

**TOOL 13**

**EVALUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESSES  
INVOLVING MARGINALISED GROUPS**

**Framework for Interviews with Stakeholders**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1 Objective	1
2.2 Purpose	2
2.3 For Whom	2
<b>3. APPROACH</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4. OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES</b>	<b>3</b>
4.1 From the NGO's conducting the Interviews	3
4.2 Delivery Date	3
<b>5. UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>6. CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Evaluation Form</b>	<b>5</b>

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Danish Co-operation for Environment and Development (DANCED) is working with the Department of Water and Forestry Affairs (DWAF) to introduce and facilitate the implementation of integrated water resources management (IWRM) in three Water Management Areas (WMAs). This is being done as part of the process of laying the foundations for establishing Catchment Management Agencies (CMAs) within the context of the National Water Act (1998). The three WMAs are: WMA 3 Crocodile West – Marico; WMA 11 Umvoti to Umzimkulu; WMA 17 Olifans – Doorn.

The DWAF/DANCED project deals with institutional, groundwater and water conservation/demand management issues plus cross cutting elements relating to capacity building, stakeholder awareness and participation, financial aspects, networking and information dissemination. The first phase of the project involves adapting existing and developing new guidelines to reflect the particular characteristics of the three project WMAs. The second phase involves testing these guidelines through project implementation in these WMAs. The ultimate aim is to develop a set of operational manuals that will be based on the project implementation experiences and will incorporate the necessary tools for local policy makers and practitioners involved in the establishment of IWRM in other WMAs of the country.

Public participation forms a cornerstone in the shift from remote to local management of water resources in an efficient manner to attain sustainable use of resources and provide equitable access to these resources. Through the joint DWAF/DANCED project, the following has been conducted for which the evaluation is intended;

1. Initial scan and preliminary identification of stakeholders in the respective WMA.
2. More detailed identification of stakeholders including any structures that have been formed for water resources management even before the promulgation of the Act.

For the purposes of this evaluation, the term initiative is synonymous with a project in that the processes are identical i.e. initiatives and interventions related to the introduction of IWRM and CMA establishment involve *change processes* and as such should be managed using project management principles.

## **2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

### **2.1. Objective**

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.

### **2.2. Purpose**

The process of establishing the institutional arrangements for CMAs in the three project WMAs is well under way, albeit at different stages of progress. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the current institutional arrangements and the establishment process within the context of requirements of the National Water Act and the Constitution. The evaluation will inform decision makers of the extent to which public participation has been carried out in the 3 WMAs within the spirit of the National Water Act and for them to be able to mitigate short-comings. Moreover, the evaluation will serve to better identify the stakeholders and the capacity building needs required to ensure the sustainable effective and efficient operation of the CMAs in the three WMAs once established. Particular attention will be paid to ensuring the meaningful and effective participation of PDIs especially black women and the rural poor to initiate the process of addressing equity.. This latter issue forms the basis for the interviews that have to be conducted under this work assignment.

### **2.3. For whom**

This is a “formative” evaluation 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 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.

## **3. APPROACH**

The approach for the survey will be to conduct interviews with stakeholders in previously marginalized communities. The persons to be interviewed will be PDI members of water forums and water user associations and members of these communities at large.

During the interview process the respondents are first to be asked to relate in their terms the contact with DWAF and other water related bodies. The purpose of this first step is to allow the person being interviewed ‘to open up’ and provide an overall picture of their involvement and participation in the forum and CMA establishment process. Moreover, to have a preliminary insight into the types of information they have received and at what stage of the process. From this “open ended” discussion the interviewer should attempt to compile a chronological road map of the respondents involvement in the forum and CMA establishment process and to obtain a preliminary indication of whether they feel that they have been adequately consulted, that their particular circumstances were taken into consideration such as:

- Meeting location, schedule and times;
- Level of information prior to the meetings;
- They understood what their roles should be;
- That due consideration was given to local and traditional cultural values and systems;

## **Integrated Water Resources Management**

---

- Whether they thought that they were involved in a programme top down process or that they considered it a bottom up process in which they felt they could actively participate;
- Whether they felt they were adequately empowered and capacitated to actively take part in the process.

The interviewer is free to use any technique they feel comfortable with in undertaking this part of the task. The information gathered should be recorded in writing and interesting cases highlighted for inclusion in the reports as short case studies to illustrate particular points.

The second part of the interview will follow a questionnaire structure to facilitate a statistical analysis.

### **4. OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES**

#### **4.1. From the NGOs conducting the interviews**

1. Full record of open ended interviews (Part One)
2. Full record of structured interviews (Part Two) to permit data analysis by DWAF/DANCED team
3. A synthesis report highlighting key issues that have emerged from the survey (no more than 15 pages)

#### **4.2. Delivery date**

1. Questionnaire forms, no later than: 19 December 2001
2. Synthesis report no later than 8 January 2002

### **5. UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS**

- ◆ The historically advantaged, literate stakeholders are informed and are participating effectively
- ◆ The project has reached a considerable number of stakeholders in all WMA
- ◆ Consultants involved in the public participation process in the 3 WMAs will supply names and contact details of PDIs that are either present members of forums, attended only some forum meetings, or attended no meetings but were contacted as part of the process. The identification of interviewees for the questionnaire will be drawn initially from this list, and possibly modified with input from appropriate Regional Office staff. Other groups e.g. members of communities not involved in forum work also need to be consulted in order to understand whether information is filtering back to them

### **6. CONCLUSIONS**

The underlying overall aim of the evaluation can also be stated as follows:

- ◆ “Levelling the playing fields” to be able to reach out to all users equally is a time and money intensive process. However, for CMAs to fulfil their role s developmental agencies, redress past imbalances and contribute to poverty alleviation, they should be truly representative, successful in fostering Batho Pele principles and give equal attention to addressing stakeholders interests and needs.

This evaluation is a reality check for working out a suitable formula and minimum requirements for Public Participation for the short, medium and long term.

## **Integrated Water Resources Management**

---

### **Section One: General Information**

1. Name.....
2. Community/Locality.....  
.....
3. Male/female, age, occupation, literacy, schooling
4. Are you a member of local committee or forum that deals with water management  
[yes] [no]
5. If [yes] please provide the name of the committee or  
forum.....
6. How long have you been a member of this committee or forum.....months

### **Section Two: Open ended introductory discussion with respondent**

#### **Box 2: Open ended Discussion**

Please record here the main points of the discussion Use additional sheet if necessary

**Section Three: Structured Interview**

**Relevance: Introduction**

The relevance of a project-programme or initiative such as establishing a water forum relates primarily to its design and the extent to which the stated objectives correctly address the identified problems or real needs. Relevance is being addressed in this evaluation as there is a need to firmly establish the original design and the extent to which these addressed the issues in terms of the National Water Act and the problem identification at that time. Hence it will be necessary to identify those factors, if any, that may have resulted in changes in courses of action to the original plans, these factors may include political, economic, social, institutional, legislative 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.

1.1. <i>Have you been informed about:</i>		Roughly how many months ago
1.1.1. The National Water Act		
1.1.2. Catchment Management	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.1.3. The establishment of water forums	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.1.4. The establishment of Catchment Management agencies	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.1.5. Water User Associations (transformed Irrigation Boards or new)	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.1.6. Developmental aspects of these institutions	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.1.7. Water processes (	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]

**Box 1.1:** Please include any additional information here.

The source(s) of information for the above must be obtained from the interviewees.

## Integrated Water Resources Management

---

1.2. <i>Have you been contacted by DWAF concerning any of these issues</i>		<i>How many months ago?</i>
1.2.1. Working for Water	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.2.2. Groundwater	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.2.3. Water Conservation	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.2.4. Bore holes	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.2.5. Water quality	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.2.6. Health issues related to water use	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.2.7. Visioning exercises	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.2.8. Payment of water	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.2.9. Water supply and sanitation	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.2.10. Water committees	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]
1.2.11. Registration for water use	[yes] [no]	[3] [6] [12] [18] [24]< [24]

**Box 1.2:** Please include any additional information here.

1.3. *Form of media by which you were informed this part should appear in 1.1 and 1.2 as a simple choice of medium through which info was obtained or contact was made.*

- |              |            |
|--------------|------------|
| 1.3.1. Radio | [yes] [no] |
| 1.3.2. TV    | [yes] [no] |

## Integrated Water Resources Management

---

- |                          |            |
|--------------------------|------------|
| 1.3.3. Newspaper         | [yes] [no] |
| 1.3.4. Community meeting | [yes] [no] |
| 1.3.5. Information pack  | [yes] [no] |
| 1.3.6. Word of Mouth     | [yes] [no] |
| 1.3.7. Other             | [yes] [no] |

**Box 1.3:** Please include any additional information here.

- 1.4. *How often are you informed about the CMA and water forum processes*
- |                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| 1.4.1. Once a month or less         | [ ] |
| 1.4.2. Every month                  | [ ] |
| 1.4.3. Between one and three months | [ ] |
| 1.4.4. Every six months or more     | [ ] |

**Box 1.4:** Please include any additional information here.

1.5. *What access do you have to water and sanitation?*

- 1.5.1. Running water (tap) [ ]
- 1.5.2. Bore hole [ ]
- 1.5.3. Pump [ ]
- 1.5.4. Water tank [ ]
- 1.5.5. River [ ]
- 1.5.6. None [ ]
- 1.5.7. Pit latrine [ ]
- 1.5.8. Well [ ]
- 1.5.9. Fountain [ ]
- 1.5.10. Spring [ ]
- 1.5.11. None [ ]

**Box 1.5:** Please include any additional information here.

- 1.6. Have heard about the National Water Act [yes] [no]
- 1.6.1. What do you think the National Water Act is about? *Rate from 1-5 (1 min 5 max importance)*
- 1.6.2. About managing water locally through CMA establishment [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 1.6.3. Charging for water to cover management costs [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 1.6.4. Taking into consideration your local needs [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 1.6.5. Taking into consideration local cultural and traditional ways of managing water? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 1.6.5. Improving the quality of life locally through improved access to water [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 1.6.6. Alleviating poverty [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 1.6.7. Getting free water [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 1.6.8. Establishing forums [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 1.6.9. Paying more for water [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

**Box 1.6:** Please include any additional information here.

1.7. *Forum issues*

1.7.1. Do you have a clear idea of what does your Forum do/ what do you think it does? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

1.7.2. How are you informed of these decisions

1.7.2.1. Newsletter [yes] [no]

1.7.2.2. Community meeting [yes] [no]

1.7.3. Were you informed about the National Water Act before the first meeting [yes] [no]

1.7.4. Were you informed about meeting procedure and protocol? [yes] [no]

1.7.4. Are you informed about decisions taken at the Forum and other organs associated with CMA establishment? [yes] [no]

1.7.5. Are there traditional values applicable to water in your area, if yes (use box below)

1.7.6. Do you think it is important to consider them in the process of IWRM or CM? If yes (use box below)

1.7.7. If so how (use box below)

**Box 1.7.1:** Please include any additional information here.

- 1.7.8. Has sufficient attention been given to traditional values and culture [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 1.7.9. Do you think that there is an appropriate level of participation to allow you and/or your community to express your views concerning these issues [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 1.7.10. Do you think you and/or your community have a voice in the decision making process? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 1.7.11. Have poverty alleviation issues been discussed within the context of water [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 1.7.12. Do you see water as contributing factor to poverty alleviation? If so how (use box below)
- 1.7.13. What are the water issues that relate to poverty? (Use box below)

**Box 1.7.2:** Please include any additional information here.

## Integrated Water Resources Management

---

Practical issues related to attending meetings

*How many meetings have you attended?*

- |   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| 1.8.1. Do you have a problem with attending meetings  | [yes] [no]          |
| 1.8.1.1. If yes, is this due to the schedule of meetings (too many)   | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 1.8.1.2 If yes, is this due to the time of day they are held (inconvenience)                                    | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 1.8.1.3 If yes, is this due to costs involved   | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 1.8.1.4 If yes, is this due to distance to travel   | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 1.8.2. Were you consulted about on the schedule and times of meetings?  | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 1.8.3. Were you consulted about the locations of the meetings   | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 1.8.4. Were you given a choice concerning timings and location  | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 1.8.5. Were you consulted about transport requirements?   | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 1.8.6. Were gender issues and constraints considered in establishing the meeting schedule, timing and locations | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 1.8.7. Were gender issues and constraints considered in the selection of persons to attend forum meetings?      | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 1.8.8. Was the issue of representation discussed/   | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 1.8.9. Wwere you consulted on who should attend meetings?   | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |

**Box 1.8:** Please include any additional information here.

**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 will have to take into account the special circumstances of South Africa in the transformation process.

- 2.1. Were you informed of why you should participate? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.2. Were you informed of the process objectives and asked whether you agree/differ? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.3. Were you clear in your own minds why you participated in the first meeting? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.4. Was the CMA establishment process explained prior to formal meetings [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.5. Did you know what the first meeting was about? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.6. Have you been adequately informed prior to other meetings  
that have taken place? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.7. Was there consistency between what you were told before meetings and  
what was actually said at the meetings? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.8. Were the presentations understandable? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

**Box 2 .1:** Please include any additional information here.

2.9. What benefits could you see from attending these meetings?

**Box 2.2:** List

- 2.7. Did you say anything at the meetings [yes] [no ]  
2.7.1. If not, why ? Did not understand [yes] [no]  
Not interested [yes] [no]  
Don't feel part of the process [yes] [no]  
2.8. Did you feel that your comments were considered adequately [yes] [no]

**Box 2.3:** List

- 2.9 If you have not attended the meetings what has been the reason?  
2.9.1. You did not know about the meetings [ ]  
2.9.2. The time was inconvenient [ ]  
2.9.3. Could not afford [ ]  
2.10. If you attended did you  
2.10.1. Feel at ease at the meetings? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]  
2.10.2. Understand what was being said? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

- 2.10.3. Feel that solutions were sought from stakeholders? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.10.4. If not did you feel that the process/decisions were being driven by consultants? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.11. Did you have questions but felt uncomfortable in asking [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.12. Did you feel that you were hindered from asking questions? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.13. Was there a common understanding among stakeholders of the objectives and vision of where you wanted to go? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.14. Did you feel that traditional and cultural norms influencing the management of water were incorporated into the process [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.15. Did you feel that traditional technology and practices were adequately addressed? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 2.16. Was language a problem? If so was translation offered? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

**Box 2.4:** Please include any additional information here.

### 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. In terms of the scope of this study this involves for example:

- The extent to which participation has been achieved by all stakeholders, in particular PDIs especially black women and the rural poor;
- That the institutional framework being proposed or established reflects the needs expressed by stakeholders; and that these will ultimately lead to incremental improvements of their representation, active participation and contribution to decision making processes.

- |       |  |                     |
|-------|--|---------------------|
| 3.1.  | Do you feel that the representation reflects the stakeholder distribution?   | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 3.2.  | Were the responsibilities for participation in groups and sub-groups clearly described before election of representatives to the Forums and other sub-groups related to CMA establishment? | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 3.3.  | Did you feel that you had the technical knowledge and competencies to effectively engage in debates  | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 3.4.  | Did you feel that had the competencies to participate in special groups?   | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 3.5.  | Were issues raised in relation to your community adequately addressed?   | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 3.6.  | Was sufficient opportunity/time allowed to discuss issues that were not on the agenda but you and/or your community considered to be important to the process?                             | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 3.7.  | Were gender and poverty issues discussed and followed up on?   | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 3.8.  | Were the meetings conducted in the way you felt they should be?  | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 3.9.  | Did you get feedback from meetings if you did not attend?  | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 3.10. | Did you provide feedback to your community if you did attend?  | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 3.11. | How was feedback provided  | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 3.12. | Do you feel that your democratically elected local authorities and/or local authorities represent your interests   | [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] |
| 3.13. | Do they inform you of the processes and decisions taken at meetings if yes how (use box)   |                     |

**Box 3:** Any additional comments on effectiveness

**4. Impact and Sustainability**

- 4.1. Do you feel that you and/or your community are actively part of what is going on? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 4.2. Do you feel this is a top down process? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 4.3. Do you feel it is a bottom up process? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 4.4. Do you feel that the CMA establishment process is a programme approach or is process driven? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 4.5. Do you feel that the process has been consultant driven to meet deadlines rather than to meet the needs of the people? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 4.6. Do you consider that this process will lead to improved access to water in your community [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 4.7. Do you consider the process will lead to improved economic well-being in your community [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 4.8. Do you consider that the process will lead to achieving improved life for you and/or your communities ? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 4.9. Do you think your communities original vision set out at the beginning of the process will be achieved? [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
- 4.10. Have any of the traditional cultural norms and practices been incorporated into plans and documents [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

**Box 4:** Any additional information concerning Impact and Sustainability