



Consulting services for the Socio-Economic Baseline Survey for the Kavango Zambezi Transfroniter Conservation Area (KAZA TFCA) and the development of a framework for monitoring and evaluating the impacts of the KAZA TFCA Programmes on rural livelihoods

Twiza ssociates Limite





Contractor:

Peace Parks Foundation on behalf of the KAZA TFCA and KfW Entwicklungsbank

June, 2014

FINAL RECORD

CONSULTING SERVICES FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC BASELINE SURVEY AND DEVELOPMENT OF A MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR THE KAVANGO ZAMBEZI TRANSFRONTIER CONSERVATION AREA (KAZA TFCA)

Contracted by:	Peace Parks Foundation on behalf of the KAZA TFCA and KfW Entwicklungsbank				
Submitted by:					
E. C. O.		AND	Twiza Associates Limited *Consulting "Training" Development "Hospitality Industry Project Management		
E.C.O. Institute of Ecology Jungmeier GmbH		University of Namibia,	Twiza Associates Limited		
Kinoplatz 6, A-9020 Klagenfurt, Austria		Multidisciplinary Research Center (MRC), Life Science Division, Private Bag 13301	P.O Box 37728, Lusaka, Zambia		
Tel.: 0463/50 41 44		340 Mandume Ndemufayo Avenue	C/O Plot 6, Lagos Road, Rhodespark		
<u>E-Mail: office@e-c-o.at</u>		Windhoek, Namibia			
nomepage: www.e-c-	<u>.0.al</u>				

Klagenfurt, June 27th 2014

Project leader:	DI MSc Susanne Glatz-Jorde, E.C.O., Austria	
Project supervision:	Dr. Hanns Kirchmeir	
Authors:	DI MSc Susanne Glatz-Jorde, E.C.O., Austria	
	DI Michael Huber, E.C.O., Austria	
	Dr. Hanns Kirchmeir, E.C.O., Austria	
	Msc. Thomas Robert Topp, Austria/South Africa	
	Dr. Alfons Mosimane, University of Namibia	
	Selma Lendelvo, University of Namibia	
	Greewell Mukvavi, Twiza Associates Limited, Zambia	
	Osward Mulenga, Twiza Associates Limited, Zambia	
	Dr. Micheal Jungmeier, Austria	
Conceptual approach and methods:	DI MSc Susanne Glatz-Jorde, E.C.O., Austria	
	Dr. Hanns Kirchmeir, E.C.O., Austria	
	DI Michael Huber, E.C.O., Austria	
	Dr. Alfons Mosimane, University of Namibia	
	Greewell Mukvavi, Twiza Associates Limited, Zambia	
	Osward Mulenga, Twiza Associates Limited, Zambia	
Proposed Citation:	Glatz-Jorde, S., Huber, M., Mosimane, A., Kirchmeir, H. Lendelvo, S., Topp T., Mukvavi, G.; Mulenga, O., Jungmeier, M. (2014): Final record of consulting services for the Socio-Economic Baseline Survey for the Kavango Zambezi Transfroniter Conservation Area (KAZA TFCA) and the development of a framework for monitoring and evaluating the impacts of the KAZA TFCA Programmes on rural livelihoods, 63 p. + Annex	

FOREWORD

The consortium of E.C.O. Institute of Ecology, and the regional Partners UNAM (Namibia), TWIZA Associates Limited (Zambia) and Peter Myles from Tournet (South Africa) feel honoured to present the findings of the project and to have had the opportunity to support with the further development of KAZA TFCA, which is the world's largest protected area.

At the end of the project we want to draw on the major achievements: Though the project schedule was ambitious, the consortium was able to complete the survey, its analysis and the delivery of the results within a reasonable timeframe. The goal of generating representative and comparable socio-economic baseline data from the five KAZA countries was met: A unique and huge valuable dataset is now available for further statistical in-depth analysis and for monitoring purpose. It also serves as a basis for the elaboration of socio-economic programmes and priorities for KAZA pilot areas.

Compared with the many other livelihood surveys, the results of this study are particularly valuable due to the fact that the focus was on quantitative analysis based on a huge dataset covering KAZA pilot areas in all of the five partner countries. The survey deserves further attention among the global protected area players. The findings give a sound picture of the situation of households and rural villages within KAZA-TFCA, and describe problems on the ground which could attract the interest of the international donor community. Additionally, qualitative community key stakeholder interviews give a picture of threats and perceived solutions, which can be used for drafting further socio-economic projects.

25 trained enumerators are now available as personnel assets for KAZA TFCA and can be employed in conducting follow up surveys. Contacts with key stakeholders in the communities have been established and the scope of the KAZA programme was illustrated to 1630 respondents meaning that the project has been a broad awareness raising activity.

The baseline results are available for monitoring and evaluation of KAZA programmes. The monitoring methods for annual rapid assessment of socioeconomic output and outcomes and the methods for follow-up surveys in order to measure the long term impact of KAZA interventions on rural livelihood are fixed and well described. A KAZA livelihood index was developed and calculated. It serves as a long term overall indicator for detecting general changes of the multi-dimensional issue of rural livelihood.

We will be very proud if our contribution helps to meet the overall goal of KAZA's interventions to improve the livelihoods of the rural population and to strengthen conservation in this region.

We want to express our thanks to KAZA Secretariat, namely Mr. Frederick Dipotso and Mrs. Panduleni Elago, and to Peace Park Foundation for their support during the projects implementation period.

We also want to thank all the persons who contributed to the success of this project: Naturally, we want to thank our partners: Dr. Alfons Mosimane and Selma Lendelvo from the Multidisciplinary Research Center of the University of Namibia; Greenwell Mukvavi and Osward Mulenga from Twiza Associates Limited as well as Peter Myles from Tournet Africa who worked closely with us during the preparation phase.

Especially, we would like to thank our indispensable local support staff, the enumerators and the field team leaders of the five national field teams who did a very good job of collecting the data in the field. We also want to thank the translators.

We also want to thank the KLOs of all KAZA partner countries, namely Mr Rui Lisboa (Angola), Mr Chilule Mlazie (Botswana), Mr Elvis Mwilima (Namibia), Mr Liwena Sitali (Zambia), Mr Godfrey Mtare (Zimbabwe). Additionally we want to thank the Angolan NGO ACADIR that organized the field surveys in Angola, all local governments and local leaders who supported the teams in the field and of course the Ministries of KAZA Countries, KAZA Secretariat and the Peace Park Foundation, who made this project possible.

On behalf of the expert team,

Susanne Glatz-Jorde (Project manager, E.C.O.)

CONTENT

E. C. O.

CONTENT

Foreword	4
Executive summary	7
1 Introduction	9
1.1 Background	9
1.2 Aim of the final project record	9
2 Key Findings of the Project	10
2.1 Key findings of the livelihood baseline survey	10
2.1.1 Human Assets	10
2.1.2 Natural Assets	11
2.1.3 Physical Assets	13
2.1.4 Financial Assets	15
2.1.5 Social Capital	17
2.1.6 KAZA Awareness	19
2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation framework	20
2.2.1 Summary of the Monitoring Handbook	20
2.2.2 Summary of Livelihood survey Handbook	23
3 Conclusions and Reccomendations	26
3.1 Conclusions	26
3.2 Recommendations	26
4 Technical results of the project	<u>29</u>
4.1 Livelihood baseline survey results	29
4.2 KAZA Livelihood Index	29
4.2.1 Background	29

CONTENT

E.	C.	0.
E.	C.	0.

4.2.2 Results and interpretation	
4.3 Monitoring and evaluation framework	
5 Implementation of the Project	50
5.1 Project implementation: Workflow	50
5.2 Project deliverables	51
5.3 Implemented project schedule	
5.4 Lessons learned	54
5.4.1 Field work experience	54
5.4.2 Data processing	55
5.4.3 Challenges for project management	
5.4.4 Recommendations for follow up surveys	56
6 Financial Documentation	<u></u>
7 Literature	<u>60</u>
8 Figures	61
9 Tables	<u></u>
10 Abbreviations	63
11 Annexes	64

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The livelihood baseline survey was done to reflect the actual living conditions of the population in the KAZA Pilot areas and to set a benchmark for comparison after the implementation of KAZA Programmes so as to measure the impact of these programmes on rural livelihoods. The baseline survey delivers valuable base data about livelihoods at household level in rural areas and establishes the base for developing a key indicator-set as a foundation for future monitoring.

The study describes the distribution of livelihood assets in the KAZA TFAC pilot area based on a representative sample of 1565 household interviews and 76 community interviews and helps to identify livelihood strategies of households.

The approach was to develop the survey using the livelihood framework tool (DFID, 2001; Scoones, 1998), which describes main factors affecting people's livelihood called assets (Ashley and Carney 1999). Attributes of the livelihood framework were used for the development of the household and the community questionnaire, which included: Human Assets, Natural Assets, Physical Assets, Financial Assets and Social Capital.

Survey results

Human assets are deficient in almost all countries in the pilot area due to low education, health risks and food insecurity. The low level of education reduces the quality of labour and skills available within the community to engage in diversified livelihoods strategies.

Financial assets are lacking in rural households throughout KAZA-TFCA. Income levels are low and there are a high percentage of households without cash income especially in Angola and in Zambia. Agriculture and livestock keeping are regarded as not very important for livelihood, and yields are low due to poor agricultural methods, droughts and additionally high losses of crops and livestock to wildlife.

Households in all KAZA countries are highly dependent on natural resources and collect many items needed to support their livelihood. KAZA residents are based on traditional land and land use rights. People collect water and firewood, edible and medicinal plants and various materials used for the construction of houses.

Physical assets in terms of basic infrastructure needed to support livelihood in villages such as housing, access to health services and health facilities, water, sanitation, electricity, roads and transport, administrative infrastructure services, and economic trading facilities are low in most of rural villages of KAZA-TFCA. Apart from Botswana, where basic infrastructure is provided, physical infrastructure is lacking.

Social capital is defined in terms of the social resource which people utilise to sustain and improve their livelihoods. These include kinship, cultural and religious facilities, and key local institutions that encourage networks and connection between individuals with shared interests.

Traditional authority is the most important office to households in most of the countries although few households participate in government activities. In Namibia and Botswana, and to Zimbabwe in some extent, CBOs and CBNRMSs play a higher role.

KAZA as an organisation and its programme scope is not yet known among most of the communities in KAZA-TFCA apart from Namibia and Botswana. In Zimbabwe community leaders know about being within KAZA but are not aware of the programme.

Monitoring approach

The proposed monitoring tools are based on a set of output, outcome and impact indicators, which were developed based on the KAZA log frame. Baseline values are derived from the survey findings. A method for annual rapid assessment was elaborated.

The proposed monitoring consists of an internal monitoring part (output level indicators) and an external monitoring part which addresses the perceived impact of KAZA interventions at community level (outcome level indicators). Focus group discussions shall be conducted at community level to rapidly detect changes on rural livelihood. Additionally, focus group discussions allow taking external influences and side-effects into account, which remain invisible if relying on secondary/statistical data only.

A repetition of the survey after five years using the same survey tools and addressing the same households for maximum comparability of the results is highly recommended. This can serve as a major evaluation tool. As the (financial and logistical) effort of such a survey is almost the same



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

E. C. O.

regardless if the full questionnaire or only part of it is used, we recommend to repeat and analyse the full questionnaire as it allows for more detailed analyses.

As an overall impact indicator the KAZA livelihood index was developed and should be calculated after subsequent surveys. It integrates all relevant aspects of livelihood and will prove if the socio-economic part of the overall goal of KAZA "To support the development and management of the KAZA TFCA, a Trans frontier Conservation Area which joins fragmented wildlife habitats across international boundaries in which wildlife is efficiently managed, biodiversity maintained and where the socio-economic conditions of the rural communities are enhanced through increased eco- and cultural tourism development and sustainable use of natural resources." can be achieved over time.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The livelihood baseline survey was done to reflect the actual living conditions of the population in the KAZA Pilot areas and to set a benchmark for comparison after the implementation of KAZA Programmes so as to measure the impact of these programmes on rural livelihoods. The baseline survey delivers valuable base data about livelihoods at household level in rural areas and establishes the base for developing a key indicator-set as a foundation for future monitoring.

The monitoring framework was developed in a participatory process based on KAZA Programme Log frame. Baseline values for key indicators were derived from the survey. Indicators at input, output, outcome and impact level were formulated to measure the impact of KAZA activities at household and community level. The expert team put the focus for indicator setting on those variables, which will likely be influenced by KAZA activities, taking into account the scope of KAZA intervention.

1.2 Aim of the final project record

This final record summarizes the findings and results of the project "Socio-economic baseline survey for Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area (KAZA TFCA) and the development of a framework for monitoring and evaluating the impacts of the KAZA TFCA programmes on rural livelihoods". It is a compilation of all results of the project and provides an overview about all project components and provides conclusions and recommendations. Additionally it describes the project implementation process and highlights the lessons learned.

Scope of the final report

The final report contains the full documentation of the project, and presents after a short introduction the key findings of the livelihood survey, the monitoring framework (Chapter 2) and recommendations for KAZA TFCA which are based on the conclusions drawn from the project (Chapter 3), The technical results (Chapter 4 and Annex), the description

of the Project implementation (work steps and workflow) (Chapter 5), and the financial documentation (Chapter 6).

A full documentation of the workshops, participants and contacts, the single reports such as the socio economic baseline survey, the survey handbook and the monitoring handbook are provided in the Annex.

The Annex includes the following reports and survey results:

- List of workshop participants (Annex 1)
- List of enumerators and field team contacts (Annex 2)
- Workshop documentation (Annex 3)
- Baseline survey report (Annex 4)
- Survey handbook (Annex 5)
- Monitoring handbook (Annex 6)

E.C.

2 KEY FINDINGS OF THE PROJECT

The study describes the distribution of livelihood assets in the KAZA TFAC pilot area and helps to identify livelihood strategies of households.

The approach was to develop the survey using the livelihood framework tool (DFID, 2001; Scoones, 1998), which describes main factors affecting people's livelihood called assets (Ashley and Carney 1999). Attributes of the livelihood framework were used for the development of the household and the community questionnaire, which included: Human Assets, Natural Assets, Physical Assets, Financial Assets and Social Capital. The following chapter provides a summary of the study findings.

The study is based on a representative sample of 2 % of the population of KAZA-TFCA. The country share of household interviews reflects the proportional share of the population in KAZA-TFCA pilot areas. 42 out of 95 community in KAZA-TFCA pilot area are reflected in the sample. The technical details (methods, tables and figures) are provided in the Livelihood Survey Report, which is provided in Annex 4.

2.1 Key findings of the livelihood baseline survey

2.1.1 <u>Human Assets</u>

Human assets are deficient in almost all countries in the pilot area due to low education, health risks and food insecurity. The low level of education reduces the quality of labour and skills available within the community to engage in diversified livelihoods strategies. The natural shocks of the past years have contributed to food insecurity and the health status of the community and the food security combined are indications of the capacity of labour available to engage in different livelihood strategies.

Demographic description

The average household size in the KAZA pilot area does not differ much between the KAZA countries. The majority of the households have 5 or less members, with Zimbabwe having the greater number of households with more than 10 members.

The distribution of age classes in the pilot area is quite similar with half the household members being in an age category that enables them to contribute towards household livelihoods. Angola has more children and less elderly people compared with the other countries, whereas Botswana has more elderly household members than the other countries. Throughout the pilot area the majority of households are dominated by females, with many female headed households.

Educational level

Most members of the households only have primary education which limits their capability to participate in development projects and take their own initiatives. On average a third of the household members have some kind of secondary education. This is however higher in Namibia followed by Botswana and Zimbabwe, whereas in Angola and Zambia only few household members have secondary education.

People with tertiary education are generally rare in rural communities. As there are no job opportunities to keep them there and those who do have this level generally move to towns. An average of 13 % of household members, excluding children under 5 years, have no formal education.

It should be noted that opportunities for rural communities to access education is a common problem in most developing countries. The villages in KAZA are no exception to this phenomenon. Most villages have limited access to educational facilities with the majority only having access to primary education.

Health concerns

The health situation of households throughout KAZA-TFCA pilot area is quite worrying with half the households indicating that diseases affect their productivity levels. With the exception of Botswana a general lack of access to health facilities such as clinics and health centres contributes to the problem.

Malaria has been identified as the most common disease in most households followed by flu/ high fever and diarrhoea with children under five being the most affected.

Botswana has the highest number of households where children are not adversely affected by any diseases. Angola and Zimbabwe have the highest number of households which experienced child mortality in the past two years whilst Botswana had the least number of households that experienced child mortality in the past two years.

Reports of recurrent health problems are common in half of the households in KAZA with Zambia being more than affected than in the other countries.

Food security

On average half of the households in the pilot area are buying their food from a market. In Botswana and Namibia more than half the households depend on the market for their food, whereas the majority in Zambia and Angola depend on their own food production, whilst households in Zimbabwe show mixed approaches to food sourcing and additionally hire out labour for food.

Crops lost due to wildlife conflicts has been mentioned as a reason for low levels of own production. The majority of the households rarely eat meat and this could mean that; this is scarce because livestock ownership numbers was generally low, or it could be that meat is too expensive to buy. As a result of this meat is only consumed on special days and people rely on vegetable and fish to complement main food.

Food security is an issue especially in Angola, where many households only have one meal per day, due to high crop losses to wildlife. However this may not be as acute in Botswana and Namibia where households have three meals per day.

2.1.2 Natural Assets

Natural assets is analysed in terms of land tenure, dependency on natural resources, water, sanitation, wildlife, perceptions about conservation and change in attitude.

Land tenure

Land tenure or ownership, refers to the rights that people have in terms of the land they reside on. Most of the households surveyed indicated that their land is under traditional rights. However there were some households in Angola and Botswana that claimed they owned the land even though they only owned use right of the land while the land remained traditional land on behalf of the state.

Only communities in Botswana and Zimbabwe have access to land for 'green schemes' a form of cash crop production under irrigation. No green schemes were mentioned in Angola, Namibia and Zambia.

Dependency on natural resources

Dependency on natural resources indicates if the livelihood strategies of communities are only or partly dependent on natural resources.

Most households in the five countries indicated a dependence on a variety of natural resources with the most important of these being; water, firewood, sand and clay, construction poles, thatching grass, reeds, fish and edible plants. A few households in the five countries also indicated the importance of some natural resources for their households such as birds, honey, insects, palm leaves and small mammals.

Angola residents view small mammals, water, firewood/charcoal and timber for poles as very important for their livelihoods.

In Botswana firewood/charcoal, water, thatching grass, fish and reeds are very important for their livelihoods.

In Namibia residents regard devils claw, small mammals, palm leaves, timber, water and wild vegetable as very important for their livelihoods.

In Zambia, water, thatching grass, timber for poles, medicinal plants, small mammals, firewood and charcoal are very important for their livelihoods.

In Zimbabwe residents view water, firewood, charcoal, birds and fish as very important for their livelihoods.

It is interesting to note the importance of small mammals in the livelihood of several households in different countries.

Most resources are accessed within an hour walking distance. Sand or clay and water were the closest as most households indicated that they obtain these within 10 minutes. Some households had members walking up to 3 hours to access resources such as firewood, reeds, thatching grass and construction poles.

Restrictions on access to natural resources

As households of the KAZA countries indicated a high dependence on natural resources it is also important to understand how the restrictions on the access to these affect their resource needs.

The resources referred to here are; Land, Wildlife, River, Forest and Water. Of these, Wildlife was the resource most households indicated were restricted to then river and then forest, with water being the least restricted.

Most households in Botswana and Namibia felt that there were restrictions on the use of land, whilst fewer households in Zambia and Angola indicated this.

In Angola households indicated that restrictions to use resources was only with regards to wildlife.

In the case of Zimbabwe, only half the households felt were restrictions on use land.

Access to water

Water is essential and supports many other natural resources on which they depend. Most communities across all KAZA villages have access to water within 1 kilometre from their villages. For more details on water see section 2.1.3 Physical assets.

Wildlife and Wildlife impact

Communities within the KAZA area interact with wildlife on a daily basis, sharing resources such as water, vegetation and land. Wildlife is a unique resource in KAZA with huge tourism potential for business and enterprise development in the region. The impact of wildlife on the livelihoods of households creates household vulnerability and could threaten the success of conservation.

• Wildlife conflict impact on humans

Community level information shows that the perceptions and frequency of wildlife conflicts differ across wildlife species and countries that are affected. It is evident that the impact of these conflicts on humans is less when compared to impact on agriculture.

Community level data shows that elephants are perceived as the biggest threat to human life in all countries except for Angola, with few incidences in Zambia. In Botswana lions and baboons are also a frequent threat to human beings. The threat from other species such as; hippo, leopard, buffalo or crocodile is very rare.

Overall the threat to human life in KAZA villages is relatively low as incidents rarely happen.

Wildlife conflict impact on agriculture

At the community level the perception is that hippo has the most impact on agriculture in all countries except for Zimbabwe. Elephants and monkeys were only mentioned in Zimbabwe and Angola. In all countries, most wildlife was considered as a threat to their agricultural activities, whilst to a lesser extends buffalo and leopard were perceived as a threat. However in Zimbabwe, Leopard was mentioned as a threat.

The community level perception shows that although half of the villages consider the treat of wildlife to agriculture to be rare, there are some incidences that warrant attention. In particular the frequency at which incidences happens requires that conservation programmes take decisive action to reduce the impact of wildlife on agriculture

Perceptions on conservation

Household information shows that Angola, Namibia and Zimbabwe cited positive attitudes among communities towards conservation. More than half of the households in Botswana and Namibia indicated that these attitudes have changed over the past 6 months for the better.

It is interesting to note that while Zambia cited negative and indifferent attitudes towards conservation, they also indicated that this attitude has not changed or worsened.

Nearly half of the households in the pilot area indicate that they have developed a more positive attitude towards conservation in the last six months. Receiving benefits or involvement in decision-making did not affect changes in attitudes from all the countries, although it did have an effect in Namibian and Angolan households.



2.1.3 Physical Assets

The Physical Assets of the households is an important issue in sustaining and improving livelihoods. In almost all of the countries there is a dependence on local material for the construction of their houses, physical infrastructure for the provision of electricity, water, sanitation, health, transport and administrative services is very low. Clearly the Physical Assets within KAZA are minimal and the impact of this on the livelihoods of communities has been highlighted by this survey.

The Physical Assets have been analysed in terms of basic infrastructure needed to support livelihood in villages such as housing, access to health services and facilities, water, sanitation, electricity, roads and transport, administrative infrastructure services, and economic trading facilities.

Housing

In almost all of the countries communities depends on local material for the construction of their houses The majority of households in the KAZA area use clay and poles for the construction of houses whereas in Botswana a high percentage also uses bricks and in Zimbabwe bricks are used for a quarter of the households. In Namibia wooden materials are also used in house construction. In the case of roofing all the five countries used thatched grass and corrugated iron sheeting with Namibia also using reeds as roofing material.

Access to facilities

Health

Access to health facilities is essential to good health of household members. More than half of the households in all countries stated that they have access to health facilities, however many of them, particularly in Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe mentioned long distances to travel in order to access these. However at community level the analysis shows that community leaders are of the opinion that most villages do not have access to health care facilities. The majority of the villages did not have access to a clinic or a health centre.

In Botswana there are clinics in all the communities, although some are

poorly facilitated and lack of doctors. In Zambia some of the village key stakeholders mention health facilities that are poorly facilitated and have a lack of trained personnel. In Angola health facilities no not exist apart from Mucusso and Luiana Sede. In Namibia a few of the villages have access to health facilities however they complain of long distances and poorly trained staff, but also complaints of far distances and lacking personnel or training. In Zimbabwe only a few communities have access to have a clinic, again with long distances to travel.

Water

In the entire sample area there are facilities for water however there are challenges in order to get good quality water for household use. In all the countries there are some communities that access water from the wells, streams, rivers and swamps, however these sources are also shared with wildlife and livestock, and are not of a good quality for human consumption.

In Angola, with the exception of water supply systems at Luiana and Mucusso with short comings, water is usually sourced from shallow wells or swamps. In Namibia, many people collect water from streams with some having access to boreholes. In Zambia, some communities have boreholes and in other cases people get water from the rivers. In Zimbabwe, the water situation is not good as the boreholes that are there and do not always function.

Distances to water varied, with a large percentage of households in Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe having shorter distances to travel. In Angola the distance is mostly quite far and in Namibia it is less than half the households have easy access to water. With the exception of Botswana access to clean water is unreliable.

Sanitation

A large number of the households do not have sanitary toilet facilities with hardly any having a toilet inside and more than half of the households having no toile at all. However the communities develop their own sanitation facilities, which in some cases, are not efficient.

Botswana has more households with toilet facilities and a small percentage of households here also have running water. On the other

hand, Namibia had the highest number of households without toilet facilities followed by Zimbabwe, Angola and then Zambia where half the households have toilet facilities.

• Electricity

The section of the questionnaire considered conventional electricity supply methods such as the power grid, solar system and the availability of power generators. Electricity is seen as an important source of livelihood for cooking and lighting, as well as for electric fencing which could reduce human wildlife conflicts.

Nearly half the households in Botswana are connected to electricity while hardly any are connected in Namibia and Zimbabwe. In Angola and Zambia there is no electricity connected.

Households in the KAZA primarily use firewood for cooking, including in Botswana where very few households use electricity for cooking.

The most popular supply of electricity in villages in Zambia is the solar systems where close to half of the villages there making use of the solar system. In Zimbabwe more than half the villages use the solar system whereas in Namibia a small percentage use solar energy and in Angola and Botswana this is not used at all.

As far as generator power is concerned very few villages have access to this power source, only in Angola did a small percentage say they used this.

• Roads and Transport

In this section we refer to transport facilities that connect villages, via main roads and small side roads, to external markets which would enable them to realise opportunities that could improve their livelihood. It also includes access to public transport available to villages. Interconnectivity between villages is very poor.

Generally the road network and condition in the KAZA area is poor, with villages in Zimbabwe and Botswana having very good access to a main road. In Zambia and Namibia main road access is available to more than half the villages whereas in Angola no villages have access to a main road.

Access to a regular bus route was only available to the villages in Zambia and Zimbabwe, whereas the Mini Bus (with the exception of Angola) is available to most villages.

Administrative Infrastructure Services

This service refers to all the social support services that communities need to improve their livelihoods. In most cases these services are provided by the national government through various structures, while in some case civil organisations also provide services. The services are generally provided in one main village whilst other villages have to travel to the neighbouring village to access the services.

The services that were considered were; Agricultural office, Veterinarian facilities, availability of a Church/mission/mosque, Market place, Police station, General Government Offices(registrations and other legal services), Wildlife authority, Border Post, Shop for agricultural implements, Shop for food.

Overall, most villages in KAZA do not have access at village level to these administrative services. Only a third of the villages in KAZA have access to the administrative services situated within their communities.

• Economic Trading Facilities

In order to assess diversification of village livelihoods the status of economic facilities available or provided in the respective villages was recorded during community level interviews. The business opportunities considered were; Local village services such as hairdresser/tailor etc., professional services, products for local markets and products for international markets.

No business opportunities were recorded in any of the villages in Angola and Zambia, whereas in Zimbabwe a few local services were recorded and one international business. Botswana and Namibia recorded the most business in the villages ranging from local businesses to international.

No trading facilities were recorded for Angola and Zambia whereas in Zimbabwe there were two trading facilities for the district markets, whilst in Botswana and Namibia there were a few trading facilities recorded for



all markets. Botswana had a significant number of trading facilities for the local markets.

The findings indicate that trading facilities are a limitation to diversification of the economy at village level especially in Angola, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

2.1.4 Financial Assets

Financial assets are defined broadly to include variables such as economic activities, household income and assets such as; savings defined in liquid assets like livestock ownership, pensions, remittances or support from social welfare programs crop production, tourism and natural resource harvesting which is traded mainly on informal markets.

Economic activity

In sample in the KAZA area showed that the majority of household members who are economically active are involved in informal economic activities which are not registered with the national governments, with only a few household members (mainly in Botswana) being involved in formal economic activities.

A very low percent of households derive cash income from some form of economic activities such as; agriculture, fishing, hunting, trading goods, non-timber products, timber, firewood, charcoal or tourism.

Household income

Main source of income

The main sources of livelihood in all the countries are; livestock, crop farming, natural resources harvest and fishing. These sources of livelihood were valued differently within households in the same country and households across the countries within KAZA in terms of their importance to the livelihood.

In Angola, all households regarded natural resources as very important whilst a majority of households regarded fishing as very important. As far as livestock and crop farming is concerned this was less important. In Botswana, some households regarded livestock as very important although on average for the country livestock and crop farming was only of moderate importance with natural resources and fishing of a very low importance.

In Namibia, crop farming and fishing was of moderate importance and the other the sources of livelihood indicated were not important.

It could thus be argued that households in Botswana and Namibia have diversified their livelihoods and thus, depend on other economic activities which are not related to the nature-based livelihoods. These sources which are external to the villages might be valued more highly than the nature-based livelihood sources.

In Zambia, crop farming, natural resources and livestock farming were valued as very important to most households in Zambia. But, there were a few households that did not value the nature-based livelihood sources.

In Zimbabwe, crop farming was valued as very important to many households followed by livestock keeping.

It also needs to be noted that livestock ownership and crop farming has declined over the past years due to diseases and natural shocks.

Estimated income of Households

Households in the KAZA countries derive their income from various sources, and these include; natural resources, diverse businesses, employment and agriculture, benefits from conservation, employment, general businesses, tourism, crop and fish farming, pensions remittances and social grants.

In Angola this income is mainly from; the use of natural resources, diverse businesses, employment and agriculture, conservation, employment, businesses, crop and fish farming.

In Botswana the main sources of annual income are employment, general businesses, and tourism related businesses, benefits from conservation, crop and livestock farming, fishing and pensions and social grants and remittances.

Sources of income in Namibia, is almost the same as that of Botswana, with Namibia deriving income from involvement in small enterprises

trading natural resources and craft products.

In Zambia and Zimbabwe the sources of income are much the same as Botswana and Namibia, however include trading farming products and general business. It should also be noted that these two countries also generated some income from different sources however this is relatively low which explains the values they attached to crop and livestock farming.

Just fewer than half the households in the pilot area are getting cash income of less than U\$500 per year, with a slightly lower percentage getting between U\$500 and U\$2000 per year.

Household assets

Households invest their income in acquiring several assets such as; farming equipment, transport, household goods and other useful assets which are for household use and to improve their livelihood. These assets either contribute to the well-being of the individual household members or place the household in a better position to take advantage of opportunities that may exist within the community.

In Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe there is a higher investment in farming assets, probably because of the importance of crop production in those countries, with Namibia also investing in more fishing equipment and canoes compared to the other countries.

Botswana is better off in terms of investment in more high value equipment such as vehicles, televisions, tractors, refrigerators, grinding equipment and radios.

Cellular phones

A significant number of households in Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe mentioned mobile phones as an asset. The presence of a cellular phone in a household provides opportunities for communication and educational awareness which can also be for trading and other economic activities,

Angola and Zambia have the least number of households with cellular phones in households.

Livestock ownership

Livestock is an important liquid asset in the rural economy, and at times the only means of savings available to a community. Communities invest by acquiring and keeping livestock, which is also traded to support the livelihood of the household. All the communities in the pilot area keep livestock, with most preferring cattle, goats and poultry

Less than a third of households in the KAZA pilot area own livestock, which could explain why livestock farming was not regarded by many households as an important main source of livelihood. The majority of households own less than 10 head of livestock with a few households recording kraals of more than 40 head.

Loss of livestock due to wildlife was considered a problem and most households indicated that this problem had not changed over the past year, while almost half of the households in Zimbabwe indicated that the problem has increased. The threats to livestock ownership are animal health, drought and loss of livestock to wildlife.

Crop production

The majority of households in the pilot area grow their own crops. Nearly every household in Zambia and in Zimbabwe is involved in crop production, followed by Angola and Namibia, both with a high percentage of own crops, whereas in Botswana less than half the households grow crops.

Maize, sorghum and millet are common crops, with an average of three quarters of households in the pilot area planting maize. Households from all the countries have also indicated that they plant ground nuts and a variety of vegetables with Cassava being only being planted in Zambia.

In Botswana, Namibia and Zambia a small percentage of the crops produced are sold whereas in Angola and Zimbabwe production is mainly for own consumption.

Crop losses due to wildlife conflicts

In all the countries other than Botswana and Namibia crop losses due to wildlife is quite high, with an average losses for the pilot area equal to more than a third.



Although all households are experiencing loss of crops to wildlife more than half of all households studied were of the opinion that the problem has decreased in the past 12 months.

However, almost a third of the households in Angola, Namibia and Zambia contested that the problem had decreased, claiming that there is no change to the problem, and it is still the same. However, it is worth noting that there were very few households that claimed that the problem of loss of crops to wildlife is increasing.

Income from natural assets

Nearly all the households in the pilot area generate an income from natural resources. This seems very high, but generally the annual income from natural resources is relatively low for most of the households. The average annual income from natural resources for the households was between U\$300 – 600. The highest income from natural resources was recorded in Namibia and Angola.

Income from tourism

Apart from Angola, income from tourism contributes to livelihood in all the KAZA countries. Annually the income from tourism ranges between U\$0 – 600 for more than three quarters of the households.

Trophy hunting and concessions

Income from other tourism related enterprises such as trophy hunting and hunting concessions is minimal, with Botswana and Namibia being the only KAZA countries that generate income from hunting concessions.

Employment opportunities

Tourism contributes mainly in terms of employment creation, even though a very low percentage of households from Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe, indicated that have members directly employed in this sector.

Indirect benefits

Very few households in the five countries had members receiving indirect benefits from the tourism sector either in the form of indirect employment, compensation, improvement of infrastructure or skilled training.

Compensation

More than a quarter of the households in Namibia said they had received compensation, whilst Zimbabwe had a slightly more households who received compensation. Two households in Zimbabwe indicated that they had received donations and a clinic in their community while about 4 households in Namibia indicated that they received cash pay-outs and game meat.

2.1.5 <u>Social Capital</u>

Social capital is defined in terms of the social resource which people utilise to sustain and improve their livelihoods. These include; kinship, cultural and religious facilities, and key local institutions that encourage networks and connection between individuals with shared interests.

Kinship

Kinship in a community contributes to a stronger social relationship upon which trusts is built to act collectively. Most people who live together in households are related through kinship. However, it is interesting to note that in almost all the countries in KAZA almost all households comprised of a nucleus family of father, mother and children. In slightly more than a tenth of cases, households included extended family and in a very few cases non-family members.

Households with extended family or non-family members could potentially have more people with diverse skills to engage in different livelihood strategies.

In the case of Zimbabwe most households included extended family members such as in-laws, as well as some non-family members.

In Botswana and Namibia many household also included grandchildren.

Cultural and religious facilities

The culture infrastructure which includes traditional, religious and formal facilities that are available to the community, offers local communities an

opportunity to come together. This facilitates communication and social networking within the village, at individual and household level and at community level, and helps develop relationships of trust and facilitates cooperation within the group.

Traditional authorities and religious facilities are the most common cultural facilities in KAZA villages, apart from Angola. These offices are used for conflict resolutions, community training, awareness raising, fire management, community assistance, settlement allocations and wildlife management. Traditional authority is the most important office to households in most of the countries although few households participate in government activities. In Angola households participate more in government activities compared to traditional authority activities where government is said to be responsible for all services in their communities.

In Angola, most of the households do not have access to traditional authority structure with only a few villages having a traditional authority, an assembly hall or religious facilities with only a quarter of the villages indicated having this facility. However they do use ceremonial places where they gather for meetings.

In Botswana villages make use of different facilities for gathering with the assembly hall and ceremonial place being most common. Traditional authority structures are accessed in less than a quarter of the villages and the religious facilities are accessible to almost all the villages.

In Namibia, traditional authority and religious facilities are accessible in almost all the villages, half the village have a designated ceremony place for meetings, and assembly halls are not common.

In Zambia, traditional and religious facilities are the only cultural facilities accessible in all villages with assembly halls and ceremonial places not available.

In Zimbabwe, religious facilities are most common whilst assembly halls and the ceremonial places do not exist. Only, a few villages have traditional authority structures with the majority of villages having no access to these structures.

Traditional authorities and religious facilities are the most common cultural facilities in KAZA villages. Ceremony places are common in less than half of the villages and the assembly hall is the least accessible cultural facility. Traditional authority structures, religious facilities and the ceremony place to some extent provide more opportunities for social capital in KAZA. Social capital is essential for establishing and sustaining of community based projects which are central to KAZA interventions.

Community based natural resource management schemes (CBNRM)

CBNRM schemes are local institutions that encourage networks and connection between individuals with shared interests in natural resources management, where members of the schemes are required to adhere to the group rules and norms.

The findings of the study reveal that there are no CBNRM schemes in Angola and only a few identified at village level in the other countries. Most of the CBNRM schemes are in conservation and these are mainly in Namibia. This, it is believed, is due to increased number of conservancy registrations in the Zambezi region of Namibia.

Zimbabwe has more CBNRM schemes involved with agriculture due to the presence of several irrigation schemes for production of vegetables and fruits.

Zambia villages recorded only one conservation scheme.

Tourism schemes were only mentioned in Botswana and Zimbabwe.

Overall in KAZA there are more conservation schemes, followed by agriculture and tourism. The low number of tourism schemes may be attributed to lack of expertise to develop community based tourism schemes.

• Community based organisations (CBO)

Participation in community based organisations (CBO) and activities indicate that close to a quarter of the household heads in Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe indicated that they participate in CBO's. Zambia has only a few people participating, while in Angola no CBOs were recorded.

However, it is possible that people may have a more negative opinion if they are not involved in the activities of the CBO or do not hold leadership

positions.

CBOs mentioned are more active in conservation and wildlife management programs, especially dealing with human-wildlife conflict and anti-poaching activities.

• Community based conservation (CBC)

Most household heads are not actively involved in the community-based conservation (CBC) initiatives in all the countries with the exception of Namibia and Botswana where a small percentage of households indicated active participation.

• Non-governmental organisations (NGO)

Households in Namibia, Botswana and Zambia use and participate more in the activities of NGOs.

2.1.6 KAZA Awareness

Awareness at village level about KAZA, its participation services, programs and benefits is generally low due to an expectation by communities that KAZA will improve their livelihoods and this is not yet visible in their daily lives. However in Botswana and Namibia, where KAZA is associated with awareness raising, wildlife management, conservation and agricultural initiatives there is more awareness of KAZA.

At community level, the majority are aware that their communities are in KAZA-TFCA, but their perceptions of the scope of KAZA Programmes do not reflect the real situation. However, in Angola, Namibia and Zambia a significant number of people are not aware that their villages are in KAZA area. This could be detrimental to the activities and programmes which KAZA introduces in these villages, because it creates an opportunity for community members to question the activities and the institutions that implement the activities. The communities might not be able to see the relationship between KAZA and existing conservation activities in their villages.

Half of the key stakeholders know that their villages are part of KAZA and might be willing to embrace the activities of KAZA. However, this overall

picture still shows the need for the KAZA secretariat to reach out to the people and raise awareness.

The knowledge that communities are in the KAZA area may be beneficial to the activities of KAZA because it will encourage the communities to embrace the activities with clear understanding of the purpose. An informed community would reduce misunderstanding and generate interest and support for KAZA activities in villages.



Fishing in the Zambezi

E.C.



Impression of everyday life in Zambia

2.2 <u>Monitoring and Evaluation framework</u>

The aim of any monitoring scheme is to detect changes, to find out how interventions, actions, programme components and projects contribute to achieving the overall goal. Monitoring & Evaluation is part of strategic planning to monitor program progress and to evaluate if program goals are met. The recently established KAZA TFCA, which is a conservation project first, also sets the goal to benefit local communities and people by active interventions and by indirect impacts and side effects. This is in line with state-of-the-art conservation area programs. There is no conservation success without benefiting people, who are confronted with its impacts (e.g. increasing human-wildlife conflicts through increased wildlife numbers). Consequently, KAZA TFCA also intends to set specific interventions such as human wildlife conflict mitigation measures and tourism incentives.

2.2.1 Summary of the Monitoring Handbook

Background, purpose and content

The socio-economic monitoring handbook is a deliverable of the KfWfunded project "Socio-economic baseline survey for the Kavango Zambezi Trans frontier Conservation Area (KAZA TFCA) and the development of a framework for monitoring and evaluating the impacts of the KAZA TFCA Programs on rural livelihoods in the pilot regions of KAZA-TFCA". The project implementation period ended in June 2014. It focuses solely on the monitoring of socio-economic impacts of KAZA TFCA interventions of the KfW Phase II Grant and the related logical framework. The handbook will facilitate KAZA TFCA Secretariat and its stakeholders to implement long-term socio-economic monitoring and provide the basis for any future socio-economic monitoring activities. It has a theoretical part on the monitoring approach, indicator development and methodological considerations. A second part is practice oriented, focusing on monitoring methodology, practical guidelines to use the tools and guide through the process of monitoring and serve as a field manual for the monitoring teams. It also contains a full list of the indicators selected by representatives of all five KAZA TFCA partner countries and by the expert team.

Socio-economic baseline study in all pilot intervention areas as a basis for monitoring

A socio-economic baseline study based on the Sustainable Livelihood Framework was carried out to collect basic data for socio-economic monitoring and to determine baseline values and targets.

A particular challenge in the context of KAZA is the fact that five countries are part of it. This means that the use of secondary data, which might be used for monitoring purposes in other contexts, is almost impossible as individual countries use different classification systems for national statistics, collecting data at different intervals or using different methodologies. Thus, the baseline study was crucial to create a comparable basis for the monitoring approach across all countries.

Development of a methodological approach

In order to understand the impact the KAZA TFCA program has on rural



livelihood, it is important to appreciate the effects, which can be attributed to KAZA TFCA interventions on the ground. Each action, every lodge constructed, every local person trained can have an influence on the life of rural communities.

The concept and tools presented in the handbook start right from the implementation level, from actions and interventions set by KAZA (output), how these activities directly influence the livelihood of rural residents (outcome) and if the overall goal of KAZA to measure improvement of livelihood of local communities, is met (Impact). Figure 1 illustrates how indicators at different hierarchical levels are related. They are all addressed by specific tailored tools.

discussion (2) with key stakeholders in the rural communities. It is up to them to judge, if the activities set led to any visible improvements. After several discussions, the decision was made that there is no other efficient way, to assess, if KAZA has contributed to changes at community level. Natural shocks, side effects, other programs compromise too many variables, which would make it impossible to link changes directly with KAZA activities. However, to ensure comparability and standardization, a detailed guideline accompanied by form sheets are included in the monitoring handbook.

This data is to be collected annually to monitor progress and changes at community level in KAZA intervention areas.





Three tools for socio-economic monitoring

The Annual Rapid Assessment compromises of two main tools. First, there is the simple monitoring sheet for each activity (1) (being a measure/intervention/action deliberately set to reach a result defined in the log frame), which will ensure the monitoring of activities directly set by KAZA.

The second tool needs a little more effort, being a focus group





Figure 2: (a) Description of how tools relate to monitoring indicators and KAZA logframe elements. (b) Monitoring scheme addressing KAZA activities, communities and households with specific tools

To monitor the long-term impact and overall changes in the community, a third tool is being introduced: A **livelihood survey repetition (3)** collecting the same data as the baseline survey. This ensures comparability and monitor changes. The results of the baseline study, its categorization and question compromise a standard that allows for comparability. Additionally, trained enumerators, detailed methodology and practical experience are available through the documentation of the baseline survey. Thus, KAZA TFCA can make long-term use of these resources.

Different monitoring tools at different hierarchical levels

Figure 2 shows that the individual tools are required to monitor changes at different levels. The annual rapid assessment tool (output focused) monitors at activity level (direct output of KAZA activities related to log frame results section). The second part outlines the outcome visible at community level to allow for immediate assessment if an activity leads to (desired) visible changes. The third tool, the livelihood survey shows in detail long-term changes at household and community level and allows one to draw conclusions as to how livelihoods have really changed.

The KAZA livelihood index

Livelihood is an extremely complex phenomenon and is consequently difficult to measure by a single indicator. The overall livelihood conditions such as; education, income opportunities, social services, infrastructure or access to land or natural resources, all influence livelihoods and are interlinked. For instance when considering the number of cattle: Is a household with 10 cattle wealthier than a household with several hectares of sorghum and peanuts but no cattle? This is not an easy question to answer and thus the results of the baseline study and the concept of the sustainable livelihood framework were used to develop a KAZA livelihood index which integrates 47 variables.

The development and refining of the index was supported by substantial contributions of representatives of all KAZA partner countries during a workshop held by the consultants. In this workshop, thresholds for good livelihood and the importance of individual variables for livelihood in the KAZA countries were determined.

Transparency and repeatability as basis for monitoring

The index, even though just presenting a single number, can be tracked back to each individual household (e.g., low livelihood in general can be tracked back to the causes such as decrease of the number of cattle owned, severe health problems or lack of access to natural resources such as firewood of an individual household). Therefore, it allows determining causes as to why a household or community develops in the way it does. The methodology used therefore also allows for easy reproduction of the study anytime and anywhere applying at household, community or regional level. The index was calculated for the year 2014 and should be recalculated when conducting the follow-up livelihood survey.

The final indicators selected

The final indicators follow the KAZA log frame and in one part address overall KAZA issues and in a second part individual country components.

<u>12 impact indicators for monitoring the overall goal were selected.</u> Next to the livelihood index, some specific indicators are depicted addressing major topics such as poverty at household level, benefits from tourism, cash income at household level, benefits from conservation and

infrastructural issues and access to services.

<u>The eight indicators are selected to monitor the program purpose</u> on an annual basis through focus group discussions and particularly refer to the extent that communities admit to receiving benefits from conservation, tourism and natural resource management schemes. It also addresses the question of human wildlife conflicts by estimating the annual loss of crops to wildlife. This is considered a direct outcome of human-wildlife conflict mitigation measures.

A considerable <u>number of output indicators</u> are presented to outline the progress made at output level taking the regional component as well as the individual country components main topics into account.

The full list of indicators, baseline values and targets is available in the monitoring handbook.

Challenges and methodological considerations

In the course of the development of the monitoring framework some challenges occurred, which are considered important for the future development of KAZA TFCA:

- The results mentioned in the log frame sometimes do not relate to the program purpose or overall goal. If, for instance, livelihood conditions are improved, active measures can be considered in the result section. The integration of a livelihood component reflecting the overall goal is highly recommended.
- A number of activities did not relate to the log frame a clear linkage between activities and the log frame would allow for a more focused monitoring approach. Maybe the development of a project database including clear reference to the respective log frame results would be considered a major improvement to increased accountability.

In general, the monitoring handbook is intended to be both a practical tool and also provide a theoretical background for monitoring. It should be considered a living document for KAZA Secretariat, where lessons learned during practical implementation are added to constantly improve

the monitoring system and keep it in use.

2.2.2 <u>Summary of Livelihood survey Handbook</u>

The Livelihood survey handbook will be used as a guideline for future follow up surveys to the KAZA-TFCA livelihood baseline survey which was conducted 2013/14. Subsequent follow up surveys are an integral part of the KAZA-TFCA impact monitoring on livelihoods and should provide comparable results after the recommended time period of five years. The goal of the follow up surveys is to compare the survey results and to measure the impact of KAZA interventions. To ensure sound comparison of development within the whole KAZA region, the expert team recommends repeating the survey with the same households and the same communities. Observed changes should not be a result of a changed sample.

The handbook describes the methods for follow up surveys based on the conduct of the baseline survey, incorporating lessons learned from the baseline survey conducted. It is meant as a practical manual, describing each step necessary for conduction and repeating the socio-economic survey.

Locality of the KAZA livelihood survey

The KAZA livelihood survey and future follow up surveys focus on the KAZA pilot areas (Luiana complex in Angola, Chobe district in Botswana, Zambezi region in Namibia, Silowana complex in Zambia and Western Region focusing on Hwange and Victoria Falls complex in Zimbabwe). Within those areas the following villages should be visited for subsequent follow up surveys:

Table 1: Villages to be visited

Angola	Botswana	Namibia	Zambia	Zimbabwe
11 de Novembro	Kachikau	Bukalo	Illwendo	Chidobe
Boa Fé	Kavimba	Cheto	Imusho	Chikandakubi
Weva Weva				
Malonga	Lesomo	Ihaha	Kalobolelwa	Deka
Kangongo	Mabele	Kongola	Kandiana	Mabale

Angola	Botswana	Namibia	Zambia	Zimbabwe
Kataha	Pandamatenga	Limai	Kapau	Matetsi
Luiana Sede	Parakarungu	Lizauli Village	Katundu	Mlibizi
Mucusso (village)	Satau	Mashambo	Lusu	Msuna
Showana		Muzii	Makande	Sipangule
		Nangwena	Nsumba	Zambezi Deka
		Sangwali	Soweto	
		Zilitene		

Interviews to be repeated:

A total of 1565 household interviews and a minimum of 76 community key stakeholder interviews should be repeated during follow up surveys using the same survey tools (KAZA household questionnaire and KAZA community questionnaire). Households can be located again using GPS coordinates, key stakeholders should be asked according to their role in the community.

Schedule for follow up survey:

The time required for follow up surveys can be set with 6 month. Two months for the preparation phase, two months for the field data collection for all the five countries, assuming that national field teams work at the same time in the countries and two months will be needed for compilation and analysing the necessary data. It is recommended that seasonal aspects are taken into account for follow up surveys: The field work should take place in the dry season, when household heads are not in the field and there is easier access to the communities. Possibly the best time for field work is between September and mid-December.

For a follow up survey an exact field work plan should be planned taking into account the findings from the baseline survey. The budget for the teams moving into difficult terrain should be increased.

Organisational aspects:

The supervision and quality control of the teams should be organized as

much as possible by one supervisor, who is also involved in the training.

It is recommended that strong national team leaders for supervising the enumerators in the field be employed. Increased guidance is necessary especially at the beginning of the fieldwork. In addition to this it is advisable to organize the supervision on weekly base. The supervisor should accompany each team for two days at the beginning of the fieldwork to clarify all upcoming issues and later on meet them again on a weekly basis.

Each team should consist of four enumerators and one team leader moving together in a car. If additional drivers are employed, the team leader can concentrate on his/her supervision role, but due to limited space in the car more team days would be needed to meet the target of required questionnaires per day.

The company responsible for contracting and supervising field personnel should be left to manage the personnel according to the agreed terms and provide for taking disciplinary measures where the need arises. This includes identification of the personnel and managing the budget for the field work and the personnel concerned. The criteria for the selection of the staff should be education and work experience, and interviews should be done by the contracting party before the staff are selected to ensure the best quality staff for doing a survey. The 25 trained enumerators who did the baseline survey might be interested to do the work again.

However it is advisable to organize the contracting of the field teams on a national base so as to avoid additional expenses.

Work steps for follow up surveys

Phase I – Preparation of survey tools

- Survey tools preparation
- Database adaption/preparation
- Recruiting and contracting of enumerators
- Training of field teams including Testing of survey tools
- Introduction of study and field teams to community heads

• Logistical organization of fieldwork

Phase II - Data collection

- Logistical coordination and supervision of field work
- Realizing community-level data collection and household surveys
- Quality control (e.g. control surveys)
- Data entry into database

Phase III Data Analysis

- Compilation of national data and data clearing
- Statistical and qualitative analysis of data
- Comparing the Indicator results with baseline values
- Reporting



3 CONCLUSIONS AND RECCOMENDATIONS

3.1 <u>Conclusions</u>

Big differences among the KAZA countries

The socio-economic survey illustrates quite big differences amongst the KAZA countries. The distribution of livelihood assets is different in households of KAZA pilot areas. In Angola and Zambia, for example, households face a lack of physical assets and a lack of access to facilities, services and markets. The financial assets like income, household production and employment or business opportunities are also low in these countries. The health status and educational levels as well as food security are also affected by these gaps. In Angola food security is especially a problem with many households only having one meal per day. The lack of access to health facilities and clean water affects the human assets in these countries. With regards to these issues, households in Botswana, by and large, have more physical assets such as road network, electricity, clean water sources and access to health facilities as these are more readily available. Namibia, too, has better conditions concerning human and physical assets. Zimbabwe represents the KAZA average concerning most of the livelihood aspects. Besides these major differences there are also common challenges for all KAZA countries. Throughout KAZA employment opportunities in rural villages are lacking and income levels are low. People are highly dependent on natural resources and the household production is affected by problems like recurrent diseases, low yields and high losses to wildlife.

KAZA is not yet known

Currently, there is hardly any knowledge about KAZA-TFCA and its programme in the communities of Zambia and Angola. In Namibia awareness is still low even though activities have already been implemented. Only in Zimbabwe and Botswana all key stakeholder were well aware about KAZA and the scope of KAZA programme.

3.2 <u>Recommendations</u>

Recommendations for livelihood programme development

Focus on human wildlife conflict mitigation

The focus on mitigation of human wildlife conflicts will definitely benefit the livelihood of rural communities, as it is a major challenge for agriculture and livestock keeping in the communities in all KAZA partner countries. Addressing these issues and finding solutions for communities and households is likely to be major contribution of KAZA-TFCA in order to improve rural livelihood.

Focus on community based natural resource management and diversification

The study shows that livelihoods of households in rural communities depend strongly on the use of natural resources. KAZA programmes should focus their training on the sustainable use of these. Additionally, diversification of livelihood opportunities for village residents could help to reduce the dependency on natural resources. Tourism can play a role, but also vocational training opportunities and alternative livelihood projects should be offered. Additionally, KAZA should work closely with the existing primary and secondary schools within KAZA-TFCA to build up a new generation of conservation sensitive people.

To make sure that decision making at community level is guided by knowledgeable and experienced people, a participative structure should be established to strengthen and support this.

Focus on the training of rural youth

The study shows that people with higher educational level are rare within rural households. KAZA should launch a training programme for young farmers that offer opportunities to rural people to improve their knowledge in applying improved natural resource management, or improved agricultural methods compatible with conservation and human wildlife conflict mitigation measures. Conservation agriculture could be a training content as well as eco-tourism, vocational training and basic knowledge in business administration.

Elaborate a common tourism strategy

To enhance the role of tourism a common tourism strategy including all the five countries should be considered. Packages and round trips would contribute to a share of tourism for all partner countries. Though tourism in Botswana and Namibia is already guite well established, there is a need to make sure that tourism benefits reach rural communities and households. A diversification of tourism facilities is needed to make sure that people in the rural communities get a share. Tourism development in those areas where there is nothing yet on the ground is a long term project and requires sensitive and participative methods to ensure strong involvement of community stakeholders and benefits for rural areas, which has to go hand in hand with community development. A programme for development of tourism facilities at community level should be drafted so that local residents have business opportunities in the supply chain (local products like herbal tea, honey, handicrafts etc.) or to give opportunities to run a community based tourism site. Besides that, the connection between tourism centres and their neighbouring communities should be strengthened, as tourism centres offer a market for businesses and jobs. KAZA can help advertising lesser known destinations besides the well-known tourist hot spots.

As much as tourism offers economic growth, there is a need to first address the issue of basic needs for those areas where nutrition or health concerns are affecting the livelihoods of the people. Basic services need to be provided before prospering tourism can be expected.

Launch a livelihood programme

It is strongly recommended that KAZA-TFCA launches a livelihood programme for rural communities, financed through a fair share of revenue from tourism, or from hunting and park fees within the rural communities. A socio-economic action plan should be considered based on the findings of the livelihood baseline survey. If it is not already existing, benefit sharing schemes with local communities should be established in each community close to a protected area. Well administrated schemes will enhance the positive attitude towards conservation. One interesting case study to learn from is for example the livelihood programme of national park buffer zones in Nepal, where 50 % of the park revenues go directly to the rural villages, which plan and implement their activities in a participative process. As they are obliged

to work out their community development plans along given guidelines, it is agreed that they use the revenue in a way that supports sustainable long term development. Apart from that, KAZA can contribute to enhance livelihoods via direct employment of people in KAZA communities during KAZA activities and build capacity and create awareness at community level.

Integrate gender aspect in planning and implementation

Male persons dominate decision-making at community level, whereas the majority of households are headed by female persons. This aspect should be considered in planning and implementing projects or programmes.

If an intervention at community level is to achieve maximum benefits and impact at household level, active involvement of women at community level is indispensable and should be considered, in order to integrate their practical knowledge and experience.

Strengthen organizational setup at community level

To ensure that people in rural communities recognize KAZA-TFCA programmes and feel that there are benefits for themselves, a strong exchange between the KAZA secretariat and community stakeholders such as key stakeholders and CBOs should be established. Projects should be implemented at community level and visible to its inhabitants. Communities should be sensitized about policy changes.

KAZA should strongly work together with the existing structures like traditional authorities as much as possible but should additionally think of strengthening structures like CBOs or community development committees where they exist. Each community should have a setup where key stakeholders are in place and can be trained for addressing conservation matters at community level.

General recommendations

Strengthen coherence

The way KAZA-TFCA is set up is a promising way of successfully achieving ecological and socio-economic improvements in the KAZA pilot areas. However, the differences among the countries are big. It is recommended that there should be a greater focus on areas where basic needs are lacking (like Angola or Zambia) to make sure that there is a common move towards improving livelihoods of people in the KAZA pilot areas. In the Luiana and Silowana Complex an additional livelihood supporting programme with a focus on improving basic needs like ensuring nutrition or access to health facilities and social services should be considered. Though these issues are not within the scope of KAZA programmes, KAZA-TFCA can play a role in lobbying for those areas and build up cooperation with other players focusing on these field of activities.

To respond to the differences between the countries, it is recommended that the KAZA programmes should keep on having national programme components tailored to address specific national problems. However, some common problems like the human wildlife conflicts should be addressed in a joint way, and exchanging experiences and lessons learned should play an increased role in future. Addressing joint problems and sharing common assets like the natural features for tourism and the human wildlife conflicts, will help to strengthen the coherence of KAZA-TFCA.

Sharing the findings and lobbying

Some of the problems of rural communities are far beyond the scope of KAZA programme. The role of KAZA in solving these issues could be to share the knowledge with the respective organisations (governmental and NGOs) and lobbying for their communities within the international donor community. The findings of the study should be shared with the respective organisations to build on synergies. KAZA can draw attention to the situation of the rural villages and lobby for funds.

Carefully monitor changes

KAZA should carefully monitor the socio-economic situation of the rural communities where policy changes, increased law enforcement on conservation matters or the establishment of new protected areas are concerned. Restrictions might adversly affect communities which strongly depend on the use of natural resources. Especially the establishment of a category II National Park in Luiana with new restrictions on natural resource harvest which could challenge the livelihood of people in these areas. As much as improvements can be expected through eco-tourism, jobs and business opportunities will be

limited and will not offer benefits for all households. To outweigh disadvantages from restrictions on natural resources, alternative livelihood opportunities should be offered at the same time.

The KAZA livelihood index was calculated as an overall aggregated socio-economic indicator taking into account a huge variety of variables which describe the livelihood of rural households. It is recommended to keep on tracking this indicator, and repeating the calculation of this index after 5 years. Long term socio-economic changes can be observed with this indicator and transparently traced back to changes at household level.

Carefully keep record of activities and interventions

KAZA also should properly keep records of activities implemented at community level and take care of a proper documentation of improvements achieved. The input at community level (like community services used or funds spent at community level) as well as the direct output of every intervention (like jobs created, people trained or contracts with stakeholders at village level) should be carefully recorded, even if they are considered only small contributions. The sum of all those will in the end be visible as a KAZA impact on rural communities. Careful record keeping will help to track back socio-economic improvements and impacts of KAZA interventions and distinguish between KAZA results and impacts from other programmes and other influences. The development of a KAZA project and intervention database is highly recommended.

Gain an overview of interventions of other regional players

Related to the previous recommendation, it is considered important to have a comprehensive overview of activities, programmes and players in the areas which are involved in KAZA relevant issues.

There are a large number of players working on the development of the area or on the improvement of specific sectors, which might also be a key objective of the KAZA programme. Being aware of these activities and all the players can help to create synergies, foster knowledge exchange and create more objective oriented and resource efficient work. This can also prevent KAZA and all the other players involved in reinventing the wheel. Thus, a log frame related intervention/project database is highly recommended for keeping track of all actions set to reach specific log frame objectives.

E C

4.1 Livelihood baseline survey results

The detailed figures and tables are provided in the Annex 4 (Livelihood survey report).

4.2 KAZA Livelihood Index

4.2.1 Background

Livelihood is a very complex phenomenon. Consequently, it is difficult to measure by a single indicator. The overall livelihood conditions, education, income opportunities, social services, infrastructure or access to land or natural resources all influence livelihood and are interlinked. The Sustainable Livelihood Framework (Carney 1998; DFID) acknowledges these characteristics of livelihood. The individual assets of a household compromise the livelihood and livelihood strategies of this household based on this concept, Thus, the results of the baseline study and the concept of the sustainable livelihood framework were used to develop a KAZA livelihood index integrating 47 variables to allow for easy and comprehensive monitoring of changes in the livelihoods of rural communities in KAZA pilot areas. This allows for monitoring livelihood development by integrating much more (interacting) indicators. For instance is a household having 10 cattle more wealthy than a household having several hectares of sorghum and peanuts but no cattle?

Transparency, reproducibility as basis for monitoring

The index, even though just presenting a single number, can be tracked back to each individual household (e.g., low livelihood in general can be tracked back to the causes such as number of cattle owned or goods owned of a certain household). Therefore, it allows determining causes why a household or community develops in the way it does. The methodology used therefore also allows for an easy reproduction of the study anytime and anywhere applying at different scopes. The index was calculated for the year 2014 and should be recalculated when conducting the follow-up livelihood survey.

To be able to monitor a change of livelihood within the intervention area of the KAZA-TFCA it was necessary to develop appropriate monitoring tools. From the household survey, a lot of information is available for each household. Each of these values that have been gathered in the 1565 questionnaires describes the actual livelihood of the household. By repeating the household survey after some years and recalculating the Livelihood index value and comparing the results with the current value, it will show if livelihoods have increased or decreased. The reasons for the change in livelihood standards can be easily detected by looking into the detailed variables.

Regional aspect of livelihood and poverty

As many previous studies and experiences show, poverty, high or low livelihood cannot be generalized as the thresholds are varying from country to country, even from district to district depending on wages, infrastructure, productivity of land or everyday living costs. This consideration was taken into account by taking values of the household survey as a basis. Regional thresholds for good livelihood and the importance of individual variables for livelihood were determined in a participatory way by substantial involvement of representatives of all KAZA partner countries during a workshop held in Kasane.

Methodology

To be able to monitor the change of livelihood, selected key-indicators on household level have been aggregated stepwise into one single livelihood index (LI) for each household. Only by reducing the huge amount of different factors onto one index value, is it possible to answer the question, if the KAZA Programmes have a positive or negative impact on the livelihood of rural communities. The livelihood index is a value ranging theoretically from 0 to 100. In this scale, 0 expresses a very low, 50 an average and 100 a very good livelihood. The normation of the scale was done by key-experts questionnaires to adopt the scale to the KAZA-TFCA region. The objective was not to compare the livelihood in the KAZA-TFCA region with other regions in the world but to compare the livelihood of different households within the KAZA-TFCA region. Therefore an LI of 50 means, that this household has an average livelihood compared with other households in this region.

The full methodology of calculating the index is provided in the Annex 4.



30

4.2.2 <u>Results and interpretation</u>

The KAZA livelihood index combines a large number of variables and describes how they add up to a livelihood score, which can be used for monitoring.

Livelihood score distribution for KAZA TFCA

Based on the weightings and thresholds defined in a participatory process with KAZA partner country representatives, the average distribution of the score is shown in Figure 4. It indicates that the average livelihood score is between 46 and 55 points. Only a small share of households reaches a score high above average, whereas there is a number of households show scores well below 50 points. This already indicates rather low overall livelihood quality.

At a first glance, numbers may appear rather high not reflecting the situation on the ground. However, by integrating a large number of variables, every household has at least some assets, which allow for a living, or at least survival. A more fundamental question is the question of how this distribution changes over time. It reflects the current distribution of livelihood quality within KAZA.



Figure 4: KAZA-TFCA Livelihood index

To further understand the overall livelihood index score Figure 5 shows the asset scores reached by the households. It indicates that many

households are rather well equipped with physical assets (household and farming goods). A general low level of financial assets becomes visible indicating that financial assets do not substantially contribute to rural livelihood in the current situation, whereas a high importance and dependence on natural assets becomes visible.

Human assets appear rather high, which is related to the fact that a household, where members have primary education, are healthy, have more than 2 meals per day and no child mortality cases, is considered productive in a sense of a healthy, nurtured and basically educated member of the community.

KAZA programme can influence livelihood by deciding on where to set actions. The result can be a shift in the share which individual assets contribute to the livelihood of the household. Taking into consideration the high degree of dependence on natural assets, strictly enforced restrictions will have the result that the natural asset score decreases (less access to natural resources, restrictions on use). However, it can be counteracted in two ways:

- If restrictions on use and access get stricter, alternative opportunities to get cash income from natural resources (e.g. through sustainable use and promotion of devil's claw) have to be promoted. Result: Natural asset score remains stable or increases even if restrictions are strictly enforced (Strategy to counteract within the asset)
- Alternatively, other assets can be strengthened to outweigh the negative impact on the use of natural resources (e.g. through HWC mitigation measures to increase yield and livestock or by creating business opportunities for residents resulting in higher financial assets) (Strategy to counteract through strengthening other assets)

In general the index and the distribution of asset scores allows for programme development as it indicates, where households are particularly weak and vulnerable.







Figure 6: Distribution of assets in KAZA-TFCA

Figure 6 shows that there is a clear lack of financial assets, which reached the lowest score. This is critical as the financial assets not only encompass cash income but also agricultural production (yield and livestock). Similar a lack of certain physical assets and social

infrastructure becomes visible across KAZA. Contrary to individual analyses, human assets are moderately high in comparison to other assets. Nonetheless the average household reaches around 50 points of 100 (100 having excellent education, 3 meals a day, regular meat access and above average health status).

Indicating vulnerability trough dependency on a single asset

If a household is depending on very few assets (high score in one or two assets, low in all others), the household is very vulnerable – If a household solely depends on livestock and crop farming, depredation and any loss of the harvest due to wildlife or climatic shocks will hit it hard as there is nothing to compensate. To improve livelihood strengthening of all assets will reduce the vulnerability of households to single events.

Livelihood score distribution per country

The analysis was also carried out for the individual partner countries illustrating their current status of livelihood.

Angola shows a rather even distribution of overall livelihood scores on the index. However, less than 10% reach a score of 66 or higher (Figure 7).



Figure 7: KAZA-TFCA Livelihood index for Angola

The Angolan score shows a very high importance of natural assets, which also explains the comparatively high livelihood scores in comparison to the situation on the ground. However, as Figure 8) indicates, apart from

natural assets (such as access to natural resources, natural products collected, income from natural resources), all other assets are comparatively low: A clear lack of financial income opportunities/agricultural production, a lack of goods, lack of infrastructure, lack of access to services and challenges regarding health, education and nutrition.



Figure 8: Distribution of assets in Angola

Particularly in Angola, it becomes obvious that, if restrictions regarding the use of natural resources are enforced or expanded, overall livelihood is likely to become tougher for local residents as they mainly depend on natural resources. Particularly regarding the establishment of national parks around Luiana and related restrictions, measures to counteract by offering alternative livelihood opportunities are indispensable.

The results of Botswana confirm the basic assumption, that it is comparatively well developed with regards to other KAZA partner countries. Figure 9 shows that a considerable number of households scores between 56 and 85 points. This indicates that across all livelihood assets, they are above (KAZA) average. However, surprisingly a considerable number of households still score rather low. This indicates that benefits of development and tourism do not necessarily reach remote

communities and are concentrated around local tourism hotspots (such as Kasane).



Figure 9: KAZA-TFCA Livelihood index for Botswana



Figure 10: Distribution of assets in Botswana

Figure 10 shows that the scores are rather evenly distributed at a medium-high level indicating that households have a large number of different assets at their disposal to make their living. Particularly the

E.

comparatively high scores of social and physical assets indicate that the basic infrastructures and services are benefiting most households. In comparison to other KAZA partner countries natural resources and agricultural production (part of financial assets) play a minor role.

In comparison to Botswana, Namibia shows a rather high share of households scoring quite low on the livelihood index (Figure 11). Remarkable 40% score below 46 points indicating rather low livelihood.



Figure 11: KAZA-TFCA Livelihood index for Namibia

The scores of individual assets show that physical (infrastructure) and human (health, nutrition, and education) are comparatively strong. Even though there is a large number of CBNRM schemes and CBOs the overall score on social assets is rather low, indicating that there are only a few services available in remote communities. Next to Angola, the use of natural resources represents an important asset for the livelihood of households.



Figure 12: Distribution of assets in Namibia

Zambian households mostly score between 36 and 55 points (Figure 13). There are hardly any households (only around 15%) who score higher than 56 points. This indicates that most households have similar (slightly low) livelihood quality (particularly in comparison to Botswana, where the index scores are broadly spread).



Figure 13: KAZA-TFCA Livelihood index for Zambia

E.

Zambian households rather strongly rely on natural resources and score particularly low on social assets (access and use of (public) services). Even though crop farming is a very important source of livelihood and income in Zambia, the overall score for financial assets is very low (Figure 14). This indicates that, the productivity is low (e.g. due to soil conditions, methods, loss to wildlife) and is not compensated by cash income or livestock keeping.

Interpreting the livelihood and asset scores:

The example of Zambia where financial assets (crop farming) reaches very low scores, although its high importance for livelihood is suitable to give guidance for interpretation of the scores: If an asset reaches low scores it means in that context low productivity (yield, livestock, cash). However, even if importance is high, the score can be low. In these cases, concrete actions/programmes or interventions should be considered.



Figure 14: Distribution of assets in Zambia

In Zimbabwe there is a very even distribution of livelihood scores. Most host households show medium scores, where few have very low or very high scores (Figure 15).

This indicates that most households have a similar status of livelihood.



Figure 15: KAZA-TFCA Livelihood index for Zimbabwe

As in most KAZA partner countries financial assets are the limiting asset. Also social assets are low in Zimbabwe indicating that communities lack the access to (public) services and all type of institutions in general. Regarding human assets, Zimbabwe scored rather well.



Figure 16: Distribution of assets in Zimbabwe

E.

E. C. O.

It is recommended to use the KAZA Livelihood index as overall indicator to observe the long term socio-economic development of KAZA-TFCA. The actual mean values are presented in Figure 17:



Figure 17: Mean livelihood index value by country


4.3 Monitoring and evaluation framework

As result of the project a socio-economic monitoring framework was developed in a participatory process to measure the impact of KAZA Programme on livelihood of the residents of KAZA Pilot areas. The framework can be considered as a further breakdown of the KAZA logframe. The Log frame indicates the overall goal, the programme purpose, regional components and country components of KAZA Programme. Socio-economic indicators at output, outcome and impact levels were formulated and baseline values derived from the survey were provided as base for target setting. The targets were set by national groups of KAZA stakeholders. Figure 18 shows the KAZA Socio-economic monitoring and evaluation framework with national target values to be achieved within the next five years.

Figure 18: KAZA Socio-economic M&E Framework

Overall objective	II To support the development and management of the KAZA TFCA, a Transfrontier Conservation Area which joins fragmented wildlife habitats across international boundaries in which wildlife is efficiently managed, biodiversity maintained and where the socio-economic conditions of the rural communities are enhanced through increased eco- and cultural tourism development and sustainable use of natural resources.										
Impact in	dicators	Means of verificatio n	Baseline value	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Remarks (by the consultant)	
Log frame reference	Overall Goal		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total		
Indicator.6	The benefits from tourism and sustainable use significantly increased										
OvG.6.1	KAZA livelihood index value increased	Livelihood Survey	50	50.5	51.5	52	52.5	53	53	This is the aggregated indicator of 47 variables of the HH questionnaire, taking into account all the 5 assets. It will improve slowly	
	Angola		51	51.5	52	52.5	53	53.5	53.5	targets recommended by the consultant	
	Botswana		58	58.25	58.5	58.75	59	59.5	59.5	targets recommended by the consultant	
	Namibia		48	48.5	49	49.5	50	50.5	51	targets recommended by the consultant	
	Zambia		48	48.5	49	49.5	50	50.5	51	targets recommended by the consultant	
	Zimbabwe		50	50.5	51	51.5	52	52.5	52.5	targets recommended by the consultant	
OvG.6.2	Percentage of households classified as "having rather poor livelihood" (HH income less than 2000 \$ per year) decreased	Livelihood Survey	88.00%							75 % of households have a yearly income below 2000 US \$ per year, + 13 % do not have a cash income at all	
	Angola		82%	75%	60%	55%	45%	40%	40%	the targets seem to be very ambitious	
	Botswana		70%	8%	5%	5%	3%	3%	46%		
	Namibia		88%	10%	4%	5%	5%	3%	61%		
	Zambia		96%	5%	10%	10%	15%	20%	36%	the targets seem to be very ambitious	
	Zimbabwe		93%	70%	65%	62%	60%	50%	50%		
OvG.6.3	Importance of tourism for economy at community level increased (Community assessment: medium/high importance)	Livelihood Survey	21.00%							21% of the key stakeholder say tourism is important for livelihood of their community	



	Angola		0	20%	26%	34%	38%	43%	43%	the targets seem to be very ambitious
	Botswana		57%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	66%	
	Namibia		36%	10%	3%	3%	4%	5%	61%	
	Zambia		0%	2%	3%	3%	5%	5%	18%	
	Zimbabwe		14%	15%	18%	20%	22%	25%	25%	
OvG. 6.4	Percentage of households acknowledging to receive benefits from tourism (direct-indirect benefits) increased	Livelihood Survey	22.00%							
	Angola		0%	4%	8%	16%	20%	23%	23%	
	Botswana		11%	12%	13%	13%	14%	14%	14%	
	Namibia		30%	10%	3%	3%	4%	5%	55%	
	Zambia		3%	5%	8%	10%	12%	13%	48%	
	Zimbabwe		20%	22%	23%	25%	27%	29%	29%	
OvG.6.5	Percentage of household members receiving regular monthly cash income increased	Livelihood Survey	70.00%							70 % of HH talk of monthly cash income (monthly wages without pension)
	Angola		40%	43%	47%	51%	55%	57%	57%	
	Botswana		84%	86%	88%	90%	92%	94%	94%	
	Namibia		48%	8%	5%	4%	3%	2%	70%	
	Zambia		96%	2%	3%	3%	4%	4%	100%	
	Zimbabwe		65%	68%	70%	73%	75%	77%	77%	
OvG. 6.6	Percentage of households receiving cash income from own businesses (including tourism 4 %) increased	Livelihood Survey	14.20%							14 % of HH say to have own businesses.
	Angola		22%	23%	25%	26%	28%	30%	30%	
	Botswana		6%	10%	14%	18%	22%	26%	26%	
	Namibia		22%	27%	35%	38%	40%	42%	42%	
	Zambia		14%	8%	9%	11%	13%	14%	55%	the targets seem to be very ambitious
	Zimbabwe		7%	8%	12%	15%	16%	18%	18%	
OvG. 6.7	Percentages of households acknowledging to receive cash benefits from conservation increased	Livelihood Survey repetition	10.50%							
	Angola		1.81%	3%	4%	5%	6%	7%	7%	
	Botswana		1.50%	2%	4%	6%	8%	10%	10%	
	Namibia		0.86%	5%	7%	9%	14%	15%	15%	
	Zambia		0.00%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	not applicable in Zambia
	Zimbabwe		0.50%	2%	5%	6%	8%	10%	10%	

OvG.6.8	Percentage of communities with no access road decreased	Livelihood Survey	20.00%							20 % of the communities state to have no access road to their village
	Angola		12.50%	7.5%	5.5%	4.5%	3.5%	2.5%	2.5%	
	Botswana		15%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	5%	
	Namibia		36.40%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	11.40%	
	Zambia		37.50%	30%	25%	20%	15%	10%	10%	
	Zimbabwe		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	not applicable in Zimbabwe
OvG.6.9	Percentage of households with good access to market places increased	Livelihood Survey	10.00%							
	Angola		1%	6%	10%	21%	33%	43%	43%	the targets seem to be very ambitious
	Botswana		4%	6%	8%	10%	12%	14%	14%	
	Namibia		13%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	38%	the targets seem to be very ambitious
	Zambia		12%	2%	4%	5%	5%	6%	22%	
	Zimbabwe		22%	23%	24%	25%	28%	31%	31%	
OvG.6.10	Percentage of households stating to use KAZA services (conservation farming, HWC, training) increased	Livelihood Survey	13.00%							13% of HH are using KAZA services or participate in KAZA activities now (only in Botswana and Namibia)
	Angola		1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	7%	7%	
	Botswana		34%	35%	36%	37%	38%	39%	39%	
	Namibia		13%	5%	8%	9%	13%	15%	65%	the targets seem to be very ambitious
	Zambia		1%	8%	10%	12%	14%	15%	59%	
	Zimbabwe		0	5%	8%	12%	15%	16%	16%	
OvG. 6.11	Percentage of households showing positive attitude towards conservation increased	Livelihood Survey	53.00%							53 % of HH say their positive attitude towards conservation has increased.
	Angola		67%	71%	76%	81%	91%	96%	96%	
	Botswana		43%	64%	69%	74%	79%	83%	83%	
	Namibia		72%	4%	3%	3%	3%	2%	87%	
	Zambia		25%	2%	2%	3%	5%	5%	42%	
	Zimbabwe		59%	70%	72%	73%	74%	75%	75%	
OvG. 6.12	Percentage of households acknowledging to have improved attitude towards conservation due to benefits from wildlife increased	Livelihood Survey	6.00%							6 % of HH say their improved attitude towards conservation is due to benefits from wildlife.
	Angola		0%	1.6%	2.6%	3.6%	4.6%	5.6%	5.60%	
	Botswana		1%	1.1%	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%	
	Namibia		19%	9%	11%	13%	10%	7%	69%	the targets seem to be very ambitious
	Zambia		1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	4%	14%	
	Zimbabwe		5%	10%	12%	15%	20%	30%	30%	the targets seem to be very ambitious





Programme Purpose	To support the development of the KA national and local levels, facilitating in conservation areas and u	egional, cture in								
Outcome	Indicators		Baseline value	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	
Log frame no.	Programme Purpose			2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total	
PP 14	Percentage of local communities (key stakeholders and focus groups) knowing KAZA and it's programme scope increased	Focus group discussion	60%							
	Angola		38%	43%	48%	53%	58%	63%	63%	recalculated from total numbers
	Botswana		43%	57%	71%	86%	86%	100%	100%	recalculated from total numbers
	Namibia		45%	64%	82%	100%	100%	100%	100%	recalculated from total numbers
	Zambia		33%	56%	67%	78%	89%	100%	100%	recalculated from total numbers
	Zimbabwe		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	recalculated from total numbers
P 15	% of households having access to services from Community based natural resource management	Focus group discussion	22%							22% of households say to use or participate in services from natural resource management.
	Angola		2%						10%	target values are recommended by consultant (if applicable)
	Botswana		51%						70%	target values are recommended by consultant (if applicable)
	Namibia		39%	5%	8%	12%	6%	4%	36%	
	Zambia		1%	3%	4%	4%	5%	5%	21%	
	Zimbabwe		7%	12%	15%	20%	24%	30%	30%	
P16	Average annual Household income increased	(Focus group discussion)	\$1'321.90							
	Angola		\$1'102	\$1'400	\$2'000	\$2'800	\$3'500	\$4'000	\$4'000	the targets seem to be very ambitious
	Botswana		\$3'309	\$3'357	\$3'407	\$3'459	\$3'511	\$3'565	\$3'565	
	Namibia		\$1'333	\$100	\$120	\$155	\$100	\$150	\$1'483	
	Zambia		\$612.00	\$95	\$110	\$120	\$140	\$150.00	\$762	
	Zimbabwe		\$957	\$1'085	\$1'140	\$1'285	\$1'435	\$1'785	\$1'785	the targets seem to be very ambitious
P17	Percentage of communities stated KAZA training activities led to visible changes in the community	Focus group discussion	0%							

	Angola		0%						10%	target values are recommended by consultant (if applicable)
	Botswana		0%	5%	6%	7%	8%	10%	10%	
	Namibia		0%	5%	7%	8%	10%	11%	11%	
	Zambia		0%	3%	5%	6%	8%	9%	9%	
	Zimbabwe		0%	2%	5%	10%	12%	14%	14%	
P18	Loss of livestock to wildlife decreased	Focus group discussion	1235							
	Angola (total numbers)		53	80%	70%	60%	50%	40%	40%	target values are recommended by consultant
	Botswana (total numbers of livestock lost)		161	62%	50%	37%	24%	10%	10%	target value recalculated from total numbers
	Namibia (total numbers of livestock lost)		277	90%	80%	70%	50%	20%	20%	target value recalculated from total numbers
	Zambia (total numbers)		340	44%	38%	35%	32%	26%	26%	target value recalculated from total numbers
	Zimbabwe (total numbers)		404	94%	92%	87%	84%	80%	80%	target value recalculated from total numbers
	KAZA (Yearly loss of Cattle)		14%						10%	14 % of the cattle got lots to wildlife in the households
	KAZA (Yearly loss of goats)		33%						10%	33 % of goats got lost to wildlife in the households within last 12 month
P19	Decrease of crops loss to wildlife (percentage of annual yield lost in KAZA pilot region)	Focus group discussion	34%							
	Angola		45.00%						20%	target values are recommended by consultant
	Botswana		36.00%	35%	30%	25%	20%	15%	15%	
	Namibia		22.00%	1%	8%	10%	8%	7%	7%	
	Zambia		41.00%						20%	target values are recommended by consultant
	Zimbabwe		27.00%	26%	25%	23%	22%	20%	20%	
P20	Number of infrastructure constructed by KAZA-TFCA at Regional and National level	Focus group discussion	0							Total number of infrastructure constructed through KAZA intervention benefitting the communities
	Angola		0							see country component
	Botswana		0							see country component
	Namibia	1	35	32	0	20	0	0	78	
	Zambia		29	36	4	2	1	1	44	
	Zimbabwe		0	2	1	2	3	2	10	

P21	Percentage of communities acknowledging to be adequately invol in KAZA-related activities and to receive benefits increased	ved group ive discuss	sion	6						
	Angola (% of communities)		0						50%	target values are recommended by consultant
	Botswana (% of communities)		439	6 439	б 57%	57%	71%	71%	71%	target recalculation done by consultant
	Namibia (% of communities)		459	64%	6 73%	82%	91%	100%	100%	target recalculation done by consultant
	Zambia (% of communities)		119	% 13%	6 16%	20%	25%	30%	30%	target recalculation done by consultant
	Zimbabwe (% of communities)		0%	5 25%	6 38%	50%	50%	63%	63%	target recalculation done by consultant
Outpu	t Indicators		Baseline value	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	
Log frame no.	Regional component			2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total	
1.4	A participatory natural resource manag fair share of the benefits originating fro	ement strateg m hunting an	gy prepared d tourism fo	ensuring tl r local com	ie sustaina munities.	ble use of	natural r	esources,	the mitiga	tion of human-wildlife conflict (HWC) and a
1.4.1	Community Revenues from concession agreements increased	ARA (part 1 - internal								
	Angola		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	not applicable
	Botswana		0	0	0.5 Mio	1 Mio	1.5 Mio	2 Mio	2 Mio	Pula
	Namibia		14Mio	1 Mio	1 Mio	1 Mio	1 Mio	1 Mio	5 Mio	Nam \$
	Zambia		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	not applicable
	Zimbabwe		58000	110000	140000	200000	230000	250000	930000	USD
1.4.2	Number of reported HWC cases reduced	ARA (part 1 - internal								
	Angola		50	57	60	56	40	30	30	Assumption: Reliable reporting system in place
	Botswana		163	145	130	117	106	96	96	
	Namibia		1500	200	300	200	400	100	1200	Remark: the same targets are set for crocodile incidents
	Zambia		340	250	200	180	160	150	150	Assumption: Reliable reporting system in place
	Zimbabwe		300	250	200	150	100	80	80	
1.4.3	Number of communities where HWC mitigation measures are applied	ARA (part 1 - internal								
	Angola		1	8	12	14	18	20	20	
	Botswana									target value setting is recommended
	Namibia		17	3	4	2	1	3	30	
	Zambia		7	7	10	13	15	18	18	
	Zimbabwe		2	1	2	1	1	1	8	



1.4.4.	Number of community-based tourism facilities established or facilitated by KAZA	ARA (part 1 - internal)								
	Angola		0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	not applicable
	Botswana		0	0	1	1	1	1	4	
	Namibia		6	2	2	2	1	5	12	
	Zambia		3	0	0	3	1	3	7	
	Zimbabwe		0	2 (per year)	3	2	4	2	11	facilities per year
1.4.5.	Percentage of households stating to use or have access to KAZA services	Focus- group discussion estimate community)	13%							
	Angola		1%	2%	6%	15%	20%	25%	25%	
	Botswana		34%	36%	38%	40%	42%	44%	44%	
	Namibia		13%							target value setting is recommended
	Zambia		1%	3%	5%	8%	10%	15%	41%	
	Zimbabwe		0%	5%	8%	10%	12%	15%	15%	
1.4.6.	Number of households voluntarily settled out of the corridors, compensated and resettled within their social environment	ARA (part 1 - internal)								
	Angola		0	0	0	5	10	15	30	
	Botswana		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	not applicable
	Namibia		10	15	20	30	40	50	155	
	Zambia		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	not applicable
	Zimbabwe		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	not applicable
Outpu	t Indicators		Baseline value	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	
Log frame no.	Country component			2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total	
	ANGOLA									
	2.1 GoA supported to establish an appropriate organizational structure to manage the NP.									
2.1.1.	% of staff from local communities employed in Luiana Mavinga National Park	ARA (part 1 - internal)	0	3%	9%	17%	22%	25%	25%	
	2.2 GoA supports effective & efficient parks' management									

2.2.1.	Number of local stakeholders involved in the planning process	ARA (part 1 - internal)	0	2%	7%	10%	13%	15%	15%	
	2.4 Sufficient personnel at various levels trained in NP management									
2.4.1.	Number of local staff (e.g. game scouts) having received training	ARA (part 1 - internal)	50	75	100	150	200	250	250	
	2.5 The private sector and local communities supported to manage Coutadas in a participatory and sustainable manner									
2.5.1.	Number of stakeholders (Chiefs, headmen, CBOs, NGOs) involved at community level	ARA (part 1 - internal)	3	6	9	12	15	18	18	
	2.6 The living conditions of the people living within or in the vicinity of Luiana NP are improved									
2.6.1.	Percentage of households with cash income	focus-group discussion for estimate	43%	50%	53%	57%	59%	62%	62%	43 % of the respondents in Angola said to have no cash income at all.
2.6.2.	Number of local people having received training (e.g. conservation agriculture)	ARA (part 1 - internal)	0	30	60	100	200	250	640	
2.6.3.	Number of business opportunities created	ARA (part 1 - internal)	3	6	12	17	23	25	83	
2.6.4.	Demined area (km ²)	ARA (part 1 - internal)	1450	2000	2100	2300	2500	2700	2700	
2.6.5.	Number of lodges constructed or facilitated by KAZA	ARA (part 1 - internal)	2	4	7	10	12	13	13	
2.6.6.	Number of communities where mitigation measures are applied	ARA (part 1 - internal)	1	3	8	12	15	18	18	
2.6.7.	Number of road km rehabilitated	ARA (part 1 - internal)	950	1200	1500	1800	2300	2500	2500	
2.6.8.	Number of projects focusing on improving livelihood	ARA (part 1 - internal)	0	3	6	9	12	15	15	
2.6.9.	Local jobs created through KAZA activities	ARA (part 1 - internal)	361	110	160	220	280	340	340	
	BOTSWANA									
	3.4 Improve appreciation of the KAZA TFCA programmes though advocacy & awareness campaigns									
3.4.1.	Number of communities acknowledging benefits from infrastructure development projects, for example, roads, bridges, gates to NPs, lodges etc.	Focus group discussion (additional question for focus-group in Botswana)	2	2	3	4	5	6	7	





	3.5 To support GoB to effectively and efficiently manage natural resources through development of management plans for Forest Reserves in Kasane									
3.5.1.	Number of local stakeholders involved in planning process of conservation management.	ARA (part 1 - internal)	0	2	2	2	2	1	9	
	3.7 Support local community to develop income generation activities through conservation enterprises									
3.7.1.	Number of community-based tourism facilities established	ARA (part 1 - internal)	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	
3.7.2.	Number of local business opportunities created	ARA (part 1 - internal)	0	0	3	3	3	3	12	
	Activity mentioned during workshop, but not visible in KAZA log frame:									Recommended to be integrated into the KAZA Log frame
	Number of communities in Botswana benefiting from the exchange of HWC measures with Namibia (4.2)		2	2	3	2	2	2		
	Number of people having received training (organized communities)? in conservation agriculture?		12	60	60	60	60	60	300	
	No. Of local jobs created through KAZA activities		8	72	30	20	40	20	182	
	NAMIBIA				0					
	4.4 Communities of the Zambezi Region have a systematic exchange of knowledge and skills with neighbouring communities in Botswana and Zambia regarding joint natural resource management									
4.4.1.	Number of people in organized communities having received training (organized communities)	ARA (part 1 - internal)	20	20	40	20	50	100	230	
	4.6 Support local communities mitigate against HWC through construction of crocodile enclosures for mitigating human-crocodile conflicts									
4.6.1.	Reduction of reported HWC incidents involving crocodiles	ARA (part 1 - internal)	1500	200	300	200	400	100	300	
	4.7 Support efficient and effective wildlife management operations through provision of transport and equipment for anti-poaching, CBNRM, HWC mitigation									

4.7.1.	Number of poaching incidents reduced (reported cases)	ARA (part 1 - internal)	100	20	20	20	10	10	20	
	4.8 Support capacity building for Protected Areas Management through training of additional staff (Wardens, Rangers and Community Game Guards)									
4.8.1.	Number of local people trained in various fields	ARA (part 1 - internal)	20	20	40	20	50	100	230	
4.8.2.	Number of local jobs created through KAZA	ARA (part 1 - internal)	107	43	50	25	20	45	183	
	Activity mentioned during workshop, but not visible in KAZA log frame:									Recommended to be integrated into the KAZA Log frame
	Number of new HWC measures applied (methods)		6	2	1	1	2	3	9	
	Number of new stakeholders (going to the community) involved at community level		10	1	0	0	0	0	1	
	Environmental awareness (number of schools, youth groups) increased		9	9	12	10	20	30	81	
	Number of local jobs created through KAZA		107	43	50	25	20	45	183	
	Namibia		11	28	37	47	48	58	218	
	Number of conservation related infrastructure built through KAZA		35	32	26	20	0	0	78	
	ZAMBIA									
	5.1 Sioma-Ngwezi NP developed and basic infrastructure built and maintained, resulting in increased visitor numbers and a reduction of poaching									
5.1.1.	Number of local temporary jobs created (Infrastructure construction)	ARA (part 1 - internal)	62	250	50	50	50	50	450	
5.1.2.	Length of roads (Km) rehabilitated	ARA (part 1 - internal)	100							target value setting is recommended
	5.2 A new Conservation Area at Ngonye Falls with the required basic infrastructure is created, leading to better managed and increased tourism and investment opportunities									
5.2.1.	Number of local community-based tourism facilities established	ARA (part 1 - internal)	3	0	0	3	1	3	7	



	5.3 ZAWA is enabled to efficiently manage the NP, the Ngonye Conservation Area and adjacent Game Management Areas									
5.3.1.	Number of local jobs created in management of National Park Ngonye conservation area and game management areas	ARA (part 1 - internal)								target value setting is recommended
5.3.2.	Number of local staff trained (e.g. village scouts)	ARA (part 1 - internal)	15							target value setting is recommended
	5.4 Participatory management approaches in the Game Management Areas are implemented and benefit local communities									
5.4.1.	Number of CBOS or community resource boards established	ARA (part 1 - internal)	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	
	5.7 Support adoption of effective HWC mitigation measures around Sioma-Ngwezi NP									
5.7.1.	Number of communities implementing HWC mitigation schemes	ARA (part 1 - internal)	0							target value setting is recommended
	5.8 Support promotion of alternative livelihoods strategies around Sioma- Ngwezi NP									
5.8.1.	Number of people having received training in conservation farming	ARA (part 1 - internal)	120	280	480	10	10	10	790	
5.8.2.	Number of local business opportunities created	ARA (part 1 - internal)	4	2	2	2	2	2	10	
5.8.3.	Number of communities where projects promoting alternative livelihood are implemented	ARA (part 1 - internal)	0							target value setting is recommended
	Activity mentioned during workshop, but not visible in KAZA log frame):									Recommended to be integrated into the KAZA Log frame
5.7.	Number of communities in Zambia benefiting from the exchange of HWC measures with Namibia (4.2)		0							target value setting is recommended
	ZIMBABWE									
	6.3 Support the process of securing the Hwange-Senyanti biodiversity corridor									
6.3.1.	Jobs created through or facilitated by KAZA initiatives	ARA (part 1 - internal)	46	50	65	30	50	70	265	

6.3.2.	Number of local people trained in various fields	ARA (part 1 - internal)	20	35	40	25	20	30	150	
6.3.3.	Number of stakeholders involved in conservation management	ARA (part 1 - internal)	30	10	5	6	4	5	30	
6.3.4.	Number of households adopting HWC measures	ARA (part 1 - internal)	50	25	15	20	40	30	130	
6.3.5.	Number of livelihood projects developed to provide incentives to local communities to accept the wildlife dispersal corridor	ARA (part 1 - internal)	1	2	1	1	2	3	9	per year
6.3.6.	Number of local business opportunities created	ARA (part 1 - internal)	0	2	3	5	3	1	14	per year
6.3.7.	Number of community stakeholders involved in securing Hwange-Senyanti Biodiversity Corridor	ARA (part 1 - internal)	5	8	10	10	12	15	55	per year
6.3.8.	Awareness among KAZA at Communities and stakeholders raised	ARA (part 1 - internal)								
	Awareness campaigns (total number)		3	2	2	3	3	2	15	
	Awareness meetings (total number)		2	2	1	2	1	2	10	
	Stakeholder consultation meetings		2	2	2	1	2	3	12	
	Activity mentioned during workshop, but not visible in KAZA log frame:									Recommended to be integrated into the KAZA Log frame
	Water infrastructure projects initiated		0	2	2	1	3	2	10	



5 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT

Looking at the TORs, the project contained two parts: The conduct of the Socioeconomic baseline survey for Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area (KAZA TFCA) and the development of a framework for monitoring and evaluating the impacts of the KAZA TFCA programmes on rural livelihoods. The project implementation was divided into four phases: Phase 1: The preparation phase, Phase 2: The Survey conduct and data analysis, Phase 3: The development of the monitoring framework and Phase 4: The final phase.

5.1 Project implementation: Workflow

Phase I: Preparation phase

The survey preparation phase started in September 2013, when the contract was signed, and was completed by the end of November 2013. The consultants drafted the survey tools and methods and presented them during the inception workshop which was held from 25th and 26th of October 2013 in Kasane. After the inception workshop the following important work steps were carried out by the consultant team:

- Revision and finalizing of the survey tools (household questionnaire and community questionnaire) and the development of a socio-economic database
- Recruitment, contracting and the training of five national field teams
- Logistical planning of the field work (villages to visit and the organisation of the field work conduct such as car rental and the introduction letters for the field survey teams to the respective communities).

The recruitment of the field teams was done by the KLOs of the partner countries according to the participative nature of the project. The consultants prepared and provided recruitment criteria. Interviews were done by Twiza Associates Limited with the exception of Zambia, where the KLO nominated the field team.

The training of the field teams took place at the Katima Mulilo Campus of UNAM from 18th to 22nd of November 2013. Twiza Associates Limited contracted all country teams apart from the Angolan team, which was contracted by the NGO ACADIR. A field work plan was done by the consultant including a list of selected villages, the chronological order for visits, and an indication of the required

number of questionnaires per village (minimum and maximum). A calculation of workdays and operational costs was done. KAZA Secretariat provided introduction letters for introduction of the field teams to community heads.

Phase II: Survey conduct and analysis

The baseline survey data collection took place from 2nd of December to 31st of January. During Christmas festive season the fieldwork was paused. The five field survey teams moved according to their field work plan and were supervised by Twiza Associates Limited and ACADIR (Angola).

The organization of the field survey followed the logistical considerations as outlined in the inception report. The fieldwork was shared amongst five national field teams. Each field team consisted of a field team leader (also acting as a supervisor) and four enumerators. The teams moved together in a hired 4WD vehicle from community to community as scheduled in the field work plan.

Team	first pr fieldwork	nase of	second fieldwork	Total kilometre s	
	Started	Ended	Started	Ended	
Angola	04.12.1 3	12.12.1 3	0	0	No data
Botswana	03.12.1 3	12.12.1 3	0	0	676
Namibia	03.12.1 3	23.12.1 3	14.01.1 4	18.01.1 4	1,814
Zambia	02.12.1 3	19.12.1 3	15.01.1 4	29.01.1 4	2,353
Zimbabw e	02.12.1 3	21.12.1 3	14.01.1 4	16.01.1 4	1,852
					2699

Table 2: Number of field days per team

The cars were hired for the field days per team. The teams were able to manage an average of 22 household interviews and two key stakeholder interviews per day. One team member was supposed to act as a driver, preferable the field team leader as he/she was also supervising the team. The field team leaders entered the data into the database after the fieldwork was completed. The database is available as KAZA socio-economic database for further use.

Field days per team

	No. of	No. of	
Country	villages	Households	Interview days
Angola	8	166	8
Botswana	7	200	10
Namibia	11	347	18
Zambia	10	452	19
Zimbabwe	8	400	16
	44	1565	71

Table 3: Country share of questionnaires and number of field days per team

By the first week of February 2014 all teams had submitted their field data to the consultants. After controlling and a plausibility check of the data E.C.O. forwarded the compilation of all country data sets to UNAM for data analysis. The livelihood baseline report and the survey handbook were compiled and distributed. The results were presented at the 3rd international KAZA workshop in Kasane.

Phase III - M&E Framework and Rapid Assessment

The concept for the socio-economic monitoring method was developed by the consultants, based on KAZA log frame and KAZA monitoring sheets. Indicators at all levels were derived from the Livelihood baseline survey results taking into account the scope of KAZA programme. The 3rd international KAZA workshop from 1st to 4th of April 2014 focused on two central objectives: 1) The presentation of the baseline survey results and receiving regional feedback on the results and 2) the introduction of the monitoring concept and related monitoring tools including the final development of the monitoring and evaluation framework for

After the workshop the proposed list of indicators was revised by the consultants in order to incorporate the feedback given by KAZA stakeholders during the workshop. The final list of indicators is based on the updated KAZA log frame for subsequent project period (2015 – to 2019). The socio-economic monitoring and evaluation framework was completed by adding baseline values and distributed to the national representatives of KAZA partner countries for target setting on 26th of April 2014. The monitoring handbook was prepared incorporating a revised annual rapid assessment method and provided to KAZA for feedback on the 5th of May 2014.

Phase IV - Final phase

The final phase started at the beginning of May 2014. It encompasses all work steps to incorporate regional feedback of KAZA and KAZA partner countries into the draft reports and the completion of all project deliverables. The monitoring framework was done and sent to national KAZA stakeholders for target value setting and revision. The final set of indicators and targets are part of the monitoring handbook.

5.2 <u>Project deliverables</u>

The following deliverables were submitted:

- KAZA socio-economic baseline survey report
- Socio-economic survey handbook
- Monitoring handbook
- Final report and financial documentation including a documentation of all workshops
- KAZA socio-economic database including a data base documentation



All reports are available both in English and in Portuguese as pdf and word documents. The final versions were additionally sent by mail as hard copies (5 English and 1 Portuguese version).

5.3 Implemented project schedule

According to the contract, the project duration was limited to eight months. In general, the project implementation schedule followed the schedule as planned. There was a minor deviation from the schedule regarding the duration of the field work, which started slightly later than scheduled, but was nonetheless completed in time. The data analysis took longer than expected due to the complexity and the amount of data to be processed and analysed. Table 4 reflects in detail the phases and work steps of the project implementation. A non cost extension of 5 weeks was agreed to with the contracting parties.

During the project three international workshops were held, aiming to present the approach of the expert team and receive regional feedback from KAZA-TFCA stakeholders. KAZA stakeholders from the five KAZA partner countries were the main target group of the workshops.

1st workshop: Inception and presentation of survey tools: October 2013

The first workshop aimed to introduce the expert team, the survey method and the survey tools (household and community questionnaire) and to collect a regional feedback of KAZA stakeholders. Additionally it aimed to agree on the project methods and results, and to clarify expectations of the client on the consultant.

2nd workshop: Field survey training: November 2013

The workshop was particularly dedicated to the practical training of the five national field teams consisting of 20 enumerators and 5 field team leaders in order to prepare them on how to conduct the field work. The training focused on using the survey tools like household and community questionnaires, using GPS devices for data collection, the process of data entry into the database, quality management of field work and data quality control. All teams were trained together at UNAM Campus in Katima Mulilo. Representatives of KAZA secretariat and the KLOs participated during the first two days and were trained together with the team leaders. A training manual was done and handed over to the field teams by their supervisors.

<u>3rd</u> workshop: Presentation of survey results and monitoring approach and the development of the monitoring framework: April 2014

The third KAZA workshop took place from 1th to 4th of April 2014 in Kasane. The workshop focused on the Livelihood baseline survey results and methods, and also on presenting the practical experiences of the fieldwork. KAZA stakeholders gave regional feedback for the interpretation of the survey results. The monitoring approach and the monitoring tools were presented, and target values on output indicators were set.



Table 4: Overview of schedule for project implementation

Month Month<			Timeplan - general overview	201	2013										2014	4													
September October November Journary Perture Journary Perture Journary Perture Main				Мо	nth	1		Мо	nth 2	2	Mo	onth	3	N	lont	h 4	N	lont	h 5		Mon	th 6		lon	th 7	T T	Mont	h 8	
No. Env.:: Morking steps and process III. 3 4 1 2 3 4 1 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Se</th> <th>pter</th> <th>nber</th> <th>(</th> <th>Octo</th> <th>ber</th> <th>N</th> <th>love</th> <th>mbe</th> <th>er</th> <th>Dec</th> <th>emt</th> <th>ber</th> <th>Ja</th> <th>nuar</th> <th>v</th> <th>Fe</th> <th>ebrua</th> <th>arv</th> <th>N</th> <th>larc</th> <th>h</th> <th></th> <th>April</th> <th></th> <th>Mav</th>				Se	pter	nber	(Octo	ber	N	love	mbe	er	Dec	emt	ber	Ja	nuar	v	Fe	ebrua	arv	N	larc	h		April		Mav
Phase I- Inception and Properties Image: Normality of existing datafeatives Image: Normality of existing datafeatives 12. Kick of I- Poljet coordination Image: Normality of existing datafeatives 13. SE-baseline study SE-baseline study Image: Normality of existing datafeatives Image: Normality of existing datafeatives Image: Normality of existing datafeatives 15. Database development/datagoin Image: Normality of existing datafeatives Image: Normality of existing datafeatives Image: Normality of existing datafeatives 17. Reclorating description and planning Image: Normality of existing datafeatives Image: Normality of existing datafeatives Image: Normality of existing datafeatives 10. Training of enumeration Image: Normality of existing datafeatives Image: Normality of existing datafeatives Image: Normality of existing datafeatives 110. Training of enumeration Image: Normality of existing datafeatives Image: Normality of existing datafeatives Image: Normality of existing datafeatives 12. Realizing Household on of Hold work Image: Normality of existing datafeatives Image: Normality of existing datafeatit		No.	Flow - Working steps and process			3 4	1	2	3 4	4 1	2	3	4	1	2 3	4	1	2 3	4	1	2 3	3 4	1	2 3	3 4	1	2 3	4	1 2
Instruction of arising data frequency Instruction Instruction Instruction 11. Completion of arising data frequency Instruction			Phase I - Inception and Preparation											T															
International methods are provided and survey tools/methods for inservey tools/methods for inservey. International methods is an inservey. International methods is an inservey. 1.3. SE-baseline study. 1.3. SE-baseline study. 1.4. SE-baseline st		1.1.	Compilation of existing data/review						-					+	-		-							+	+				
Internating and retining sampling design and survey tools/methods for Image: Ception Wissission 14. Regional feedback loop 1 1 14. Regional feedback loop 1 1 15. Brains device works 1 1 16. First Reporting 1 1 17. Training of enumerators 1 1 18. Training of enumerators 1 1 11.0. Training of enumerators 1 1 1 1 12. Disticational dualitation of field work 1 1 1 1 13. Disticational and planing 1 1 1 1 1 13. Disticational and planing dualitative analyses 1 1 1 1 1	c	1.2	Kick off - Project coordination												١.		_												
13. SE-baseline study 13. SE-baseline study 14.	<u>0</u>		Harmonizing and refining sampling design and survey tools/methods for							T	IC	ec	Dtr	O		Ŵ	S												
14. Regional feedback loop 1 </td <td>at</td> <td>1.3.</td> <td>SE-baseline study</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Т</td> <td></td> <td>11</td> <td></td>	at	1.3.	SE-baseline study							1				Т		11													
15. Database development/adaption 1	ar	1.4.	Regional feedback loop																						Τ				
10. First Requiring 1 <td1< td=""> 1 1</td1<>	də	1.5.	Database development/adaption																										
17. Recruing of enumerators 1<	ď	1.6.	First Reporting																						Τ				
18. Training of KAZA staff and trainers 1 <td>Ň</td> <td>1.7.</td> <td>Recruiting of enumerators</td> <td></td>	Ň	1.7.	Recruiting of enumerators																										
19. Pite-lessing 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1 1 <</th1<>	Ve	1.8.	Training of KAZA staff and trainers																										
1.10. Training of enumerators Image: Sector Sec	n	1.9.	Pilot-testing										F	ie	h	S	In	Ve	V										
Inst. Logistical organization and planning Inst. Logistical coordination and planning Inst. Logistical coordination of field work Inst. Logistical coordination database Inst. Logist	S	1.10.	Training of enummerators											T					דק										
Phase II - Data collection phase - Baseline survey IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII		1.11.	Logistical organization and planning										Т	ra	in	in	D	$\cdot V$	٧S	~									
Proposed for the description Image: Control and a collection Image: Control an			Phase II - Data collection phase - Baseline survey											Υ			gu	'	ľ										
2.2. Realizing community-level data collection		2.1.	Logistical coordination of field work																										
23. Realizing Household surveys 1	pu	2.2.	Realizing community-level data collection																										
24. Cuality control (e.g., control surveys) 1 </td <td>aı</td> <td>2.3.</td> <td>Realizing Household surveys</td> <td></td>	aı	2.3.	Realizing Household surveys																										
25. Data entry into database 1 <td< td=""><td>, ct</td><td>2.4.</td><td>Quality control (e.g. control surveys)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	, ct	2.4.	Quality control (e.g. control surveys)																										
26. Pilot statistical and qualitative data analyses 27. Statistical and qualitative analysis of data 28. Plausibility check of data 29. Reporting - Baseline survey 210. Presentation baseline survey 211. Survey handbook (for conducting baseline studies) 211. Survey handbook (for conducting baseline studies) 212. Capacity building of XAZA staff (baseline studies) 31. Development of Monitoring & Evaluation Framework 32. Compilation of monitoring handbook (Rapid Assessment) 32. Compilation of monitoring handbook (Rapid Assessment) 33. Feedback loop for monitoring framework 41. Training of implementing bady (KAZA stakeholders) Phase IV - Final phase 41. Compilation of all results (draft final report) 51. Project coordination and project management 52. Compilation of all results (draft final report) 53. Reporting of Project Coordination and project management 54. Compilation of A PPF 56. Communication KiW A PPF 56. Communication KW A PPF 56. Communication KWA APPF 57. Ongoing Training 7. Ongoing Tra	du	2.5.	Data entry into database						_																				
8 0 1	ŭ <u>Š</u>	2.6.	Pilot statistical and qualitative data analyses			_																							
See 28. Plausibility check of data 2.1. Reporting - Baseline survey 2.1. Survey handbook (for conducting baseline studies) 2.1. Survey handbook (for conducting baseline studies) 2.1. Survey handbook (for conducting baseline studies) 3.1. Development of Monitoring & Evaluation Framework 3.2. Compliation of monitoring handbook (Rapid Assessment) 3.3. Feedback loo for monitoring framework 3.4. Training of implementing body (KAZA statk holders) 4.1. Compliation of all results (draft final report) 4.1. Compliation of all results (draft final report) 5. Project coordination and project management 5.1 Project coordination and project management 5.1 Project coordination and project management 6.1. Compliation of all results (draft final report) 5.1 Project coordination and project management 6.1. Compliation of all results (draft final report) 5.1 Project coordination and project management 6.1 Compliation of all results (draft final report) 5.2 Backstopping and Quality control 5.3 Reporting of Project Planning, management and monitoring 5.4 Contracting KW and Accounting 6.5 Communication KW & PPF 5.6 Communication KW & PPF 5.7 Ongoing Training Place of assignments: 7.7	y co anal	2.7.	Statistical and qualitative analysis of data			_																							
2.9. Reporting - Baseline survey 1		2.8.	Plausibility check of data																										
210. Presentation baseline survey 210. Presentation baseline survey 211. Survey handbook (ro conducting baseline studies) 212. Capacity building of KAZA staff (baseline studies) 212. Capacity building of KAZA staff (baseline studies) 212. Capacity building of KAZA staff (baseline studies) 213. Development of Monitoring Ascessment 31. Development of Monitoring handbook (Rapid Assessment) 32. Compilation of monitoring handbook (Rapid Assessment) 33. Feedback loop for monitoring framework 34. Training of implementing body (KAZA stakeholders) Phase IV - Final phase 41. Compilation of all results (draft final report) 42. Final reporting 51. Project coordination and project management 52. Backstopping and Quality control 53. Reporting of Project Progress 54. Contracting KIW and Accounting 55. Communication KIW & PPF 56. Communication KIW & PPF 57. Ongoing Training Place of assignments: 18. Project Coordination and Windhouk 28. Assame (Workshops, KAZA Training) 19. Consolition in KIW & PPF 30. Consolition in KIW & PPF 31. Compilation KIW & PPF 32. Computation KIW & PPF 33. Reporting (Mad Accounting 34. Contracting KWa and Windhouk 34. Contracting KWA and Windhouk 35. Communication KIW & PPF 36. Outreach 36. Outreach 37. Ongoing Training Place of assignments: 37. Ongoing Training Place of assignments: 38. Contracting (Mad Accounting) 39. Compute on KIW & PPF 30. Consolition in KIW & PPF 30. Consolition in KIW & PPF 30. Consolition in KIW & PPF 31. Consolition in KIW & PPF 32. Reporting (Mad Accounting) 33. Reporting (Mad Accounting) 34. Contracting (Wad Accounting) 35. Communication KIW & PPF 36. Outreach 37. Ongoing Training 38. Reporting (Mad Accounting) 37. Ongoi	, Ve	2.9.	Reporting - Baseline survey						_					_															
60 2.11. Survey handbook (for conducting baseline studies) 1 <td>n</td> <td>2.10.</td> <td>Presentation baseline survey</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	n	2.10.	Presentation baseline survey						_					_							_								
2.12. Capacity building of KAZA start (baseline studies) Image: Capacity building of KAZA start (baseline studies) Image: Capacity building of KAZA start (baseline studies) 3.1. Development of Monitoring & Evaluation Framework Image: Capacity building of Monitoring & Evaluation Framework Image: Capacity building of KAZA start (baseline studies) Image: Capacity building of KAZA start (baseline studies) 3.1. Development of Monitoring & Evaluation Framework Image: Capacity building of monitoring framework Image: Capacity building of monitoring framework Image: Capacity building of monitoring framework 3.3. Feedback loop for monitoring framework Image: Capacity building of Monitoring framework Image: Capacity building of Monitoring framework Image: Capacity building of monitoring framework 3.4. Training of implementing body (KAZA stakeholders) Image: Capacity building of Monitoring framework Image: Capacity building of Monitoring framework Image: Capacity building of Monitoring framework 4.1. Compliation of all results (draft final report) Image: Capacity building of Monitoring framework	S	2.11.	Survey handbook (for conducting baseline studies)			_			_		-			_	_				+ +	_		-		_					
Phase III - M&E Framework and Rapid Assessment Image: Complexity of the control		2.12.	Capacity building of KAZA staff (baseline studies)			_			_	_			_	+							0	to	+ 2		_				
3.1. Development of Monitoring & Evaluation Framework Image: Second			Phase III - M&E Framework and Rapid Assessment											1		<u> </u>	uII	Ļ	лe	5	er	llċ	lll	ווע					
3.2. Compilation of monitoring handbook (Rapid Assessment)	m ę ×	3.1.	Development of Monitoring & Evaluation Framework												h,	C													
3.3. Feedback loop for monitoring framework 3.4. Training of implementing body (KAZA stakeholders) Phase IV - Final phase 4.1. Compilation of all results (draft final report) 4.2. Final reporting 5. Project coordination and project management 5.1 Project planning, management and monitoring 5.2 Backstopping and Quality control 5.3. Reporting of Project Progress 5.4 Contracting KfW and Accounting 5.5 Communication KfW & PPF 5.6 Outreach 5.6 Outreach 7.7 Ongoing Training Place of assignments: 1.1 Consortium in Klagenfurt, Lusaka and Windhouk 2.2 Kasane (Workshops, KAZA Training) 2.3 Kasane (Workshops, KAZA Training) 3.3. Feedback loop for monitoring framework 3.4. Training / Distribution 3.5. Communication KfW & PPF 5.6 Outreach 3.7 Ongoing Training 3.8 KAZA Training 3.9 Construction Klagenfurt, Lusaka and Windhouk 3.9 Construction KfW A A Training 3.1 Project Distribution 4.1 Construction KfW A PPF 5.2 Communication KfW & PPF 5.4 Contracting KfW and Accounting 5.5 Communication KfW & PPF 5.6 Outreach 5.7 Ongoing Training 9 Decention of All reports 1.1 Consortium in Klagenfurt, Lusaka and Windhouk 2.1 Consortium in Klagenfurt, Construction KfW & Distribution 3.2 Kasane (Workshops, KAZA Training) 3.3 Reporting of Distribution 3.4 Construction KfW & Distribution 4.4 Construction Kf	8 m or	3.2.	Compilation of monitoring handbook (Rapid Assessment)												vv	Ρ						_							
3.4. Training of implementing body (KAZA stakeholders) Image: Construction of all results (draft final report) Image: Construction of all report) Image: Construction of all report reports Image: Construction of all report reports Image: Consot reports Image: Construction of all reports	N To N	3.3.	Feedback loop for monitoring framework						_											_									
Phase IV - Final phase Image: Second sec	-	3.4.	Training of implementing body (KAZA stakeholders)						_																				
4.1. Compilation of all results (draft final report) I			Phase IV - Final phase																										
4.2. Final reporting I		4.1.	Compilation of all results (draft final report)																										
5 Project coordination and project management 1		4.2.	Final reporting																										
5.1 Project planning, management and monitoring Image: transmit and monitoring Image: transmit and monitoring Image: transmit and monitoring 5.2 Backstopping and Quality control Image: transmit and monitoring Image: tran		5	Project coordination and project management																										
5.2 Backstopping and Quality control Image: Control <t< td=""><td>ut</td><td>5.1</td><td>Project planning, managment and monitoring</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	ut	5.1	Project planning, managment and monitoring																										
5.3 Reporting of Project Progress Image: Constructing of Project Progress Image: Constructing of Project Progress 5.4 Contracting KfW and Accounting Image: Construction KfW and Accounting Image: Construction KfW and Accounting Image: Construction KfW and Accounting 5.5 Communication KfW & PPF Image: Construction KfW and Accounting Image: Constructing and Accounting and Accounting	:t ne	5.2	Backstopping and Quality control														_												
5.4 Contracting KtW and Accounting	en	5.3	Reporting of Project Progress						_					_	_						_	_							
5.5 Communication KW & PPF 6 7 7 0 going Training 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 7 0 going Training 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 7 0 going Training 7 0 going Training 7 1 Consortium in Klagenfurt, Lusaka and Windhouk 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1 <</th1<>	jo j	5.4	Contracting KfW and Accounting						_						_		_			_				_					
5.6 Outreach Outr	le su	5.5	Communication KfW & PPF		_									_	_									_					
S.7 Ongoing Training Image: Construct of the construction of th	na	5.6	Outreach			_			_								_			_									
Place or assignments: Image: Consortium in Klagenfurt, Lusaka and Windhouk Image: Consort	-	5./		┥┤	_																								
2 Kasane (Workshops, KAZA Training) 1<		4	Prace of assignments:	┝┼	+	_	\vdash	\vdash	-	+	\vdash	\vdash	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	-	+	+		+	+	++		+	++
Z nasane (workshops, NAZA rialming)		2	Consortium in Magenturt, Lusaka and Windhouk	\vdash		_		\vdash	+	-	+			+	+	+	-	-	++	-				+	+	++	_	+	+
		2	Local support staff in KAZA Halling)	┼┼			\vdash	\vdash		+	+	\vdash	_	+	+	+		+		-		+		+	+	++		+	+
4 Kama Mullo Campus (Trainings consortium HQs)		4	Katima Mulilo Campus (Trainings, consortium HOs)	╞┼┼				\vdash		+	+	\vdash	-	+	+			-				+		+	╋	++		+	

E. C. O.

5.4 Lessons learned

During the project implementation, some considerations need to be borne in mind when repeating the survey.

5.4.1 Field work experience

In general, the fieldwork went well and was completed with no major incidences. Minor, unforeseen problems which usually happen with working in the field could be solved on the spot or within a reasonable timeframe. No big problems were reported by the supervisors, neither from Twiza Associates Limited who supervised the field teams of Botswana, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe or from ACADIR who supervised the work in Angola.

A summary of field work experience reported from the supervisor Twiza associates limited is provided in the following section:

The field work finished on time for the data enter and processing although the targeted number of questionnaires was not achieved by all teams. Certain assumptions made were not right with regards to the sites that had to be visited. The continued provision of feedback to the team whenever they faced challenges helped quicken the process. The initiative of networking amongst supervisors helped the Team Leaders resolve some of the issues on their own, without having to depend entirely on the Consultants.

Work planning in all the four country teams was found to be good up to the end of the field work. Completion of the questionnaires was good for all the four countries. During the first days the checking of completeness and accuracy of questionnaires was not properly and regularly done by team leaders. After the first supervision visit, the team leaders improved this and performed in line with their allotted roles.

Security for vehicle, GPS equipment, laptops and indeed of team members was generally good. The Zambia team's consumption of batteries for the GPS was found to be too high relative to other country teams.

Uncertainties in finding communities

Due to the fact that parts of the fieldwork plan were based on assumptions due to a lack of information (e.g. size of communities, resettled villages), some problems were reported when the planning was different from reality in the field. This problem basically occurred in Namibia and Zambia.

Technical problems with GPS and database

Technical problems regarding GPS collection of waypoints and data entry into the database occurred at the beginning of the field work in Namibia and Zambia. Some of the enumerators were not yet fully confident with the use of the tools even although they had been carefully trained. The technical problems could be solved timely within the field data collection phase. Backups via email and screenshots as well as database improvements could be communicated using the given channels.

Problems regarding the field manual

Namibia Team had difficulties with understanding some questions particularly on the definition of employment and profession even although this had been discussed during field training. This could be seen from the questionnaires they submitted, but any problems were sorted out during the cleaning of data.

Communication with teams in the field

One challenge for the project lead was the communication with the field teams and supervisors regarding urgent issues. It was difficult to immediately pass information on and to provide responses on queries received as the teams in the field did not always have access to electricity or networks. However, the communication flow was regularly and organized using technical tools like mobile phones and email. Most of the queries could be solved in a reasonable timeframe whenever the teams reached places where electricity and a network was available.

In general the team leaders gave feedback that the communities were mainly supportive and welcomed the field teams. Problems were reported from Zambia, where some of the communities showed general distrust in authorities.

Difficult terrain

Though the teams were able to complete their assignments on time, the teams faced different challenges in reaching the targeted communities. No problems were reported from Botswana and from Zimbabwe. They could reach all communities according to their field survey plan on time. The funds allocated were

appropriate.

Due to the situation in Angola and its remoteness more funds for fuel and car rental was allocated to the Angolan field team. It seemed appropriate as there was no comment from the NGO ACADIR who were in charge of carrying out the field work. However, during the monitoring workshop the Angolan liaison officer mentioned that for the Angolan field work more funds were required because of the difficult and inaccessible terrain as well as because of the fact that the team had to go in a convoy of two cars.

Namibia and Zambia reported difficult terrains as well, as access roads to some of the communities were poor. A major issue was getting to the settlement and resettlement of communities in the floodplains. They needed more funds for travel than expected.

Team wellbeing, team spirit and team motivation

The field data collection ended well with no major incidences or fatalities to the team members. Nor were there any ill health cases reported, apart from Botswana team members having suffered insect bites necessitating medical attention.

The perception of the supervisor was that team morale varied from low to high with Zimbabwe taking up the low score and Zambia the high. Generally, teams lead by females had some coordination problems and this appeared mainly to have been caused by the control over the vehicle as the male team members wanted to dominate control over the vehicles even if they were not team leaders and also the influence of the owners of the vehicles of who they preferred to drive.

5.4.2 Data processing

The processing of data went well. All teams submitted the GPS data of the households and the household interviews on time. The GPS coordinates were taken from each household and the geographical information was added to the socio-economic database. The GPS waypoints taken also serve as control instruments, verifying the location of the interviews, the interviewer, and the distribution of the sample as well as time information and reflecting the duration of interviews.

The national socio-economic databases were filled and submitted in time according to the requirements. Apart from minor errors which were deleted using

queries, a valuable socio-economic dataset is provided for KAZA-TFCA for further analysis and planning of socio economic programmes.

The output of the survey is a representative sample for KAZA-TFCA pilot area. The teams collected a valid dataset in a rather short time (1565 household interviews + 76 key stakeholder interviews).

Feedback of field team leaders

The feedback of the team leaders on the assignment was generally positive. Thinking of improvements, they mentioned seasonal aspects as rain which was partly disturbed the teams and the possible provision of camping equipment as "nice to have". There was some confusion especially of the Namibian and the Zambian teams in finding the right community, though road maps were provided.

Some improvements derived from observations and practical experiences of the field teams are reflected in the final survey handbook.

5.4.3 Challenges for project management

The project was conducted within limitations regarding funds and time. Thus the results can be seen as big achievement. Though the project went smoothly, the schedule was challenging during all the project implementation phases. There was a time limitation which did not allow for sufficient revision phases for the consultant as well as the client.

During the preparation phase the time between inception workshop and start of the fieldwork was very short. Some technical challenges were as a result of that: Due to a delay with customs in South Africa, not all GPS devices were available at the start of the project. However, this was solved after the first quality control visit, but either way this was a challenge for the field teams to organize the sharing of technical tools.

The field work had to start only one week after the training. Thus, some of the findings from the field survey pilot testing could only



be incorporated into the field manual. However, the communication with the team leaders went via e-mail and not all the teams printed the field manual before they broke off for the survey. The field survey road map was also handed over to the teams later, so the Namibian team, for instance, had difficulties in finding some of the villages. These minor problems could have easily been prevented if there had been some time scheduled to get all the required issues and devices in place.

Due to limited funds, field survey supervision was limited. This was counteracted by giving more responsibility to team leaders. However, they could not make some of the decisions or help in technical issues with the minimum training and it also took some time for them to accept their role.

The considerable amount of field-costs had to be almost completely pre-financed by the consultant, which was challenging. It would be helpful to have at least the funds required for the field survey in advance, as some issues like the car rental also required advance payments, to smoothly facilitate the fieldwork. The processing of bank transfers took long and was therefore slowing down the field teams after Christmas break. Additionally, it was expensive to transfer small instalments across country borders.

5.4.4 <u>Recommendations for follow up surveys</u>

The recommendations for follow up surveys are incorporated into the survey handbook (Annex 5).

Addressing the lessons learned and challenges for project management, some additional recommendations can be drawn. The baseline survey was conducted with limited funds and limited time. If more funds and more time were available, some changes could be taken into account:

Team composition:

The issue of the team leader acting as a driver can be addressed during follow up surveys. If additional drivers are employed, the team leader can concentrate on his/her supervision role, but due to limited space in the car more team days would be needed to meet the target of questionnaire per day. The gender issue played a role for some teams, but should be addressed in a women friendly way in future: If male enumerators have difficulties in accepting female team leaders with higher educational level, they should be excluded. In any case, the criteria for the selection of the staff should be education and work experience. Given enough preparation time, interviews should be done by the contracting party before the staff are selected to ensure the best quality staff for doing a survey.

Organisation of supervision

Within this project the field supervisor had an average of five days per team for supervision. This is enough once the team leaders play their role as team supervisors efficiently. To ensure increased guidance especially at the beginning of the fieldwork, it is advisable to organize the supervision on a weekly bases. The supervisor should accompany each team for two days at the beginning of the fieldwork to clarify all upcoming issues and later on meet them again on a weekly basis.

The partner responsible for contracting and supervising field personnel should be left to manage the personnel according to the agreed terms and provide for taking disciplinary measures where the need arises. This includes identification of the personnel and managing the budget for the field work and the personnel concerned.

Time frame

For follow up surveys a sufficient preparation phase is recommended in order to ensure that all necessary equipment for the field teams is ready before they start. For follow up surveys, the survey tools and the entry database is now available and the equipment (GPS devises, Laptops, Survey tools) is stored at KAZA secretariat.

Due to limited time, the team leaders could not join the KLOs for introduction to the communities as agreed upon during the inception workshop. However, an introduction letter was issued by KAZA Secretariat. In future, it would be recommendable to use the recognised channels for pre-informing communities to avoid a field team from not being welcomed.

Seasonal aspects

For follow-up surveys, the seasonal aspects should be taken into account: The field work should take place in the dry season, when household heads are not in the fields and easy access to remote communities is available. Possibly the best time for field work is EC

between September and Christmas.

Increased funds for difficult terrain

Some of the teams overspent the funds for car rental and fuel due to difficult terrain conditions. Some communities had to be visited twice. However, for a follow up survey, the field work plan can be based on the findings from the baseline survey and can be calculated according to the requirements of the communities to be visited. The villages to be visited and the number of households are clearly set.

Involvement of KAZA KLOs

For future follow up surveys KAZA Secretariat should provide a focal point person to be available to the teams to respond to the queries concerning the program that come from the communities. A joint introduction of KAZA and the field team leader to the community head and key stakeholders should be organized.





6 FINANCIAL DOCUMENTATION

Internal remark: [The final financial documentation of the project cannot yet be provided, because the project is still in progress and the accounting is not yet fully done. Some of the costs are not yet available, like the costs for translation and printing of the final reports, also the final personnel costs because the final accounting with our partners is not yet finalized. Thus a preliminary financial documentation can be provided (Table 5).]

The financial part of the project followed the estimated budget given in the financial proposal. For the majority of the cost categories the costs stay within the given frame with minor deviations. Additionally costs occur in the cost categories personnel costs and international travel costs: much higher amounts than estimated were spent. Also the printing of the questionnaire required more funds than estimated.

The implementation of the project required a lot of work, so the estimates were far below the work time needed. Oversees allowances were spent, according to the given frame; the costs for accommodation remain slightly below the estimates. International travel costs were underestimated, due to higher flight costs and due to coordination difficulties regarding the inception workshop. When the inception workshop date was postponed, flights were already booked and had to be cancelled. Local transport as well as the field work have been organized within a given cost frame. The same applies for the procurement of technical tools.

To avoid high money transfer costs being deducted by banks for international payments, E.C.O. did not contract the enumerators and field team leaders directly. Our regional partner Twiza associates limited contracted and supervised them. There were still considerable costs due to money transfer payments, but it was not possible in the short preparation period between inception and beginning of the fieldwork to come up with a different solution for contracting the field teams. The best approach would have been to have a national company to contract each team, but contacts to such companies were not established and they normally also deduct administrative costs. Thus unforeseeable costs derive from the nature of those contracting and working across five countries: Taxes on professional fees (20 % on fees, but not on operational costs or per diems) are to be paid according to Zambian law, and also applies to short term contracts of non-Zambian residents. The amount of the tax is preliminary calculated as 2.600 €.

The costs for translation of the reports as well as the printing and mailing of the report hard copies is not yet finished at that stage of the project. Planning workshops and meeting could be done within the given cost frame and the budget for miscellaneous costs is not fully utilized at that stage.

Table 5: Preliminary financial documentation

	ltem	Unit	Quantity I	Unit Rate Amount		Total planned T	otal spent [Difference	not yet finalized
i	Costs of Personnel					89.904,00	-143.148,50 €	-53.244,50 €	x
	Total staff								
	E.C.O								
	Jungmeier (ECO)	month	0,7	13.120,00 €	8.528,00€	0,05	656,00- €		
	Glatz-Jorde ((ECO)	month	3,1	13.120,00 €	40.016,00 €	3,6	47.232,00-€		
	Kirchmeier (ECO)	month	0,5	13.120,00€	6.560,00€	2,5	32.800,00-€		
	Huber (ECO) and support staff	month		13.120,00 €		2,3	30.176,00- €		
	Contracts:								
	Peter Myles (Consultant)	month	1,2	9.000,00€	10.800,00 €		3.533,50- €		
	Twiza associates limited (G. Mukwavi, O. Mulenga	month	2,3	6.000,00€	13.500,00 €		13.500,00- €		
	Twiza associates limited Addendum 1						1.800,00-€		
	UNAM (Alfons Mosimane (MRC - Namibia)	month	1,8	6.000,00€	10.500,00 €		13.451,00-€		
	UNAM (Selma Lendelvo (MRC - Namibia)	month	0,7	4.540,00€	2.951,00€				
	Overseas allowances in the KAZA TFCA	days	118,0	20,00 €	2.360,00€	2.360,00€	-2.361,00 €	-1,00 €	
	Overseas accomodation in the KAZA TFCA	nights	118,0	50,00€	5.900,00€	5.900,00€	-3.308,19 €	2.591,81 €	x
II	Costs for local transport					16.800,00	-15.411,27 €	1.388,73 €	x
	aquisition, lease or rent of vehicles as a lump sum per month	days	120,0	70,00€	8.400,00€		-5.475,56 €		
	running costs of vehicles per month (fuel) (including taxi and public tran	slitre	8400,0	1,00€	8.400,00€		-2.427,04 €		
	costs of local air, rail and road transport as a lump sum	lump			0		-7.508,67 €		
III	International travel costs					5.720,00	-11.705,83 €	-5.985,83 €	
	3 Flights Austria to Livingston (1000) 1 x 2, 2x 1 Persons	flights	4,0	1.000,00€	4.000,00€		-10.752,77 €		
	2 flights Port Elizabeth - Kasane	flights	2,0	500,00€	1.000,00€		-600,00€		
	Transfer Livingstone to workshop place (Transfer to and from airport)	transfer	6,0	120,00€	720,00€		-353,06 €		
IV:	Costs of local support staff					50.700,00	-48.680,19 €	2.019,81 €	x
	Drivers	days	147,0	50,00€	7.350,00€				
	Ennumerators and field team leaders (inl. Per diems)	quest.	2000,0	21,00€	42.000,00 €		-45.396,19€		
	Translator (English, Portuguese)	days	12,0	100,00 €	1.350,00€		-3.284,00 €		
VII	Procurement of Equipment					5.400,00	-5.557,72 €	-157,72 €	
	GPS (5)	piece	16,0	150,00€	2.400,00€		1.940,39- €		
	Mobliephones and call charges (Air time)	minutes	1800,0	0,50€	750,00€		199,71-€		
	Laptops	piece	5,0	450,00€	2.250,00€		1.855,57-€		
	Stationary for questionnaires						1.562,05- €		
VIII	Production of Reports					2.850,00	-2.748,64 €	101,36 €	x
	costs for report production	piece	18,0	75,00€	1.350,00€		-1.350,00€		
	Costs for additional copies of alltypes and reports	piece	20,0	75,00€	1.500,00€		1.398,64- €		
IX	Costs for planning workshops and meetings	WS	3,0	600,00€	1.800,00€	1.800,00 €	-1.446,12 €	353,89 €	
Х	Miscellaneus costs				5.000,00€	5.000,00€	-2.029,67 €	2.970,33 €	x
Subtota	al					186.434,00 €	-236.397,12€	-49.963,12 €	
Total:			-	3% discount		180.840,98 €		-55.556.14 €	



7 LITERATURE

- ASHLEY, C., & CARNEY, D. (1999). Sustainable livelihoods: Lessons from early experience (Vol. 7, No. 1). London: Department for International Development.
- CARNEY, D. (1998). Implementing the sustainable rural livelihoods approach. Paper presented to the DfID. Natural Resource Advisers' Conference. London: Department for International Development.
- DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (DFID) (2001): Sustainable Livelihood Guidance Sheets, DFID, London, U.K.
- MOSIMANE, A., LENDELVO, S. GLATZ-JORDE, S., KIRCHMEIR, H. HUBER, M. (2014): Livelihood baseline survey report for the Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area (KAZA TFCA), 112p. + Annex
- GLATZ-JORDE, S.; KIRCHMEIR, H.; HUBER, M., (2013): Inception report on Lifelihood baseline survey and development of a monitoring framework for KAZA TFCA., 36 p.
- HUBER, M.; KIRCHMEIR, H.; MUKVAVI, G.; MULENGA, O; GLATZ-JORDE, S. (2014): KAZA socio-economic monitoring handbook 42p. + Annex
- HUBER, M., GLATZ-JORDE, S., KIRCHMEIR, H. MOSIMANE, A., LENDELVO, S (2014): Livelihood survey handbook. Survey manual for the socio-economic baseline survey for the Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier conservation area (KAZA-TFCA). 26 p + Annex
- SCOONES, I. (1998). Sustainable rural livelihoods: a framework for analysis. **IDS Working Paper 72**, Brighton: IDS

FIGURES

8 FIGURES

Figure 1: The hierarchy of indicators: From input to impact	21
Figure 2: (a) Description of how tools relate to monitoring indicators and KAZA logframe elements. (b) Monitoring scheme addressing Kacommunities and households with specific tools	AZA activities, 22
Figure 3: Variables used for KAZA Livelihood Index calculation	30
Figure 4: KAZA-TFCA Livelihood index	31
Figure 5: Asset score per household in KAZA-TFCA	32
Figure 6: Distribution of assets in KAZA-TFCA	32
Figure 7: KAZA-TFCA Livelihood index for Angola	32
Figure 8: Distribution of assets in Angola	33
Figure 9: KAZA-TFCA Livelihood index for Botswana	33
Figure 10: Distribution of assets in Botswana	33
Figure 11: KAZA-TFCA Livelihood index for Namibia	34
Figure 12: Distribution of assets in Namibia	34
Figure 13: KAZA-TFCA Livelihood index for Zambia	34
Figure 14: Distribution of assets in Zambia	35
Figure 15: KAZA-TFCA Livelihood index for Zimbabwe	35
Figure 16: Distribution of assets in Zimbabwe	35
Figure 17: Mean livelihood index value by country	36
Figure 18: KAZA Socio-economic M&E Framework	37

E. C. O.

E. C. O.

9 TABLES

Table 1: Villages to be visited	23
Table 2: Number of field days per team	51
Table 3: Country share of questionnaires and number of field days per team	51
Table 4: Overview of schedule for project implementation	53
Table 5: Preliminary financial documentation	<u>59</u>



10 ABBREVIATIONS

PPF Peace Park Foundation KAZA-TFCA Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area KLOs KAZA Liaison Officer HH Household SLF Sustainable Livelihood Framework

SPSS Statistic Package for the Social Sciences



11 ANNEXES

Annex 1: List of workshop participants	.64-69
Annex 2: List of enumerators and field team contacts	.70-71
Annex 3: Workshop documentation	72-75
Annex 4: Livelihood Baseline survey report (see separate document on CD-ROM)	
Annex 5: Survey handbook (see separate document on CD-ROM)	
Annex 6: Monitoring handbook (see separate document on CD-ROM)	



Annex 1: Lists of workshop participants

#	NAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION	COUNTRY	E-MAIL
1	Godfrey Mtare	KLO-Zim	KAZA Secretariat	Zimbabwe	tgmtare@yahoo.com
2	Sedia Modise	Manager TSOSA	Peace Parks Foundation	Botswana	
3	Arrie Van Wyk	Project manager	PPF	RSA	avanwyk@ppf.org.za
4	Sevi Nyathi	Camp Fire Officer	Hwange RDC	Zimbabwe	Sevinyathi@gmail.com
5	Sam Mwiinde	Training Officer	Binga RDC	Zimbabwe	smwiinde@gmail.com
6	Simelisizwe Sibanda	Executive Officer Natural Resources	Tsholotsho RDC	Zimbabwe	simelisizwesibanda@gmail.com
7	Dorothea Theunissen	Consultant	KAZA Secretariat/Harewelle Int.	Germany	dorotheatheunissen@gmail.com
8	Nkatya Kafuli	Finance Manager	KAZA TFCA	N/A	
9	Simon Munthali	Technical Advisor	KAZA TFCA	Botswana	
10	Elvis Mwilima	Liaison Officer	KAZA – Namibia	Namibia	simbaelvis@yahoo.com
					simbamwil@gmail.com
11	Joseph Oukenetse	CBNRM Officer	Kalahari Conservation Society	Botswana	onkemetse@kcs.org.bw
					joseph72636109@yahoo.com
12	Nelson Muyaba	Planning Officer	ZAWA – Zambia	Zambia	nelsonmuyaba@yahoo.com
					nelson.muyaba@zawa.org.zm
13	Kambole Sikate	Statistical Officer	Ministry of Tourism & Arts	Zambia	gkambole@gmail.com
14	Sesame Keakabetse	Wildlife Officer	Department of Wildlife & National Parks	Botswana	skeakabetse@gmail.com, skeakabetse@gov.bw
15	Wamupu S Akapelwa	M&E Specialist	Ministry of Finance	Zambia	akawasi0501@gmail.com
					cornelius.akapelwa@mofnp.gov.zm
16	Karel P S Ndumba	Chief Warden	Ministry of Environment & Tourism	Namibia	Kndumba@met.na or kndumba@yahoo.com
17	Josephine Naambo IIPINGE	Chief Warden	Ministry of Environment & Tourism	Namibia	andthose@yahoo.com



Atte	endance list 1 st Workshop: 25	th and 26th October, Kasa	ane		
#	NAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION	COUNTRY	E-MAIL
18	Hilde lileka	CBNRM Warden	Ministry of Environment & Tourism	Namibia	hiileka@met.na
19	Bright Sanzila	CBNRM Warden	Ministry of Environment & Tourism	Namibia	bsanzila@yahoo.com
20	C Maketo	Deputy Director	Ministry of Environment & Tourism	Namibia	cmaketo@met.na
21	Colgar Sikopo	Director	Ministry of Environment & Tourism	Namibia	csikopo@met.na
22	Frederick Dipotso	KAZA Secretariat	KAZA	Botswana	fmdipotso@hotmail.com
23	Mathias Mwanza	KAZA Desk Officer	Ministry of Tourism and Arts	Zambia	Mathymania2010@gmail.com
24	Prof. Andrew Nambota	National TFCA Director	Ministry of Tourism	Zambia	Andrewnambota56@gmail.com
25	Poifo Jibajiba	Park Ranger – Chobe	Department of Wildlife National	Botswana	poifoajibajiba@gmail.com,
		National Park	Parks		pjibajiba@gov.bw
26	Osward Mulenga	Consultant	Twiza Associates Limited	Zambia	omulenga@gmail.com
27	Greenwell Mukwavi	Consultant	Twiza Associates Limited	Zambia	gmukwavi@hotmail.com
28	Susane Glatz- Jorde	Consultant	ECO	Austria	glatz-jorde@e-c-o.at
29	Peter Myles	Consultant	TourNet	RSA	tournet@iafrica.com
30	Hanns Kirchmeir	Consultant	ECO	Austria	kirchmeir@e-c-o.at

Attendan	Attendance list 2nd Workshop: Field team training 22th to 26 th November 2013, Katima Mulilo										
Titel	Name	Address	Town	Country	Email	Position					
Mr.	Kirchmeir Hanns	Kinoplatz 6	Klagenfurt	Austria	Kirchmeir@e-c-o.at	Consultant					
Mrs.	Selma Lendelvo		Windhoek	Namibia	Slendelvo@unam.na	Trainer, UNAM					
Mr.	Greenwell Mukvavi		Lusaka	Zambia	gmukwavi@hotmail.com	Director of TWIZA					
						Associates					
Mr.	Osward Mulenga		Lusaka	Zambia	omulenga@gmail.com	Trainer, TWIZA					
						Associates					
Mr.	Denton Joachim		Stellenbosch	South Afrca	djoachim@ppf.org.za	GPS Training PPF					



Attendance list 2nd Workshop: Field team training 22th to 26 th November 2013, Katima Mulilo											
Titel	Name	Address	Town	Country	Email	Position					
Mr.	Dipotso Frederick		Kasane	Botswana	fmdipotso@hotmail.com	Programme Director KAZA TFCA					
Mr.	Antonio Chipita Chipita		Menongue	Angola	antoniochipita2012@gmail.com	Director ACADIR					
Mr.	Elvis Mwilima Simba		Katima Mulilo	Namibia	simbaelvis@yahoo.com	KLO					
Mr.	Lrui Lisboa		Luanda	Angola	jjorgerui@hotmail.com	KLO					
Mr.	Liwena Sitali		Lusaka	Zambia	liwenas2002@yahoo.com	KLO					
Mr.	Chilule Mlazie		Kasane	Botswana	jmlazie@gmail.com	KLO					
Mr.	Godfrey Mtare		Hwange	Zimbabwe	tgmtare@yahoo.com	KLO					
Mrs.	Poniso Matengu (TL – F)	ERF 1228, Rocky crest, Liberty Island Road	Windhoek	Namibia	matengup@yahoo.com	Teamleader					
Mr.	Ronneld Mbanga (Driver) (M)	ERF Nr. 1461 N.H.E.	Katima Mulilo	Namibia	-	Enumerator					
Mrs.	Serio Sanimombo (F)	ERFN: 2772 NHE Ext 3	Katima Mulilo	Namibia	-	Enumerator					
Mr.	Eddy Simasiku Nchindo	ERF 1587 Chotto	Katima Mulilo	Namibia	-	Enumerator					
Mrs.	Lilata Winny	ERF 34. 3Rd Avenue	Oranjemund	Namibia	mrskaoobmpy@yahoo.com	Enumerator					
Mr.	Onkarabile Khane	POBOX: 555,	Kasane	Botswana	onkarabile.khane@yahoo.com	Teamleader					
Mr.	Siseho Mukamba	POBOX: 934	Kasane	Botswana	seemusenda@gmail.com	Enumerator					
Mr.	Bornright Mufaladi	POBOX: 670	Kasane	Botswana	bonniemojuladi@yahoo.com	Enumerator					
Mr.	Tlamelo KhuPela	POBOX: 140	Kasane	Botswana	tkhupela@yahoo.com	Enumerator					
Mrs.	Miyaze Nawala	POBOX: 140	Kasane	Botswana	miyazewal@yahoo.com	Enumerator					
Mr.	José Américo Filipe	Menongue		Angola	fjoseamericofilipe@yahoo.com.br	Teamleader					
Mr.	Daniel Alberto Ngongo		Kuausar	Angola		Enumerator					
Mrs.	Mayira Geraldo Moyo		Moensso	Angola	gmayira@gmail.com	Enumerator					
Mr.	Foibe Cassicombeno		Calai	Angola		Enumerator					
Mr.	Usona David Kawika		Calai	Angola	pemukawika@yahoo.com, kawika.davies@gmail.com	Enumerator					



Attendance list 2nd Workshop: Field team training 22th to 26 th November 2013, Katima Mulilo								
Titel	Name	Address	Town	Country	Email	Position		
Mr.	Muylinda Libakengi	Plot 640/Northland	Lusaka	Zambia	Libakengi@yahoo.com	Teamleader		
Mr.	Namaku Inambao		Sesheke	Zambia		Enumerator		
Mrs.	Hope K. Matengu		Sesheke	Zambia		Enumerator		
Mr.	Henry Ikafa		Kafue	Zambia	henryikafa86@yahoo.com	Enumerator		
Mrs.	Gift Lifumibo		Sesheke	Zambia		Enumerator		
Mrs.	Brightness Khupe	984 N. I Village	Hwange	Zimbabwe	khupebrighness@yahoo.com	Teamleader		
Mr.	Farai Gwekwerere	378 Squire Comming Road	Victoria Falls	Zimbabwe	fraigweks@gmail.com	Enumerator		
Mr.	Mkhumbuzi Sibanda	5399 Mkhosana	Victoria Falls	Zimbabwe	mkhuesibs@gmail.com	Enumerator		
Mr.	Methuli Nyathi	4459 Chinotimsa	Victoria Falls	Zimbabwe	nyathimethuli@gmail.com	Enumerator		
Mr.	lorraine Nyoni	8B West End Road	Hwange	Zimbabwe	lorrainemasoleynyoni@gmail.com	Enumerator		

Attendance list 3 st Workshop: 1 st fo 4 th April 2014, Kasane								
#	NAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION	COUNTRY	E-MAIL			
1	Olive Ncube	KAZA secretariat, Translator	KAZA	Botswana	oncube@KAZAtfca.org.bw			
2	Panduleni Elago	M&E officer	KAZA secretariat	Botswana	pelago@KAZAtfca.org.bw			
3	Alfons Mosimane	Researcher	UNAM	Namibia	amosimane@unam.na			
4	Jesaya Nakanyela	Researcher	UNAM	Namibia	jnakanyela@unam.na			
5	Rui Lisboa	KLO-Angola	KAZA Secretariat	Angola	jjorgerui@hotmail.com			
6	Jose ´Ame ´ricano	Member KAZA Angola		Angola	fjoseamericanofilipe@yahoo.com.br			
7	Usona D. Kawika	Member KAZA Angola		Angola	pemukawika@yahoo.com.br			
8	Mokvaledi Mafa		Wildlife and National Parks	Botswana	mokvaledimafa@gmail.com			
9	Chilule Mlazie	KAZA KLO	KAZA secretariat	Botswana				



Attendance list 3 st Workshop: 1 st fo 4 th April 2014, Kasane								
#	NAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION	COUNTRY	E-MAIL			
10	Sennye Neo-Mahu	Ag+ TFCA Coordinator		Botswana	nsennye@yahoo.com			
11	Joseph Oukenetse	CBNRM Officer	Kalahari Conservation Society	Botswana	onkemetse@kcs.org.bw			
					joseph72636109@yahoo.com			
12	C Maketo	Deputy Director	Ministry of Environment & Tourism	Namibia	cmaketo@met.na			
13	Bright Sanzila	CBNRM Warden	Ministry of Environment & Tourism	Namibia	bsanzila@yahoo.com			
14	Elvis Mwilima	Liaison Officer	KAZA – Namibia	Namibia	simbaelvis@yahoo.com			
					simbamwil@gmail.com			
15	Karel P S Ndumba	Chief Warden	Ministry of Environment & Tourism	Namibia	Kndumba@met.na or kndumba@yahoo.com			
16	Stephen Turner	Consultant	SE Framework	UK	Sdturner@iafrica.com			
17	Godfrey Mtare	KLO-Zim	KAZA Secretariat	Zimbabwe	tgmtare@yahoo.com			
18	Alec Dangare	National TFCA coordinator		Zimbabwe	adangare@yahoo.co.uk			
19	Sam Mwiinde	Training Officer	Binga RDC	Zimbabwe	smwiinde@gmail.com			
20	Sevi Nyathi	Camp Fire Officer	Hwange RDC	Zimbabwe	Sevinyathi@gmail.com			
21	Liwena Sitali	KLO-Zambia	KAZA	Zambia	Liwena.liswoamwa@gmail.com			
22	Mathias Mwanza	Tourism Development Officer/ KAZA Desk Officer	Ministry of Tourism and Arts	Zambia	Mathiasmwanza 1@gmail.com			
23	Simelisizwe Sibanda	Executive Officer Natural Resources	Tsholotsho RDC	Zimbabwe	simelisizwesibanda@gmail.com			
24	Johnson Lebotse	Wildlife		Botswana	johnsonlebotse@gmail.com			
25	Sesame Keakabetse	Wildlife Officer	Department of Wildlife & National Parks	Botswana	skeakabetse@gmail.com, skeakabetse@gov.bw			
26	Gilpin Kambole Sikate	Statistical Officer	Ministry of Tourism & Arts	Zambia	gkambole@gmail.com			
27	Nelson Muyaba	Planning Officer	ZAWA – Zambia	Zambia	nelsonmuyaba@yahoo.com			
					nelson.muyaba@zawa.org.zm			



Attendance list 3 st Workshop: 1 st fo 4 th April 2014, Kasane								
#	NAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION	COUNTRY	E-MAIL			
28	Greenwell Mukwavi	Consultant	Twiza Associates Limited	Zambia	gmukwavi@hotmail.com			
29	Mike Huber	Consultant	ECO	Austria	huber@e-c-o.at			
30	Susanne Glatz- Jorde	Consultant	ECO	Austria	Glatz-jorde@e-c-o.at			
31	Sedia Modise	Manager TSOSA	Peace Parks Foundation	Botswana				
32	Mokyanedi Ntana	ToM-Bto		Botswana	mntana@botswanatourism.com			
33	Osward Mulenga	Consultant	Twiza Associates Limited	Zambia	omulenga@gmail.com			
35	Prof. Andrew Nambota	National TFCA Director	Ministry of Tourism	Zambia	Andrewnambota56@gmail.com			
36	Frederick Dipotso	KAZA Secretariat	KAZA	Botswana	fmdipotso@hotmail.com			
36	Simon Munthali	Technical Advisor	KAZA TFCA	Botswana				



Annex 2: List of enumerators and field team contacts

	Name	Address	Town		Phone	Email
	Poniso Matengu (TL – F)	ERF 1228, Rocky	Windhoek		0813049964	matengup@yahoo.com
		crest, Liberty Island				
Mrs.		Road		Namibia		
	Ronneld Mbanga (Driver)	ERF Nr. 1461 N.H.E.	Katima Mulilo		0813600667	
Mr.	(M)			Namibia		
Mrs.	Serio Sanimombo (F)	ERFN: 2772 NHE Ext 3	Katima Mulilo	Namibia	0813219484	
	Eddy Simasiku Nchindo	ERF 1587 Chotto	Katima Mulilo		0812081952,	
Mr.				Namibia	0814088088	
Mrs.	Lilata Winny	ERF 34. 3Rd Avenue	Oranjemund	Namibia	0816459451	mrskaoobmpy@yahoo.com
Mr.	Onkarabile Khane	POBOX: 555,	Kasane	Botswana	0026777001010	onkarabile.khane@yahoo.com
Mr.	Siseho Mukamba	POBOX: 934	Kasane	Botswana	0026774923627	seemusenda@gmail.com
Mr.	Bornright Mufaladi	POBOX: 670	Kasane	Botswana	0026774923985	bonniemojuladi@yahoo.com
Mr.	Tlamelo KhuPela	POBOX: 140	Kasane	Botswana	0026774605157	tkhupela@yahoo.com
Mrs.	Miyaze Nawala	POBOX: 140	Kasane	Botswana	0026772982270	miyazewal@yahoo.com
Mr.	José Américo Filipe	Menongue		Angola	813049964	fjoseamericofilipe@yahoo.com.br
	Daniel Alberto Ngongo	Kuausar			0814523198,	
Mr.				Angola	+244947727223	
Mrs.	Mayira Geraldo Moyo	Moensso		Angola	081710025	gmayira@gmail.com
Mr.	Foibe Cassicombeno	Calai		Angola	0812097412	
	Usona David Kawika	Calai			+244936565340,	pemukawika@yahoo.com,
Mr.				Angola	0817490690	kawika.davies@gmail.com
	Muylinda Libakengi	Plot 640/Northland	Lusaka		+0966169161,	Libakengi@yahoo.com
Mr.				Zambia	00260978126700	
Mr.	Namaku Inambao		Sesheke	Zambia	0964766668	
	Hope K. Matengu		Sesheke		0978126455,	
Mrs.				Zambia	0965440547	
Mr.	Henry Ikafa		Kafue	Zambia	0976865168	henryikafa86@yahoo.com
Mrs.	Gift Lifumibo		Sesheke	Zambia	0950488480	



Mrs.	Brightness Khupe	984 N. I Village	Hwange	Zimbabwe	+263774598913	khupebrighness@yahoo.com
	Farai Gwekwerere	378 Squire Comming	Victoria Falls		+263776877668	fraigweks@gmail.com
Mr.		Road		Zimbabwe		
Mr.	Mkhumbuzi Sibanda	5399 Mkhosana	Victoria Falls	Zimbabwe	+263776579316	mkhuesibs@gmail.com
Mr.	Methuli Nyathi	4459 Chinotimsa	Victoria Falls	Zimbabwe	+263773736647	nyathimethuli@gmail.com
Mr.	Iorraine Nyoni	8B West End Road	Hwange	Zimbabwe	+263775236688	lorrainemasoleynyoni@gmail.com
Annex 3: Workshop documentation

During the project three international workshops were held, aiming to present the approach of the expert team and receive regional feedback from KAZA-TFCA stakeholders.

- <u>1st workshop: Inception and presentation of survey tools:</u> October 2013
- <u>2nd workshop: Field survey training: November 2013</u>
- <u>3rd workshop: April 2014</u>

Inception Workshop

The inception workshop took place from 25th to 26th of October 2013 at Kasane Chobe Marina Lodge. KAZA stakeholders from the five KAZA partner countries were the main target group of the workshop.

Content of the inception workshop

The first workshop aimed to introduce the expert team, the survey method and the survey tools and to collect a regional feedback of KAZA stakeholders. Additionally it aimed to agree on the project methods and results and to clarify expectations of the client on the consultant.

Following issues were discussed during inception workshop:

- The project aims
- The project work steps
- The project methods (sampling, focus on rural households, participation of KLOs in the recruitment of the field teams)
- The implementation schedules
- The survey tools (household and community questionnaire)

Inception workshop results

KAZA stakeholders and the consultants agreed on the implementation procedure.

Comments of the participants on the survey tools were collected and incorporated later on.

The KAZA Pilot area community list was corrected and information about the communities provided by workshop participants.

Contacts to the Angolan NGO ACADIR could be established with the help of the Angolan KLO and Peace Park Foundation.

The results and agreements are described in detail in the inception report (Glatz-Jorde et.al. (2013).

Training Workshop

The field survey training workshop took place from 18th to 23rd of November 2014 at Katima Mulilo Campus of UNAM.

Training content

The workshop was particularly dedicated to the practical training of the five national field teams consisting of 20 enumerators and 5 field team leaders in order to prepare them how to conduct the field. The training focused on using the survey tools like household and community questionnaires, using GPS devices for data collection, the process of data entry into the database, quality management of field work and data quality control.

All teams were trained together at UNAM Campus in Katima Mulilo. Representatives of KAZA secretariat and the KLOs participated during the first two days and were trained together with the team leaders.

The pilot testing of questionnaire was done during the training. The training was held in collaboration with all project partners (UNAM, Twiza Associates Limited, E.C.O. and with support of PPF for training on the use of GPS).

E.C.

ANNEXES



The following issues were included in the training:

- Introduction to the study and its objectives
- Detailed logistical planning of the fieldwork
- Explanation of the questionnaire starting from a broad perspective, narrowing down to thematic areas and finally to the questions
- Exploration of anticipated answers
- Mock administration of the questionnaire/stakeholder interview guide among the participants
- Explanation and use of the procedures manual
- GPS training
- Data entry training
- Pilot testing of the tools in a village close to Katima Mulilo
- Question and answer sessions
- Sharing of cultural aspects across the five countries
- Ethics of interviewing

A training manual was elaborated and handed over to the field teams by their supervisors.

Results of training workshop

- The five teams were contracted.
- The enumerators were familiar with the survey tool and the way of conducting it. The field team leaders were familiar with the key stakeholder interviews and their role of organising the field work and administrating the questionnaires.
- A field survey plan was elaborated and clearly explained to the team.
- Roles and Responsibilities of national coordinator, field team leader and enumerators during field work were clarified.
- The team leaders were familiar with the data entry, data processing and the data handover.
- Survey tools like the questionnaire copies as well as the

technical instruments (one laptop per team and four GPS devices per team) were handed over.

• Quality measures for the fieldwork were set at various levels and understood by the teams.



Field teams in Katima Mulilo

ANNEXES





Training of data entry



How to sample in communities



GPS data collection, theory and practice



Practical training on carrying out household interviews

ANNEXES



Pilot testing of questionnaire

Result presentation and monitoring workshop

The third KAZA workshop took place from 1th to 4th of April 2014 in Kasane at Chobe Marina Lodge. KAZA stakeholders from the five KAZA partner countries were the main target group of the workshop.

Content of result presentation workshop

Two days on livelihood baseline survey

- Presenting survey methods applied
- Presenting the practical experiences of the fieldwork
- Presenting the survey results
- Interpretation of the survey results to gain regional feedback on results

Two days monitoring framework

• Presenting the monitoring approach and monitoring tools

- Developing achievable targets and fixing indicators
- Determination of baseline values and setting target values
- Practical training on monitoring tools
- Collecting regional feedback

Workshop results

The participants of the workshop actively participated during the complete workshop period. A considerable number of group works was aiming at the interpretation of the survey results and their connection to the KAZA programme objectives. Some of the workshop results shall be summarized for further consideration.

<u>One group work was reflecting the national results of the survey</u> addressing following questions:

- What are the major challenges considering livelihood in your country?
- What should be done?
- What is the role of KAZA?

Another group work on the second workshop day dealt with the rating of livelihood assets of households for the KAZA livelihood index. The index variables were individually rated. Additionally, national groups rated the importance of livelihood assets for their country. The results were discussed in the group and raised the awareness of the participants regarding livelihood in KAZA pilot areas.

The third workshop day basically addressed the monitoring framework. National working groups were setting target values for output indicators using the operational plans provided by KAZA Secretariat. E.C.