

**Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and
Integrated Rural Development and Natural Resources Conservation
(IRDNC)**

**SDC contribution to the Project: Kwando Ecological Corridor –
Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area (KAZA TFCA)**

END OF PROJECT EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT JULY 2011

Simon Milligan



Key project data

Project title:	Kwando Ecological Corridor – Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area (KAZA TFCA)
Status:	Contribution completed
Aid modality:	Project
Geographical zone:	Namibia (primarily), Zambia, Botswana
Contracted party:	Integrated Rural Development and Natural Resources Conservation
Contract start-date:	January 2005
Contract end-date:	February 2011
Responsible SDC office:	Pretoria

Financial data

SDC contract value:	N\$ 4,725.000
	N\$ 1,300,000 (2005-2006)
	N\$ 1,775,000 (2007-2008)
	N\$ 825,000 (2009-10)
	N\$ 825,000 (2010-11)
Total spent (2009-11 only, i.e. focus of evaluation)	N\$ 825,446.95 (2009-10)
	N\$835,138.55 (2010-11)

Evaluation data

Evaluators:	Simon Milligan
Date of evaluation:	28 June - 01 July 2011
Draft report date:	10 July 2011
Final report date:	13 July 2011

Currency notes

1 NAD (N\$) = 0.14888 USD (10 July 2011)

1 NAD (N\$) = 12.449 CHF (10 July 2011)

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CBNRM	Community-based Natural Resource Management
CBO	Community-based Organisation
CRM	Community Resource Monitor
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
GoB	Government of Botswana
GoN	Government of Namibia
HACCSIS	Human-Animal Conservancy Self-Insurance Scheme
HWC	Human-Wildlife Conflict
IRDNC	Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation
IS	Institutional Support
JV	Joint Venture
JVA	Joint Venture Agreement
KAZA	Kavango/Zambezi Tranfrontier Conservation
KEC	Kwando Ecological Corridor
LF	Logframe (logical framework)
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism (Namibia)
MNC	Mudumu North Complex
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSC	Mudumu South Complex
N\$	Namibian Dollars (NAD)
NACSO	Namibian Association for CBNRM Support Organisations
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WWF	World Wildlife Foundation
ZAWA	Zambian Wildlife Authority

Project Summary

SDC provided 'contribution funding' to IRDNC between January 2005 and February 2011 (budget: N\$ 4,725,000). The initial vision was to assist key stakeholders, including IRDNC, to "turn white areas green", i.e. to create a new corridor of parks and conservancies along the so-called Kwanda Ecological Corridor in the East Caprivi, therefore linking Zambia and Botswana through Namibia. SDC's contribution was utilised for governance and institutional matters, therefore enabling communities to meet the requirements laid down in the 1996 legislation and better ensure careful management and distribution of benefits to community members.

Conservancies are self-defined common property management and social units. These unfenced multiple use areas are zoned by members for their livelihood needs, including crop and livestock farming, mixed wild and domestic animal grazing and exclusive wildlife and tourism. In return for responsible management of wildlife, government gives a conservancy the rights over its consumptive and non-consumptive use. Conservancy members (share-holders) are required to elect a representative committee (board of directors) to manage natural resources and equitably distribute income derived from tourism and hunting.

SDC's contribution has enabled IRDNC to support, *inter alia*:

- The introduction of management frameworks, including benefit distributions plans and wildlife utilisation plans.
- An institutional event book system, in which information such as benefit distribution, the number and purpose of meetings, employment and training are recorded and communicated to conservancy members in a visual and structured manner for the purposes of transparency and accountability;
- Financial governance, so as to increase the quality, accuracy and information flows on conservancy finances to conservancy membership and Ministry of Environment and Tourism.
- Conservancy constitution review and revision to respond to lessons and demands, and therefore better ensure the accountability of, access to and engagement between the executive committee and the conservancy membership.

Highlights

1. The programme has initiated the transboundary fora that will allow rural communities who are resident in the KAZA area to have a voice in KAZA – this is a significant highlight, especially since the initial vision for this funding was to create these trans-boundary conservation areas.
2. The programme seeks to create sufficient income for conservancies to cover their operational costs, to create viable livelihood options for some (e.g. game guards, enterprise officers), and an additional, albeit small and variable income/benefit stream for others (i.e. for conservancy members). IRDNC positions itself as a facilitator and therefore communities and other key stakeholders are central to decision-making and planning processes.
3. The SDC funding period, and the range of activities supported, were realistic. They were in line with IRDNC's mandate and areas of 'comparative advantage'. Moreover, SDC's contribution complemented other funding streams that focused on other aspects of the IRDNC programme, and has partly enabled or complemented innovative tools and processes, such as the Dashboard exercise supported by the University of Florida, which tracks the satisfaction of members with committee performance and the conservancy's constitution.
4. The IRDNC appears to have excellent relationships with communities and local authorities, and the longevity of the programme and IRDNC's physical presence better enables trust, confidence and

understanding – all critical success factors for governance-related initiatives. Communities (or beneficiaries) are centrally involved in planning and review processes, and IRDNC support appears always to be tailored to the specific needs.

5. Effort is made to respect and work with traditional authorities and institutions, and due effort is placed on raising awareness of responsibilities and obligations alongside rights and possible benefits. These, and the existence of fora to discuss issues of mutual interest, are critically important in a programme that deals with different scales, e.g. the broad landscapes required for effective wildlife management, the conservancy boundaries along locally-defined traditional boundaries lines, the communities within that and the interests of households and individuals at the very micro-level. Interests and needs may not always be aligned. Time and resources are required to ensure that support partners, such as the IRDNC, remain accessible and can provide the support and mentorship required.
6. Whilst the KEC logframe makes no overt reference to desired changes in policy and practice, in working closely with government structures, most notably the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), it has institutional access to advocate for change. The collaboration has also provided opportunity for IRDNC to support MET to provide and interpret legislation, and therefore the rights and responsibilities placed on conservancies. The MET has also benefited from capacity building in areas such as financial management and legislative requirements, which has helped to strengthen their role and enable them to better fulfill their mandate (albeit staffing numbers and recurrent budget constraints act and will continue to act as impediments).
7. IRDNC works with and through NACSO and its working groups, thereby capturing and linking field experience with other fora whose members may wish to understand, replicate and/or scale-up IRDNC approaches. In working with institutional structures in neighbouring countries (e.g. Zambian Wildlife Authority, ZAWA), the programme offers scope to facilitate change at policy, sub-regional, community and ultimately household level. IRDNC's ability to influence government policy and practice is informed by the organisation's long, in-country and in-regional record, and therefore the trust, confidence, credibility and understanding that that typically creates.
8. IRDNC has been cognisant of gender interests and dynamics, though female-headed households were never explicitly identified as a key target group and indicators and targets in the logframe were not disaggregated by sex. Whilst female committee members are outnumbered by their male counterparts, the programme has taken steps to empower women, e.g. through public-speaking capacity building. Programme measures to support devil's claw and craft marketing are highly gender-sensitive.

Weaknesses

9. The programme had two core weaknesses. First, Output Area 4 concerning orphaned children is somewhat disconnected with the remainder of the support financed by SDC, even if it may have been justifiable in developmental terms, had linkages with conservancy committees (i.t.o. the identification of orphans) and apparently attained positive results in relation to their registration for government grants.
10. Secondly, the logical or results framework contained a number of flaws (see Annex A), the consequences of which are described in the section below. Flaws include:
 - a. The impact indicators do not speak to the Overall Goal statement, and are actually output-based in nature
 - b. "Quality of life" (goal) is undefined, and as such lacks a baseline, milestones and a target to track the direction of travel and IRDNC's contribution to the same.

- c. The outcomes are too many and are too 'low-level', i.e. they are outputs. Moreover, a purpose or outcome statement should convey what will change and for whom, thereby illuminating the problem that the organisation/programme is seeking to address.
- d. There are areas of overlap between outputs and outcomes, and their respective indicators (which explains the degree of overlap between sections of IRDNC reports, e.g. between the status of some output, outcomes and impacts).
- e. Some indicator statements are imprecise, creating assessment difficulties.
- f. There is little or no disaggregation within indicators.

Overall assessment

1. The SDC contribution and the broader IRDNC programme in the Caprivi are evidently highly relevant:
 - To the expressed needs and priorities of the rural Caprivians.
 - To national policy frameworks, such as the conservancy legislation for communal areas in 1996 and the Forest Amendment Act of 2005
 - To the regional policy frameworks and realities, such as the KAZA TFCA's commitment to multilateral protocols to harmonise the management of wildlife resources (and the movement of tourists) across international boundaries..
2. IRDNC and SDC's initial vision was to assist key stakeholders, including IRDNC, to "turn white areas green", i.e. to create a new corridor of parks and conservancies along the so-called Kwanda Ecological Corridor in the East Caprivi, therefore linking Zambia and Botswana through Namibia. This vision has been achieved. Moreover, SDC's support coincided with and probably enabled a strategic shift in IRDNC's work; specifically a gradual move away from a focus on assisting rural communities to meet the legal requirements for conservancy registration to a facilitation from the mid 2000s of the institutional sustainability of conservancies, with due attention on issues of governance, management, accountability and benefit distribution.
3. The target conservancies have secured their natural resource management rights and all but one is generating income from trophy hunting, tourism and timber harvesting. In an immediate sense, therefore, the conservancies and their structures are demonstrating financially and economically sustainability. This represents a significant success given the brief history of conservancies in Namibia and the significant extent to which the legal requirements placed on conservancy structures require a new, transparent and accountable governance model in rural Caprivi.
4. The registration and then the subsequent, more complex and more long-term support to conservancy management and governance has provided a good return on donor 'investment', even if further support will be required from 2011. By way of example, the eight sub-areas of Wuparo received just over N\$41,000 in 2010. This is illustrative of the distance traveled from the 1990s, i.e. before the establishment of the conservancies and therefore at a time when community members received no such benefits from their natural resource base.
5. The significant collective income seen in some conservancies represents a very positive outcome but also a formidable challenge. Unwise selection of community-based projects or inadequate support in business planning, marketing, and operation and maintenance of capital assets, for example, might create a sense of despondency about conservancy benefits and nurture a sense of withdrawal of support. The role of IRDNC in this regard needs careful consideration. As this would suggest, many areas of IRDNC's programme of support are clearly work in progress. The ability (and willingness) of committees to perform in line with their constitutional requirements and the broader legal framework, their ability to remain transparent and accountable, their ability of to negotiate and enforce beneficial joint venture agreements, and the the scope for a 'meaningful'

level of timely benefit distribution will depend on future IRDNC (and MET) support. This is and this will remain a long-term programme; a programme that is dependent on ongoing donor support.

6. Institutional, management and governance capacity are at the front and centre to IRDNC's programme. This has increasingly been the case in the last decade, and SDC's contribution has been central in allowing the organisation to respond to these issues following the wave of conservancy registrations after 1998-99. IRDNC recognises that the establishment of conservancies is relatively easy when compared to the challenges faced in meeting the governance and management requirements laid down in the legislation.
7. Project evaluations are obliged to determine the extent to which a project has achieved its intended objective. Based only on a review of the expected outcomes provided in the logframe, IRDNC has wholly achieved the expected high-level results. However, from a design and logframe perspective, the SDC-KEC logframe has weaknesses in that it contains four outcome statements and none indicate what will change. This is probably because they are too 'low level'. For example, outcomes 1, 2 and 3 are output statements, i.e. "products and services produced or competences and capacities established directly as a result of project activities" (SDC). The question then becomes: *what was the expected, attributable result of the conservancies having been registered and implementing their management frameworks?*
8. Going forward, and given the increasing focus on results and accountability within the aid and development sector, IRDNC should respond to three challenges:
 - Better articulate the high-level results that stem from their activities and outputs. As such, they must be able to address the question: *What does it all add up to?* Further to that, they must then be able to articulate what those results are expected to contribute to, e.g. a reduction of rural poverty, an increase of food security, improved nutrition etc., etc. These likely speak to the improved "quality of life" that IRDNC envisages¹.
 - Better articulate why their resource-intensive approach constitutes value-for-money in relation to: a) the intended and actual results; b) the field or operational realities of their programme areas, and; c) any alternative modalities for the pursuit of the intended results. In so doing, IRDNC must be able to answer two key questions:
 - i. Can the programme deliver the same results at less cost?
 - ii. Can the costs be justified in relation to the results?²
 - Examine whether there is scope to better harmonise monitoring and reporting requirements. IRDNC has proved highly capable of attracting donor finance, has a mature relationship with donor agencies, and has sought to target/use particular donor finance and other assistance (e.g. from University of Florida) in a synergistic fashion. However, having +/- 15 donors inevitably places pressure on any organisation, and there is therefore merit in exploring whether there is scope to develop a basket of standardized indicators at outcome and output level: indicators which meet the needs of the various donors and key stakeholders but which are also manageable and useable by IRDNC. Similarly, there would be merit in any harmonized results framework being explicit about the financial contribution each donor makes to each output area and therefore enabling IRDNC to better capture the likely donor contribution to specific results at output and outcome level.

¹ Is it noteworthy that IRDNC has a rich data- and information-mine, and the collation and presentation of high-level results is not likely to be burdensome.

² These matters are important and are likely to become increasingly important to current bilateral donors. However, the presentation of a persuasive, evidence-based argument may also be attractive to prospective donors, if only because it shows that the organisation is mindful of the 'VFM issue'.

Disclaimers, caveats and points of note

1. The evaluator would like to place on record his gratitude for the logistical support, openness and professionalism of the IRDNC 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 financial contribution spanned the period 2005-11, SDC agreed that the evaluation focus on the period 2009-11.



Annex A: observations on the SDC-IRDNC logframe

1. The IDRNC goal statement is fine insofar as a goal is not intended to be achieved solely by one project³. However, “quality of life” is undefined (see below) and one wonders if in future there may be merit in tying the goal statement and indicators more closely to MDGs, to which presumably IRDNC, its donors, the Namibian state and the broader KAZA region subscribe. For merely illustrative purposes, resultant indicators might include:
 - The proportion of poor and vulnerable men, women and children in the Caprivi region whose income is less than USD 1/day (MDG1)
 - The number of people in the Caprivi region who suffer from hunger (MDG1)
 - The number of [specific ‘environmental resources’] within the Caprivi region (MDG7).
2. The impact indicators do not speak to the Overall Goal statement for two reasons:
 - They do not provide for performance measurement in relation to “quality of life”⁴.
 - Besides the 4th impact indicator, they are all output indicators, i.e. they speak to specific, direct deliverables of the project.
3. Further to the above, the 4th impact indicator is a performance measure of the other three impact indicators, i.e. N\$ 10m of benefits are foreseen as a consequence of the new or improved rights, structures and capacity. Going forward, and depending on the purpose or objective statement, the 4th indicator might be highly appropriate because it goes some way to answering the “so what?” question. Additional indicators might focus on the number of (quality⁵) jobs created, total collective income, total cash distributed to membership.
4. As a consequence of the above, it would be very difficult to determine the project impact on a defined group of stakeholders in a defined geographical area. As this would suggest, without the right indicators it becomes very difficult to measure the extent of any change as a result of project activities. (Any absence of baseline data creates the same problem).
5. The LF is sound in the sense that there is an internal logic and the IF-AND-THEN logic adds up. However, an Outcome states should convey what will change and for whom⁶. As such, they also point to the problem that is being addressed. The SDC-KEC logframe contains three outcomes and none indicate what will change. This is probably because they are too ‘low level’. For example, outcomes 1, 2 and 3 are output statements, i.e. “products and services produced or competences and capacities established directly as a result of project activities” (SDC). The question then

³ According to SDC, Impact (or Overall Goal) represents the “improvements of a situation in terms of social and economic benefits which respond to identified development needs of the target population under a long-term vision”.

⁴ Which also begs the question: is there consensus about what “quality of life” means? There is obviously merit in having ‘meaningful’ indicators, and therefore it would be worthwhile looking at the research conducted by Brian’s student on the notion of ‘quality of life’. The findings appeared to focus on food security and there is probably merit, therefore, in selecting food security indicators that are regularly used by the GoN and for which periodic data is presumably collected, processed and disseminated.

⁵ The notion of ‘quality’ would need to be defined but would likely point to long-term, well paid positions, such as those within coconservancy management teams, campsites and lodges.

⁶ SDC states that an outcome or Purpose is the “intended situation at the end of or soon after the project’s lifespan in terms of *gains in performance* (as a result of changes in knowledge and behaviour)”. By way of example, a project purpose may be to increase agricultural productivity and yields, with the goal being to reduce hunger or improve nutrition. The outcome and impact will derive from evidence-based promotion of Conservation Agriculture and Agroforestry through government and NGOs as an appropriate response to food insecurity and climate change (i.e. a project output).

becomes: *what was the expected, attributable result of the conservancies having been registered and implementing their management frameworks?*

6. It is always best to have one purpose or outcome statement, thereby better ensuring clarity of purpose.
7. Some indicator statements are imprecise, creating assessment difficulties. For example:
 - What constitutes “sound” financial management (outcome 2)?
 - Is “management of earnings” a performance measurement (outcome 2)? What does it mean and will it mean the same thing to all people?
8. There is some degree of overlap between output 1.1 and outcome 1 and their respective indicators, which supports the notion that the outcome statement is actually an output. One also suspects that elements of Output 1.1 are actually activities⁷. Similarly, and as currently formulated, Output 3.2 is an activity.
9. Current best practice advises that indicators, baselines, milestones and end-of-project targets must be separated out in additional LF columns. It is acknowledged that this is at variance to SDC’s LF guidance material, though that itself should be reviewed and updated based on best international practice and critical reflection of lessons learnt within SDC’s project portfolio. Current thinking advises that targets should be SMART, i.e. specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound. Indicators, by contrast, identify what will be assessed to measure and track performance or change, e.g. number of, occurrence of, frequency of, % of, etc., etc. By way of example indicators in the health sector might include:
 - Output indicators (i.e. in relation to the specific, direct deliverables of the project)
 - i. Number of health workers trained in x,y,z (disaggregated by sex).
 - ii. % functioning facilities with comprehensive obstetric care per 10,000 pregnant women
 - Outcome indicators (i.e. in relation to the change statement)
 - i. Number/Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel
 - ii. Proportion of mothers who report being satisfied with services
 - Impact indicators
 - i. Maternal mortality ratio
10. With a focus on indicators as performance measures, it becomes imperative that baseline data, targets and, where appropriate, time-bound milestones are provided to chart the direction and speed of travel. The first indicator within Outcome 2 includes reference to “additional”. Additional to what? Again, a baseline (with specific time point referenced) would be beneficial to an outsider and for accountability and reporting purposes.
11. There is little or no disaggregation within indicators.

⁷ Activities should illuminate the processes by which inputs (e.g. project funding) are converted to an output, e.g. training of xxx in the fields of yyyy and zzzz, which produces the output of extension workers being trained in specific, new techniques.

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? Was their a targeting strategy? 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><i>Context</i></p> <p>The IRDNC CBNRM programme in Caprivi was launched in 1990, and gained momentum , when new conservancy legislation for communal areas was passed in 1996 and, later, when the Forest Amendment Act of 2005 was passed. The policy framework devolves rights over resources to those living in communal areas. The programme is founded on the premise that communities will manage natural resources (including wildlife) and use them for community and individual benefit when they have ownership over these resources and an incentive to do so.</p> <p>The 1996 legislation gives conditional user rights over huntable wildlife to communities in communal areas that form a conservancy – a self-defined management unit. Namibia's first conservancy was registered in February 1998; by 2011 the number had increased to 64, with a further 20 in emergence.</p> <p>The Caprivi region has low and variable rainfall of 500-700mm/annum, offering relatively few non-agricultural livelihood options but, traditionally, an abundance of wildlife, including elephants. The region is bounded by four countries – Angola and Zambia to the north, Zimbabwe to the east and Botswana to the south – creating transboundary NRM and governance issues (e.g. around poaching) but also opportunities to secure benefit from the natural capital assets of the region. The first conservancy in Caprivi was registered in June 1998; by 2011 there were 12 registered conservancies and one community association representing the residents of a national park, and a further four emerging conservancies.</p> <p>SDC provided 'contribution funding' to IRDNC between January 2005 and February 2011 (budget: N\$ 4,725,000). The initial vision was to assist key stakeholders, including IRDNC, to "turn white areas green", i.e. to create a new corridor of parks and conservancies along the so-called Kwando Ecological Corridor in the East Caprivi, therefore linking Zambia and Botswana through Namibia. SDC's contribution was utilised for governance and institutional matters, therefore enabling communities to meet the requirements laid down in the 1996 legislation and better ensure careful management and distribution of benefits to community members. The vision was that the conservancy model for communal management of natural resources could inform and guide similar initiatives across the international borders, and that communities would establish links across boundaries so that they would have a voice in the development of the Kavango-Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area (KAZA).</p> <p>IRDNC's programme in Caprivi commenced with initial funding from the Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) Programme (USAID, WWF) in the 1990s. SDC's subsequent support was</p>

	<p>timely (and is recognised and valued by IRDNC as being such), allowing for a continuation and deepening of support, and with particular emphasis on the committee management and governance matters required within conservancy legislation. SDC's support coincided with and probably enabled a strategic shift in IRDNC's work; specifically a gradual move away from a focus on assisting rural communities to meet the legal requirements for conservancy registration to a facilitation from the mid 2000s of the institutional sustainability of conservancies, with due attention on issues of governance, management, accountability and benefit distribution.</p> <p>SDC's contribution has enabled IRDNC to support, inter alia: a) the introduction of management frameworks, including benefit distributions plans and wildlife utilisation plans; an institutional event book system, in which information such as benefit distribution, the number and purpose of meetings, employment and training are recorded and communicated to conservancy members in a visual and structured manner for the purposes of transparency and accountability; c) financial governance, so as to increase the quality, accuracy and information flows on conservancy finances to conservancy membership and MET; conservancy constitution review and revision to respond to lessons and demands, and therefore better ensure the accountability of, access to and engagement between the executive committee and the conservancy membership.</p> <p>In sum, therefore, the IRDNC programme, and SDC's contribution to the same, was (is) highly consistent with national policies and regional issues, and was also highly relevant in addressing pre-existing problems and responding to the changing needs of conservancies and their committees post-registration. SDC's contribution was also well-time to coincide with the emergence of KAZA, and has ensured that CBOs and their trans-boundary fora, are recognised as legitimate stakeholders in KAZA.</p> <p><i>Results framework: logframe commentary</i></p> <p>The logframe (LF) and reporting framework had some positive features. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The notion of having a project goal statement that is nested within a higher IRDNC goal statement is sound. • IRDNC sought to have a small number of LF indicators, reducing the onus placed on the project team. • IRDNC has sought to report actual results against intended results. <p>The LF is also sound in the sense that there is an internal logic and the IF-AND-THEN logic adds up. However, an Outcome statement should convey what will change and for whom. As such, it should also point to the problem that is being addressed. The SDC-KEC logframe contains three outcomes and none indicate what will change. This is probably because they are too 'low level'. For example, outcomes 1, 2 and 3 are output statements, i.e. "products and services produced or competences and capacities established directly as a result of project activities" (SDC). The question then becomes: <i>what was the expected, attributable result of the conservancies having been registered and implementing their management</i></p>
--	--

frameworks?

Further weaknesses are as follows:

- Whilst the IDRNC goal statement is fine insofar as a goal is not intended to be achieved solely by one project, “quality of life” is undefined and one wonders if in future there may be merit in tying the goal statement and indicators more closely to MDGs, to which presumably IRDNC, its donors, the Namibian state and the broader KAZA region subscribe. For merely illustrative purposes, resultant indicators might include:
 - The proportion of poor and vulnerable men, women and children in the Caprivi region whose income is less than USD 1/day (MDG1)
 - The number of people in the Caprivi region who suffer from hunger (MDG1)
 - The number of [specific ‘environmental resources’] within the Caprivi region (MDG7).
- The impact indicators did not speak to the Overall Goal statement for two reasons:
 - They do not provide for performance measurement in relation to “quality of life”.
 - Besides the 4th impact indicator, they are all output indicators, i.e. they speak to specific, direct deliverables of the project.
- The 4th impact indicator is a performance measure of the other three impact indicators, i.e. N\$ 10m of benefits are foreseen as a consequence of the new or improved rights, structures and capacity.

The SDC funding period and range of activities supported were realistic, and were in line with IRDNC’s mandate and areas of ‘comparative advantage’. However, Output Area 4 concerning orphaned children is somewhat disconnected with the remainder of the support financed by SDC, even if it may have been justifiable in developmental terms, had linkages with conservancy committees (i.t.o. the identification of orphans) and apparently attained positive results in relation to their registration for government grants.

Ownership, empowerment and partnership are central features of IRDNC’s approach, and are evident in the interventions supported by SDC funding. For example, IRDNC has and continues to implement its programme in partnership with a number of stakeholders, most notably government (e.g. Ministry of Environment and Tourism), the private sector, rural communities and the traditional authorities. It has sought close engagement with the Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisations (NACSO) and participates in its structures, e.g. the working groups as a means for improved lesson-sharing. It has also forged close relationships with academic institutions, including the University of Namibia (through facilitating annual internship for Bachelor in Tourism students, as well as postgraduate researchers), the Polytechnic of Namibia (through facilitating annual internship of Diploma in Nature Conservation students), NRI (UK) and the University of Florida (USA). Engagement with the latter has enabled the development and utilisation of the innovative ‘Dashboard’

		mechanism, which tracks the satisfaction of members with committee performance and the conservancy's constitution (and therefore complements and reinforces the activities supported by SDC finance).						
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.	SDC should consider revising its current logframe format to separate out indicators, milestones and targets.							
2.	IRDNC should review its results framework(s) to ensure correct delineation of outputs, outcome and goal, and appropriate indicators, milestones and targets for each.							
3.	SDC should consider financing an IRDNC workshop that would support staff to review/refine its next 3-5 year strategy, the results framework within that and an appropriate basket of value for money (VFM) indicators.							

2. Efficiency

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

Performance target: output-by-output

Output 1.1: Emerging conservancy applications are compiled and submitted to Government.

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
2 emerging conservancy [sic] have an elected committee, an agreed area to manage and a constitution (6 conservancies in the target area already have this in place)	[0]	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	Although tribal disputes prevented the gazettment of one of the emerging conservancies which had been identified in the lograme (Shikhakhu), the target of registering a further two conservancies in the target area was achieved (Balyerwa and Bamunu). One of the emerging conservancies (Balyerwa) was one of the originally identified frontline conservancies, whilst the other (Bamunu) was not included in the original list of frontline conservancies, as it emerged after the lograme had been developed.
Output 1.1: Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Unachieved or unknown <input type="checkbox"/>

Output 1.2: Conservancy management plans are compiled, implemented and reviewed.

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
8 conservancies have management plans that complement the management framework	[0]	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	Management plans developed and revised in some cases, e.g. Dzoti, Sobbe, Balyerwa, Mayuni and Kwando.
8 conservancies are applying adaptive management strategies by evaluating monitoring data and adapting work plans accordingly.	[0]	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	Bi-annual planning meetings held, offering a peer review mechanism of plans and performance. Chairperson's forum can play a similar role. Evidence that data is broadly collected and presented, though in the case of the Kwando Conservancy noticeboard the content appears not to meet the information needs of members, e.g. it lacks financial reports and minutes. Institutional event book audits were conducted in seven conservancies; all conservancies reported to be implementing the book.
Output 1.2: Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Unachieved or unknown <input type="checkbox"/>

Output 2.1: Conservancies with no self-generating income are managing 'start-up' grants.

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
7 conservancies in year one and 4	[0]	Embedded within the indicator	Based on agreement from SDC, and due to their strategic positioning for

in year two will access 'start up' grant funds according to approved work plans.		statement, see left.	trans-boundary conservation, four of the five conservancies that received start-up grants do not fall within the Kwandu Corridor, but in the Chobe Complex. Five conservancies received 'start-up' grant funds: Kabula-Bula, Sikunga, Bamunu, Impalila and Kasika. Dzoti, Kasika and Sikunga now financially sustainable, given hunting revenues exceed running costs.
Output 2.1: Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Unachieved or unknown <input type="checkbox"/>
Output 2.2: Financial and natural resources management competencies of conservancies' selected committee members are improved.			
Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
8 treasurers are accounting and reporting on their finances on a monthly and annual basis.	Treasurers were keeping basic financial records and reporting on the use of finances at Annual General Meetings, but their reporting was sub-standard, which necessitated the recruitment of accounting specialists to train treasurers.	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	Seven of the eight conservancies have received intensive support, and there is ongoing provision of book-keeping/accountancy matters. This will continue to August 2011. There is evidence of book updating and regular reporting. Given the withdrawal of financial support to one of the eight target conservancies for reasons described earlier, this output area can be said to be "wholly achieved".
Output 2.2: Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Unachieved or unknown <input type="checkbox"/>
Output 3.1: Collaborative management forums are functional and implementing their work plans			
Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
2 more collaborative management fora are meeting regularly (1 already in place)	[0]	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	Mudumu North Complex active. In addition, the Mudumu South Complex was initiated (visioning and planning was facilitated).
1 collaborative management forum is implementing its management plan.	[0]	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	Achieved. See MNC.
Output 3.1: Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Unachieved or unknown <input type="checkbox"/>
Output 3.2: Community based TBNRM forums are functioning			
Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
3 community based TBNRM forums	[0]	Embedded within the indicator	Achieved. The Kwandu Conservancy (Nam)/Imusho Ward (Zam) TBNRM

continue to meet regularly and develop and implement plans and 1 more is established.		statement, see left.	forum is the most active, meets regularly and engages in joint activities, e.g. joint patrolling. See comments elsewhere in this report concerning TBNRM activities.
Output 3.2: Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Unachieved or unknown <input type="checkbox"/>
Output 3.3: Regional partners are sharing experiences through networking activities.			
Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
Approaches and management plans across the border start complementing each other.	[0]	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	MoUs between the forums demonstrate that there is some collaborative cross-border natural resource management taking place, with complementary approaches being adopted across borders. But these MoUs are not formally recognised management plans in their respective countries. Some progress has been made in harmonizing land-use and natural resource management plans across borders since IRDNC has started playing the role of technical support organisation to WWF Zambia in the Silwana Complex area just north of the Caprivi Region.
Output 3.3: Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Unachieved or unknown <input type="checkbox"/>
4.1 Orphaned children are supported in attending school			
Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
61 orphaned children are attending school	[0]	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	Not assessed by the evaluator for reasons provided but IRDNC reports suggest achievement.
Output 4.1: Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Unachieved or unknown <input type="checkbox"/>
Output 4.2: HIV AIDS support groups are supported in developing and implementing ideas that assist them			
Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
5 HIV AIDS support groups are conducting projects	[0]	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	HIV testing undertaken in conservancies, reports of increased understanding and openness, and provision of support by peer educators.
Output 4.2: Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Partly achieved <input 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? By whom where they monitored? Were contractual procedures clearly understood and did they facilitate project To what extent were activities implemented as scheduled? If there were delays how can they be rectified? 				<p>Personnel costs account for +/-40% of total SDC programme costs, with travel, meeting and workshops accounting for a further +/-10%. As such, programme delivery costs are reasonably high. However, governance work is resource-intensive, IRDNC's philosophy (and success to date) is founded on accessibility, and the area of implementation is large. As such, IRDNC's costs are probably defensible but IRDNC should consider preparing a case for its cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>There is no evidence of significant or unreasonable delay.</p>				
Performance conclusion	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input checked="" 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>The logframe was used as a basis of reporting, though SDC and IRDNC should have identified weaknesses in logframe content and therefore the degree of overlap within reports, e.g. between output, outcome and impact status.</p> <p>IRDNC has proved highly capable of attracting donor finance, has a mature relationship with donor agencies, and has sought to target/use particular donor finance and other assistance (e.g. from University of Florida) in a synergistic fashion. With +/-15 donors, IRDNC may require donors to better harmonise monitoring and reporting requirements, and there may be value in IRDNC promoting 'away weeks' for donor staff to meet the project team and 'experience' the programme. Such an event would offer opportunity for IRDNC to 'hammer out' agreements with the donors, and identify future funding windows.</p>				
Performance conclusion	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>
To what extent have outputs been achieved?								
Framing questions				Findings				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Have all planned outputs been delivered to date? What is the quality of outputs to date? Are the outputs achieved likely to contribute to the intended project outcome? 				<p>Outputs have been delivered with evidence of high quality. Outputs contribute to the intended outcome but, as noted elsewhere, there is inadequate separation of outputs, an outcome and a goal.</p>				
Performance conclusion	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input 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?		There is no obvious evidence to suggest poor performance in this regard. During the last phase of SDC funding, IRDNC was able to secure funding from EED, which has taken over most of the personnel costs of the Institutional Support team that SDC's funding supported.						
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>
Key lessons learned and/or actions recommended								
1.	Bilateral donors are placing ever greater focus on the results and VFM agenda. It is advised that IRDNC builds a VFM case for its programme, with due focus on external comparitors (where available) and economy, efficiency and effectiveness, and doing so with a view to building a compelling case for VFM.							
2.								
3.								

3. Effectiveness

Focal issue: the contribution made by the project's results to the achievement of the project purpose.

Performance target

Outcomes:

1. Targeted conservancies are registered and implementing their management frameworks.
2. Targeted conservancies are financially independent.
3. Targeted conservancies have coordinated management structures with their neighbours.
4. Targeted groups are supported with HIV AIDS mitigation strategies

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
1.1.: 2 further conservancies are registered	6 already registered	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	SDC's support was targeted at so-called 'frontline' conservancies in the East Caprivi and along the Kwando Ecological Corridor: Kwandu, Mayuni, Mashi, Wuparo, Sobbe, Balywera, Dzoti (formerly Malengalenga). Support to an eighth conservancy – Shikhakhu (formerly Mbara) – was foreseen but rescinded because of continued conflict and a (correct) decision to re-deploy the resources to areas signalling greater interest and sustainability. In total, there are now 12 registered conservancies and a Resident's Association (representing residents of the Bwabwata National Park) in Caprivi. These include the SDC 'targets': Kwandu (Dec 99), Mayuni (Dec 99), Mashi (Mar 03), Wuparo (Dec 99), Sobbe (Oct 06), Balywera (Oct 06), Dzoti (Oct 09).
1.2: 8 conservancies are implementing their Management Framework; 4 conservancies with 5 components being implemented and 4 conservancies with 3 components being implemented.	[0]	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	8 conservancies are applying their management frameworks: whilst a management framework is not being used in Shikhakhu (see above), IRDNC shifted support to Bamunu.. Long-term institutional support is required to support conservancies to understand, value and implement aspects of their management frameworks, the extent to which all components are being implemented in line with expectations inevitably ebbs and flows. As such, the indicator phraseology has limitations because "implementing" and "implemented" are ambiguous and open to interpretation. There are presumably degrees of implementation and indicators should speak to that reality. There may also be a positive correlation between extent of implementation and the extent of benefits derived from the conservancy.
2.1: 4 more conservancies are earning and managing their own income (4 already are in target area)	4 conservancies were earning an income in 2009	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	Besides Shikhakhu, all of SDC's targeted conservancies are generating income and are financially independent. SDC's 'frontline' conservancies derive income from a variety of sources, with the nature and extent of income varying in accordance with, for example, the area's natural

			<p>resource assets and related scope for eco-tourism. By way of example, Mashi has joint venture tourism agreements with Namushasha Lodge and Camp Kwando, whereas Kwandu relies on (comparatively smaller) trophy hunting concessions and a community campsite. Wuparo has received significant income from trophy hunting and, with MCA support, has entered into a JVA and co-ownership agreement with an Italian investor for a new tented safari lodge. Besides distributing c. 50% of cash benefits to community members, Wuparo has also used a percentage of its income to finance community projects and has sent two members on vocational training in South Africa, e.g. game management in the Kruger Park.</p> <p>There is evidence that treasurers keep monthly financial records, financial reports are prepared and AGMs held, though weaknesses and variable performance measures have resulted in IRDNC deploying a book-keeper to provide specialist mentorship and support. Financial projections by some committees err on the side of great optimism but this may be symptomatic of the learning curve committees and management teams are undertaking. IRDNC recognises that financial governance and management will continue to represent a focal area of their support and mentorship.</p>
<p>3.1: 100% of target area represented on coordinated management structure (national collaborative forms and / or transboundary forums).</p>	<p>[0]</p>	<p>Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.</p>	<p>There is evidence of trans-boundary natural resource management fora being in place, e.g. at Kwandu (Nam) and Imusho (Zambia). There are also claims in Kwandu that collaboration has reduced poaching and incidences of stock theft but this is not verified. Incentives for collaboration are evident in the case of conservancy members (i.e. Kwandu) but less clear in Zambia (Imusho) where economic benefits of wildlife are less evident.</p> <p>Community-driven, transboundary initiatives face inevitable constraints in relation to transport and logistics. IRDNC has recently reviewed progress in relation to TBNRM fora. This process included the facilitation of a workshop in November 2010, attended by, inter alia, representatives of four Namibian conservancies, the Chobe Conservancy Conservation Trust of Botswana, Ministries of Fisheries and Environment from Namibia, the Ministry of Livestock from Zambia, the Namibian Nature Foundation and the KAZA Secretariat. Challenges to future TBNRM were said to be: a lack of financial resources, low capacity and high turnover of forum members, and limited access to technical advisors.</p> <p>Elsewhere, an intra-national collaborative management forum is operational within Mudumu North Complex, which includes SDC's 'frontline conservancies' of Kwandu, Mashi, Sobbe and Mayuni, coupled with the Kyaramacan Resident's Association The Forum seeks to implement joint</p>

			<p>activities to manage wildlife, fire and forest resources, and is managed by a Senior Decision-makers' Forum and supported by a series of working groups, e.g. on law enforcement. The extent to which local stakeholders are able to shift their agendas from community and conservancy focus to a larger MNC perspective is unclear to the evaluator, as is the extent to which self-interest over-rides or challenges the rhetorical commitment to a 'joined-up landscape'. The Complex has created a forum for multiple stakeholders (government, CBO and private sector) to meet and jointly review plans and activities in the area, and has led to increased collaboration between government ministries (e.g. police, defence force and community game guards establishing a joint anti-poaching unit). The Complex has also made it possible for conservancies to leverage donors for funds to develop infrastructure in their area (e.g. new Mashi Crafts building, and windmill waterpoint on the boundary between Mashi and Mayuni Conservancies).. Nevertheless, such work is likely to require a long-term commitment from IRDNC and other secondary stakeholders, e.g. MET.</p>					
4.1: Affected families are supported	[0]	Unclear	<p>The evaluator did not examine this outcome area for reasons provided earlier, i.e. it is deemed by the evaluator to be outside of the core support provided by IRDNC. IRDNC reports stated that 61 girls, who are either orphans or identified by the government as highly vulnerable children, were supported to stay in school. The targeted orphans, as well as a further 47 children have been registered for further financial support from the government.</p>					
Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved	<input checked="" 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 purpose can be attributed to progress made in delivering the outputs? 2. Were the OVs/targets for the Project purpose appropriate and were they reported against? 3. What is the quality of the results? 4. Are there any factors which prevented target groups from accessing the results/services? 5. To what extent did the project adapt to changing external conditions (risks and assumptions) in order to ensure benefits for the target groups? 					<p>Based only on a review of the expected outcomes provided in the logframe, IRDNC has wholly achieved the expected high-level results. However, from a design and logframe perspective, the SDC-KEC logframe has weaknesses in that it contains four outcome statements and none indicate what will change. This is probably because they are too 'low level'. For example, outcomes 1, 2 and 3 are output statements, i.e. "products and services produced or competences and capacities established directly as a result of project activities" (SDC). The question then becomes: what was the expected, attributable result of the conservancies having been registered and implementing their management frameworks? Put another way, "so what?" <i>Why do the outcomes matter? What does it all add up to? What is the expected result of the gazetting, improved management etc?"</i>.</p>			

<p>6. If any unplanned negative effects on target groups occurred, to what extent did the project management take appropriate measures?</p> <p>7. To what extent did unplanned positive effects contribute to results produced / services provided?</p>	<p>Whilst this line of questioning should persist and represents a challenge to IRDNC in the future, the programme has achieved considerable success and this should not be overlooked for LF weaknesses. On one level, the registration and then the subsequent, more complex and more long-term support to conservancy management and governance has provided a good return on donor 'investment', even if further support will be required from 2011. By way of example, the review of the Wuparo conservancy constitution has led to increased benefit distribution across the eight sub-areas, with each area receiving just over N\$41,000 in 2010. On another level, empowerment, voice and accountability are recurrent themes, and the extent to which they have been achieved is difficult (but not impossible) to quantify and capture in a results framework.</p>
<p>Key lessons learned and/or actions recommended</p>	
<p>1.</p>	<p>Future results frameworks and logframes must use unambiguous statements. Words such as "implementing", "implemented" and "managing" are ambiguous and therefore hinder a clear line of sight on what constitutes acceptable performance. Similarly, baseline information should be explicit within the project logframe. Without a clear statement of the reality at commencement (and avoidance of terms such as "Additional"), the extent of 'travel' during the programme lifetime becomes harder to distil. As such, monitoring and evaluation can be compromised. In future, it is advised that IRDNC identifies one purpose or outcome statement, thereby better ensuring clarity of purpose and better ensuring a better separation of outputs from outcome. It is also advised that indicator, baseline and target data be disaggregated, e.g. by sex and gender. It is therefore recommended that IRDNC reviews its results framework, in part with a view to preparing manageable and useable baskets of indicators that meet the needs and interests of a range of donors.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>IRDNC should seek to capture relevant voice, accountability and empowerment indicators. DFID, for example, has standard indicators, some of which may be applicable.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>For SDC and partners: projects must be able to demonstrate that the activities and outputs 'add up' to something, i.e. specific headline results. IRDNC has a rich mine of data about, <i>inter alia</i>, jobs created, meat distributed, collective income, area falling under conservation management, total value of gross benefits, internal rates of return, net present values etc. but this is rarely captured in reports. In a number of cases, this often stems from the development of poor logframes at or before project commencement, and therefore a tendency to focus on input and activity reporting. Concerted effort must be made to better support implementing partners to identify, capture and report headline results, i.e. results which are meaningful to those sitting far away from the project site but who may be central to funding decisions.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>For SDC, it is notable that projects which support improved governance of natural resources require a long-term investment and one that is longer than the typical project cycle. Evidence suggests that it took six years for total benefits to break even with total investments; it was estimated that it would take a further four years for conservancies to generate enough fees or "collective income" (e.g. from hunting, JVAs) to break even with total investments. Such collective income is critical for the underwriting the collective conservation and development costs associated with conservancies and the realisation of the economic benefits that shape the incentives (see Diggle 2009). Stand-alone, short-term projects of a 2-3 year duration may register some superficial, short-term responses but long-term sustainability may be sacrificed.</p>

4. Impact

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

Performance target

Impact: To contribute to an enhanced quality of life of rural Caprivians in targeted conservancies through social and economic empowerment and improved natural resource management

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Comments
8 conservancies with secured natural resources management rights	6 were registered/gazetted.	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	Achieved. By becoming gazetted, conservancies are conferred the right to manage their huntable game.
8 conservancies with sustained structures	6	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	See comment below
8 conservancies with financial and institutional (governance issues) capacity	-		See comment below
Minimum of N\$ 10 million in cash benefits to conservancies and their members	Not readily available	Embedded within the indicator statement, see left.	IRDNC reports that combined income from the SDC 'frontline conservancies' in the 2010 financial year was N\$ 4,384,509. When included the two further conservancies which received SDC-financed 'start-up grants', total combined income from the 10 conservancies is said to be N\$ 5,285,559 in 2010
Performance conclusion	Wholly achieved <input type="checkbox"/>	Largely achieved <input checked="" 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 OVIs/targets for the Project goal appropriate and were they reported against? 3. Were the OVIs/targets realistic? Were they met? 4. Were there any external factors that jeopardised the project's direct impact? 5. To what extent did the project have any indirect positive and/or negative impacts? (i.e. environmental, social, cultural, gender and economic) 6. Were there any unplanned positive impacts on the planned target groups or other non-targeted communities arising from the project? How did this affect the impact? 	<p>As noted earlier, the formulation of the Impact/Goal statement and its indicators has significant weaknesses, which compromises an assessment of the extent to which the intended impacts have been achieved. For example, "quality of life" is undefined and the impact indicators do not speak to the Overall Goal statement for two reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They do not provide for performance measurement in relation to "quality of life". • Besides the 4th impact indicator, they are all output indicators, i.e. they speak to specific, direct deliverables of the project. <p>Some indicator statements are imprecise, creating assessment difficulties. For example, what constitutes a "sustained structure" or "financial and institutional capacity"? Above all, the impact indicators are pitched at the wrong level, and speak to output areas. As noted earlier, impact should likely focus on the 'quality' or extent of the natural resource base (e.g. in terms of wildlife numbers) and/or the extent of poverty, food security and/or nutritional intake. It is</p>

	<p>noteworthy that this raises two further considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRDNC pitches its programme as a community-based initiative and therefore places emphasis on community benefits. Is it acceptable to look to capture community benefits at outcome level but household benefits at impact level? • Is an increase in wildlife numbers an end in itself (goal) or a means to an end (therefore an outcome-level indicator)? The answer may depend on the funding source but it is valuable for IRDNC to think through the cause-effect model (the “theory of change”) so that the correct indicators, baselines and targets are identified at output, outcome and impact level.
Key lessons learned and/or actions recommended	
1.	See commentary above about outcomes. The statements there are applicable here.
2.	

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>The target conservancies have secured their natural resource management rights and all but one is generating income from trophy hunting, tourism and timber harvesting. In an immediate sense, therefore, the conservancies and their structures are demonstrating financial and economic sustainability. This represents a significant success given the brief history of conservancies in Namibia and the significant extent to which the legal requirements placed on conservancy structures require a new, transparent and accountable governance model in rural Caprivi. However, their ability to perform in line with their constitutional requirements and the broader legal framework, their ability to remain transparent and accountable, the ability of committees to negotiate and enforce beneficial JV agreements, the scope for a 'meaningful' level of timely benefit distribution and the extent to which benefit-derived community projects generate positive outcomes will depend on future IRDNC (and MET) support. This is and this will remain a long-term programme; a programme that is dependent on ongoing donor support, unless conservancies are willing to pay IRDNC for support services.</p>									
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%;">Performance conclusion</td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">Excellent</td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">Very good</td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">Good</td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">Weak</td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Performance conclusion	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Weak	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Performance conclusion	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Weak	<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>The involvement of local level institutions, such as MET, traditional authorities and private sector actors, has helped to successfully embed IRDNC's programme in the target areas. The MET has also benefited from capacity building in areas such as financial management and legislative requirements, which has helped to strengthen their role and enable them to better fulfil their mandate (albeit staffing numbers and recurrent budget constraints act and will continue to act as impediments).</p> <p>The programme seeks to cover the operational costs of conservancies, as well as to create viable livelihood options for some (e.g. game guards, enterprise officers), and an additional, albeit very small and variable, additional income/benefit stream for others (i.e. for conservancy members). IRDNC positions itself as a facilitator and therefore communities and other key stakeholders are central to decision-making and planning processes. Effort is made to respect and work with traditional authorities and institutions, and due effort is placed on raising awareness of responsibilities and obligations alongside rights and possible benefits. These, and the existence of fora to discuss issues of mutual interest, are critically important in a programme that deals with different scales, e.g. the broad landscapes required for effective wildlife management, the conservancy boundaries along chieftaincy lines, the communities</p>

				<p>within that and the interests of households and individuals at the very micro-level. Interests and needs may not always be aligned. Time and resources are required to ensure that support partners, such as the IRDNC, remain accessible and can provide the support and mentorship required.</p> <p>Turnover of committee members often represents an unintended positive consequence on two levels: a) people using their new skills to secure permanent employment (e.g. within government); b) removal as evidence of members' understanding of accountability and rights. Places strain on IRDNC because training needs to be re-done.</p>				
Performance conclusion	Excellent	☒	Very good	☐	Good	☐	Weak	☐
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?				<p>The SDC KEC logframe makes no overt reference to desired changes in policy and practice. However, in working closely with government structures, most notably the MET, it has institutional access to advocate for change. For example, the conservancy-initiated HACCSIS (Human-Animal Conflict Conservancy Self-Insurance Scheme) strongly influenced and informed the government's Human-Wildlife Conflict Policy and Guidelines. The collaboration has also provided opportunity for IRDNC to support MET to provide and interpret legislation, and therefore the rights and responsibilities placed on conservancies. The organisation also works with and through NACSO and its working groups, thereby capturing and linking field experience with other fora whose members may wish to understand, replicate and/or scale-up IRDNC approaches. In working with institutional structures in neighbouring countries (e.g. ZAWA), the programme offers scope to facilitate change at policy, sub-regional, community and ultimately household level. IRDNC's ability to influence government policy and practice is informed by the organisation's long, in-country and in-regional record, and therefore the trust, confidence, credibility and understanding that that typically creates.</p> <p>As noted above, IRDNC's programme in the Caprivi has been shaped by the opportunities created in the national policy framework regarding CBNRM.</p>				
Performance conclusion	Excellent	☒	Very good	☐	Good	☐	Weak	☐
Key issue (c): project's contribution to institutional and management capacity								
Framing questions				Findings				

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How far is the project embedded in institutional structures that are likely to survive beyond the life of the project? 2. Are project partners being properly developed (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing to deliver the project's benefits/services? 3. Will adequate levels of suitable qualified HR be available to continue to deliver the project's benefits? 4. 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>Institutional, management and governance capacity are at the front and centre to IRDNC's programme. This has increasingly been the case in the last decade, and SDC's contribution has been central in allowing the organisation to respond to these issues following the wave of conservancy registrations after 1998-99. Prior to the conservancy legislation, there was not legal framework to support any democratic or accountable structures for NRM in the project area. . Experience of formal training is patchy and capacity needs are considerable. IRDNC recognises that the establishment of conservancies is relatively easy when compared to the challenges faced in meeting the governance and management requirements laid down in the legislation. Indeed, the local MET office estimates that about a third of the conservancies in the Caprivi are currently compliant with the policy framework, with about 20% being "poor". In such circumstances entitlement to secure hunting concessions may be frozen with the ultimate (but unlikely) sanction of de-gazetting. As such, whilst there is little evidence to suggest that the structures supported with SDC funding will fall-away, there will be an ongoing need for IRDNC to provide technical and managerial support.</p> <p>The significant collective income seen in some conservancies represents a very positive outcome but also a formidable challenge. Unwise selection of community-based projects or inadequate support in business planning, marketing, and operation and maintenance of capital assets, for example, might create a sense of despondency about conservancy benefits and nurture a sense of withdrawal of support. The role of IRDNC in this regard needs careful consideration.</p>							
Performance conclusion	Excellent	☒	Very good	☐	Good	☐	Weak	☐
Key lessons learned and/or actions recommended								
1.								
2.								
3.								

6. Cross-cutting issues

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

Sub-areas	Findings						
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If so, how and to what effect? If not, why not? If n/a, explain. 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? 	<p>Yes, the IRDNC has been cognisant of gender interests and dynamics, though female-headed households were never explicitly identified as a key target group and indicators and targets in the logframe were not disaggregated by sex. Whilst female committee members are outnumbered by their male counterparts, the programme has taken steps to empower women, e.g. through public-speaking capacity building. Programme measures to support devil's claw and craft marketing are highly gender-sensitive.</p>						
Performance conclusion	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">No</td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">N/A</td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
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						
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If so, how and to what effect? If not, why not? If n/a, explain. 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? 4. Was environmental damage caused or likely to be caused by the project? What kind of environmental impact mitigation measures were taken? 5. Was the achievement of project results and objectives likely to generate increased pressure on fragile ecosystems (natural forests, wetlands, coral reefs, mangroves) and scarce natural resources (e.g. surface and groundwater, timber, soil)? 	<p>The programme and the CBNRM movement more widely is based on sound conservation and environmental protection approaches.</p>						
Performance conclusion	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">Yes</td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">No</td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">N/A</td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
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
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If so, how? If not, why not? If n/a, explain. 2. Please consider the following aspects of governance. Were legislative aspects adequately covered in the project? 	<p>Whilst households living with HIV / AIDS were not identified as a key target group in the programme, there is secondary evidence that “the capacity and confidence built within communities has...enabled citizens to... go for HIV/AIDS testing and counselling” (see Butcher 2010)</p>

Performance conclusion	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
Key lessons learned and/or actions recommended						
1.						
2.						
3.						

7. Persons and documents consulted

Persons	
Name	Organisation
Karine Nuulimba	IRDNC
Peggy Tatalife	IRDNC
Simone Nawa	IRDNC
John Kamwi	IRDNC
Bennety Likulela	IRDNC
Reuben Mafati	IRDNC
Beavan Munali	IRDNC
Justice Muhindi	IRDNC
Allan Homela (consultant)	IRDNC
Elvis Mwilima	MET
Richard Diggle	WWF
Brian Child	Univ. of Florida
Kenneth Mutuso, Rector Kapelwa, Bridness Muatuli, Hoster Mukuni, Patrick Chali, annety Kachitomwa	Kwando Conservancy
Roux Malamo, John Mulauli, Fidelis Lizumo, Cebens Munanzi, Coster Munali Mayumbelo, Brutus Musutela, Hasken Sinasi, Lameck Limbo, Calvin Shozi	Wuparo Conserancy
Documents	
Butcher, C. 2010. (November). Independent External Evaluation of WWF-UK's Partnership Programme Arrangement with DFID 2008-2011 (PPA). Draft Report. GY Associates.	
Diggle, R.W. 2009 (July). Valuing Support to Community Conservation in Caprivi and Kunene, Namibia. Drawing on Financial and Economic Measurements to Determine the Impact of WWF UK Investments for a CBNRM Programme in Namibia. Report prepared by IRDNC for WWF UK. Final Draft (8).	
Fournier, M. 2010. Community Based Transboundary Natural Resource Management Workshop Proceedings, 22-23 November 2010, Katima Mulilo, Namibia. IRDNC.	
Grant Thornton, IRDNC-SDC, Agreed-upon procedures engagement – 7F-04205.02.01 for Kwando Ecological Corridor – Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area for the period 01 April 2010 to 31 March 2011	
IRDNC. 2008. WWF/SDC Project Technical Progress Report – CAPRIVI. Reporting Period 1 July 2007 to 30 June 2008.	
IRDNC. 2010. SDC Technical Progress Report. IRDNC Caprivi. Sept 2009 – March 2010.	
IRDNC. 2010. SDC Technical Progress Report, IRDNC Caprivi, April – September 2010.	
IRDNC. 2010. IRDNC 6 Monthly Progress Report to SDC from Sept 2009 – March 2010. Kwando Ecological Corridor Project	
IRDNC. 2010. IRDNC 6 Monthly Progress Report to SDC from April - September 2009. Kwando Ecological Corridor Project	

IRDNC. 2010. (Jan). IRDNC Support to the frontline Conservancies Project funded by Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. Request for a 1 year extension Ending February 2011	
IRDNC. 2011. IRDNC Annual Progress Report to SDC from April 2010 – March 2011.	
IRDNC. 2011. Monthly Financial Report for SDC KEC TAZA TFCA, October 2010 – March 2011.	
IRDNC. 2011. SDC Technical Progress Report, IRDNC Caprivi, October 2010 – March 2011.	
IRDNC. 2011. Community-based Natural Resource Management: lessons from the field. IRDNC-WWF.	
NACSO. 2009. Namibia's communal conservancies: a review of progress, 2008. NACSO.	
NACSO. 2010. Namibia's communal conservancies: a review of progress and challenges in 2009. NACSO.	
NNF. 2009. Conservancies in the Mudumu North Complex. NNF.	
SDC. 2010. Agreement between SDC and IRDNC concerning the granting of a contribution to the Project, Kwando Ecological Corridor – Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area, for the period from April 1 2010 to March 31, 2011.	
SDC. 2007. Addendum to the Agreement 14.01.2005 between SDC and IRDNC concerning the granting of a contribution to the Project, IRDNC Support to the frontline conservancies, for the period from 01.01.2007 to 31.12.2008	