

Draft

**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)**

FINAL REPORT: VOLUME 2

Department of Water Affairs and Forestry

This report contains
restricted information
and is for official use only.

Carl Bro a/s
Date: April 2002

Ref. J. No. 123/138-0154

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABBREVIATIONS	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
1. PREAMBLE	1
2. BACKGROUND & GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	3
3. METHODOLOGY	5
4. OLIFANTS/DOORN WMA	7
4.1 Relevance	7
4.2 Efficiency	11
4.3 Effectiveness	11
4.4 Impact and Sustainability	12
4.5 Evaluation	14
5. MVOTI-MZIMKULU WMA	20
5.1 Relevance	20
5.2 Efficiency	22
5.3 Effectiveness	23
5.4 Impact and Sustainability	23
5.5 Evaluation	24
6. CROCODILE-WEST/MARICO WMA	29
6.1 Relevance	29
6.2 Efficiency	31
6.3 Effectiveness	31
6.4 Impact and Sustainability	32
6.5 Evaluation	33
7. CONCLUDING REMARKS	38
7.1 Relevance	38
7.2 Efficiency	39
7.3 Effectiveness	40
7.4 Impact	41
7.5 Sustainability	41

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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 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 early 2002.

During the Inception Phase it became clear that the 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*¹ The supporting material for that meeting and work undertaken by IWMI commissioned by DWAF² further emphasised the need to undertake this review.

The majority of the review work has been undertaken by South African service providers using internationally recognised standards for undertaking evaluations using the following criteria:

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

This document presents a detailed review of the public participation processes associated with CMA establishment in the three WMAs, with particular reference to PDI issues. Amongst the significant findings were the following:

- 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 are generally not used, such as the logframe matrix.
- Mechanisms to realistically budget for the active participation of PDIs are not in place.
- 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 the rural poor.

¹ Meeting held on

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

1. PREAMBLE

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 which 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. The consultation process during the Inception Phase further served to emphasise this need. Ongoing difficulties are being encountered in the selected project WMAs to empower these groups to participate in the decision-making processes through the Catchment Management (CM) Fora. Recent statistics from the Inkomati CMA proposal indicate that the limited participation of these groups exists elsewhere.

Participation among black women in CM fora was as low as 3%. DWAF senior management views the integration of these groups into the decision-making processes as a matter of priority.

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.

This report (Volume 2) reflects the outcome 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)

The objective of the evaluation was to enable DWAF/DANCED to ensure that lessons learned from the various initiatives to support the introduction of IWRM and CMA development 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. The evaluation was undertaken within the context of requirements of the National Water Act and the Constitution. Moreover, the evaluation will serve to better identify the capacity building needs of the stakeholders required to ensure the sustainable effective and efficient operation of the CMAs in the three WMAs once established. Particular attention will be paid to addressing the needs of PDIs especially black women and the rural poor.

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 views 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).

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 overarching 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 overarching principles for public participation are as follows:

- a) Flexibility, to adapt to local needs and circumstances
- b) Inclusivity, to include all sectors, perspectives and interests
- c) Transparency and honesty, to explain all identified and potential impacts
- d) Visible DWAF commitment, to assure stakeholders of responsibility
- e) Rights and responsibilities of stakeholders
- f) Independent facilitation, to encourage raising of issues
- g) 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:

- a) Integration of public issues and technical assessment into decision making
- b) 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:
- c) Stakeholders should have a say in how they will be consulted
- d) A reference group should be established, especially where there are powerful vested interests, or a large proportion of stakeholders are marginalised communities
- e) 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.
- f) Delegate some responsibility to stakeholders (eg assist with facilitating participation, raise awareness among PDIs, distribute documents)
- g) Stakeholders be allowed to nominate peer reviewers for technical evaluations.

- h) Sufficient, accessible, ongoing information to stakeholders (allay fears, check expectations)
- i) Ample announcement of opportunity for involvement
- j) Ample opportunity for comment
- k) Participation according to ability and interest level (educational assistance may be necessary)
- l) Ample opportunity to exchange views (multiple options, leading to convergence in thinking)
- m) Ongoing feedback and acknowledgement (the need to feel “heard”, and where issues have been taken up, and if not, why not)
- n) Respect for cultural diversity
- o) Efficiency (assessed by stakeholders)
- p) 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.

3. METHODOLOGY

The main purpose of the project was to evaluate the involvement of Previously Disadvantaged Individuals in public participation processes, in the three selected WMAs. The processes were aimed at establishing a CMA in each of the three WMAs and are being managed and implemented by the three respective DWAF Regional Offices, through contracts with consultants. The evaluation entailed an integration of the following steps:

- a) Acquire and examine key reference documents and supporting documents. These included the National Water Act (No 36 of 1998), Guide 4 in the CMA/WUA series: Public Participation for the establishment of CMAs and WUAs, Generic Guidelines for Public Participation, Terms of Reference for consultants, Inception reports, minutes of forum meetings etc.
- b) Visit Regional Offices to discuss project details with relevant officials, and acquire additional documents and supporting information.
- c) Prepare a review questionnaire, and appoint a Non Governmental Organisation in each of the three WMAs to use the questionnaire to interview a minimum of 100 randomly selected PDIs that reside in the WMA, and summarise the findings in a report.
- d) Combine the survey findings with a desktop study of the process in each area through examination of documents, attending meetings and workshops, and interviews/discussions with various individuals.
- e) Prepare a draft report and present preliminary findings and recommendations to stakeholders (DWAF and external) at a workshop.
- f) Prepare final report, taking account of comments from workshop, and any other supporting information.

The search and requests for documents was reasonably successful, although some difficulty was experienced in acquiring key information from DWAF officials and consultants. Interviews with DWAF officials were very useful for filling in some of the gaps in the document trail.

The study adopted the following internationally recognised evaluation criteria: *relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability*.

Relevance relates primarily to process design and the extent to which the stated objectives correctly address the identified problems or real needs. There is also a need to establish the extent to which the design addressed the issues in terms of the National Water Act and the problems identified at that time. Factors that may have resulted in changes in courses of action to the original plans also need to be identified; these factors may include political, economic, social, institutional or policy issues that may have resulted in a change of focus. 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.

Efficiency refers to how well the various activities transformed the available resources into intended outputs, in terms of quantity, quality, and timeliness. It also examines whether similar results could have been achieved by other means, at a lower cost, and in the same time.

Effectiveness concerns how far the results of the various initiatives have achieved the original purpose. It measures the practical difference that the initiative has made, and how far the intended beneficiaries have really benefited.

Impact is synonymous with outcome and denotes the relationship between the purpose of the initiative and the overall objectives. It denotes the extent to which the extent to which the benefits have or can be received by the beneficiaries. Sustainability relates to whether progress thus far will lead to anticipated outcomes, and whether they will be sustainable.

4. OLIFANTS/DOORN WMA

4.1 RELEVANCE

In the case of the Olifants/Doorn Water Management Area, the process under review is the public participation process for the establishment of catchment forums. The Western Cape Regional Office of DWAF appointed a consultant to undertake this process. Phase I of the process started in February 2001, and phase II in July 2001. A significant feature of the process is that the consultant is a PDI who resides in the area.

4.1.1 *Real versus perceived needs*

The objectives of the public participation process were sensitive to PDI issues, in that they focussed on enabling all stakeholders to participate, on making use of appropriate participation methodologies, and on communicating relevant information at an understandable level and in the preferred language. The same sentiment was expressed in the “operational values” and principles that supported the process, namely, mutual respect, flexibility to adapt the process, empowerment of HDIs and organisations with a view to achieving sustainability, and inclusiveness of all parties.

The Terms of Reference (as reflected by the consultant) were somewhat mechanical and brief, consisting of four basic steps. The consultant was required to facilitate and arrange public meetings, establish catchment forums, arrange, attend and facilitate at least two forum meetings, and provide secretarial and communication support. No details appear to have been given with regard to the scope of work, or proposed approach or methodology.

Needs assessment was not part of the public participation process design. However, water resource management issues were identified at catchment forum meetings. Forty of the most frequently-raised issues have been documented by the consultant; most of these issues centre around procedural, institutional and matters of a general nature. Some needs can be inferred from the issues, such as improving drinking water quality, providing capacity building and awareness creation, and addressing inadequate water supply to communities and farms. The type of issues raised varies widely (social type issues, to complex administrative concerns); this is due in large measure to the disparity between the overall disposition between race groups. This was corroborated by the questionnaire survey finding, that white commercial farmers and PDIs do not share a common vision.

A study of community needs in this area was undertaken a few years ago. The Olifants/Doring River Basin Study (DWAF, 1997/8) undertook a ‘Needs and Preferences’ assessment in six magisterial districts, although only five of these appear in the report (namely Calvinia, Ceres, Clanwilliam, Vredendal, and VanRhynsdorp). Although the Basin Study was concerned primarily with water resources development, the fieldwork for needs assessment focussed on the disadvantaged community, and many of the needs and preferences that emerged then still bear relevance to this process of forum establishment. Examples of needs that arose then are access to water for rural development, training and skills development, and establishment of unions for small farmers.

If these needs were incorporated into the planning process for forum establishment, it could have added much value to the issue raising process. Experience from participation processes elsewhere in the country has shown that if attention is given to seemingly unrelated needs raised at public gatherings, it can elevate stakeholder morale and encourage meaningful participation.

Prior knowledge of needs in the area affords a good opportunity to anticipate and proactively prepare for meetings of the forum process, thereby demonstrating sensitivity and building trust.

4.1.2 Stakeholder identification and consultation

The main approach towards identifying stakeholders was to acquire stakeholder databases of other institutions and organisations, and to iteratively supplement these by requesting those that attend meetings to supply additional names of those who should also be present. With regard to other WMIs, members of Lower Olifants WUA were invited to the public meeting. Their response was negative, and they did not see the need for a forum - probably due to the fact that they wished to remain "in control" of their area.

Twelve stakeholder categories were created to promote broad representation on each forum. The categories are:

- Conservation and environmental organisations
- Community organisations
- Farmers associations
- Small farmers (emerging farmers)
- Organised labour
- Business for a
- Water user associations
- Forestry
- Local authorities
- District municipalities
- Nature conservation boards (Western and Northern Cape)
- Working for Water (W and N Cape)

Although not specified as a category, at least one NGO was represented at forum meetings. Apart from three of the eleven forums, there was a distinct lack of women present at forum meetings.

The identification and communication with stakeholders was done quite intensively and to good effect. In addition to placing advertisements and a press release in local newspapers, stakeholders were contacted by letter, telephone and fax. Contact groups were defined on the basis of geographic locality and access, in order to minimise travel distances. In this way, subgroups were addressed prior to the larger group. Meeting venues were selected to suit convenience of travel by PDIs. In this way, 80% of the stakeholders in the WMA were contacted (figure quoted by consultant). This correlates fairly well with the independent PDI survey in which 70% of respondents said that they were informed about the forum establishment process. There were some claims from PDI interviews that Xhosa speaking Blacks (although they constitute a minority) were not adequately involved in the process.

4.1.3 Capacity assessment

No formal assessment of the capacity of PDIs to participate in decision-making processes appears to have been undertaken. The lack of capacity was however picked up through forum meetings as "gaps in the level of understanding of water related issues" and was recorded as a constraint of the public participation process. Skills and training needs were clearly identified in the Olifants/Doring Basin study; if these were gleaned beforehand, the forum process could have been designed to proactively anticipate and cater for these needs.

4.1.4 Preparatory activities

Preparatory activities related specifically to the forum establishment process were, as far as can be gathered, limited to discussions between DWAF Regional Office staff and consultant, and desktop appraisal of the work to be undertaken. Outside of this project, there were several related activities:

- The public participation process and social impact assessment of the Olifants/Doring study conducted public meetings in all parts of the WMA, as a result of which many PDIs were sensitised to water resource management issues
- Water committees associated with other DWAF initiatives did exist prior to the forum establishment process. All except one committee in Southern Namaqualand fell away with the completion of their associated projects – members of this committee were incorporated into the appropriate forum.
- Intensive public participation process was undertaken for Lower Olifants WUA – it is not clear whether any lessons from this exercise were drawn into design of the forum establishment process.

4.1.5 Appropriateness of initial consultations

The forum process design was sensitive to the lack of previous forum activities in that the meeting process was phased. Generally, three sets of meetings were held. The first was a public meeting to inform stakeholders about the CMA process and identify individuals or groups that should still be part of the process. The second meeting was set up to establish the forum, and the third was the initial meeting of the forum. Where travel distances were a constraint, sub groups were addressed prior to the “formal” public meeting, which is an attempt to cast the awareness net as wide as possible.

4.1.6 Complementarity/coherence

With regard to complementarity and coherence with other DWAF initiatives, the following comments are relevant:

- Olifants/Doring Basin study (1997/8) – no apparent reference to public participation and social impact assessment.
- Surplus Peoples Project identified budget problems with Olifants/Doring study, and the absence of linkages with land reform programmes – does not appear as though this information was used in the process design
- Lower Olifants Water User Association has a history of public involvement prior to forum process - no obvious references appear to have been made
- Upliftment of emerging farmers by DWAF Regional Office – it is not clear how or whether this was incorporated into the process design
- Western Cape Regional Strategy – no reference to this seems to have been made

Assumptions, risks and indicators could not be evaluated as no Log Frame matrix was drawn up for the forum establishment process.

4.1.7 PDI and gender concerns

Meeting venues were suited to accessibility by the majority of stakeholders. In this regard nearly 60% of the interviewees said that they were consulted about the schedule, time and location. Monetary compensation was provided for travel to and from meetings. Despite this facility, nearly half of the PDIs that were interviewed had practical problems with attending meetings. The main reasons cited were transport (availability and cost), inconvenient time and not knowing about the meeting(s). In addition, about 51% of interviewees indicated that they were not given a choice about the meeting location.

With regard to the gender issue, there was a low female presence at meetings. This is attributed partly to cultural preferences and shyness, working women or single parents who cannot attend, and men who do not want their wives or family members to attend. The survey found that 55% of PDIs felt that gender was not considered in selecting persons to attend meetings. The survey also found that less than 20% of forum members are women. Black women are generally not considered for election, and those that are elected do not clearly understand their role on the forum. Participation by women in public and forum meetings was quoted as “insignificant”.

It is evident from the survey that mechanisms to ensure participation of all groups in meetings were lacking in some respects. In some areas like Vredendal, PDIs are quite vocal about empowerment issues. Overall, though, some 53% of interviewees had questions in meetings but felt uncomfortable to ask. This could be due in part to the perception that the questions from white participants “carried more weight” at public meetings, the fact that PDIs feel under-resourced to participate effectively, and partly to the finding that most people did not understand the details of the issues because of the technical nature of discussions. On the positive side, 51% made inputs during meetings and 62% felt that their comments were considered adequately.

Emerging from the survey are some strong feelings and perceptions among PDIs which suggests that their participation in the process was stifled:

- Forums are perceived as institutions controlled by the white commercial farming sector, and those with business interests who wield power in the rural economy
- Whites protect their interests in the forums
- PDIs do not really have a say because they do not own land or property, and those that do have little or no water rights (bulk of the quotas being allocated to white farmers, which adds to the resentment and reluctance to participate)
- PDIs feel intimidated by the presence of whites at meetings
- The language at meetings was at times too technical to grasp

4.1.8 Overall strengths and weaknesses

Overall strengths and weaknesses of the process are as follows:

- The approach and methodology to public participation was clear and consistent, and the consultant succeeded in being effective without dominating the process. In support of this, some 53% of interviewees said that the process or decisions were not “driven” by consultants.
- Presentation material for meetings is informative and language friendly
- Ample opportunity was provided for stakeholders to raise issues – some 55% of interviewees did not feel hindered or constrained from asking questions.

- Number of forums and meetings required was predetermined, but later changed to adapt to actual circumstances
- Stakeholder categories (12) fairly comprehensive, but exclude NGOs, interest groups
- Forum establishment programme was quite focussed on outcomes, although there was some adaptation to stakeholder suggestion en route.

4.2 EFFICIENCY

In general, efficient use was made of the limited resources allocated to undertake the project. The activities carried out by the PDI consultant, although covering a wide geographic area, were planned carefully and conscientiously, with meetings often held twice on the same day (for different groups in the same catchment) and after business hours (to accommodate as many people as possible).

Budget allocation was based on a predetermined number of meetings to be held and forums to be established. It turned out that additional meetings had to be held as the process developed; although these were not allowed for in the original budget, they were accommodated without additional cost. The novelty of this type (and extent) of project makes it difficult to make comparisons, but has the advantage of providing useful benchmark data for future public participation projects in the WMA.

The average cost for establishing a forum, based on consultant's fees, was R13 000. The overall benefit achieved was that 11 catchment forums were established in the WMA and that each forum held at least two meetings. Another clear benefit is the increase in general awareness and participation in water resource management. As a PDI from the area, the consultant was able to relate to and empathise with PDI stakeholders, and established a good rapport with most of them.

With regard to monitoring, the main criterion used was attendance at meetings, as recorded in attendance registers. No other indicators were identified for monitoring efficiency of the process. Participation during meetings was largely voluntary, and the extent of participation varied between forums; requests to speak in Afrikaans were usually acceded to in order to encourage participation. Other suggestions from stakeholders were also taken into account, such as splitting a forum into two smaller forums to accommodate certain differences.

Attendance by PDI communities at public and forum meetings was relatively good, varying between 40 and 50%. According to the survey, however, Xhosa speaking blacks were absent from most meetings, and no PDI representation from Lamberts Bay exists on the forums.

4.3 EFFECTIVENESS

In many respects, planned benefits were delivered to and received by the beneficiaries, in the sense that stakeholders in the WMA were informed about the CMA and related issues, they have elected representatives from their communities on a number of catchment forums, and are now able to participate in water management issues that affect their lives. Awareness creation has been reasonably successful: some 60% to 70% of survey participants have been informed about CMAs, forums and WUAs, 54% know about the National Water Act, and 52% are aware of water processes generally. Further, more than 60% knew why they should participate in meetings.

With only two meetings being held (primarily for awareness and information sharing), it is still early to comment on significant behavioural changes in the forums and their members.

More recently, some attitude changes have been noted on the part of commercial farmers who seem to be more receptive to emerging farmers. Feedback from forum members to non-forum members appears to be effective, since 71% of interviewees indicated that they are informed about decisions taken at forums. However, 63% indicated that they do not have a clear idea what the forum does or is supposed to do, which suggests that the forum environment is not yet conducive to personal growth and development amongst PDI forum members. Presently, only a chairperson and vice-chairperson have been elected for each forum. A formal structure of too many office bearers sometimes encumbers a newly formed forum with too much formality, and the present arrangement is well suited to encourage more free participation.

Although efforts have been made to accommodate travel, timing and language requests from stakeholders, freedom to participate by PDI stakeholders is clouded by feelings of intimidation and tension between race groups. According to the survey, 53% of interviewees said that they had questions at meetings but felt uncomfortable to ask. This is likely to be a feature common to any Government driven initiative that brings people of all groups to a single forum to discuss matters of common interest.

With regard to the institutional framework, it would appear that catchment forums were presented by the consultant as the appropriate institutions to be formed, and only the number and geographical distribution of forums was discussed with stakeholders. It appears as though stakeholders were not given the option of considering or proposing structures other than catchment forums.

4.4 IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

With regard to the process under review, the main objectives were achieved, namely the establishment of catchment forums for the Olifants/Doorn WMA.. With regard to PDI's, there is a certain level of participation in the forums.

PDIs have definitely been impacted positively by the process:

- 60% to 70% of survey participants have been informed about CMAs, forums and WUAs,
- 54% know about the National Water Act, and 52% are aware of water processes generally.
- more than 60% knew why they should participate in meetings 55% of survey respondents feel that their community is part of the process
- 70% feel that this process would lead to improved access to water, economic well being and quality of life of the community.
- 78% feel that their community's vision, which was set out at the beginning of the process, will be achieved, which augers well for sustainability of the process

However, some people in the broader community felt they needed to be more involved and that benefits should be spread more widely. Some felt that the time allocated to address the community's need was limited; in this respect 75% indicated that the process was driven by consultants.

The process is also starting to effect attitude changes on the part of some white commercial farmers, who appear to be becoming more receptive to the concerns of the PDIs. With regard to enhancing development, there are indications that issues are receiving attention and actions are being implemented. PDIs are also getting actively involved in "action items", such as identifying possible solutions to water related problems. This is particularly true of women from poorer and water-scarce areas.

With regard to sustainability of the catchment forums:

- The momentum enjoyed by forum activities thus far has certainly been influenced by the support of the consultant and the DWAF Regional Office – whether this will be sustained without that support has not yet been tested and cannot be predicted with certainty. Although DWAF is providing financial support for secretarial services to forum meetings, will the withdrawal of travel allowances for PDIs affect participation negatively?
- A significant number of PDIs feel uncomfortable to speak at forum meetings largely due to historical imbalances between race groups. There appear to be some signs of changes in attitude in some areas, which should be exploited to derive maximum benefit in other areas as well.

4.5 EVALUATION: OLIFANTS/DOORN

Relevance	
Objectives vs problems/needs & NWA, causal factors wrt change in plan, appropriateness of design	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What processes were adopted to identify real vs perceived problems/needs wrt establishment of WUAs/forums/CMA establishment process, ▪ How did initial project design address these needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Needs assessment not formal part of process design? Issue raising was a standard feature of forum meetings, from which needs can be inferred.</i> ▪ <i>Needs and preferences of disadvantaged community in the WMA were determined during Olifants/Doorn Basin Study – do not appear to have been incorporated into process design.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification and consultation of correct beneficiaries/stakeholders ▪ How well did project design address these needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Databases of several institutions were used as main source, supplemented by requests at meetings for additional names of individuals/groups</i> ▪ <i>Advertisements and press release in local newspapers</i> ▪ <i>Approximately 80% of stakeholders in WMA contacted via letter, phone, fax</i> ▪ <i>70% of respondents said they were informed about forum estab process</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment of local implementation capacities wrt empowerment in decision making process (quality) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No formal assessment of PDI capacity undertaken</i> ▪ <i>Lack of capacity inferred from forum meetings, but not formally assessed.</i> ▪ <i>Skills and training needs were identified in Olifants/Doorn basin study</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preparatory activities undertaken (feasibilities, workshops, analyses), by whom, and how well findings incorporated into process design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Appears to have been limited to discussions between DWAF RO and consultant, and desktop appraisal of area and work to be covered</i> ▪ <i>Prior to the process, water committees associated with other DWAF initiatives existed, but fell away except for Southern Namaqualand – these members were incorporated into a forum.</i> ▪ <i>Public participation process of O/D Basin Study covered whole WMA but had limited stakeholder involvement. Positive spinoff – many PDIs were already sensitised to water resource management issues – findings do not appear to be incorporated into process design</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appropriateness of initial consultations with and participation by stakeholders before establishment process was confirmed/implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Three sets of meetings conducted: public mtg to inform re CMA process and identify individuals & groups, second meeting to establish forum, third forum meeting. Findings/recommendations from 1st mtg incorporated into process design where appropriate</i> ▪ <i>Intensive public participation took place wrt establishment of Lower Olifants WUA – not clear whether any lessons/outcomes from here were incorporated</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complementarity and coherence with other related activities/initiatives by DWAF and others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>O/D Basin study – no apparent reference to PP process or Social imp asses</i> ▪ <i>Surplus Peoples Project- chose not to get involved in O/D Basin study – budget problems and land reform initiatives – no obvious links detected</i> ▪ <i>Lower Olifants WUA – no obvious links were detected</i> ▪ <i>W Cape Regional Strategy – no obvious links detected</i> ▪ <i>Emerging farmer upliftment by RO – no clear references</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of assumptions, risks, conditions of LF at different levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No LF matrix prepared</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis of overall strengths, weakness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of logframe ▪ Clarity, consistency of overall objectives, purposes, results ▪ Were objectively verifiable indicators used (well chosen, widely agreed) ▪ Choice and quantity of inputs – were they realistic ▪ Flexibility/adaptability to facilitate rapid responses to changes in circumstances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Overall approach to public participation clear and consistent</i> ▪ <i>Presentation material informative, language friendly</i> ▪ <i>Number of forums predetermined but later adapted to suit conditions</i> ▪ <i>Stakeholder categories comprehensive but exclude NGOs, WUAs</i> ▪ <i>Questions raised – varied and searching, indicative of lack of overall awareness and understanding of IWRM</i> ▪ <i>Outcome focussed process, but some adaptation to stakeholder suggestion</i>
<p>PDIs, gender, poverty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were stakeholders clearly defined (socio-economic status, subgroups) ▪ Were different groups consulted – how, how often, processes used ▪ Access/attendance at meetings – were needs, resources, constraints identified and incorporated into design? ▪ What solutions were sought ▪ How well are gender roles taken into account? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>PDIs were consulted on meeting schedule, time and venue (60% confirmed this)</i> ▪ <i>Monetary compensation for travel was provided</i> ▪ <i>50% had practical problems attending</i> ▪ <i>Gender: 55% said gender was not considered in selecting people to attend meetings; less than 20% of forum members are women; black women generally not considered for election.</i>

EFFICIENCY	
Transformation of resources into intended outputs (quantity, quality, timeliness, cost)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were adequate budgets allocated? ▪ How were relations managed with WMIs, institutional and other stakeholders, PDIs, black women, rural poor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>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)</i> ▪ <i>Consultant is PDI from W Cape – empathy and good relations with stakeholders (DWAF view)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How far were costs justified by benefits generated (relative to similar initiatives) (Analyse 3 WMAs comparatively) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Some clear benefits – 11 forums established, positive response from stakeholders, good attendance and participation, increased general awareness</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monitoring (quality, accuracy, flexibility), adequacy of baseline information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Meeting attendance was main monitoring criterion</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Efficiency indicators (suitability, amended where necessary?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Not aware of any specific indicators in use</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unplanned results (were there any) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Constraints – how they were managed 	
INVOLVEMENT OF PDIS, GENDER, POVERTY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mechanisms to ensure participation of all groups in meetings and decision making processes (appropriateness) ▪ Were solutions/suggestions sought from stakeholders? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>53% felt uncomfortable to ask questions</i> ▪ <i>51% made inputs during meetings</i> ▪ <i>62% felt that their comments were considered adequately</i>

EFFECTIVENESS	
Achievement of original purpose. Practical difference – extent of real benefits. Extent of participation, appropriateness of instit frame work, lead to improvement	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were planned benefits delivered and received by key beneficiaries (taking account of views of DWAF and NGOs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Planned benefits were received by beneficiaries</i> ▪ <i>More than 60% knew why they should participate in meetings</i> ▪ <i>60 to 70% were informed about CMAs, WUAs, forums</i> ▪ <i>54% knew about National Water Act</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Behavioural changes in organisations, institutions, stakeholders, visible improvements in communication, productivity (wrt reaching consensus and generating meaningful actions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Not enough forum development to comment on behavioural changes</i> ▪ <i>71% are informed about decisions taken at forums (feedback)</i> ▪ <i>63% are not clear what a forum does or is supposed to do.</i> ▪ <i>PDIs getting actively involved in proposals/suggestions at meetings</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flexibility of management (under changing situations to ensure results still achieve purpose, and how well was this supported by DWAF and s/h) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Balance of responsibilities between various s/h – was it correct, what measures were taken and what were the consequences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Presently only have chair and vice-chair with little responsibility sharing</i> ▪ <i>Members contribute collectively towards forum efforts</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effect of unplanned results on benefits received 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were any shortcomings due to failure to account for cross-cutting issues (PDIs, gender, poverty) 	
INVOLVEMENT OF PDIs, GENDER, POVERTY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who has access/control of inputs by these groups ▪ Is training provided for right groups, given participation requirements of NWA ▪ Do women/vulnerable groups participate in diff phases of implementation? 	

IMPACT	
Relationship between purpose and objectives. Extent to which benefits have been/can be received by beneficiaries. Extent of o/a effect in catchment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent overall objectives can be achieved (NWA) – to what extent is it attributable to initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Initiative is in line with objectives of NWA – enabling public participation, redressing past imbalances</i> ▪ <i>55% feel that community is part of process</i> ▪ <i>70% feel that process will lead to improved water access and economic well being</i> ▪ <i>78% feel that community vision will be achieved</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planned Institutional arrangements: can they enhance economic & social development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Too early to evaluate – forums have only just been formed</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unplanned impacts – were there any, how have they affected overall impact 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Logframe indicators: were they suitable, amended if necessary? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No LF matrix</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of o/a impact (yes or anticipated) due to neglect of PDI, gender, poverty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Not likely because of attention being given to Involving PDIs</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Could overall wider impact – be better achieved otherwise? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The extent of disparity in participation “entry levels” is significant - it is believed that impact could have been greater if information and awareness campaign preceded forum establishment</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent did stakeholders perceived objectives – influence overall impact 	
INVOLVEMENT OF PDIs, GENDER, POVERTY	

SUSTAINABILITY	
Whether progress will lead to anticipated (and sustainable) outcomes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extent of ownership of objectives and achievements to date (how far have stakeholders been consulted on objectives, did they agree & remain in agreement) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Presentations inform stakeholders of institutional structures, their roles, responsibilities – no evidence of objectives being discussed</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutional capacity, degree of commitment of all parties (DWAF RO, WMI, LA etc), how well is NWA embedded in these institutions, are they supportive of CMA establishment, are appropriate capacity building arrangements being made to ensure sustainability of CMA 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are planned budgets adequate for sustainability 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sensitivity to local perceptions of needs and benefit achievement, status systems, beliefs, perceptions, power structures. ▪ If change is desired, how well is it accepted and based on s/h participation in design? ▪ What is the quality of relations bet DWAF, consultants & local communities (esp leaders) 	

▪ Technology issues: extent to which embedded IWRM principles fits in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills, knowledge	
INVOLVEMENT OF PDIS, GENDER, POVERTY	
▪ Have cross-cutting issues been adequately addressed (poverty alleviation, good governance etc)	

5. MVOTI-MZIMKULU

5.1 RELEVANCE

For the Mvoti-Mzimkulu WMA, public participation (at the time of this evaluation) is pursued by the DWAF Regional Office on three different fronts:

- Through supporting the activities of Catchment Forums,
- Through the community outreach programme, which focuses on creating awareness among rural black communities, and
- Through the public participation component of the CMA proposal development project.

Forum development started well before the National Water Act was promulgated. More than 30 forums were in operation at one stage, many of which had (and still have) a water quality focus, and were initiated by organisations or individuals besides DWAF. Initially DWAF staff played an active role in many of these forums. Current policy however, is to facilitate interaction (within and between forums), co-ordinate activities, provide guidance when requested, build partnerships, and above all encourage forums to be self-sufficient.

The community outreach programme of the Regional Office consists of ongoing contact with Zulu traditional leaders (at meetings arranged by Department of Traditional Affairs) and informal meetings with rural communities to disseminate general information regarding the National Water Act and catchment management. This programme is conducted around four major geographic nodes: Durban, Pietermaritzburg, Stanger, and Port Shepstone.

As part of a simultaneous CMA proposal development initiative for all three WMAs (Mvoti-Mzimkulu, Thukela, Usutu-Mhlatuze), the DWAF Regional Office launched a public participation component in June 2000. A local public participation consultant has been appointed for this component, who is supposed to tie in with the forum and outreach processes, and run as far as facilitating the process for the appointment of each CMA's governing board. It is this public participation component that forms the main focus for the evaluation exercise.

5.1.1 Real versus perceived needs

In general, the process design was relevant and in line with the provisions of the National Water Act. The Terms of Reference provides useful background information, acknowledging the limited success of the catchment management forums, the importance and demands of capacity building, and the rationale behind the simultaneous development of three CMA proposals. With regard to needs of stakeholders, the proposal development initiative is in response to the "frequent request" from stakeholders to establish CMAs sooner rather than later, and to the fact that the Regional Office was "constantly being pressured by external stakeholders" to establish the CMAs. It is not clear who these stakeholders are and how in fact the requests and pressure emerged.

Whilst it seems that stakeholders in the forums and rural areas were kept informed by the Regional Office about the National Water Act and catchment management, there is no evidence to indicate whether they were also consulted (during the design stage) on the objectives and methodology of the proposal development initiative, and in particular with regard to the public participation component.

The Terms of Reference for the public participation project was, in many respects, thorough and sensitive to PDI issues; for instance:

- A representivity analysis (racial, gender, sectoral, geographical) must be conducted after stakeholders are identified
- Workshop venues must be strategic and accessible
- The desire/interest to establish more CMFs must be stimulated
- Capacity must be built amongst participants
- Translation services must be provided where required
- Continued participation of delegates must be stimulated and encouraged

The ToR was however also lacking in certain respects. The purpose and objectives of the project were not specified, nor was there any requirement to discuss these with stakeholders before being finalised. There was no requirement to develop a Logframe matrix to clarify objectives, risks, assumptions, indicators for monitoring, etc. No criteria for stakeholder representivity were specified, although a representivity analysis was called for. With regard to other DWAF initiatives, reference was made to the forums without specifying how they are to be linked with this process. Many of the important positive aspects listed in the task description could have either provided or asked for more detail from the consultant; for instance on how to stimulate the establishment of more CMFs, on what “detailed documentation” of workshop proceedings should entail, and on *how* capacity should be built amongst participants.

The identification of and consultation with correct beneficiaries is a crucial aspect of this process. Stakeholders were defined as organisations or individuals that have an interest (direct or incidental) in the water resources of the WMA. It appears that the issue of representivity at workshops and meetings was never quite settled. A few months into the project, the consultant raised several concerns in a report to DWAF, which included the adoption of a suitable model for representivity, devising a strategy to get the right people involved, and ensuring participation from rural and tribal areas. To overcome the logistical challenge of reaching millions of PDIs, the consultant recommended a strategy of “active participation of those mandated to speak in terms of representative democracy”. “Appropriate” representatives were identified prior to public meetings and were sent special invitations to attend.

Despite these invitations and ample advertising, there was a lack of attendance from forum members and rural communities at the CMA process workshops – this concern was also raised repeatedly by those present at the workshops. According to the Regional Office, the forums chose not to attend but preferred to concentrate on local issues and just be kept informed of developments regarding the CMA process, and the traditional authorities also elected to be not actively involved. The lack of attendance from the rural “subsistence community” was also recorded as a concern in the CMA proposal document. The crucial point is this: it is difficult for PDIs in rural areas to feel a sense of ownership of the process when they are far removed from it. Even though some traditional leaders elected to remain passively involved, it appears as though the message was not filtering through to the communities, because less than 20% of those interviewed in the PDI survey knew about the CMA.

With regard to assessment of local capacity, no formal assessment appears to have been done. It was accepted from past experience of Regional Office staff that capacity building would be required, but no programme was incorporated in the process design. It was highlighted by the consultant that a strategy to deal with professionals was needed because of the ease with which they could dominate proceedings at meetings.

With regard to other activities, linkages were established with the Strategic Environmental Assessment project in the Mhlatuze catchment, and with Community Development Officers (CDOs) of the Water Services section of the Regional Office. Good coherence within DWAF was achieved by involving the CDOs with the community outreach programme. On a wider scale, DWAF Regional Office established links with various regional scale initiatives in order to promote catchment management, and in many instances, succeeded in placing it on other agendas.

Some overall strengths and weaknesses are outlined below:

- Most of the Regional Office public awareness initiatives focus on promoting catchment management rather than CMA establishment as a better long-term investment in capacity building.
- There is significant PDI participation in some catchment forums, but their main concern is local catchment management issues.
- PDIs do not actively participate in the CMA process. There are several other contact initiatives between Regional Office and PDIs, such as community meetings, open days, water week, harbour day, gala events etc.

Attendance and participation by women in workshops and meetings is very low. Sensitivity to gender issues is generally not prominent in the CMA public participation process.

5.2 EFFICIENCY

This evaluation cannot comment on management efficiency for the following reasons. Although all the tasks outlined in the ToR were not accomplished at the time of this evaluation, no deadlines were specified for the activities and no budget data is available. It appears that budget increases were applied for during the process and approved at various stages of the process.

PDIs, women and the rural poor were not an integral (active) part of the process; relations with the project team were therefore limited to information updates and invitations to meetings. With regard to process monitoring, incremental additions were made to constantly update the stakeholder database, and questionnaires were circulated amongst stakeholders at the end of a workshop; no evidence of other specific indicators has come to hand.

With regard to ensuring participation by all in meetings, "house rules" were established that allowed everyone an equal say, accorded respect to culture, language and educational background, and militated against any one party dominating proceedings. However, this did not cater for those who did not feel comfortable to speak or ask questions, for whatever reason. No attempt appears to have been made to organise preview meetings/workshops to prepare PDIs for more meaningful participation at the public workshops. The issue of capacity building/training to understand the technical content of workshops was raised at early workshops, but it does not appear as though any concerted effort was made to address this issue.

Record keeping and circulation of minutes appears to have been less than adequate. Documents for reference were presented for collection at the start of the meeting on several occasions, instead of circulation beforehand. Issues raised by stakeholders were summarised, with no reference as to who raised the issue. This makes it difficult to discern the issues that are of concern to PDIs.

5.3 EFFECTIVENESS

Effectiveness must be evaluated against what the project had set out to achieve, which was to provide logistical and facilitation support towards, inter alia, developing a CMA proposal, Catchment Steering Committees, appointment of CMA governing board, stimulate interest in establishment of more CMFs, and build capacity amongst participants. The key benefit has been delivered, namely the CMA proposal, and towards this end, a Proposal Development Working Group was formed from among workshop participants. This group comprises 19 volunteers and nominees, of which only one is a PDI from a farmer support group, who was also not present at all PDWG meetings.

Clearly, participation has not been achieved by all stakeholders in the CMA proposal process. On the one hand, less than 20% of the PDIs interviewed in the survey know about the CMA, and on the other catchment forums only received information from the consultant at various stages rather than participated actively in the process.

5.4 IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

The CMA proposal process had no direct impact on social or economic development, because no new institutional arrangements were put in place to facilitate this. Upliftment and improved management of water resources has and will probably continue to take place at forum level where concerted efforts are being made by many stakeholders. It is possible that these local efforts could receive a boost and some co-ordination once Catchment Management Committees are in place, as put forward in the CMA proposal.

It is probably fair to say that, for PDIs, there is very little sense of ownership of the achievements to date on the CMA proposal development. They were not consulted on the objectives and methodology from the outset, and were not instrumental in shaping the outcome of the process. It also appears from the survey that most of them were not informed about the CMA although this was the intention. What makes this more surprising is that an intensive media campaign was launched by the Regional Office (consisting of newspaper articles, radio messages and information packages) to increase the level of awareness throughout the region.

There is a great deal of participation in community activities amongst the PDIs. The nature of the activities varies from community gardens, to poultry projects and water committees. According to the survey, 90% of those interviewed attend community meetings, and 80% participate actively in these meetings. Well over half the interviewees believe that they benefit from attending these meetings, and there are a significant number of women who participate. Should this form of commitment to development through community groups not be tapped into and supported for participation water resource management through higher level structures?

5.5 EVALUATION: MVOTI- MZIMKULU

RELEVANCE	
Objectives vs problems/needs & NWA, causal factors wrt change in plan, appropriateness of design	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What processes were adopted to identify real vs perceived problems/needs wrt establishment of WUAs/forums/CMA establishment process, ▪ How did initial project design address these needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>In the case of forums, many were established out of a real need to address water quality issues. Forums focus on issues with direct impact (“operational issues of local interest) – only contact DWAF when necessary. Forums are encouraged to become self-sufficient.</i> ▪ <i>For CMA process, stakeholders are asked to raise issues/concerns at workshops.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification and consultation of correct beneficiaries/stakeholders ▪ How well did project design address these needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>DWAF has extensive database of economic users. Supplemented by databases of two major institutions – Umgeni Water, Durban. For PDIs, use is made of population register of DCs and census data, and the database of Dept of Traditional Affairs. Representation on forums is monitored by DWAF, forums are urged to have equal representation from all groups</i> ▪ <i>CMA process: stakeholders identified on basis of interested and affected parties, and representative democracy.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment of local implementation capacities wrt empowerment in decision making process (quality) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No formal assessment done. Forum members are guided by DWAF through presenting options, workable propositions, and by teaching them responsibility to be able to help themselves.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preparatory activities undertaken (feasibilities, workshops, analyses), by whom, and how well findings incorporated into process design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Linkages with SEA in Mhlatuze, and work done by community development officers in Water Services (KZN)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appropriateness of initial consultations with and participation by stakeholders before establishment process was confirmed/implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Forums re invited to CMA workshops – they prefer not to interact directly with establishment process but to be kept informed. PDIs in rural areas consulted through separate community outreach programme by DWAF, supplied with information package</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complementarity and coherence with other related activities/initiatives by DWAF and others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Several links with other institutions/initiatives: Participation in iNdlovu and King Shaka Regional Council meetings, Forestry Owners Assoc Water Liaison Committee, Drakensberg Special Case Area Plan, Coastal Working Group, Community Development Officers (DWAF water services), Traditional Authority meetings</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of assumptions, risks, conditions of LF at different levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No LF matrix</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis of overall strengths, weakness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of logframe ▪ Clarity, consistency of overall objectives, purposes, results ▪ Were objectively verifiable indicators used (well chosen, widely agreed) ▪ Choice and quantity of inputs – were they realistic ▪ Flexibility/adaptability to facilitate rapid responses to changes in circumstances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Public Participation approach sensitive to socio-political dynamics of region</i> ▪ <i>Focus on catchment management rather than CMAs better investment in capacity building</i> ▪ <i>Process is adapted to suit stakeholder preferences when necessary</i> ▪ <i>PDIs not strongly linked to CMA process (apparently out of choice) – could prejudice partnership building and ownership of process</i>
<p>PDIs, gender, poverty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were stakeholders clearly defined (socio-economic status, subgroups) ▪ Were diff groups consulted – how, how often, processes used ▪ Access/attendance at meetings – were needs, resources, constraints identified and incorporated into design? ▪ What solutions were sought ▪ How well are gender roles taken into account? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Rural PDIs identified through Community outreach programme which covers large no of Traditional Authorities in WMA, and to lesser extent on some forums eg Mdloti.</i> ▪ <i>Attendance by PDIs in CMA process is a problem. Only 20% have basic understanding about NWA, CMA etc</i> ▪ <i>Forum membership is not actively pursued – should be self motivated. PDI attendance at forum meetings recurring problem. Perception that there are job/selling opportunities at forums.</i> ▪ <i>PDIs consulted only after Amakhosi's approval – either at local school halls and the like, or singularly. Special events are also arranged or made use of for PDI contact (Open days, Water week, harbour day). These contact processes are not aimed at integration with establishment process</i>

EFFICIENCY	
Transformation of resources into intended outputs (quantity, quality, timeliness, cost)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were adequate budgets allocated? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>CMA process: ToR requires facilitation of establishment of CMA - budget extends as required</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How were relations managed with WMIs, institutional and other stakeholders, PDIs, black women, rural poor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Management approach: public participation on 3 fronts: forums, community outreach, and CMA establishment (by Consultant). Latter only commenced June 2000. Forum activity started 1994.</i> <i>Forums: participation limited to some meetings only, except Isipingo forum (lack of capacity). Correspondence maintained, DWAF contacted when needed.</i> <i>Community outreach process: less formal, no correspondence, ongoing</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How far were costs justified by benefits generated (relative to similar initiatives) (Analyse 3 WMAs comparatively) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Benefits: Awareness about NWA, CMA. Mobilisation of concerned stakeholders to take CMA proposal forward (PDWG)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring (quality, accuracy, flexibility), adequacy of baseline information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>No specific monitoring. DWAF would like to spend more time on forums. Presently making use of “catch-up” workshops – want to change to organised “gala” events. Have developed pro-forma “issues” and generic ToR for forums. DWAF believe that public participation cannot be rushed</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efficiency indicators (suitability, amended where necessary?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Not in use</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unplanned results (were there any) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Forums: drop in interest. Response varies- change venue to suit PDIs has usually increased attendance, Resuming chairmanship of forum (unplanned)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constraints – how they were managed 	
INVOLVEMENT OF PDIS, GENDER, POVERTY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mechanisms to ensure participation of all groups in meetings and decision making processes (appropriateness) Were solutions/suggestions sought from stakeholders? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Forums and PDIs: DWAF ensures that information reaches many, but does not ensure all participate – stakeholders must be self-motivated. Same applies to decision making in forums – its up to the stakeholders to encourage suggestions and make decisions.</i>
EFFECTIVENESS	
<p>Achievement of original purpose. Practical difference – extent of real benefits. Extent of particip, approp of instit frame work, lead to improvement</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were planned benefits delivered and received by key beneficiaries (taking account of views of DWAF and NGOs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Increased level of awareness amongst PDIs about NWA and catchment management.</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Behavioural changes in organisations, institutions, stakeholders, visible improvements in communication, productivity (wrt reaching consensus and generating meaningful actions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Greater interaction between stakeholders, co-ordination of activities, and partnership building in forums</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flexibility of management (under changing situations to ensure results still achieve purpose, and how well was this supported by DWAF and s/h) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Balance of responsibilities between various s/h – was it correct, what measures were taken and what were the consequences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Sharing of responsibilities is left to the stakeholders in forums.</i> ▪ <i>CMA process – volunteers take on responsibilities like the PDWG (which is not intended to be representative)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effect of unplanned results on benefits received 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were any shortcomings due to failure to account for cross-cutting issues (PDIs, gender, poverty) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>PDI participation in forums relatively low</i>
INVOLVEMENT OF PDIS, GENDER, POVERTY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who has access/control of inputs by these groups ▪ Is training provided for right groups, given participation requirements of NWA ▪ Do women/vulnerable groups participate in diff phases of implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>PDIs are largely in awareness and capacity building stages – do not make direct input to establishment process</i> ▪ <i>Recent capacity building programme instituted by DWAF</i>

IMPACT	
Relationship between purpose and objectives. Extent to which benefits have been/can be received by beneficiaries. Extent of o/a effect in catchment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent overall objectives can be achieved (NWA) – to what extent is it attributable to initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Meaningful participation by PDIs in water resource management long way off</i> ▪ <i>CMA proposal is approaching finality</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planned Institutional arrangements: can they enhance economic & social development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Yes, subject to effectiveness of linkages between PDIs and CMA process</i> ▪ <i>No response from survey – so few knew about the process</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unplanned impacts – were there any, how have they affected overall impact 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Logframe indicators: were they suitable, amended if necessary? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No LF matrix</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of o/a impact (yes or anticipated) due to neglect of PDI, gender, poverty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Impacts diffuse because of separate public participation initiatives</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Could overall wider impact – be better achieved otherwise? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Perhaps stronger integration between initiatives</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent did stakeholders perceived objectives – influence overall impact 	
INVOLVEMENT OF PDIS, GENDER, POVERTY	

SUSTAINABILITY	
Whether progress will lead to anticipated (and sustainable) outcomes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extent of ownership of objectives and achievements to date (how far have stakeholders been consulted on objectives, did they agree & remain in agreement) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Forum objectives largely set by members. DWAF advises on CM and CMA process. Rural PDIs have no sense of ownership of CMA process. Sustainability (continuity) has been problematic for several forums</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutional capacity, degree of commitment of all parties (DWAF RO, WMI, LA etc), how well is NWA embedded in these institutions, are they supportive of CMA establishment, are appropriate capacity building arrangements being made to ensure sustainability of CMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Forums and community outreach are not intended to be supportive of CMA establishment</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are planned budgets adequate for sustainability 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sensitivity to local perceptions of needs and benefit achievement, status systems, beliefs, perceptions, power structures. ▪ If change is desired, how well is it accepted and based on s/h participation in design? ▪ What is the quality of relations bet DWAF, consultants & local communities (esp leaders) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>There is sensitivity to local status systems and beliefs</i> ▪ <i>There is contact and understanding between DWAF and communities, forums etc, supported by DWAFs understanding of overall political/institutional dynamics within the region. Umgeni Water has played significant role – partnering with DWAF in studies/projects, and fostering forum establishment</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Technology issues: extent to which embedded IWRM principles fits in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills, knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Appropriate mix of technology used: written communications, email, personal visits, radio broadcasts, newspapers, workshops</i>
INVOLVEMENT OF PDIS, GENDER, POVERTY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have cross-cutting issues been adequately addressed (poverty alleviation, good governance etc) 	

6 CROCODILE-WEST/MARICO WMA

6.1 RELEVANCE

In 1999, the Directorate: Water Quality Management initiated a project for the establishment of the Crocodile/Marico CMA. Gauteng and North-West Regional Offices were also involved with the management and monitoring of the project. The project comprises four main tasks: inception report, creation of public participation structures, facilitating establishment of CMA, facilitating appointment of governing board. The focus of this evaluation is the second component, namely, the creation of public participation structures.

In many respects, the Terms of Reference was relevant in terms of the issues referred to in the National Water Act; for instance the ToR

- Recognises the importance of involving stakeholders and the special effort required, especially in respect of the rural community
- Acknowledges the need to include PDIs (rural communities, women's groups, traditional leaders) and empower stakeholders in order to allow them to participate in the process
- Acknowledges the need to establish stakeholder issues and needs, ensure participation and establish communication channels.

In addressing the challenge of facilitating public participation towards establishing a CMA, the process design was weak in the following respects:

- The time allowed for establishing public participation structures, namely 9 months, was ambitious, given the limited existing forum activity at inception, the desire to create five new forums, the high rural population (30%), and the lack of previous studies on community participation in water projects. To compound the problem, the process of facilitating CMA establishment was scheduled to run in parallel with the public participation component for two-thirds of its duration. This means that without having much time to consolidate and develop, fledgling forums are going to be tasked immediately with the challenges of CMA establishment.
- Given the vast extent of the WMA, its highly skewed demographic characteristics, and the considerable effort that was acknowledged as necessary to involve the rural community, the number of participation structures that were created were probably more than necessary *from the PDI perspective*. The ToR envisaged a steering committee, liaison committee, and nine forums. The Inception report later added theme teams, business units (with convenors), task leaders. Towards the end of 2001, a regional management team was also formed from four of the nine forums. Whilst a highly structured organogram may be convenient from a project management and administrative point of view, there is a distinct likelihood of PDIs, who are still getting accustomed to forums and water issues, to be overwhelmed by bureaucratic procedures.

A thorough effort appears to have been made to identify and engage with marginalised groups, including a desktop study, the use of local government councillors, traditional leaders and mass village meetings. With regard to the latter, some 290 villages were reportedly contacted, and visits were made to 150 of them. However, there are no details of the nature or content of these visits, nor is there evidence that PDIs were consulted about the process objectives and the design of the participation process, or whether their needs in this respect were specifically identified.

DWAF staff consulted with stakeholders in the Molopo/Marico and Hartebeespoort areas prior to this project. However, it is not known whether these stakeholders were incorporated into the process design or invited to forum meetings

In the ToR, representatives were to be identified from empowering workshops to form a Liaison Committee, from which a Steering Committee will be appointed. No guidelines are given with regard to the composition of these groups, particularly with regard to representivity. Given the important roles of the LC (such as responding to stakeholder concerns, identifying reasonable alternatives and seeking consensus on problems and opposing views) it is difficult to accomplish this efficiently if it is to meet only twice a year, as suggested. Furthermore, it could be argued that in addition to the SC, the LC also deserves administrative support from the Consultant. Initially, LC representatives were to be drawn from stakeholders attending the empowerment workshops; this was likely to result in a fairly high PDI component. The Inception report specifies a different setup: a chairperson elected by the PMC, maximum of 3 nominees per major sectoral interest, 1 local govt representative, and 1 community representative, which significantly diminishes the PDI component.

With regard to forums, the identification of forum champions is a significant move towards fostering credibility and sustainability. It is not clear to what extent this initiative was actually implemented.

No formal assessment of capacity of PDIs appears to have been undertaken. This is of concern because of PDIs that are either volunteering or being elected to serve on forums, theme teams, business units etc without adequate capacity to satisfy the requirements of those positions, or without a proper understanding of their roles and responsibilities.

With regard to complementarity with other initiatives, a list of previous DWAF studies undertaken in the catchment was supplied with the ToR; this would have enabled the consultant to acquire background information regarding water resources in the catchment. However, experience of the process seems to indicate that not many lessons were learnt from prior forum activities, for instance:

- Jukskei steering committee: there was a lack of interest and eventual departure of CBOs due to the overwhelming presence of local authorities and government officials, to the predominantly technical focus of the committee, and to the fact that their repeated concerns were not really being addressed. Although female representation on the steering committee was around 30%, no women's groups were invited to the meeting for the establishment of a Crocodile CMA
- Molopo forum: the municipality lost interest after a water quality problem became a contentious issue with DWAF
- Marico forum: a change in meeting venue from urban (Zeerust) to rural (Thandikwe) resulted in a sudden increase in attendance by PDIs

Much prior work was done by Community Development Officers (Water Services, DWAF) with regard to water committees in rural areas, but there seems to be poor linkages between these committees and the CMA establishment process.

Assumptions, risks and conditions could not be assessed because no Logframe matrix was developed for the process. This also means that no suitable indicators were selected for monitoring progress as the process developed.

The issue of supporting PDI attendance at meetings was not consistent through the process. In some areas, minibus loads of passengers were transported to and from meetings. In other areas, a relatively generous travel/subsistence allowance was provided to PDIs for a limited period only, which raises questions about the *bona fides* of those that made use of this facility, and seemed to have unsettled the beneficiaries when this support was withdrawn.

With regard to PDI and gender representation on structures, 44% of forum management are blacks and 28% are women. Among convenors of business units, 43% are blacks and 33% are women (Source: Inception report). No indication is given with regard to the quality of contributions made by these people or to the extent of capacity building being received (if any).

6.2 EFFICIENCY

With regard to the overall project budget, public participation is the largest single component (around 40%) as would be expected (Source: Inception report). Dividing the total sum for this component through nine forums gives an expenditure of some R80 000 per forum. No indication is given of the nature of activities relating to forum establishment and support. There appears to have been no systematic monitoring of expenditure on public participation activities or adequate description of what was actually done on a monthly basis. The process of engaging PDIs has no structure for monitoring other than hours used by consultants.

It is difficult to comment on how far the costs justify the benefits received. As far as benefits are concerned, there are numerous participation structures in place, but the extent to which PDIs have actually benefited is not convincing:

- 55% of survey respondents said they had not been informed of the ongoing forum and CMA establishment process
- 56% of respondents indicated that they had not said anything at meetings
- 45% of respondents felt that their questions had not been considered

As far as meetings/workshops are concerned, agendas appear to have been predetermined by the project team, driven very much by the CMA proposal programme of deadlines, and without any assessment of existing capacity or cultural preferences. English was usually the medium of communication at meetings as well as for the newsletter; it is not known whether translation services or use of an alternative language were offered at meetings. There is no evidence to indicate whether stakeholders were asked to comment on whether they understood what was going on, or to evaluate the process in a formal manner. Documentation and record keeping was weak and not easily accessible. Meeting minutes do not reflect the name of the person against the issue raised, nor is there a consistent "action item" trail.

At this early stage of the process it is useful to offer explanations to stakeholders on the details regarding the Act; in this respect, a legal expert was sometimes present at meetings to answer stakeholder queries related to the Water Act

6.3 EFFECTIVENESS

With regard to delivery of benefits, nine forums were established, each with a number of stakeholders holding various portfolios. Stakeholders are starting to work in groups discussing various issues relating to each forum, for example water quality problems, youth issues, eco-monitoring, etc.

With regard to PDI benefits, 82% of survey respondents felt that issues relating to gender, local community needs, local technologies, traditions and culture were not taken into consideration. In addition, 55% of responses indicated that they had not been informed in any form of the ongoing forum and CMA establishment process. Forum members are also unclear about their roles and responsibilities in terms of reporting back to their constituents. Even within well-established structures like the CLC, communication between members is weak and understanding of roles and responsibilities is not clear.

6.4 IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

The current institutional arrangement is not likely to contribute to an improvement in the economic and social well being of PDIs and the rural poor. Some 63% of respondents provided a negative view on questions relating to impact and sustainability. Against this background, and the even higher proportion who feel that their issues are not being considered, it is difficult to conceive any sense of ownership of the process amongst PDIs. It appears that PDIs will continue to remain marginalised in terms of knowledge and capacity to participate actively in the process.

RELEVANCE	CROCODILE-WEST/MARICO
Objectives vs problems/needs & NWA, causal factors wrt change in plan, appropriateness of design	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What processes were adopted to identify real vs perceived problems/needs wrt establishment of WUAs/forums/CMA establishment process, ▪ How did initial project design address these needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Field visits were apparently made by Consultant to various chiefs and communities prior to forum estab process. No evidence of what was discussed or whether needs were enquired about, or whether they were incorporated into forum process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification and consultation of correct beneficiaries/stakeholders ▪ How well did project design address these needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consultation with stakeholders by DWAF commenced prior to forum establishment in Molopo/Marico and Hartebeestpoort areas – not clear to what extent these people incorporated/invited to forum process ▪ Good demographic data available
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment of local implementation capacities wrt empowerment in decision making process (quality) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No formal assessment of local capacity appears to have been done. Stakeholders are volunteering or being elected to serve on various committees, theme teams, business units
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preparatory activities undertaken (feasibilities, workshops, analyses), by whom, and how well findings incorporated into process design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Field visits were apparently made by Consultant to various chiefs and communities prior to forum estab process ▪ Consultant was accompanied by Community Development Officer to visit water services committees in some areas – not aware of follow through into forum activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appropriateness of initial consultations with and participation by stakeholders before establishment process was confirmed/implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On a broad basis of issues ranging from being informed of the NWA, establishment of CMAs, WUAs, forums, 61% of respondents stated that they had not been informed prior to their participation in the first meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complementarity and coherence with other related activities/initiatives by DWAF and others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 38% of respondents had not heard of related DWAF activities. There seems to be a poor linkage between the work of local water committees and the forum and CMA establishment process

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of assumptions, risks, conditions of LF at different levels 	<p>LFAs not prepared. Objectives for stakeholder participation not set out.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analysis of overall strengths, weakness ▪ Quality of logframe ▪ Clarity, consistency of overall objectives, purposes, results ▪ Were objectively verifiable indicators used (well chosen, widely agreed) ▪ Choice and quantity of inputs – were they realistic ▪ Flexibility/adaptability to facilitate rapid responses to changes in circumstances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verifiable indicators that could be measured in qualitative and quantitative terms not established and as a consequence not discussed with stakeholders
<p>PDIs, gender, poverty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were stakeholders clearly defined (socio-economic status, subgroups) ▪ Were diff groups consulted – how, how often, processes used ▪ Access/attendance at meetings – were needs, resources, constraints identified and incorporated into design? ▪ What solutions were sought ▪ How well are gender roles taken into account? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Baseline studies to establish stakeholder needs not undertaken and as such no monitoring mechanism established ▪ Not clear from documentation ▪ Not established in a systematic manner ▪ Payment of expenses but not clear on what criteria ▪ No evidence that this was specifically addressed

EFFICIENCY	
Transformation of resources into intended outputs (quantity, quality, timeliness, cost)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Management ▪ Were adequate budgets allocated? ▪ How were relations managed with WMIs, institutional and other stakeholders, PDIs, black women, rural poor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Means of monitoring performance in terms of empowerment and inclusion not in place and do not appear to have been considered</i> ▪ <i>Given the large percentage of respondents (indicated elsewhere) not knowing about the CMA development process it would appear that these were not managed well</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How far were costs justified by benefits generated (relative to similar initiatives) (Analyse 3 WMAs comparatively) 	<p><i>Not possible to indicate at this stage</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monitoring (quality, accuracy, flexibility), adequacy of baseline information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No systems in place</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Efficiency indicators (suitability, amended where necessary?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Not in place</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unplanned results (were there any) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Appears not to have been catered for (45% of responses felt that their questions had not been considered)</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Constraints – how they were managed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Establishment of the CMA is the driving force. Effectively leap frog of project phases in terms of taking into consideration PDI needs</i>
INVOLVEMENT OF PDIS, GENDER, POVERTY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mechanisms to ensure participation of all groups in meetings and decision making processes (appropriateness) ▪ Were solutions/suggestions sought from stakeholders? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>55% of responses indicated that respondents had not been informed in and form of the ongoing forum and CMA establishment process</i> ▪ <i>56% of responses indicated that they had not said anything at meetings</i> ▪ <i>45% of responses felt that their questions had not been considered</i>
EFFECTIVENESS	
Achievement of original purpose. Practical difference – extent of real benefits. Extent of particip, approp of instit frame work, lead to improvement	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were planned benefits delivered and received by key beneficiaries (taking account of views of DWAF and NGOs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>82% of respondents considered that issues relating to gender, local community needs, local technologies, traditions and culture were not taken into consideration</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Behavioural changes in organisations, institutions, stakeholders, visible improvements in communication, productivity (wrt reaching consensus and generating meaningful actions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Roles and responsibilities of forum members remain unclear in terms reporting back to their constituents.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flexibility of management (under changing situations to ensure results still achieve purpose, and how well was this supported by DWAF and s/h) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Balance of responsibilities between various s/h – was it correct, what measures were taken and what were the consequences 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effect of unplanned results on benefits received 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>PDis continue to remain marginalized in terms of knowledge and capacity to actively be involved in the process</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were any shortcomings due to failure to account for cross- cutting issues (PDis, gender, poverty) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>There remains a distinct information gap between those participating in the forum and CMA establishment process and those who are not 55% of responses indicated that respondents had not been informed in any form of the ongoing forum and CMA establishment process</i>

INVOLVEMENT OF PDIS, GENDER, POVERTY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who has access/control of inputs by these groups ▪ Is training provided for right groups, given participation requirements of NWA ▪ Do women/vulnerable groups participate in diff phases of implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The process of engaging PDIs has no structure for monitoring other than hours used by consultants. There are no qualitative indicators to monitor consultants.</i> ▪ <i>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.</i>
IMPACT	
Relationship between purpose and objectives. Extent to which benefits have been/can be received by beneficiaries. Extent of o/a effect in catchment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent overall objectives can be achieved (NWA) – to what extent is it attributable to initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>In terms of the Equity strand of the NWA there is a risk that the PDIs will continue to remain marginalized</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planned Instit arrangements: can they enhance economic & social development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The current institutional arrangements will not contribute to an improvement in the economic and social well-being of the PDIs and rural poor</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unplanned impacts – were there any, how have they affected overall impact 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Logframe indicators: were they suitable, amended if necessary? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Not prepared</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of o/a impact (yes or anticipated) due to neglect of PDI, gender, poverty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>On a range of questions relating to impact and sustainability and the processes adopted, 63% of the respondents provided a negative view.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Could overall wider impact – be better achieved otherwise? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Structured consultation, capacity building of PDI stakeholders</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent did stakeholders perceived objectives – influence overall impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No evidence that this exercise conducted in a structured manner to develop consensus and establish objectives and verifiable indicators</i>
INVOLVEMENT OF PDIS, GENDER, POVERTY	

SUSTAINABILITY	
Whether progress will lead to anticipated (and sustainable) outcomes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extent of ownership of objectives and achievements to date (how far have stakeholders been consulted on objectives, did they agree & remain in agreement) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutional capacity, degree of commitment of all parties (DWAF RO, WMI, LA etc), how well is NWA embedded in these institutions, are they supportive of CMA establishment, are appropriate capacity building arrangements being made to ensure sustainability of CMA 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are planned budgets adequate for sustainability 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sensitivity to local perceptions of needs and benefit achievement, status systems, beliefs, perceptions, power structures. ▪ If change is desired, how well is it accepted and based on s/h participation in design? ▪ What is the quality of relations bet DWAF, consultants & local communities (esp leaders) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Technology issues: extent to which embedded IWRM principles fits in with existing needs, culture, traditions, skills, knowledge 	
INVOLVEMENT OF PDIS, GENDER, POVERTY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have cross-cutting issues been adequately addressed (poverty alleviation, good governance etc) 	

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

7.1 RELEVANCE

Relevance was 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. 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. Thus 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.

7.2 EFFICIENCY

The efficiency criterion 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.

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.

7.3 EFFECTIVENESS

Effectiveness criterion 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. Thus 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.

7.4 IMPACT

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.

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.

7.5 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 been adequately addressed. Co-operative governance involving other government departments is also lacking.