



**INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION  
TECHNICAL COOPERATION**

**Mid-Term Self Review of the project on  
'Promoting and Implementing the Rights of the San Peoples of the Republic of  
Namibia'**

1	<b>Project title</b>	Promoting and application of indigenous peoples' rights: San peoples of Namibia
2	<b>Country</b>	Republic of Namibia
3	<b>Project number</b>	NAM/08/50/SPA
4	<b>Donor</b>	Spanish Cooperation AECID
5	<b>Project start</b>	December 2008
6	<b>Project completion date</b>	31 December 2012
7	<b>Budget</b>	500,000 Euro
9	<b>Managing ILO Unit</b>	ILO SA; ILO SRO Harare; PRO169&IPLED, NORMES, Geneva
10	<b>Geographical coverage</b>	Namibia
11	<b>Evaluation data:</b>	31 March 2011
a.	<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Mid-Term Self evaluation
b.	<b>Start/completion date of evaluation mission</b>	01 – 31 March 2011
c..	<b>Name of evaluator</b>	Oladele O. Arowolo
d..	<b>Date of submission of evaluation final report</b>	31 March 2011

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Introductory Page</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. Project Background</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2. Background on Evaluation</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3. Methodology</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4. Evaluation Findings</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4.1 Relevance and strategic fit</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4.2 Validity of design</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4.3 Project effectiveness</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>4.4 Project efficiency</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>4.5 Effectiveness of management arrangements</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4.6 Impact orientation and sustainability</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>5. Conclusions</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>6. Recommendations, Lessons Learned and Good Practices</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>7. Annexes:</b>	<b>33</b>
• <b>Terms of Reference</b>	
• <b>Project Work Plan</b>	
• <b>List of Meetings and Interviews</b>	
• <b>Other Documents</b>	

## **List of Acronyms and Abbreviations**

AECI	Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo
CBO	Community Based Organization
CESB	Community Based Natural Resource Management Enterprise Support project
C.111	ILO Convention No. 111 on Discrimination (Employment and Occupation)
C.169	ILO Convention No. 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries
DRFN	Desert Research Foundation of Namibia
GRN	Government of the Republic of Namibia
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation
FCEAR	Foundation CEAR
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPLED	ILO programme on Indigenous Peoples & Local Economic Development
ITC	International Training Centre Turin
LAC	Legal Assistance Centre
LED	Local Economic Development
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NNDF	Nyae Nyae Development Foundation
NPC	National Planning Commission
NPD	New Product Development
ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
PRO 169	ILO programme on the Promotion of Convention 169
PEG	Partnership for Growth programme
SDP	San Development Programme
TDIM	Territorial Diagnosis and Institutional Mapping
UNDRIP	United Nations Declaration of the rights of Indigenous Peoples
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WIMSA	Working Group for Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1. Background & Context**

This project (NAM/08/50/SPA: Promoting and application of indigenous peoples' rights - San peoples of Namibia) is the Namibia component of the 'Indigenous Peoples Programme' under the AECI-ILO partnership programme 2008/12; it was designed to address aspects of the development challenges being faced by the San in Namibia. The overall objective of the project is to contribute to poverty reduction through the promotion of the rights and participatory socio-economic development of the San peoples of Namibia based on their needs and aspirations. The immediate objectives of the project are to: a) Strengthen the San development planning and coordination capacity of policy makers in ministries and government departments and; b) Generate greater coherence among development interventions in support of the San communities in Namibia through improved networking and knowledge sharing.

The logic behind the project strategy is based on the recognition that the stakeholders on this project operate at two interrelated but distinct levels; one is the Government and its agencies, operating at governance level of policy and regulatory framework formulation and development programming; while the other comprises local and international programme implementers at the operational level. Hence, the project has focused its strategy on improved coordination and consultation among national level stakeholders for the promotion of the rights of the San; and capacity strengthening and sensitizing the Government of Namibia (through research, information sharing, social marketing, training, etc.) to a more participatory and inclusive development approach that seeks to engage the San as partners in sustainable development.

The project is coordinated by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), supported by a national Steering Committee which comprises of one representative each from ODPM (Chair), San Council, WIMSA, SECID, and ILO (Project Coordinator). The project is being financed with 500,000 Euro from the AECI and contributions in cash and kind from the Government of Namibia, through the ODPM. Project activities are being financially, technically and administratively backstopped by the ILO Pretoria with support of PRO169 & IPLED programme in ILO Headquarters.

### **2. Present situation of project implementation**

Two years into the implementation of the project, not much has been achieved in addressing the immediate objectives of the project due largely to the rather slow take off of critical management interventions. Although the project started officially in December 2008 the substantive ILO National Project Coordinator (NPC) was not in place until September 2010; before then, aspects of initial project activities were being backstopped

by the ILO Office Pretoria and an official based in Pretoria, South Africa. Significant among these were the three studies carried out by the Legal Assistance Centre (LAC): namely: i) Addressing the development of the San peoples in Namibia as a marginalized community within Government planning and services; ii) Review of development partners and ongoing and planned San development initiatives and; iii) Review of the existing legal and regulatory framework for the promotion and protection of San rights in Namibia.

Based on the initial project work plan, the project also conducted two important workshops; one was 'Stakeholders workshop on Training Needs Analysis regarding the rights and sustainability of development efforts within San communities' (April 2010); the LAC report on needs assessment was a useful background document for the workshop. In addition, the project was involved in the organization of two regional workshops: i) Sub-regional conference was organized (November 11-12), introducing the topic of Indigenous peoples' rights, the ILO Conventions No.169 and 111 and the context of the San in Namibia; ii) Regional Consultative Workshop was held in Windhoek, with the objectives, amongst others, of strengthen working relations between OPM and regional decentralized structures and to create coordinated development approach towards San development in Namibia (13 November 2010). Towards the end of 2010, the project also organized a Stakeholders study tour to South Africa for the purpose of visiting and gaining experience on San Communities and from developmental actors in the country.

Overall, about half of the scheduled activities for the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the project could not be carried out due to the slow start; but efforts have been made to incorporate these and new activities in the Work Plan designed for 2011. It is suggested that, in the light of the findings of this review, the work plan should be reviewed and a two-year schedule of activities designed (2011-2012).

### **3. Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation**

The project document stipulates that towards the 20th month of the project cycle, an ILO internal progress review will be commissioned, whose findings will be presented in the following steering committee meeting. Based on this review, the detailed results and activities as well as the implementation plan of the second phase (2010-12) will be specified. This review is a response to this agreement. The purpose of the mid term review is to assess whether the project has delivered its outputs as per work plan thus far; it is also an assessment of the process of implementation with recommendations for improvements in the ongoing implementation of the project. Being a national project, the scope of this evaluation covers the Republic of Namibia.

This independent mid term review has been undertaken in accordance with the ILO Evaluation Policy adopted by the Governing Body in November 2005, which provides for systematic evaluation of programmes and projects in order to improve quality, accountability and transparency of the ILO's work, strengthen the decision-making process and support constituents in forwarding decent work and social justice.

Furthermore, the evaluation is undertaken in line the ILO Manual for Technical Cooperation released by PARDEV in 2010.

The primary clients of the review are the ILO (Geneva and Pretoria), project partners and stakeholders— ODPM, WIMSA and AECID.

#### **4. Methodology of evaluation**

The review has been based on data from primary and secondary sources. Data and information from primary sources were derived from semi-structured interviews of stakeholders and project management as defined in the project document. Interviews and discussions targeted the ODPM. It was planned to also interview Ministries that have a part-mandate for San development; however, since they are yet to be fully involved in the implementation of this project the idea was dropped. Interviews were extended to select NGOs with major focus on San peoples (The Working Group for Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA), The Nyae Nyae Development Foundation, and Desert Research Foundation of Namibia). In addition, officials involved with research works on the project from the Legal Assistance Centre (LAC), as well as the representative of the donor agency (AECI) were interviewed. The ILO Programme Coordinator of the 'Towards the Elimination of the worst form of Child Labour II' in Namibia was also interviewed given the relevance of their activities. The interviews utilized semi-structured schedules and addressed the main evaluation questions based on the evaluation criteria defined in the TOR: a) *Relevance and strategic fit*, b) *Validity of design*, c) *Project effectiveness*, d) *Project efficiency*, e) *Effectiveness of management arrangements* and, f) *Sustainability*. The evaluation criteria guided the formulation of evaluation questions in the course of field work.

Secondary sources of data /information included the ILO project document; project related reports, and any commissioned research reports and workshop proceedings; Government publications; UN publications; project management reports and relevant publications/reports from the internet.

Data collected from all the sources mentioned were collated and analyzed using appropriate statistical methods. Conclusions and recommendations of this evaluation are based on the results of analysis of data collected from both primary and secondary sources.

One limitation of the evaluation process was time constraint; the exercise allowed only two days for field work, obviously inadequate to make and agree on appointments, meet and interview clients scattered in different offices in Windhoek. Time and resource constraints also precluded field visit to any San community given their long distant location from Windhoek.

#### **5. Main Findings & Conclusions**

##### ***5.1 Relevance and strategic fit***

The deplorable plight of the San has since been recognized by the Government of Namibia, and in response, policies and programmes have been designed to empower them to achieve recognition within the body politic and identify potentials for sustainable development of the local resources available, including the promotion of self-employment in non-traditional service sectors, creation of enabling environment for San local economic development, and enactment of measures to end the discrimination. This project is strategically relevant to the San Development Programme (SDP) which was approved by Cabinet in November 2005 and is driven by the ODPM. The main objective of the programme is to ensure the integration of the San into the mainstream of Namibia's economy in line with Vision 2030 (the country's long term development policy) and specific national development programmes.

Therefore, the ILO San development project remains valid; so also are the project objectives, outcomes and strategy. Particularly relevant at this point is the project's activity under Output 2 targeting the establishment of a National Working Group on San development issues among San organisations, international and national agencies and NGOs, so as to improve coordination and collaboration of national and international agencies at national and local levels through concrete joint San activities. However, the work plan for phase 2 should review the definition of outputs and address the need for project specific output indicators for future evaluation.

### ***5.2 Effectiveness of management***

The project is coordinated by ODPM, supported by National Steering Committee (NSC), with the ILO Pretoria providing financial and administrative support and technical backstopping by the PRO169 & IPLED programme in ILO Headquarters. The ODPM initially worked directly with the ILO Pretoria office through an official for most part of the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the project; but little is known about the intervention of the ILO official due to a virtual absence of institutional memory. It was not until September 2010, following the appointment of a National Project Coordinator by the ILO, that the Project Steering Committee was constituted; the Committee held its inaugural meeting on 17 November 2010. The ILO national project coordinator works closely with the ODPM to arrange meetings and circulate minutes to members. So far, the Steering Committee has demonstrated commitment to implementation of the project, while recognizing the need to make up for lost grounds in the earlier months of the project. The evaluation found that the composition of the Steering Committee is rather limited considering the range of actors in the field; an expanded committee should be considered. Given the circumstances which constrained the appointment of the ILO project coordinator at the start of the project and the prolonged delay in appointing one, it is not surprising that the evaluation has no information about records of periodic project monitoring reports, including financial analysis.

### ***5.3 Project efficiency***

In terms of management ILO backstopping efforts have been effective, although the delay in appointing a national project coordinator hampered project implementation to a considerable degree. Since the intervention of the project coordinator started in

September 2010, project implementation has progressed satisfactorily and this has contributed to greater efficiency of resource utilization.

However, not more than 50% of planned activities were actually carried out; and less than 20% of the funds for the project were expended during the first two years of its operation. The Steering Committee should ensure that the annual work plan for the remaining two years of the project incorporates those activities which could not be executed during the 1<sup>st</sup> Phase and define for execution activities considered strategic to the achievement of the immediate objectives of the project.

#### ***5.4 Impact orientation and sustainability***

This is essentially a capacity building project with focus Government institutional strengthening and human capacity building. In order to address the capacity building concerns of the project, activities being implemented are anchored on the strategy which addresses the capacity needs of Government decision makers and planners on the one hand, while on the other hand, targeting San development programme implementers in the communities. The main outputs of the project will be improved awareness and acknowledgement of indigenous peoples' rights by public and private stakeholders, and improved capacities of relevant Government ministries and other selected actors to apply the principles of ILO Conventions 111 and 169 in development programmes and activities with San communities across Namibia. If effectively implemented, the sustainability of project activities would be assured.

The project also addresses capacity building of the institutions with a mandate for San development in the country. In order to strengthen the ODPM in its coordination role, a national Steering Committee has been set up and has worked quite well; however, an enlarged Committee would facilitate the coordination of project activities even better, thus paving the way for a formal institutional mechanism. In recognition of the need to achieve coherence and effective coordination of the numerous San projects and programmes across the country, the project also focuses on the creation of a National Working Group on San; with the collaboration of WIMSA, LAC and ODPM under this project, efforts are being made to move the project in this direction during the 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase. In support of sustainability, the project also has its focus on human capacity building; so far, this has been done through workshop training involving Government officials from 11 Ministries with a mandate related to San development; participation of stakeholders in knowledge sharing at ILO project workshops and Conferences; exposure of selected stakeholders to San development issues in another country, South Africa, through the study tour organized by the project in December 2010. Also through the San Website being developed under this project, knowledge sharing will be broadened and capacities strengthened on San development and human rights issues. The project itself plans to support the creation of the San Council and recruit a San intern soon, paid by the ILO, to work closely with the Project Coordinator, on the understanding that ODPM will absorb the San official into the Government structures and continue working on related project activities after the end of the project cycle in 2012.

## **6. Recommendations & Lessons Learned**



### **6.1 Main recommendations**

- a) It is important that ODPM honors its pledge in the signed Project Document by providing office space (and possibly infrastructure) for the smooth operation of the project.
- b) The project management should consider a review of the Steering Committee in order to more effectively by broadening its membership.
- c) Project management should prepare the required project monitoring reports on a regular basis in accordance with the ILO practices.
- d) In support of sustainability and effective policy and programme management, the project should take the necessary steps towards the establishment and sustained functioning of a National Working Group on San Development and the San Council in Namibia.
- e) In order to facilitate policy and planning formulation and implementation, the project should support a small-scale socio-economic study of San peoples to produce a profile of the San peoples, showing the dynamics of their population and associated social, demographic and economic indicators in comparison with the national averages available.
- f) Project management should consider a re-evaluation of the structure of the project's Logical Framework and include for the remaining two years (or so) of the project cycle project specific output indicators, together with their corresponding baselines and targets.
- g) The project should facilitate linkages between Government and potential donors to support the implementation of specific development projects in San communities by local CBOs and NGOs.
- h) To the extent possible, the project should collaborate with relevant UN agencies, particularly in Joint Programmes that are of interest to the ILO, under the current UNDAF for Namibia in order to achieve synergy.

### **6.2 Important lessons learned**

- a) By broadening the composition of the Project Steering Committee, the project would have taken an important step towards the establishment and sustained functioning of a National Working Group on San development in Namibia. Such an efficient project implementation arrangement, involving the active involvement of Government and implementing partners, provides the best strategy for smooth project implementation.
- b) Prolonged delay in sharing project reports (including research reports, workshop reports, etc.) undermines the utility of such reports and might amount to inefficient utilization of project's resources.

### **6.3 Good Practices**

Project's research reports were shared with a wider audience than originally intended through the ILO Sub-Regional Conference thereby generating impact beyond the national level.

The project addressed knowledge sharing meeting of stakeholders in conjunction with the ILO Sub-Regional Conference on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples/Marginalised Communities in November 2010 by utilizing the Conference venue to share the research reports prepared for the ILO project by LAC, and provided recommendations for addressing some of the most critical issues regarding the promotion and protection of the rights of San peoples in Namibia. According to the Conference report, the Conference provided an excellent opportunity to delegates (including stakeholders from Namibia) to:

- a) Bring to the fore and deliberate the major challenges regarding development of marginalized communities, and especially San Communities in Namibia; and
- b) Provide inputs to a White Paper on Marginalised Communities to be drafted in Namibia.

## **1. Project Background**

### **1.1 Introduction**

Namibia is a multi-ethnic society and there are constitutional provisions for the protection of the right of every person to enjoy, practice, profess, maintain and promote any culture, language, tradition or religion without compromising the rights of others or national interest. Among the major ethnic groups are Ovambo who make up half of the population, followed by the Kavango at 9%, the Herero at 7%, and Damara 7%; others include Nama 5%, Caprivian 4%, Baster 2%, San 2% and Tswana 0.5% . The available evidence shows that the San, with an estimated total population of 33,000, are the most marginalized and impoverished minority group in the Namibian society. Scattered in districts across the Northern and Eastern parts of Namibia, the San rely on small scale agricultural practices subsidized by government welfare subventions and are by any measure the poorest ethnic group in the country. Post-independence efforts by the Government and development partners to redress the imbalances in social and economic conditions of the population of Namibia resulting from apartheid policy have had little effect on the plight of the San who have become increasingly marginalised from mainstream society, worsened by their limited capacity to access social services and economic opportunities.

It has been reported that one of the most sensitive areas as regards the rights of the San in Namibia is their socio-economic rights, and improving their socio-economic conditions remains a challenge (Leslé Jansen, 2010). All socio-economic indicators show the San community not accessing their rights in conformity with the broader group of historically disadvantaged Namibians (Ute Dieckmann, 2010). The African Commission's Working Group on Indigenous Populations/Communities also states in its 2005 report that indigenous minorities in Namibia find themselves in a "structurally subordinate position to the dominant group, leading to marginalization". However, the ILO evaluation mission (2009) reported that there is a political will in Namibia to improve the political and socio-economic situation of the San communities, but that most other agencies are addressing the issues in a piecemeal fashion. Given that the ILO has the experience, knowledge and international mandate to support governments to improve the situation for indigenous peoples in independent countries, the government of Namibia requested ILO support. This is also in line with ILO Pretoria priorities and outcomes in the DWCP for Namibia.

The Government has also been collaborating with national organizations and bodies (LAC, WIMSA-NSU, CESP, etc.), international agencies (UNDP, ILO, UNICEF, UNESCO, EU) and bilateral organizations (SECI, CEAR) in addressing the development challenges of San peoples in the country. In addition, Namibia ratified in 2001 the ILO

Discrimination Convention (Employment and Occupation, No. 111), which is an important legal instrument for the promotion and protection of indigenous peoples rights and decent work in line with the ILO's Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) and the 2007 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

However, as Dieckmann's report (2010) shows, these interventions have had limited effect on the San peoples due to, among others, lack a shared objective and an integrated strategy. Worse still, the policy and programme inputs into San peoples' development remain uncoordinated. Review of the San situation also shows that due to the lack of disaggregated data for the San, little is known about their social, economic and demographic characteristics in Namibia beyond generalities.

### **1.2 ILO Project (2008-2012)**

This project (NAM/08/50/SPA: Promoting and application of indigenous peoples' rights - San peoples of Namibia) is the Namibia component of the Indigenous Peoples Programme under the AECI-ILO partnership programme 2008/12. It has been designed to address aspects of the development challenges being faced by the San in Namibia.

#### **Objectives**

The overall (or development) objective of the project is to contribute to poverty reduction through the promotion of the rights and participatory socio-economic development of the San peoples of Namibia based on their needs and aspirations. The immediate objectives are to:

- i) Strengthen the San development planning and coordination capacity of policy makers in ministries and government department and,
- ii) Generate greater coherence among development interventions in support of the San communities in Namibia through improved networking and knowledge sharing.

### **2.2 Project strategy**

In order to achieve the immediate objectives of the project within four years, the following strategies have been planned:

- i) Sensitizing the Government to the principles of C. 169 and c. 111 and improving the policy response and current Government practices as well as overall coordination all organizations that are involved in the development of San communities.
- ii) Initiating and supporting a more effective dialogue between the stakeholders (including national and international organizations with a mandate to facilitate or directly provide services to San communities - WIMSA, the NNDF, CESB, and FCEAR and a number of CBOs) and the government in order to reinforce the impact of development efforts for the San.

The logic behind the project strategy derived from the recognition that the stakeholders on this project operate at two interrelated but distinct levels; one is the Government and

its agencies, operating at governance level of policy and regulatory framework formulation and development programming; while the other comprises local and partner programme implementers (international agencies and bodies, and local NGOs, and CBOs) at the operational level. Hence, the project has focused its strategy on improved coordination and consultation among national level stakeholders for the promotion of the rights of the San. On the one hand, the project strategy consists of capacity strengthening and sensitizing the Government of Namibia to a more participatory and inclusive development approach that seeks to engage the San as partners in sustainable development rather than as beneficiaries of aid and welfare; and on the other, enlisting a more effective participation of implementers (international and local organizations) in implementing San related development policies, laws and programmes in a coordinated manner.

### **2.1.1 Outcomes**

Given that there are many agencies in the country, including Government, implementing numerous policy and development initiatives that focus on the human rights and socio-economic development of San peoples, it is expected that effective implementation of the project should lead to: a) increased coherence in the policy, regulatory and legal framework that constitutes the San development policy environment in Namibia, b) more effective mainstreaming of San peoples' rights in the context of ministerial programmes and activities by national policy makers and planners and; c) more effective coordination of the ongoing rights and livelihoods development and cross-sectoral programmes in support of the San that is undertaken by the various national and international actors, through the Government of Namibia, resulting in measurable synergies and scale effects.

The expected long-terms outcomes of the project are:

- i) The Namibian society will have a more positive perception of the San and their contribution to the rich cultural heritage of Namibia;
- ii) The San will have developed stronger ties as equal citizens of the Namibian society;
- iii) The Government of Namibia continues to develop participatory and enabling policies and practices for San development and;
- iv) San women, men and youth will have improved access to employment and income generation opportunities.

### **2.1.2 Outputs and activities**

The main outputs of the project are improved awareness and acknowledgement of indigenous peoples' rights by public and private stakeholders, and improved capacities of government ministries and departments and other selected actors to apply the principles of ILO conventions 111 and 169 in development programmes and activities with San communities across Namibia. The two stated outputs of the project and their corresponding activities are the following:

*Output 1: National policy makers and planners have improved capacities to mainstream San peoples' rights into national development programmes and activities*

- a) Review of the existing legal and regulatory framework for the promotion and protection of San peoples' rights in Namibia
- b) Training needs analysis and a series of training workshops for government staff on the international debate about the rights of indigenous peoples, the principles of C. 169 and C. 111 and their relevance for San development in Namibia
- c) Facilitate national and district-level dialogue events between traditional authorities and the government to appropriately understand the needs and aspirations of the San
- d) Develop plans of action for selected ministries on how to appropriately consult and include San peoples in ministerial programmes and activities
- e) Establish quality control system for the monitoring and evaluation of the impact of Government supported San development programmes

*Output 2: Local stakeholders and multi-bilateral development partners have increased capacities to more effectively coordinate San development programmes and activities*

- a) Undertake review of ongoing San development programmes and activities implemented by government institutions and other actors, with a view to identifying linkages, overlaps, gaps, best practices and lessons learned
- b) Undertake national knowledge sharing seminars with line ministries, government institutions, national and international development organisation and representatives from San traditional authorities to present studies etc., and discuss challenges and constraints concerning San development
- c) Establish National Working Group on San development issues among San organisations, international and national agencies and NGOs
- d) Improve coordination and collaboration of national and international agencies at national and local levels through concrete joint activities
- e) Establish an internet-based resource platform to widely disseminate information on San development programmes in Namibia and the government's efforts to promote the rights of the San
- f) Mobilise additional resources to undertake social marketing campaign on the contribution of the San culture to the national cultural heritage of Namibia in order to stem stigmatization and foster appreciation of the San culture among other ethnic groups
- g) Assess the impact of the social marketing campaign and the appreciation and retaining of its messages by the broader population

### **2.3 Implementation arrangements and project management**

The project identified the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) as the main Government counterpart in the public sector for the coordination of implementation activities. A Steering Committee was constituted and is made up of four members representing Government and partner agencies.

In terms of management, following the appointment of a National Project Coordinator in September 2010, the Project Steering Committee was set up and their inaugural meeting held 17 November 2010.

The ILO appointed a national Project Coordinator, Mr Bryan Gaomab, in September 2010 to oversee the day-to-day running of the project and monitor the overall project implementation. He acts as Secretary to the Steering Committee. It planned that a San Intern will soon be recruited under the project to support the national coordinator and who, after the project, would be absorbed by the ODPM into the Government system.

The project financed with 500,000 Euro from the Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AECI) and contributions in cash and kind from the Government of Namibia, through the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM). It is a 4-year project which started in December 2008 and is scheduled to end by December 2012. The project is financially, administratively and technically backstopped by the ILO Pretoria and the PRO169 & IPLED programme in ILO Headquarters. Mr Albert Barume (NORMS, ILO Geneva) is in charge of all C. 169 programmes, including Namibia. Also, Mr Karl Pfeffer was appointed Associate Expert in August 2010 by the ILO as coordinator for the DWCP in Namibia and has since been active in technically backstopping the San project as well. Apart from the ILO Pretoria office, the project draws on technical input from other units in the four sectors of the ILO, Geneva (Standards, Employment, Social Protection, Social Dialogue) and the ILO's International Training Centre, Turin, Italy.. The office of the ODPM is expected to make an in-kind contribution through the provision of office space. Furthermore, national and local institutions participating in programme activities are expected to invest time and funds to implement the continuous activities of their organizations.

This evaluation has been carried out by the ILO office Pretoria, utilizing the services of an independent evaluator, in accordance with the 1st phase of the project document; it is expected that the findings will be presented in the next steering committee meeting and its recommendations will inform the formulation of the activities of Phase 2 of the project (2010-12).

## **□ □ Present situation of project**

### **2.4.1 Project activities**

Although the project started officially in December 2008 the substantive ILO National Project Coordinator (NPC) was not in place until September 2010; before then aspects of initial project activities were being technically backstopped by an ILO official based in Pretoria, South Africa. Significant among these were the three studies carried out by the Legal Assistance Centre (LAC): namely: i) Addressing the development of the San peoples in Namibia as a marginalized community within Government planning and services; ii) Review of development partners and ongoing and planned San development

initiatives and; iii) Review of the existing legal and regulatory framework for the promotion and protection of San rights in Namibia.

In terms of knowledge sharing, the reports were presented at the Sub-Regional ILO Conference on indigenous and marginalized peoples, in Windhoek in October 2010; one of the reports was also shared at the needs assessment training workshop.

#### **2.4.3 Project inputs and sustainability**

The project is being financed with inputs from AECI amounting to 500,000 Euro (see budget summary in the Annex 5) for four years (2008-2012). The project expected contributions in cash and kind from the local counterpart, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM). So far the Donor agency has responded to its pledge in a timely manner; in addition, representative of the agency has participated actively in the Project Steering Committee activities, including meetings and this Mid-Term evaluation process. The ODPM on its part has also supported the project enthusiastically through coordination of project activities as Steering Committee Chair and by providing support to workshops and related project activities.

#### **▣ Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation**

The purpose of the mid-term review is to assess whether the project has delivered its outputs as per work plan thus far, and to assess the process of implementation with recommendations for improvements in the ongoing implementation of the project. Being a national project, the scope of this evaluation covers the Republic of Namibia.

This external mid-term review has been undertaken in accordance with the ILO Evaluation Policy adopted by the Governing Body in November 2005, which provides for systematic evaluation of programmes and projects in order to improve quality, accountability and transparency of the ILO's work, strengthen the decision-making process and support constituents in forwarding decent work and social justice. Furthermore, the evaluation was undertaken in line the ILO Manual for Technical Cooperation released by PARDEV in 2010.

The primary clients of the review are the ILO (Geneva and Pretoria), project partners and stakeholders— ODPM, WIMSA and AECID.

#### **▣ Methodology of evaluation**

The review has been based on data from primary and secondary sources. Data and information from primary sources were derived from semi-structured interviews of stakeholders and project management as defined in the project document. Interviews and discussions targeted the ODPM. It was planned to also interview Ministries that have a part-mandate for San development; however, since they are yet to be fully involved in the implementation of this project the idea was dropped. Interviews were extended to selected NGOs with major focus on San peoples (The Working Group for Indigenous



Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA), The Nyae Nyae Development Foundation, Desert Research Foundation of Namibia). In addition, officials involved with research works on the project from the Legal Assistance Centre (LAC), as well as the representative of the donor agency (AECI) were interviewed. The ILO Programme Coordinator of the ‘Towards the Elimination of the worst form of Child Labour’ in Namibia was also interviewed given the relevance of their activities. The interviews utilized semi-structured schedules and addressed the main evaluation questions based on the evaluation criteria defined in the TOR: a) Relevance and strategic fit, b) Validity of design, c) Project effectiveness, d) Project efficiency, e) Effectiveness of management arrangements and, f) Sustainability. The evaluation criteria guided the formulation of evaluation questions in the course of field work.

Secondary sources of data /information included the ILO project document; project related reports, and any commissioned research reports and workshop proceedings; Government publications; UN publications; project management reports and relevant publications/reports from the internet.

Data collected from all the sources mentioned were collated and analysed using appropriate statistical methods. Conclusions and recommendations of this evaluation are based on the results of analysis of data collected from both primary and secondary sources.

One limitation of the evaluation process was time constraint; the exercise allowed only two days for field work, obviously inadequate to make and agree on appointments, meet and interview clients scattered in different offices in Windhoek. Time and resource constraints also precluded field visit to any San community given their long distant location from Windhoek.

## **4. Evaluation Findings**

### **4.1 Relevance and strategic fit**

The deplorable plight of the San has since been recognized by the Government of Namibia, and in response, policies and programmes have been designed to empower them to achieve recognition within the body politic and identify potentials for sustainable development of the local resources available, including the promotion of self-employment in non-traditional service sectors, creation of enabling environment for San local economic development, and enactment of measures to end the discrimination. Significant among such steps are the Communal Land Reform Act of 2002 which gives the San people the legal right to participate equally in decisions affecting their lands, and the 2005 San Development Programme (SDP) which was enacted through parliament decision and placed in the Deputy Prime Minister’s Office (DPMO) to coordinate San development initiatives in areas such as education and scholar ships. This project is also strategically relevant to the San Development Programme (SDP) which was approved by Cabinet in November 2005 and is driven by the ODPM. The main objective of the programme is to ensure the integration of the San into the mainstream of Namibia’s

economy in line with Vision 2030 (the county's long term development policy) and specific national development programmes. The Programme also makes reference to the National Development Plan 3, in which the welfare of the San falls under "Key Result Area: Quality of Life", with its goal to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger.

In support of Government efforts, the ILO itself has been collaborating with interested UN agencies in Joint Programmes to address the plight of the San in Namibia. Under the current UNDAF for Namibia (2006-2010), the ILO is involved (in collaboration with UNESCO, the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, the United Nations Environment Programme) in a Joint Programme on Sustainable Cultural Tourism submitted to the UNDP–Spain MDG Achievement Fund. The Joint Programme aims to help to achieve MDGs 1, 3, 6 and 7 by focusing on poverty reduction, gender mainstreaming, mainstreaming of HIV and AIDS issues linked to the cultural tourism sites, and ensuring the sustainability of environmental/cultural assets. The UN agencies involved are UNESCO, and the ILO. The programme aims at empowering local communities, including San communities, through community-based tourism and local economic development initiatives. The ILO has a leading role in the implementation of this component, given its extensive experience in employment creation and small business enterprise development.

The San project is part of the Namibian DWCP and, within the context of the current UNDAF for Namibia (2006-2010), it contributes to the following country specific outcomes: capacity building of government departments and officials; policy advice and Policy Dialogue; Social Marketing Campaigns; Study Tours; coordination and Knowledge Sharing events; Knowledge management Systems and; networking support.

In spite of Government efforts and interventions by the development partners including the ILO since independence, the plight of San peoples have not improved significantly. Presently, there are three major development challenges still facing the San in Namibia; namely, i) to empower the San to unlock this development potential and to work their way out of poverty, ii) to increase awareness of the rights of the San as equal partners in development and, iii) to effectively coordinate the formulation and implementation a comprehensive development framework.

Given the above narrative, the ILO San development project remains valid; so also are the project objectives aimed at capacity building of Government policy and programme designers as well as the programme implementers in the San communities. Particularly relevant at this point is the project's activity under Output 2 targeting the establishment of a National Working Group on San development issues among San organisations, international and national agencies and NGOs, so as to agree on a common objective, shared strategy and improved coordination and collaboration of national and international agencies at national and local levels through concrete joint San activities.

#### **4.2 Validity of design**

In general terms, the design of the project is valid. The background review draws evidence from the country and makes a clear case for a project of this nature, with

justification for the role of ILO under the Namibia DWCP. The project is also appropriately designed to sensitize the Government to the principles of C. 169 and c. 111 and improve the policy response and current Government practices as well as overall coordination of all organizations that are involved in the development of San communities in the country. In addition, the project focuses on initiating and supporting a more effective dialogue between the stakeholders (including national and international organizations with a mandate to facilitate or directly provide services to San communities - WIMSA, the NNDF, CESB, and FCEAR and a number of CBOs) and the Government in order to reinforce the impact of development efforts for the San.

The overall (or development) objective of the project is to contribute to poverty reduction through the promotion of the rights and participatory socio-economic development of the San peoples of Namibia based on their needs and aspirations. This is consistent with the expressed concerns, which have also been echoed by the development partners, for the need to uphold and promote the rights of the San peoples as a minority group in the country and to enhance their capacity through education, training and technical support for their increasing access to productive resources and social services.

The immediate objectives, as already defined above, are two both anchored on the need for capacity building of Government policy makers and programme planners, and the development partners, local and international, including the bilateral and multilateral organizations in the country. Expected long-term outcomes are that the Government of Namibia continues to develop participatory and enabling policies and practices for San development and that San women, men and youth will have increased awareness of their rights and improved access to employment and income generation opportunities.

In terms of its design, the Logical Framework for the project specifies most of its output indicators at national rather than project level; and in the absence of indicator baseline and target, it is difficult to objectively assess progress made in implementation beyond description of activities carried out. In addition, evaluation is made more difficult when, as in this project, outputs are pitched at such a high level of national achievement. Output indicators are specified in the Logical Framework as follows:

*Output 1:*

- 1.1 At least 75% of policy stakeholders targeted for capacity building show improved knowledge and capacity of IP rights;
- 1.2 Existing plans of actions for San development in government programmes.

*Output 2:*

- 2.1 At least 75% of stakeholders participating in knowledge sharing events report increased awareness and understanding of San development
- 2.2 National working group on San rights and development meet regularly
- 2.3 Number of opportunities for joint programming for San development identified and implemented
- 2.4 More consistent messages on the UN's role and activities in San development communicated to stakeholders
- 2.5 Greater information flow between UN agencies on San development initiatives in Namibia

If indeed, the capacities of national policy makers is improved by whatever measure at the end of this project, such an achievement cannot be attributed to this project efforts alone since there are many actors in the field including Government itself and development partners (bilateral and multilateral organizations) contributing to this empirical indicator. The same applies to Output 2, which focuses on increased capacities of local stakeholders and multi-bilateral development partners to mainstream San peoples' rights into national development programmes and activities. Any indicator of this output can only be the result of contributions by various development agencies, including this ILO project input. Therefore, it is difficult to determine in any evaluation the relative contribution of any agency to the output indicator. Only the indicator 2.3 above has been operationally defined and can be measured in relation to project performance.

Given this design, project evaluation could only identify and describe the range of activities carried out under each output; it is difficult in such an exercise to measure the degree of progress made in achieving the ILO San project objectives. In the circumstance, project management may wish to consider a re-valuation of the project Logical Framework and realistically define for the remaining two years (or so) of the project cycle output indicators specific to project activities rather than the results of all inputs by Government and development partners. Without such a modification to the Logical Framework, it will be difficult to rigorously determine the extent of progress made in project implementation at the end of the project cycle in December 2012.

### **4.3 Project progress and effectiveness**

The issue addressed here is the extent to which project's immediate objectives were achieved, or expected to be achieved, since the official beginning of the project taking into account their relative importance. As already noted in section 4.2 above, the design of the project makes it difficult to for an evaluation to determine the extent of progress towards the achievement of project's immediate objectives; at best, project activities carried out under each output are examined in terms of execution and results. The first phase of the implementation plan (2008-2010) details all the activities expected to be carried out in addressing each of the two project immediate objectives and their corresponding outputs (Prodoc. Section 3, p18-19).

#### **4.3.1 Immediate objective 1**

The first immediate objective is to strengthen the San development planning and coordination capacity of policy makers in ministries and government departments. The expected output is: *National policy makers and planners have improved capacities to mainstream San peoples' rights into national development programmes and activities*. Under output 1, the project identified five activities to be carried out in the first two years of its operation as detailed in section 2.2.2 above; but at the end of 2010, the project touched only on three of them.

Under a contract awarded to the LAC in 2010, Ms Lesle Jansen carried out a study: "Review of the existing legal and regulatory framework for the promotion and protection of San peoples' rights in Namibia". The study was well researched and the report

circulated to ILO and ODPM, and later shared with stakeholders at the ILO Sub-Regional Conference organized in partnership with the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights and the Office of the Prime Minister in Namibia on: on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples/Marginalised Communities and the launch of the Overview Report on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 24 African Countries from 11 to 12 October 2010 at Safari Hotel and Conference Centre in Windhoek, Namibia.

Regarding training needs of Government functionaries dealing with San issues, two related activities were carried out as planned under the first phase of the project. The first was a commissioned study by the ILO to LAC to undertake a study of the training needs of 11 Namibian Government Ministries. The study dealt with a training needs analysis for Government staff and relevant civil society organizations on the inclusion of San peoples' issues in the planning and implementation of Government services in Namibia (Lesle Jensen, April 2010). Related to this was the conduct of a one-day workshop (19 April 2010) on: Training needs analysis for government staff on the international debate about the rights of indigenous peoples, the principles of C. 169 and C. 111 and their relevance for San development in Namibia. The LAC report provided the background for the workshop deliberations. The workshop attracted 18 participants drawn from the level of Government planners representing ministries with mandates related to the development of San peoples in Namibia. Following the workshop, project management prepared a report and circulated it to all the concerned parties. It is difficult to determine the impact of the one-day workshop on the participants, given the complexity of the issues to be addressed and the slow process of capacity building efforts. The project itself recognized this and planned that "a series of training workshops" of this nature should be carried out in support of this output. At best, the one-day training workshop, even if the training was rigorous and useful, should be regarded as a start. Similar training workshops should be carried out with the same set of participants in the course of implementing the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of this project in order to generate the expected impact.

Taken together, it is not clear how these workshops have impacted on the project in general or, arising from their conclusions and recommendations, whether Government and/or implementing partners have taken any steps related to the achievement of the ILO San project objectives. The reports of these workshops were prepared by the project coordinator and were sent to ODPM for comments before finalization and distribution to the stakeholders. However, the response from ODPM is still being awaited. It is suggested that the Steering Committee should specifically list such reports for discussion and agree on when they should be circulated to concerned parties in order to avoid long delays.

The project also organized a consultative meeting with representatives of the planned San Council (20 April 2010), an activity designed to facilitate national and district-level dialogue between traditional authorities and the government in order to appropriately understand the needs and aspirations of the San. Later on 13 October 2010, the project again organized a national workshop to discuss the needs and aspirations of the San peoples which would be addressed in any future San related development activities. The project coordinator also participated in the San Steering Committee AGM on 3

November 2010 at which the project's aims and objectives were shared with members. In addition, the project still has plans to organize a series of consultations with the stakeholders in the course of the project implementation beyond the first phase. Whatever is being done to improve dialogue with the San, the establishment and sustained functioning of a San Council should be regarded as priority and a veritable strategy for the promotion of their social recognition and effective participation in the development process.

#### **4.3.2 Immediate objective 2**

The second immediate objective of the project is to generate greater coherence among development interventions in support of the San communities in Namibia through improved networking and knowledge sharing. This objective has one output: *Local stakeholders and multi-bilateral development partners have increased capacities to more effectively coordinate San development programmes and activities*. The project planned to carry out seven related activities in order to achieve the stated output at the end of the first phase of the project (2010); however, only three planned activities were actually done.

While the project was still being managed from Pretoria, South Africa, one of the initial activities was the contract awarded to LAC early in 2010 to undertake three studies under this project. Of direct relevance to the second project output was the LAC Report III based on the ILO commissioned studies on the San of Namibia in 2010. The study report, titled: *Review Report on Ongoing San Development Initiatives in Namibia* was prepared by Dr Ute Diekmann and submitted to the ILO in April 2010. As specified in the project's work plan, the report reviewed of ongoing San development programmes and activities implemented by government institutions and other actors, and identified linkages, overlaps, gaps, best practices and lessons learned. The major conclusions and recommendations of this important report should not be taken lightly by the Government and other stakeholders. Among others, the report states:

“..... diverse initiatives regarding development initiatives in San communities in various parts of Namibia are under way. However, an integrated strategy towards such development is lacking. Consequently, proper coordination of development activities is lacking as well. Although the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) established the SDP, even Government activities in relation to the San generally lack an integrated strategy, and programmes of the various O/M/As are not all integrated into the SDP. In addition, the activities of UN agencies regarding the San are not coordinated properly (apart from the Joint Programmes, where activities have to be coordinated, but not around a special San focus). To ensure sustainability of all San-directed development activities, therefore, coordination has to become institutionalised across all the organisations involved in San-directed development programmes” (Diekmann, 2010, p32).

A related activity was the organization of a knowledge sharing meeting of stakeholders in conjunction with the ILO Sub-Regional Conference on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples/Marginanised Communities, and the launch of the “Overview Report of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 24 African Countries” held in Windhoek (11-13 October

2010). This was a direct response to the project plan to undertake national knowledge sharing seminars with line ministries, government institutions, national and international development organisation and representatives from San traditional authorities to present study reports and discuss challenges and constraints concerning San development. The project utilized the Conference venue to share the reports prepared for the ILO-AECID Project on “Promoting the Implementation of the Rights of the San in Namibia” done by the Legal Assistance Centre in Namibia, and provide recommendations for addressing some of the most critical issues regarding the promotion and protection of the rights of San peoples in Namibia. According to the Conference report, the Conference provided an excellent opportunity to delegates to: a) Bring to the fore and deliberate the major challenges regarding development of marginalized communities, and especially San Communities in Namibia; and b) Provide inputs to a White Paper on Marginalised Communities to be drafted in Namibia. The Conference report has since been widely distributed by the ILO.

The project also organized a study tour for selected stakeholders to South Africa with the objective to visit San communities and interact with San development actors in the country. The idea was that through such a joint concrete activity, the project would be contributing to improved coordination and collaboration of national and international agencies at national and local levels. The study tour was undertaken from 5 to 11 December 2010. It involved 9 officials, 3 women and 6 men, representing some of the stakeholders: 2 from Government; 4 San traditional chiefs; 1 WIMSA education coordinator; and the ILO project coordinator. According to the tour report, it was the first cross boundary visit between the San communities residing within the boundaries of South Africa and Namibia and was regarded as remarkable. Based on experience sharing and lessons learned, the participants made a number of recommendations that could be useful in policy formulation and programme management in the San communities.

#### **4.4 Project efficiency**

The ILO expertise deployed to the project consists of the national Project Coordinator, Mr. Brian Goamab and Officials who backstopped the project from Pretoria, including Mr. Karl Pfeffer who joined the ILO in July 2010 and started working on the project in August 2010. Apart from financial management, ILO expertise supported a number of important project activities carried out from 2008 to 2010. Significant among them were the three research works commissioned to LAC, and the ‘Stakeholders workshop on Training Needs Analysis regarding the rights and sustainability of development efforts within San communities’ (April 2010). With additional support from the ILO Office in Geneva, technical backstopping was also provided for two regional workshops: i) Sub-regional conference was organized (November 11-12), introducing the topic of Indigenous peoples’ rights, the ILO Conventions No.169 and 111 and the context of the San in Namibia; ii) Regional Consultative Workshop was held in Windhoek, with the objectives, amongst others, of strengthening working relations between OPM and regional decentralized structures and to create coordinated development approach towards San development in Namibia (13 November 2010). The ILO support to the Sub-Regional Conferences included Mr Albert Barume, ILO Geneva; Mr. Karl Pfeffer, ILO Pretoria, Ms Poppy Mthembu, ILO Pretoria; Mr. Mandigona Matema, ILO Pretoria and; Mr.

Bryan Gaomab, ILO Namibia. Towards the end of 2010, the ILO Office Pretoria also supported a Stakeholders study tour to South Africa for the purpose of visiting and gaining experience on San Communities and from developmental actors in the country. To the extent that research reports were presented and discussed at national and regional workshops to the benefit of stakeholders beyond Namibia, the backstopping support provided by the ILO in general has been quite effective.

Following his appointment in September 2010, the national ILO Project Coordinator has followed through the implementation of project activities: he developed an inventory of project stakeholders; participated in the organization of the Sub Regional Conference on the Rights of Indigenous /Marginalized Communities and the launch of Overview Reports of Indigenous Communities in 24 African Countries (11-12 October 2010); participated in the national Conference on the Rights of Indigenous Communities in Namibia 13 October 2010; was actively involved in the organization of the Regional Consultative Workshop (22-25 November 2010). He facilitated the establishment of the project's Steering Committee and the conduct of its inaugural session on 17 November 2010. He also worked closely with the ILO Office Pretoria in project monitoring, organized and participated in the Namibian San Leadership study tour to South Africa (5-12 December 2010) in which he also participated; carried out a review of the work plan for 2010 and, in collaboration with the Steering Committee, developed a new one for 2011.

However, the project lacks an adequate working environment; the small office space being used is rented by the ILO from a local NGO, though moderately furnished. The ODPM should be encouraged to respond to the pledge to provide office space for project activities. The ILO should provide logistic support to the NPC, including telephone and transportation at the cost of the project. Below is the equipment inventory.

**Table 1: Inventory of Project Equipment (March 2011)**

<b>Equipment</b>	<b>Condition</b>
DELL Laptop	Functional
Digital Sony Camera	Functional
Cell phone – Nokia N97	Functional (no cell phone allowance)
Office space with 1 desk and 3 chairs	Rent from RISE Namibia (N\$3500.00)
Transport	None

*Source: ILO Project Office, Windhoek.*

**Finance:** As already noted, the project is being financed with inputs from AECI amounting to 500,000 Euro (see budget summary in the Annex 5) for four years (2008-2012). ILO has been managing the project financially and has records of expenditure from 2009 to 2011. The ILO expenditure records are rendered in US Dollars and, given fluctuations in the currency conversion rates internationally, the evaluation has focused on the Dollar figures generated by the Finance Section of the ILO (see Table 2). From the available records, it seems that the project did not specify any budget provisions on an



annual basis or for the 1<sup>st</sup> Phase of the project 2008-2010. In the absence of a budget as basis for specific activities, it is difficult to measure the implementation rates; information is available only for commitment/expenditure. If allocation is taken as the budget for the reference period, from the records available, the implementation rates are (artificially) 100% on all the budget lines. The evaluation suggests that the project management should prepare detailed budget based on annual work plan, then make request for allocations; an evaluation would then be able to compute implementation rates on an annual basis.

**Table 2: Project expenditure patterns, 2009-2010 (US\$)**

BL	Description	Allocation	Commitment	Expenditure	Allocation balance
<b>2009</b>					
011	International Experts	165	165	165	
017	National Professional Personnel	3,670	3,670	3,670	
021					
067	Prog. Support cost Ad hoc	312	311.93	312	-0.07
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4147</b>	<b>4,146.93</b>	<b>4,147</b>	<b>-0.07</b>
<b>2010</b>					
011	International Experts	15,889	20,224	20,224	-4,335
013	Administrative support	499			499
015	Travel costs	6,540	6,540	6,540	
016	Mission costs	6,477	6,477	6,477	
017	National Professional Personnel	13,900	13,900	13,900	
021	Sub-contract	13,763	13,763	13,763	
031	Fellowships & Study Tours	6,477	6,477	6,477	
032	Capacity Building & Training	27,850	24,430	24,430	3,420
041	Equipment	3,238	2,938	2,938	300
051	Operation & Maintenance	3,238	3,000	3,000	238
053	Sundries	3,238	3,238	3,237	1
067	Prog. Support Cost Ad Hoc	8,593	8,214	8,214	379
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>109,702</b>	<b>109,199</b>	<b>109,199</b>	<b>503</b>
<i>Source: ILO, Pretoria, Budget Management System- Technical Cooperation Projects, (16-03-2011)</i>					

Project implementation in 2009 was limited, only \$4,147 was expended in the year. In terms of expenditure patterns, in 2009, there were only three operational budget lines; about 88.5% of all expenses went to payments for National Professional Personnel. This

pattern changed dramatically in 2010 as the project swung into action. In all, project expenditure in 2010 amounted to \$109,199, most of which went to financing capacity building and training activities (22.4%), followed by International Experts (18.5%), National Professional Personnel (12.7%), and Sub-Contract (12.6%). In the two years of its operation the project expended a total of \$113,346 out of the 500,000 Euro approved for its execution in four years. Overall, project implementation rate has been rather low, probably not more than 20%, depending on the conversion rate from Euro to Dollar during the period. From the design of the 2011 work plan and based on the recommendations of this evaluation, the project seems to be poised for an increased rate of project implementation during the 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase.

#### **4.5 Effectiveness of management arrangements**

As already noted above, the project identified the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) as the main Government counterpart in the public sector for the coordination of implementation activities. It was planned that soon after its commencement, the project will be supported by a national Steering Committee comprising selected stakeholders. The ODPM initially worked directly with the ILO Pretoria office through an official for most part of the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the project. Little is known about the intervention of the ILO official in 2009 and part of 2010 due to a virtual absence of institutional memory. In terms of project management in Namibia, it was not until September 2010, following the appointment of a National Project Coordinator by the ILO, that the Project Steering Committee established. The ILO project coordinator, Mr. Bryan Gaomab, stands in as Secretary to the Committee and he works closely with the Chairperson to arrange meetings and circulate minutes to members. So far, the Steering Committee has demonstrated commitment to the implementation of the project, in recognition of the need to make up for lost grounds in the earlier months of the project.

The evaluation found that the composition of the Steering Committee is rather limited considering the range of actors in the field and, based on opinions expressed by those interviewed, an expanded Committee could also include one representative each from: the Legal Assistance Centre (LAC); National Planning Commission (NPC); Ministry of Education and Training (MET); Ministry of Higher Education (MHE) and; Ministry of Lands and Resettlement (MLR).

Except from the slow pace of implementation in the first year, the project has been well managed and, with the national project coordinator in place supported by a reconstituted Steering Committee, project implementation in the second phase should be more effective and efficient.

In terms of project monitoring and evaluation, the Project Coordinator was expected to prepare an inception report in time for the constitutive meeting of the programme steering committee after the first three months of the programme cycle, followed by regular quarterly project implementation updates to the relevant ILO offices and the PRO169/IPLED programme. In addition, the national Project Coordinator should prepare half-yearly progress reports (including detailed work plans) for submission to the Steering Committee and ahead of its half-year meetings. Given the circumstances which

constrained the appointment of the ILO project coordinator at the start of the project and the prolonged delay in appointing one, it is not surprising that the evaluation has no records of periodic project monitoring reports, including financial analysis.

In terms of the Project Steering Committee the evaluation found that, under the ODPM as Chair and supported by the ILO Project Coordinator as Secretary, the Steering Committee has performed quite well; its expanded membership should further increase its effectiveness in achieving the objectives of the project.

#### **4.6 Impact orientation and Sustainability**

The project strategy is based on the need to build capacity among national stakeholders (Government planners and policy makers, local and international development partners – NGOs, CBOs, UN, and bilateral agencies present in Namibia) that will favour sustainable development in San communities. In order to generate impact, project's activities have focused on Government institutional strengthening and human capacity building. In order to address the capacity building concerns of the project, activities being implemented are anchored on the strategy which addresses the capacity needs of Government decision makers and planners on the one hand, while targeting San development programme implementers in the communities, on the other hand. If effectively implemented, the sustainability of project activities would be assured.

At the institutional level, the project has constituted a national Steering Committee to manage the implementation of project activities, thus strengthening the ODPM in facilitating the formulation of policies and coordination of programmes aimed at the development of San peoples. An enlarged Committee as suggested above would facilitate the coordination of programme activities even better, thus paving the way for a formal institutional mechanism. In recognition of the need to achieve coherence and effective coordination of the numerous San projects and programmes across the country, the project also focuses on the creation of a National Working Group on San; with the collaboration of WIMSA, LAC and ODPM under this project, efforts are being made to move the project in this direction during the 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase. The national San Working Group will support ODPM to coordinate the implementation of the various San related development policies and programmes being carried out by the stakeholders – Government, NGOs, UN, bilateral agencies, etc – across the country. Also at the institutional level, the project has been addressing the establishment and sustained functioning of a San Council that will serve as a veritable link between the San peoples on the one hand, and the Government and development partners on the other.

In support of sustainability, the project also its focus on human capacity building; so far, this has been done through workshop training involving Government officials from 11 Ministries with a mandate related to San development; participation of stakeholders in knowledge sharing at ILO project workshops and Conferences; exposure of selected stakeholders to San development issues in another country, South Africa, through the study tour organized by the project in December 2010. Also through the San Website being developed under this project, knowledge sharing will be broadened and capacities strengthened on San development and human right issues. The project itself plans to

recruit a San officer paid by the ILO to work closely with the Project Coordinator, on the understanding that ODPM will absorb the San official into the Government structures to continue working on related project activities after the end of the project cycle in 2012.

The main outputs of the project will be improved awareness and acknowledgement of indigenous peoples' rights by public and private stakeholders, and improved capacities of Government and other selected actors to apply the principles of ILO Conventions 111 and 169 in development programmes and activities with San communities across Namibia. The project complements other national initiatives focusing on capacity building among San support organizations and improving the livelihoods of the San.

Also in order to broaden participation and build capacity, the project is linked to related programmes under the UNDAF. For illustration, the proposal for a Joint Programme on Sustainable Cultural Tourism recently submitted by UN in Namibia to the UNDP–Spain MDG Achievement Fund aims to draw on the development of cultural tourism as a vehicle for poverty reduction, particularly among women and disadvantaged or vulnerable groups. The Joint Programme, which advocates the improvement of livelihoods/food security and empowerment of rural communities through the promotion of cultural tourism is being planned by UNESCO, the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, the United Nations Environment Programme and the ILO. One component of the Joint Programme aims to develop sustainable tourism services at the local level that will lead to job creation and poverty reduction. Local communities will be empowered, including San communities, through community-based tourism and local economic development initiatives. The ILO will have a leading role in the implementation of this component, given this San project and its extensive experience in employment creation and small business enterprise development.

## **5. Conclusions**

The rather slow pace of San development in Namibia has been attributed to the lack of a shared objective, an integrated strategy and poor programme coordination. Given its objectives and expected outcomes and outputs, this project is strategically relevant to the San Development Programme (SDP) which was approved by Cabinet in November 2005 and is driven by the ODPM.

The project strategy is based on the need to build capacity among national stakeholders (Government planners and policy makers, local and international development partners – NGOs, CBOs, UN, and bilateral agencies present in Namibia) that will favour sustainable development in San communities. In order to generate impact, project's activities have focused on Government institutional strengthening and human capacity building. Through its involvement in workshops and conferences, the project has contributed to improved awareness and acknowledgement of indigenous peoples' rights by public and private stakeholders, and improved capacities of relevant Government ministries and other selected actors to apply the principles of ILO Conventions 111 and 169 in development programmes and activities with San communities across Namibia. Also through the San Website being developed under this project, knowledge sharing will be broadened and capacities strengthened on San development and human rights issues. The

project itself plans to support the creation of the San Council and recruit a San officer soon, paid by the ILO, to work closely with the Project Coordinator, on the understanding that ODPM will absorb the San official into the Government structures and continue working on related project activities after the end of the project cycle in 2012. Critical aspects of the project activities not addressed during Phase 1 should be incorporated into the work plan for phase 2.

In terms of management, ILO backstopping efforts have been effective, although the delay in appointing a national project coordinator hampered project implementation to a considerable degree. Since the intervention of the project coordinator started in September 2010, project implementation has progressed satisfactorily and this has contributed to greater efficiency of resource utilization.

However, not more than 50% of planned activities were actually carried out; and less than 20% of the funds for the project were expended during the first two years of its operation. The Steering Committee should ensure that the annual work plan for the remaining two years of the project incorporates those activities which could not be executed during the 1<sup>st</sup> Phase and define for execution activities considered strategic to the achievement of the immediate objectives of the project.

## **6. Lessons Learned, Good Practices and Recommendations**

### **¶ Lessons learned**

- a) By broadening the composition of the Project Steering Committee, the project would have taken an important step towards the establishment and sustained functioning of a National Working Group on San development in Namibia. Such an efficient project implementation arrangement, involving the active involvement of Government and implementing partners, provides the best strategy for smooth project implementation.
- b) Prolonged delay in sharing project reports (including research reports, workshop reports, etc.) undermines the utility of such reports and might amount to inefficient utilization of project's resources.

### **¶ ¶ Good Practices**

Project's research reports were shared with a wider audience than originally intended through the ILO Sub-Regional Conference thereby generating impact beyond the national level.

The project addressed knowledge sharing meeting of stakeholders in conjunction with the ILO Sub-Regional Conference on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples/Marginanised Communities in November 2010 by utilizing the Conference venue to share the research reports prepared for the ILO project by LAC, and provided recommendations for addressing some of the most critical issues regarding the promotion and protection of the rights of San peoples in Namibia. According to the Conference report, the Conference provided an excellent opportunity to delegates (including stakeholders from Namibia) to:

- a) Bring to the fore and deliberate the major challenges regarding development of

marginalized communities, and especially San Communities in Namibia; and b) Provide inputs to a White Paper on Marginalised Communities to be drafted in Namibia.

**☐☐ Recommendations**

- i) It is important that ODPM honors its pledge in the signed Project Document by providing office space (and possibly infrastructure) for the smooth operation of the project.
- j) The project management should consider a review of the Steering Committee in order to more effectively broaden its membership.
- k) Project management should prepare the required project monitoring reports on a regular basis in accordance with the ILO practices.
- l) In support of sustainability and effective policy and programme management, the project should take the necessary steps towards the establishment and sustained functioning of a National Working Group on San Development and the San Council in Namibia.
- m) In order to facilitate policy and planning formulation and implementation, the project should support a small-scale socio-economic study of San peoples to produce a profile of the San peoples, showing the dynamics of their population and associated social, demographic and economic indicators in comparison with the national averages available.
- n) Project management should consider a re-evaluation of the structure of the project's Logical Framework and include for the remaining two years (or so) of the project cycle project specific output indicators, together with their corresponding baselines and targets.
- o) The project should facilitate linkages between Government and potential donors to support the implementation of specific development projects in San communities by local CBOs and NGOs.
- p) To the extent possible, the project should collaborate with relevant UN agencies, particularly in Joint Programmes that are of interest to the ILO, under the current UNDAF for Namibia in order to achieve synergy.

## Annexes

### Annex1:

#### Background documents consulted

##### i) Background documents

- (a) Namibia DWCP
- (b) Technical Cooperation Document
- (c) Project study reports and workshop proceedings
- (d) Implementation Plan
- (e) Vision 2030 and NDP3
- (f) MDG & ICPD PoA Reports

##### ii) Project-related documents

- (a) Project document
- (b) Project (revised) budget and summary of expenditure
- (c) Various project progress reports, work plans and strategy maps
- (d) Inception workshop report,

### Annex 2: List of persons met

Gerson H. Kamatuka	ODPM
Mr. Rhingo Mutambo	ODPM
Karl Pfeffer	ILO, Pretoria
Simonee Shihepo	ILO, Namibia
Stella S. Iyambo	ILO, Namibia
Brian Gaomab	ILO, Namibia
Lesle Jansen	LAC
Wendy Viall	Nyae Nyae
Lara Diez	Nyae Nyae
Maria T. Namupala	WIMSA
Malechi Yumbo	WIMSA
Brighten Simasiku	WIMSA
Eva Weitz	WIMSA
Erik-Jan Dirkx	DRFN
Johanna Fernadez	AECID

### Annex 3: References

ILO, report on fact finding mission to Namibia and South Africa 26 March- 5 April, 2007, ILO Geneva.

### Annex 4: Project Work Plan\*

Activity	Responsible party	Days	Planned dates
1. Desk study	Evaluator	2	1-3 March
2. Plan & coordinate meetings	NPC, Namibia	1	3 March

3. Develop question matrix and instruments due to Evaluation Manager who will circulate to other stakeholders for comments	Evaluator	1	4 March
4. Briefing on evaluation	Evaluation Manager, Associate Expert	1	7 March
5. Interview main stakeholders	Evaluator	2	9-11 March
6. Focus groups	Evaluator	2	14-15 March
7. Report writing	Evaluator	4	16-21 March
8. Circulate draft report for inputs & inclusion of comments	Evaluation Manager	?	22 March
9. Send comments to Evaluator & work comments into the final report	Evaluation Manager & Evaluator	2	24-25 March
10. Present final report	Evaluator	1	28 March
11. Edit, proof read & submit final report to the ILO, Pretoria	Evaluator	1	29-31 March

- Based on the TOR

## Annex 5: Project Budget Summary

### *Project Budget Summary (2008-2012) \**

BL	Item	Euro
15	Travel in Namibia	30'000
16	Missions costs	20'000
17	National Project Coordinator	190'000
17	National consultants	70'000
31	Study tour	20'000
32	Seminars	86'000
41	Equipment	10'000
51	Operations & maintenance	10'000
53	Sundries	10'000
68	Programme support (7%)	31'000
71	Provision for cost increase	22'000
99	<b>Total</b>	<b>€ 500'000</b>

Source: ILO Project Document