



---

## **Namibia**

### **Mid-Term Evaluation**

**Thematic window: Culture and Development**

**Programme Title: Sustainable Cultural Tourism in Namibia**

**Author:** Roger Maconick, Consultant

## Prologue

The current mid-term evaluation report is part of the efforts being implemented by the Millennium Development Goal Secretariat (MDG-F), as part of its monitoring and evaluation strategy, to promote learning and to improve the quality of the 128 joint programs in 8 development thematic windows according to the basic evaluation criteria inherent to evaluation; relevance, efficiency , effectiveness and sustainability.

The aforementioned mid-term evaluations have been carried out amidst the backdrop of an institutional context that is both rich and varied, and where several UN organizations, working hand in hand with governmental agencies and civil society, cooperate in an attempt to achieve priority development objectives at the local, regional, and national levels. Thus the mid-term evaluations have been conducted in line with the principles outlined in the Evaluation network of the Development Assistant Committee (DAC) - as well as those of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). In this respect, the evaluation process included a reference group comprising the main stakeholders involved in the joint programme, who were active participants in decisions making during all stages of the evaluation; design, implementation, dissemination and improvement phase.

The analysis contained in the mid-term evaluation focuses on the joint program at its mid-term point of implementation- approximately 18 months after it was launched. Bearing in mind the limited time period for implementation of the programs (3 years at most), the mid-term evaluations have been devised to serve as short-term evaluation exercises. This has limited the scope and depth of the evaluation in comparison to a more standard evaluation exercise that would take much longer time and resources to be conducted. Yet it is clearly focusing on the utility and use of the evaluation as a learning tool to improve the joint programs and widely disseminating lessons learnt.

This exercise is both a first opportunity to constitute an independent 'snapshot' of progress made and the challenges posed by initiatives of this nature as regards the 3 objectives being pursued by the MDG-F; the change in living conditions for the various populations vis-à-vis the Millennium Development Goals, the improved quality in terms of assistance provided in line with the terms and conditions outlined by the Declaration of Paris as well as progress made regarding the reform of the United Nations system following the "Delivering as One" initiative.

As a direct result of such mid-term evaluation processes, plans aimed at improving each joint program have been drafted and as such, the recommendations contained in the report have now become specific initiatives, seeking to improve upon implementation of all joint programs evaluated, which are closely monitored by the MDG-F Secretariat.

Conscious of the individual and collective efforts deployed to successfully perform this mid-term evaluation, we would like to thank all partners involved and to dedicate this current document to all those who have contributed to the drafting of the same and who have helped it become a reality (members of the reference group, the teams comprising the governmental agencies, the joint program team, consultants, beneficiaries, local authorities, the team from the Secretariat as well as a wide range of institutions and individuals from the public and private sectors). Once again, our heartfelt thanks.

The analysis and recommendations of this evaluation report do not necessarily reflect the views of the MDG-F Secretariat.

Submitted to MDGF Secretariat - New York

Report on Mid-Term Evaluation of the

MDG-F

Culture and Development programme

Submitted by Roger Maconick

7 November 2010

30 Waterside Plaza, New York,NY,10010, USA *E-mail:* [rm73@nyu.edu](mailto:rm73@nyu.edu)

## ACRONYMS

AAN	Arts Association of Namibia
DBS	Database System
DNA	Digitised Namibian Archives
HABITAT	United Nations Human Settlements Programme,
ICH	Intangible Cultural Heritage
ILO	International Labour Organisation
JP	Joint Programme
MAN	Museums Association of Namibia
MBSEC	Ministry of Basic Education and Culture
MDG-F	Millennium Development Goals Achievement - Fund
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
MICT	Ministry of Information Communications and Technology
ME	Ministry of Education
MYNSSC	Ministry of Youth, National Service, Sports and Culture
NAC	National Arts Council
NAGN	National Arts Gallery of Namibia
NAN	National Archives of Namibia
NASCAM	Namibian Society of Composers and Authors of Music
NBC	Namibian Broadcasting Corporation
NDP	National Development Policy
NHC	National Heritage Council
NLN	National Library of Namibia
NMC	National Monuments Council
NMN	National Museum of Namibia
NTN	National Theatre of Namibia
SPARC	SWAPO Archives
SWAPO	South West African People's Organization
TCH	Tangible Cultural Heritage
UCCB	University Central Consultancy Bureau
UNAM	University of Namibia
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNEP	United Nations Coordinator office
V2030	Vision 2030

## **Table of contents**

Summary of major findings and recommendations	4.
Introduction: Background and Purpose of the evaluation	5.
Concept	8.
Ownership in the design	13.
Ownership in the process	15.
Results level .	17.
Sustainability	20.
Some Conclusions and Recommendations	23.
Annex 1 Terms of Reference	27.
Annex 2 Mission SCHEDULE	38.
Annex 3 Basic Findings presented to Reference group & Round up meeting	43.
Annex 4 Consolidated comments and suggestions to the draft final report with Evaluators reaction to comments in Column 3.	45.
Annex 5 Bibliography	52.
Annex 6 PMU response to <a href="#"><u>Evaluation Questions 29 Sept</u></a>	54.
Annex 7 Report on Annual Review and Planning Meeting (Otjiwarango workshop)	65.

<u>MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>SUGGESTED ACTORS</u>
1. The issue of culture and development poses a potentially important challenge to smooth sustainable development in Namibia. It is not yet clear that the programme is addressing the issue in the best way possible and that the UN system is bringing its best thinking and experience to bear. So there is an urgent need by all stakeholders to <b>clarify what this programme is about.</b>	PMU/NPC/MYNSSC/MET/ME/MRLGHRD/MTI/MME UNESCO/UNRCO/ILO/HABITAT/UNEP
2. This would include rapidly modifying/simplifying the programme document, as the MDG-F Secretariat suggested from the outset; reducing outcomes/outputs to manageable and attainable levels, extending the time frame for up to one year for those essential elements retained. Also making clear <b>what management is supposed to manage for</b> , defining both reasonable expectations of all stakeholders and simple means, both for managers and eventual evaluators, of observing performance, where measurement is either impossible or not cost effective.	PMU/NPC/MYNSSC/ MET/ME/MRLGHRD/MTI/MME UNESCO/UNRCO/ILO/HABITAT/UNEP
3. This was all suggested at the National Planning Commission end of mission round-up, without significant objection by any of the various stakeholders and, if it cannot be completed within a reasonable period of time it is difficult to foresee how the programme can achieve its outcomes.	MDG-F SECRETARIAT/UNRCO/NPC
4. If the NPC, UNCT and the MDG-F secretariat are concerned to set in motion a self sustaining process of development of cultural tourism, it may be appropriate to consider an alternative to the current practice of outright grants to communities. The Joint Programme could advance the resources needed to communities to start viable pilot projects, but once they are successful require the cost to be reimbursed into a central fund. Resources thus freed up could be used to help to sustain this programme or some worthy successor well beyond the three years initially foreseen without prolonged recourse to external donor resources.	PMU/NPC/UNESCO/UNRCO/ILO/HABITAT/UNEP
5. The concept of "lead UN agency" needs to be better clarified and/or better operationalised, both for the ' <u>leader</u> ' (UNESCO) and for the ' <u>followers</u> '(ILO, Habitat,UNEP). This includes being clear about the respective intellectual contributions the different agencies are making to defining the problem, the consequent solutions they propose and the knowledge and wisdom they bring to bear and guidance they offer on implementation of mutually agreed solutions. That would also require a visibly proactive effort to work together in a way that advances a common Namibian agenda rather than that of the agency concerned.	MDG-F SECRETARIAT/PMU/NPC/UNESCO/UNRCO/ILO/HABITAT/UNEP
6. As the 'problematique' is one where actionable issues and substantive solutions are not completely clear, all concerned are to be applauded for courage in addressing an important and difficult question. But as the programme is exploratory, it needs to be monitored in a way that reflects that nature, recording results as they emerge and helps all concerned to learn from them.	PMU/NPC/UNESCO/UNRCO/ILO/HABITAT/UNEP
7. There are other external actors in Culture and Development in Namibia. Greater involvement with those partners can leverage the programme's policy effect. If future monitoring and evaluation in the sector can include all of them, seeing evaluations as an opportunity rather than a curse, there may be gains in synergy and a saving of time for government and national institutions	NPC/UNRCO/FRG/MCA/GOF
8. Monitoring, analysing data and using the resulting analysis is time consuming and involves an opportunity cost. The right balance between effort and product has yet to be found but should be. That may prompt some reflection by all concerned on whether the current monitoring and work planning procedures are optimal and whether there may be some scope to rationalise them, shifting the focus away from an effort to assure perfect and transparent accountability and in the direction of how to get to outcomes desired. In the context of results based management, <b>to the rational recipient, opaque performance may be superior to transparent non performance.</b>	MDG-F SECRETARIAT/UNESCO/UNRCO
9. These are all areas in which the RCO may wish to maintain its vigilance and to convey the results of their vigilance to the MDG-F secretariat. The MDG-F secretariat may wish to consider whether any other of its development programmes show similar signs and if that warrants any action on their part.	MDG-F SECRETARIAT/UNRCO

## **Introduction**

*Tse-Lu said: "The Prince of Wei is ready to hand over the reins of government to you. What is the first task that you will undertake, Master?" The Master said: "Unquestionably, the clarification of concepts." Tse-Lu said: "How impractical you are. Why care for the clarification of concepts?" The Master said: "How crude you are, Tse Lu"..." If concepts are not clear, words do not fit. If words do not fit, the day's work cannot be accomplished. If the day's work cannot be accomplished, morals and art do not flourish. If morals and art do not flourish, punishments are not just. If punishments are not just, the people do not know where to put hand or foot."* Confucius, Analects 13 3.

*"Slowly, slowly the egg will walk" (Ethiopian proverb)*

### **I. Background and Purpose of the evaluation**

The objective of this mid-term evaluation is to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of programme activities in relation to the stated objectives so far and to generate knowledge including the identification of best practices and lessons learned. Its specific objectives are to:

1. Discover the programme's design quality and internal coherence (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, the National Development Strategies and the Millennium Development Goals, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
2. Understand how the joint programme operates and assess the efficiency of its management model in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks.
3. Identify the programme's degree of effectiveness among its participants, its contribution to the objectives laid out in Namibia's concept note on the thematic window on Culture and Development, and the Millennium Development Goals at the local and/or country level.

It seeks to offer conclusions and recommendations to improve the direction and implementation of the programme during the rest of its period of implementation.

### **Scope of the Evaluation**

The unit of analysis is the joint Culture and Development programme i.e. the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that are detailed in the joint programme document. The evaluation is to assess the planned, ongoing, or completed joint programme interventions to determine their relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

The evaluation addresses the questions identified in the TOR at the outset of this mid-term evaluation. A particular emphasis has been put on the current programme results and the possibility of achieving all the objectives in the given timeframe, taking into consideration the rate at which the programme is proceeding and the programme monitoring framework that was developed at the design stage, including the review of the set of indicators to monitor the programme progress.

More specifically, the evaluation assesses four levels of the programme: Concept and Design level, Management/Process level, Results level, Country level

Evaluation Users This evaluation was initiated by the MDG-F Secretariat. The audiences for this evaluation are the Programme Management Committee of the UNCT, the National Steering Committee, the concerned UN agencies and the concerned departments in the Governments of Namibia, Spain and the Secretariat of the Fund. The evaluation findings are intended to provide these managers with some evidence concerning the progress of the programme and – based on the degree of programme achievement to date, some conclusions and recommendations for the remaining implementation period of the programme. It will also provide the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

Stakeholders An important aspect of the joint programme is the number and diversity of local groups/public and private institutions involved. There is broad group of players on both the UN side and the Namibian side. A sample of these partners and end-user beneficiaries was interviewed during the mission in Namibia; including members of the programme management committee and national steering committee.

2. Evaluation Approach and Methodology The methods used sought to promote a shared understanding of culture and development and its ramifications for the economy and society. Evidence was gathered from different types of stakeholders and different levels of management. The basic methodological approach was laid out from the outset in the Inception report. Evaluation of such culture and development programmes as this one is not straightforward in that they contain many qualitative aspects, which are not susceptible to easy measurement. As the Joint Programme (JP) document itself notes in the Summary of Results Framework “ Due to the nature of the projects proposed in this window for culture and development the required baseline data that could serve as indicators for the JP are not available since there is no research so far carried out so far.”<sup>1</sup>

As this evaluation is a mid term exercise<sup>2</sup>, it seeks to make some provisional judgements on progress towards outputs and outcomes and suggestions, hopefully helpful ones, to facilitate further progress.

Initially there were some signals of concern from programme management that the exercise was intended to be an audit or an investigation and some effort had to be devoted to allaying these concerns. To this end the evaluator sought to stress that evaluations, particularly formative ones have learning and management as objectives as much as accountability concerns and sought to promote active involvement of all stakeholders in all aspects and stages of the process. This effort was only partially successful.

Preliminary hypotheses were circulated to stakeholders for their comment. At the end of mission round up meeting all stakeholders were presented with a brief summary (circulated the day before to key actors) of findings and recommendations in a format that invited them to fill in gaps in the evaluators knowledge and understanding. (See Annex 3). This was based on the principle that if those who are responsible for actual follow up of an evaluation have a role in suggesting its recommendations, said recommendations are more likely to be both achievable and accomplished.

A number of comments on the Draft Report were received in the consolidated format mandated by the MDG-F. This useful framework offers the various parties to comment and for the evaluator to respond to their observation. This matrix including the contributions of all agencies concerned and the reactions of the evaluator is attached as Annex 4

---

<sup>1</sup> Joint Programme Document, page 23

<sup>2</sup> The Terms of Reference (TOR) are located in Annex 1

A point on which the national authorities and the UNCT might wish to reflect, may be the attitude to evaluations in general. The initial reaction to this mission was that it was analogous to an audit or a hostile investigation. So a defensive mindset was in evidence and as noted the mission had to take some pains to convey that evaluations can/should be useful tools for all stakeholders. It also endeavoured to involve stakeholders as much as possible in the deliberation of the mission and in the process of deriving findings and offering recommendations.

Also at time being a scarce resource, it can be saved if national authorities, supported perhaps by the UNCT, urge donors in specific substantive areas to pool their requirements for evaluation into one shared exercise. This was mooted with the other actors in the culture and development sector and appeared to be accepted. If as part of this process national organisations such as the University and any other independent think tanks can be enlisted in the evaluation process, there is an automatic 'evaluation capacity building by doing' effect.

Whatever the concerns and some initial delays in the supply of information regarding achievement against the outcomes in the Programme Monitoring Framework, the international evaluator worked in a highly cooperative manner with national officials notably members of the PMU, MNYSSC, NPSC as well as relevant staff of UN agencies present in Windhoek from 13 September - 02 October 2010.

The majority of the research was done in Windhoek, but the team also travelled to a number of proposed pilot sites principally in the north of the country. The knowledge and expertise of the PMU<sup>3</sup> provided to the exercise a great deal of very useful background on the social, cultural and political context for the task.

The evaluator applied several techniques in carrying out the research, including key informant interviews, focus group discussions, site observation and review of documents. The key informant interview technique was the primary mode used in questioning informants. This includes both government officials, members of civil society and representatives of Namibia's international partners including the UN agencies involved. Interviews were guided by questions derived from the TOR, applied flexibly depending on the relationship of the interviewee to the programme.

The evaluator also carried out a review of extensive documentation, including Government reports, UN and other donor reports, and UN and UNESCO office files among others (See Bibliography).

Consideration was given to trying to elaborating and suggesting some suggested measures of the capacity to be created but it was decided that the data and observations were not yet available. Necessarily this makes the evaluation's findings and recommendations subjective and supports the view that caution should be exercised by Government and the UNCT in interpreting them. It does also reinforce the thought that both Government and the UNCT should come up with some clear and observable indicators of what is expected in future in the way of developing culture and development capacity in future.

The report follows the Outline provided and the Terms of Reference. The latter were 'generic' and the addition to the TOR of specific suggestions from the stakeholders might have enabled a more useful exploration of some of the issues. Mandatory evaluations such as this one do offer opportunities for all concerned to raise issues related to the topic of the evaluation, in effect killing two birds with one stone and it is possible this exercise could have been further exploited in this way. Perhaps the final evaluation might be used for such ends, for example as a foundation for a look at the whole sector.

## **II. Concept**

### **Design level:**

---

<sup>3</sup> The consistently excellent administrative support provided by the PSU, notably Ms Nampa Asino, should be recognised  
7

## **1. Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people,/ the needs of the country, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies of associates and donors.**

This is an interesting and challenging initiative. It is addressing albeit in an exploratory way a key development issue for Namibia . There is an unequal distribution of income and opportunity and the What the programme is really trying to achieve could be clearer and the logic of how activities and expected outputs could lead to the outcomes foreseen in the Joint Programme, could be much clearer.

The underlying reality indicates considerable potential for tourism and even for an expansion of welfare among the poor via 'cultural tourism'. As noted in a recent IBRD<sup>4</sup> study on the MET, Namibia's tourism sector contributes one of the world's largest relative percentages to GDP, similar to other countries like South Africa, Tanzania, and Kenya. Much of this impact is from tourism related to wild life and the natural landscape of Namibia and cultural tourism has not received a great deal of attention in the past. Now there is a hope that it will be possible to apply the Community Based management approach, which has been successful in the management of Natural Resources, to Namibia cultural heritage.

This a plausible starting point for an eventual implementation approach dealing with an issue of culture and development . However beyond that the programme's logic as presented in the joint programme is a little fuzzy, which maybe a result of stretching the stated objectives to link to MDGs 1, 3 & 7 but perhaps also because of the exploratory and possible innovative nature of the initiative,when in fact the problematic is more subtle and perhaps more important to the society.

More formally in one part of the programme document( the front page) there are 3 outcomes,with associated targets and indicators, (See Box 1) while in the Programme Monitoring Framework there are four outcomes, with associated targets and indicators (See Box 2) and the first three outcomes common to both are similar but not identical. It would be appropriate to eliminate the potential for confusion these differences might promote. This could be done by eliminating the fourth outcome, which appears to have been added almost as an afterthought. This issue was pointed out to the stakeholders during the evaluation but none of them appeared to have strong views on the subject. One possible interpretation of that is that Programme Monitoring Framework is not much used in programme management.

### **Box 1.**

---

<sup>4</sup> “1. The Namibian economy is primarily driven by the use of the country's natural resources. The economy's core natural resource based sectors are mining (especially diamonds), fishing, agriculture, manufacturing (meat, fish, and other food processing), and tourism. Sustainable management of natural resources directly and positively affects the national and local economy as well as the local, national, and global environment. The nature-based tourism sector of Namibia is a strong example of that linkage: the tourism receipts contributed 7.8 percent to Namibia's Growth Domestic Product (GDP) 2003 and shows the sector plays an important role in national development. Namibia's tourism sector contributes one of the world's largest relative percentages to GDP, similar to other countries like South Africa, Tanzania, and Kenya. Key contributors to the sector are tourism expenditures attributable to protected areas (for example, in the form of park fees, accommodation and trips) that, conservatively estimated, account for about N\$ 1–2 billion, or 3.1–6.3 percent of GDP 2004. Other contributions come from the direct use of wildlife through trade, hunting, and wildlife consumption.

2. **The sector contributes to job generation and improved livelihoods in rural areas.** The bulk of jobs generated in this sector originates from services(accommodations, restaurants, and tour safari operations) and accounted for 6.2 percent of total Namibian employment in 2004. Given that the majority of tourism establishments are in rural areas, the sector has an impact on rural employment and rural poverty. It is estimated that around 21 percent of trophy hunting income accrues to the Government and some 40 percent to low-income earners and communal land communities”. Executive Summary, World Bank, Report No.:42472 Implementing the Agenda of the Namibian Ministry of Environment and Tourism. Christophe Crépin and Kirk Hamilton 2008

**The UNDAF Outcome (2) to which the programme is linked is that : 'By 2010, livelihoods and food security among most vulnerable groups are improved in highly affected locations'. The Joint Programme Outcome(s) are given as**

1. KNOWLEDGE BASE

Within the framework of national strategic plans, national knowledge base developed on linkages between customary/traditional practices, tangible and intangible cultural/natural heritage and livelihoods

2. Livelihoods are mainstreamed into sustainable gender sensitive cultural} natural heritage legislation, policies and programmes with capacity and awareness enhanced on sustainable cultural/natural heritage and livelihoods and related international cultural legal instruments

3. Pilot Programmes using knowledge base and streamlined enhanced policies and legislations.

**Box 2**

JP Outcome 1 Knowledge and capacity base enhanced, heritage identified and safeguarded

JP Outcome 2 Livelihoods are mainstreamed into sustainable cultural policies and standards are made compatible with expected cultural tourism

JP Outcome 3 In pilot sites social development is integrated in cultural policies to reduce poverty among poor communities improve their livelihoods and further empower women

Outcome 4 Programme coordination and M&E

It would also simplify programme implementation and encourage operational focus if resources and managements principal attention were devoted in first instance to achieving Outcomes 1 and 3. and if the number of outputs is reduced to those the professionals consider absolutely essential and a consequent reduction/simplification of the indicator.

**2. Is the identification of the problems, inequalities and gaps, with their respective causes, clear in the joint programme?**

Not entirely, and that has consequences for management and the achievement of short term targets. Many development programmes address issues that are not clear and only become less murky, more clearly defined and capable of being addressed by coherent planned activities via a process of shared identification of the important dimensions of the issue by UN stakeholders ( in this case ) and the national actors concerned. The most desirable solutions become clearer by an equally shared process. This programme, notwithstanding its complications and diversity of foci and management lacunae, does have 'virtuous' exploratory aspects and dimensions, and these should not be lost sight of in any rush to "reform" and refocus the programme document.

There could and should be a much clearer identification of what the programme should be doing, whether it is cultural heritage, income generation for HIV/AIDs sufferers, unusually poor people especially in female headed households, who nevertheless are custodians of traditional culture and actors in intangible heritage or what? The UNCT under the leadership of the RC and the lead agency UNESCO may wish to engage the national authorities and organisations concerned in short order to sort out the situation.

This evaluation via its interactions with the stakeholders has already endeavoured to instigate such a process see Annex 3

**3. Does the Joint Programme take into account the particularities and specific interests of women, minorities and ethnic groups in the areas of intervention?**

Apparently yes in the sense that it is targeted at those groups, though how well it is succeeding in achieving those targets is as yet an open question.

**4. To what extent has the intervention strategy been adapted to the areas of intervention in which it is being implemented? What actions does the programme envisage, to respond to obstacles that may arise from the political and socio-cultural background?**

The essence of the current Joint Programme appears to be how to help to promote the “traditional culture” so it contributes to the country's development and to the reduction of poverty because tourism is the 4<sup>th</sup> sector in the economy and little of its benefit goes to the poor. By its very nature the intervention has to be exploratory and possibly iterative, since the models to be followed and the methods to be used in such an intervention are not yet well known.<sup>5</sup> It is exploratory in the first instance because of an emerging national perception that there is a need for an inventory of what Namibian culture is. This a very plausible goal for a country emerging from a period where the dominant culture was not that of most of the people of the country.

These caveats aside there is a less than desirable indeterminacy in the document as to what the programme is about and how that is linked to the outputs, activities and inputs foreseen. All stakeholders may wish to review the programme preparation process in particular the quality control mechanisms used by the UNCT when the programme was prepared and approved in order to avoid such situations being repeated

**5. Are the follow-up indicators relevant and do they meet the quality needed to measure the outputs and outcomes of the joint programme?**

There are no follow up indicators. Culture programmes by their nature are rarely measurable but may be/should be observable, especially by qualified observers. So the question should be can the outputs and outcomes and progress towards their achievement be observed and can these processes be monitored over time. There is therefore scope for judgements to be made by wise and informed observers. There is considerable scope for UNESCO as lead agency, but in concert with the other three UN agencies involved, to lead on this in terms of elaborating observable (measurable as and where possible) indicators based on their respective and collective experience of what it is reasonable to expect for each of the programme's outcomes. Through such a process it may be possible to clarify a central issue for the programme and its managers what is it reasonable to achieve with the resources available and for what should programme management be managing.

---

<sup>5</sup> Current M&E rules for MDG-F may not fully take account of this.

There is another reason why this is a priority activity. It is a programme, which is exploring issues of potentially great importance for the UNESCO and is trying to come up with innovative solutions to a relatively new problematique, yet it is being run without monitoring by UNESCO to show how the programme is/was evolving in the light of experience, and to inform senior management and peer programmes elsewhere in the UNESCO portfolio about consequent developments.

Furthermore some research on capacity building done within UNDP some years ago has suggested that organisations with extraverted information systems, ones which give ready access to the data, results and the processes of producing them tend to be more client oriented, therefore more responsive to their environments and so more sustainable.

In this instance the involvement of the Spanish Fund and its interest in lesson learning and the promotion of UN system coherence makes it all the more pressing to monitor very openly the experience of such programmes and to report on successes, issues encountered, solutions proposed and applied as they occur.

There is a secondary problem, one of M&E capacity in the PMU. Attached as Annex 6 is the statement of achievement against the performance framework. It was a product of interaction with the programme team and represents an abject failure by the evaluator, who has not been able to convey to those preparing the report that statements stating “xx” has been strengthened (a process which could continue to eternity) without saying what can now be done as a result of said strengthening does not give a meaningful indication of progress towards an output or outcome.

Thus statements such “**Two thirds of professionals can explain how to document tangible and cultural heritages**” or “**Four (4) of the eight (8) recommendations of the preliminary assessment have been incorporated into town planning frameworks**” are adequate as statements of progress against established targets/ indicator as they can be verified.

Statements such as “**Individuals have increased knowledge on the identification of heritage sites which have a potential to be inscribed in the National Heritage Register**”; or “**Communities have increased participation in the identification process of heritage sites to be inscribed in the National Heritage Register**.” are not, as they cannot be verified and would not mean much if they could, unless one knows the significance of the “increase”

This is an area where the whole UNCT (and the NPC) may wish to contribute.

#### **6. To what extent has the MDG-F Secretariat contributed to raising the quality of the design of the joint programmes?**

There was not much conclusive evidence one way or other on this in the files and as there has been extensive turnover in the office it is difficult to ascertain the degree of informal interaction. As already indicated the joint programme document contains too many suboptimal elements to be satisfactory.

During the appraisal/approval process the MDG-F Secretariat did make some eminently sensible suggestions on the programme document not least to focus on fewer targets and to reduce the number of indicators. **They remain relevant and very pertinent to this day and the report recommends they should be acted on.**

Quite why the UNCT did not take on board their suggestions is not clear. Equally why the MDG-F Secretariat did not insist that their suggestions be fully implemented is not clear. It may be because there were some ongoing issues between national authorities and the UNCT with a number of the transactions over government concerns over the overheads to be charged on the programme, which reduced available resources from \$6 to \$5.3 million.

The only discernible substantive support came from UNESCO. They now have a staff member, with competence in culture and development (and sub regional responsibilities) in post. They also sent a staff member from UNESCO HQ during the formulation process, who made ostensibly good suggestions to improve the document but they do not seem to have been pursued. There may have been suggestions from

the other specialised agencies concerned intended to raise the quality of the design of the joint programme, but if there were, there is no evidence of them in the files.

### **Ownership in the design: Effective exercise of leadership by the country's social agents in development interventions**

#### **7. To what extent do the intervention objectives and strategies of the Joint Programme respond to national and regional plans?**

To the extent they are clear they appear consistent with the current plan and Vision 2030

#### **8. To what extent have the country's national and local authorities and social stakeholders been taken into consideration, participated, or have become involved, at the design stage of the development intervention?**

National/local authorities/ social stakeholders have been taken into consideration, have participated, and have become involved, to varying degrees in the design stage of the development intervention. This is more true of the national authorities than the local ones, many of whom are still being apprised/are less than fully aware of the essence of the programme. The success of this latter interaction varies from locality to locality and from outcome to outcome as this is a complex programme with many diverse elements, some of which are only emerging via an experimental and exploratory approach. Perhaps more seriously there were apparently some sub optimalities in the early communications between the RC's office and the national co-ordinating authorities. The latter (in the National Planning Commission) expressed concerns that the RCO had been in direct touch with technical ministries and about the share of programme management and M&E costs in the total allocated. The complicated nature of the Joint Programme is not the only difficulty which has hindered smooth formulation and implementation but it is likely to have contributed to it.

From the comments by the national authorities about the way the government was informed at the outside and the process of programme formulation it appears that the process has been fraught with misunderstandings and mistrust. The laudable diversity of institutions and actors in government and in civil society, who have been involved in the joint programme may be a complicating factor. As already noted, well on in the process, UNESCO sent a staff member from headquarters to contribute to the thinking and elaboration of a satisfactory document, though much of his contribution does not appear to have made much difference to the final version of the document. These early transactional difficulties appear to have been ironed out and a new RC has been in post for about one year. However these sub optimalities may have made it difficult for the two sides to take sufficient heed of feedback received recommending simplification of planned activities so as to make them more manageable and more easy to monitor.

### **Process level**

#### **Efficiency: Extent to which resources/ inputs (funds, time, etc.) have been turned into results**

#### **9. To what extent does the joint programme's management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) contribute to obtaining the predicted products and results?**

There have been complaints by the national authorities many of them which appear to be well justified about the time it has taken/is taking to carry out straightforward procurement and recruitment. They have been echoed within the UN system. One counter to that argument is that transparency demands a certain rigour and that rigour requires in turn careful adherence to financial and administrative procedures. This may be so and the pressure from auditors and other oversight offices is a significant factor in development

managers allocation of their time and resources, but it is also important to consider the outcome and the cost of achieving such rigour<sup>6</sup>.

In view of the above, the joint programme's management model viability is unclear at this stage but as it has many of the characteristics of a 'parallel project implementation unit', it is open to question and worthy of ongoing scrutiny on long run sustainability grounds.<sup>7</sup>

It appears that the programme manager has left the programme for an other post within the UN system in Namibia immediately after the evaluation<sup>8</sup>. This will provide an opportunity for all concerned to consider issues of programme purpose, how to focus on the most essential purposes retained and how to sustain any positive process set in motion once the programme ends.

#### **10. To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other, with the government and with civil society? Is there a methodology underpinning the work and internal communications that contributes to the joint implementation?**

Participating agencies do appear to be trying to co-ordinate with each other in an administrative sense. However the ruling administrative approach appears to be that every agency is very happy to follow any administrative procedure as long as it is theirs.

Three of the agencies are "HACT"<sup>9</sup> agencies. The lead agency is not. So notwithstanding the dedicated efforts of hard working local actors in the UN offices concerned, the different procedures appear to have contributed to the delays in implementation.

The extent to which that degree of bureaucratic convolution converts into a synergy whereby the best wisdom, experience and intellectual know how of the international system is made available to Namibia to deal with a significant aspect of nation building is another question and one worthy of the UNCT's reflection and action preferably in the near future .

At present it appears there is a lot of ground to catch up. For example (albeit a minor, and indirect but nevertheless symptomatic one) in this mid term evaluation exercise there were lacunae in involvement of the agencies.

Four agencies are involved in the programme with UNESCO in the lead. There is a UNESCO representative, who is also an expert in evaluation, who left in the middle of the first week. The UNESCO staff member responsible for cultural heritage and who was a tower of strength while there, had to leave for Botswana and Paris at the end of the first week.

Of the others, ILO, Habitat and UNEP, only HABITAT has anyone located permanently in the country, the other two agencies send staff as and when perceived need dictates their presence. ILO has supplied some substantive products including a draft tourism sector feasibility study and a number of site specific assessments, just in time for the evaluation. HABITAT also provided useful substantive material. UNEP

---

<sup>6</sup> See a recent article by the former Administrator of USAID. **The Clash of the Counter-bureaucracy and Development**, Andrew Natsios, July 2010. [www.cgdev.org/content/publications/detail/1424271](http://www.cgdev.org/content/publications/detail/1424271)

<sup>7</sup> a) Donors agree to use country systems as the first option for aid programmes in support of activities managed by the public sector. b) Should donors choose to use another option and rely on aid delivery mechanisms outside country systems (including parallel project implementation units), they will transparently state the rationale for this and will review their positions at regular intervals. Where use of country systems is not feasible, donors will establish additional safeguards and measures in ways that strengthen rather than undermine country systems and procedures. **Accra Agenda for Action para 15 b**

<sup>8</sup> This had apparently been contemplated for some time before the evaluation, but was not communicated to the evaluator (or to the lead agency) until after his departure.

<sup>9</sup> Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers

has been less productive so far<sup>10</sup>. However notwithstanding their variable individual substantive contributions regarding the state of advancement and professional achievements in the diverse set of programme activities, there was no sign of any synergy in the process or indeed much sharing of information.

This may be a problem of UNESCO's leadership, or HABITAT/ILO/UNEP's followership or both. There may be some scope for greater interventionism by the RCO supported by the MDG-F Secretariat. However there were some tentative indications that all specialised agencies may not be fully open to this in Namibia but this topic could perhaps be raised at the next UNDAF review or other convenient occasion.

**11. Are there efficient coordination mechanisms to avoid overloading the counterparts, participating population/ actors?**

There are several questions here. Are the mechanisms efficient and effective; also do they overload participants. Co-ordination should also perhaps be divided into the responsibilities within the UN system and the larger task of co-ordinating other actors. As for much else it is too early to tell on most of these dimensions. It does appear that there was some scope, if the NPC so desires, for greater information exchange and perhaps co-ordination of other external partners in the area of culture and development.<sup>11</sup>

**12. Is the pace of implementing the products of the programme ensuring the completeness of the results of the joint programme? How do the different components of the joint programme interrelate?**

The different components of the joint programme are disparate and not easy to link one to another. This may be affecting the pace of implementation, which is uniformly behind schedule, but it is difficult to separate out each and every source of implementation delay. In broad terms they appear to be both.

**13. Are work methodologies, financial instruments, etc. shared among agencies, institutions and Joint Programmes?**

Whatever their respective work methodologies and approaches to financial management there does not appear to be much in the way of effective sharing and self propelled harmonisation by the agencies concerned. This appears to be something of an obstacle to efficient implementation. Three of the agencies practice HACT, while the lead agency UNESCO does not. Perhaps they should, at least for DAO countries.

---

<sup>10</sup> UNEP have objected to this observation on the grounds that they have produced a significant number of reports including environmental impact studies. They have indeed produced and delivered them. They have also apparently not grasped that this comment refers to the question in the TOR 'To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other, with the government and with civil society? Is there a methodology underpinning the work and internal communications that contributes to the joint implementation?' So the issue, which a complex one worthy of serious thought, is coordination and its outcomes as well as joint implementation, not report production.

It may be using a hammer to swat a gnat to note that the most recent Nobel lecture in economics argued that "*Designing institutions to force (or nudge) entirely self-interested individuals to achieve better outcomes has been the major goal posited by policy analysts for governments to accomplish for much of the past half century. Extensive empirical research leads me to argue that instead, a core goal of public policy should be to facilitate the development of institutions that bring out the best in humans. We need to ask how diverse polycentric institutions help or hinder the innovativeness, learning, adapting, trustworthiness, levels of cooperation of participants, and the achievement of more effective, equitable, and sustainable outcomes at multiple scales (Theo Toonen 2010). To explain the world of interactions and outcomes occurring at multiple levels, we also have to be willing to deal with complexity instead of rejecting it.*" Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems, Elinor Ostrom. AER American Economic Review 100 (June 2010): 641–672

<sup>11</sup> The NPC indicated that Finland, FRG and the US funded MCA were all active in the same area as the MDG-F initiative. All three were visited and indicated an openness to nationally led greater co-ordination of their efforts.

Another noteworthy issue is that despite the existence of a PMU, the national managers are unable to manage<sup>12</sup> because they do not have control of, and responsibility for, the financial resources. Thus the PMU were unable to say what expenditures have been for 2010 so far and indicated they would have had to refer to each agency headquarters to obtain data more recent than for end 2009. Perhaps pooling all resources in a single fund under the RCO and accessed on joint signature of the programme managers and the UN agency concerned might simplify matters.

**14. Have more efficient (sensitive) and appropriate measures been adopted to respond to the political and socio-cultural problems identified?**

Not as far as can be discerned at present, but as noted the programme is still very much at the exploratory stage, looking for appropriate algorithms so this question is perhaps a little premature .

**Ownership in the process: Effective exercise of leadership by the country's social agents in development interventions**

**15. To what extent have the target population and participants made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation have taken place?**

The categories of target population, participants and modes of participation all need to be disaggregated. Modes of participation are still being established and while it is too early to judge and there are no hard data there was in some instances a sense of patient dependency waiting for resources to be dispensed from the central authorities to the communities involved. Thus the beneficiaries in the target populations appeared be waiting patiently for promised benefits, without much sense of the intricacies of the processes involved.

This is not uncommon in societies emerging from a recent colonial heritage which had stressed an ultra hierarchical approach, but perhaps more could be done to include local organisations in the national decision making (and M&E) chain to promote understanding and transparency and above all ownership. Thus if local committees for each pilot site could become part of the monitoring and evaluation process it may perhaps not only increase a sense of ownership but also might make the transition recommended in this report from the grant arrangement currently being used to one where resources are advanced to communities but subsequently repaid to the centre more easily accepted.

The central organisations implementing different bits of the programme appear to be quite well informed, active and justifiably impatient over some aspects of programme implementation.

In one of pilot sites visited, it is foreseen that youth of the area would be involved in the management of the handicraft village which is projected to be built , but there was no sign of any young person in any of the mission's transactions in the area or indeed any sign of their involvement in the process.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> The PMU might be therefore better called the Programme Administration Unit.

<sup>13</sup> It may all depend on the definition of youth in Namibia. One of the project reports in its conclusion notes that "*The activity achieved the goal of training 'at least 20 professionals' in the documentation of tangible heritage. During the workshop and the subsequent museum visits a total of 27 people were trained. Of these 23 were 'professional' heritage workers, whilst the other 4 were student interns. Participants at the workshop consisted of 50% youth (9/18 defined as people under the age of 35) and 89% women (16/18, reflecting the predominance of women curators in our regional museums). If an analysis is made of the total group of people trained 74% (20/27) were women and 37% (10/27) youth. The training in year one did not provide training to representatives of the pilot projects as most of the pilot projects had not been clearly identified by the time that the training was due to take place, nor did any of the proposed pilot projects have collections of tangible heritage that needed to be documents. It is proposed that in Year Two training will be extended to those pilot projects that propose to start a collection of artifacts. The priority in Year One was therefore to provide the basis for the establishment of a uniform inventory of objects that might be of relevance to the pilot projects, since our museums generally contain objects collected from 15*

## **16. To what extent have public/private national resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme's objective and produce results and impacts?**

Counterparts have been mobilised for specific elements though there have been delays in bringing them into the programme team. It does appear that the creation of the PMU may have been motivated partly by a desire provide extra incentives for national staff beyond what they would receive in “normal” government posts. However understandable in terms of providing supposed incentives for productivity such a practice, if indeed it is occurring, would be inimical to sustainability.

Apart from commitments of the different national ministries involved, which do not appear to be very strong in the absence of incentives such as those enjoyed by those employed at the PMU it does not appear that other public/private national resources have been mobilized to contribute to the programme.

### **Results level**

#### **17. - Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved or are expected to be achieved, bearing in mind their relative importance.**

Delays in implementation obscure the situation so one cannot know if the statement of the problem is flawed or the solution(s) envisaged are suboptimal. The HIV component appears almost to have been tacked on as an after thought and not really part of the programme. The programme management and steering committees may wish to revisit this component in the light of the overall recommendations of this mission

#### **18. Is the programme making progress in helping to achieve the set results?**

The potential is clear, if the pathway is not. Namibia is a country emerging from a period of history where the rulers tended not to identify with the values of the ruled and vice versa. One of the outcomes/hangovers of that period is very significant differences of income, wealth and general socio-economic well being between those who are inheritors of the former rulers and those of the formerly ruled. Reducing those differences would seem to be a prerequisite for a stable state and for the reduction of poverty. Coming to terms with the past roles of different groups and knitting different economic and ethnic groupings into a cohesive national identity and modern state is a major challenge facing the society. This may well be a task whose dimensions are best identified and addressed by the society on its own. However if the involvement of the UN system is sought, UNESCO is a potentially valuable source of experience on the role of culture in development and in converting that knowledge into actionable programmes.

Whether that potential is being actualised in Namibia is as yet an unresolved question. The main causes of that indeterminacy appear to be a mix of uncertainty re the central thrust and purpose of this culture and development programme, the diversity of administrative procedures of the agencies and entities concerned. There has been room for greater collaboration on the part of the UN agencies currently involved. Whether this last feature is a problem of will is a question on which this exercise can not pronounce a view, as there was little opportunity to interact with the representatives concerned. The Resident Co-ordinator (RC) was ill at the outset of the mission and contact could only be established in the 3<sup>rd</sup> week of the mission. Two of the agencies concerned have no representation locally and the representative of the lead agency left half way through the first week<sup>14</sup>.

---

*several different regions of Namibia.” Report on Training in the Documentation of Tangible Heritage; Jan 2010. In many other contexts and countries being a youth ends at 18.*

<sup>14</sup> In fairness it should be noted that this mid term evaluation has been postponed more than once.

Given that the Spanish fund has had the courage to take on the issue of system coherence, this aspect of UNCT performance is an issue the final evaluation of the programme may need to consider and the MDG-F to monitor during the rest of the implementation period.

**19. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the Millennium Development Goals on a local level and in the country?**

The MDGs to which this programme is dedicated are according to the joint programme;- the reduction of poverty, gender mainstreaming, mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS issues and ensuring the sustainability of environmental/cultural assets. There is a perhaps slightly tortuous logic through which it is asserted that improving incomes of those active in the “culture” segment of the tourism industry service will reduce poverty. This is however reasonably plausible. Namibia's economy is principally involved with the extraction and processing of minerals. It is the fourth-largest exporter of non fuel minerals in Africa and taxes and royalties from mining account for 25% of its national revenue. However the mining sector employs only about 3% of the population while about half of the population depends on subsistence agriculture for its livelihood. The Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) country report on the development of sustainable tourism in Namibia<sup>15</sup> had indicated that there was a growing demand for tourism products and cultural aspects. There was an increase in the number of foreign tourists that visit the country (e.g. 321,773 in 2005 - 405,904 in 2006) and according to the same report, "Namibia is the fourth fastest growing tourism economy in the world." An increase in the demand for community-based tourism products was indicated by the corresponding increase in the number of tourists, who visited community-based projects, from 30,000 in 1999 to 90,000 in 2004.

The MCA report also records that “the tourism industry in Namibia is one of the significant employers in the country accounting for 18% of the work force, thus contributing 14.2 % of the GDP. While the increase in visitors brought affluence to selected places and operators, most of the population remained disadvantaged. Previously disadvantaged Namibians could not tap into the mainstream tourism since the industry "mirrored the pre independence apartheid regime where development of business was unavailable to the majority of Namibians"<sup>15</sup>.

So the aspiration to raise both employment and incomes in communities that are both “culture generating” and repositories of an under documented and as yet under recorded tradition, especially when it comes to intangible cultural heritage, is a reasonable one. It is too early to tell but so far any such contribution, while eagerly awaited by the communities concerned, is at best imperceptible.

The extent to which the programme is contributing to gender mainstreaming, mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS issues and ensuring the sustainability of environmental/cultural assets is much less clear. HIV/AIDS is certainly a major issue with more than 10% of the population living with the disease. However nothing significant appears to have been done on this score so far and given the concerns over the need for programme focus it may be best to pursue this important concern via other avenues. It is already being addressed by other UN supported programmes. Regarding gender please see the next response.

**20. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the objectives set by the thematic window on gender equality and the empowerment of women?**

---

<sup>15</sup>

MCA Namibia Report, p157.

The programme is managed by a Programme Management Unit that also manages a gender programme giving the potential for considerable synergy. See also recent gender programme evaluation for whether there is synergy.

**21. Is the schedule for the set products being met? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the products and results?**

The schedule is not being met and the major delaying factors appear to include procedural difficulties both on UN and national side. BUT perhaps the question should not be posed in terms of a schedule for set products but rather whether the processes that such a culture/development programme should set in motion are actually going forward? And to some extent that appears to be the case. There are the very first signs of local community awareness being raised, even if the stance is one of patiently waiting for largesse from the centre rather than active lobbying getting on with local pilot projects with their own resources which would perhaps reflect less of a 'dependency culture'.

There has been some progress towards creating an inventory of intangible cultural heritage. The achievement to date is as intangible as the subject matter, however there does appear to be an emerging awareness of the issue and that in and of itself is a positive process. Progress towards a web portal appears to be no further than the "thinking about it" stage.

**22. Do the products created live up to the necessary quality?**

As already noted it is too early to comment in depth on the processes the programme is helping to set in motion. There is promise to some of the processes. Indeed by requiring this 'mandatory' mid term evaluation at this stage when in terms of actual implementation it was a little "early", the MDG-F secretariat may have stimulated some of these processes, not least an awareness of the advantages of a sector wide approach and the possibilities inherent in involving all actors in the sub sector in the process as well as attention to, and concrete action on, the need to simplify the programme document including a functional M&E component and reducing, hopefully, the number of outputs and indicators to an information set that can be more easily collected, analysed and learned from than at present; thus converting M&E work from a dreaded curse or a meaningless ritual into a useful and cost effective tool serving all of the programmes stakeholders .

**23. Does the programme have follow-up mechanisms (to verify the quality of the products, punctuality of delivery, etc.) to measure progress in the achievement of the envisaged results?**

No, nor should it. It would be more appropriate for such questions to come under the remit of a national M&E system covering donor financed activities something the National Planning commission indicates is only nascent for externally financed technical co-operation. It should be recalled that the national authorities raised some serious concerns at the stage of programme formulation over the share of the available resources that had to be devoted to overhead costs and to M&E. It may be helpful to encourage the programme in carrying out its ( hopefully more focussed on outcomes and achievement indicators) M&E work in future to seek how best to meld that effort into any ongoing work by the national M&E system.

**24. Is the programme providing coverage of the participating population as planned in the joint programme document?**

It is making diligent efforts to do so. These efforts have been hampered by the administrative and process issues to which allusion has already been made. Also the need to allow different areas of the country to have access to the resources for pilot projects may be playing a part. However this question does provoke a query as to whether resources are being dispersed in to many activities that have insufficient critical

mass and if we follow that logic to questions of sustainability and impact it is easy to come to a more fundamental issue: whether it is the best approach to provide “coverage” to participating populations.

If the NPC and the MDG-F secretariat are concerned to set in motion a self sustaining process of cultural development with all the laudable outcomes foreseen, it may be appropriate to consider an alternative to outright grants to communities with worthwhile project ideas. They could advance communities resources needed to set in motion viable pilot projects, but require the cost to be reimbursed into a central fund which is then used to finance new income generating culture and development activities.

A case can be made for not giving money to communities for pilot projects just so as to avoid dependency relationships and to encourage local ownership and initiative. Resources thus freed up could be used to sustain this programme or some worthy successor well beyond the three years initially foreseen without prolonged recourse to external donor resources.

#### **25. What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of products and results?**

Many of the factors which are contributing to delay in the achievement of products and results have already been touched upon ? One other issue that may need some attention is the procedural requirements of the Fund and the time and effort that have to go into work planning, budget preparation and reporting, and the burden that linking disbursement to the degree of disbursement in time period t to delivery in period t-1 imposes. Rigour and precision are important but there is an opportunity cost to achieving such standards and a dynamic analysis of the benefits and costs involved may be in order for a fully results based approach to management of such programmes

The current procedures appear to be well designed and may work very well for those instances where the task is well defined and clear, where there is an accepted algorithm and where there are straightforward achievement and progress indicators as well and well grasped administrative and financial procedures being used by all stakeholders. That does not appear to be the case in this instance and some consideration might be given to see if any simplification would be possible if it led to an increased likelihood of achieving desired outcomes. In a lengthy recent article relevant to the future management of this programme, the former Administrator of USAID Andrew Natsios has noted

*“Essentially, accountability should not be confused with developmental effectiveness. A program can be highly accountable with no fraud or abuse, yet be a developmental failure; conversely, a program can suffer from a leakage of funds and poor record keeping and yet be highly innovative and successful developmentally”.<sup>16</sup>*

#### **26. In what way has the programme come up with innovative measures for problem-solving?**

As yet innovative measures for problem-solving have yet to make themselves visible but they may emerge as the programme advances

#### **27. What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples have been identified?**

It is too early to identify any as such.

#### **28. In what way has the joint programme contributed towards the issue of culture and development being included on the public agenda? To what extent has it helped to build up and/or bolster communication and cooperation among, civil society organizations and decision-makers?**

---

<sup>16</sup> op cit. See footnote 7.

A tentative impression is that the joint programme responds to a need to identify what is the national culture unsullied by the distortions of interactions with apartheid and colonialism and to have that help development and facilitate poverty reduction. Indeed even the long drawn out and somewhat troubled process of programme formulation may have helped this process in that a variety of entities, sometimes collaborating, sometimes in competition with each other, seem to have by their interactions begun to define the social and institutional terrain over which such a programme could operate. Some of the interaction has been over the access to external resources but some also about the proper role and balance in such a programme.

That being said, the extent to which it has helped to build up and/or bolster communication and cooperation among civil society organizations and decision-makers is a premature question at this stage, but the issue of culture and development as an evolving concept does appear somewhat tentatively to be on the public agenda.

**29. What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the joint programme in accordance with the sex, race, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent?**

It is far too early to tell.

**Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.**

**30. Are the necessary premises occurring to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the joint programme? At local and national level?**

It is too early to tell but there are some promising signs. There is a range of entities from government and civil society involved in the programme, its implementation and its governance so there is a great deal of potential for starting a series of durable processes which could further the very diverse desired outcomes of the programme even once they have been whittled down to a manageable set, as this evaluation suggests elsewhere.

It would be rash to make predictions about their durability at this stage. But the conceptual and managerial challenges the programme is facing may provoke a renewed attention to thinking through what are the durable processes that such an intervention should seek to promote and to keep in motion. These are questions that should in future be reviewed by the Programme Steering committee every three months.

**31. Is the programme supported by national and/or local institutions?**

It is, but the creation of a special Programme Management Unit, apart from regular government ministries in order to assure implementation of both the gender and the culture and development programmes, does creates some questions as to the long run sustainability of the institutional support for the programme<sup>17</sup>. This may or may not matter. The PMU has had manifold start up problems so it is too early to tell if it can obtain resources to survive beyond the three year framework of the culture programme. This also may or may not matter. Local initiatives in culture development may start up and take over, given the start/help/example that has been given by the programme. Proposals have been forthcoming for pilot sites from local communities, which implies a certain kind of capacity is being created.

Other outcomes in terms of identification, inventory and maintenance of different aspects of Namibia's cultural heritage may be advanced, thanks to initiatives by civil society organisations.

---

<sup>17</sup>

See earlier remarks under item 9

**32. Are these institutions showing technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme and to repeat it?**

Culture and development activities by their nature may be better carried on by self supporting forces within a society so it is by no means certain that a PMU would be a desirable long run source of technical capacity and leadership. Such elements could come from a variety of national NGOs and Ministries such as those concerned with Culture and Tourism. This is perhaps one of the topics on which a reformulated programme might instigate/contribute to a national debate

**33. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?**

It is too early to assess this.

**34. Do the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?**

It is too early to assess this.

**35. Is the duration of the programme sufficient to ensure a cycle that will project the sustainability of the interventions?**

All the signs are that the current duration will be at best sufficient to set some processes in motion. It is much too early to make judgements about the sustainability of the interventions? It would be useful if all concerned but most decidedly the Programme Steering Committee would spend a little time to consider what sustainability means in such a context and then to record the kind of observable indicators that future managers and evaluators might find useful in addressing the lasting effects of such an intervention. It would be timely to consider now how ongoing activities in the culture and development could be funded after the end of this initiative. The programme and the UN RC may wish to suggest to the National Planning Commission that they involve other external partners and civil society actors in a discussion of how best to achieve this.

**36. To what extent are the visions and actions of the partners consistent or divergent with regard to the joint programme?**

No inconsistencies apparent as yet. Interestingly there has been very little interaction with culture related programmes supported by other donors (Finland, FRG,MCA). This may be a lacuna and if under closer examination it proves to be, so the National Planning Commission might wish to consider the issue. As already indicated these external partners of Namibia in this area have indicated willingness to work for greater coherence. As to the visions and actions of the national partners they appear to be consistent with those of the joint programme.

**37. In what ways can the governance of the joint programme be improved so that it has greater likelihood of achieving future sustainability?**

This question can better be addressed if/once the rationalisation of the programmes objectives recommended by this exercise has taken place. At present there are too many disparate strands in this programme to make any sensible judgement on its governance and on likely sustainability

Some parties to it complain about the degrees of participation in the Programme management committee. And to a lesser extent in the Steering committee. This may reflect a lack of a feeling of ownership by those concerned.

**Country level**

**38. What lessons learned or good transferable practices to other programmes or countries have been observed during the evaluation analysis?**

There are certain truisms about operational activities that emerge even in a limited mid term evaluation exercise of any UN programme, which involves more than one agency . The first is that country teams will collaborate, provided the chemistry is right, to the extent possible but are limited from further collaboration by the failure to rationalise mandates at the headquarters level.

It is also a truism that the UN RC has more than one role and that there is an inherent conflict in this but this applies to all to the other members of the RC system. They are all members of a team and agency representatives. As such they are all subject to the calls of conflicting loyalties and pressures. The best way to address this is to recognise that each has rights and responsibilities. It is also apparent that these rights and responsibilities are not clear to many players and that they should be made explicit and they should be acted on. In this instance they have not been. There is no evidence that the agency headquarters have acted to ensure their colleagues at the country level can optimise their collaboration.

So in this case the first and most obvious lesson is not to embark on a bold and innovative initiative in culture and development without mechanisms to ensure the UN agency coherence necessary was assured at the outset and maintained throughout. The second lesson may be that constant monitoring from the outside shining the spotlight of public attention on the participating agencies is needed to assure the coherent, collegial behaviour and synergy necessary to increase the likelihood of success of such an exploratory exercise such as this one.

**39. To what extent and in what way is the joint programme contributing to progress towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals in the country?**

It is too early to tell but in a rather tenuous indirect way it would potentially be important by creating a precondition for MDG 1 Reduction of Poverty.

**40. To what extent and in what ways are the joint programmes contributing to progress towards United Nations reform? One UN?**

The existence of the programme with four agencies is in itself a positive indicator, so conceptually there was a willingness to take risks. However the evidence available from actual performance so far has been that synergy has been lacking and there are no signs as yet of the necessary changes in day to day agency practice needed to make the programme work.

Agencies have tended, where they have had them, to offer their presentations about work completed in the context of this programme as the advancement of their respective agency agendas, not as a contribution to a coherent programmatic whole, designed to advance a Namibian agenda. This may be partly due to the flaws in the details of the concept of the joint programme, but once upon a time a UNDP Administrator speaking to the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> committees of the UN General Assembly, said "as long as you fund us separately and evaluate us separately there will be competition and incoherence". The remark appears applicable in the Namibia case.

**41. How are the principles of aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, management for development results and mutual responsibility) being applied in the joint programmes?**

It is too early to tell but the preliminary indicators have yet to turn positive. Please see in particular the remarks concerning the PMU and the degree of national ownership of the approach to monitoring and work planning.

**42. To what extent is the joint programme helping to influence the country's public policy framework?**

Not yet but the potential is very considerable because culture and development is a topic which is likely to become more rather than less important.

### **III. Some Conclusions and Recommendations**

1. **Concept and surrounding reality** This programme appears based on a bold underlying concept, using the cultural heritage of a new nation as one instrument for reducing poverty and gradually addressing a suboptimal distribution of income and wealth, at the same time strengthening a sense of national identity. However the programme document, as currently approved, has too many competing goals, is overly complicated and unclear in terms of how to achieve them and there are too many outcomes and outputs, so it is very difficult to discern for what managers should be managing. This has dissipated management focus and retarded progress.
2. Coupled with that, the work and time involved in complying with the administrative requirements of the several UN specialised agencies associated with the exercise and the possibly rigorous but time consuming financial management and reporting procedures, have contributed to a situation where the programme is well behind schedule and there is some urgent work to be done by all stakeholders to put matters back on a path that will be more productive for Namibia and more worthy of the UN system.
3. It is clear that issues of culture and development may pose an important challenge to smooth sustainable development in Namibia. It is much less clear that the programme is yet addressing the issue in the best way possible and that the UN system are bringing the best thinking and experience on issues of culture and development to bear on the question. That would involve a much more proactive effort to work, exchange and learn together in a way that advances a common Namibian agenda rather than that of the agency concerned.
4. One underlying concept has been to apply a successful model of community based management of natural resources to the area of culture heritage. This is an interesting demarche and should be maintained, but the country context is of consequence and the files are innocent of a documented consideration of the historical and political background of the country in the formulation of the programme document. Yet this is an important element in UNESCO's flagship report on culture and development 'Our Creative Diversity' , which notes "Heritage has become a pawn in the process first identified by the British historian E. J. Hobsbawm as the "invention of tradition".<sup>18</sup>
5. The importance of such 'tradition' in creating models for both colonial and post colonial states is well documented<sup>19</sup> and Namibia has a particular historical experience, which will affect how the society moves forward. While not urging on the programme that it undertake a learned disquisition on such issues it is noteworthy that UNESCO, which has a standing and 'track record' in this important area does not appear to have drawn very visibly on its intellectual resources in formulating the programme.
6. Furthermore the problematique is one where the actionable issues and the substantive solutions are not yet clear. It was courageous and praiseworthy of all concerned to take on such a delicate set of issues. However the programme is exploratory both in terms of defining the problem and issues involved and in defining and trying out approaches to solutions, yet there has been no evident thought given to monitoring this experimental aspect and deriving indicators that help to show if the problems is becoming clearer and if the tentative solutions being tried out can be affirmed or not.

---

<sup>18</sup> Our Creative Diversity, p 195: Report of WCCD, UNESCO 1995

<sup>19</sup> The Invention of Tradition. Ed. E. Hobsbawm & T. Ranger, CUP 1983

7. The evaluation was advised that a national M&E system covering donor financed activities<sup>20</sup> is only nascent for externally financed technical co-operation. If this is indeed so it may be worth extending the remit of the national system to cover such activities as the culture and development programme.
8. It would be timely to consider now whether activities in the culture and development are of central importance and if so how ongoing or successor activities could best be supported organisationally and financially after the end of this initiative. The programme and the UN Country team may wish to suggest to the National Planning Commission that they involve other external partners and civil society actors in a discussion of how best to achieve this.
9. A case can be made for not giving money to communities for pilot projects just so as to avoid dependency relationships and to encourage local ownership and initiative. If the NPC and the MDG-F secretariat are concerned to set in motion a self sustaining process of cultural development with all the laudable outcomes foreseen, it may be appropriate to consider an alternative to outright grants to communities with worthwhile project ideas. The Joint Programme could advance to communities the resources needed to set in motion viable pilot projects, but require the cost to be reimbursed into a central fund once the projects are well established and profitable. Resources thus freed up could be used to sustain this programme or some worthy successor well beyond the three years initially foreseen without prolonged recourse to external donor resources.
10. The current work planning, monitoring procedures appear to be well designed and may work very well for those instances where the task is well defined and clear, where there is an accepted algorithm and where there are straightforward achievement and progress indicators and well grasped administrative and financial procedures are being used by all stakeholders. That does not appear to be the case in this instance and some consideration might be given to see if any simplification would be possible if it led to an increased likelihood of achieving desired outcomes.
11. The conceptual and managerial challenges the programme is facing may provoke renewed attention to thinking through what are the durable processes that such an intervention should seek to promote, how to observe such processes once they are in motion and how to keep them in motion. These are questions that should in future be reviewed by the Programme Steering committee every six months. This requires some thought both by the lead Agency and its partners and by the Namibian entities involved as what are the most important processes that such an initiative can start or strengthen.
12. Culture and development activities by their nature may be better carried on by self supporting forces within a society, so it is by no means certain that a PMU would be a desirable long run source of technical capacity and leadership. Such elements could come from a variety of national NGOs and Ministries such as those concerned with Culture and Tourism. This is perhaps one of the topics on which a reformulated programme might instigate/contribute to a national debate
13. The first and most obvious lesson of this programme is not to embark on a bold and innovative initiative in culture and development without mechanisms to ensure the UN agency coherence necessary was assured at the outset and maintained throughout. UNCT members are all members of a team and agency representatives. As such they are all subject to the calls of conflicting

---

<sup>20</sup>

The indication was that nationally financed activities were covered by such system

loyalties and pressures. The best way to address this is to recognise that each have rights and responsibilities. It is also apparent that these rights and responsibilities are not clear to many players and that they should be made explicit and they should be acted on. In this instance they have not been. In future agency headquarters concerned should act to ensure their colleagues at the country level can optimise their collaboration.

14. The second lesson may be that constant monitoring from the outside shining the spotlight of public attention on the participating agencies is needed to assure the coherent, collegial behaviour and synergy necessary to increase the likelihood of success of such an exploratory exercise such as this one. One mechanism to ensure such Agency coherence may be constant monitoring by the MDG-F Secretariat, keeping attention on the various participating agencies and involving interested individuals within government and the society as well as local representatives of member states. Also this issue could be one question to be addressed during the next evaluation of the UNDAF.

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF JOINT PROGRAMMES ON CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT**

### **General Context: The MDGF Culture and Development Window**

In December 2006, the UNDP and the Government of Spain signed a major partnership agreement for the amount of €528 million with the aim of contributing to progress on the MDGs and other development goals through the United Nations System. In addition, on 24 September 2008 Spain pledged €90 million towards the launch of a thematic window on Childhood and Nutrition. The MDGF supports countries in their progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and other development goals by funding innovative programmes that have an impact on the population and potential for duplication.

The MDGF operates through the UN teams in each country, promoting increased coherence and effectiveness in development interventions through collaboration among UN agencies. The Fund uses a joint programme mode of intervention and has currently approved 128 joint programmes in 50 countries. These reflect eight thematic windows that contribute in various ways towards progress on the MDGs.

The Culture and Development Window comprises 18 joint programmes that promote culture as a vehicle for social and economic development. The main interventions focus on supporting the development of public policies that promote social and cultural inclusion; and seeking to stimulate the creation of creative industries to expand people's opportunities.

The beneficiaries of the Joint Programs in the Culture and Development Window are diverse, ranging from national governments to local population. Virtually all joint programs involve supporting the government, at the national and/or local levels, civil society organizations, professional associations, communities, and individuals.

#### **The following points should be provided by the joint programme team**

- Describe the joint programme, programme name and goals; include when it started, what outputs and outcomes are sought, its contribution to the MDGs at the local and national levels, its duration and current stage of implementation.
- Summarize the joint programme's scale of complexity, including its components, targeted participants (direct and indirect), geographical scope (regions) and the socio-economic context in which it operates.
- It is also useful to describe the human and financial resources that the joint programme has at its disposal, the number of programme implementation partners (UN, national and local governments and other stakeholders in programme implementation).
- Changes noted in the programme since implementation began, and how the programme fits in with the priorities of the UNDAF and the National Development Strategies.

### **2. OVERALL GOAL OF THE EVALUATION**

One of the roles of the Secretariat is to monitor and evaluate the MDGF. This role is fulfilled in line with the instructions contained in the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Implementation Guide for Joint Programmes under the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund. These documents stipulate that all joint programmes lasting longer than two years will be subject to an mid-term evaluation.

Mid-term evaluations are highly formative in nature and seek **improved implementation of the programmes during their second phase of implementation. They also seek and generate knowledge, identifying best practices and lessons learned** that could be transferred to other programmes. As a result, the conclusions and recommendations generated by this evaluation will be addressed to its main users: the Programme Management Committee, the National Steering Committee and the Secretariat of the Fund.

### **3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC GOALS**

The mid-term evaluation will use an expedited process to carry out a systematic, fast-paced analysis of the design, process and results or results trends of the **joint programme**, based on the scope and criteria included in these terms of reference. This will enable conclusions and recommendations for the joint programme to be formed within a period of approximately three months.

**The unit of analysis or object of study for this interim evaluation is the joint programme**, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the joint programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation.

This mid-term evaluation has the following **specific objectives**:

6. To discover the programme's **design quality and internal coherence** (needs and problems it seeks to solve) and its external coherence with the UNDAF, the National Development Strategies and the **Millennium Development Goals**, and find out the degree of national ownership as defined by the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.
7. To understand how the joint programme **operates** and assess the **efficiency of its management model** in planning, coordinating, managing and executing resources allocated for its implementation, through an analysis of its procedures and institutional mechanisms. This analysis will seek to uncover the factors for success and limitations in inter-agency tasks within the **One UN** framework.
8. To identify the programme's **degree of effectiveness** among its participants, its contribution to the objectives of the **Environment and Climate Change thematic window**, and the Millennium Development Goals at the local and/or country level.

### **4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS, LEVELS AND CRITERIA**

**The main users of the evaluation represented in the evaluation reference group (Section 8 of the TOR), and specifically the coordination and implementation unit of the joint programme, are responsible for contributing to this section. Evaluation questions and criteria may be added or modified up to a reasonable limit, bearing in mind the viability and the limitations (resources, time, etc.) of a quick interim evaluation exercise.**

The evaluation questions define the information that must be generated as a result of the evaluation process. The questions are grouped according to the criteria to be used in assessing and answering them. These criteria are, in turn, grouped according to the three levels of the programme.

**Design level:**

- **Relevance:** The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the needs and interest of the people, the needs of the country, the Millennium Development Goals and the policies of associates and donors.

- a) Is the identification of the problems, inequalities and gaps, with their respective causes, clear in the joint programme?
- b) Does the Joint Programme take into account the particularities and specific interests of women, minorities and ethnic groups in the areas of intervention?
- c) To what extent has the intervention strategy been adapted to the areas of intervention in which it is being implemented? What actions does the programme envisage, to respond to obstacles that may arise from the political and socio-cultural background?
- d) Are the follow-up indicators relevant and do they meet the quality needed to measure the outputs and outcomes of the joint programme?
- e) To what extent has the MDG-F Secretariat contributed to raising the quality of the design of the joint programmes?

- **Ownership in the design: Effective exercise of leadership by the country's social agents in development interventions**

- To what extent do the intervention objectives and strategies of the Joint Programme respond to national and regional plans?
- To what extent have the country's national and local authorities and social stakeholders been taken into consideration, participated, or have become involved, at the design stage of the development intervention?

#### **Process level**

- **Efficiency: Extent to which resources/inputs (funds, time, etc.) have been turned into results**
- a) To what extent does the joint programme's management model (i.e. instruments; economic, human and technical resources; organizational structure; information flows; decision-making in management) contribute to obtaining the predicted products and results?
  - b) To what extent are the participating agencies coordinating with each other, with the government and with civil society? Is there a methodology underpinning the work and internal communications that contributes to the joint implementation?
  - c) Are there efficient coordination mechanisms to avoid overloading the counterparts, participating population/actors?
  - d) Is the pace of implementing the products of the programme ensuring the completeness of the results of the joint programme? How do the different components of the joint programme interrelate?
  - e) Are work methodologies, financial instruments, etc. shared among agencies, institutions and Joint Programmes?

f) Have more efficient (sensitive) and appropriate measures been adopted to respond to the political and socio-cultural problems identified?

**- Ownership in the process: Effective exercise of leadership by the country's social agents in development interventions**

g) To what extent have the target population and participants made the programme their own, taking an active role in it? What modes of participation have taken place?

h) To what extent have public/private national resources and/or counterparts been mobilized to contribute to the programme's objective and produce results and impacts?

## **Results level**

**- Effectiveness: Extent to which the objectives of the development intervention have been achieved or are expected to be achieved, bearing in mind their relative importance.**

- a) Is the programme making progress in helping to achieve the set results?
  - a. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the Millennium Development Goals on a local level and in the country?
  - b. To what extent and in what ways is the joint programme contributing to the objectives set by the thematic window on gender equality and the empowerment of women?
- b) Is the schedule for the set products being met? What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of the products and results?
- c) Do the products created live up to the necessary quality?
- d) Does the programme have follow-up mechanisms (to verify the quality of the products, punctuality of delivery, etc.) to measure progress in the achievement of the envisaged results?
- e) Is the programme providing coverage of the participating population as planned in the joint programme document?
- f) What factors are contributing to progress or delay in the achievement of products and results?
- g) In what way has the programme come up with innovative measures for problem-solving?
- h) What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples have been identified?
- i) In what way has the joint programme contributed towards the issue culture and development included on the public agenda? To what extent has it helped to build up and/or bolster communication and cooperation among, civil society organizations and decision-makers?
- j) What types of differentiated effects are resulting from the joint programme in accordance with the sex, race, ethnic group, rural or urban setting of the beneficiary population, and to what extent?

## **Sustainability: Probability of the benefits of the intervention continuing in the long term.**

- a) Are the necessary premises occurring to ensure the sustainability of the effects of the joint programme?

At local and national level:

- i. Is the programme supported by national and/or local institutions?
- ii. Are these institutions showing technical capacity and leadership commitment to keep working with the programme and to repeat it?
- iii. Have operating capacities been created and/or reinforced in national partners?
- iv. Do the partners have sufficient financial capacity to keep up the benefits produced by the programme?

- v. Is the duration of the programme sufficient to ensure a cycle that will project the sustainability of the interventions?
- b) To what extent are the visions and actions of the partners consistent or divergent with regard to the joint programme?
- c) In what ways can the governance of the joint programme be improved so that it has greater likelihood of achieving future sustainability?

### **Country level**

- d) What lessons learned or good transferable practices to other programmes or countries have been observed during the evaluation analysis?
- e) To what extent and in what way is the joint programme contributing to progress towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals in the country?
- f) To what extent and in what ways are the joint programmes contributing to progress towards United Nations reform? One UN
- g) How are the principles of aid effectiveness (ownership, alignment, management for development results and mutual responsibility) being applied in the joint programmes?
- h) To what extent is the joint programme helping to influence the country's public policy framework?

## **5. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH**

The mid-term evaluations will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR, the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, consultants are expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as annual reports, programme documents, internal review reports, programme files, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide evidence on which to form opinions. Consultants are also expected to use interviews as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the desk study report and the final evaluation report, and should contain, at a minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, field visits, questionnaires or participatory techniques.

## **6. EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables to the Secretariat of the MDGF:

 **Inception Report** (to be submitted within seven days of the submission of all programme documentation to the consultant)

This report will be 5 to 10 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The desk study report will propose an initial theory of change to the joint programme that will be used for comparative purposes during the evaluation and will serve as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the consultant and the evaluation managers.

 **Draft Final Report** (to be submitted within 10 days of completion of the field visit)

The draft final report will contain the same sections as the final report (described in the next paragraph) and will be 20 to 30 pages in length. This report will be shared among the evaluation reference group. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be shared with evaluation reference group to seek their comments and suggestions.

 **Final Evaluation Report** (to be submitted within seven days of receipt of the draft final report with comments)

The final report will be 20 to 30 pages in length. It will also contain an executive report of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the joint programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report will be sent to the evaluation reference group. This report will contain the following sections at a minimum:

1. Cover Page
2. Introduction
  - o Background, goal and methodological approach
  - o Purpose of the evaluation
  - o Methodology used in the evaluation
  - o Constraints and limitations on the study conducted
3. Description of interventions carried out
  - o - Initial concept
  - o - Detailed description of its development: description of the hypothesis of change in the programme.
4. Levels of Analysis: Evaluation criteria and questions
5. Conclusions and lessons learned (prioritized, structured and clear)
6. Recommendations
7. Annexes

## **7. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION**

The mid-term evaluation of the joint programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of the Joint Programme in connection with

the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.

- **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence.** The consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the Secretariat of the MDGF. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated by the Secretariat of the MDGF in these terms of reference.
- **Validation of information.** The consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.
- **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

## 8. ROLES OF ACTORS IN THE EVALUATION

The main actors in the interim evaluation process are the Secretariat of the MDGF, the management team of the joint programme and the Programme Management Committee that could be expanded to accommodate additional relevant stakeholders. This group of institutions and individuals will serve as the evaluation reference group. The role of the evaluation reference group will extend to all phases of the evaluation, including:

- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design.
- Identifying information needs, defining objectives and delimiting the scope of the evaluation.
- Providing input on the evaluation planning documents,( Work Plan and Communication, Dissemination and Improvement Plan).
- Providing input and participating in the drafting of the Terms of Reference.
- Facilitating the evaluation team's access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods.
- Monitoring the quality of the process and the documents and reports that are generated, so as to enrich these with their input and ensure that they address their interests and needs for information about the intervention.
- Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group.

The Secretariat of the MDGF shall promote and manage Joint Programme mid-term evaluation in its role as proponent of the evaluation, fulfilling the mandate to conduct and finance the joint programme evaluation. As manager of the evaluation, the Secretariat will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation process is conducted as stipulated, promoting and leading the evaluation design; coordinating

and monitoring progress and development in the evaluation study and the quality of the process. It shall also support the country in the main task of disseminating evaluation findings and recommendations.

## **9. TIMELINE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

### **1. Design phase (15 days total)**

1. Each of the Secretariat's portfolios managers shall send the generic TOR for the window in question to the specific country where the evaluation takes place. These are then to be adapted to the concrete situation of the joint programme in that country, using the lowest common denominator that is shared by all, for purposes of data aggregation and the provision of evidence for the rest of the MDGF levels of analysis (country, thematic window and MDGF).

This activity requires a dialogue between the Secretariat and the reference group of the evaluation (the body that comments on and reviews but does not interfere with the independent evaluation process). This dialogue should be aimed at rounding out and modifying some of the questions and dimensions of the study that the generic TOR do not cover, or which are inadequate or irrelevant to the joint programme.

2. The TOR will be sent to the MDG-F Secretariat consultant.

3. From this point on, each programme officer is responsible for managing the execution of the evaluation, with three main functions: to facilitate the work of the consultant, to serve as interlocutor between the parties (consultant, joint programme team in the country, etc.), and to review the deliverables that are produced.

### **2. Execution phase of the evaluation study (55-58 days total)**

#### **Desk study (15 days total)**

1. Briefing with the consultant (**1 day**). A checklist of activities and documents to review will be submitted, and the evaluation process will be explained. Discussion will take place over what the evaluation should entail.
2. Review of documents according to the standard list (see TOR annexes; programme document, financial, monitoring reports etc.).
3. Submission of the inception report including the findings from the document review specifying how the evaluation will be conducted. The inception report is sent and shared with the evaluation reference group for comments and suggestions (**within seven days of delivery of all programme documentation to the consultant**).
4. The focal person for the evaluation (joint programme coordinator, resident coordinator office, etc) and the consultant prepare and agenda to conduct the field visit of the evaluation. (Interview with programme participants, stakeholders, focus groups, etc) (**Within seven days of delivery of the desk study report**).

#### **Field visit (9-12 days)**

- The consultant will travel to the country to observe and contrast the preliminary conclusions reached through the study of the document revision. The planned agenda will be carried out. To accomplish this, the Secretariat's programme officer may need to facilitate the consultant's visit by means of phone calls and emails, making sure there is a focal person in the country who is his/her natural interlocutor by default.
- The consultant will be responsible for conducting a debriefing with the key actors he or she has interacted with.

### **Final Report (31 days total)**

- 1 The consultant will deliver a draft final report, which the Secretariat's programme officer shall be responsible for sharing with the evaluation reference group (**within 10 days of the completion of the field visit**).
- 2 The evaluation reference group may ask that data or facts that it believes are incorrect be changed, as long as it provides data or evidence that supports its request. The evaluator will have the final say over whether to accept or reject such changes. For the sake of evaluation quality, the Secretariat's programme officer can and should intervene so that erroneous data, and opinions based on erroneous data or not based on evidence, are changed (**within seven days of delivery of the draft final report**).

The evaluation reference group may also comment on the value judgements contained in the evaluation, but these may not affect the evaluator's freedom to express the conclusions and recommendations he or she deems appropriate, based on the evidence and criteria established.

- 3 The Secretariat's programme officer shall assess the quality of the evaluation reports presented using the criteria stipulated in the annex to this evaluation strategy (**within seven days of delivery of the draft final report**).
- 4 On the completion of input from the reference group, the evaluator shall decide which input to incorporate and which to omit. The Secretariat's programme officer shall review the final copy of the report, and this phase will conclude with the delivery of this report to the evaluation reference group in the country (**within seven days of delivery of the draft final report with comments**).

### **3. Phase of incorporating recommendations and improvement plan (within seven days of delivery of the final report):**

1. The Secretariat's programme officer, as representative of the Secretariat, shall engage in a dialogue with the joint programme managers to establish an improvement plan that includes recommendations from the evaluation.

2. The Secretariat's programme officer will hold a dialogue with the point person for the evaluation to develop a simple plan to disseminate and report the results to the various interested parties.

## 10. ANNEXES

### a) Document Review

**This section must be completed and specified by the other users of the evaluation but mainly by the management team of the joint programme and by the Programme Management Committee. A minimum of documents that must be reviewed before the field trip shall be established; in general terms the Secretariat estimates that these shall include, as a minimum:**

#### MDG-F Context

- MDGF Framework Document
- Summary of the M&E frameworks and common indicators
- General thematic indicators
- M&E strategy
- Communication and Advocacy Strategy
- MDG-F Joint Implementation Guidelines

#### Specific Joint Programme Documents

- Joint Programme Document: results framework and monitoring and evaluation framework
- Mission reports from the Secretariat
- Quarterly reports
- Mini-monitoring reports
- Biannual monitoring reports
- Annual reports
- Annual work plan
- Financial information (MDTF)

#### Other in-country documents or information

- Evaluations, assessments or internal reports conducted by the joint programme
- Relevant documents or reports on the Millennium Development Goals at the local and national levels
- Relevant documents or reports on the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action in the country
- Relevant documents or reports on One UN, Delivering as One

### c) File for the Joint Programme Improvement Plan

After the interim evaluation is complete, the phase of incorporating its recommendations shall begin. This file is to be used as the basis for establishing an improvement plan for the joint programme, which will bring together all the recommendations, actions to be carried out by programme management.

<b>Evaluation Recommendation No. 1</b>			
<b>Response from the Joint Programme Management</b>			
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up Comments
1.1			
1.2			
1.3			
<b>Evaluation Recommendation No. 2</b>			
<b>Response from the Joint Programme Management</b>			
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up Comments
2.1			
2.2			
2.3			
<b>Evaluation Recommendation No. 3</b>			
<b>Response from the Joint Programme Management</b>			
Key actions	Time frame	Person responsible	Follow-up Comments
3.1			
3.2			
3.3			

### b) Evaluation timeline

**Annex 2**

Time table **SCHEDULE** 13 September - 02 October 2010

Date	Time	Activity	Venue	Responsible Party
Mon, 13 Sep	09h00- 10h30	Meeting with Heads of participating Agencies	UN House	
	09h00- 10h00	Meeting with MYNSSC, Permanent Secretary, Dr. P.T. Shipoh	NDC Building, Goethe Street	Mrs. Ester Goagoses Ms. Freda Tawana Mr. Felix Amporo/Mr. Nandiuasora Mazeingo
	10h50- 11h45	Meeting with Reference Group	PMU	PMU
	12h00- 13h00	Meeting with National Planning Commission - (Director - Development Co- operation): Ms. Susan Lewis	NPC, Government Office Park	Ms. Mary Hangula Ms. Celia Stephanus Ms. Hilaria Ndadi
	14h15- 15h15	Meeting with Programme Management Unit (PMU)	PMU	PMU
Tues, 14 Sep	08h00- 09h00	Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Directorate of Tourism Development, Mr. Sam Shikongo (Director)/Ms. Olga Katjiuongua (Dep. Director)	MET Office, Capital Centre Levinson Arcade	Ms. Olga Katjiuongua
	09h30 10h30	Meeting with Spanish Ambassador	38 Bismarck Street	Ms. Elena Suero Ms. Celia Stephanus Ms. Hilaria Ndadi
	11h00- 13h00	Programme Management Committee	PMU, Boardroom	Mr. Felix Amporo/Mr. Nandiuasora Mazeingo Mr. Boyson Ngondo Mr. Erling Kavita

				Ms. Nampa Asino
--	--	--	--	-----------------

Date	Time	Activity	Venue	Responsible Party
Wed, 15 Sep	08h00  09h00  10h00  11h00  12h00	Meeting with some key local implementing partners/stakeholders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Museums Association of Namibia</li><li>• National Heritage Council</li><li>• National Theatre of Namibia</li><li>• National Art Gallery</li><li>• Ovaheroro Genocide Committee (OGC)</li><li>• National Museums of Namibia</li></ul>	•Museums Association of Namibia • National Heritage Council •National Theatre of Namibia •National Art Gallery • UNAM Block Y133	Mr. Felix Amporo/Mr. Nandiuasora Mazeingo Mr. Boyson Ngondo Mr. Erling Kavita Ms. Nampa Asino
	15h00- 16h30	Meeting with German Embassy  Visit Habitat Research & Development Centre (UN-Habitat) budget?	6 <sup>th</sup> floor Sanlam Centre 47 Cladius Kandovazu Street	Ms. Nampa Asino  Mr. George Kozonguizi Mr. Kamanja Tjatjuitua
Thurs, 16 Sep	08h00- 09h00  10h00- 16h00	Meeting with Millenium Challenge Account (MCA)  Day Visit to Duineveld (UNESCO, ILO, MET, MTI)	MCA Offices  Duineveld	Ms. Nampa Asino  Ms. Olga Katjiuongua Mr. Silas Newaka

#### FIELD VISIT SCHEDULE

17 September - 25 September 2010

Date	Time	Activity	± kms	Contact Person
Fri, 17 Sept		Depart Windhoek Overnight in Tsumeb	426	-
Sat, 18 Sept		Departure to Ondangwa via King Nehale Cultural Centre  Overnight in Ondangwa	247	Mr. Fabian Venasiu – 0813662919 Mr. Immanuel Shali - 0813136561
Sun, 19 Sept		Overnight in Ondangwa	-	-
Mon , 20 Sept	09h00  10h00  13h00  14h00	Depart Ondangwa en-route to Outapi and visit:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chief Iipumbu's Traditional Homestead</li> <li>• Omusati Cultural Trail/Elim</li> <li>• Uukwaludhi Traditional Homestead via Okahao</li> <li>• Omugulugoombash e Interpretation Centre</li> <li>• Lunch (Outapi)</li> </ul> Overnight in Outapi	210	Chief Iipumbu Herman Iipumbu – 0812686308 or Ms. Lydia Iipumbu – 0812801502  Ms. Novatha Iipinga 0812885858 Cultural Office Omusati  Ms. Hilda Itta – 0813012739 or  Ms. Elizabeth Kashikuka - 0814333502 at Uukwaludhi Traditional Homestead – 065- 25802  Mr. Edmund Iishuwa at Okahao Town Council 0812336684  Mr. Ellie Mulilo – Omugulugoombashe Interpretation Centre – 0812900455 or  Mr. Jonas Kahumba - 0812963847
Tue, 21 Sept		Visit Ombantu Boabab Tree and depart to Opuwo  Overnight in Opuwo	250	Mr. Gebhard Shiimbi at Ombantu Boabab Tree 0814384705 or telefax 065-251005
Wed, 22 Sept	08h30  09h00  10h30  11h30  12h00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural Dance by Ovahimba Group upon arrival</li> <li>• Pay courtesy visit to the Governor</li> <li>• Visit Opuwo Cultural Village</li> <li>• Cultural Dance by</li> </ul>	-	Ms. Sharon Katjiuongua - 0812581997

	13h00	<p>Ovazemba Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meet Opuwo Cultural Village Committee &amp; Line Ministries</li> <li>• Lunch</li> </ul> <p>Overnight in Opuwo</p>		
Thurs, 23 Sept		<p>Depart Opuwo and travel to Khorixas</p> <p>Overnight in Khorixas</p>	325	-
Fri, 24 Sept	09H00 09H45 10H30 13H00	<p>Visit Khorixas Cultural Centre and travel to Otjiwarongo</p> <p>Courtesy visit to the Mayor</p> <p>Meeting with the Site Committee (Constituency Office)</p> <p>Visit Proposed sites for the Construction of the Centre</p> <p>Light Lunch</p> <p>Overnight in Otjiwarongo</p>	212	Mr. Charlton Richter - 0816105692
Sat, 25 Sept		Departure to Windhoek	245	-

Note: Approximate total kms

**1915**

Date	Time		
Mon, 27 Sep	08h30 10h00 11h00-17h00	<p>Meeting with Finnish Embassy</p> <p>Report writing - Consultant</p>	Finnish Embassy

Tues, 28 Sep	10h00-11h00  14h00- 16h00	Meeting with UCCB/UNAM Mr. Akiser Pomuti 081 35164 19 / 206 3341  Meeting with the participating UN agencies:	Industrial area in Prosperita, Gold Street No. 3.  PMU - Boardroom
	14h00	Draft report to RG for review	
Wed, 29 Sep	08h00- 17h00	Draft report to RG for review Continue	
Thurs, 30 Sep	08h00- 09h30  15h00-17h00	Meeting with Mr. Jabulani Ncube – Joint Programme Coordinator  Meet with RG to present draft report and key findings  Share with relevant stakeholders	PMU  PMU
Fri, 01 Oct	09h00-13h00	Presentation of Preliminary findings, Debriefing meeting	NPC

### Annex 3

#### **Basic Findings presented to Reference group & Round up meeting 30.9/1.10**

Basic Finding	Some implications /unanswered issues/possible Follow up	GAPS:Knowledge/ Analysis/Findings / Recs /TO DO/ BY WHOM
<p>1. Clarify what this programme is about and so what management is supposed to manage for.</p> <p>Recognise and honour its innovative and exploratory nature.</p> <p>2a. Modify/simplify ( s.t. govt concurrence ) programme document recognising present plans can not be realised, seeking to extend time frame for up to 1 year for those most essential elements (outcomes outputs) retained.</p> <p>2b Need to answer            ?1. Is it essential to deliver all initial outcomes/outputs;            ?2. Is it feasible to do so given systems, capacity and expertise currently available</p> <p>3. Strengthen information exchange and collaboration in definition of problem/solution/implementation on national side.</p> <p>4. Strengthen information exchange and collaboration in definition of problem/solution/implementation on part of UN agencies involved.</p>	<p>1. Is this programme about cultural tourism, poverty reduction or preservation and validation of a living evolving cultural heritage?</p> <p>How do you involve all elements in society?            How do you honour programme's innovative and exploratory nature.</p> <p>2a Suggest you need a fully participatory process involving all concerned. To consider key question both substantive and managerial with a deadline of 1 month for <b>all parties</b> to agree, produce revised document and obtain approval</p> <p>2b. If no what are absolute priorities?            NB ? most efficient way to carry out programme may not be best way to strengthen national capacity in this area</p> <p>3. Role of PMU. What comes after ? how to use process as CB by doing involving lead Ministries/ decentralised communities.            ?? Trade offs involved between prog achievement and sustainability of those achievements .</p> <p>How can PMU or any national managers be accountable for delivery of inputs activities when do have real time responsibility for funds? Could a single pool of funds under NPC or RCO operate more efficiently.</p> <p>4. UN Specialised agencies may wish i. to stress relevance their set of expertise and wisdom to tasks chosen and avoid presenting elements they 'execute' as separate 'lines' in support of an agency agenda rather than integrated contrib. of substantive nature to complex national programme.</p>	

	<p>ii. find a way <b>immediately</b> for their differences in procedure not to be an obstacle.</p> <p>5. Involve partners in sector and leverage programme's policy effect via active information exchange and joint evaluations.</p> <p>6. See evaluations as an opportunity rather than a curse. Involve national institutions (e.g. U Nam) more in process.</p>	
--	--	--

## Annex 4

### MATRIX TO CONSOLIDATE COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS TO THE DRAFT FINAL REPORT with Evaluators reaction to comments in Column 3.

In order to ease the process of sharing information and ensuring a smooth compilation of the different perspectives of the evaluation reference group. We kindly ask you to use this matrix to group your comments and suggestions to the evaluation report. When referring to the text in the report be specific on the paragraph

Topics to comment and suggestions	This column shall be used by the members of the evaluation reference group	This column is for the use of the evaluator
1. Indicate the information you consider is incomplete in the report  In case there is any incomplete information, please complete.	<p>The Consultant in many areas was using the term "national culture" throughout the report. This terminology has a completely different meaning and does not relate to the objective of this project. The correct term is "cultural heritage"</p> <p>The evaluation report appears to be presented in isolation. The report would benefit from information on lessons learned elsewhere which would allow the programme team to benchmark from such experiences.</p> <p>The evaluator failed to include a section on the methodology used, which makes it difficult to identify the criterion followed in this exercise. This in turn makes it difficult to assess the extent to which the evaluator engaged with the information/materials base generated through the JP (a great volume of reports were sent to the evaluator before his arrival and the remaining ones were delivered upon the return of the evaluation team from the field visits). Describing the methodology used during the evaluation would enable the team to trace information sources and verify the validity of information contained in the report.</p> <p>As per the evaluation Terms of Reference, the evaluator was expected to produce an</p>	<p>The objective of the programme is indeed somewhat unclear; something the report tries to point out. And the issue of whether it is about inventory/preservation of cultural heritage or promotion of a national culture certainly is worthy of deeper consideration than it has received.</p> <p>However the comment is a little confusing as the words 'national culture' appear only once in the draft report in section 28 on page 13 in the context of "<i>what way has the joint programme contributed towards the issue of culture and development being included on the public agenda?</i>".</p> <p>The words "cultural heritage" appear 6 times in the body of the draft report in the context of the purpose and the implementation of the programme.</p> <p>The desire for comparative lessons is laudable and can perhaps be satisfied with UNESCO's help. It certainly should be maintained as a feature of management concern going forward. A couple of lessons learned are in the section on recommendations but experience with this programme is too short to offer much more than cautionary lessons on how to start up and implement such a programme.</p> <p>See current text Section II.</p> <p>The criteria followed in this exercise are those laid out in the joint programme document and the terms of reference.</p> <p>A great deal of material was indeed produced under the aegis of the programme and provided to the evaluator. What was far less evident was whether all this material had been already viewed critically, digested and used by programme management and/or by the partner agencies in their management responsibilities with a view to its relevance as to achievement against established outcomes, targets and indicators against which they were supposed to manage. This evidence of possible overload supplies part of the motivation/justification for the suggestion to simplify the number of outcomes, targets and indicators in a simplification of the programme.</p> <p>The inception report was provided to the MDG-F Secretariat with cc to UNRCO on 14 September. In the ensuing dialogue with the former the difficulty of seeing exactly what was the point of the programme</p>

	<p>inception report, which among other things, would act as a guide to the evaluation process given the issues it might have covered. We are therefore, uncertain as to the impact of the unavailability of the inception report on the overall expectations of stakeholders regarding process and content as well as the basis of the findings.</p> <p>Given the evaluator's self-confirmed limitations of experience with culture programmes, the question arises as to whether he felt he had enough time to evaluate a complex programme of this nature single handedly. Lastly, it is difficult to understand the evaluation parameters when they are not stated explicitly.</p>	<p>and the difficulty of discerning the theory of change underlying it was noted. Also touched on was the issue, of the M&amp;E approach, its detailed focus on monitoring and delivering according to AWPs linked to the release of funds and the eventuality that that may not necessarily be optimal for programmes with capacity building elements (perhaps especially culture programmes).</p> <p>This was a mid term evaluation not a technical review. For evaluation parameters please see remarks above on methodology</p>
<b>2. Point out any discrepancies with the information and/or assessments included in the report</b> <b>Señalar puntos de discrepancia sobre la información contenida en el</b> In case there are any discrepancies you should provide relevant evidence to support your point.	<p><b>Paragraph 10:</b> The Consultant appears not to be focusing on the question at hand of "inter-agency collaboration" but focusing on whether the collaborating agencies supplied information to him.</p> <p>Further, even though the inter agency collaboration is not at its best, there is evidence of inter agency collaboration in some areas. These areas can be used as a good model for enhancing the said poor collaboration. Examples of inter agency collaboration in programme relates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• preliminary environmental impact assessments for all the nine sites,</li> <li>• Territorial Diagnosis and Institutional Mapping,</li> <li>• Supply and Demand Analysis,</li> <li>• And pilot sites proposals.</li> </ul>	<p>It is correct that there was initially under performance by some agencies in providing reporting on progress against planned outputs and outcomes and such material is a normal prerequisite for an evaluation. That was/is an issue because it appears that some agencies did not/still do not yet fully comprehend what is involved in such a report. Essentially the problem is that recording/reporting effort and input, however well intentioned is not adequate; reporting on observable/ verifiable progress towards production of outputs and achievement of outcomes is.</p> <p>But the issue here is another one. This programme is supposed to involve substantive and administrative collaboration by 4 UN agencies. There is no recorded indication of any significant collaboration by any agency in defining/exploring the problem, coming up with solutions or in finding innovative ways of implementing them. There has been some collaborative work in implementation between UNESCO and ILO and UNESCO and HABITAT. The role and contribution of other agencies in this aspect of the programme is much harder to discern.</p> <p>The environmental impact assessments, Supply and Demand Analysis/TDIMs were provided, (delivery of the latter both by ILO coincided with the evaluation). They are, if of good quality, potentially useful milestones along the way to attaining the outcomes. Whether they are sufficient conditions for doing so is a question the agencies concerned may wish to have a collective and collegial view on going forward. The suggestion for a forum is an excellent one and perhaps a "wiki" could be created for culture and development programmes supported by MDG-F</p>

	<p>Each of these milestone interventions (implemented jointly with all stakeholders and partners) contributes to the successful implementation of the JP especially at the Pilot Sites level. In response to key findings of the evaluation, the reference group responded to the finding (4, annex 2- inter-agency collaboration) by suggesting a forum to afford UN agencies participating in the Culture JP space to think innovatively about approaches to inter-agency collaboration and synergy making.</p> <p>The Consultant also did not utilise the reports available. A list of year 1 activity reports had been produced and could have helped the evaluation in getting more detailed information on programme interventions, including the efforts of the participating UN agencies and the Namibian government. This information is available at PMU.</p> <p><b>Please delete the reference that UNEP was not productive from the final report.</b></p>	See remarks on methodology
<b>3. Comments and suggestions on the methodology used</b>  Please reflect and contribute with your comments and suggestions to the improvement of the evaluation process (evaluation focus, collection of data, analysis methods, etc). Please bear in mind the limitations and constraints on time and resources	The evaluation process can be improved by the use of more information technology such as telephone and Skype. This is more so for non resident agencies.	This is a constructive point and the UN RCO and the MDG-F Secretariat may wish to take this on board both for future M& E work as well as to give an opportunity to the non resident agencies to contribute to future meetings of the programme steering committee.

when contributing your comments		
---------------------------------	--	--

Topics to comment and suggestions	This column shall be used by the members of the evaluation reference group	This column is for the use of the evaluator
4. Comments and suggestions on findings and conclusions  Please asses if the findings and conclusions of the evaluation report are sustained by credible evidence and if they are consistent with the data collected and the methodology used during the evaluation process	<p>Suggestions on findings are acceptable, See Annex 1 for detailed comments.</p> <p>The evaluation report makes certain comments on critical issues (i.e. question 15 last paragraph – youth involvement). It would be useful to give more specific information (i.e. in this case the name of the pilot site in question). This would help the programme team to follow up on the recommendations of the evaluation.</p> <p>It is not clear what is meant by the phrase "... <i>in the absence of incentives from the PMU...</i>", (Question 16 last paragraph). Please clarify what this is referring to.</p>	<p>See minor comments interleaved into Annex 1 in Bold &amp; italics</p> <p>Opuwo. This point was made when there in discussions with the PMU team and the local officials .</p> <p>It appears that staff of the PMU are in receipt of different incentives than regular staff of the Ministries. If this is not accurate in any way then the remarks should be corrected.</p>
5. Asses the utility of the recommendations and contribute with suggestions and comments to its improvement.  As an example , you may consider the recommendations are too broad and you might need a set of more specific ones	See Annex 1 for detailed comments.	

that can apply to the joint programme in the short term		
6. Other comments and suggestions that you consider	<p>For ease of reference, it will be helpful that the pages in the report are clearly numbered. Without being prescriptive, MDG-F Culture Namibia would also benefit from a simply structured report covering details shown in Annex 2. ( A list of 'Achievements' and 'Challenges' would be very useful)</p> <p>(in response to question 16 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph – establishment of PMU):</p> <p>Given the multiplicity of partners involved in the programme, both at national, regional as well as at Pilot Sites level, the rationale behind the creation of the PMU has remained being to oversee coordination of the diverse partners and to enable them to work together and deliver jointly.</p> <p>The decision to establish a joint PMU in Namibia (for both thematic windows, i.e. Gender Equality; Culture and Development) was not a unilateral decision by donors, but it was established by the Namibian government and endorsed by the National Steering Committee.</p> <p>PMU is thus housed within a government institution – Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare which is the lead ministry in the Gender programme. The Unit is further supported by the government through the provision of equipment and other operational costs. Furthermore, there are clear expectations from government with regards to the role of PMU. Amongst its key responsibilities, PMU is expected by government to advance national interests and priorities through the JPs.</p> <p>The concept of the MDG-F PMU in no way suggests a permanent structure, (Acrra Agenda for Action) in respect of such programmes, but rather stems from a need to create required capacity for achieving the set objectives over a period of time.</p> <p>The recommendation for an extension is</p>	<p>Pages in final draft are numbered. Structure of report follows that ordained by the MDG-F and the TOR</p>

<p>acceptable. A request will be submitted in line with the guidelines established by the secretariat. The main reasons include the following:</p> <p><b>Phase one of the implementation is significantly behind schedule. Secondly, there has been a delay in the recruitment process of the staff of the PMU; protracted initial consultations and consensus building. Finally the JP needs an opportunity to implement lessons learned and recommendations of the evaluation.</b></p> <p>The recommendation pertaining to possible pooling of funds is noted and is receiving attention at the highest level in the country. However, it is recognized that this is a technical and a complex issue which needs careful consideration.</p> <p>Secondly, it will be helpful for the Namibian joint programme if we were made aware of other viable examples (models, formulas, approaches) of pooling of funding as may exist in other joint programmes.</p> <p>We recommend that the mid-term evaluation report follows a standard/prescribed format. This will help guide the presentation of the evaluation findings and recommendations. As presently submitted, the draft report is rather too casual and makes it difficult to follow and understand what it is that the evaluator is specifically recommending.</p>	<p>Concur</p> <p>Good!</p> <p>MDG-F and UNRCO may wish to explore with UN DOCO</p> <p>Format of report follows that ordained by the MDG-F and the TOR. The draft circulated on 11 October was certainly intended to be incomplete in both form and content ( though following the prescribed outline and the TOR) so as to promote as much involvement by and contributions from those who will have to interpret its findings and implement its recommendations.</p>
--	---

We thank you for the interest showed and highly value your participation during this evaluation process.

## Annex 1

	<b>WHAT HAS TO BE DONE (As given on the first page of the draft report)</b>	<b>COMMENTS BY REFERENCE GROUP</b>
1	<b>Clarify what this programme is about and for what management is supposed to manage, defining reasonable expectations of all stakeholders and means, both for managers and eventual evaluators, of observing performance, where measurement is either impossible or not cost effective.</b>	<b>Agreed:</b> The programme logic should be clarified, showing its linkage and relevance for progress towards MDG-1, MDG-3 and to some extent MDG-7; and also that the programme was NEVER meant to sort out or address questions of 'national identity of a new nation'. <i>See Background and Rationale of the Concept Note</i>
2	<b>Modify/simplify programme document rapidly reducing outcomes and outputs to manageable and attainable levels and extending time frame for up to one year for those essential elements retained.</b>	<b>Agreed to the extent that # 2 is essentially contained in # 1.</b> UNCT Namibia however, could have benefited from some concrete examples, for instance: a listing of outputs and outcomes accompanied by some ASSESSMENTS as to their relevance, desirability and why they may or may not be achieved. <b><i>That has been done to a modest extent but it would have been facilitated had there been any documented appreciation by any of the parties of where the programme was vis a vis the Programme Monitoring Framework.</i></b>
3	<b>Strengthen information exchange and collaboration in definition of problem/solution /implementation on national side.</b>	<b>Too generic!</b> Evidence is not presented or analysed in the report. The report does not reflect an evidence-based evaluation. What is the lead agency supposed to do with this recommendation, given the extensive consultation that went into the formulation of the project, plus the equally elaborate management structure? The 'information exchange' that characterized the project is more than enough. MDG- F Cultural Tourism could have benefited from concrete proposals as to how management could be improved (structure and processes), etc. <i>See above</i>
4	<b>Strengthen information exchange and collaboration in definition of problem/solution /implementation on part of UN agencies</b>	See above comments

	<b>involved.</b>	
5	<b>See evaluations as an opportunity rather than a curse. Involve national institutions</b>	<p>Generic! What was and is the case with MDG-F Culture?</p> <p><i>1. The prevailing attitude among PMU staff initially was defensive . Reference was made to 'crucifixion' at the first meeting with the programme management committee.</i></p> <p><i>2. Admitting this is a delicate point because some of its departments are involved in implementation perhaps more effort could have been made to involve organisations in civil society such as the University. Involving such entities can amount to 'evaluation capacity strengthening by doing'.</i></p>

**Overall Comments:**

Not a very useful draft. Weak on evidence!

There is a scarcity of specific MDG-F Culture Namibia contents in the report. Overall, the report would benefit from a structured analysis of the concrete issues as suggested for # 2 above, as this will help the partners in Namibia to take concrete actions going forward.

## Annex 2

### Sample structure of an evaluation report

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

Executive Summary

Introduction

- Objective of the evaluation
- Methodology applied
- Limitations of the evaluation

Description of the development intervention

- The need
- The purpose
- Components
- Detailed description of the Theory of Change of the programme

Level of analysis: Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions

Findings, remarks and lessons learnt ( A list of 'Achievements' and 'Challenges' would be very useful)

- Design
- Implementation
- Results

Conclusions

Recommendations

Annexes (detailed graphs, tables of data, bibliography, list of discussants, etc.)

## Annex V BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Mid-Term Evaluation Briefing Package (1<sup>st</sup> Package):
    - Summary of M&E frameworks and Common Indicators
    - Advocacy & Communication Strategy
    - Advocacy Action Plan Guidance Note General
    - Joint Implementation Guidelines Final
    - M&E Strategy Publish
    - MDGF Framework Document
    - Culture and Development - Indicators Final
  - Culture and Development - TOR Final (English)
  - MDGF Feedback Message
    - 2009 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester – Color Coded
    - 2009 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester – Monitoring Report
    - 2009 Q1 – Progress Report Update
    - 2009 Q2 - AWP – Color Coded
    - 2009 Q2- Mini Monitoring Report
    - 2009 Q2 Progress Report Update
    - 2010 Q1 AWP – Color Coded
    - Signed JP Programme : Part I & Part II
    - Transmit Memo
  - Draft Minutes of the National Steering Committee – Meeting, 26 February 2010
  - Annual Work Plan – Year 2
  - Colour Coded Work Plan 201
    - Annexure 1
- Namibia - Culture - 2010 1st Semester - Monitoring Report.doc  
Narrative Report on Annual Review and Planning Meeting.pdf

Ozombu Zovindimba Feasibility Study Final Report

Heritage into Education Report.doc

UNESCO NAMRRO MICT IPR 2009

UNESCO NAMRRO JOINT IP PROGRAM 2009

King Nehale Cultural and Interpretation Center.

Munyondo gwaKapande Cultural Village in Kavango.

Gondwana Park.

King Nehale cultural centre assessment

Opuwo cultural village assessment

Overall Environmental Impact Assessments

### Annex 6

Evaluation Questions/issue	Tentative conclusions reached based on Data / analysis received	
<p><b>The Proposed Joint Programme identifies the following three outcomes to achieve its goals:</b></p>		
<p><b>OUTCOME 1 – Knowledge and capacity enhanced, heritage identified and safeguarded</b></p>	<p><b>O1</b> Virtually no indication of progress or achievement</p> <p>Achievements</p> <p>As per Culture window a broad approach of what has been regarded as capacity enhancement has been conducted into two forms: support to stakeholders to strengthen institutional and management arrangements and systems and transfer of skills to key implementing bodies and personnel through various trainings and workshops.</p> <p>Heritage sites with potential to be inscribed in the national Heritage Register has been identified under the Heritage Hunt programme and management plans to safeguard existing heritage assets are being developed</p> <p>Reference documents and reports:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culture JP staff have increased skills in coordination and planning for events</li> <li>• Stakeholders have increased knowledge/awareness of the joint programme objectives</li> <li>• Stakeholders have improved knowledge and skills in management of resources, product marketing...</li> <li>• Existing database updated, functional and user-friendly after review process</li> <li>• </li> </ul>
<p><b>OUTCOME 2 – Livelihoods are mainstreamed into sustainable cultural policies and standards are made compatible with expected cultural tourism</b></p>	<p><b>O2</b> No indication of any mainstreaming of livelihoods into cultural policy/standards</p> <p>Achievements</p> <p>As part of the <i>enabling environment</i> (entry point for capacity enhancement) for outputs 1-3 under outcome 1 in Year 1 several national policies, legislation, acts, development frameworks and administrative procedures have been reviewed and recommendations on how to integrate sustainable cultural tourism in national policies and developmental frameworks discussed and strategies developed for implementation. Additionally, numerous</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff have increased knowledge of national policies, legislation, acts, etc</li> <li>• Staff support the review of national policies, legislation, acts, development frameworks, etc</li> <li>• 3 of the 5 recommendations have been integrated in national policies and developmental frameworks</li> <li>• Technical staff have improved skills in strategic planning and effective programme implementation strategies</li> <li>• Recommendations of</li> </ul>

	<p>baseline studies, reports and manuals have been conducted, written and developed and are being utilized to direct the way forward for identification, development and implementation of new projects or re-activation of existing projects in targeted regions.</p> <p>Reference/titles of the mentioned documents and reports: Give the list of policies, acts, development frameworks Exact titles of the baseline studies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the...baseline study have been utilized for the identification, development and implementation of new projects</li> <li>• Technical staff have improved analytical skills to write and analyze technical reports</li> </ul>
<p><b>OUTCOME 3 – In pilot sites, social development is integrated in cultural policies to reduce poverty among poor communities, improve their livelihood and further empower women</b></p>	<p>O3 Some tentative indications of progress with regard to integrating social development in cultural policies to reduce poverty among poor communities, improve their livelihoods and further empower women</p> <p>Achievements</p> <p>By way of LED approach, ILO together with the Ministry of Trade and Industry coordinates ongoing activities aimed at empowering communities and regional government structures to be able to generate employment and income from the pilot projects proposed in the programme document.</p> <p>UNEP in collaboration with the Ministry of Environment and Tourism is implementing ongoing activities related to the environmental impact of the pilot sites activities. This output will enhance sustainable utilization of natural and cultural resources at the targeted pilot sites.</p> <p>UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Local Government, Housing and Rural Development, is leading the activities related to the feasibility of proposed pilot sites and review of Town Planning instruments, as well as the use of indigenous knowledge systems for architectural designs and how they relate to Cultural Tourism and Development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical staff have improved knowledge/skills in coordination, planning and organizing of stakeholders</li> <li>• Technical staff support joint planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting of JP activities</li> </ul>

	Reference documents and reports: List titles	
<b>OUTCOME 4: Programme coordination and M&amp;E</b> <b>Target</b> By year 3 of the programme cycle Programme coordination and M&E system is in place and impacts and results of the implemented activities evaluated	O4 No achievements to record in either system introduction or evaluations undertaken  Achievements Inception workshop held, functional PMU established, annual planning meeting held and site monitoring and evaluation visits undertaken. Reports for these activities are available. Pls give the titles and dates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joint programme staff have increased knowledge/awareness of the implementation modalities of the programme</li> <li>JP staff know/understand the roles and responsibilities of PMU</li> <li>JP staff have improved skills for planning, monitoring and reporting programme results</li> </ul>
<b>Implicit Outcome 5</b> In addition there is the intent to encourage greater cohesion and collaboration of the UN agencies involved	O 5 Achievement zero and possible negative. Notwithstanding dedicated efforts by many staff of UN offices in Namibia, UN system performance seems to have been poor and to have hampered programme achievement. This appears to apply both <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to synergy between agencies with the purpose of making available to Namibia the best knowledge and experience of the UN system to deal with the jointly defined 'problematique' and</li> <li>to administrative and management processes</li> </ol>	
	<b>See below</b>	
<b>They are disaggregated as follows:</b>		
<b>OUTCOME 1 – Knowledge and capacity enhanced, heritage identified and safeguarded</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Output 1.1:</b> Knowledge base and information-sharing portal development, baseline on tangible and intangible heritage and training</li> </ul>	<b>O1.1 some activity/ no output</b> Achievement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research &amp; review of existing databases</li> <li>In-service training of professionals in tangible cultural heritage documentation</li> <li>Training workshop on the documentation of intangible heritage</li> <li>Training on intellectual property rights</li> <li>Training in cataloguing digital cultural archives</li> <li>Preliminary assessment on the incorporation of culture and development into town planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing database updated, functional and user-friendly after review process</li> <li>Two thirds of professionals can explain how to document tangible and cultural heritages/ Two thirds of professionals have increased knowledge on cultural heritage documentation</li> <li>Professionals have increased knowledge on intellectual property rights in Namibia</li> <li>Professionals can explain the importance of intellectual property rights...</li> <li>Participants can demonstrate the steps of cataloguing digital cultural archives</li> <li>Four (4) of the eight (8) recommendations of the preliminary assessment have been incorporated into town planning frameworks</li> <li>Education institutions of higher learning have demonstrated redness to integrate in their curriculum a completed land use planning modular course outline</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use course planning course outline developed</li> <li>Assessment carried out on mainstreaming of heritage issues in secondary and tertiary education systems</li> <li>Needs and capacity assessment on handicraft industry for community based capacity building actions</li> <li>and 4 are ongoing (refer to Reports 1-9 arranged according to their respective Outputs)</li> </ul> <p>Reference documents and reports:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Six (6) of the ten (10) recommendations of the assessment on heritage issues mainstreamed in secondary and tertiary curriculum systems</li> <li>Recommendations of the needs and capacity assessment on handicraft industry incorporated in community-based capacity building actions</li> <li>Communities are taking action on handicraft industry to improve their livelihoods</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Output 1.2:</b> Identification of new heritage sites</li> </ul>	<p>O1.2 9 sites identified</p> <p>Achievements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage sites with potential to be inscribed in the national Heritage Register has been identified under the Heritage Hunt programme and management plans to safeguard existing heritage assets are being developed</li> <li>Two students awarded scholarship for further education: One student studying Marine Archeology (UK) and the other studying Heritage Management (South Africa)</li> <li>A Committee of heritage managers setup to determine training needs</li> </ul> <p>Reference documents and reports:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individuals have increased knowledge on the identification of heritage sites which have a potential to be inscribed in the National Heritage Register.</li> <li>Communities have increased participation in the identification process of heritage sites to be inscribed in the National Heritage Register.</li> <li>Communities demonstrate good decision making for the management plans to safeguard existing heritage assets</li> <li>Communities support management plans to safeguard existing heritage assets.</li> <li>There is strong public and private support to management plans for the safeguard of existing heritage assets.</li> <li>Scholarships awarded to two students to enhance their understanding, knowledge, skills and professionalism in marine archaeology and heritage management</li> <li>An established committee of heritage managers understands the training needs of the sector.</li> <li>Two (2) of the four (4) recommendations of the training needs assessment report....</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Output 1.3:</b> Identification and documentation of legal, cultural and community barriers between cultural tourism and poverty reduction</li> </ul>	<p>O1.3 some activities under way modest achievement so far</p> <p>Achievements</p> <p>The following Territorial and Institutional mappings were realized by the MTI in June – July – August and September of 2010 at 11 sites, resulting in the following draft reports to be validated with local stakeholders in October 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Duineveld Dune Tannery</li> <li>• Ozombu Zovindimba National site and interpretive centre</li> <li>• \Muyondo Gwakapande Cultural Village</li> <li>• Opuwo Cultural Village</li> <li>• Khorixas Cultural centre – Kunene cultural Trail</li> <li>• King Nehale Cultural and interpretive centre</li> <li>• Omusati cultural trail and Omungulugombashe interpretive centre (review in process by consultant)</li> <li>• /ciao o Ju/hoansi cultural village and Otjopzondjupa Geopark (review in process by consultant)</li> </ul> <p>Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessments and Baseline Studies undertaken at all pilot sites. Validation workshops planned for the 5-6<sup>th</sup> October 2010 4 activities were planned. 3 activities were completed and one is ongoing (refer to Draft and Completed reports available</p> <p>Reference documents and reports:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MTI professional staff have know how to conduct territorial and institutional mapping</li> <li>• MTI professional staff have improved skills/expertise in writing technical reports</li> <li>• MTI professional staff demonstrate advanced skills in planning, organising, coordination and collaboration with local stakeholders in events management</li> <li>• MTI professional staff demonstrate advanced leadership abilities to organize events (e.g. workshops) with local stakeholders</li> <li>• Ministry professional staff have increased knowledge of how to conduct EIAs and baseline Studies</li> <li>• Ministry professional staff have improved analytical skills related to the analysis of research findings</li> <li>• </li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Output 1.4:</b> Identification of pilot sites for implementation</li> </ul>	<p>O1.4 Identified sites are pilots. No sign of system to monitor their experimental</p>	

and replication	<p><b>exploratory nature</b></p> <p>Achievements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project proposals developed at all pilot sites with detailed construction plans</li> </ul> <p>All activities under this output have been implemented (refer to 10 reports attached)</p> <p>Reference documents and reports:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individuals/community members have knowledge of the project proposal development process</li> <li>Individuals/community members can explain the project proposal life cycle process</li> <li>Individual/communities demonstrate/have knowledge and skills in project proposal development using MTI/Grant Fund Project Proposal Development Guidelines</li> </ul>
<p><b>OUTCOME 2 – Livelihoods are mainstreamed into sustainable cultural policies and standards are made compatible with expected cultural tourism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Output 2.1:</b> Harmonization and publicizing of relevant policies and legislation on tangible/intangible heritage and customary laws</li> </ul>	<p><b>O 2.1 Achievement zero</b></p> <p>Achievements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research and review of national policies on tangible and intangible heritages is being undertaken by National Heritage Council of Namibia Activity for this output is ongoing</li> </ul> <p>Reference documents and reports:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Heritage Council members have knowledge of existing national policies on tangible and intangible heritages</li> <li>National Heritage Council members have improved communication skills on existing tangible and intangible national policies</li> <li>National Heritage Council members have improved skills in conducting research and review of national policies</li> <li>National Heritage Council members have improved presentation/analytical skills on the findings of the research/review process of the national policies</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Output 2.2:</b> Communities /groups in the nine focus regions reaping benefits from cultural/natural heritage assets.</li> </ul>	<p><b>O 2.2 Achievement zero BUT groups are aware of programme as potential source of resources and expectations are high</b></p> <p>Achievements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Groups are aware of programme as potential source of resources and expectations are high. For all 9 focus regions local community management committees are in place</li> <li>Stakeholders workshop conducted on heritage policies</li> <li>Draft manuals on cultural and natural heritage assets developed and translated into different languages The activity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communities/groups have increased awareness/understanding/knowledge of the benefits of cultural/natural heritage assets.</li> <li>Communities/groups have increased better management systems for management of resources (cultural/natural heritage assets)</li> <li>Communities/groups/stakeholders have increased knowledge of the 5 existing heritage policies</li> <li>Stakeholders support the development of manuals on cultural and natural heritage assets and their translation into different local languages</li> <li>Stakeholders have increased knowledge of cultural and natural heritage assets</li> <li>Stakeholders support the integration of the cultural and natural heritage assets</li> </ul>

	<p>for this output is ongoing and Draft reports are attached</p> <p>Reference documents and reports:</p>	content into secondary and tertiary level curricular
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Output 2.3:</b> Strengthening governance of Namibia's Geopark programme</li> </ul>	<p>O 2.3 Achievement zero</p> <p>Achievements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Bill to review the Parks and Wild Management Act has been submitted to Parliament for approval in 2008 and will allow for the strengthening of protected areas' regulation and the proclamation of the Geopark programme and its launch in Namibia. The delay in passing the law has negatively impacted the proclamation of the Geopark programme hence the delay in the implementation of the Geopark related activities</li> </ul> <p>Reference documents and reports:</p> <p>Copy of the draft bill – pls indicate in writing the problem in timing relative to the approval of the bill and the activity implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parliamentary Standing Committee on Parks and Wildlife Management has increased knowledge on policy review and Bill drafting processes</li> <li>Parliamentarians support the review of the Parks and Wildlife Management Act</li> <li>Parliamentarians support/have positive attitudes towards the strengthening of the existing law on Parks and Wildlife Management</li> <li>Parliamentarians support increased funding for the proclamation and launch of the Geopark programme</li> </ul>
<b>OUTCOME 3 – In pilot sites, social development is integrated in cultural policies to reduce poverty among poor communities, improve their livelihood and further empower women</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Output 3.1:</b> Communities' capacities, end products and livelihood upgraded through establishing pilot sites and HIV/AIDS awareness campaigns instituted</li> </ul>	<p>O 3.1 Achievement zero and link between site activity and HIV/ AIDS awareness indiscernible</p> <p>Achievements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Management Teams have been established in all pilot sites. HIV/AIDS mainstreaming is part of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community members have improved management and leadership skills</li> <li>Community members have increased understanding of mainstreaming HIV/AIDS in their development initiatives</li> <li>Community members have improved</li> </ul>

	<p>Phase 1 of implementation at all pilot sites. The Community Management Teams are expected to liaise with RACOCS responsible for the HIV/AIDS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A baseline and needs analysis for handicraft /leather based products was carried out in Duineveld in September 2010. Final results are not yet been delivered by consultant.</li> <li>• HIV/AIDS is pretty much intrinsic to development, particularly in the context of Namibia. Therefore, agencies such as UNDP and UNAIDS have been approached by extending the initiative of community capacity enhancement (CCE) in these pilot sites. However, this attempt is still in infancy stages and it depends on resource availability from their sides.</li> </ul> <p>Reference documents and reports: Mission reports making reference to the contacts in the regions/pilot sites and the concrete agreements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge of how to mainstream HIV/AIDS in their development initiatives</li> <li>• Community members demonstrate how to mainstream HIV/AIDS prevention messages in their development plans</li> <li>• Community Management Team members have improved coordination, communication and events management skills</li> <li>• Community Management Team members have increased understanding of their roles and responsibilities in relation to project</li> <li>• MTI professional staff have increased research skills</li> <li>• Community members have increased knowledge of HIV/AIDS related issues</li> <li>• Community members support the approach of the Community Capacity Enhancement initiatives</li> <li>• Lead Ministry, UNDP and UNAIDS support the scaling up of the Community Capacity Enhancement initiatives</li> <li>• Lead Ministry, UNDP and UNAIDS support the increase of technical assistance (human &amp; financial resources) for the roll-out of the Community Capacity Enhancement initiatives</li> <li>• </li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Output 3.2:</b> By way of LED approach, communities and empowered to generate employment and income from the pilot projects</li> </ul>	<p>O 3.2 Achievement zero and link between empowerment communities to generate employment and income from the pilot projects indiscernible.</p> <p>Achievements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The supply and demand diagnosis in on ongoing. LED awareness creation initiatives are ongoing at both national and regional</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MTI staff and communities have increase awareness/knowledge of the LED initiatives</li> <li>• MTI and community members support the implementation of LEDactivities</li> </ul>

	<p>levels. LED sensitization workshop held on 19-20 January 2010.</p> <p>Reference documents and reports:</p> <p>At this stage enclose pls the reports in the draft format.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Output 3.3:</b> Integration of cultural/natural heritage assets into national and international tourism</li> </ul>	<p>O 3.3 Achievement zero and algorithm to be used unclear</p> <p>Achievements</p> <p>There has been a mobilization process for tour operators and business people at national level under the LED awareness creation initiatives. The linking of this activity to the international network is planned for year 2.</p> <p>Reference documents and reports:</p> <p>I believe ILO may have their mission reports (or MET relative progress documents) making reference and intermediate outputs on these contacts with tour operators and local businesses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 of the 15 tour operators have increased knowledge/awareness of LED initiatives</li> <li>• 20 of the 25 business people have increased knowledge/awareness of the LED initiatives</li> <li>• Tour operators/business people support the development of a functional electronic database</li> <li>• 40 of the tour operators/business people support the networking of their activities to international operators/markets</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Output 3.4:</b> Promote skills transfer, built capacity and enhance market opportunities</li> </ul>	<p>O 3.4 Achievement zero</p> <p>Achievements</p> <p>Training on innovative products and the launch of the Award of Excellence for Handicraft Products is ongoing</p> <p>Reference documents and reports:</p> <p>Pls ask NTN as implementing partner to give the progress report.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community members have increased knowledge on the development of innovative products</li> <li>• Community members have improved entrepreneurial skills</li> <li>• Community members have improved skills in marketing their products</li> <li>• Community members have increased understanding/knowledge of the Award of Excellence for Handicraft Products</li> <li>• Community members support the idea of the Award of Excellence for Handicraft Products</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Output 3.5:</b> Support the establishment and management of a Geopark</li> </ul>	<p>O.3.4 Achievement zero</p> <p>Achievements</p> <p>Tour Guiding and Land Use Planning Course Outlines as well as Management Plans being developed. Draft plans</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Institutions of higher learning have readiness to integrate the completed Tour Guide and Land use planning course outlines in their curricular.</li> <li>2. Tour guide operators know/are aware of the course outline developed</li> </ol>

	<p>available</p> <p>Reference documents and reports: Indicate the titles and dates of the draft plans and give them at Roger's disposal</p>	
IN addition there is a 4 <sup>th</sup> output in the JP document though it does not appear everywhere it should	Is a cross-cutting organizational component of the JP that applies and services all the 3 JP outcomes.	
<b>OUTCOME 4: Programme coordination and M&amp;E</b> <b>Target</b> By year 3 of the programme cycle Programme coordination and M&E system is in place and impacts and results of the implemented activities evaluated	<p>O 4 Achievement zero and algorithm to be used in introducing system unclear</p> <p>Achievements</p> <p>Inception workshop held, functional PMU established, annual planning meeting held and site monitoring and evaluation visits undertaken. Reports for these activities are available.</p> <p>Reference documents and reports:</p> <p>Please enumerate the inception workshop report, decisions of the NSC on PMU, Otjivarongo report, site visits reports (title and date for each relevant document)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joint programme staff have increased knowledge/awareness of the implementation modalities of the programme</li> <li>JP staff know/understand the roles and responsibilities of PMU</li> <li>JP staff have improved skills for planning, monitoring and reporting programme results</li> </ul>
<b>Implicit Outcome 5</b> In addition there is the intent to encourage greater cohesion and collaboration of the UN agencies involved	<p>O 5 Achievement zero and possible negative. Notwithstanding dedicated efforts by many staff of UN offices in Namibia, UN system performance seems to have been poor and to have hampered programme achievement.</p> <p>This appears to apply both</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to synergy between agencies with the purpose of making available to Namibia the best knowledge and experience of the UN system to deal with the jointly defined 'problematique' and to administrative and management processes</li> </ul> <p>Achievements</p> <p>MoU was signed and implemented between UNESCO and UNDP in terms of PMU establishment and functioning.</p> <p>Although initially intended that RCO is</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Culture JP staff know the implementation modalities of the programme</li> <li>Culture JP staff support the implementation mechanism</li> <li>Culture JP staff have improved skills for joint planning, coordination and implementation of programme activities</li> </ul>

	<p>the platform for such a coordination, UNDP was chosen as RC does not have the admin capacity of contracting and admin follow up.</p> <p>The objective of such a cooperation was to eliminate/minimise the agency specific admin procedures that may cause confusion on the national counterparts' side in terms of programme coordination PMU's mandate in a nutshell is to insure the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- maximum national ownership</li> <li>- synergies between Gender and C&amp;D JPs</li> <li>- consolidated M&amp;E, communication and knowledge management</li> <li>- better integration of UN agencies' specific implementation modalities</li> <li>- <b>focal platform unifying the inputs, outputs of all stakeholders in implementation and review of strategic direction of the programme (on both micro and macro level)</b></li> </ul> <p>ideally – representing a structure that would continue living beyond the conclusion MDG F programmes (by the bias of the government decision and/or alternative sources of funding) proliferating the activities compatible to the both JPs – replication as defined in C&amp;D programme Joint planning session held in Otjiwarongo with the participation of central and regional governments, programme beneficiaries and participating UN agencies for the development of Year 2 workplans.</p> <p>National Steering Committee took a decision to set up a Joint Programme Management Unit whose primary objective is to enhance coordination among all</p>	
--	--	--

involved parties and to identify possible areas of collaboration between the two joint programmes supported under the MDGF.

- Reference documents and reports:

1. Please enclose the UNESCO – UNDP MoU
2. Make reference to the UNEP, ILO and Habitat participation specifically in the Otjivarongo meeting as well as a continuous exchange by mail
3. Job descriptions of the PMU positions
4. Above mentioned NSC decisions and rationale on the PMU.

## **Annex 7**

### Report on the Annual Review and Planning Meeting of the MDG-F Joint Programme for Sustainable Cultural Tourism in Namibia (Otjiwarango workshop) : Recommendations and Points of Concern from the Annual Planning Meeting for consideration by the Programme Management Committee.

The three day workshop provided an opportunity for participants to raise concerns and make recommendations, although it was noted that the meeting itself was not a decision-making body and that any recommendations or concerns would have to be taken up by the Programme Management Committee in its meetings.

**1. Circulation of Reports to the PMC.** It was recommended that the members of the PMC should receive copies of all the reports produced for each of the activities funded by the Programme. It was suggested that this could be done by email to save on costs.

**2. The GeoPark.** Concern was expressed about the pace of the development of the GeoPark and it was proposed that the PMC should discuss the state of this project and consider the viability of identifying an alternative pilot project. It was recommended that the Ministry of Mines and Energy should provide a written progress report on the Geopark.

**3. Trainees.** It was suggested that a system should be developed to link those receiving training through the programme to the pilot projects so that their training will be used to benefit the pilot projects.

**4. Reviewing Reports.** It was proposed that a mechanism should be established, in the absence of a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer for the Programme, to enable the effective review of all Narrative Reports produced by the Programme to ensure that they are effective.

**5. World Tourism Organisation.** A concern was raised as to why the WTO, given their specialised expertise in the field of tourism, were not involved in the programme.

**6. Reporting.** A concern was raised that the reporting requirements of the United Nations were extensive and, given the staff shortages in the Project Management Unit, this was absorbing a lot of the Manager's time. The Manager was currently working on the Quarterly Financial Report, the Monitoring and Evaluation Report, the Colour-coded Year Two Work Plan and the Annual Report for Year One. All four of these reports were due for submission by 21st February, 2010.

**7. Heritage Hunt Funding.** The Museums Association of Namibia expressed concern that the reduction of the funding originally budgeted for the extension of the Heritage Hunt to the remaining seven regions of Namibia from US\$50,000 to US\$10,000 would make it difficult for MAN to effectively implement this activity. MAN noted that the delay in the continuation of the Heritage Hunt project meant that, ideally, a new public awareness campaign would be required before site visits took place to the remaining regions.

**8. Staffing.** It was noted that there was still only one staff member in post for the Programme in Sustainable Cultural Tourism, although the first year of the three year programme was coming to an end. It was agreed that the establishment of a full staff component for the Project Management Unit should be a urgent priority. The advertising and appointment of the Programme Co-ordinator, the Monitoring and Evalution Officer, the Assistant to the Manager for the Cultural Tourism and the Administrator should be fast-tracked. The delay in the appointment of staff had been the fundamental reason for the delay in the start of activities in Year One.

**9. Co-ordination of Heritage Awareness Activities.** It was noted that there were a number of activities involving the promotion of awareness about heritage issues and international conventions. It was recommended that these activities should be effectively co-ordinated.

**10. Request for Funding for Environmental Management Plans.** A request was made that, if savings can be made in other areas of the budget, US\$20,000 should be budgeted to be used for the writing of Environmental Management Plans.

**11. Confirmation of Pilot Project for Khorixas.** It was noted that there were two potential sites in Khorixas that might be used for the development of a Cultural Centre and it was noted that the location must be finalized and indicated to the PMC.

**12. Confirmation of Pilot Project for Tsumkwe.** It was noted that no final decision had yet been taken as to the site of the Cultural Village and it was recommended that the location must be finalized as soon as possible and indicated to the PMC.

**13. Establishment of Community-based Management Committees.** It was recommended that the priority for many of the pilot projects would be the establishment of a community-based management committee. It was noted that the UNAM consultants who had been tasked to draw up project proposals for the selected pilot projects had also been asked to help establish Committees at the pilot projects.

**14. Role of UN-Habitat.** It was recommended that UN-Habitat should be requested to play a role in providing support for the construction of environmentally friendly buildings at 50 sites such as Khorixas where they were not currently involved according to the initial Work Plan.

**15. Land Ownership.** It was recommended that an urgent priority for all the pilot project sites should be the obtaining of the relevant documentation to confirm the land rights.

**16. Site Evaluation Reports.** The Regional Councils expressed concern that the site evaluation reports that had been carried out on the pilot projects should be made available to them.

**17. Regional Representatives of MAN.** It was noted that the Museums Association of Namibia had locally-based regional representatives who, in some cases, might be able to provide advice and support to the pilot projects in their regions.

**18. Legal Status of the Pilot Projects.** It was noted that a decision had to be made about the legal status of the community-based Committees that were being established to manage the eleven pilot projects. Should they be registered as Section 21 Companies ? It was suggested that the legal status and management structures of each pilot project would have to be clear and acceptable financial mechanisms would have to be in place before any funds could be transferred to the pilot projects.

**19. Evaluation of Reports on Pilot Projects.** In the absence of a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer it was recommended that all the reports on each pilot project produced by the consultants from the University of Namibia should be submitted to the members of the PMC.

**20. Feasibility Studies.** It was noted that Ozombu Zovindimba was the only site where it had been planned to conduct a feasibility study.

**21. Launch of Pilot Projects.** It was recommended that funding should be budgeted for the official opening of each of the pilot projects.

**22. Marketing, Management and HIV/Aids Policies.** It was suggested that generic policies should be drawn up that can be adapted for each pilot project as every pilot project has to develop both a marketing and an HIV Policy.