UNDEF — The United Nations Democracy Fund

PROVISION FOR POST PROJECT EVALUATIONS FOR THE UNITED NATIONS DEMOCRACY FUND
Contract NO.PD:C0110/10

EVALUATION REPORT

TRANSTEC PROJECT MANAGEMENT

UDF-RAF-08-220: Governance and Transparency through Radio (GTR) Project

Date: 11 January 2013

Authors
This report was written by Phillip Rawkins and Amusaa Inambao.
Landis Mackellar was responsible for quality assurance with the support of Aurélie Ferreira, Evaluation Manager. Eric Tourrès was Project Director at Transtec.

Table of Contents

I.   Executive Summary

i.   Project Data

This report is the evaluation of the project entitled "Governance and Transparency through Radio" (GTR), implemented by Panos Southern Africa (PSAf), based in Lusaka, Zambia, between November 1, 2009 and October 31, 2011 (24 months).

The project featured field operations in four countries: Lesotho, Malawi, South Africa and Zambia. It was implemented by the grantee in cooperation with national implementing agency partners in Lesotho, Malawi and South Africa, as well as with rural community radio stations in three countries and the national broadcaster in Lesotho, as well as with urban radio stations. The three implementing partners were: the Malawi Media Women's Association; the Association of Community Based Organizations in KZN, South Africa (COMBOCCO); and, Participatory, Ecological Land Use management (PRELUM), Lesotho. The radio station partners were: in Malawi, the Malawi Broadcasting Corporation and the Dzimwe Community Radio Station; Lesotho: Radio Lesotho (there are no community stations in the country); South Africa: SAFM and Maputoland Radio; and, Zambia, Radio Phoenix and Mkushi Community Radio.

The UNDEF project built on the earlier experience of PSAF, and, in particular, on the lessons learned from a national project in Zambia with the same name. The overall aim of Governance and Transparency through Radio was to enhance dialogue between citizens, and particularly the poor, and policy-makers at local level, while enhancing the responsiveness and accountability of government institutions. The broader experience of PSAf with community radio and the setting up and training of Radio Listener Clubs (RLCs) goes back many years, and it has a well-established methodology for training RLCs and community radio teams.[1]

The Project Document defines three *intended outcomes* (Medium-Term Impacts);
- Outcome 1) *Increased awareness, knowledge and dialogue around development issues by rural and marginalized communities in the target project sites.*
- Outcome 2) *Increased engagement and debate between the poor and marginalized communities and policy makers in the target project sites.*
- Outcome 3) *Increased capacity of CSOs and media in Zambia, Malawi, Lesotho and South Africa to involve the poor and marginalized in democracy and development processes.*

ii.   Evaluation Findings

Relevance: The project emphasized the role of Radio Listener Clubs (RLCs) and the production of interactive radio programming to bring their voices to the attention of a wider audience. Beyond this, the focus was on bridging the gap between local decision-makers and poor rural and urban communities by utilizing radio as a mechanism for two-way communication and dialogue. In this way, it contributed to enhancing local democracy and the responsiveness of local governance, and, hence, was a good fit with UNDEF's mandate.

The Baseline Study conducted for the Project, based on case studies completed in the four participating countries, confirmed the importance of radio as the most accessible medium of

---

[1] See: Panos Institute of Southern Africa, Development through Radio: A Guide to Setting Up Radio Listener Clubs, 2003.

communication for rural communities. Community radio is effective in such settings, since it is close to the people it serves, and since, state policy permitting, it is able to broadcast in local languages and dialects.

In principle, the Project was relevant to the needs of the primary beneficiary groups: poor and marginalized rural and urban communities, which are largely excluded from political life, except during election campaigns. In practice, while the Project did reach poor, rural communities, it failed to engage with their urban counterparts.

Effectiveness: The Project was ambitious, organizationally complex and geographically scattered. It required strong coordination and direction. The Project's partner and participant organizations included: the grantee, three implementing agencies, three community radio stations, 32 Radio Listener Clubs and four urban radio stations, as well a local government in target areas. However, for the most part, it did not receive the leadership it required.

Substantial responsibility for Project oversight was placed in the hands of the implementing agencies in three of the target countries and with PSAf itself in Zambia. For various reasons, including gaps in Project planning, a weak central management role, a lack of clarity on organizational roles and responsibilities, and inadequate resources allocated for monitoring and technical support, this responsibility was not met.

GTR's agenda included a long list of activities and most of these were completed, though not necessarily with the number of outputs projected. However, a major weakness was the weak integration across Project components in support of results. One example of poor integration concerns the baseline research undertaken in the four participating countries, which led to the publication of an informative baseline report. Surprisingly, it did not inform the planning and needs assessment work done at the Project sites.

Further, while the project aimed to benefit both urban and rural beneficiaries, drawn from poor and marginalized communities, as noted above, only the rural groups were engaged directly, through the RLCs, in Project activities. The intended connection between the two beneficiary groups was to be established via a series of interactive radio programs produced by urban broadcasters. These would draw on material produced by the rural community radio stations, carrying the voices of the RLC members. In practice, the linkage between the rural community stations and the urban broadcasters was not well-established. There was little relationship between the rural and urban programming supported, and the urban programming was not aimed at the poor, but at the educated middle class.

Roundtable Discussion Forums (RDFs) were described as contributing to Outcome 1. In practice, the Forums did play a significant role in informing the work of the RLCs and community radio stations by setting out key issues to frame the discussion and programming agenda for the Clubs, on the basis of community priorities. However, it was intended that there were to be four RDFs per year, one in each country. In fact, only the initial set of four was held. This reduced the opportunity for maintaining stakeholder involvement, and, particularly, for engaging with local decision-makers and building their understanding of the purpose of the Project.

The project was not able to meet all of the numerical targets for deliverables. There were a number of contributory factors leading to this state of affairs. There were numerous delays in beginning field operations; difficulties in finalizing agreements and contracts with broadcasting partners, particularly in Malawi and Lesotho. In addition, there were delays in transferring funds to community radio stations by PSAf, which led to the postponement and/or cancellation of

recording and airing of RLC-based programs. There was also the failure of the plan for RLCs to record themselves, as had been planned. This placed additional demands on the limited resources made available to the community radio stations.

Despite such problems the Project succeeded in production and airing of a substantial set of programs by both the community radio stations and the urban stations. In terms of its contribution to achieving the specified outcomes, the Project did succeed, to some degree at least, in making a difference in terms of Outcome 1 and, to a lesser degree, Outcome 2. For the members of some of the RLCs and their broader communities in the participating rural target areas, in at least three of the participating countries, the Project increased to some degree awareness and knowledge of development issues and encouraged dialogue within communities in determining priorities for advocacy with local government.

In Zambia at least, the Project contributed in some way to increased engagement between the poor and local decision-makers in the rural target areas. The improved sense of political efficacy and citizenship experienced in Mkushi, Zambia, was particularly striking. Similarly, there was a willingness on the part of local decision-makers to respond to particular problems raised by the RLCs as reported through the Interactive radio programs. The success in building a dialogue with local government elsewhere appears to have been more problematic. Under Outcome 3, as PSAf recognizes (Final Report), the Project made little difference in increasing the capacity of CSOs and media in "involving the poor and marginalized in democracy and development processes".

Efficiency: As suggested above, In order for the project to achieve its intended results (Medium-Term Impacts as specified in the Logical Framework), and, given its complexity, there was a clear need for the grantee and/or the implementing agencies to take a strong guidance and monitoring role. In practice, this guiding hand was largely absent.

Although some of the key working relationships among partner organizations proved effective, there were many gaps in the linkage process. Further, resources were scattered over too many components, and some core activities lacked the funds they required. One of its outcomes, building the capacity of community media and CSOs, was left aside altogether. In Lesotho, it is apparent that the basic conditions to facilitate Project effectiveness were not present. The Project strategy was overly complex and overly ambitious, and roles and relationships required far more work to make the management arrangements effective.

Impact: The broader impact of the Project has been limited. It has made a difference, certainly in Zambia, and, in the case of some communities in Malawi, within the target areas, in improving the understanding of development issues and of the value of community organization in advocacy with local authorities in seeking support to solve local problems. In South Africa, the Project was valued by participants in the RLCs for providing a forum through which communities might raise issues with municipalities on issues relating to service delivery and local development. More broadly, the Project has also strengthened the case for community radio as a vehicle for enhancing participation in development dialogue by local communities, and, thus, enhancing local democracy in Southern Africa.

There was an expectation in the Project, as expressed in the Development Objective, that the Project would have an impact on democracy, as well as development. The discussion of issues by RLCs and the topics taken up by the rural community radio stations focused on matters of immediate relevance to local communities, and not, directly on efforts to enhance local

democracy. In the view of the Evaluators, to expect more at this stage would have been unrealistic.

Sustainability: The project had no exit strategy. All the community stations supported face ongoing financial challenges, and, without additional project funds, will be unable to produce programs with the RLCs. PSAf is utilizing other funds to continue its cooperation on the *Our Voice* program with Radio Phoenix in Lusaka. However, support to other urban stations has ceased.

UNDEF Added Value: In a region where the strengthening of support for democratic principles and practice remains a struggle, it was advantageous for PSAf to be able to attach the UN label to the Project.

iii.   Conclusions

- The Project objectives were highly relevant to UNDEF's mandate through its effort to promote the social and political inclusion of marginalized rural and urban communities through their engagement with local decision-making.

- The focus on the role of radio in bridging the gap between marginalized communities and decision-makers through the mechanism of Radio Listener Clubs represented a valuable contribution to addressing the virtual exclusion of the voices of the rural poor from local government decision-making. The Project's direct beneficiaries included both rural and urban marginalized communities. While rural beneficiaries received support, the designated urban beneficiaries were not included in the Project.

- Project Strategy proved to be overly complex and ambitious. If it was to be effective, with linkages established between urban-and rural-centred activities and beneficiary groups, it would be necessary for a set of complex inter-organizational relationships to work smoothly and professionally. While some of these relationships worked reasonably well, others did not, and many of the connections necessary to ensure that the project reached its potential were not made.

- The Project succeeded in completing a long list of activities and has a large number of outputs to its credit, notably radio programs produced by both community radio stations and urban radio stations in the four participating countries (N.B. In Lesotho, there are no community radio stations).

- For all this, the Project was unable to meet all of its numerical targets for outputs. This shortfall resulted from: an unrealistic Project plan; inadequate resources, especially for the community radio stations; delays in launching operations; and, the absence of monitoring and strong central direction.

- The urban radio broadcasts supported by the Project - for example those aired by Radio Phoenix in Lusaka – featured well-produced public interest programs. Yet, programming was aimed at an educated, English-speaking urban audience and was not accessible by the urban poor.

- The Project's research and publications component produced materials, including the "baseline study", which were of good quality. However, the documents and their distribution contributed only very indirectly to the achievement of Project outcomes.

- The project succeeded, to a degree at least, in contributing to one of its three outcomes (the Medium-Term Impact {MTI} results) sought: It enhanced the awareness and knowledge of local development issues, and of how to advocate for community priorities with local government officials, on the part of the members of some of the RLCs and the broader communities from which they came.

- In Zambia, It contributed to the second MTI result, increasing the level of engagement between the people and local decision-makers in the target rural areas. Elsewhere, the record in improving the extent and effectiveness of engagement is more mixed. Among the factors holding back the achievement of stronger results in terms of engagement was the limited openness of local government to entering into discussions with local communities, the short period of Project support to RLC/community radio cooperation, and the limited support provided by the Project to enhancing local dialogue.

- Under Outcome (MTI) 3, the Project was unable to support activities, and, thus, did not contribute to strengthening the capacity of CSOs and community media.

- Given the amount of the budget, the scope of the work was too ambitious. Particularly important in influencing both outputs and results achieved was the insufficiency of resources allocated to core activities. At the same time, scarce resources were allocated to activities which had marginal relevance for Project outcomes.

- The community radio stations in Zambia in South Africa demonstrated their commitment to the Project and to supporting the Radio Listener clubs. Overall, they were found to have done a professional job within the constraints imposed.

- The Project lacked the ongoing guidance and direction a strong management presence would have provided. It is probable that internal organizational and leadership problems within PSAf, subsequently resolved, contributed to weak management performance. Field activities did not receive the level of support required.

- The overall impact of the Project has been limited. Its principal accomplishment was to demonstrate the potential of cooperation between local communities and community radio as a vehicle for enhancing community engagement in local decision-making.

iv. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- While PSAf is encouraged to seek further funding to continue its promising work in support of radio listener clubs and community radio stations, it devotes more attention to project design, effective project management, building working partnerships, and investing in technical support and monitoring in the course of implementation, as well as avoiding unnecessary complexity, and focusing resources on those activities most relevant to the achievement of core results.

- PSAf makes it a priority to ensure that all projects are well-documented and assigns responsibility, on an ongoing basis, even where there is a change in personnel, for securing and maintaining full project records.

▪ In preparing a project design and budget, PSAf bears in mind, in considering a baseline study, that it should be: shaped to inform other activities; undertaken early in the project on a rapid assessment basis; modest in scope, and focused on specific issues of direct relevance to the achievement of results.

▪ UNDEF recognizes the value in supporting public participation and political inclusion of marginalized communities through the mechanism of radio listener clubs (or their equivalent) and community radio stations and looks for further opportunities to build on experience to date.

▪ UNDEF considers developing an additional advisory guideline for those preparing proposals for regional projects to counsel: (i) a realistic limiting of scope to take into account the modest resources available, and, (ii) the particular need for management to work continually to ensure the integration of project components, while also maintaining quality control across countries.

II. Introduction and development context

i. The Project and Evaluation Objectives

This report is the evaluation of the project entitled "Governance and Transparency Through Radio" (GTR), implemented by Panos Southern Africa, based in Lusaka, Zambia, between November 1, 2009 and October 31, 2011 (24 months). The project benefited from an UNDEF grant of $350,000, with a project budget of $325,000, plus an UNDEF monitoring and evaluation component of $25,000.

The PANOS Institute of Southern Africa (PSAf) is a regional NGO, based in Lusaka, Zambia, with satellite offices in Johannesburg, South Africa and Maputo, Mozambique. The organization, which focuses particularly on communications for development, was established as part of PANOS London in 1996. It became an autonomous organization in May 2005, but remains a member of an international network of autonomous PANOS Institutes. PSAf has substantial experience in community-based development.

The project featured field operations in four countries: Lesotho, Malawi, South Africa and Zambia. It was implemented by the grantee in cooperation with national implementing agency partners in Lesotho, Malawi and South Africa, as well as with rural community radio stations in three countries and the national broadcaster in Lesotho, as well as with urban radio stations. The overall aim of Governance and Transparency through Radio was to enhance dialogue between citizens, and particularly the poor, and policy-makers at local level, while enhancing the responsiveness and accountability of government institutions. Its formal objective was stated thus: "*To bridge the communication gap between citizens and policy makers around democracy and development issues in Zambia, Malawi, Lesotho and South Africa.*"

The UNDEF project builds on earlier experience, and, in particular, on the lessons learned from a national project in Zambia with the same name. Essentially the UNDEF-supported GTR represented a means for scaling-up the benefits of the Zambia project, and for adapting and refining the model employed through its application on a regional basis. The Project was built on the foundation of facilitating a four-way interchange among: (i) community radio stations; (ii) local radio listeners' groups, with members drawn from poor communities in rural areas, who contributed their voices to programming; (iii) a broader local radio audience; and, (iv) Local Government officials and local subject-matter experts. Beyond this, inputs from local programming were utilized to inform or focus policy debates and other initiatives in urban centres.

UNDEF and Transtec have agreed a framework governing the evaluation process, set out in the Operational Manual. According to the manual, the objective of the evaluation is to "undertake in-depth analysis of UNDEF-funded projects to gain a better understanding of what constitutes a successful project which will in turn help UNDEF devise future project strategies. Evaluations also assist stakeholders to determine whether projects have been implemented in accordance with the project document and whether anticipated project outputs have been achieved."

ii. Evaluation methodology

The evaluation was conducted by two experts, one international and one national, under the terms of a framework agreement between UNDEF and Transtec. The methodology of the evaluation is set out in the Operational Manual governing this framework agreement, as well as

in the evaluation Launch Note. A set of project documents was provided to the evaluators in the weeks preceding the field mission. On that basis, they prepared the Launch Note (UDF-RAF-08-220) setting out key issues and particular areas of focus to be considered during the field mission, which took place in Zambia (the International Consultant) from September 24 to 28, and in South Africa (the National Consultant) from November 1 to 4 ,2012.

In order to make the most effective use of the time and budget available for the evaluation, as well as the distances involved, it was decided to focus on two countries only and to adopt a division of labour between the International Consultant, who focused on Zambia, and the National Consultant, who dealt with the field research for South Africa. Plans for the mission and mission budget were developed in close consultation with the grantee and Transtec. For logistical reasons, there was a considerable delay in the completion of the South Africa component of the Evaluation, and, hence in the finalization of this report.

Additional documents drawn on in the Evaluation were obtained from Panos Southern Africa during the field mission, as well as from other relevant sources (see list of documents consulted in Annex 3).

The field mission in Zambia included meetings with the management and staff of Panos Southern Africa and Radio Phoenix in Lusaka. The International Consultant then travelled by road to Mkushi, where he stayed overnight. Meetings were held there with staff of Mkushi Community Radio Station, representatives of Radio Listeners' Clubs who travelled into the town of Mkushi for the meeting, and other local stakeholders in the Project, including the District Commissioner. A final, wrap-up meeting was held with Panos in Lusaka. The International and National Consultant had the opportunity to meet in Johannesburg on September 29 (Saturday) to discuss plans for the South Africa field work before the International Consultant travelled on to begin another UNDEF project evaluation in Mozambique.

In South Africa, meetings were held over two days in Jozini, KwaZulu-Natal Province, with representatives of the Radio Listener Clubs (RLCs) and management and staff of Maputaland Community Radio Station. Additional Meetings were held with Board members of Isixaxa, a local social support group, whose local branches formed the basis for the RLCs, and the former mayor of Hlabisa Municipality. A final meeting was held in Johannesburg with the local representative of PSAf.

iii.   Development context

Of the four countries included in the Project, all except South Africa ranked in the Low Level category of Human Development according to UNDP's Human Development Index for 2012. Of 189 countries included in the rankings, South Africa was ranked 123rd (Medium Level of Human Development) with the other three at a lower level and with very similar rankings: Lesotho 160th, Zambia 164th, and Malawi 171st.[2] The countries' level of human development achievement provides an initial context for an assessment of potential in terms of democratic governance, human rights and rule of law. However, a closer examination of the governance performance and potential of each country is required as a basis for appreciating the relevance and appropriateness of the GTR Project.

The Mo Ibrahim Foundation's Index of African Governance (IIAG) provides a comprehensive and broad-based summing-up of the comparative performance of African states on a set of key factors in governance. In addition, it offers a useful perspective on change within individual

---

[2] UNDP Human Development Report 2011, Sustainability and Equity: A Better Future for All. New York: UNDP, 2011.

countries over the period since 2006, when the data for the Index was first collected. The 2012 Index indicates that Southern Africa is the best-performing region on the continent. However, a detailed reading of the components of the Index and changes in performance on measures for each component also reveals areas of weakness highly relevant to the areas of focus for the GTR Project. [3]

South Africa ranks 5th of 52 countries ranked. However, to put this relatively positive showing into perspective, there has been a steady decline in its level of performance since 2001. Particularly noteworthy, and relevant to the substantive focus of the GTR Project, is the decline on the reading for "participation" from 91.9% in 2006 to 73.0% in 2011, a decline of 18.9 percentage points.[4]

As its placing in the HDI rankings would suggest, Zambia continues to struggle with persistently high levels of poverty, particularly in the countryside According to UNDP, drawing on the most recent data available (2006), relatively high levels of economic growth in recent years have led to some improvements in reducing the overall level of extreme poverty in the country, with an overall decline from 58 % in 1991 to 51% in 2006. However, the benefits of growth have been scattered unevenly among the population, with 67% of the rural population still in extreme poverty.[5]

In terms of governance, Zambia ranks 12th of 52 countries on the IIAG, with some recent improvements resulting from the election in 2011 of a new government, more open to change and public engagement. Lesotho is in 9th place on the Index, with no measurable improvement since 2006. Malawi is in 17th position, with some modest improvement discernible in recent years.

Among the factors which make up the IIAG, two composite measures assess the ranking of countries in terms of *Participation* and (the condition of) *the Rural Sector*. A brief review of the rankings of the 4 countries included in the GTR Project will serve to focus the particular development issues which it sought to address.

Country	Participation	% Change 2001-2006	Rural Sector	% Change 2001-2006
S. Africa	5th	-18.9%	22nd	-----
Zambia	13th	+4.2%	26th	+2.8%
Lesotho	20th	-4.9%	30th	-3.6%
Malawi	16th	+5.1%	27th	+7.6%

By comparing their overall rankings on the IIAG with their position for the two thematic fields, it may be seen that all countries "underperformed" in the performance of governance in supporting the rural sector. The GTR focused its effort in South Africa in KwaZulu-Natal, the

---

[3] http://www.moibrahimfoundation.org/
[4] "The IIAG is structured in such a way that the composite IIAG score is the aggregate of four overarching categories: Safety & Rule of Law; Participation & Human Rights; Sustainable Economic Opportunity; and Human Development. These four categories are themselves composed of 14 sub-categories… ***Governance***, as defined by the Foundation, is considered from the viewpoint of the citizen. The definition is intentionally broad so as to capture all of the political, social and economic goods and services that any citizen has the right to expect from his or her state, and that any state has the responsibility to deliver to its citizens."
(See: http://www.moibrahimfoundation.org/downloads/2012-IIAG-data-report.pdf, p.9.)
[5] Zambia: National Human Development Report 2011. Lusaka: UNDP, 2011, p.10.

province with the highest levels of poverty and unemployment in the country.[6] As to participation, while Zambia and Malawi performed at a level on par with their overall ranking, Lesotho underperformed significantly, while South Africa's performance had worsened considerably. It should also be borne in mind that the levels of popular participation in politics and decision-making throughout Africa, except during elections and exceptional events (such as the recent "Arab Spring" in Egypt and Tunisia), tends to be low.

As detailed studies included in the Baseline Study produced for the Project demonstrated, substantial barriers continue to block opportunities for participation and public engagement by rural populations in all four countries.[7] Consequently, as noted by the grantee in the Situation Analysis included in the Project Document, the rural poor secure little attention in policy and decision-making circles in any of the four countries, despite the fact that they continue to constitute a majority of the population in three of the four countries. In South Africa, the percentage of the population living in rural areas (2009) is 43%, but 70% of the country's poor live in rural areas, and 70 % of rural people are poor.[8] Given the weak connection between national capitals and the priorities of the rural poor, a critical focus for promoting change is local government.

Enhanced participation by local communities in seeking to influence the decisions which are made at local level is essential in building for effective and accountable local governance and local democracy. As is noted in the 2012 Africa Human Development Report, which focused on food security and the needs of rural populations, a key recommendation of the 1996 World Food Summit Plan of Action was "to strengthen local government institutions in rural areas and provide them with adequate resources, decision-making authority and mechanisms for grassroots participation."[9]

---

[6] South Africa Press Agency (SAPA) Report, January 31, 2012.
[7] Communication for Governance and Development: Lusaka, Panos Institute Southern Africa, 2010.
[8] Data from Republic Of South Africa: Department of Human Settlements, 2009.
[9] Africa Human Development Report 2012 New York: UNDP, 2012, p.121.

III. Project strategy

i. Project approach and strategy

The Situation Analysis presented in the Project Document provides a strong rationale for the Project as a means to further the grantee's vision of empowering local communities to drive their own development. The UNDEF project fits closely with the mandate of PSAf and the goals of its Governance Program. The Development Objective which provided the focus for the Project was stated thus: *To bridge the communication gap between citizens and policy makers around democracy and development issues in Zambia, Malawi, Lesotho and South Africa.*

The Project was to be built on the foundation of a two-way interchange between community radio stations and local radio listeners' groups, with members drawn from poor communities in rural areas. In turn, the community radio stations would produce programming based on the voices of the people in local communities discussing issues of immediate concern. They would also engage local government representatives and thematic experts (for example, in education, health care, transportation or farming) in responding to the concerns raised, and, where, possible, encourage the brokering of solutions.

Maputaland Community Radio Station, Jozini, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

Beyond this, inputs from local programming were to be utilized to inform or focus policy debates and other initiatives through interactive (phone-in) radio broadcasts, featuring expert panels, in urban centres, as well as in the rural centres which were the base for the community radio stations The overall aim, as suggested in the Development Objective, was to enhance dialogue between citizens, and particularly the poor, and policy-makers.

The UNDEF Project built on earlier experience, and, in particular, on the lessons learned from a national project implemented by PSAf in Zambia with the same name. Essentially the UNDEF-supported GTR represented a means for scaling-up the benefits of the Zambia project, and for adapting and refining the model employed through its application on a regional basis. The broader experience of PSAf with community radio and the setting up and training of Radio Listener Clubs (RLCs) goes back many years, and it has a well-established methodology for training RLCs and community radio teams.[10]

The Project Document defines three *intended outcomes* (Medium-Term Impacts, in terms of UNDEF's results framework). These are:
   i) *Increased awareness, knowledge and dialogue around development issues by rural and marginalized communities in the target project sites.*
   ii) *Increased engagement and debate between the poor and marginalized communities and policy makers in the target project sites*
   iii) *Increased capacity of CSOs and media in Zambia, Malawi, Lesotho and South Africa to involve the poor and marginalized in democracy and development processes.*

---

[10] See: Panos Institute of Southern Africa, Development through Radio: A Guide to Setting Up Radio Listener Clubs, 2003.

Key activities, as set out in the Project Document, included:

Outcome 1
- Country-based research studies to support the production of a regional baseline report on communication and democracy; and, abridgements of key policy documents to support Outcome 1;
- Video and audio production for broader dissemination (2 regional video documentaries and 40 radio programs);
- Community roundtable discussion forums (4 per year per country);

Outcome 2
- Interactive radio programs with community radio stations (monthly 30 minutes - I hour programs) on 4 stations in 4 countries;
- Radio Listening Clubs (RLCs), working with 16 existing RLCs in Zambia and Malawi (8 RLCs per community per country), and mobilization of 16 RLCs in Lesotho and South Africa; weekly listening to the interactive radio programs and recording of Club sessions by 4 RLC groups per country per week; editing of sessions to bring "the peoples' voices" into policy dialogue forums, also to be recorded and aired.
- Direct response programming (live phone-in radio programs): 13 studio-based live panel discussion sessions, over three stations per country per year, associated with production of 78 Direct Response Radio Programs.

Outcome 3
- Stakeholder mapping exercise and capacity needs assessment for CSOs and media in each participating country; and,
- Training of CSOs and media in each country.

Management arrangements:

The management arrangements for the project, as planned, involved a long list of organizations, and the Project strategy and operational plan required an integrated approach requiring multi-organizational cooperation. PSAf retained overall responsibility for the Project and was clearly the driving force behind the overall plan for programming, with direct involvement at conceptual, if not activity planning, levels for all programming components. The implementing partners were given responsibility for organizing meetings and identifying RLC participants, along with monitoring, at community level. Community radio stations, plus Radio Lesotho (there are no community radio stations in the country), also had a precisely defined role in working with the RLCs and recording programs featuring the voices of RLC members, as did national or regional radio broadcasters, which would produce and air interactive radio programs.

Mkushi, Zambia: Community Mapping - *Note Batttery-Driven Radio*

The three implementing partners were: the Malawi Media Women's Association (MAMWA); the Association of Community Based Organizations in KZN, South Africa (COMBOCCO); and,

Participatory, Ecological Land Use management (PRELUM), Lesotho. The radio station partners were: in Malawi, the Malawi Broadcasting Corporation and the Dzimwe Community Radio Station; Lesotho: Radio Lesotho (there are no community stations in the country); South Africa: SAFM and Maputaland Radio; and, Zambia, Radio Phoenix and Mkushi Community Radio.

ii. Logical framework

The chart is based on detailed information included in the project's results table.

Project activities	Intended outputs/outcomes	Medium-term impacts	Long-term development objective
4 Country-based research studies, summarized in a Baseline Report (400 copies); Abridged policy documents published & disseminated (800 copies) Video & audio documentary production: 2 regional video documentaries, plus 40 radio documentaries & features disseminated to broader audience Roundtable Discussion Forums (RDFs) held, 4/year in 4 countries	Research & publications produced to inform public awareness & engagement Collection & dissemination of lessons learned to inform enhanced public knowledge	Increased awareness, knowledge & dialogue on development issues by rural & marginalized communities in the target project sites	**To bridge the communication gap between citizens and policy makers around democracy and development issues in Zambia, Malawi, Lesotho and South Africa.**
Plans, schedules and issue lists developed as a basis for dialogue in 4 countries MOUs developed with 4 radio stations to produce and air Interactive Radio Programs (IRPs) Live IRPs produced monthly in 4 countries Collection & compilation of reports from community radio stations/implementing agencies on issues raised and # of calls received	Interactive Radio Programs (IRPs) enhance information flow & dialogue between citizens and policy-makers	Increased engagement & debate between poor and marginalized communities and policymakers in the target project sites	
16 Radio Listener Clubs (RLCs) mobilized & established in S. Africa & Lesotho, 40 members/club; 16 existing RLCs are identified and involved, 40 members/club Training of 8 RLCs per country on	RLCs meet on a		

voice recording, & equipping them with radio receivers, and 4 of them with voice recorders Weekly listening to IRPs by RLCs, with recording afterwards by 4 RLCs/week Collection, editing & production of programs weekly by radio producers Monthly airing of RLC voices in radio programming Conducting evaluation & reporting for 384 RLC-recorded programs in 4 countries in 2 years	weekly basis, discussing issues of common concern on an agreed schedule		
Collection & editing of materials from RLCs & RDFs to identify issues as focus for DRRPs Developing timetable, outline scripts and issue list for DRRPs to be produced & broadcast over 3 radio stations in target countries Holding 13 studio-based live discussions with expert panel (4 members) over 3 radio stations/country/year Producing & airing 78 DRRPs over 3 national radio stations within the project period (excluding Lesotho) Collecting 78 reports of issues raised & #s of callers/program for 3 countries	Direct Response Radio Programmes (DRRPs), involving the gathering of people's voices & expert/duty-bearer responses, inform discussion and provide the basis for phone-in listener responses		
Stakeholder mapping undertaken through stakeholder meeting in each country (25-30 participants) Stakeholder needs assessment exercise conducted at stakeholder meetings One-day training workshop held in each country	Capacity assessment of CSOs & media is assessed, & capacity enhanced	Increased capacity of CSOs & Media in target countries to involve the poor & marginalized in democracy & development processes	

IV. Evaluation findings

This evaluation is based on a set of Evaluation Questions or EQs, designed to cover the Development Assistance Committee's (DAC) criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and value added by UNDEF. The Evaluation Questions and related sub-questions are presented in Annex 1.

i. Relevance

The grantee presented a persuasive case for the relevance of the GTR initiative in responding to the "democracy gap" concerning the participation and public engagement of poor and marginalized communities in decision-making on issues of immediate concern to them. In principle, the emphasis on the role of radio listener groups, and interactive community radio programming featuring their voices, in enhancing dialogue between local communities and local government decision-makers represented a practical contribution to closing the gap. The Project supported the establishment of a viable mechanism for the articulation of citizen demands for more effective responses from government authorities in addressing their priorities. In this way, it contributed to enhancing local democracy and the responsiveness of local governance. Hence, it was a good fit with UNDEF's mandate.

RLC training, Mkushi, Zambia: Practising with Recorders & Receivers

The Relevance of Community Radio: Radio has a proven position in all regions of the globe, including Africa, as an effective medium for reaching rural and marginalized populations, particularly in regions afflicted by high levels of poverty, low levels of educational attainment, and high levels of illiteracy. The Baseline Study conducted for the Project, based on case studies completed in the four participating countries, confirmed the importance of radio as the most accessible medium of communication for rural communities.[11] Community radio has proved to be effective in such settings, since it is close to the people it serves, and since, state policy permitting, it is able to broadcast in local languages and dialects. Where radio is used as a mechanism to foster public participation in consideration of issues of direct concern to its audience, rather than as a "top-down" medium for conveying information from state agencies, it can make a difference to local democracy and governance.

As noted above, under the Strategy adopted for the GTR Project, PSAf delegated a degree of responsibility for implementation in three of the four participating countries (Zambia, its home base, was the exception) to intermediary, implementing agencies, as well as to community radio stations and urban broadcasters. In order for the project to achieve its intended results (medium-term impacts as specified in the Logical Framework), and, given its complexity, there was a clear need for the grantee and/or the implementing agencies to take a strong guidance

---

[11] See: Communication for Governance and Development, 2010, cited above.

and monitoring role. This would serve to ensure that the linkages among organizations and across activities would be made. Further, through close overall monitoring of developments, PSAf would be able to ensure that critical components of the Project process received the degree of support necessary for the undertaking of major tasks as planned.

In practice, this guiding hand was largely absent. Although some of the key working relationships proved effective, there were many gaps in the linkage process. Further, resources were scattered over too many components, given the size of the available budget, and some core activities lacked the funds they required. In Lesotho, it is apparent that the basic conditions to facilitate Project effectiveness were not present. These included: the availability of cooperating community radio stations; and, the presence of supportive government institutions. The Project strategy was overly complex and overly ambitious – reflecting a particular temptation for regional organizations and UNDEF regional projects - and roles and relationships required far more work to make the management arrangements effective.

As will be discussed, the effort to link urban and rural target groups was a step too far, particularly since implementation took place in four countries. Similarly, the linkage between programming produced by community radio stations in rural areas and programs produced and aired by urban stations with large audiences was weakly developed. The urban programming may well have been a valuable and worthwhile investment in promoting a greater understanding of democracy and development issues on the part of an educated urban audience, and may have contributed to focusing the attention of government officials on specific issues. However, while worthwhile, this component of the Project was a stand-alone contribution, with a very slight linkage to the core Project work with rural communities. Overall, a more focused strategy, building on the rural radio listener clubs, local community radio stations and local democracy in rural areas, would have made for a more effective Project.

Relevance to beneficiaries and their needs: The direct beneficiaries of the Project, as specified in the Project Document, were:
  - Rural and urban poor and marginalized communities in Zambia (Mkushi and Lusaka), Malawi (Mangochi and Central), South Africa (Jozini and Gauteng) and Lesotho (Mafeteng and Maseru).
Other beneficiaries included:
  - Community media; community-based organizations (CBOs), civil society organizations (CSOs) and policy-makers (Both local government and parliamentarians).

As interviews conducted for the Evaluation confirm, the Project engaged effectively (though on too limited a basis), and was generally appreciated, by members of many of the RLCs, drawn from poor rural communities. By contrast, both in theory and practice, its approach to engaging the urban poor was insufficiently developed, and the group was not reached by the project.

The Project sought to involve local government in the rural sites where it operated. However, except perhaps in Zambia, insufficient attention was given to the sensitization of local decision-makers to the objectives of the Project, and the opportunities it sought to provide for more effective communication between local government and citizens. The clearest negative result of this gap in Project engagement was experienced in Jozini, South Africa.

Community radio stations certainly benefited, but it is not clear that the project benefited CSOs and CBOs. The Project also supported the production of programming focusing on development and governance by urban radio stations, and the stations and their audiences benefited to varying degrees.

ii. Effectiveness

As noted above, the Project was ambitious, organizationally complex and geographically scattered. It required strong coordination and direction. However, for the most part, it did not receive it. After start-up and initial training with the RLCs, and the signing of MOUs with other participating organizations, PSAf was not a presence at the project sites, nor was there sustained interaction between it and its partner organizations.

Considerable responsibility for Project oversight was placed in the hands of the implementing agencies in three of the target countries and with PSAf itself in Zambia. For various reasons, including gaps in Project planning, a weak central management role, a lack of clarity on organizational roles and responsibilities and inadequate resources for monitoring and support, this responsibility was not met.

This conclusion is supported by comments on the limitations of the role of the implementing agency in Malawi in the *Malawi Impact Assessment*, April 2011. In Zambia, PSAf staff members confirmed in the course of Evaluation interviews that they did not make monitoring or assessment visits to Mkushi after the training workshop for RLC members in May 2011. Similarly, in South Africa, COMBOCCO appears to have played a minimal role after organizing the stakeholder workshop at the outset of local Project activities in Jozini. No information is available on Lesotho.

Although many deliverables, notably radio programs, were produced, despite the connections suggested in the Logical Framework, the different elements of the Project did not blend together as might have been expected. For example, the research component of the Project (Outcome 1) was largely separate from what has been described as the Project core. The four planned country studies for the baseline study were completed and published together in 2010 in *Communications for Governance and Development*.[12] A series of national workshops/conferences was held to publicize and discuss the findings of the studies. However, these activities did not appear to inform other aspects of Project work. Thus the community mapping process and holding of Roundtable Discussion Forums (RDFs) at the four rural Project sites seem to have been entirely separate from the process of collecting and summarizing baseline data.

While the baseline data, which focused on those rural localities constituting the target areas for the Project, was interesting in documenting the situation of the rural poor and their communication needs, and of value in its own right, it did not form a basis for guiding or informing Project activities. Hence its production constituted a stand-alone activity, of use in informing future work on enhancing participatory community media activities by PSAf and others, but not enhancing the knowledge and awareness of rural communities, as suggested by its place in relation to Project outcomes.

The Roundtable Discussion Forums (RDFs) were also described as contributing to Outcome 1. The Forums played a significant role in informing the work of the RLCs and community radio stations by setting out key issues to frame the discussion and programming agenda for the

---

[12] In addition, **four "abridged policy documents" were produced** to enhance knowledge of citizens on relevant issues. These were published in bilingual format, using English and a local language. In Zambia, the document that was produced (*Your Municipality: How It Works)* explained the importance of local government, how to access its services, and how communities might organize to influence its decisions. In this case, the second language used was *Lala*, one of two predominant local languages in Mkushi. While the documents were printed and distributed, it is not known how they were used. No reference was made to the document by those interviewed in Mkushi.

Clubs, on the basis of community priorities. However, it was intended that there were to be four RDFs per year, one in each country. In fact, only the initial four were held. The fact that only one Forum was held in each country reduced the opportunity for maintaining stakeholder involvement, and, particularly, for engaging with local decision-makers and building their understanding of the purpose of the Project.

In addition to its production of research materials, The Project succeeded in completing an extensive set of activities:

a) Preparing for the initiation of the Project by selection of target rural areas in the four participating countries, completing a community mapping process, and holding a stakeholder meeting and needs assessment process for each target area, which set the agenda for the RLCs and community radio station programming;
b) Supporting the establishment and training of RLCs to discuss issues of immediate concern and preparing for recording of discussions on community-based development issues in each country;
c) Making local arrangements and allocating resources to ensure that there would be cooperation between the RLCs and the community radio stations in three countries, and with the state broadcaster in the fourth. There was variation in practice from country to country, since the community radio stations were left to make their own decisions on how to manage production of programs, and on how to record, or use recordings provided by, the RLCs;
d) Providing guidance and resources to support the production of Interactive Radio Programs (IRPs), utilizing the voices of RLC members, along with responses from experts and/or duty-bearers;
e) Providing resources and guidance to support the production of "Direct Response Radio Programs" focused on key development and/or governance issues, and including "voices of the people", an expert panel, and a listener phone-in segment. These programs were produced by both community radio stations and urban radio stations with larger audiences.
With support from the project, through a contract running from February-December 2011, Radio Phoenix in Lusaka broadcast its weekly one-hour radio program, "Our Voice" throughout the period of the Project. Program content was provided by PSAf, and the programs are prepared and produced by a PSAf staff member, who is also an experienced radio journalist and on-air presenter. Themes covered included: Alcohol and Drug Use; Sanitation and Overcrowding: a Health Issue at Universities; the Place of the Physically Disabled in the Zambia Constitution; the Role of Community Media; and, Strengthening Citizen Demand for Good governance. With continuing PSAf support, utilizing other funds, the program maintains its place in the Radio Phoenix weekly broadcast schedule.
f) Producing three regional video documentaries on "challenges of citizen engagement in governance processes, instead of the two planned. These were aired by the national broadcasters in all four countries. In addition, a set of audio features and news clips was also produced. It is not known how these were used elsewhere, but, in Zambia, Radio Phoenix, A Lusaka radio station whose signal is also carried in the "Copper Belt" and on the internet, regularly used clips from the weekly "Our Voice" program, supported by the Project, to lead off its news stories.

The project was not able to meet all of the numerical targets for deliverables.[13] There were a number of contributory factors leading to this state of affairs:

---

[13] From information gleaned though interviews and document review in Zambia and South Africa, it is clear that the probably unrealistic numerical targets, as set out in the Logical Framework, could not be met. It is difficult to be precise, since the documentation and reporting of activities by partner organizations and by PSAf itself is uneven and erratic. There were major personnel changes during the life of the Project and this may be a particle explanation for gaps in record-keeping. An incomplete listing of outputs is provided in the Program Manager's *Handover Report* of June 26, 2011.

- Numerous delays in beginning field operations;
- Difficulties in finalizing agreements and contracts with broadcasting partners, particularly in Malawi and Lesotho;
- Delays in transferring funds to community radio stations by PSAf; the failure of the plan for RLCs to record themselves[14]; this placed additional demands on the limited resources made available to the community radio stations.
- Inadequate resources for the rural community radio stations; poor, or non-existent, cooperation between the urban radio stations and the rural, community radio stations; weak overall direction and coordination, and the absence of on-going monitoring and guidance by the grantee and its implementing agency partners;
- Uncertain commitment to public interest programs by some of the participating radio stations;
- Inadequate budgeting for the project as a whole and for some activities in particular.

Despite all of these problems, the Project succeeded in production and airing of a very substantial set of programs by both the community radio stations and the urban stations. In terms of its contribution to achieving the specified outcomes, the Project did succeed, to some degree at least, in making a difference in terms of both Outcomes 1 and 2:

- For the members of some of the RLCs and their broader communities in the participating rural target areas, the Project increased awareness and knowledge of development issues and encouraged dialogue *within* communities in determining priorities for advocacy with local government;
- The Project contributed to increased engagement between the poor and local decision-makers in the rural target areas. The improved sense of political efficacy and citizenship experienced in Mkushi, Zambia, was particularly striking. Similarly, there was a very positive view by local decision-makers there of enhanced participation by citizens, along with a willingness to grapple with and respond to issues and particular problems raised by the RLCs as reported through the Interactive radio programs. The level of engagement with local government in Malawi appears to have been more problematic. In Jozini, South Africa, there was initial cooperation with local government. However, following local elections and the replacement of the governing party, there was a dramatic change, with the new council opposed to cooperation with community media and suspicious of the motives of those involved in the Project.

A major difficulty for the Evaluators in assessing the difference the Project made is the absence of documentation and reporting by the implementing agencies and PSAf on activities. The exception to the reporting void is the Malawi Impact Assessment of 2010, based on interviews with RLC members, other community members and other Project stakeholders. Although the assessment was of limited scope and was based on a small number of interviews, it has provided useful information which has been drawn on in the Evaluation.

---

[14] This was the result of: inadequate training and technical support; poor quality of equipment provided; the purchase of an insufficient number of voice recorders; poor recording quality; uneven performance and commitment on the part of the RLCs.

There was no meeting with the RLCs in each country at the end of the Project to sum up lessons learned, to assess what had worked well, where the gaps were, and what RLC members hoped for in the future. This was an opportunity missed.

A more general gap in understanding the impact of both community media and urban radio more broadly in Southern Africa is the absence of detailed audience research. For the most part, there is little information on the size and composition of audiences for broadcasts, or on the information needs and listening habits of those within the reception area. Information of this kind will be critical to community radio stations as they seek to serve their listeners better, to design more effective programs, and to determine when during the day to schedule particular programs if they are to reach a specific audience (young people, women, farmers, etc.) In the case of the UNDEF Project, the lack of data of this kind makes it more difficult to gauge the relevance and effectiveness of investment in radio production.

Under Outcome 3, as PSAf recognizes (Final Report), the Project made little difference in increasing the capacity of CSOs and media in "involving the poor and marginalized in democracy and development processes".

The major disappointment of the project was its complete inability to engage with marginalized urban communities. The Urban broadcasting component may have worthwhile in that, in Zambia at least, it contributed on a

Mkushi Case-Study (1): The Community Radio Station and Radio Listener Clubs

Mkushi is situated in the Central province of Zambia and is one of 73 districts in the country. The district has high unemployment, and only a small proportion of the population is formally employed. As elsewhere in rural Zambia, links between local government and the communities are weak, and local people have little opportunity to have their say in decisions which affect them (information from *Communication for Governance and Development, 2010, pp.42-44).*The Mkushi community Radio Station was established in 2004 and has a transmission range of 150 kilometers. There is poor reception in the periphery of the district. While the Station is well-regarded by local government, it receives no state funding to meet recurrent costs. Its financial situation is precarious, and it relies on advertising from a mobile phone service provider as its principal source of income. The broadcast schedule extends over 16 hours, with programming predominantly in the local languages of Lala and Swaka, as well as in English. Popular music alternates with public interest coverage, along with some sponsored religious programming.

There is steady flow of local people in and out of the station, except during the period of the Project, but the radio station has not been able to reach out to local communities away from the town. The station has a very small staff, with only one journalist, and only one motor bike to meet its transport needs. Given this background, it performed well during its involvement with the PSAf/UNDEF Project. However, the limited funds made available restricted the period of engagement with the 8 Radio Listener Clubs trained to take part in the Project to less than 12 months. For budgetary reasons, the Mkushi radio team explained that they could only record each group twice.

Each week, the RLCs would meet to discuss a given issue, with the agenda set by the Mkushi stakeholder and needs assessment meeting in September 2010. Three of the groups would be asked to prepare a summary of their discussion for a recording with the community station. As the producer explained: *"people like to hear their voices on the radio, so they practice and prepare for the recording."* A small radio production team from the station would visit the three groups and record them for later broadcast, spending about half-a-day in each community. Each recording would form the basis for a separate program. Each program would also include an interview with a local "expert", who would respond to issues raised. There would be a cycle of three such programs, flowed by an expert panel discussion and phone-in in the 4th week.
Source: interviews in Mkushi for Evaluation

sustained basis to enhancing knowledge and awareness of key development and governance concerns on the part of an educated urban audience, and may well have influenced government officials and elected representatives in their deliberations. Little has been reported on what took place in urban broadcasting elsewhere. The Project strategy anticipated a linkage between the rural and urban broadcasts, and a bridge from the rural to the urban poor. In practice, this link was never established, and the urban programming was not intended for a marginalized community audience.

On a more positive note, the Project succeeded in demonstrating the potential of RLCs in collaboration with community radio stations as a vehicle for participation in local dialogue and decision-making, and, hence for inclusion of marginalized communities in local democracy. A decision to scatter Project resources across many activities in a variety of settings deprived this core component of the support it needed to become established and accepted, but the promise remains.

iii.   Efficiency

The Project used its resources broadly as planned in support of the activities set out in the Project Document. However, given its objectives and the scope of work proposed, the Project was overly-ambitious . Further, resources were not allocated in the most effective and efficient way in supporting the Project's objectives. The Project tried to do too much and, not surprisingly, as a result failed to allocate the resources necessary to achieve its objectives in full. One of its outcomes, *building the capacity of community media and CSOs*, was left aside altogether. Beyond this, in the view of the Evaluation team, the misallocation of resources resulted in insufficient support for those activity sets most critical to the main objectives of:

- Increased awareness, knowledge & dialogue on development issues by rural & marginalized communities in the target project sites; and,
- Increased engagement & debate between poor and marginalized communities and policymakers in the target project sites.

After the initial training, RLCs received no additional support or guidance, except from the community radio stations. In turn, the resources allocated to the community stations were insufficient to enable them to put on an extended series of programs and to engage with the RLCs for more than a few months in the context of a Project which extended over 24 months. In Mkushi, each of the eight RLCs which received training was recorded on only two occasions; limited budgets allocated to the Mkushi Community Radio Station held back additional recording and programming. In Jozini, South Africa, the level of activity was similarly constrained, and only 10 programs based on RLC inputs were aired by Maputaland Community Radio between October 2009 and April 2011.

In considering the limited resources made available to the community stations and support structures to the RLCS and local public engagement, it is important to look at where project resources were spent. Given its lesser relevance to the achievement of Project outcomes, urban programming absorbed too large a share of Project financial resources and of PSAf management and staff time. Similarly, research and publications absorbed significant resources through consulting and printing costs, along with national workshops. The work undertaken was certainly worthwhile in its own right. However, its share of the overall budget was far too large, given its indirect relationship to core outcomes.

Another critical factor in ensuring that the Project worked as planned was strong management and overall direction. In addition, there was a need for careful management and an on-going review of expenditures and financial needs to ensure that resource were being used efficiently to support the achievement of core objectives. In these respects, management was somewhat deficient.

While appraising the management of the Project, some more serious problems in PSAf as an organization cannot be ignored. In the course of the Project, during 2011, the Executive Director and Finance Manager of PSAf were relieved of their duties by the PSAf Board, and subsequently dismissed, as a result of misappropriation of funds and fraud as documented through a management audit (the problems identified were traced back to 2009, prior to the initiation of the Project and there seems to have been no financial impact on UNDEF funds).

Both the distorted priorities of the senior managers dismissed and the period of uncertainty and diminished staff morale in 2011 during the investigations of the conduct of the two senior managers by the Board are likely to have had an impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of project work during this time. It may be that some of the gaps in Project management identified above reflected this "time of troubles." In addition, the Project Manager left for another position five months before the end of the Project, and this also had an impact on supervision of activities, the wrapping up of the Project and documentation.

It should be noted that the PSAf Board undertook an exhaustive review of the

---

Mkushi Case-Study (2): Voices of Mkushi

*"To begin with we received the idea of the Radio Listener Club (RLC) with mixed feelings…the training was an eye-opener – we saw that we could have our voice heard, and people appreciated it…after training, we were supposed to have a radio and a recorder, but the recorders were not enough, so there was the need for Radio Mkushi to visit us to record (retired public employee);

The new idea of the RLC: to use your own voices and bring them to the attention of the authorities was positive. There was training for a few days on how RLCs would work. We had some challenges to begin with, but we raised some issues and some programs were aired…our friends at the radio station did not have the means to visit the communities as often as we hoped, and when they did not visit it was difficult to continue…(an RLC Chairman); At first, we were fearful of speaking out, but PANOS opened our eyes and ears. We didn't have to fear speaking out, and government officials should hear the voices of ordinary people…It would be better for us to record ourselves, because then all the issues would be tackled (RLC member);

The PANOS project brought a lot of benefit to our community. It was introduced to a lot of people in a meeting; some got interested and the group was formed. The first program that was broadcast, based on our group's discussions, encouraged others to come in…the program was about the need to fix the road to the village. When it was aired, a lot of people heard it, and, after some time, the road was fixed (RLC leader);

It's a good idea for young people to come in. How will they be empowered if they are not involved in such groups, to have access and speak out on big issues? It also helps us to talk to people and gives us exposure to ideas to help us lead in the future (Young woman, member of RLC executive. Women, several of them young, are the driving force in her RLC. Some representatives from other RLCs, older men, had expressed concern at the prospect of young men becoming involved and causing trouble);

We are very much proud of what PANOS and Radio Mkushi did: effective training and a lot of interest in our community. We have had some programs broadcast, things change, and we are hoping for more opportunities in the future…We talked about the need for a clinic, since the nearest one is 14 kms away. The new clinic is being built, so our voices are being heard.* **RLC Executive member**

performance of the organization and the conduct of management and staff. It has now retained the services of a different firm of auditors, put in place new financial controls and established a Finance and Audit Sub-Committee, whose membership includes a chartered accountant. The Finance Department has been restructured and all former members of the staff of the department have been replaced. Donors were notified of the problems identified in the organization and the steps taken to ensure that there was no recurrence. NORAD, its principal financial supporter, indicated that it was satisfied with the actions taken.

A further factor undermining the efficiency of the project was the set of institutional arrangements put in place. Like many other regional non-governmental organizations across the globe, dependent on donor funding, PSAF is constrained by the concentration of programming and staffing in the country where it is based, resulting in a minimal presence in other countries served.[15] Consequently, maintaining involvement at country level for inter-country programming is a challenge. In the case of GTR, as discussed above, while PSAF delegated operational responsibilities in three countries to implementing agencies, this arrangement seems to have been ineffective. Although there were contracts with the agencies, and the Project Manager travelled frequently from country to country, the contracts do not seem to have been managed or funded appropriately. Consequently, the role of these intermediate bodies seems to be a missing link in the institutional framework of the Project.

RLC Members, Jozini, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

There is no reporting on file from any of the agencies, nor from any of the community radio stations which were to report to them.[16] The Malawi Impact Assessment refers to both dissatisfaction by RLCs at the lack of support from the implementing agency, and the difficulties experienced by the agency because of its distance from the target area and the lack of funds assigned to enable it to travel there regularly. In both Malawi and South Africa, the location of the implementing agency was hundreds of kilometres away from the Project site.

As has been noted above, in Zambia, where PSAF acted without the assistance of another agency, it provided no on-going monitoring or guidance to the partners in Mkushi, nor did it collect information on the Project experience. For South Africa, the Program Manager provided a short mission report on a meeting with RLCs in June 2011.

Many of these problems would appear to have had their roots in a design and plan which promised too much, and which lacked the foundation of a careful assessment of the costs of activities listed, as well as of their relevance to Project outcomes. The lack of strong central management and effective inter-organizational communications, along with poor budget planning and the absence of a shared understanding of roles and responsibilities, all played a part in undermining overall efficiency.

---

[15] This is recognized by PSAf. See: PSAf Strategic Plan for 2012-2016, Internal SWOT Analysis, p.5.

[16] It is possible that there was other reporting, but no additional reports were available either in hard copy or as electronic files. It may be that some files were lost with the departure of the Program Manager prior to the end of the Project.

iv. Impact

The broader impact of the Project has been limited. It has made a difference, certainly in Zambia, and, in the case of some communities in Malawi, within the target areas, in improving the understanding of development issues and of the value of community organization in advocacy with local authorities in seeking support to solve local problems. In South Africa, the Project was valued by participants in the RLCs for providing a forum through which communities might raise issues with municipalities on issues relating to service delivery and local development. More broadly, the Project has also strengthened the case for community radio as a vehicle for enhancing participation in development dialogue by local communities, and, thus, enhancing local democracy.

In South Africa, steps taken at the early stage of the Project to support implementation provided to be inadequate. A decision was made by CAMBOCCO, the implementing agency, to partner with a local social support group in Jozini, Isixaxa, with branches throughout the district.[17] Its branches formed the basis for the formation of Radio Listener Clubs (RLCs). While this arrangement seemed practical, it had the effect of excluding those who were not members of the organization, thus marginalizing other residents of the community from the Project. Further, the absence of detailed attention to explaining the purpose of the RLCs and the community radio stations in a project dedicated to enhancing the effectiveness and transparency of governance meant that the RLCs focused mainly on community grievances, and this was reflected in the programs based on their discussions.

Inattention to the need to work closely with local politicians, party representatives and local government officials, in explaining the purpose of the Project and its anticipated contribution to enhancing local governance, resulted in a lack of buy-in on the part of local decision-makers. Maputaland community Radio tried to hold things together, but the Project lacked both the necessary foundations and the necessary resources to achieve much in the way of results.

Impact on local communities in the rural target areas, along with benefits obtained by them through the Project, could have been more substantial. This would have been possible if Project design, and management priority setting and resource allocation had better reflected the need to allocate resources to support those components of the project most directly associated with achieving medium-term impact results. Delays during the first half of the project also held back the launching of key operations. This also served to limit impact.

There was an expectation in the Project, as expressed in the Development Objective, that the Project would have an impact on democracy, as well as development. Indirectly, this aspect of the Project objective was addressed by enhancement of dialogue between marginalized, rural communities and local authorities. The topic of enhancing public engagement on issues of accountability and enhancement of local democracy was raised in the Roundtable Discussion Forums (stakeholder workshops) and the training sessions for RLCs. However, in practice, this was not addressed outside these settings. The discussion of issues by RLCs, along with the set of topics taken up by the rural community radio stations, focused on issues of immediate relevance to local communities, and not on efforts to enhance democracy. In the view of the Evaluators, to expect more at this stage would have been unrealistic.

The political process in Southern Africa remains highly centralized, and local government is not primarily a focus for local democracy, but rather a vehicle for bringing central government decisions to the people. The Project has introduced an important mechanism for community

---

[17] Isixaxa is a community-based support group, with a membership fee and a monthly subscription payable by members. It provides financial assistance to members on the basis of need for such events as weddings, funerals and emergency situations.

advocacy, which can make a difference. However, the "receiving environment" remains a difficult one to penetrate. Members of District Councils are dependent for their positions on the central government and political party which appoint them, not on local citizens.[18] The RLCs and community media are attempting to introduce a local two-way dialogue between citizens and power-holders in a system which - except during national elections - has not made a place for them, except as petitioners, rather than as citizens.

The focus on democracy was addressed more directly in the public interest broadcasting – the Direct Response Radio Programs (DRRPs) - produced by the urban broadcasters, at least in Zambia. The topic of enhancing democracy and citizenship was also central to the content of the research documents produced through the Project, and in the national workshops to discuss the findings of the Baseline Study. However, these activities had limited impact and were connected only weakly to the mainstream of the Project.

The Project is best viewed as a pilot, and, as such, is unlikely to have a catalytic effect on democracy, the role of the media and citizen participation. However, if lessons are learned in focusing a future project on the essentials, much more can be done to build on the initial work with Radio Listener Clubs and Community Radio Stations. Despite the many challenges to be faced, the Project was able to illustrate the potential of a new vehicle for engaging a population normally remote from the public arena in dialogue over community priorities and seeking to have them resolved.[19]

v. Sustainability

The project lacked an exit strategy, and the RLCs (in Zambia, at least) were left hoping that there would be further funding to enable them to continue to work with the community radio station. All the community stations face ongoing financial challenges, and, without additional project funds, will be unable to produce programs with the RLCs. PSAf is utilizing other funds to continue its cooperation on the *Our Voice* program with Radio Phoenix in Lusaka. However, support to other urban stations has ceased.

vi. UNDEF Added Value

As a well-established regional organization, PSAf has been successful in obtaining funds from other donors for its operations. However, it has had less success in securing support for its Governance Program. Hence, in this respect, the awarding of an UNDEF grant was of assistance to the organization as it sought to extend its work in this sphere. In a region where the strengthening of support for democratic principles and practice remains a struggle, it was also advantageous to be able to attach the UN label to the Project.

---

[18] In South Africa, there are local elections, and levels of voting are unremarkable. However, it is the parties, and, particularly the governing party with its powers of patronage and an unassertive electorate, which determines who will be selected and elected and who elected. Outside elections, citizen engagement with local government is at a very low level, both in absolute terms, and in comparison with other African countries. Local government is less trusted by citizens than the provincial and national government, and, according to survey data, is also viewed as the most corrupt (Robert Mattes, "South Africans' participation in Local Politics and Government", <u>Transformations</u>. #66-67, 2008, see: pp.117-141).

[19] In principle, the role of Radio Listener Clubs had been introduced to Zambia some years earlier by the Ministry of Agriculture under the format of Radio Farm Forum, the concept for which had been developed in Western Canada in the 1930s and 1940s, and later adopted successfully in India and elsewhere. As adapted in Zambia, the concept mainly involved listener groups discussing agricultural topics which were the focus of weekly broadcasts and sending letters with questions to the radio stations and/or the agricultural extension service. What was innovative in the Project, and a Zambia-only project which preceded it, was the effort to introduce two-way communication through radio.

V. Conclusions

i. The Project ***objectives were highly relevant in relation to the promotion of the social and political inclusion of marginalized rural and urban communities*** through their engagement with local decision-making. The focus on the role of radio in bridging the gap between marginalized communities and decision-makers through the mechanism of Radio Listener Clubs, while also enhancing the knowledge of development and democracy among listeners, represented a valuable contribution to addressing the virtual exclusion of the voices of the rural poor from local government decision-making. The Project's direct beneficiaries included both rural and urban marginalized communities. While rural beneficiaries received support, the designated urban beneficiaries were not included in the Project. *Conclusion based on findings for Relevance and Effectiveness.*

ii. The urban ***radio broadcasts*** supported by the Project - for example those aired by Radio Phoenix in Lusaka – ***featured well-produced and presented public interest programs,*** which were aired over a sustained period. Yet, despite the focus of the Project, as summed up in its outcomes (Mid-Term Impacts) and development Objective, programming was aimed at an educated, English-speaking urban audience. ***As such, it was not accessible by the urban poor***. *Conclusion based on findings for Relevance and Effectiveness.*

iii. ***The Project's research and publications component produced materials, including the "baseline study", which were of good quality***. However, the documents and their distribution ***contributed only very indirectly to the achievement of Project outcomes***. *Conclusion based on findings for Effectiveness.*

iv. ***Project Strategy proved to be overly complex and ambitious. If it was to be effective, with linkages established between urban-and rural-centred activities and beneficiary groups, it would be necessary for a set of complex inter-organizational relationships to work smoothly and professionally.*** The Project's partner and participant organizations included: the grantee, three implementing agencies, three community radio stations, 32 Radio Listener Clubs and four urban radio stations, as well as local government in target areas. While some of these relationships worked reasonably well, others did not, and many of the connections necessary to ensure that the project reached its potential were not made. Nevertheless, The Project succeeded in completing a long list of activities and has a large number of outputs to its credit, notably radio programs produced by both community radio stations and urban radio stations in the four participating countries (N.B. In Lesotho, there are no community radio stations). At the same time, The Project was unable to meet all of its numerical targets for outputs (i.e. the number of different types of radio programs of different types, as listed in the Logical Framework, and the number of Roundtable Discussion Forums). This shortfall resulted from: an unrealistic Project plan; inadequate resources, especially for the community radio stations; delays in launching operations; and, the absence of monitoring and strong central direction. *Conclusion based on findings for Effectiveness.*

v. Another output of the Project was a ***set of video documentaries which were broadcast by state television in all four of the participating countries***. In addition, a number of radio features and "clips" were produced, suitable for use in public affairs and new programs. Through these vehicles, ***the Project reached a large audience with information about the Project, its focus and its goals***. However, i***t did not engage with these broader audiences and nothing is known about either the audience reached or the effect of the programs***. *Conclusion based on findings for Effectiveness.*

vi. The project succeeded, to a degree at least, in contributing to two of its three outcomes (the medium-term impact results) sought:
- It ***enhanced the awareness and knowledge of local development issues***, and of how to advocate for community priorities with local government officials, on the part of the members of some of the RLCs and the broader communities from which they came;
- It contributed to ***increasing the level of engagement between the people and local decision-makers in the target rural areas***, at least in some cases, most notably in Mkushi, Zambia. Elsewhere, the record in improving the extent and effectiveness of engagement is more mixed.
- Among the factors holding back the achievement of stronger results in terms of engagement was the ***limited openness of local government to entering into discussions with local communitie***s, the short period of Project support to RLC/community radio cooperation, and the limited support provided by the Project to enhancing local dialogue.
- ***Despite the lack of adequate resources and expert support, the community radio stations in Zambia in South Africa demonstrated their commitment to the Project*** and to supporting the Radio Listener clubs. Overall, they were found to have done a professional job within the constraints imposed. Their efforts are to be commended.
- ***Under Outcome 3, the Project was unable to support activities, and, thus, did not contribute to strengthening the capacity of CSOs*** and community media. Conclusion based on findings for Impact and Relevance.

vii. ***Given its ambitions and the scope of work proposed, the Project was significantly under-budgeted***. Particularly important in influencing both outputs and results achieved was the insufficiency of resources allocated to core activities (technical support to the RLCs, funding for the community radio stations and advice on promoting dialogue). At the same time, scarce resources were allocated to activities which had marginal impact on Project outcomes. *Conclusion based on findings for Efficiency.*

viii. ***The Project lacked the ongoing guidance and direction a strong management presence would have provided***. It is probable that internal organizational and leadership problems within PSAf, subsequently resolved, contributed to weak management performance. Field activities did not receive the level of support required. Given its commitment to the core ideas driving the Project, and the need to bring together the various elements of a complicated and scattered initiative, there was a need for PSAf to maintain a regular schedule of visits to field sites and meetings with partner agencies. Given the way resources were allocated, this was not possible, or, when it occurred, was not effective. The relative inactivity of the implementing agencies may also be a result of inadequate resources for field visits. *Conclusion based on findings for Efficiency and Effectiveness.*

ix. ***The overall impact of the Project has been limited***. Its principal accomplishment was to demonstrate the potential of cooperation between local communities and community radio as a vehicle for enhancing community engagement in local decision-making. *Conclusion based on findings for Impact.*

VI. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

i. While ***PSAf is encouraged to seek further funding*** to continue its promising work in support of radio listener clubs and community radio stations, it ***devote more attention to project design, building working partnerships, and investing in technical support and monitoring*** in the course of implementation, as well as avoiding unnecessary complexity, and focusing resources on those activities most relevant to the achievement of core results.

ii. ***PSAf makes it a priority to ensure that all projects are well-documented and assigns responsibility***, on an ongoing basis, even where there is a change in personnel, for securing and maintaining full project records.

iii. ***In preparing a project design and budget, in considering a baseline study, PSAF bears in mind that it should be: shaped to inform other activities;*** undertaken early in the project on a rapid assessment basis; modest in scope, and focused on specific issues of direct relevance to the achievement of results. It is further recommended that UNDEF considers including a note on baseline studies in its guidelines to those preparing grant applications.

iv. ***UNDEF recognizes the value in supporting public participation and political inclusion of marginalized communities through the mechanism of radio listener clubs*** (or their equivalent) and community radio stations and *looks for further opportunities to build on experience to date.*

v. ***UNDEF considers developing an additional advisory guideline for those preparing proposals for regional projects*** to counsel: (i) a realistic limiting of scope to take into account the modest resources available, and, (ii) the particular need for management to work continually to ensure the integration of project components, while also maintaining quality control across countries.

VII. Overall assessment and closing thoughts

In conclusion, it must be noted that PSAF is an organization with sound technical and professional knowledge and experience. It has been through a period of difficulties which, not surprisingly, and as evidenced above, seems to have had an impact on programming performance. Despite this, its longer-term reputation is sound; further, it has taken the necessary steps to strengthen organizational structure and internal processes. It is to be hoped that donors will recognize its undoubted strengths as they consider funding future activities. At the same time, on the evidence of this Evaluation, PSAf will be well-advised to take a hard look at the way it plans and manages development projects, and the basis for its partnering with other organizations.

The core idea of this Project was sound, and, although it did not achieve what it might have done. The Project supported an innovation and mechanism for enhancing local democracy and for bringing marginalized communities into the public realm. It is to be hoped that UNDEF will find ways to offer further support to radio listener clubs and building the capacity of community radio to provide a platform for two-way communications and dialogue between citizens and decision-makers.

VIII. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Evaluation questions

DAC criterion	Evaluation Question	Related sub-questions
Relevance	To what extent was the project, as designed and implemented, suited to context and needs at the beneficiary, local, and national levels?	▪ Were the objectives of the project in line with the needs and priorities for democratic development, given the context? ▪ Should another project strategy have been preferred rather than the one implemented to better reflect those needs, priorities, and context? Why? ▪ Were risks appropriately identified by the projects? How appropriate are/were the strategies developed to deal with identified risks? Was the project overly risk-averse?
Effectiveness	To what extent was the project, as implemented, able to achieve objectives and goals?	▪ To what extent have the project's objectives been reached? ▪ To what extent was the project implemented as envisaged by the project document? If not, why not? ▪ Were the project activities adequate to make progress towards the project objectives? ▪ What has the project achieved? Where it failed to meet the outputs identified in the project document, why was this?
Efficiency	To what extent was there a reasonable relationship between resources expended and project impacts?	▪ Was there a reasonable relationship between project inputs and project outputs? ▪ Did institutional arrangements promote cost-effectiveness and accountability? ▪ Was the budget designed, and then implemented, in a way that enabled the project to meet its objectives?
Impact	To what extent has the project put in place processes and procedures supporting the role of civil society in contributing to democratization, or to direct promotion of democracy?	▪ To what extent has/have the realization of the project objective(s) and project outcomes had an impact on the specific problem the project aimed to address? ▪ Have the targeted beneficiaries experienced tangible impacts? Which were positive; which were negative? ▪ To what extent has the project caused changes and effects, positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen, on democratization? ▪ Is the project likely to have a catalytic effect? How? Why? Examples?
Sustainability	To what extent has the project, as designed and implemented, created what is likely to be a continuing impetus towards democratic development?	▪ To what extent has the project established processes and systems that are likely to support continued impact? ▪ Are the involved parties willing and able to continue the project activities on their own (where applicable)?
UNDEF value added	To what extent was UNDEF able to take advantage of its unique position and comparative advantage to achieve results that could not have been achieved had support come from other donors?	▪ What was UNDEF able to accomplish through the project that could not as well have been achieved by alternative projects, other donors, or other stakeholders (Government, NGOs, etc.). ▪ Did project design and implementing modalities exploit UNDEF's comparative advantage in the form of an explicit mandate to focus on democratization issues?

Annex 2: Documents Reviewed

Communication for Governance and Development: Lusaka, Panos Institute Southern Africa, 2010

Hammer, Joshua, "A New Crisis in South Africa", New York Review of Books, April 26, 2012, pp.41-43

Mattes, Robert: "South Africans' Participation in Local Politics and Government", Transformations. #66-67, 2008, pp.117-141

Mo Ibrahim Foundation Index of African Governance (IIAG):
http://www.moibrahimfoundation.org/downloads/2012-IIAG-data-report.pdf

Panos Institute of Southern Africa, Annual Reports 2010 and 2011

Panos Institute of Southern Africa, Development through Radio: A Guide to Setting Up Radio Listener Clubs, 2003

Panos Institute for Southern Africa, Your Municipality: How it Works, not dated (UNDEF support acknowledged)

Panos Institute of Southern Africa, Strategic Plan for 2012-2016

UNDP Africa Human Development Report 2012 New York: UNDP, 2012

UNDP Human Development Report 2011, Sustainability and Equity: A Better Future for All. New York: UNDP, 2011

UNDP Zambia: National Human Development Report 2011. Lusaka: UNDP, 2011, p.10.

What is Community Radio? A Resource Guide: AMARC Africa and PANOS Southern Africa, 1998.

Annex 3: Persons Interviewed by International Consultant
a. Zambia and South Africa

September 23, Sunday	
Arrival in Lusaka of International Consultant	
September 24, Monday	
Ms. Lilian Chigona	Executive Director, PSAf
Mr. Ken Kapata	Regional Finance and Administration Manager
Meeting with members of PSAf Team on current program and methodological approaches: ▪ Mr. Pryd Chitah, Regional Manager, Governance and Development ▪ Mr. Elias Mthoniswa Banda, Regional Manager, Media Development & ICTs ▪ Mr Nervious Siantombo, Senior Program Officer, Environment and Natural Resources Management ▪ Ms.Felistus Chipako Nwaneri, Program Officer, Governance & Development ▪ Mr. Masauso Soko, Program Officer for the Health & Development Program	
Meeting with Mr. Pryd Chitah for more detailed review of Project and Filed Mission Plans	
September 25, Tuesday	
Second Meetring with Mr. Pryd Chitah on Project and field operations in Mkushi	
Meeting on Project Development and Operations with Ms Felistus Chipako Nwaneri and Mr. Nervious Saintombo	
Visit to Radio Phoenix, Lusaka, with Ms. Felistus Chipako Nwaneri; meetings with Mr. Luciano Hambok, Station Manager, and Mr. Billy Kazoka, News Editor	
Second Meeting with Ms Lilian Chigona, Executive Director, on organizational finances and restructuring.	
September 26, Wednesday	
Travel to Mkushi by car; Meeting with Staff of Mkushi Radio: ▪ Mr. Peter Malsha, Program Manager ▪ Ms May Chembo, Producer; ▪ Ms Audrey Lewensa, News Manager ▪ Meetings with Community Stakeholder: ▪ Mr. Christopher Chibuye, District Commissioner ▪ Mr. Frank Chumfwa, Former District Council Secretary ▪ Ms Dorothy Mwemba, Businesswoman and Former Council Deputy Secretary Overnight in Mkushi	
September 27, Thursday	
AM Meeting with nine Radio Listener Group Representatives at Mkushi Radio Brief Concluding meeting with Mr. Peter Malsha, Program Manager at Mkushi Radio Return to Lusaka by car.	
September 28, Friday	
Wrap-up meetings at PSAf with Mr. Pryd Chitah, and Ms. Felistus Chipako Nwaneri and Mr Nervious Siantombo PM Departure of International Consultant for Johannesburg	
September 29, Saturday	
AM JOHANNESBURG: Meeting with national Consultant to review Zambia experience and plan for field research in South Africa. PM: Departure of International Consultant for Maputo, Mozambique	

Annex 3: Persons Interviewed by National Consultant
b. South Africa

November 1, Friday
Arrival in Durban by air and proceed to Jozini, KwaZulu-Natal of National Consultant
Meeting with members of Isixaxa RLC Representatives: i)   Sibongile Mngomezulu Isixaxa ii)   Jabu Ndlazi   Isixaxa iii)   Nkosigipile Mabika   Isixaxa iv)   Samkelo Zikhali   Isixaxa v)   Hleziphi Mpontshane   Isixaxa vi)   PhumzileMlambo   Isixaxa In addition, two staff members of Maputaland Community Radio were present vii)   Silence Khumalo   MCR Technical Assistant viii) Thulile Tembe   MCR head of News
Meeting with Mr. Alson Ncube, Former Mayor of Hlabisa Municipality
November 2, Saturday
Meeting at Maputaland Radio Station with Board members of Isixaxa Society; Chairman Sodwana Nxumalo Members Mrs Jeffry Gina Mr. Enock Mtshali Ms T Mnguni Mrs. Khehla Lemfene Mr. M. Gumede
Return to Johannesburg by air
November 4, Monday
Meeting at Panos Southern Africa Office Johannesburg with Reshoketswe.

Annex 4: Acronyms

CBO	Community-Based Organization
COMBOCCO	Association of Community-Based Organizations
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DRRP	Direct Response Radio Program
EQ	Evaluation question
GTR	Governance and Transparency through Radio
HDI	Human Development Index
IIAG	Ibrahim Index of African Governance
KZN	KwaZulu-Natal
MTI	Medium-Term Impact
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PSAf	Panos Southern Africa
RDF	Roundtable Discussion Forum
RLC	Radio Listener Club
UN	United Nations
UNDEF	United Nations Democracy Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Program