

ZAMBEZI VALLEY ADVOCACY PROJECT

END OF TERM EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT

DFID CIVIL SOCIETY CHALLENGE FUND

PROJECT NO 415

25 JANUARY 2011

PREPARED AND SUBMITTED BY
BOLUMUS CONSULTING
(Dr. Paradzayi Pathias Bongo and Mr. Wilfred Lunga)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	3
LIST OF ACRONYMS USED	4
1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1.1 Introduction and Background	5
1.2 Aims and purpose of the External Evaluation	5
1.3 Evaluation Methodology	5
1.4 Summary of Key Findings from the Field	6
1.5 Summary of Key Recommendations	8
2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	10
2.2 Brief on Project Hierarchy of Objectives	11
3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	11
4.1 Review of Documents	11
4.2 Individual In-depth Interviews	11
5. FINDINGS FROM THE EVALUATION	14
5. 1 Relevance	14
5.2 Efficiency	15
5.3 Effectiveness	17
5.4 Equity	18
5.5 Impact	19
5.6 Sustainability	22
5.7 Replicability	23
5.8 Information Dissemination and Networking	23
6. LESSONS LEARNED	24
7. RECOMMENDATIONS	25
8. APPENDICES	28
8.1 PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT RATING	28
8.2 SCHEDULE OF QUESTIONS	33
8.3 EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE	36
8.4 LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED	41
8.5 Vital Statistics on Fisheries and Lobby Groups	43

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is the culmination of close to two months intensive work by Bolumus Consultants, Northumbria University's Disaster and Development Centre (DDC), Basilwizi Trust and Save the Children Zimbabwe. We would like to thank Basilwizi Trust, Save the Children and DDC staff and their partners who participated in the production of this report. We are grateful particularly to Mr. Frank Mudimba (Basilwizi Director), Mrs. Danisa Mudimba (ZVAP Project Officer), Chris Chikanya (Save the Children Zimbabwe), Dr. Bernard Manyena (ZVAP Project Coordinator) and Dr. Andrew Collins (DDC Director) for facilitating the evaluation exercise with sensitivity and enthusiasm. We would like to acknowledge the support we received during fieldwork from Binga, Gokwe North, Hwange and Nyaminyami RDCs, traditional leaders, CAMPFIRE and fishing community groups.

LIST OF ACRONYMS USED

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
CAMPFIRE	Communal Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources
CEOs	Chief Executive Officers
COPAC	Constitutional Parliamentary Committee
CSCF	Civil Society Challenge Fund
DAs	District Administrators
DDC	Development and Disaster Centre
DFID	Department for International Development
NP&WMA	National Parks and Wildlife Management Authority
DPP	Department of Physical Planning
EMA	Environmental Management Agency
FCAs	Foreign Currency Accounts
FCUs	Fishing Co-operative Unions
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
FPPs	Focal Point Persons
HAP	Humanitarian Accountability Partnership
HIV	Human Immuno-deficiency Virus
KLCMP	Kariba Lakeshore Combination Master Plan
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MYDEC	Ministry of Youth Development and Employment Creation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NTFPs	Non-Timber Forest Products
PA	Problem Animal
PAC	Problem Animal Control
PAPD	Participatory Action Planning Development
PLWHA	People Living With HIV and AIDS
RDC	Rural District Council
RDCs	Rural District Councils
TOR	Terms of Reference
TOT	Training of Trainers
UK	United Kingdom
VCAs	Vulnerability and Capacity Analysis
ZELA	Zimbabwe Environmental Lawyers Association
ZVAP	Zambezi Valley Advocacy Project

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction and Background

In November of 2010, DDC, Basilwizi Trust and Save the Children Zimbabwe commissioned an evaluation of the Zambezi Valley Advocacy Project (ZVAP). ZVAP was a community-driven project that aimed at reducing poverty and vulnerability risks through fair access and equitable benefit-sharing of fishing, water and wildlife resources using a rights-based approach to development. ZVAP's purpose was to increase civic knowledge, build organisational capacity, and develop advocacy skills on grassroots – enabling local communities to mobilise themselves, articulate concerns, formulate interventions and lobby the relevant stakeholders to bring about the desired change. The project was implemented in four districts along the Zambezi Valley, namely, Binga, Hwange, Gokwe North and Nyaminyami. Local project implementing partners were Basilwizi Trust and Save the Children Zimbabwe. Apart from these, the project also worked in collaboration with key government institutions and agencies like the Environmental Management Agency (EMA), Ministry of Local Government, the Department of Physical Planning (DPP), Ministry of Environment and Tourism and National Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (N&WMA). Other key stakeholders include the four Rural District Councils (RDCs) of Binga, Nyaminyami, Hwange and Gokwe North, the Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) in the four Districts, safari operators, fishing cooperatives, and fishers. In all project activities, there was special emphasis on marginalised social groups like the disabled, women, children and people living with HIV and AIDS (PLWHA).

1.2 Aims and purpose of the External Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation was to:

- i. Assess and evaluate the ZVAP against the set targets to find out if the project still maintained its focus;
- ii. Continuously improve and maintain proper project design and management;
- iii. Identify gaps within ZVAP's operating plans and find ways of addressing the gaps in order which could have helped the project achieve its stated objective;
- iv. Take note of the lessons learned during the project implementation and see if there are any new strategies that could inform future projects for organisations involved in ZVAP and CSCF;
- v. Ensure that funds were used effectively and efficiently to deliver results; and
- vi. Enable DFID to monitor and evaluate the performance of the ZVAP, making sure ZVAP has contributed to poverty reduction and demonstrating, for public accountability purposes, that ZVAP was an effective use of money.

1.3 Evaluation Methodology¹

A multi-method, rights based and gender sensitive participatory approach was used in the evaluation. The methodological mix comprised a literature review, semi structured key informant interviews, focus group discussions with beneficiary groups and personal observations by the consultants. The wide range of issues outlined in the Terms of Reference and the diversity of thematic areas and activities carried out by the implementing partners

¹ See detail on methodology in Section 4 of the Introduction to this document.

with variable capacities, size and focus, required a flexible evaluation design leading to a relatively high sample size. The inception meeting with project staff highlighted the overall scope, focus and timeframe for the evaluation. Relevant programme documents were reviewed before and during the evaluation. FGDs were conducted with fishing unions and cooperatives based in various fishing camps in the four districts. The evaluation team was able to successfully meet all sampled organizations and stakeholders prior to compilation of the report.

1.4 Summary of Key Findings from the Field

Relevance

- *Project Contribution to Rights awareness* – Informants indicated that project beneficiaries were now more knowledgeable on how to utilize natural resources sustainably together with authorities such RDCs and NPWMA.
- *There is improved transparency in both the licence systems for fish and CAMPFIRE management systems.* Wildlife conservation and fish poaching have been addressed. More local people have obtained licences for fishing, and this has contributed to improved flow of funds to communities.
- *Implementation of the KLCMP* – local authorities and central government are in agreement on it and want to have it implemented.
- *Cross-cutting issues* – HIV and AIDS and other cross cutting issues like DRR and disability have been addressed. Save the Children Zimbabwe implemented initiatives in Child Protection and Disability awareness.

Efficiency

- *Community involvement* - The project has had a high impact in creating an enabling development programming environment especially through use of Focal Point Persons (FPPs)
- *Personnel and Equipment* - The Project staff exhibited adequate knowledge of the project mandate and direction. Mobility of project staff could have been improved.
- *Partnership* - The project partnership was adequate and functioned very well with frequent meetings, communication using telephones and emails.
- *Project Implementation* – Was well managed. Apart from the NGO ban by the government of Zimbabwe where eight months were lost, the project posted positive results. The no-cost extension from July 2010 to December 2010 helped the project meet some of the planned activities such as the stakeholder conference which was held in Harare from 1st to 3rd December, 2010.
- *Operationalisation of the Kariba Lakeshore Combination Master Plan (KLCMP)* that needed implementation since its approval in 1998.
- *Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation* – Project financial management was satisfactory. Audit reports indicate efficient use of resources in project implementation. The project made a lot of savings by operating from field based project offices, thereby saving on time and dead mileage, among others.
- *Project risks and assumptions* – these were realistically formulated and relevant, and so were the mitigation strategies. It was easy for the project to remain flexible and adapt activities to the changes in the socio-economic environment.

Effectiveness

- *Development Rights Awareness Training* – was effective for those trained, but was very thin on coverage
- *Multi stakeholder review workshops* – Three multi-stakeholder project review workshops were conducted, one in each year. This was a good strategy for monitoring and evaluation of project activities.
- *Focal Point Persons (FPPs)*– enhance sustainability and project ownership by community

Equity

- *Traditional historical livelihood structures* have largely influenced participation of marginalised socio-economic groups like women, children and the disabled.
- *The politics and dynamics of exclusion and enclosure have largely militated against equity* in the project, generating differential impacts with implications for achievement of project objectives.
- *CAMPFIRE dividends payment system* is changing from indirect to direct payment into community bank accounts.
- *Issuing of permits is being increasingly questioned*, particularly with regard to the basis for determining the numbers of permit holders and thresholds for resource use.

Impact

- Project initiatives have had positive ripple effects that can be built on throughout the Zambezi valley and Zimbabwe in general.
- *Advocacy* – has made great impact in terms of awareness raising on accessing, conserving and sharing of natural resources using development rights of beneficiaries.
- *Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and DFID Core CSCF areas* –The project has contributed to the achievement of four of the eight MDGs and the DFID's Core CSCF areas.
- *Conflict Management* - The project activities can be paralleled to 'Pandora's box'. ZVAP has brought out many issues into the open. Examples include equity issues in relation to the issuance of licences, hunting concessions and access and benefit sharing.
- *Community Complaints* on natural resource use have increased.

Sustainability

- *Exit package and timing* – project still needed more support in advocacy and negotiation skills, documentation and development rights.
- *Basilwizi's local base* - gives them ready acceptance that enables them to achieve easier buy-in of project initiatives from the people.
- *Look and learn tours* – very relevant and critical learning hotspots
- *Development priorities with local involvement* – Inclusion of chiefs and other local leaders in key development and investment decisions ensures sustainability of project initiatives.
- *Project Design* – ZVAP was rightly designed, using a non-interventionist mode by making use of existing structures at all levels.

Replicability

- Development rights awareness raising and advocacy have great likelihood of replicability, based on a number of factors

Information Dissemination and Networking

- Project lessons still needed more documentation and sharing as the project wound up. The impact and outcomes of the project, if shared more widely, have the potential to influence demand for development rights training in other parts of the country and beyond.

1.5 Summary of Key Recommendations

Fisheries

- Although gains have been made in *involvement of marginalized social groups* (women, children, the sick and disabled, there was need for more initiatives in the project as a few, about 20% of women participated in ZVAP project.
- Fishing camps have historically provided challenges to ‘normal’ family life. There is need to draw lessons from the Chalala experience on how best to accommodate total *family life on other camps*.
- *Institutional supports to fishing cooperatives* - There is need for more project management training and other forms of support, e.g. *Participatory Action Planning and Development (PAPD)* and through look and learn visits. There is need to complement software of the project with the hardware aspects.

CAMPFIRE and Wildlife

- *Determining thresholds on resource use and Problem Animal Control (PAC)*– There is need to incorporate more community participation in PAC and come up with locally defined conceptions of realistic thresholds.
- *Return on rates and levies as part of social responsibility* – there is need for more accountability on the part of the RDC-National Park liaisons.
- *Education and awareness raising on NRM policy*: There is need for advocating for harmonizing policies around NRM – like The Forestry Produce Act, the one governing RDCs, Environmental Management Act (EMA) and the Minerals and Mining Acts so that they are understood by all stakeholders, particularly local communities.
- *Issuing of resource use permits*: There is need to consider putting in place a system that sees permits being taken from RDCs and not NPWMA. There is need to involve chiefs and wider local stakeholders and institutions in issuing out safari hunting and fishing permits to increase downward accountability (to local communities).

Project Management

- *Differential Packaging of Advocacy messages*: there is need to work at differentiated packaging of advocacy messages to cater for different constituencies.
- *Project Vulnerability and Risk Assessments*: Project risk assessment should intensify addressing matters relating to the risks associated with accessing the lake resources, e.g. HIV and AIDS, drowning, safety issues in relation water based predators, particularly crocodiles.

KLCMP Issues

- *Need for Basilwizi Trust and stakeholders to lobby policy makers for creation of a Statutory Instrument* that will outline the implementation framework for the KLCMP.

- *Guiding beneficiary innovation towards discovering diverse livelihoods:* For people engaging in fishing and wild life based livelihoods, there is need to consider assisting them realise livelihood opportunities beyond just harvesting resources, like for instance opportunities for them in tourism.
- *Investment in legal issues* – considering the nature of ZVAP activities, there was need to enhance the capacity of Basilwizi's staff in human rights and environmental law.

2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This report provides the findings of the Zambezi Valley Advocacy Project (ZVAP) end of term evaluation conducted from 16 November 2010 to 12 December 2010. It outlines the background of ZVAP, the aims of the evaluation, key findings, lessons learned and recommendations.

The ZVAP project was implemented in the Zambezi Valley, which is amongst the most marginalized, poorest and least developed parts of Zimbabwe. The project targeted Tonga and Korekore communities living along the Zambezi River who were displaced by the colonial government to pave way for the construction of the Kariba Dam. The predicament of the peoples of the Zambezi valley is largely attributed to the involuntary displacement in 1957 to make way for the Kariba Dam Hydroelectric Scheme. No compensation was paid either at community level through provision of basic infrastructure and services or at household level for disrupting social networks, loss of livelihoods, lands and natural resources. Today the Kariba Dam is a lifeline for the Zimbabwean and Zambian economies. Yet, the Kariba project has left a legacy of impoverishment amongst the displaced communities due to entitlement losses. Nyaminyami Rural District has the lowest Human Development Index while Binga district is the third lowest out of 77 Districts in Zimbabwe. They also have the lowest Gender Empowerment Measure. Empirical evidence from World Commission of Dams study (2000), Save the Children (UK) Household Economy Assessment (2001 – 2005) and Basilwizi Trust Survey (2005) also confirms that the resettlement areas continue to suffer from high levels of poverty, chronic water and food shortages, and lack basic socio-economic services. Notwithstanding the above statistics, the situation has improved in recent years. Attempts by local communities to increase their access to resources in and around the Kariba Dam have been limited by statutory bodies which include the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (NPWMA), Zambezi River Authority and RDCs charged with a range of responsibilities to manage and protect the areas.

The Zambezi Valley Advocacy project (ZVAP) was a community-driven project that aimed at reducing poverty and vulnerability risks through fair access and equitable benefit-sharing of fishing, water and wildlife resources using the rights-based approach to development. ZVAP's purpose was to increase civic knowledge, build organisational capacity, and develop advocacy skills on grassroots – enabling local communities to mobilise themselves, articulate concerns, formulate interventions and lobby the relevant stakeholders to bring about the desired change.

2.1 Rights Based Approaches to Development

A rights-based approach to development is a conceptual framework for the process of human development that is normatively based on international human rights standards and operationally directed to promoting and protecting human rights. There is no single, universally agreed rights-based approach, although there may be an emerging consensus on the basic constituent elements. These include emphasis on non-discrimination, attention to vulnerability and empowerment. Women and girls are among the first victims of discrimination. A rights-based approach to development includes the following elements: express linkage to rights, accountability, empowerment, participation, non-discrimination and attention to vulnerable groups

2.2 Brief on Project Hierarchy of Objectives

2.2.1 Project Goal: to reduce poverty and vulnerability risks through increased access to natural resources using the rights-based approach to development. It aims to increase civic knowledge, build organisational capacity, and develop advocacy skills on a grassroots level - enabling local communities to mobilise themselves, articulate concerns, formulate interventions and lobby the relevant stakeholders to bring about the desired change.

2.2.2 Project Purpose: to empower communities living in the 26 Tonga and Korekore chiefdoms to advocate for legislation and programmes that address inequities in the access, control and use of natural resources in the Zambezi Valley.

2.2.3 Project Main Activities: The **main project activities** centred on resolving conflicts around (1) indigenous fishing rights, (2) access and utilization of the huge expanses of Lake Kariba water both for domestic and agricultural production, and (3) community control of, access to the natural resources of the region including wildlife management and exploitation.

2.2.4. Beneficiaries and Stakeholders: the rural communities living in the 26 Tonga and Korekore chiefdoms. Key stakeholders in the advocacy and training processes include the local traditional and elected leadership, and women representatives, local government and central government institutions. Community-based task forces were expected to take the lead role in designing the advocacy campaign and conducting lobbying activities.

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

A multi-method and rights based participatory approach was used in the evaluation to generate as much information as necessary and to triangulate the findings. The methodological package for the evaluation was variegated and used multiple data collection methods. The data collection methods were intended to generate information relevant in answering the evaluation questions above linked to the evaluation objectives. This evaluation collected both qualitative and quantitative information from a variety of sources.

3.1 Review of Documents

Relevant programme documents were reviewed before and during the evaluation. These were: the ZVAP CSCF DFID project document, the three ZVAP annual reports for 2007-8, 2008-9 and 2009-10. Reports on training, reviews and monitoring visits were also examined. Relevant correspondence, audit reports and minutes of relevant minutes at project level were also examined. Other documents that were reviewed included the project original logical framework, the amended log frame, the Kariba Lakeshore Combination Master Plan (KLCMP) and the ZVAP mid-term evaluation report. Overall, documents review assisted in the development of participatory question guides for discussions and interviews with various categories of respondents that were selected after literature review. Literature review is a continuous process that will be conducted throughout the whole evaluation process.

3.2 Individual In-depth Interviews

Individual in-depth interviews were conducted with key informants, who included ZVAP staff members (project management, Field officers, financial management staff), Silveira House and stakeholders Environmental Management Agency (EMA), NPWMA, Area Manager for Binga and Chete, Ministry of Youth Development and Employment Creation (MYDEC), RDC Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) and District Administrators (DAs)

(RDCs), Communal Area Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) managers based on different thematic areas, field staff in all project areas, relevant government departments, local leadership from local authorities and traditional leadership in programme areas (5 chiefs) and project beneficiaries in project areas. Four sets of open ended questionnaires were designed to cater for different categories of respondents as follows: ZVAP project beneficiaries and fishing unions, project stakeholders and partners, traditional leadership and project and partner staff.

The information collected during the individual in-depth interviews included strategies used in promoting development rights awareness and empowerment programmes for the disabled, women, PLWHA, and other indices of vulnerability as agreed with the project team. Interviews also generated information on staff and partner organisation capacity building strategies, evidence of knowledge transfer to local target groups.

3.3 Focus Group Discussions

FGDs were conducted with fishing unions and cooperatives based in various fishing camps in Binga (Kujatana Kwesu and Masumu), Hwange (Musuna), Nyaminyami (Chalala, Sibilobilo and Musambakaruma), and Gokwe North. The information collected during FGDs included perceptions of the project in terms of relevance; appropriateness; effectiveness; efficiency; and sustainability. FGDs complimented the literature review and in-depth interviews and generated information on capacity levels of target groups to empower themselves and the extent to which they were aware of their developmental rights, and were accessing natural resources. Participants to FGDs were also asked to suggest what they thought could be done differently which could have increased the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the ZVAP.

3.4 Observations

The evaluation team observed different livelihoods and activities which resulted from advocacy programmes, among other things. The team visited Chalala, Musuna and Masumu fishing camps and took the opportunity to observe how programme implementation and activities were being carried out on site and their current state. This was useful for validating some of the information collected from individual in-depth interviews and from the focus group discussions. Such observations also led to inference on the impact of the project.

3.5 Attendance of National Policy Dialogue Conference

Members of the evaluation team attended the three day national policy dialogue conference organised by the project and held in Harare from 1 to 3 December 2010. The main purpose for attending the conference was to capture issues raised by the various stakeholders with a stake in the Zambezi Valley Advocacy Project. It also provided an opportunity for understanding the global and historical scenario around ZVAP and development rights, especially as they relate to natural resource policy and practice.

3.6 Sampling and Justification

A stratified and multi-stage random sampling methodology was used. This was meant to be inclusive of resource harvesters in the same proportion they exist in society, to avoid over or under-representing them. In order to comprehensively address the TOR and the evaluation questions, selection of ZVAP beneficiaries, partners and stakeholders for in-depth interviews and field visits the following criteria was used;

1. Thematic areas- the need to establish the relevance of all thematic areas required the evaluation to assess all thematic areas regardless of beneficiaries. (Here focus was on making

sure that beneficiaries and stakeholders involved in fishing, wildlife, advocacy and other forms of livelihoods were given a chance according to their proportion in society).

2. Geographical location- the need to assess interventions in locations with different forms of accessibility to different amenities and livelihood strategies; Areas where there were a number of project initiatives addressing diverse thematic areas were prioritised to get maximum returns from field visits.

In cases where there was need for verification or follow through of issues, snow balling was used in identifying respondents and interviewees.

3.7 Data Collection, Presentation and Analysis

Data collection was conducted by three consultants, who included a local Tonga speaking person, was especially helpful with his knowledge of local language and culture. For speedy conducting of field work, the consultants was split into two teams, each accompanied by at least one locally based Basilwizi Trust staff member and/or one of the focal persons to assist with interpretations. Basilwizi Trust staff were involved in the evaluation in the following ways:

- Commenting on the design and contents of data collection tools
- Providing interpretation role, where there were no local people or stakeholders who could play the role, to minimize biased responses from beneficiaries, stakeholders, partners, etc

The team used a video camera and a still digital camera for capturing some scenes that were relevant in complementing data collected through interviews, observations and FGDs. Data generated from these tools was mainly qualitative.

Data collected was analysed based on key thematic areas related to the TORs and the sub-headings in each of the categories of questionnaires. Responses were subjected to rigorous triangulation, comparing section specific responses across a wide spectrum of respondents and data sources to reduce bias and check for inconsistencies in the data.

3.8 Ethical Considerations in the Evaluation Exercise

The evaluation team adhered to research ethics that enshrine respect for, and sensitivity to, respondents. There was clear separation between rights holders and duty bearers to reduce bias and ensure freedom of expression. The following principles were key in guiding field work - Informed consent, Inclusion, Participation, Fair power relations² and Use of mixed methods for more effective triangulation

3.9 Feedback and Report Writing

The consultants met with Basilwizi Trust staff after the field work to discuss key preliminary field findings and agree on presentation and quality of the report, among other things. Comments and clarifications provided by Basilwizi Trust staff in this meeting were useful in preparation of the draft report. The final report would be produced after receiving comments on the draft report from all stakeholders concerned.

² To minimize bias in responses by respondents, the evaluation team, while requiring the presence of Basilwizi Trust members in interpretation, made use of alternative people where possible.

4. FINDINGS FROM THE EVALUATION

4.1 RELEVANCE

4.1.1 Response to human and environmental rights awareness needs – ZVAP responded to community needs by building their capacity in human and environmental rights to reduce poverty. Informants indicated that project beneficiaries are now more knowledgeable on how to utilize natural resources instead of playing hide-and-seek with authorities (National Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (NPWMA)). For instance in fishing, fishers now aware of the types of nets to use and what not to use. Whereas in the past they used to be docile and afraid of questioning professionals, communities are also now demanding to know how RDCs use resources, especially financial. One informant also emphasized the role played by the ZVAP project in empowering communities, pointing out that empowerment is the key that unlocks all other themes and issues e.g. MDGs, poverty alleviation, HIV and AIDS, etc. Understanding of development rights by project beneficiaries has also been seen in ZVAP's campaign to encourage all fishers and other natural resource harvesters to obtain licences from relevant authorities (NPWMA and RDCs where necessary). One major outcome has been in the highly contested area of the RDCs and NPWMA levying system that was largely 'double taxation'³. With corruption being one of the challenges Zimbabwe is facing, The ZVAP project is credited for encouraging arrested people to seek just justice through courts rather than paying unclear 'spot fines' to law enforcement agents. Access and benefit sharing focus of the project by using government policy e.g. the Appropriate Authority status accorded to RDCs and the RDC Act. This is why the project got the buy-in; it was relevant to local needs. The network of partners was very instrumental in the revival of CAMPFIRE structures that had virtually died before the project came into being.

4.1.2 There is improved transparency in the licence systems for all stakeholders, especially with regard to fishing and safari hunting – Calls and lobbying for transparency from communities and other stakeholders with regard to equity and accessing licences have yielded positive outcomes. NPWMA and Wildlife Management Authority and RDC employees are now treating fishers and other resource users with caution, seen in declining cases of harassment of those caught allegedly 'infringing' on rules and regulations, for example, fishing without valid permits. More locals have obtained licences for fishing, and this has contributed to improved flow of funds to communities. As a result of ZVAP project initiatives there is a total of people involved in fisheries as at end of project period. In addition, there are now 7 lobby groups in the four Districts, comprising of district lobby groups, inter-district lobby groups, natural resources committees and groups composed of special councillors.⁴

4.1.3 Implementation of the KLCMP – The project, through lobbying and advocacy, has managed to exert pressure on local authorities, central government and other policy making stakeholders on the imperative to implement the KLCMP. Consequently, local authorities and central government are in agreement on it and want to have it implemented. The December 2010 stakeholders' conference in Harare set the stage for the formulation of critical resolutions on the KLCMP, which included identification of a steering committee for the plan.

³ For instance, if one was caught fishing without a valid permit, they would pay a fine of \$20 a person, \$500 for the boat, and another amount for operating on shallow water, all for the same single offence.

⁴ See appendage 8.5 for detailed statistics on fishers and lobby groups

4.1.4 Cross-cutting issues – ZVAP conducted HIV and AIDS awareness workshops focusing on STI/HIV knowledge and risk perceptions, relations with steady, casual and commercial sex partners, condom use, and STI symptoms and care seeking. Information, Education and Communication (IEC) materials distributed focused on the importance and significance of testing and counseling, the role of nutrition for treatment, treatment of opportunistic infections (OIs) and STIs, ARVs, and PMTCT. Basilwizi and Save the Children (UK) integrated ZVAP activities with the National Action Plan for Orphans and Vulnerable Children programme funded by UNICEF, which both organisations jointly implemented. . ZVAP also collaborated with other projects within Basilwizi and other NGOs on programmes that focus on climate change, support universal access to treatment, including access to quality home-based care as well as gender equity, with a specific impetus on strengthening leadership and organisation of women.

4.1.5 Poverty Alleviation – The project was relevant in responding to chronic poverty reduction in the Zambezi Valley. The project benefitted at least 300,000 people in the four districts. For instance, Nyaminyami district has started implementing the direct payment systems of CAMPFIRE dividends. The safari operators have already started depositing the 50% allocation for the communities from the CAMPFIRE into the community ward's bank accounts. This has increased flow of funds to the communities for developmental purposes. For example, Mola ward in Nyaminyami District was receiving a maximum of US\$20,000 per month from the CAMPFIRE dividends. In addition, the permit fees for Parks & Wildlife Authority have not been increased in all four districts and the fisher folk continue to pay US\$250.00 (previously US\$500) for a Kapenta fishing rig per quarter, which permit charge they successfully negotiated for its reduction with NPWMA in 2008-9. The fishermen get a maximum of 100 x 30 kg of Kapenta per month if the harvest is good which they sell at US\$140-\$150 each bag if the demand is high. Most fishing groups have a maximum of 15 members, 2-3 employees mostly book keepers. This means that the money they get after calculating their expenditure which is at most US\$3000 (employees, permits, services and camp maintenance) the fishermen still manage to get at most maximum of US\$800 per month if the harvest was good. The fishing industry is very relevant for Zambezi Valley people and it creates employment for other people other than their own members. Also the fishers take care of the deceased members' school going children. All these efforts help reduce poverty in the Zambezi valley.

4.2 EFFICIENCY

5.2.1 Community involvement – monitoring and evaluation role of FPPs

A key achievement has been the extent to which people have broken their silence on the need for just use of resources in the Zambezi Valley. To most community members, Basilwizi Trust and the ZVAP project are synonymous. In this community involvement, use of locally based FPPs by the project also contributes to cutting down on field monitoring and support visits by project staff. Chiefs also play critical monitoring and community mobilization roles, thereby again cutting down on cost of driving to the field to mobilize communities.

4.2.2 Personnel and Equipment

ZVAP staff exhibited adequate knowledge of the project mandate and direction. The Project Officer was suitable for the tasks she had at hand, and so were the field officers, who were based in the field to facilitate adequate support to communities and also for effective monitoring of project activities, including information management. Staff based in the field

offices (e.g. Gokwe North and Nyaminyami) enabled the project to cut down on operational costs.

4.2.3 Partnership

The project partnership was adequate in that it was getting specialist technical support from Basilwizi, and Save the Children. The Disaster and Development Centre at Northumbria was mentioned in key informant interviews as a very useful partner and anchor to the project. This saved the project a lot of money in consultancy fees that would have been paid to someone to provide technical support to the project. The involvement of the Zimbabwe Environmental Lawyers Association (ZELA) at the Harare Conference on 1st – 3rd December, 2010, was a demonstration of the project's innovative use of networking in partnership building and also in reducing the possibility of having to hire legal consultants for the project. Having opened Pandora's box⁵, the project still managed to even elicit the support and involvement of powerful stakeholders in access and benefiting sharing such as NPWMA, CAMPFIRE, RDCs, the Department of Physical Planning (DPP) and Ministries of Local Government and Environment and Tourism, Minister of Public Works and Members of Parliament. All these stakeholders played critical role in monitoring and evaluation, as well as community mobilization, where possible, thereby enabling Basilwizi to work even with fewer direct field monitoring trips. This cut down on project expenses.

4.2.4 Project Implementation

There were indications from the Project office that ZVAP implementation was delayed by almost eight months due to the ban of NGO field activities in 2008 by the government of Zimbabwe. The lost time was covered by the no-cost extension period that the project agreed between the project implementation team and CSCF Project Management Team. During the ban of NGOs project staff undertook training in LFA, for example, finalised the project brochure and training manual. This showed efficient use of time.

4.2.5 Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation – The total budget was adequate for the work at hand. In the first two years of project implementation, the project faced challenges with currency – the Zimbabwean dollar weakened tremendously against major currencies to such an extent that it was almost worthless. Fluctuation in prices of commodities and services made it difficult to manage the budget. Shortage of commodities also hampered scheduling of project activities. Although there were both negative and positive variances on some budget lines, the overall expenditure was within the budget and reflects the good value of funds spent on ZVAP. Proper records were kept according to international standards of financial management systems according to annual audit reports kept by all the three ZVAP partners.

4.2.6 Project risks and assumptions – The project identifies three major risks that had a bearing on project scheduling and the amount of work done on the ground. These were hyperinflation and managed exchange rates, droughts and politicization. The project addressed these risks in the best way possible given the socio-economic environment which prevailed in Zimbabwe. The risks were very relevant and the risk management strategies employed by the project were very effective in preventing divergence from focusing on core

⁵ The Project opened Pandora's Box in that it sought to tackle issues that others would have wanted to gloss over, or would have wanted to avoid, as it meant triggering issues that would foment a collision course with local authorities, Government bureaucrats and above all, the politics of resource entitlements and development rights.

project objectives. It is evident that the project drivers were very tactful in its implementation at such a challenging time.

4.3 EFFECTIVENESS

4.3.1 Community Complaints – CAMPFIRE members interviewed indicated that one key impact of the project was the increase in community complaints to the RDC. This is because after the rights awareness trainings conducted, people now know how and where to channel their grievances

4.3.3 CAMPFIRE dividends payment system – Following from lobbying and learning lessons from the look and learn tour to Mbire District, most CAMPFIRE dividends from safari operators are no longer going to The RDC, but directly straight to communities, who have since opened up foreign currency accounts (FCAs). In some RDCs where this was not yet happening, informants were very passionate about the need for switching to the direct payment system.

4.3.3 Permits and CAMPFIRE quotas – Most resource harvesters and traditional leaders were questioning the issue of permits, particularly with regard to the basis for determining the numbers of permit holders and thresholds for resource use. To them, the current arrangement where NPWMA and other authorities unilaterally set targets, allocate quotas for hunting, and issue permits accordingly, is flawed in that it excludes input from local communities. Further, they argued that there was need for some participatory ecological assessments that would enable communities to better understand the issue of quotas, resource use, and ultimately, issuing of fishing and hunting permits. What also emerged from the assessment was that when it came to negotiations and lobbying over resource issues at The RDC level, chiefs and local councilors were not taking enough time to digest and brainstorm on the issues on their own before they got to full Council meetings, where they would be ‘outwitted’ in major decisions.

4.3.4 Development Rights Awareness Training –As has been highlighted earlier on, development training yielded some commendable results, judging from the wide local awareness of development rights and entitlements to the Zambezi Valley resources. When some fishers attended training on rights, they noticed the discrepancy between the treatment they got at the hands of NPWMA game wardens and what they learned to be the actual policy. This enabled them to then follow up on the issues, challenge the rough treatment from NPWMA game wardens and eventually, cases of ill-treatment of resource users have dropped considerably. Most interviewees put this drop at around 80%. However, considering the centrality of the issue of rights in the project, and the vast expanse of area to be covered in the four Districts, the training was not adequate not in terms of content but in numbers trained. The average 20% figure of people trained either in fishing cooperatives or in FCUs appears inadequate to disseminate the knowledge to the many others that were left out of the training. Also as a direct result of the training, community complaints on natural resource use have increased.

4.3.5 Operationalisation of the Kariba Lakeshore Combination Master Plan (KLCMP) – Despite the fact that this Plan had been drafted in 1996, there appears to have been fundamental problems with central government in implementing this policy. There was no legal framework, normally in the form of a statutory instrument, from central government to guide the implementation of KLCMP Key informants revealed that the KLCMP document

was given to key development stakeholders in these three RDCs of Binga, Hwange and Nyaminyami, even though most of them professed ignorance about having KLCMP copies. This inadvertently entailed exclusion of communities and other local would-be beneficiaries from taking part in the development of the Zambezi valley. In spite of these initial setbacks, the KLCMP has generated a lot of enthusiasm and unity of purpose across the Zambezi Valley. This unity of purpose was demonstrated during COPAC meetings where people from the region proposed that the Zambezi Valley be established as a separate administrative provincial region.

4.3.6 Multi stakeholder review workshops – Three multi-stakeholder project review workshops were conducted, one in each year. This was a good strategy for monitoring and evaluation of ZVAP activities. These workshops allowed opportunities to debate and share ideas on how to better improve on ZVAP delivery. They also functioned as platforms for information dissemination, lesson learning and experience sharing. However, although the project set out to conduct information dissemination through seminars and publications, these have not been very visible, and there has not been much documentation on project experiences, lessons and successes. Where these have been done, they have not been circulated to a very wide audience apart from key institutions and stakeholders in development, mainly in the four districts, and very thinly outside this immediate zone of operation.

4.4 EQUITY

The project's hierarchy of objectives are very explicit on the need for equity and equitable sharing and accessing of natural resources in the region. There have been attempts to buttress this emphasis mainly through advocacy and development rights training. The evaluators consider the project to have made fairly good progress with regard to equity by setting the platform for future improvement in this area, especially looking at the participation of women, children, the disabled and the sick, particularly people living with HIV and AIDS. ZVAP attempted to address a number of factors that have militated against achievement of equity. The factors, which are largely structural in nature, are highlighted below.

4.4.1 Traditional historical livelihood structures and participation of marginalised socio-economic groups- Musuna in Hwange District is an exception, where two women hold top positions on the Natural Resources and CAMPFIRE committees. At Chalala, where there were 2 female permit holders out of a total of 38 (5.3%), informants said that women who were part of fishing cooperatives were given light duties. There were also 5 children (all boys) who were recommended to get permits (13%). There is a group of women at Siachilaba who run a fish market there. In addition, there were also other women who get permits and hire other people to work for them. It is important though to note that there are some children who are benefitting through construction of schools from CAMPFIRE proceeds. Others are benefitting through procurement of learning materials and payment of school fees from fish sales. Consumption of fish also improves nutrition for children as they eat fish caught by adults in the river.

One major factor that has affected the achievement of equity in enjoying program benefits is traditional-historical configuration of livelihoods. Fishing camps do not readily accommodate family life. Apart from Chalala fishing village which has a school and a health centre, viable family life has not been demonstrated at some of the fishing camps. The traditional-historical mode of fishing and wildlife has tended to exclude women, children and the disabled from

engaging in these livelihoods. For example, night fishing for married women is a contentious issue and requires the consent of the husbands who, in most cases, would most unlikely support such an arrangement. Children involvement has to be examined within the broader rubric of child rights programming so that they are not harmed in the process of promoting their rights. ZVAP was tactical in approaching the inclusion of children by making a special emphasis on child protection by raising awareness to traditional leaders and government authorities. These factors have stood in the way of project objective of including the marginalized. There is also the issue of how to balance going to school and engagement in activities like fishing for school going age children.

4.5 IMPACT

4.5.1 'Snowballing effect' of ZVAP. Even though ZVAP started with an original mandate of improving people of the Zambezi valley's access to fishing and wildlife resources primarily through awareness of their development rights, the project has had a ripple effect throughout the valley and the country. This is a powerful indicator of the impact of the project. When people see results, they want to be a part of where the action is. The Conference on Access Benefit Sharing of Natural Resources in the Zambezi Valley held in Harare in early December 2010 showed how ZVAP managed to draw the interest and attention of at three cabinet ministers from the Zimbabwe Government responsible for Local Government, for Environment and Public Works. There were also 80 stakeholders, ranging from community members to top level government and civil society institutions. This was a good launching pad for future programming and fund raising not only for ZVAP partners, particularly Basilwizi Trust and Save the Children Zimbabwe, and other development agencies working in the Zambezi Valley. . There are two notable 'off-shoot' effects of ZVAP that provide future opportunities even for staff development as they are prepared for handling more complex and bigger initiatives generated by the current project. One of these opportunities are in broadening staff understanding and involvement in wider human rights issues, without only being limited to development rights. Another is the demand by fishing cooperative members and other project beneficiaries for more capacity building in the area of development rights. Ultimately, the FCUs are in fact Community Based Organisations that await formalization and further training, thereby enhancing local capacity for project planning and management. The number of stakeholders and the zone of influence of ZVAP has been growing over the years.

4.5.2 Advocacy – has made great impact in terms of awareness raising on access and benefit sharing and development rights of beneficiaries. The same also applies to the CAMPFIRE projects in the four RDCs. There were indications that original CAMPFIRE structures had virtually collapsed in these districts but they were revived by the ZVAP. Through CAMPFIRE, community members and project beneficiaries were now able to approach NPWMA and RDCs for clarification and to demand wildlife quotas allocated to them. The fishers were also questioning both NPWMA and the RDC tariffs on fish licenses. The issue of 'double taxation', where fish traders bought fish trading licenses from both NPWMA and RDCs who charged US\$20 and US\$10 per month respectively, came out strongly in both individual in-depth interviews and FDGs. It was also highlighted at the national policy dialogue conference where chiefs and other stakeholders strongly demanded clarification of the matter. Project activities have led to creation of demand for more advocacy training from other communities and people not directly reached out to by the ZVAP project. Overall, the project has changed the way of thinking on the part of many stakeholders, including policy makers on issues of entitlement, rights and access with regard to natural resource use in the

Zambezi Valley. Even though the number of people trained in each co-operative was relatively small compared to the vast Zambezi valley, the training generated demand for training for other members, and this is an indication of impact of member performance after the training.⁶

4.5.3 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

The project also assisted towards achievement of the three MDGs that the Zimbabwean Government selected to concentrate on, namely MDG1 (Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger), MDG 3 (Promote gender equality and empower women) and MDG 6 (Combating HIV and AIDS, malaria and other diseases). The goal of ZVAP was formulated to directly address poverty and vulnerability risks through increased access to natural resources using the rights based approach to development in the Zambezi Valley. This is relevant, considering that in most cases, it is the poor and vulnerable who rely heavily on natural resources, and whatever happens to these resources (depletion, denial of access, improvement, etc) affects them the most, compared with other people. Although women still constitute a relatively smaller percentage within the fishing co-operatives and CAMPFIRE structures, there have been deliberate efforts to create a larger operating and 'livelihood space' for them. This was seen at Chalala fishing camp where women members have been allocated workloads and schedules, unlike in the past when this was not being practiced. On HIV and AIDS, the project made preliminary inroads by embarking on HIV and AIDS awareness campaigns in some fishing camps like Chalala, Malala and Masumu. The fact that fishing entails people staying away from their families for long periods of time means they are at high risk of casual sex. There is scope for future project expansion in HIV and AIDS programming. In addition to the three MDGs Zimbabwe has decided to comprehensively address, the table below shows how the project contributed towards addressing the other MDGs.

Table 1: Other MDGs addressed by ZVAP

MDG	HOW ZVAP ADDRESSES MDG
MDG 2: Achieve Universal Primary Education	Construction of schools and provision of learning material through royalties from CAMPFIRE and fishing. Families better able to send their children to school from incomes earned through fisheries and other natural resources.
MDG 4. Reduce Child Mortality MDG 5. Improve Maternal Health	Fish obtained through fisheries supplementing household food, thereby contributing to enhanced child nutrition. Income from natural resources used to buy food and pay for health services. Similarly, in Gokwe North, a community-led clinic is under construction to address health issues, including children's health
MDG 7. Ensure Environmental Sustainability	Sustainable conservation through prevention of poaching of fish and wildlife has led to greater realization of the importance of ecosystem services. The KLCMP as part of a broader strategy for improving sustainable livelihoods and environmental management for the people in the Zambezi Valley.
MDG 8. Develop a Global Partnership for Development	Commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction – both nationally and internationally. This is seen in the development rights advocacy thrust. The December 2010 national policy dialogue conference on the Zambezi Valley was another case in point.

⁶ Upon seeing the success of other trained and registered fishing unions, the Nyaminyami Fishing Committee, was, at the time of conducting the research, indicating its intention to register as a Union.

Table 2: Project Contribution to Core CSCF Areas

Core CSCF Area	How ZVAP Contributed to CSCF Area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building capacity of Southern civil society to engage in local decision making processes • Building capacity of Southern civil society to engage in national decision making processes 	Fairly good progress has been made in building community, FCU, RDC, partner and other stakeholder capacity in tackling ABS issues. There has been mobilization of critical mass of people and organizations that can question decisions, dispensing with the destructive culture of fear that had been prevalent during the time of ZVAP implementation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising awareness of entitlements and rights 	Through advocacy and training in development rights, communities are now more aware of their resource entitlements and rights. They have become more assertive in the way they engage RDCs, service providers, partners and other stakeholders on ABS of fisheries and wildlife based livelihoods.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service delivery in difficult environments 	The project managed to achieve comparatively great impact through an effective non-interventionist project delivery strategy. Advocacy projects were particularly targeted at the time of project implementation, when the country had compound economic, political and social problems.

4.5.4 Conflict Management – The project activities can be paralleled to ‘Pandora’s box’. They have brought out many issues into the open. When beneficiaries are aware of their rights and entitlements, they demand them, taking authorities and other stakeholders to task – demanding more accountability. Examples include clashes between fishers and NPWLMA, fish traders, NPWMA and RDCs, Basilwizi Trust and RDCs, black fishers and white fishers, safari operators and communities, RDCs and hunting concessions, NPWMA and CAMPFIRE. Some of the conflict inherent in legislative instruments such as the Mines and Minerals Act and Environmental Management Act are being addressed by fishers and CAMPFIRE using skills gained from ZVAP. For example, it was alleged by the fishers that NPWMA officials were harassing them, including physical abuse, confiscating their fishing equipment such boats and nets without any good cause. Using advocacy skills gained from ZVAP, fishers caused meetings involving Zimbabwe Republic Police, NPWMA, RDCs and Ministry of Local Government. The relations between fishers and NPWMA have improved which have bearing on both fishers’ livelihoods and conservation of fish resources.

4.5.5 Social responsibility and corporate citizenship versus community needs and priorities – Apart from isolated, minimal cases, the corporate and stakeholders involved in natural resource extraction were not ploughing back some of their profits to producing communities. Chiefs and RDCs confirmed the need to come up with a corporate social responsibility policy framework to guide business in ploughing back some of their profits to the communities. This could also be addressed as the KLCMP implementation commences. Many informants expressed strong sentiments about the agony of having to watch corporate make huge sums of money from local resources, yet their rarely plough back some of the profits to the community. This has tended to breed frustration and alienation that causes people to support both commercial and subsistence poaching activities. This erodes the ideal of responsible

citizenship that feeds into sustainable utilization of resources. The community leadership and ordinary members of the community have realised for the benefits of natural resources to be shared equitably. All the RDCs confirmed their support for increased corporate social responsibility.

4.6 SUSTAINABILITY

4.6.1 Use of existing structures - The project is being implemented through the existing structures and these structures will remain even at the end of the project. The structures involved are guided by existing legislative policies, meaning their existence is guaranteed even after the end of ZVAP. For instance, the establishment of the coordinating and monitoring system for the KLCMP and revival of the technical team by DPP is already supported by the Rural, Urban and Town Planning Act. The involvement of the traditional leadership in the project and community structures which include the ward CAMPFIRE committees ensure that the skills remain within the communities' key developmental people. The project encourages dialogue between the community structures and the stakeholders. By so doing the project improved the relationship between the community structures and the stakeholders especially the relationships between communities and state actors. Project initiatives were overly skewed towards fishers and did not include safari operators and white fishers were outside the existing structures.

4.6.2 Coalition around the KLCMP - The establishment of the secretariat committee and the coordination role of the DDP for the KLCMP shows that the ZVAP's benefits will continue to accrue after the project has come to an end. Also, the four target local authorities are already engaged in access and benefit sharing policy formulation and implementation processes to ensure increased natural resource benefits to local communities, particularly from fishing and wildlife revenue. For instance, local fishing and wildlife committees are participating in Rural District Development Committees and full-council meetings where relevant issues are discussed and these processes would continue beyond this project.

4.6.3 Look and learn tours - ZVAP funded look and learn tours to Mbire District to share experiences on CAMPFIRE projects and to Botswana, targeting fisheries, were critical events that can be built upon as a way of demonstrating that there are other contexts where people have devised locally adaptable strategies of equitable use of natural resources. They are also lesson learning hotspots that they can always consult in future for guidance in designing their own resource utilization models. Tours are mostly likely to become a regular feature in CAMPFIRE programmes.

4.6.4 Development priorities without local involvement – The issue of exclusion of chiefs and other local leaders in key development and investment decisions may hamper sustainability of project initiatives. The fact that RDCs and NPWMA sometimes make unilateral decisions has been noted. If this continues unabated, there is a danger that some of the investment and development priorities drawn by RDCs and other authorities without much local input will not pass the sustainability test in the long run as there will be mismatch with community priorities dictated by local realities.

4.7 REPLICABILITY

The project has clearly equipped communities with skills on how to engage authorities with regard to resource use and access, as well as advocacy. Development rights awareness raising and advocacy have great likelihood of replicability, based on the following factors, among others:

- The existence of many other sites in the country and beyond, where local people have a real need and desire to access and utilise their natural and even man-made resources
- Development rights awareness has the potential to put pressure on authorities and implementing agencies to be more accountable not only to governments and donors, but also to project beneficiaries. This is happening against a background of widespread interest in Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP).
- Rights awareness is relatively less costly in terms of both financial and material resources and this makes it amenable to operational contexts that are thin on resources
- Rights issues are a software aspect of development, and are therefore not easily degraded once they are ingrained within society through training and day-to-day interactions.
- The same structures (RDCs, NPWMA, traditional leaders) that the ZVAP has been working with on are also present elsewhere in the country. If these structures have borne this project, they can also bear similar projects in other parts of the country.

Assuming that the political and policy leadership of Zimbabwe is earnest on indigenisation and local empowerment plans, the tenets forming the pillars of the ZVAP project will go a long way in complementing these efforts by central government. The principles could even go beyond just NRM issues, but could also be applied in tourism, industrial development, mining education, health and other relevant sectors. The advocacy project was implemented in a tight socio-political environment where advocacy was not a popular word with the establishment, but still managed to post some results. It should be much easier for replication in more stable socio-political environments.

4.8 INFORMATION DISSEMINATION AND NETWORKING

Project information dissemination and information sharing have mainly been through annual stakeholder review meetings, brochures, conferences and workshops. There was also use of the media at the Victoria Falls and Harare Conferences. There was also a newsletter on the Harare December 2010 Conference. Also there will be three publications from the project on CAMPFIRE, Fishing and KLCMP which are already in draft. However, these workshops were important in raising awareness on development rights and on what could be possible to achieve when local people develop a common vision for development. One weakness with some of the workshops is the exclusion of key stakeholders in the region, namely safari operators and white fishers. These stakeholders were visibly absent at the Harare stakeholder conference held in December 2010. In future, such critical stakeholders e.g. should participate in these conferences. Project lessons still need more documentation and sharing as the project winds up. The impact and outcomes of the project, if shared more widely, have the potential to influence demand for development rights training in other parts of the country and beyond.

5. LESSONS LEARNED

- *The Dynamics of Collaboration on Access and Benefit Sharing* is not a process in which people agree on everything. However, it can be a way for them to work together to meet different objectives. The real power of the experience comes from this collaboration. Mutual resource use can be a basis for establishing and strengthening relationships. This collaboration lays a foundation and motivation for future development partnership. Collective resource tenure as part of CBNRM can lead to exclusion, but it may not necessarily lead to conflict if all the participants accept the exclusion, and that based on concessionary gains in other areas on the part of those excluded. It is also possible that while some will want it, others will accept it reluctantly, while still others might oppose it, depending on material circumstances and discourses of what *is* or is not legitimate. Sometimes the exclusion may be facilitating the implementation of government policies, and in that case, there is not much other stakeholders can do, apart from mitigating the impact of such exclusion.
- *Partnership approach*: Much as we are trying to empower fishing cooperatives to increase their profit margins, it has been established that in addition to this kind of support, the fisher folk need marketing and business skills for their products. Such training can include packaging of fish within and outside the Zambezi Valley region to add value to their products. Unfortunately, these activities are not covered under this project and thus ZVAP could not meet some of the demands from the target population. However, through collaborative work with other NGOs into economic justice, these non-core ZVAP training activities were offered to the fisher folk, though ‘piece-meal’, during the period under review. For example, ZVAP partnered with Silveira House to offer training workshops in welding skills and making welding machines for the fisher folk. It also provided the fisher folk with iron sheets to repair their rigs. The welding skills have empowered and enabled them to repair their boats on their own, hence cost savings that translated to improved fishing operations.
- *Access to natural resources by marginalised groups*: Access by the poor to natural resources (land, forests, water, fisheries, pastures, etc.), is essential for sustainable poverty reduction. The livelihoods of rural people without access, or with very limited access to natural resources are vulnerable because they have difficulty in obtaining food, accumulating other assets, and recuperating after natural or market shocks or misfortunes.
- *Need to curb conditions allowing for elite capture of initiatives*: When resource use and tenure policies are not explicit and where there is no political will for these to be addressed equitably, there is a tendency for elite capture of higher-value resources (safari hunting, commercial fishing, commercial forestry) and uncontrolled privatisation of common access resources to the disadvantage of locals.
- *Development rights and politics*: It is important to explain the link between land and territory in the politicians view and its consequences in the practices of power. There is need for policy makers and those in top leadership at all levels to realise the importance of reading and interpreting local communities’ quest for exercising their development rights. For such exercising to be realised, it should not be misconstrued as political challenge or rebellion; rather, it should be seen as part of rights-based development programming.

- *Benefits of pooling resource and ideas:* It is very feasible to bring together people who have been operating individually to understand the need to work as a team, based on demonstration that it works.
- *Effective development facilitation:* NGO and other agencies' staff should be well conversant with traditional and local cultural formalities for effective facilitation of development initiatives that have a strong local empowerment component. In such cases, community entry can spell the difference between project buy-in and acceptability and project failure and rejection.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Most recommendations are not necessarily limited to any specific aspect being evaluated, like efficiency, impact, effectiveness, etc, but cut across all these facets. Because of this, the recommendations are open and not in any order of importance or weighting.

6.1 Fisheries

- *Involvement of Marginalised Social groups:* There is need for guiding communities in devising innovative ways of involving women and children in both fisheries and safari hunting. There is need to explore getting women, children and the disabled to take part in upstream industries that are related to fishing and safari hunting, for instance in local tourism. In this case, there will be need for a case by case analysis of each of the various contexts where fishing is being conducted along the Zambezi Valley. In the Zambezi Valley for instance, women could be involved in welding and repair of boats, among other locally available opportunities.
- *Fishing Camps and Family life:* We have seen how, apart from some progress at Chalala Fishing Camp, fishing camps do not readily accommodate family life. This makes HIV and AIDS intervention very relevant. The project needs to intensify HIV and AIDS activities in liaison with key government and private sector stakeholders in the health field in order to safeguard and build on gains made so far in investment in fishing, for example the scenario at Chalala Fishing Camp where there is a clinic, a police post, a satellite school and residences where there is possibility of whole families living together at the camp.
- *Institutional support to fishing co-operative and unions* – Some groups had no working institutional structures, especially at Musumu camp. Complicated by former SAFA office bearers who feel that Basilwizi Trust is pulling the rug from under their feet. There is need for more project management training and other forms of support, e.g. Participatory Action Planning and Development (PAPD) and through look and learn visits as happened with leadership who visited Mbire RDC and Botswana. One major issue resonating throughout most interviews with the fishers and other stakeholders is that though the project did well on the software aspect (rights awareness raising), there is need to complement this with the hardware aspect (like assistance in sourcing equipment and other materials).

6.2 CAMPFIRE and Wildlife

Determining thresholds on resource use and Problem Animal Control (PAC) – there is the issue of determining how and when to draw the line between thresholds on sustainable and unsustainable natural resource use. Need to incorporate community participation in

this to come up with locally defined conceptions of realistic thresholds. For instance, NPWMA may allocate a quota of 5 elephants a year for a particular area, and yet there may be more elephants in a particular area, some of which end up being PAs. Closely linked to this is the issue of PAC. There is need to link problem animal control and quota systems in ways that are logical and meaningful to communities for them to see value in, and be more supportive of, conservation initiatives. Although PAC and the quota system stem from entirely different premises, to the communities, the major issue is about animal control and how to access proceeds from the slaughter of the same. People do not understand this, and as long as this continues, they may also continue to collaborate with poachers. There is therefore need to holistically address the quota system.

- *Return on rates and levies as part of social responsibility* – there is need for more accountability on the part of the RDC-National Park liaisons. Fishers and those involved in water based resources indicate that they do not see any meaningful investment in development by RDCs, and they question the use of the money they pay as levies and taxes to these authorities. A case in point is Chalala, where the road is very bad. The project could also work with beneficiaries to demand for improved services from RDCs and other local government institutions involved in community development.
- *Education and awareness raising on NRM policy*: With reference to indications of conflicting obligations and roles in NRM, there is need for advocating for harmonizing policies around NRM – like The Forestry Produce Act, the one governing RDCs. Environmental Management Act (EMA) and the Minerals and Mining Acts. For instance, in this project, there is focus on local people's right to access their resources. However, when the resources are minerals, then the Minerals and Mining Act then overrides all the other laws. The sticky issue is, the generality of the populace are not aware of this, and this creates a lot of tension between those who implement these policies and local communities, among other interested parties. There is also the issue of RDCs' appropriate authority status versus chiefs' powers. This needs to be repackaged or even harmonised because as it stands, both chiefs and RDCs can each claim to have supreme powers over local affairs, and if both are unflinching, this creates a difficult operating environment. There also need to redefine a PA, and clarify what really constitutes one in unambiguous ways. Again, in order to achieve consistency between policy and practice, there is need to ensure NPWMA effectively monitor the behaviour of its field staff who interact directly with communities.
- *Issuing of resource use permits*: Considering the contention and controversy around issuing of fishing and hunting permits, there is need to consider putting in place a system that sees permits being taken from RDCs and not NPWMA. There is need to consider involving chiefs and wider local stakeholders and institutions in issuing out safari hunting and fishing permits. There will of course be need to agree on a strategy to explore how NPWMA could still benefit from that kind of arrangement. Need to address the quota system

6.3 Project Management

- *Differential Packaging of Advocacy messages*: The impact of the advocacy component of the project has already been emphasised. To consolidate gains made in this area, there is need to work at differentiated packaging of advocacy messages to cater for different constituencies. Some people jump the gun to approach higher level authorities because the local level structures do not understand their concerns and are not therefore in a

position to effectively assist them. Such cases can be avoided when all people effectively understand advocacy messages.

- *Project Vulnerability and Risk Assessments:* Project risk assessment should address matters relating to the risks associated with accessing the lake resources, e.g. HIV and AIDS, drowning, safety issues in relation water based predators like crocodiles, provision of health care services, transport, security in handling cash after fish sales, banking facilities, etc. Hazard and Vulnerability and Capacity Analyses (VCAs) need to be periodically conducted to enable resource harvesters quickly anticipate, cope with, and respond to hazard situations or events and dangers that may befall them as they engage in their livelihoods.

6.4 KLCMP Issues

- *Need for Basilwizi Trust and stakeholders to lobby policy makers for creation of a Statutory Instrument* that will outline the implementation framework for the KLCMP, including resource mobilization, establishment of the Combination Authority Secretariat and national budgetary commitments.
- *Guiding beneficiary innovation towards discovering diverse livelihoods:* For people engaging in fishing and wild life based livelihoods, there is need to consider assisting them realise livelihood opportunities beyond just harvesting resources, like for instance opportunities for them in tourism. This could be achieved for instance through look and learn visits to other parts of Zimbabwe where community based tourism and ecotourism projects have been implemented, notably Chiredzi.
- *Investment in legal issues* – considering the nature of work Basilwizi Trust is spearheading (advocacy, rights and entitlements), and against a background of increased pressure on authorities to implement the KLCMP, the organization could consider enhancing the capacity of staff in human rights and humanitarian law. They could also set up a Human Rights Desk to improve their effectiveness in providing paralegal support to beneficiaries and partner organizations. This will also enable them to brace up for possible expanded future paralegal consultations from other organizations that will have seen the impact of ZVAP on rights-based programming.

7. APPENDICES

7.1 PROJECT ACHIEVEMENT RATING

- 1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings
 2 = largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings
 3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced
 4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings
 5 = not achieved

	Achievement Rating for whole project period	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for indicators	Progress against the indicators	Comments on changes over the whole project period, including unintended impacts
Purpose To expand livelihoods portfolios of Zambezi Valley communities through improved access and sustainable conservation of water, fisheries and wildlife resources as a result of change in policy formulation and implementation process	2	1. Increased and sustainable resource flow to poor communities: from wildlife, fishery, and water resources; 2. Improved participation of communities (chief's councils, local councillors, CAMPFIRE Committees, District Fishers Association and	1. 90 percent of (approximately 400, 000) rural Zambezi valley communities considered poor and livelihoods unsustainable due to limited access to natural resource utilisation 2. CAMPFIRE dividends share to producing communities was as low as 20%, for example, Binga RDC.	-There has been substantial improvement in community access to natural resource utilization at various levels (District, ward, community and household). This is attributable mainly to the effectiveness of the advocacy route in development rights awareness in the four Districts of Hwange, Binga, Nyaminyami and Gokwe North. Field evidence and document analysis point towards an approximate figure of between 60% to 70% improvement in access and benefit sharing for these areas. -As a result of changes in the	-Some changes were made on the logical framework, instead of policy changes it was realised that the policies were adequate but there was need to enforce the policies. The KLCMP was one of the policy documents which needed full implementation. Three changes were made on the logical framework during the project's lifetime. (1) Change of policy to effective implementation of policies. (2) The Kariba Lakeshore Combination Master Plan (KLCMP) was included on the logical framework as one of the policy documents that needed effective implementation. (3) The technical team to the lobby groups was removed as one of the structures that were supposed to be

		women and children) in water, wildlife and fishery policy formulation and implementation processes		<p>payment system attributed to the project, three of the RDCs have already instituted systems of direct payment of dividends to communities, as opposed to via RDCs.</p> <p>-There is overwhelming evidence of involvement of chiefs and local community structures in matters pertaining to natural resource access and benefit sharing.</p>	formed.
Outputs <i>Output 1</i> Advocacy structures established to influence water, fisheries and wildlife management policy formulation and implementation processes.	1	1. Advocacy networks in place and active, by end of 2008 and two lobby groups engage authorities on policy processes eg Kariba Lakeshore Combination Master Plan 2. 30 fishing cooperatives, consisting 300 people in three districts have increased access to fishing by end of 2010 with 400 children benefiting	1. 70 CAMPFIRE communities structures in the Zambezi Valley are non-functional and flow of funds to communities are not transparent 2. No gillnet fish structures and Kapenta fishing cooperatives not recognised by RDCs in decision-making	<p>-CAMPFIRE structures have been resuscitated by the project. They are now more active and making demands and holding local authorities and policy makers to account. The culture of 'fear' of authorities has slowly died down, and people are more articulate on issues that affect their very survival and livelihoods.</p> <p>-Gill net and Kapenta fishing cooperatives are now relatively powerful entities that can now make submissions and contributions to RDCs, Parks and Wildlife Authority and other relevant authorities on matters to do with fisheries and wildlife. They have even formed Unions that are legal entities in their own right.</p>	-The Zambezi Valley Communities were enlightened on their rights and their problem solving skills were enhanced. They are now capable of demanding active participation in decision making processes on issues concerning the access and management of locally available resources. In Mola ward in Nyaminyami district for example, the communities petitioned the RDC to help them put in place a more accountable structure for the CAMPFIRE project than the previous one where the councillor dominated the decision-making process. The fishers have, for the first time in their working relationship with local authorities, advocated for their inclusion in the designing of fish trading licences. The achievement of the impact is attributed to (i) Working through existing structures which ensured ownership of the project by the beneficiaries. (ii) the good working relationship with key stakeholders that

		through improved income for school fees by end of 2009. 3. 250 000 people including 9 000 children benefit from wildlife revenues by end of project		Further, their advocacy work has resulted in reduction in cases of harassment of fishers by Parks and Wildlife Authority and Lake Navigation Control members. -Annex 7.5 details the co-operative unions and fishing cooperatives active in the valley. There is some representation of women in the composition of these groups, thereby contributing towards both gender balance and equity in decision making and leadership roles.	united key players of the project.
<i>Output 2</i> Cross-cutting issues: gender, HIV/AIDS, child protection, environment and disaster risk reduction (DRR) integrated into project activities	2	Cross-cutting (HIV and AIDS, child protection, gender and DRR reduction) integrated in project by end of 2009 and involving 500 and 300 women and children involved respectively	1. No females in leadership positions in all four RDCs 2. 3 out of 24 gillnet fishing camps and 6 out of 65 kapenta cooperatives have limited awareness of HIV and AIDS prevention, treatment and counselling services 3. Children and Young people excluded in the development process	-All cross cutting issues were taken care of. The project did not isolate those in special cases such as the HIV positive, the disabled, women and children. However there were few women in the CAMPFIRE project and the Fishing cooperatives structures due to gender blindness that existed in the communities. Basilwizi is addressing this factor through another project in partnership with ZUBO Trust. Like in other communities in Africa, gender balance is still a challenge in the Zambezi valley. It is hoped that in future there will be change in local leadership after	Cross cutting issues have been addressed by the project, but these could have been spread in terms of their implementation. There was still more scope for mainstreaming disability into the project. Environmental, child protection and DRR issues were well-covered.

				the communities received gender trainings.	
<i>Output 3</i> Improved knowledge and skills for the target groups in developmental rights, lobbying and advocacy in the four districts	2	One lobby group per district is trained on advocacy and leadership and applies some of the learnt skills by December 2009	80% of the Zambezi valley population have limited understanding of legislative policies on water, wildlife and fishing	Inter-district lobby group is in place and involved in coordinating lobbying on issues to do with development rights programming.	The lobby groups have been trained successfully. A key issue arises when it comes to progress with regard to their application of these skills especially in influencing others who have not been part of the project beneficiaries.
<i>Output 4</i> Improved capacity for communities to demand their rights and entitlements to fisheries, water and wildlife management in the Zambezi Valley	1	1. At least two lobby groups prepare advocacy plans and take up three initiatives to engage with government agencies by 2011 2. Two lobby and advocacy meetings held per year 3. Application of lobby and advocacy in development planning and implementation activities in each district	1. Low capacity to lobby relevant authorities by eg fishermen and CAMPFIRE structures 2. No lobby group and advocacy meetings held by wildlife or fishers 2. Rights-based approaches to development viewed as distinct from development planning	This has been achieved, and this lobbying has culminated in the holding of an all stakeholders workshop on access benefit and sharing for people of the Zambezi Valley in December 2010 in Harare. The fact that this conference managed to attract the attention of top civil servants in the relevant ministries and two cabinet ministers (Environment and Local Government) portrays its capacity to draw their attention. Local leaders, particularly chiefs, took this as an opportunity to speak out on their submissions to the policy makers.	The project has done very well in this area. One of the strong points here include the ability of the project to push for a resuscitation of discussion and action over the KLCMP. This happened against a background of general lethargy on the part of policy makers and authorities at all levels to implement it.

<p>Activities</p> <p>Please comment on the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the activities overall</p>	<p>The project activities were very relevant for the achievement of the project hierarchy of objectives. The project operated under tough socio-economic and political conditions where advocacy was not popular with the political Establishment, but still managed to post some successes. The various types of informants concurred that there are some visible and tangible changes on the way communities, institutions and authorities engage each other over accessing and making claims to use of natural resources – in fisheries, water and wild life. Communities have broken out of the shell of fear of challenging authorities and questioning certain decisions that affect their livelihoods. The project targeted community structures involved in natural resources harvesting and conservation. However there were more men than women participants in these structures due to the nature of work done there as well as inbuilt community traits with regard to gender. The project targeted the fishing, natural resources and CAMPFIRE committees in the four districts. ZVAP led to the establishment of Kujatana Kwesu Kapenta fish Union in Binga, Zambangulwe fishing Committee in Nyaminyami and Musuna fish committee in Hwange districts. The project managed to resuscitate the CAMPFIRE committees in the four administrative districts. These structures had since collapsed during the 2000-2007 period of hard economic and political situation experienced in Zimbabwe. The project activities helped the communities of the Zambezi valley realise their right to participate effectively in the access and benefits sharing of the natural resources. The active participation of the target groups helped the Zambezi valley leadership to advocate and lobby for fair benefits sharing, the benefits that would be channelled to development of the region and reduction in poverty. For example the lobbying done to reduce the permit fees for fishermen would help the fishermen to retain more money for family support. The activities were very relevant to the project goals and have built strong confidence levels among community members to engage policy implementers on issues that affect their livelihoods. The Zambezi valley communities are rich in natural resources yet they are poorly developed in terms of infrastructure. The advocacy training, look and learn visits and, lobby group meetings helped the Zambezi valley communities to be united for the lobbying done with relevant authorities. The approach to work with already existing structures made it possible to achieve the stated objectives even with high political tensions in Zimbabwe.</p>
---	---

7.2 SCHEDULE OF QUESTIONS

Schedule A: Schedule of Questions for ZVAP Project beneficiaries and Unions

Relevance and Equity

1. Indicate your mode of livelihood and explain why and how you were/are involved in it
2. What do you know about the ZVAP project? How and why did you become involved in it?
3. In what ways does your mode of livelihood relate to the ZVAP project? Would you continue operating under ZVAP in future? Elaborate
4. Comment on the participation of different types of people in your mode of livelihood (women, the elderly, girls, boys, the disabled, PLWHA). Comment on the participation of different types of people in the ZVAP project.
5. What is your understanding of development rights? What are the development rights in your mode of livelihood? How do you demonstrate them? In what ways does the ZVAP project address (these) development rights?
6. Did the project help you in any way in your livelihoods?

Effectiveness and Efficiency

7. Comment on the way different organizations/institutional arrangements have been working in this project
8. What has been your involvement in the project? To what extent do you think you own the project? Justify your answer
9. What factors hindered the smooth running of the project? What factors facilitated the smooth running of the project?
10. What is your opinion on the way the project was run? How could it have been improved?

Impact and Sustainability

11. What are the major changes in your life and local environment that you can attribute to the project?
12. What other developmental priorities/themes does the project address? (Here probe their understanding of MDGs, poverty alleviation plans, DRR, disability, HIV and AIDS, Gender, etc, and their ability to link these to the project)
13. Would you/your community continue organizing yourselves in the same way the project set the tone for your livelihood strategy if Basilwizi Trust's support was withdrawn? Why?
14. How would you want the project to continue in future, both with or without Basilwizi Trust's supporting you?

Replicability and Lessons Learned

15. What are the key lessons you have learned from the ZVAP project?
16. Comment on the direction of the project from the beginning up to the end? Were there any major changes from the original focus/plan? What caused these changes?
17. To what extent were you involved in the formulation and implementation of these and any other project changes?

Schedule B: Schedule of Questions for Stakeholders and Partners

Relevance and Equity

1. What do you know about the ZVAP project? How and why did you become involved in it?
2. In what ways does your organizational focus/objectives relate to the ZVAP project? Would you continue partnering with ZVAP in future? Elaborate
3. Comment on the participation of different types of people in the project (women, the elderly, girls, boys, the disabled, PLWHA).
4. What is your understanding of development rights? How have these been demonstrated by various stakeholders in the ZVAP project?
5. How are you addressing development rights as partner/stakeholder?

Effectiveness and Efficiency

6. Comment on the way different organizations/institutional arrangements have been working in this project
7. To what extent do you think you own the project? Justify your answer
8. What factors hindered the smooth running of the project? What factors facilitated the smooth running of the project?
9. What is your opinion on the way the project was run? How could it have been improved?

Impact and Sustainability

10. What are the major changes in the lives of those involved in the project and local environment that you can attribute to the project?
11. What other developmental priorities/themes does the project address? (Here probe their understanding of MDGs, poverty alleviation plans, DRR, disability, HIV and AIDS, Gender, etc, and their ability to link these to the project)
12. Would you continue working on the same project/livelihood strategy if Basilwizi Trust's support was withdrawn? Why?
13. How would you want the project to continue in future, both with or without Basilwizi Trust's supporting/partnering with you?

Replicability and Lessons Learned

14. What are the key lessons you have learned from the ZVAP project?
15. Comment on the direction of the project from the beginning up to the end? Were there any major changes from the original focus/plan? What caused these changes?
16. To what extent were you involved in the formulation and implementation of these and any other project changes?
17. Would you replicate this project? How and Why?

Schedule C: Schedule of Questions for Traditional leadership

Relevance and Equity

1. Indicate your modes of livelihoods in your community and explain why and how they were/are involved in them
2. What do you know about the ZVAP project? How and why did you allow your people to become involved in it?
3. Would you continue operating under ZVAP in future? Elaborate
4. Comment on the participation of different types of people in your mode of livelihood (women, the elderly, girls, boys, the disabled, PLWHA).Comment on the participation of different types of people in the ZVAP project.

5. What is your understanding of development rights? How do you demonstrate them? In what ways does the ZVAP project address development rights?

Effectiveness and Efficiency

6. Comment on the way different organizations/institutional arrangements have been working in this project
7. As a community leader, what has been your involvement in the project? To what extent do you think you own the project? Justify your answer
8. What factors hindered the smooth running of the project? What factors facilitated the smooth running of the project?
9. Comment on financial and budget management in the project
10. What is your opinion on the way the project was run? How could it have been improved?

Impact and Sustainability

11. What are the major changes in the community and local environment that you can attribute to the project?
12. What other developmental priorities/themes does the project address? (Here probe their understanding of MDGs, poverty alleviation plans, DRR, disability, HIV and AIDS, Gender, etc, and their ability to link these to the project)
13. Would you/your community continue organizing themselves in the way the project set the tone if Basilwizi Trust's support was withdrawn? Why?
14. How would you want the project to continue in future, both with or without Basilwizi Trust's supporting you?

Replicability and Lessons Learned

15. What are the key lessons you have learned from the ZVAP project?
16. Comment on the direction of the project from the beginning up to the end? Were there any major changes from the original focus/plan? What caused these changes?
17. To what extent was the community involved in the formulation and implementation of these and any other project changes?

Schedule D: Schedule of Questions for ZVAP Project and Partner Staff

Relevance and Equity

1. Explain why and how you were/are involved in the ZVAP project
2. In what ways does the ZVAP project contribute to community modes of livelihood?
3. Comment on the participation of different types of people in the ZVAP project (women, the elderly, girls, boys, the disabled, PLWHA).
4. What is your understanding of development rights? How does the community demonstrate them? In what ways does the ZVAP project address development rights?

Effectiveness and Efficiency

5. Comment on the way different organizations/institutional arrangements have been working in this project
6. To what extent do you think the community and other partners/stakeholders own the project? Justify your answer
7. What factors hindered the smooth running of the project? What factors facilitated the smooth running of the project?

8. Comment on financial and budget management in the project. What proportion of budget went towards admin and direct programming? (*Further information on financial reports and audits to be collected from the Basilwizi Trust office*)
9. What is your opinion on the way you ran the project? How could it have been improved?

Impact and Sustainability

10. What are the major changes in the community and local environment that you can attribute to the project?
11. What other developmental priorities/themes does the project address? (Here probe understanding of MDGs, poverty alleviation plans, DRR, disability, HIV and AIDS, Gender, etc, and their ability to link these to the project)
12. In your opinion, would the community continue organizing themselves in the way the project set the tone if Basilwizi Trust's support was withdrawn? Why?
13. How would you want the project to continue in future, both with or without Basilwizi Trust's supporting the beneficiaries?

Replicability and Lessons Learned

14. What are the key lessons you have learned from the ZVAP project?
15. Comment on the direction of the project from the beginning up to the end? Were there any major changes from the original focus/plan? What caused these changes?
16. To what extent did you involve the community in the formulation and implementation of these and any other project changes? Provide evidence

7.3 EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

ZAMBEZI VALLEY ADVOCACY PROJECT END OF TERM EVALUATION

1. Background

The Zambezi Valley is amongst the most marginalized, poorest and least developed parts of Zimbabwe. The predicament of the peoples of the Zambezi valley is largely attributed to the involuntary displacement in 1957 to make way for the Kariba Dam Hydroelectric Scheme. No compensation was made either at community level through provision of basic infrastructure and services or at household level for disrupting social networks, loss of livelihoods, lands and natural resources. Today the Kariba Dam is a lifeline of the Zimbabwean and Zambian economies. Yet the Kariba project has left a legacy of impoverishment amongst the displaced communities due to entitlement losses. Nyaminyami (Kariba Rural) has the lowest Human Development Index while Binga is the third lowest out of 77 Districts in Zimbabwe. They also have the lowest Gender Empowerment Measure. Empirical evidence from World Commission of Dams study (2000), Save the Children (UK) Household Economy Assessment (2001 – 2005) and Basilwizi Trust Survey (2005) also confirms that the resettlement areas continue to suffer from high levels of poverty, chronic water and food shortages, and lack the basic socio-economic services. Attempts by local communities to increase their access to resources in and around the Kariba Dam have been limited by statutory bodies which include the Department of NPWMA and Wildlife Management; Zambezi River Authority and Rural District Councils (RDC) charged with a range of responsibilities to manage and protect the areas.

2. The Zambezi Valley Advocacy project

2.1 Project Goal

The Zambezi Valley Advocacy project (ZVAP) is a community-driven project that aims at reducing poverty and vulnerability risks through fair access and equitable benefit-sharing of fishing, water and

wildlife resources using the rights-based approach to development. ZVAP's purpose was to increase civic knowledge, build organisational capacity, and develop advocacy skills on grassroots – enabling local communities to mobilise themselves, articulate concerns, formulate interventions and lobby the relevant stakeholders to bring about the desired change.

2.2 Aims and purpose of the External Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation will be to:

- vii. Assess and evaluate the program against the set targets to find out if the project still maintain its focus;
- viii. Continuously improve and maintain proper project design and management;
- ix. Identify gaps within the operating plans and find ways of addressing the gaps in order to help the project achieve its stated objective;
- x. Take note of the lessons learnt during the project implementation and see if there are any new strategies to be adopted that may help achieve project goals;
- xi. Ensure that funds are used effectively and efficiently to deliver results; and
- xii. Enable DFID to monitor and evaluate the performance of the CSCF as a whole, making sure the overall CSCF project portfolio is contributing to the reduction of poverty and demonstrating, for public accountability purposes, that the fund is an effective use of money.

3. Outputs from the Evaluation

The evaluator will produce a report (**no more than 30 pages** plus appendices, in Microsoft Word using Arial font 12). The report should include:

a. Basic Information (1 A4 page maximum)

- Project title
- Agency name
- CSCF number
- Country
- Name of local partner(s)
- Name of person who compiled the evaluation report, including summary of role/contribution of others in the team
- Period during which the evaluation was undertaken

b. Executive Summary (1 A4 page maximum)

c. Achievement Rating Scale (5 A4 pages maximum - see template at Annex A).

Please note that the overall achievement rating should have a score and a comment only.

d. Full Evaluation of Project: The format of the full evaluation report must make reference to the logframe and progress in relation to indicators where appropriate

4. Evaluation Criteria

The following evaluation criteria will be used:

Relevance: Details of the project's significance with respect to specific needs and its relevance to country poverty reduction priorities

- To what extent has the project contributed to rights awareness, whose rights and what impact has there been?
- How well did the project relate to the country's poverty reduction plans and DFID's country assistance plan?

Equity: Discussion of social differentiation (e.g. by gender, ethnicity, socio-economic group, disability, etc) and the extent to which the project had a positive impact on the more disadvantaged groups.

- How did the project actively promote gender equality?
- What was the impact of the project on children, youth and the elderly?
- If the project involved work with children, how were child protection issues addressed?
- How were the needs of excluded groups, including people with disabilities and people living with HIV/AIDS addressed within the project?

Efficiency: How far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time, other resources and procedures contributed to or hindered the achievement of results.

- How well did the partnership and management arrangements work and how did they develop over time?
- How well did the financial systems work?
- How were the beneficiaries involved, how effective was this and what have been the benefits of or difficulties with this involvement?
- Were the risks properly identified and well managed?

Effectiveness: Assessment of how far the intended outputs and results were achieved in relation to targets set in the original logical framework.

- How effective and appropriate was the project approach?
- With hindsight, how would the implementers have changed it?

Impact: Details of the broader economic, social, and political consequences of the project and how it contributed to the overall objectives of the CSCF.

- What was the project's overall impact and how did this compare with what was expected?
- Which of the following Millennium Development Goals did the project contribute to?
 - ☐ *Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger*
 - ☐ *Achieve universal primary education*
 - ☐ *Promote gender equality and empower women*
 - ☐ *Reduce child mortality*
 - ☐ *Improve Maternal Health*
 - ☐ *Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases*
 - ☐ *Ensure environmental sustainability*
 - ☐ *Develop a global partnership for development*
 - ☐ *None of the above*
- Which of the following core CSCF areas did the project contribute to?
 - ☐ *Building capacity of Southern civil society to engage in local decision-making processes*
 - ☐ *Building capacity of Southern civil society to engage in national decision making processes*
 - ☐ *Global advocacy*
 - ☐ *Raising awareness of entitlements and rights*
 - ☐ *Innovative service delivery*
 - ☐ *Service delivery in difficult environments*
- Did the project address the intended target group and what was the actual coverage?
- Who were the direct and indirect/wider beneficiaries of the project?
- What difference has been made to the lives of those involved in the project?

Sustainability: Potential for the continuation of the impact achieved and of the delivery mechanisms, following the withdrawal of external support.

- What are the prospects for the benefits of the project being sustained after the funding stops? Did this match the intentions?
- How has/could collaboration, networking and influencing of opinion support sustainability?
- How was the exit strategy defined, and how was this managed at the end of the funding period?

Replicability: How replicable is the process that introduced the changes/had impact? Refer especially to innovative aspects which are replicable.

- What aspects of the project are replicable elsewhere?
- Under what circumstances and/or in what contexts would the project be replicable?

Lessons Learned: Key lessons learned throughout the period of the project, which can be utilised to guide future strategies, projects or agencies working in development. It is useful to divide these into project, sector and broader developmental lessons.

- Were there any significant changes in the project design or the project context? What were the reasons for these and can any useful lessons be learned from this for application elsewhere?
- How did the project engage with poor and marginalised groups and support their empowerment most effectively?
- For whom could these lessons have relevance?
- How do the lessons relate to any innovative aspects of the project that were highlighted in the project proposal?
- How has the design of the project been amended as a result of lessons learned during implementation?

Information, Dissemination and Networking: Detail the mechanisms used for dissemination to outside project stakeholders.

- Have lessons been shared during the life of the project – with whom, and to what effect?

Recommendations: Recommendations for improvements based on observations during the evaluation process (e.g. for sustainability, future project design and management)

4. Format for the Evaluation

A common evaluation report format would be:

- Contents page
- Abbreviations and acronyms page
- Executive summary
- Achievement Rating Scale
- A short introduction to the project
- The evaluation methodology
- Findings from the evaluation in relation to the issues noted in bold above
- A summary of recommendations
- A one page summary of lessons indicating with whom and how lessons should be shared

The terms of reference for the evaluation should be included as an annex, as well as names and contact details of the evaluators along with a signed declaration of their independence from the project team. Other annexes will include the evaluation schedule, people met, documents consulted, statistical data on baselines and end of project surveys. The original and final logical framework (if different) must also be included.

5. Evaluation Requirements

The evaluation will be carried out by an external evaluator. The following competencies are required:

- Significant evaluation experience in the rights-based approaches to development related to access and benefits-sharing of wildlife and fisheries resources in the Zambezi Valley
- Strong knowledge of poverty reduction and development planning in Zimbabwe
- Strong knowledge and experience of cross-cutting development issues including gender and HIV and AIDS issues in development;
- Facilitation skills, particularly design and facilitation for consultations;
- Strong qualitative data collection and analysis skills;
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English.
- In addition, it is an advantage if the team includes members who are **fluent in ChiTonga**

The evaluation process should include:

- A desk review of project information including the key documents listed in these terms of reference.

- Interviews with project managers and partners to collect information on achievements and impact and difficulties faced by the project including the management aspects of work.
- Interviews with key project stakeholders to include questions on the degree to which project has had the intended impact; and what could have been done differently or better, so that the lessons can be learned.
- Presentation of preliminary overview of findings to the project partners and receives comments from stakeholders before preparing the draft evaluation report.
- Submit a draft report to the project team for written comments before finalising the report, to minimise the chance of inaccuracies and to maximise ownership of the findings.

5. Reporting arrangements

The evaluator will report to the Director of Basilwizi Trust who will be supported by the Disaster and Development Centre at Northumbria University.

6. Documents to share with the evaluators

- The approved project proposal document.
- The original project logframe and any subsequent amended log frames with the rationale for the changes.
- Annual Project Reports, including financial information.
- Any case studies submitted to DFID.
- Examples of lessons shared during the lifetime of the project.
- Original baseline studies and any subsequent studies to show impact.
- Other evidence of impact that the project team thinks is important. This could include anecdotes of decisions having been taken, policies or programmes that have changed or communication material that may have an impact on decision-making.

6. Submission of Applications

All teams applying must provide in electronic format (Microsoft Word) a **technical proposal** including:

- a brief (MAXIMUM ten page) proposal for how the evaluation could be implemented to address the evaluation purpose, objectives and questions outlined above, including some discussion of relevant evaluation frameworks and performance benchmarks, how the methodologies will be brought to bear to meet the objectives, distribution of labour within the team, a work calendar and key assumptions that shape the proposed design;
- curriculum vitae for each team member (MAXIMUM four pages each) demonstrating relevant qualifications and experience;
- Two **examples of relevant evaluation** work for the evaluator was responsible for the final product
- A **budget submission** including a breakdown of person days and daily fees for team members.
- Travel costs should not be included. These will be agreed with the evaluation team during negotiations based on the work calendar. **Full contact details of at least two references** from among recent employers/clients for each team member.

Proposals will be assessed for the quality of proposals and adequacy of teams against the requirements outlined above, and balancing this against costs, taking into account the assumptions identified in the technical proposal.

Deadline for submissions is 15th October 2010. 4:00 pm.

Annex A: Achievement Rating Scale

- 1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings
- 2 = largely achieved, despite a few shortcomings
- 3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced
- 4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings
- 5 = not achieved

	Achievement Rating for whole project period	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for indicators	Progress against the indicators	Comments on changes over the whole project period, including unintended impacts
Purpose (state below, then rate and comment)					
Outputs (list the main outputs below, rate against each , then give an overall rating): 1, 2, 3. etc.					
Activities Please comment on the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the activities overall					

7.4 LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

List of interviewees	Gender	Designation
Chief Nolutkova Dingani	M	Chief, Hwange District
Chief Sikalenge	M	Chief, Binga District Homestead
Mr. A. Mudenda (CEO)	M	District Engineer and once Acting CEO for Hwange Rural council
Mr. L. Muntanga	M	Binga Rural District Council CAMPFIRE Officer
Mr. B. Mackenzie	M	Councillor and Council Chairperson, Nyaminyami RDC
Mrs. N. Moyo	F	Area Manager NPWMA for Binga
Mrs. D Mudimba	F	Basilwizi Project Officer, Binga Office
Mr. S. Nyathi	M	Hwange CAMPFIRE Manager
Mr.T. Mugoriya	M	Assistant DA Binga
Chief Negande	M	Chief, Nyaminyami District
Chief Simuchembu	M	Chief, Gokwe North District
Mr. P. Ncube	M	CEO, Hwange RDC
Chief Mola	M	Nyaminyami District
Mr. B. B. Munkuli	M	CEO, Binga RDC
Mr. E. Kawina	M	Project Manager, Basilwizi
Mr. F. Mudimba	M	Director, Basilwizi
Dr. B. Manyena	M	DDC, United Kingdom
Mr. G. Mushonga	M	Chairperson, Chalala fishing camp
Mr.W. Murenga	M	Member, Chalala fishing camp

List of FGDs Participants		
Nixon Nyoni	M	Chairperson, Musuna Fishing camp
Elias Chuma	M	Member, Musuna Fishing camp
Chamunorwa Ngwenya	M	Member, Musuna Fishing camp
Oliver Nyoni	M	Member, Musuna Fishing camp
Enock Mumpande	M	Member, Musuna Fishing camp
Getrude Ncube	F	Member, Musuna Fishing camp
Elinah Munzamba	F	Member, Musuna Fishing camp
Purity Tshuma	F	Member, Musuna Fishing camp
Maria Ngwenya	F	Member, Musuna Fishing camp
Kenvas Seneti	M	Chairperson, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
Philimon Mutale	M	Member, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
Kitchen Sibanda	M	Member, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
Creogor Siamanya	M	Member, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
Saviours sianyongora	M	Member, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
Christopher Munsaka	M	Member, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
Pencil Munenge	M	Member, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
Rufaro Muzingili	M	Member, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
M.S Muleya	F	Member, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
Mercy Muleya	F	Member, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
Andrew Sande	M	Member, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
Munsaka stanley	M	Member, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
Aron Samande	M	Member, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
Mathews Munkuli	M	Member, Kujatana Kwesu Fishing Union Binga Hall
Luckson Kalulwe	M	Chairperson, Musumu Camp
Patson Masumu	M	Member, Musumu Camp
Pilato Kalulwe	M	Member, Musumu Camp
S. Mudimba	F	Member, Musumu Camp
Samuel Mudenda	M	Member, Musumu Camp
Thomas Muleya	M	Member, Musumu Camp
Cleopas Muleya	M	Member, Musumu Camp
Thokozani Ncube	F	Member, Musumu Camp
Rejoice Madzorera	F	Member, Musumu Camp
Josephine muchimba	F	Member, Musumu Camp
Audience Munenge	M	Member, Musumu Camp
Patrick mutale	M	Member, Musumu Camp
Wonder Mugande	M	Member, Musumu Camp
J.Bango	F	Member, Musumu Camp
Praymore Sithole	M	Member, Chalala Gillnet Fishing Camp
Christopher Murumisa	M	Member, Chalala Gillnet Fishing Camp
Siakaluma John	M	Chairman, Mulange Carpenter Cooperative, Chalala
Patrick Kalombe	M	Vice-Chairman, Chalala Fishing Camp
Benson Siabumbeni	M	Chalala Fishing Camp

7.5 Vital Statistics on Fisheries and Lobby Groups

District Lobby groups-Fishing Rights Kujatanakwesu Union - Binga

Name	Position	Sex
Kenias Chigwagwa	Chairperson	M
Everson Milisi Mudenda	Vice	M
Philimon Mutale	Secretary	M
John C Muchimba	Vice	M
Dudzai Naison	Treasurer	M
Richard Kaitano	Committee members	M
Kichani Sibanda	Committee member	M

Zambangulwe Lobby group - Nyaminyami

Name	Position	Sex
Leonard Litaba	Chairperson	M
Patrick Kalombe	Vice	M
Thomas Sibekwa	Secretary	M
Felix Ngilazi	Vice	M
Bernard Makombe	Treasurer	M
Wonder Murenga	Committee members	M
King Marumisa	Committee member	M

Fishing Lobby Group-Hwange

Name	Position	Co-operative	Sex
Oliver Nyoni	Chairperson	Kasambabezi	M
Sithembile Lupahla	Vice	Tulijatile	F
Tapela Ngwenya	Secretary	Tulumbamwami	M
Fida Ngwenya	Vice	Tulijatile	F
Cosmas Sibanda	Treasurer	Tulumbamwami	M
Lawrence Ngwenya	Committee member	Kasambabezi	M
Douglas Mumpande	Committee member	Twasyalila	M
Sam Mumpande	Committee member	Twasyalila	M

Inter-district Lobby group fishing rights

Name	Position	Sex	District
Kenias Chigwagwa	Chairperson	M	Binga
Fida Ngwenya	Vice	F	Hwange
Leonard Litaba	Secretary	M	Nyaminyami
John Muchimba	Vice	M	Binga
Oliver Nyoni	Treasurer	M	Hwange
Felix Ngilazi	Committee Member	M	Nyaminyami

District Lobby groups -Wildlife Resources

Name	Sex	Position in the committee	Ward /zone
1. Richard Dube	M	Chairperson	Kalungwizi
3. Micho Munkuli	M		Sianzyundu
4. Fanta Muchimba	M		Tyunga
5. Pat M Siasayi	M		Sikalenge
6. Phinias Ngwenya	M		Sinampande /Nagangala
7. Puntu Muzamba	M		Nabusenga
8. Juta Munsaka	M	Chairperson	Siabuwa zone
9. George Muleya	M		Mujele Zone

10.Muzingili S Super	M	Chairperson	Tyunga zone
11.Michael Mweembe	M	Chairperson	Kariangwe zone
12	M	Chairperson	Manjolo Zone
13			

Gokwe North Natural Resources Committees

Name	Sex	Position in the committee
1. Fadzai Ntabeni	F	Chairperson
2. Isabel R. Chipungari	F	
3. Faison Siambelebele	M	
4. Davison Tswakirai	M	
5. Kuzasi Mabhena	F	
6. Vimbai Makonese	F	
7. Headmen Gumunyu	M	
8. Chief Chireya	M	
9. Chief Nenyunga	M	
10. Chief Simchembu	M	
11. Headmen Mashame	M	

Nyaminyami

Name	Sex	Position in the committee
1. Negande Lovemore	M	
2. Gilbert Chibayamagora	M	
3. Julius Charlie	M	
4. David Mufepi	M	
5. Elisha Sithole	M	
6.Christopher Ciyandamali	M	V/Chairperson
7. Mackenzie Bucha	M	Chairperson
8. Buta Leonard	M	
9. Mufepi David	M	
10. Ophias Chidakwa	M	
11. Mika Ruwanika	M	
12. Matimbidzire Rogers	M	
Special Councillors		
13. Emerson Chisengere	M	
14.Nophias Chimukudu	M	
15. Mai Jonasi	F	