However all the interventions require long-term support in a coordinated manner through transfrontier structures such as KAZA TFCA, which is still in its infancy. The short time frame of both projects limited the likelihood of the outcomes being achieved.			
Key lessons learned and/or actions recommended								

4. Impact

Focal issue: the project's likely contribution to the project's Overall Objective.

Performance target

Impact: The livelihood level of poor people is improved and they are prepared to cope with the consequences of climate change

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
1. food gap periods have disappeared or are shorter 2. access to services is improved (eg health)	No baseline available	No targets specified	<p>For both projects it is too early to say what the impact of the interventions will be. The indicator "access to services is improved" is not an appropriate indicator for these projects, which do not contribute to better access to services, such as health.</p> <p>The indicator "food gap periods have disappeared or are shorter" is a valid indicator, but because of the short project time frame it is too early to tell if any associated target has been met. The garden projects, the HEC mitigation and the dorper sheep interventions provide the best chance to improve food security all year round.</p> <p>KAZA</p> <p>The research done by the Pabalelo Trust on traditional farming across three trans-frontier countries produced very important information of current and historical patterns of small scale subsistence agriculture across the nations of Botswana, Namibia and Zambia and also the constraints that rural people face and the assistance they need. The findings were disseminated to help communities understand where they needed to make changes because of changes to the environment as a result of climate change.</p>
Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Unachieved or unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Qualitative assessment of performance			
Framing questions		Findings	

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What evidence is there that achieving the project outcome is contributing to the realisation of the goal? 2. Were the OVI's/targets for the Project goal appropriate and were they reported against? 3. Were the OVI's/targets realistic? Were they met? 4. Were there any external factors that jeopardised the project's direct impact? 	<p>In the cases of both TNND and KAZA the OVI's in the logframe that formed part of the credit agreement between SDC and CI were not reported against. This is probably due to the fact that negotiations with SDC on the final version of the contract were not completed. Since CI and their sub-contractor NNF, appear to have been working towards different outcomes and goals, to what is in the credit agreement logframe this assessment is only partially valid where the OVI's match the project interventions.</p>
Key lessons learned and/or actions recommended	
1.	The time frame of both TNND and KAZA was too short to make a significant contribution to the intended impact

5. Sustainability

Focal issue: the likelihood of a continuation in the stream of benefits produced by the project after the period of external support has ended.

Key issue (a): financial and economic viability

Framing questions	Findings								
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the services/results have to be supported institutionally, are funds likely to be made available? If so, by whom? 2. Are the services/results affordable for the target groups at the completion of project? 3. Can the benefits be maintained if economic factors change? 4. Are the beneficiaries and/or relevant authorities/institutions able to afford maintenance or replacement of the technologies/services infrastructure introduced by the project? 	<p>Sustainability of the all of the interventions through TNND and KAZA will depend largely on the commitment, capacity and motivation of the communities. Using the examples of the ACCT hiking trails, the vegetable gardens, beekeeping and the chilli HEC mitigation, some level of continuous support and capacity building will be required to ensure that the full benefits of the different interventions are fully realised.</p> <p>Target communities were provided with appropriate low cost technology. However the availability of chilli for HEC mitigation is a serious constraint to the sustainability of this intervention. It is not clear whether the projects are adequately supported by local government structures. The test will be if the problem with the water tank in the Warmbad vegetable garden can be sorted out by the district water office.</p> <p>The Klein Kara farming cooperative has the best chance of sustainability with the potential income from the introduction of Dorper sheep.</p> <p>The vegetable garden in Aus appears to have a ready market in local shops and hotel / lodges. The issue is whether the interest of all the gardeners who were trained will be maintained.</p>								
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%;">Performance conclusion</td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">Excellent <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 25%; text-align: center;">Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Weak <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor <input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Performance conclusion	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Weak <input type="checkbox"/>	Fair <input type="checkbox"/>	Poor <input type="checkbox"/>	
Performance conclusion	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
	Weak <input type="checkbox"/>	Fair <input type="checkbox"/>	Poor <input type="checkbox"/>						

Key issue (b): Level of involvement and ownership of partner beneficiaries

Framing questions	Findings
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How far the project is embedded in local structures? 2. To what extent have target groups and possibly other relevant interest groups / stakeholders been involved in the planning process? 3. To what extent have relevant target groups been actively involved in decision-making concerning project orientation and implementation? 4. What is the likelihood that target groups will continue to make use of relevant results? 5. Do the target groups have any plans to continue delivering the stream of benefits and if so, are they likely to materialise? 	<p>In the cases of both TNND and KAZA the level of community consultation, involvement and decision making on what sort of projects they wanted was high.</p> <p>There has been a good level of engagement of the target groups in both projects. The projects and activities were all designed based on inputs from communities. In the case of TNND, NFF visited each of the communities to discuss needs and to develop project concepts into project proposals. The projects were then presented to the Namibian Governments National Small Grants Programme Selection Committee to ensure coordination with other funding streams and on-going or planned projects.</p> <p>Both projects have laid the foundations for successful enterprises, better food security and better adaptation to climate change. However, without further support and capacity building some of the targets groups may not see the full benefits materialise. There is a good chance that the members of the Klein Karas farmer cooperative will continue with Dorper sheep and will continue the conservation skills they learnt during the workshops and exchange visit to the</p>

				Kalahari Research Station. It is unlikely however that beekeeping for example, will realise its full potential unless there is further support and capacity building.				
Performance conclusion	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>
Key issue (c): the level of policy support provided and the degree of interaction between project and policy level								
Framing questions				Findings				
1. Do changes in policies and priorities affect the project and how well is it adapting in terms of long-term needs for support?				Once the KAZA structures are formally established and operational it is likely that policies will be developed which will directly affect the communities where the project has been operating.				
Performance conclusion	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>
Key issue (c): project's contribution to institutional and management capacity								
Framing questions				Findings				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> How far is the project embedded in institutional structures that are likely to survive beyond the life of the project? Are project partners being properly developed (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing to deliver the project's benefits/services? Will adequate levels of suitable qualified HR be available to continue to deliver the project's benefits? Are there good relations with new or existing institutions and are there plans to continue with some or all of the project's activities? 				<p>The evaluator did not find strong evidence that the projects were embedded within institutional structures. However, the Governments of Botswana and Namibia are actively promoting the development of vegetable gardens as a source of income and food security.</p> <p>The project partners have developed – technically, financially – to the extent that was achievable within the short timeframe of both TNND and KAZA with training, business and marketing advice, tools etc, However, building up a successful and sustainable enterprise or change in agricultural practices requires on-going investment, including monitoring, additional financial support and capacity building.</p>				
Performance conclusion	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>
Key lessons learned and/or actions recommended								
1.	It is recommended that SDC and the implementing partners make available to the KAZA structures information and lessons learned from the investments made in TNND and KAZA. Alternatively, SDC could organise an end of project workshop where the implementing partners, selected individuals from the target communities and KAZA officials are brought together to share lessons and discuss how issues arising can be taken forward.							

6. Cross-cutting issues

Key question (a): was gender interests adequately considered in the project implementation?

Sub-areas	Findings
1. If so, how and to what effect? If not, why not? 2. Please consider the following aspects of gender mainstreaming: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Has the project been planned on the basis of gender analysis? b. To what extent has a focus on female headed households led to an improved impact of the project? c. What is the likeliness of increased female participation beyond project end? 	Women's participation in both projects was high and this will likely be the case beyond the end of the projects. Women play a very large part working the land and in taking care of livestock. No assessment could be made on the extent to which female-headed households benefited the project.

Performance conclusion	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------	-----	--------------------------

Key question (b): Did the project respect conservation and environmental needs?

Framing questions	Findings
1. If so, how and to what effect? If not, why not? 2. Were environmental constraints and opportunities considered adequately in the project design? 3. Were good environmental practices followed in project implementation (in relation to use of water and energy and materials, production of wastes, etc)? Did the project respect traditional, successful environmental practices?	Environmental and climate issues were strong themes in both TNND and KAZA. Both TNND helped to raise awareness of climate change and environmental issues, including the importance of bees for pollination of crops and on the problems associated with over grazing. The research done by the Pabalelo Trust on traditional farming across three trans-frontier countries produced very important information of current and historical patterns of small scale subsistence agriculture across the nations of Botswana, Namibia and Zambia and also the constraints that rural people face and the assistance they need. The findings were disseminated to help communities understand where they needed to make changes because of changes to the environment as a result of climate change.

Performance conclusion	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------	-----	--------------------------

Key question (c): were HIV / AIDS issues included in the project?

Framing questions		Findings			
1. If so, how? If not, why not?		It appears that there was an intention to include health gardens for individuals with HIV / AIDS however the evaluator found no evidence that HIV AIDS issues were included in either TNND or KAZA.			
Performance conclusion	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
Key lessons learned and/or actions recommended					
1.	<u>If one of the target groups was to be people suffering with HIV / AIDS, it is recommended that a separate strategy be developed for this particular target group and, given the sensitivity surrounding HIV / AIDS, this should have be sub-contracted to a specialist organisation.</u>				

7. Persons and documents consulted

Persons	
Name	Position and organisation
1. Leo Braack	Director Southern Africa Wilderness Program, Conservation International
2. Anna Songhurst	HEC consultant
3. Loki Osborn	HEC consultant
4. Anne Clift Hill	Bee-Keeping consultant
5. Willemiem le Roux	Pabalelo Trust
6. Mojita	HEC project assistant
7. Sarah Mugunda, J.P. Markus, Elizabeth Rooi, Maria Markus, Jakobus Cleassen, Masina Markus, Ernst Mugunda, Esmeralda Rooi, Isak Markus,	Klein Karas cooperative
8. Jonas Nghishidi,	NFF Project Coordinator
Documents	
1. Socio-economic baseline study for Klein Kara, Aus and Warmbad, September 2010	
2. TNND final operational report February 2011	
3. Self Evaluation Questionnaires	
4. SDC Credit Proposal	
5. Report of Bees wax extraction and processing workshop, December 2010	
6. Business Plan for Aus Walking Trails 2010	
7. Human – elephant conflict management workshop report June 2010	
8. KAZA final report February 2011	
9. Promoting Bee-keeping in the mid Zambezi-Okavango region workshop proceedings report, February 2010	
10. Training of rural small-scale farmers in Community Based Human Elephant Conflict Mitigation techniques and Chilli Production Consultant's report 2010	
11. Klein Karas Strategic Development Plan	
12. KAZA 12 month Narrative Report March 2009 – February 2010	