

The Botswana mid-term evaluation was conducted at national and district government levels which included the project government affiliates, Department of Forest and Rangeland Resources (DFRR). The evaluation also included the four BORAVAST communities and the IUCN staff.

The evaluation focused on the following five major issues (see Annex 1 for more detailed Terms of Reference):

1. Review progress in the implementation of project activities – are partners delivering according to the EC requirements? Are they on track to complete the project in the allotted time?
2. Review progress towards the project goals and objectives (review activities against the theory of change) – how are our activities taking us towards our objectives? What assumptions is the project making and how do they stand up to scrutiny?
3. Review of challenges – what challenges are being overcome? What challenges still need to be resolved, and what modifications to the project will this require? What lessons should be learned about project design based on these challenges?
4. How effective is the project monitoring strategy? What lessons is the project yielding so far and what more monitoring and evaluation is required?
5. What is already known about the next steps after this project is implemented? What follow up activities are needed and what are the fund raising priorities?

The evaluation consisted of a day with the IUCN project team identifying delivery challenges and updating on overall progress, constraints and also to demonstrate the participatory evaluation methodology to the participants ; two days with project partners and community delegates to evaluate project progress and; one day conducting the evaluation process at the project site in Bokspits with the communities; a final day with the project IUCN team and DFRR associates implementing the project with government TAC focal people to reflect on lessons and ways forward. Each evaluation conducted was run between 4-6 hrs.

The workshop methodology was participatory in order to draw on reflections of community members and Government affiliates. The basic methodology (which is outlined in more detail in Annex 2) consisted of two steps:

1. Discussion and consensus on the overarching vision and broad aims of the initiative (thinking further ahead than the limits of this project);
 - a. Part 1 focused on the larger ambitions of the project in order to shift attention away from delivery of outputs and towards how the overall implementation process contributes to long-term ambitions such as empowerment, governance, self-sufficiency etc.
 - b. Part 1 also gave a good insight into how the project goals and objectives are understood by different participants.
2. Discussion and analysis of progress in implementing activities and how they contribute to achieving the overall vision.
 - a. The discussion with project partners focused more on activities as defined by the project, whereas the community discussion focused on the activities they had prioritised through their Community Environmental Management Planning (CEMPs) processes.

Finally each meeting closed with an open discussion around relationships, identified changes and what happens in the future (questions of sustainability).

wealthy individuals. Although the individual wealthy livestock owners have been allocated their own parcels of land they are still free to graze their livestock on community rangeland, and the community does not have the authority or power to regulate them. The community does not have a long standing tradition of pastoral management and their use of herd mobility as a management strategy does not appear to be strongly developed, although more investigation is needed into local herding knowledge.

Alternative livelihood options are limited and livestock rearing is the principle industry. Efforts have been made to strengthen this sector through breed improvement, for example with Dorper sheep, but

Community Environmental Action Planning in March 2011. The activities undertaken here

Motivation of Government: The Botswana Government have taken a major role in supporting the project and acting as mediators between IUCN and the BORAVAST communities. In Botswana the government has an existing relationship with communities who are more likely to trust and work with projects if the government are on board. There was an interest in the project from the national to the district government level highlighting the potential for tangible success and sustainability of achieving the project objectives.

beginning of the project from the Department of Forestry and Rangeland Resources (DFRR) to the Department of Environment and Agriculture (DEA) and back to DFRR.

There is a high turn-over in government staff,

recipient community. IUCN needs to maintain closer presence on the ground both to scale up delivery and also to maintain clarity of communication with the community over the value of the CEMP approach. This is a capacity building project to enable the community to be more self-reliant and less dependent on external (usually unreliable) investment projects – this point needs to be continuously reinforced.

Community

Accelerate project delivery: Two steps are recommended to greatly increase the rate of delivery of this project. Hiring a project officer is imperative to

purposes they imply the same thing – their difference simply relates to their evolution within IUCN (IUCN now uses the term CEAP, but at the time of project development the term CEMP was in use). The choice of acronym is not important but the project team should ensure consistency in the version they use to minimise confusion.

Awareness Raising: The Department of Forest and Rangeland Resources (DFRR) could use lessons from other project country component strategies for rangeland management such as Jordan. The focal person from DFRR should be supported by the coordination unit to identify technical aspects of rangeland management and ecology for community-government learning for improv5()-23(C)

Financial and managerial training/guidance is required for all Trust board members.

Project Planning:

Changes to partnerships, budgets, work-plans, implementing arrangements, project outputs etc.

Changes to overall strategic approach

Lessons and how to use them

What is the audience for the lessons learned in project implementation? How can relevant information be conveyed how can ICUN learn as an institution?

Areas of intervention that need continuation

Areas of interventions worth scaling up

Opportunities for project continuation compared with IUCN exit strategy

Roles and responsibilities for next steps in project development or continuation

This outline does not allow for travel to the field. Additional days should therefore be inserted where required. This plan can be modified according to the needs of each country.

Day 1	Review of project documentation with project team, meetings with support staff and technical coordinators.
Day 2	Meeting with key project partners full day (6 hours) Simple workshop format with presentations of project outline, feedback on progress and partnerships, breakout sessions to discuss performance etc. National Level Government Officials.
Day 3	Meeting with the Key project partners full day (6 hours) Simple workshop format with presentations of project outline, feedback on progress and partnerships, breakout sessions to discuss performance etc. District Level Government Officials on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).
Day 4	Meeting with communities full day (6 hours) if required (some countries may engage all communities in Day 3 which would be more appropriate).
Day 5	De-briefing with project partners (govt) and project team, feedback on lessons and discussion about progress in the second half of the project (half day meeting).

Date	Meeting Times	Meeting	Key questions	Methodology	Location
Sun 29 th July	Start Time: 9am Lunch: 1-2pm End Time: 4pm	IUCN project team, support staff and technical coordinators IUCN SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of the Mid Term Evaluation Process Review of documentation Review of work plan and deliverables Review of Theory of change and monitoring strategy Review of impacts monitored to date Review of partnerships Sustainability (more for day 5?) Challenges in delivery (including reporting and financing difficulties) Challenges in achieving impact Recommended changes to the project Lessons that we can learn learning strategy for the future (day 5?) 	One to one or group meetings led by evaluators	Metcourt Inn Hotel - Gaborone
Mon 30 th July	Start Time: 9am Tea: 11- 11.15am Lunch: 1-2pm Tea: 3-3.15pm End Time: 5pm	IUCN and Key project partners DFRR and DEA full day (6 hours)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall what are we trying to achieve? What did you plan to do? Why was this important/relevant? 		

2. Presentation to be made by coordination team (broad components of what the project aims to accomplish and why discussion centred round the project goals and gaps).
3. Groups to discuss the questions in the grid below (we will discuss these at length first to see if we all agree)
 - a. Group discussion for up to 2 hours followed by feedback to the wider group

ToC Category	What did you plan to do?	Why was this relevant to the overall goal?	What did you achieve?	What you achieve?	What constrained you?	What will you differently next time?	What lessons can you take for the future?	How will actions be sustained beyond the project?
--------------	--------------------------	--	-----------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------	---	---