

## Integrated Water Resources Management in South Africa

**Evaluation of the involvement of Previously Disadvantaged  
Individuals in the CMA establishment process in the three WMAs  
of the DWAF/DANCED IWRM Project  
(WMA 3 Crocodile West – Marico; WMA 11 Umvoti to  
Umzimkulu;  
WMA 17 Olifants – Doorn)**

### **Volume I**

### **Summary of Findings**

**DRAFT**

**Department of Water Affairs and Forestry – South Africa**

This report contains:  
Restricted information  
Date: April 2002  
And is for official use only.  
Ref. J. No. 123/138-0154

**Carl Bro a/s**

# Evaluation of the involvement of Previously Disadvantaged Individuals in the CMA establishment process

## **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

This document is in draft form and has yet to receive formal approval. As such, the opinions, findings and recommendations expressed in this report are those of the evaluation team and do not necessarily represent those of DWAF, Danced or anyone else who assisted the project team.

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>FOREWORD</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>1. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 FINDINGS	1
1.1.1 Relevance	1
1.1.2 Efficiency	2
1.1.3 Effectiveness	2
1.1.4 Impact	3
1.1.5 Sustainability	3
1.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	4
<b>2. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 PDI PARTICIPATION & LEGAL REQUIREMENTS	5
2.2 BACKGROUND & GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	6
<b>3. REVIEW OBJECTIVES &amp; PURPOSE</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 OBJECTIVE	8
3.2 PURPOSE	8
3.3 FOR WHOM	8
3.4 PLANNED OUTPUTS	8
<b>4. RELEVANCE</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1 RELEVANCE	9
4.2 INITIAL PROJECT DESIGN & REAL NEEDS	9
4.3 IDENTIFICATION OF CORRECT BENEFICIARIES	10
4.4 LOCAL CAPACITY ASSESSMENT	10
4.5 PREVIOUS STUDIES / PREPARATORY ACTIVITIES	11
4.6 PDI AND GENDER CONCERNS	12
4.7 CONCLUSIONS RELATING TO RELEVANCE	12

<b>5. EFFICIENCY</b>	<b>14</b>
5.1 EFFICIENCY	14
5.2 BUDGETING FOR & COST OF PDI STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION	14
5.3 MEETING DOCUMENTATION	15
5.4 MEETING LOGISTICS	16
<b>6. EFFECTIVENESS</b>	<b>17</b>
6.1 EFFECTIVENESS	17
<b>7. IMPACT &amp; SUSTAINABILITY</b>	<b>20</b>

## ABBREVIATIONS

CBO	Community Based Organisations
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CMA	Catchment Management Agency
CMC	Catchment Management Committee
CMS	Catchment Management Strategy
DWAF	Department of Water Affairs and Forestry
DANCED	Danish Cooperation for Environment and Development
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
IFR	In-stream Flow Requirements
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
NWRS	National Water Resources Strategy
PDI	Previously Disadvantaged Individuals
PPM	LFA Project Planning Matrix
RO	DWAF Regional Office

## FOREWORD

This evaluation has been jointly funded by DWAF and DANCED under the auspices of the DWAF-DANCED IWRM project. This is a “formative” evaluation/review and as such its main purpose will be to provide DWAF/DANCED with a decision-making and monitoring tool related to PDI needs in relation to institutional, capacity building, stakeholder awareness and participation issues in each of the three project WMAs. These will be incorporated into the terms of references that will be prepared for the contracts for Service Providers for the implementation phase of the project due to commence in mid 2002.

The evaluation was not launched to assess individuals and as such it is hoped that the findings will be taken in the spirit communicated to the evaluation team in the early stages of the review, namely, that there is a need to stand back and learn from the different approaches that have been adopted. Moreover, given the importance of water in socio-economic development and efforts to alleviate poverty it is not a coincidence that DWAF is considered to be at the forefront in South Africa in recognizing the need for stakeholder participation. With this in mind, it is hoped that the findings presented in this report will contribute to a debate and adjustments to current practices in order that DWAF maintains this leading edge and sets an example to other public and private organisations that are committed to improving the well being of the marginalized groups of South African Society.

This evaluation could not have been conducted without the cooperation of regional DWAF staff who offered much of their time to discuss with team, seek out information and comment on documents such as the field study questionnaire. The team wishes to particularly acknowledge the assistance provided by: Rens Botha Petrus Venter & Chadwick Lobakerg (Crocodile West-Marico); A. Seetal, Gabsie Mathenjwa, Nirvashnee Naidoo & Naledi May (Mvoti – Umzimkulu); and Willie Enright & Abdulla. Parker (Olifants-Doorn) and of course last but not least members of the poorer segments of South African society who agreed to participate in interviews in the field work phase.

## The Review Team

*Team Leader:* Roger Short, Institutional & Capacity Building Adviser DWAF-DANCED IWRM Project. International Advisor and Evaluation Expert

*Local Technical Expert:* Mohummad Mayet, PDI Consultant

*NGOs (for PDI field survey):* Surplus Peoples Project (Olifants/Doorn) Qambothi Consultants (Mvoti-Mzimkulu); South African Women in Construction (Crocodile-West/Marico)

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During its Inception Phase it became clear that the DWAF-Danced IWRM project would have to pay particular attention to the participation, empowerment and inclusion of previously marginalized groups in order to address the first strand of the National Water Act namely: **equity** and its inherent intention to **redress the inequities** of South Africa's recent past and which fully recognises the role of water in **alleviating poverty** among these groups. Towards the end of the Inception Phase, DWAF organised a meeting on the *Developmental Role of CMAs*<sup>1</sup> The supporting material for that meeting and work undertaken by IWMI commissioned by DWAF<sup>2</sup> further emphasised the need to undertake this review.

The review work has been undertaken using internationally recognised evaluation criteria, namely:

- Relevance,
- Efficiency,
- Effectiveness,
- Impact; and
- Sustainability.

This Summary Report provides an overview of the evaluation of PDI involvement in public participation processes leading to the establishment of the Catchment Management Agency, in three pilot Water Management Areas, namely: Olifants/Doorn (WMA No 17); Mvoti/Mzimkulu (WMA No 11) Crocodile-West/Marico (WMA No 3)

Amongst the significant findings were the following:

- Measures to capacitate and empower the rural poor, in particular black women to be enable them to address IWRM issues and actively participate in the CMA establishment process are inadequate;
- Processes adopted to identify real problems or needs in relation to the establishment of the CMA, particularly in relation to addressing equity, are inadequate.
- Mechanisms to identify correct beneficiaries, and mechanisms of consultation that will lead to incorporation of the needs of the rural poor, are in general, not practised.
- Recognised project planning techniques relevant to developmental planning such as the logical framework approach, are generally not used;
- Mechanisms to realistically budget for the active participation of PDIs are not in place.
- The current structure, organisation and management of forums need to be adapted to ensure the needs of the rural poor are effectively addressed;

---

<sup>1</sup> Meeting held on

<sup>2</sup> Review of Guidelines on Catchment Management Agencies from a Poverty Perspective, Internal Document for Discussion, Barbara van Koppen, International Water Management Institute, September 2001

## 1. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1.1 FINDINGS

#### 1.1.1 Relevance

In relation to relevance the evaluation team found that:

- a) Processes adopted to identify the real, as distinct from perceived, problems or needs in relation to the establishment of WUAs and /or forums in relation to the CMA establishment process, particularly in relation to addressing **equity** are inadequate. PDIs and the rural poor in all three areas were not consulted on the process design and approach, on whether they had alternative suggestions to establishing forums, whether they agreed in principle that workshops are appropriate, etc.
- b) Mechanisms for identifying the correct beneficiaries i.e. stakeholders and the mechanisms of consultation that will lead to the incorporation of the needs of the rural poor in the initial project design are in general not practiced. There is a tendency to consider domestic water users under traditional groupings such as urban or rural, whereas finer resolution is required in such processes. Local government is sometimes viewed as representing the domestic users that are served by them and therefore local government presence at meetings etc should cover that stakeholder group.
- c) There appears to have been limited effort in the design phase to ensure the establishment and further development of linkages with existing local (rural) initiatives such as local water committees as these seem to be well represented and active in addressing local issues
- d) The issue of assessing local implementation capacities in terms of empowerment in the decision making processes has not been appropriately addressed and included as clear outputs at the outset of embarking upon the CMA establishment process. In this respect, the need for capacity building amongst participants is often intended, but rarely implemented with any great resolve.
- e) In some cases there appears to have been a duplication of efforts and/or poor exchange of information relating to preparatory activities and of taking into consideration previous studies such as policy assessments, pre feasibility and feasibility studies including financial and economic analysis, to ensure that these findings are incorporated into the design of the WUAs and/or forums and other institutional arrangements linked to introducing IWRM and CMA establishment. Moreover, it appears that findings of previous studies are not always communicated to newly hired service providers. In a number of occasions the studies and relevant documentation were in the offices of the service providers who had undertaken the work and not with DWAF.
- f) In general, recognised programme and/or project planning techniques relevant to developmental planning are not used. None of the terms of reference insisted on the preparation of a logframe matrix. Thus within the context of stakeholder participation and the addressing of the equity issue
  - There is no common understanding of the clarity and internal consistency of the stated overall objectives, purpose and results as these were not established other than the overall objective of establishing a CMA
  - Mechanisms for the monitoring of pre-determined qualitative and quantitative indicators, agreed at the outset of the process through participatory consultation with stakeholders, in particular the rural poor are non-existent.

- The mechanisms for determining the realism in choice and quantity of inputs in relation to stakeholder participation especially the rural poor are not in place
- In view of the foregoing there is a limited degree of flexibility and adaptability to facilitate rapid responses to changes in circumstances in particular the requirements for empowerment and inclusion. I.e. the CMA establishment is of paramount importance.

### **1.1.2 Efficiency**

This analysis takes into account the special circumstances of South Africa in the transformation process. In relation to efficiency the evaluation team found that:

- a) Mechanisms to realistically budget for the active participation of PDIs are not in place. It is clear that objective budgets in general cannot be established as realistic allowances for activities and interactions with stakeholders are generally not made.
- b) Many PDIs cite the cost of attending meetings as an inhibiting factor. In some cases costs are reimbursed but not with uniformity, and in some cases there is no reimbursement. This issue needs to be addressed and a consistent policy adopted.
- c) It is not clear as to how far the costs are justified by the benefits they generated in comparison with other similar initiatives. This has to be viewed in the context of the appropriateness of the current forum structure to address the needs of the rural poor and whether the use of CBOs and NGOs would be a more cost effective approach. Based on the figures available, the average cost for forum establishment and organising initial meetings is R13 000 per forum in Olifants/Doorn and R 80 000 per forum in Crocodile/Marico.
- d) Systematic monitoring of budgets against measurable qualitative and quantitative indicators is virtually non-existent especially as baseline information is often lacking.
- e) Indicators of efficiency appropriate to empowerment and inclusion of the rural poor needs have not been established either at national or WMA level.
- f) The accounting and documentation trail is weak resulting in a “scattered” institutional memory that often rests with individuals within and/or outside of DWAF
- g) There are strong reservations as to whether the current structure of forums based on sub-catchments is the appropriate model for addressing the needs of the low volume users of water i.e. primarily the rural poor.

### **1.1.3 Effectiveness**

The evaluation of participation in terms of effectiveness is not a question of numbers but of a qualitative assessment of inputs to the process made by this group of stakeholders.

The evaluation team found that:

- a) Active participation stakeholders, in particular PDIs especially black women and the rural poor, in broad terms remain low.
- b) The institutional framework being proposed or established in their present form do not adequately address the needs of PDIs and the rural poor
- c) In broad terms there is limited evidence that the situation will improve and will ultimately lead to incremental improvements of their representation, active participation and contribution to decision making processes.

- d) Opinions vary between DWAF staff and service providers on what are the minimum requirements for stakeholder representation and this is reflected in the interpretation of the guidelines prepared by DWAF. Notwithstanding this, the planned benefits through Equity as envisaged in the NWA are not likely to be achieved if the current processes continue.
- e) Information dissemination between those involved in the forum and CMA establishment process and those who are not remain weak. Communication between forum or team members is also not taking place effectively. The roles and responsibilities of forum members in general have not been clearly set out.
- f) Performance indicators for consultants in relation to stakeholder participation have not been established
- g) Issues of particular importance to PDIs, especially the rural poor, and that would contribute to poverty alleviation are frequently excluded from discussions as these have been regarded as not relevant to the CMA establishment process.
- h) The process is viewed as being consultant driven with the establishment of the CMA being of paramount importance and PDI stakeholders being left behind as they do not fully understand the process.

#### **1.1.4 Impact**

In terms of impact the evaluation team found that:

- a) There is limited evidence to suggest that the planned overall objectives (three points of the National Water Act) in particular equity can be expected to be achieved in the processes that have been adopted to date.
- b) The planned institutional arrangements associated with the CMA establishment cannot be expected to enhance economic and social development within the WMAs given that this issue has not been specifically addressed.
- c) In broad terms PDIs and rural communities feel alienated from the process through lack of participating or being able to participate, and through feeling that their issues are not being addressed.

#### **1.1.5 Sustainability**

Given the different levels of progress in the three WMAs, sustainability for the purpose of this evaluation relates to whether progress so far will lead to the anticipated outcomes and that they will be sustainable. In particular it will be important to achieve a clear understanding of the most appropriate interventions for the implementation phase of the DWAF/DANCED project to address any possible risks to sustainability.

In terms of Sustainability the evaluation team found:

- a) PDIs, and especially the rural poor have limited ownership of the objectives and achievements to date. This is primarily because these stakeholders were not consulted on the objectives from the outset.
- b) In terms of socio-cultural factors: the initiatives are viewed as not being in tune with local perceptions of needs and ways of producing and sharing benefits; (tradition, culture) nor gender issues.
- c) It appears that cross cutting issues such as gender equity, poverty alleviation and good governance are not being adequately addressed. Co-operative governance involving other government departments is also lacking.

## 1.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the information used investigations made during the evaluation, the following preliminary recommendations are suggested at this stage:

**Recommendation 1:** DWAF needs to have a clear focus on PDI needs and especially those of the rural poor in relation to the CMA establishment process and IWRM. Moreover, for the purposes of using the CMAs as a vehicle for IWRM, structures should be put in place to ensure that poverty alleviation is appropriately addressed.

**Recommendation 2:** Mechanisms need to be introduced to correct the “scattered” DWAF institutional memory relating to CMA development. This is a pre-condition for monitoring stakeholder participation and the overall effectiveness and efficiency of interventions.

**Recommendation 3:** The current structure of forums to support the CMA process should be strictly monitored to determine whether this is the most appropriate mechanism to respond to the needs of PDIs, especially the rural poor

**Recommendation 4:** In order to ensure stakeholder “buy in” especially PDIs and rural poor, participatory design mechanisms need to be introduced and/or strengthened. This process should also ensure that in the design and subsequent implementation phase, linkages to other water initiatives and those of other Government Departments relating to poverty alleviation should be strengthened

**Recommendation 5:** DWAF and key external stakeholders need to be capacitated in the area of designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating developmental projects, in order that they can, among others, set clear verifiable indicators for monitoring purposes– Action - Training under Output 5 already planned

**Recommendation 6:** The IWRM project should include a monitoring questionnaire in its regional newsletters – This has already been addressed and is included in PIG

**Recommendation 7:** Strict guidelines for hiring and monitoring service provider performance related to stakeholder participation of PDIs (empowerment, capacity building) need to be introduced. This will be addressed under capacity building for DWAF staff

**Recommendation 8:** A “fast tracking” process of empowerment through capacity building needs to be implemented for:

- PDI forum members
- Champions

**Recommendation 9:** Public awareness on CMA & IWRM issues for PDIs and the rural poor need to be presented as integral element of a wider process of poverty alleviation

## 2. INTRODUCTION

### 2.1 PDI PARTICIPATION AND LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The requirement to integrate historically disadvantaged groups into the decision-making processes is firmly embedded in The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act No 108 of 1996), the supreme law of South Africa. Consequently, all laws, conduct and policies must be measured against the Constitution to determine their validity. In addition, the Constitution contains a Bill of Rights that is the cornerstone of democracy in South Africa, and the state is obligated to respect, protect, promote and fulfil the rights in the Bill of Rights. Of particular relevance to this project are the following:

- *A requirement that the public administration to be efficient, development oriented, transparent, accountable, representative, encourage public participation and to comply with all basic values and principles governing public administration provided for in Chapter 10.*
- *It commits all spheres of government and organs of state to the principles of cooperative governance as provided for in Chapter 3.*
- *A Provision, in Section 27, for, amongst others the right to sufficient water, and obligates the state to take legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to achieve the progressive realisation of this right.*
- *It confers in Chapter 4, on the national sphere of government, the legislative and executive competence to manage, develop, protect and conserve the nation's water resources.*

These aspects of the Constitution and Bill of Rights serve as a basis for guiding principles of IWRM and Catchment Management namely:

- *Equity* in access to water resources, benefits and services, particularly for those who have historically not benefited from water resources management, such as women and the poor, is a fundamental principle that underlies the Policy and the Act.
- *Sustainability* in terms of water resources and the ecology, socio-economic development which is dependent upon these resources, and the institutions responsible for catchment management is fundamental to the Policy and the Act.
- *Optimal beneficial use* (or efficiency) has both social and economic elements, and is one of the fundamental principles that underlie the Policy and the allocation of water resources.
- *Redress* of past racial and gender discrimination, to facilitate equity and promote social beneficial use.
- *Local participation* by stakeholders in decision-making about water resources management, based on transparency and appropriate mechanisms.

These guiding principles, in particular the need to redress past racial and gender discrimination, will have a profound impact upon the selection of appropriate mechanisms to ensure sustainability of the project interventions. During the Inception Phase, the consultation process further served to emphasise this need as it became clear that ongoing difficulties were being encountered in the selected project WMAs to empower these groups to participate in the decision-making processes through the Catchment Management (CM)

## 2.2 BACKGROUND AND GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The purpose of establishing CMAs is to delegate water resource management to the regional or catchment level and to involve local communities in water resource management. The end goal of catchment management is to achieve equity, efficiency, sustainability **and representivity** in the management of water resources in a Water Management Area (s2). Public participation needs to be keenly focussed on this goal. When implemented properly, it harnesses the collective wisdom and resources of everyone in the Water Management Area. This enhances the quality of catchment management decisions and facilitates their implementation.

During the process to establish a CMA, public participation should produce the following outcomes in regards to representivity:

- Verification by stakeholders of the proposed public participation process
- Suggestions for catchment structures to be established based on an understanding of local water resource management needs
- Achieving representivity in the various catchment structures in terms of appropriate race, gender and geographic representation (s2) and other membership requirements
- Establishment of, and participation in, catchment structures (s82).

Two broad sets of principles guide the public participation process, namely over-arching principles and practical process principles. These are derived from “Public Participation for CMAs and WUAs”, Guide 4 in the CMA/WUA series published by the Directorate: Catchment Management. The over-arching principles for public participation are as follows:

- Flexibility, to adapt to local needs and circumstances
- Inclusivity, to include all sectors, perspectives and interests
- Transparency and honesty, to explain all identified and potential impacts
- Visible DWAF commitment, to assure stakeholders of responsibility
- Rights and responsibilities of stakeholders
- Independent facilitation, to encourage raising of issues
- Pursuing a common end goal, namely catchment management with possibility of trade offs

Some of the important practical principles that should be followed are listed below:

- Integration of public issues and technical assessment into decision making
- Checks and balances, to ensure that the views of all participants are fairly heard and considered, that the process needs of participants are met, and that the process itself cannot be unfairly attacked or delayed. In this respect:
  - Stakeholders should have a say in how they will be consulted
  - A reference group should be established, especially where there are powerful vested interests, or a large proportion of stakeholders are marginalised communities
  - Verification by stakeholders at each phase of the process that the issues they have raised have been covered, before the process continues into the next phase.

- Delegate some responsibility to stakeholders (eg assist with facilitating participation, raise awareness among PDIs, distribute documents)
  - Stakeholders be allowed to nominate peer reviewers for technical evaluations
- 
- Sufficient, accessible, ongoing information to stakeholders (allay fears, check expectations)
  - Ample announcement of opportunity for involvement
  - Ample opportunity for comment
  - Participation according to ability and interest level (educational assistance may be necessary)
  - Ample opportunity to exchange views (multiple options, leading to convergence in thinking)
  - Ongoing feedback and acknowledgement (the need to feel “heard”, and where issues have been taken up, and if not, why not)
  - Respect for cultural diversity
  - Efficiency (assessed by stakeholders)
  - Special efforts for historically disadvantaged communities (contactability, language preferences, travel limitations)

The public participation process should be evaluated at least every six months (by all parties involved) so that the process and methods can be adapted where necessary.

A fundamental principle of stakeholder participation in programme and project design in a developmental environment is that of anchoring the process in the context of the project in order to determine, problems, objectives, choices and actions. The evaluation has, also taken these principles into consideration, in addition to those drawn from the guidelines in the preceding paragraphs.

The diverse socio-economic context between and within the WMAs in South Africa require that considerable investment is made to address this diversity especially in relationship to empowerment, inclusion and poverty alleviation. In other words a blanket approach for designing the implementation CMA establishment and the introduction of IWRM in one WMA is not appropriate.

In order to address this issue greater emphasis needs to be placed upon public awareness targeted at these groups, and to capacity building as a contribution towards the empowerment process. Moreover, greater attention needs to be given to public participation processes that are aimed at involving stakeholders in water resource management, to ensure that these processes are relevant, efficient, effective and sustainable, and are carried out in the spirit of the National Water Act.

### **3. OVERVIEW OBJECTIVES & PURPOSE**

#### **3.1 OBJECTIVE**

The objective of the evaluation was to enable DWAF/DANCED to ensure that lessons learned, with specific reference to the participation of PDIs in the CMA establishment processes in the three project WMAs, as a whole and on an individual WMA basis, are taken into account in the implementation phase of the DWAF/DANCED IWRM project.

#### **3.2 PURPOSE**

The process of establishing the institutional arrangements for CMAs in the three project WMAs at the time of starting the review in late 2001 was well under way, albeit at different stages of progress. The purpose of the evaluation was to review the involvement of PDIs in the current institutional arrangements and the establishment process within the context of requirements of the National Water Act and the Constitution. Moreover, the evaluation was to serve to better identify the capacity building needs of the stakeholders to ensure the sustainable effective and efficient operation of the CMAs in the three WMAs once established. Particular attention was to be paid to addressing the needs of PDIs especially black women and the rural poor.

#### **3.3 FOR WHOM**

This is a “formative” evaluation and as such its main purpose was to provide DWAF/DANCED with a decision making and monitoring tool related to institutional, capacity building, stakeholder awareness and participation issues in each of the three WMAs, with specific reference to PDI involvement. These will be incorporated into the terms of references that will be prepared for the contracts for Service Providers for the implementation phase of the project due to commence in mid 2002.

#### **3.4 PLANNED OUTPUTS**

- a) Evaluation report for each of the WMAs incorporating conclusions and recommendations.
- b) Combined evaluation report incorporating conclusions and recommendations.
- c) Feedback seminar for key stakeholders.
- d) Tailored tools (i.e. Project Planning Matrix) to monitor the implementation phase of the DWAF/DANCED project in each of the WMAs

## 4. RELEVANCE

### 4.1 RELEVANCE

Relevance relates primarily to process design and the extent to which the stated objectives correctly address the identified problems or real needs. Relevance is being addressed in this evaluation, as there is a need to firmly establish the original design and the extent to which these addressed the issues in terms of the National Water Act and the problem identification at that time. It is also necessary to identify those factors, if any that may have resulted in changes in courses of action to the original plans. In other words, the relevance concerns the appropriateness of the project design to the problems to be resolved at two points in time i.e. when the project was designed and at the time of this evaluation.

### 4.2 INITIAL PROJECT DESIGN AND REAL NEEDS

Stakeholders, PDIs and the rural poor in particular, were not able to verify the proposed participation process because they were not consulted with regard to process design, how they will be consulted and process methodology; as a result they were also not able to comment on whether they felt that forums were appropriate structures for their meaningful participation, or suggest alternative participation strategies.

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Olifants/Doorn</b>	<b>Mvoti-Mzimkulu</b>	<b>Crocodile-West/Marico</b>
Overall project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No logframe matrix prepared</li> <li>▪ Objectives of process sensitive to PDI issues</li> <li>▪ PDIs not consulted on process design</li> <li>▪ ToR lacks detail on scope &amp; methodology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No logframe matrix prepared</li> <li>▪ ToR for public participation did not specify objectives, but sensitive to representivity and capacity building</li> <li>▪ PDIs (forums &amp; rural areas) not consulted on process design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No logframe matrix prepared</li> <li>▪ ToR acknowledges PDI involvement, empowerment, needs</li> <li>▪ PDIs not consulted on process design</li> <li>▪ Participation structures not appropriate</li> <li>▪ Unrealistic timelines</li> </ul>

Recognised developmental planning techniques such as, for example, the participatory Logical Framework Approach were not used. The purpose, objectives, assumptions, risks, constraints and goals were not clearly spelt out at the beginning of the process. Qualitative and quantitative progress indicators were also not discussed and agreed to with stakeholders at the design stage.

There was no evidence to indicate that concerted efforts were made to integrate the technical nature of presentations with public perceptions and issues, or indicators to monitor whether this was taking place successfully.

### 4.3 IDENTIFICATION OF CORRECT BENEFICIARIES

<b>FIGURE 4.2: IDENTIFICATION OF CORRECT BENEFICIARIES – COMPARISON BETWEEN THREE WMAS</b>			
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Olifants/Doorn</b>	<b>Mvoti-Mzimkulu</b>	<b>Crocodile-West/Marico</b>
Identification of correct beneficiaries and real needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Intensive identification and contact process</li> <li>▪ 70% of respondents were informed about forum process</li> <li>▪ Initial meeting venues adapted to suit PDI travel constraints</li> <li>▪ No needs assessment done before forum establishment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Stakeholder identification (PDI, rural poor) not comprehensive</li> <li>▪ Only 20% of respondents knew about the CMA</li> <li>▪ No evidence that “representative democracy” accepted by PDIs</li> <li>▪ No needs assessment done before process started</li> <li>▪ Forums and rural poor not actively part of process (apparently by choice)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identification – initial effort not sustained- 61% of PDI respondents were not informed prior to their 1<sup>st</sup> meeting</li> <li>▪ No needs assessment done before process started</li> <li>▪ No evidence whether members of past forum activities were included in process</li> </ul>

In general, mechanisms for identifying the correct beneficiaries (stakeholders) were not always appropriate. Stakeholder categories varied in description and number among the three initiatives (between four and twelve). The tendency to consider traditional groupings, such as urban or rural, is inappropriate and only a finer resolution will pick up the less formal and publicised groupings, such as the large number of committees that are active in the rural parts of the Mvoti Mzimkulu WMA, or tribal/cultural differences that require sensitive handling. Domestic users living in a metropolitan area should not be grouped under a single category (say municipality) as this masks the needs and participation of the large numbers of PDIs that live in these areas.

### 4.4 LOCAL CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

<b>FIGURE 4.3: IDENTIFICATION OF LOCAL CAPACITY NEEDS– COMPARISON BETWEEN THREE WMAS</b>			
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Olifants/Doorn</b>	<b>Mvoti-Mzimkulu</b>	<b>Crocodile-West/Marico</b>
Local capacity assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No formal assessment undertaken</li> <li>▪ Identified as constraint during process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No formal assessment undertaken</li> <li>▪ Identified as a requirement, but no specific programme</li> <li>▪ Domination of meetings by professionals noted by consultant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No formal assessment undertaken before process started</li> </ul> <p>Series of empowerment workshops were planned in ToR – no evidence of outcome</p>

There were no deliberate initiatives or sub-projects to assess the capacity of PDIs with regard to their understanding the content, importance and impact of the CMA establishment process and its associated decision making trail. In most cases, stakeholder capacity was inferred from their participation in meetings, but this excludes those who chose not to or could not attend.

#### 4.5 PREVIOUS STUDIES/PREPARATORY ACTIVITIES

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Olifants/Doorn</b>	<b>Mvoti-Mzimkulu</b>	<b>Crocodile-West/Marico</b>
Links with previous studies, preparatory activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No specific preparatory initiatives</li> <li>▪ Weak links with Olif/Doorn Basin study, no evidence regarding others</li> <li>▪ Members of S Namaqualand water comm &amp; LOWUA were included</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Links with CDOs for reaching rural poor, and with SEA in Mhlatuze area</li> <li>▪ DWAF contact with other Regional initiatives – no direct link to process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lessons from previous initiatives do not appear to be incorporated</li> <li>▪ Poor linkages with work of CDOs in rural areas</li> </ul>

In some cases there appears to have been a duplication of efforts and/or poor exchange of information relating to preparatory activities and of taking into consideration previous studies such as policy assessments, pre feasibility and feasibility studies including financial and economic analysis ,to ensure that these findings are incorporated into the design of the WUAs and/or forums and other institutional arrangements linked to introducing IWRM and CMA establishment. Moreover, it appears that findings of previous studies are not always communicated to newly hired service providers. In a number of occasions the studies and relevant documentation were in the offices of the service providers who had undertaken the work and not with DWAF.

There also appears to have been limited effort in the design phase to ensure the establishment and further development of linkages with existing local (rural) initiatives such as local water committees as these seem to be well represented and active in addressing local issues.

#### 4.6 PDI AND GENDER CONCERNS

FIGURE 4.5: IDENTIFICATION OF PDI AND GENDER NEEDS – COMPARISON BETWEEN THREE WMAS			
Criterion	Olifants/Doorn	Mvoti-Mzimkulu	Crocodile-West/Marico
PDI and gender concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mechanisms to ensure participation lacking – 53% respondents felt uncomfortable to ask questions</li> <li>▪ Low female participation – 20% of forum members are women, 55% felt that gender not considered in selection of persons to attend meetings</li> <li>▪ Participation generally stifled by tension and perceptions of racial nature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Limited PDI participation in process</li> <li>▪ Low participation by women</li> <li>▪ PDI presence in PDWG lacking</li> <li>▪ No travel allowance provided to PDIs for attending meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 44% of forum management are Black and 28% are women – no indication regarding nature of their contribution or capacity building</li> <li>▪ Travel allowance not consistently applied</li> </ul>

Identification of stakeholders tended to focus on organised sectors of society; PDIs were usually grouped broadly as communities or the rural component. In the case of Mvoti-Mzimkulu, PDIs in the rural areas were not part of the public participation process for CMA establishment, whereas in the other two, they were identified and participated in varying degrees.

Constraints regarding travel for PDIs to meetings were identified and catered for in Olifants/Doorn and Crocodile-West Marico. PDIs were paid travel expenses and sometimes provided food as well, but not in a consistent manner. There did not appear to be a clear plan in place for the amount to be paid per person and the duration of the support. Given the value of this kind of support to bona fide PDIs who wish to participate meaningfully, it is a moot question as to whether this facility will be sustained when the consultant's contract is complete.

#### 4.7 CONCLUSIONS RELATING TO RELEVANCE

- a. Processes adopted to identify the real, as distinct from perceived, problems or needs in relation to the establishment of WUAs and /or forums in relation to the CMA establishment process, particularly in relation to addressing **equity** are inadequate
- b. Mechanisms for identifying the correct beneficiaries i.e. stakeholders and the mechanisms of consultation that will lead to the incorporation of the needs of the rural poor the initial project design are in general not practiced;

- c. There appears to have been limited effort in the design phase to ensure the establishment and further development of linkages with existing local (rural) initiatives such as local water committees as these seem to be well represented and active in addressing local issues
- d. The issue of assessing local implementation capacities in terms of empowerment in the decision making processes has not been appropriately addressed and included as clear outputs at the outset of embarking upon the CMA establishment process;
- e. In some cases there appears to have been a duplication of efforts and/or poor exchange of information relating to preparatory activities and of taking into consideration previous studies such as policy assessments, pre feasibility and feasibility studies including financial and economic analysis, to ensure that these findings are incorporated into the design of the WUAs and/or forums and other institutional arrangements linked to introducing IWRM and CMA establishment. Moreover, it appears that findings of previous studies are not always communicated to newly hired service providers. In a number of occasions the studies and relevant documentation were in the offices of the service providers who had undertaken the work and not with DWAF.
- f. In general, recognised programme and/or project planning techniques relevant to developmental planning are not used. Thus within the context of stakeholder participation and the addressing of the equity issue
  - There is no common understanding of the clarity and internal consistency of the stated overall objectives, purpose and results as these were not established other than the overall objective of establishing a CMA
  - Mechanisms for the monitoring of pre-determined qualitative and quantitative indicators, agreed at the outset of the process through participatory consultation with stakeholders, in particular the rural poor are non-existent.
  - The mechanisms for determining the realism in choice and quantity of inputs in relation to stakeholder participation especially the rural poor are not in place
  - In view of the foregoing there is a limited degree of flexibility and adaptability to facilitate rapid responses to changes in circumstances in particular the requirements for empowerment and inclusion. I.e. the CMA establishment is of paramount importance.

## 5. EFFICIENCY

### 5.1 EFFICIENCY

Efficiency deals with how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results (outputs) in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. A key question is “how were things done and were they done right?” and examines also whether similar results could have been achieved more by other means at lower cost in the same time.

### 5.2 BUDGETING FOR & COST MONITORING OF PDI STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

Mechanisms to budget realistically for the active involvement of PDIs and the rural poor are not in place. Realistic allowances for activities and interactions with stakeholders are generally not made. In general, certain benefits have been delivered, eg establishment of forums, and participation (albeit limited) by stakeholders is taking place in forum meetings/workshops. However, the extent to which the costs incurred justify the benefits received is difficult to evaluate, especially in the context of the appropriateness of the forum structure in addressing the needs of the rural poor. There is no systematic monitoring of costs incurred by consultants in relation to involvement by PDIs, addressing their needs, or with respect to empowerment related activities. In one particular instance, the consultant’s fee invoice claimed three days of payment with “empowerment” as the only description of professional service.

The extent to which the costs incurred are justified by the benefits they have generated to the PDIs and rural poor in particular, is not the same in each WMA. In most cases, PDIs have been asked to participate in a predetermined process, which they were not in a position to influence from its planning stages

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Olifants/Doorn</b>	<b>Mvoti-Mzimkulu</b>	<b>Crocodile-West/Marico</b>
Management of budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Budget for forum establishment was constrained by number of meetings to be held and forums to be formed- extra meetings were held and not charged for. Average Cost per forum R13 000 (consultant)</li> <li>▪ Consultant is PDI from W Cape – empathy and good relations with stakeholders (DWAf view)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No information in ToR on budget or deadlines. Appears that motivations for additional sums were made as required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Means of monitoring performance in terms of empowerment and inclusion not in place and do not appear to have been considered</li> <li>▪ Given the large percentage of respondents (indicated elsewhere) not knowing about the CMA development process it would appear that these were not managed well</li> </ul>

<b>FIGURE 5.1B: COSTS VERSUS BENEFITS</b>			
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Olifants/Doorn</b>	<b>Mvoti-Mzimkulu</b>	<b>Crocodile-West/Marico</b>
Costs versus benefits generated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Some clear benefits – 11 forums established, positive response from stakeholders, good attendance and participation, increased general awareness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Difficult to quantify from PDI perspective. No real benefit to PDIs and rural poor from the process itself</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Difficult to quantify</li> <li>▪ Numerous participation structures set up (forums, theme teams, business units) but real benefit to PDIs not evident</li> </ul>

### 5.3 MEETING DOCUMENTATION

Efficiency with regard to record keeping and document trails is less than adequate. Minutes of public meetings usually do not record the name of the stakeholder against the issue raised. Very basic questions that were raised, even at a late stage of development of the process, were often not given due attention at the time as this probably detracted significantly from the rest of the programme, and was rarely recorded accurately. Quite often, stakeholders were requested to collect documents upon arrival at a meeting or workshop, and are expected to discuss them during the meeting. This not only denies stakeholders opportunity to digest the content of the documents but also to exchange views openly, develop options and converge their thinking. In this respect, facilitation by the public participation consultant may not be regarded as independent (to encourage freedom of expression by all) because of his/her vested interest in trying to complete the contract on time and within budget.

<b>FIGURE 5.2: MEETING DOCUMENTATION</b>			
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Olifants/Doorn</b>	<b>Mvoti-Mzimkulu</b>	<b>Crocodile-West/Marico</b>
Monitoring and indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Meeting attendance was main monitoring criterion</li> <li>▪ No record of PDI inputs from minutes of meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Stakeholder database updated incrementally through process</li> <li>▪ Stakeholders were asked by consultant to fill in a questionnaire – no evidence of outcome/findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No systematic monitoring in place</li> <li>▪ No record of PDI input at meetings</li> <li>▪ Document trail scattered</li> </ul>

## 5.4 MEETING LOGISTICS

What has also been lacking from a PDI perspective is:

- Adequate stakeholder analyses at the planning stage,
- Adequate say regarding how they wish to be consulted. In this respect there are strong reservations as to whether the current structure of forums based on sub-catchment areas is the appropriate model for addressing the needs of PDIs and the rural poor,
- Sufficient, accessible, understandable flow of information with ample announcements of opportunity to be involved, and ample opportunity for comment and exchange of views
- Ongoing feedback from the project team regarding PDI issues (where and how they have been taken up, and if not, why not)
- The respect for cultural diversity
- Interim opportunities for PDIs to objectively and formally evaluate the process.

<b>FIGURE 5.3: MEETING LOGISTICS</b>			
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Olifants/Doorn</b>	<b>Mvoti-Mzimkulu</b>	<b>Crocodile-West/Marico</b>
Unplanned results			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Appears not to have been catered for</li> </ul>
Management of constraints			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establishment of the CMA is the driving force. Effectively leap frog of project phases in terms of taking into consideration PDI needs</li> </ul>
Mechanisms to ensure participation by PDIs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 53% felt uncomfortable to ask questions</li> <li>▪ 51% made inputs during meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ DWAF ensures that information reaches PDIs but does not enforce participation</li> <li>▪ PDIs from rural areas are not active part of meetings and workshops.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 55% of responses indicated that respondents had not been informed in and form of the ongoing forum and CMA establishment process</li> <li>▪ 56% of responses indicated that they had not said anything at meetings</li> </ul>
Were solutions sought from stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 62% felt that their comments were considered adequately</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 45% of responses felt that their questions had not been considered</li> </ul>

## **6. EFFECTIVENESS**

### **6.1 EFFECTIVENESS**

Effectiveness concerns how far the results of the various initiatives related to introducing IWRM and CMA establishment achieved the original purpose. The key question is what difference the initiative has made in practice, as measured by how far the intended beneficiaries really benefited.

In broad terms, active participation by PDIs , especially black women and the rural poor, remains low. The survey has shown that their participation is relatively more pronounced in the Olifants/Doorn than in the other two WMAs.

The institutional framework being established appears to have limited impact in the way it functions in practice. The needs of the rural poor do not seem to get adequate attention, and there is limited evidence to suggest that it will lead to improved representation, active participation and contribution to decision-making processes. In this respect, there still appear to be differences in interpretation as to what constitutes adequate representation. There is a weak communication link between those involved in forums and the CMA process, and those who are not. In fact, there is also a lack of communication between members within a forum or one of its sub groups. There is also uncertainty among stakeholders about their rights, roles and responsibilities.

The process is perceived as being consultant driven, with the establishment of the CMA as being of paramount importance, even if PDIs feel alienated, as they do not fully understand the process. Basic issues of particular importance to PDIs that have a bearing on poverty alleviation are frequently excluded from discussions as they are seen to be not relevant to the CMA establishment process.

<b>FIGURE 6: SOME INDICATORS OF EFFECTIVENESS</b>			
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Olifants/Doorn</b>	<b>Mvoti-Mzimkulu</b>	<b>Crocodile-West/Marico</b>
Were benefits delivered and received	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Planned forums were received by beneficiaries</li> <li>▪ More than 60% knew why they should participate in meetings</li> <li>▪ 60 to 70% were informed about CMAs, WUAs, forums</li> <li>▪ 54% knew about National Water Act</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Key (indirect) benefit – submission of CMA proposal</li> <li>▪ Only some 20% of respondents knew about the CMA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 82% of respondents considered that issues relating to gender, local community needs, local technologies, traditions and culture were not taken into consideration</li> </ul>
Behavioural/ productive changes in organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Not enough forum development to comment on behavioural changes</li> <li>▪ 71% are informed about decisions taken at forums (feedback)</li> <li>▪ 63% are not clear what a forum does or is supposed to do.</li> <li>▪ PDIs getting actively involved in proposals/suggestions at meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The only “organisation” associated with CMA proposal is the PDWG – which has virtually no PDI participation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Roles and responsibilities of forum members remain unclear in terms reporting back to their constituents.</li> </ul>
Balance of responsibilities between stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Presently only have chair and vice-chair with little responsibility sharing</li> <li>▪ Members contribute collectively towards forum efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Volunteers take on responsibilities in the PDWG (which is not representative)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PDIs continue to remain marginalized in terms of knowledge and capacity to actively be involved in the process</li> </ul>
Shortcomings due to ignoring cross-cut issues			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There remains a distinct information gap between those participating in the forum and CMA establishment process and those who are not.</li> <li>▪ 55% of responses indicated that respondents had not been informed in any form of the ongoing forum and CMA establishment process</li> </ul>

Training for PDIs		Limited & Not structured	Limited & Not structured
Participation by women/vulnerable groups	Low female participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Low female participation in CMA process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The process of engaging PDIs has no structure for monitoring other than hours used by consultants. There are no qualitative indicators to monitor consultants.</li> <li>▪ This appears to happen at the water committee level but there appears to be very weak linkages between these structures and the forum and CMA establishment process.</li> </ul>

## **7. IMPACT & SUSTAINABILITY**

Impact is synonymous with outcome and denotes the relationship between the purpose of the initiatives within the scope of this study and the overall objectives, that is the extent to which the benefits have or with reasonable certainty can be received by the target beneficiaries and stakeholders. Moreover, it is essential to determine whether the steps taken to date will lead to a wider overall effect on larger numbers of people in the Catchment or sub-Catchment area.

It would appear from the PDI survey, that overall impact in the Olifants/Doom has been relatively greater than in the other two areas. A larger proportion of respondents could foresee enhanced social and economic development through this process.

With regard to equity, there is limited evidence to suggest that the planned overall objectives with regard to the Act; the equity strand in particular, can be expected to be achieved in the three processes as they have progressed to date.

Sustainability for the purpose of this evaluation relates to whether progress so far will lead to the anticipated outcomes and that they will be sustainable. In this respect, PDIs and especially the rural poor, have limited ownership of the objectives and achievements to date, primarily because they were not consulted on the objectives from the outset.

With regard to socio-cultural factors, the initiatives are viewed as not being in tune with local perceptions of needs and ways of producing and sharing benefits, particularly with regard to tradition and culture, and gender issues. Cross-cutting issues, such as gender equity, poverty alleviation and cooperative governance are not being adequately addressed.

Criterion	Olifants/Doorn	Mvoti-Mzimkulu	Crocodile-West/Marico
To what extent overall objectives can be achieved (NWA) – to what extent is it attributable to initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Initiative is in line with objectives of NWA – enabling public participation, redressing past imbalances</li> <li>▪ 55% feel that community is part of process</li> <li>▪ 70% feel that process will lead to improved water access and economic well being</li> <li>▪ 78% feel that community vision will be achieved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Meaningful participation by PDIs in water resource management seems long way off</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In terms of the Equity strand of the NWA there is a risk that the PDIs will continue to remain marginalized</li> </ul>
Planned Institute Arrangements: can they enhance economic & social development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Too early to evaluate – forums have only just been formed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Yes, subject to effective linkages between PDIs and CMA process</li> <li>▪ No response from survey – so few knew about the process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The current institutional arrangements will not contribute to an improvement in the economic and social well-being of the PDIs and rural poor</li> </ul>
Unplanned impacts – were there any, how have they affected overall impact			
Logframe indicators: were they suitable, amended if necessary?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No LF matrix prepared</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No LF matrix prepared</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No LF matrix prepared</li> </ul>
Lack of o/a impact due to neglect of PDI, gender, poverty	Not likely because of attention being given to Involving PDIs	Impacts diffuse because of separate public participation initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ On a range of questions relating to impact and sustainability and the processes adopted, 63% of the respondents provided a negative view.</li> </ul>

<p>Could overall wider impact – be better achieved otherwise?</p>	<p>The extent of disparity in participation “entry levels” is significant - impact could have been greater if information and awareness campaign preceded forum establishment</p>	<p>Stronger integration between initiatives could have made some difference to PDI participation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Structured consultation, capacity building of PDI stakeholders</li> </ul>
<p>To what extent did stakeholders perceived objectives – influence overall impact</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No evidence that this exercise conducted in a structured manner to develop consensus and establish objectives and verifiable indicators</li> </ul>