

UNDEF



The United Nations
Democracy Fund

**POST PROJECT EVALUATIONS FOR THE
UNITED NATIONS DEMOCRACY FUND**

EVALUATION REPORT

UDF-16-702-ZIM

Advocating for Community Radio in Zimbabwe

21 December 2020

Acknowledgements

The evaluator expresses gratitude to the staff members of Amnesty International Zimbabwe (AIZ) and Zimbabwe Association of Community Radio Stations (ZACRAS) for taking the time to share their experiences and information regarding this project. More gratitude goes to all the stakeholders and beneficiaries of the project; particularly the three Community Radio Stations (CRIs) visited for purposes of this report.

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this report are those of the evaluator. They do not represent those of UNDEF or of any of the institutions referred to in the report. All errors and omissions remain the responsibility of the author.

Author

This report was written by Stanley Tsarwe (tsarwes@gmail.com).

Project Area

The project covered a total of ten Community Radio Stations located in Zimbabwe's ten provinces. The evaluator visited the following three project areas: Vemuganga FM (Manicaland Province), Nkabaywe CRI (Midlands Province), and Wezhira FM (Masvingo Province).

Map of Community Radios in Zimbabwe



List of Acronyms

| | |
|--------|---|
| AIPPA | Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act |
| AIZ | Amnesty International Zimbabwe |
| BAZ | Broadcasting Authority of Zimbabwe |
| BSA | Broadcasting Services Act |
| CRIs | Community Radio Initiatives |
| FOA | Freedom of Information Act |
| MAAZ | Media Alliance of Zimbabwe |
| MM | Media Monitors |
| MISA | Media Institute of Southern Africa |
| POSA | Public Order and Security Act |
| ZMC | Zimbabwe Media Commission |
| ZACRAS | Zimbabwe Association of Community Radio Stations |
| ZUJ | Zimbabwe Union of Journalists |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Introduction | 4 |
| Project Context and Overview | 4 |
| Development context | 4 |
| Summarised Project Logical Framework | 6 |
| Evaluation methodology | 7 |
| FINDINGS | 7 |
| A. Relevance | 7 |
| Alignment | 8 |
| Project Design | 9 |
| B. Effectiveness | 10 |
| C. Efficiency | 12 |
| Value for Money | 13 |
| Partnerships and synergies | 13 |
| D. Impact | 14 |
| Institutional Impact | 14 |
| Local Impact | 15 |
| National Impact | 16 |
| E. Sustainability | 17 |
| F. UNDEF Value Added | 18 |
| G. Conclusion and Recommendations | 19 |
| H. 1. Lessons learned | 20 |
| ANNEX 1: Detailed Summary of Methodology | 21 |
| ANNEX 2: Evaluation Questions | 23 |
| ANNEX 3: Survey Instrument | 24 |
| ANNEX 4: Key Informant Interview Guide | 27 |
| ANNEX 5: Focus Group Interview Guide | 29 |
| ANNEX 6: List of Documents Reviewed | 31 |
| ANNEX 7: List of KIIs and Focus Group Interviews Conducted | 34 |
| ANNEX 8: Comprehensive Logical Framework | 35 |

Executive Summary

Evaluation Overview

The project, “*Advocating for Community Radio in Zimbabwe*” (UDF-16-702-ZIM), was implemented by Amnesty International Zimbabwe (AIZ) and its local partner, Zimbabwe Association of Community Radio Stations (ZACRAS), from 1 January 2018 to 31 December 2019 with a UNDEF grant of USD\$198 000. The project advocated the licensing of community radio stations in Zimbabwe. Evaluation of this project was based on UNDEF’s key elements of standard evaluation criteria: 1) relevance (focus on project design and time), 2) effectiveness (focus on outcomes), 3) efficiency (focus on output delivery and project management), 4) impact (focus on short-term outcome effects and long-term demonstrated change), 5) sustainability (focus on viability of the initiatives and continuing civic engagement), and 6) UNDEF value added (focus on the unique position of UNDEF funding provided to the project).

Method

Evaluator conducted a project document review, online survey, focus group discussions, Key Informant Interviews (KII), field observations, and in-depth interviews with project beneficiaries. Field visits to three Community Radio Institutions (CRIs) brought together a combined 60 trained community radio advocates for focus group discussions. At each CRI, a focus group discussion brought together 20 Community Radio Advocates (CRAs). These advocates were drawn from groups of people with disabilities, women, youth, ward councillors, church leaders, and traditional leaders. In addition, 2 KIIs at each radio station were also conducted with the Station Coordinator and a ward councillor. Skype interviews were conducted with ZACRAS and one of the CSOs who formed an alliance that partnered in advocating for freedom of information and the licensing of CRIs in Zimbabwe. A face-to-face interview was also conducted with IAZ. In addition to these, a desk review of project documents and annexes was conducted. Observations at the three CRIs also yielded data used in this report.

Results: Based on UNDEF’s key elements of standard evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and UNDEF value added, the overall assessment of the project is very **positive** as the project achieved most of its goals and met the mandate of UNDEF. All three project outcomes were mostly achieved and yielded significant impact. Most importantly 50% (5 out of 10) of CRIs that participated in this UNDEF project successfully applied for licencing and by 17 December 2020 one of these CRIs (Ntepe FM) had already been awarded a licence. By the time of writing this report, the licensing process was still on-going and should more CRIs get registered, the overall impact of the project would be further enhanced.

Relevance: The project was relevant to the real needs of CRIs and their stakeholders. Overall, the project outcomes were adequate and aligned with the mandate and strategic aims of the donor (UNDEF), the grantee (AIZ), and the local implementing partner (ZACRAS). To demonstrate project relevance, it is a fact that, in Zimbabwe, access to information and community media among underprivileged communities, women, and disabled people, largely among rural communities, remains extremely constrained by low levels of political will to license CRIs. Interestingly, the relevance of CRIs became more amplified at the peak of COVID-19 between March 2020 and September 2020 when all CRIs interviewed stated that they were cascading relevant government communications on COVID-19 using local languages. During a baseline survey conducted prior to project implementation, locals were able to articulate the purpose of CRIs as instruments for political accountability, communication of disaster threats and preparedness, promotion of local culture and languages, empowerment of women, and Human Rights Education (HRE). In Zimbabwe, access to the media and information is restricted to urban areas

because unlike rural areas, urban areas enjoy basic connectivity and easier access to infrastructure such as road networks, internet, electricity, running water, and other social amenities.

Effectiveness: According to project documents, project activities were effectively able to achieve the project's objectives as planned without detracting from the original plan. Based on the results reported at output level, the evaluator concluded that all the project's three outcomes were effectively accomplished, with outcomes 2 and 3 having achieved the largest success. Outcome 1 sought to conduct strong advocacy and citizen petitions for community radio licensing by civil society stakeholders. Unfortunately, the petitions were suspended following the advice from policy makers that petitions may be viewed as confrontational to the government, while engagement would be viewed as more appropriate. Outcome 2 sought for policy and regulatory reforms towards the licensing of CRIs, which was effectively achieved as Zimbabwe saw some key regulatory reforms through the repealing of three laws notorious for restricting media freedom and the practice of journalistic work in Zimbabwe (i.e. the Broadcasting Services Act [BSA], the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act [AIPPA], and the Public Order and Security Act [POSA]). Outcome 3 aimed at building the capacity and relevance of the ten target CRIs in preparation for licensing. This was achieved as all CRIs were trained in diverse operational needs, such as production of community radio content, management, sustainability, advocacy, and monitoring and evaluation.

Efficiency: The evaluator concluded that management of the project was sound and that the departure of some key staff members from AIZ in 2018 did not affect the flow of project activities and progress. While at the inception of the project's evaluation, UNDEF raised concerns about some alleged misappropriation of finances at AIZ -- issues that UNDEF became aware of following local and international press coverage in early 2018 -- a 2020 audit report by Deloitte & Touche firm requested by UNDEF allayed these fears.

Impact: The project was able to achieve visible short- and long-term impacts. The advocacy activities contributed to an overall softening of the government of Zimbabwe's stance towards the licencing of CRIs, which resulted in the first ever public call for potential licensees. It also resulted in the repealing of some media laws in Zimbabwe and the publication of community radio licensing regulations and allotment plans. In addition, 50% (5 out of 10) of CRIs that participated in this UNDEF project successfully applied for licencing and by 17 December 2020 one of these CRIs (Ntepe FM) had already been awarded a licence. By the time of writing this report, the licensing process was still going on and should more CRIs get registered, the overall impact of the project would be further enhanced. The advocacy work managed to enlist buy-in for community radio from local ward councillors, traditional leaders, and church leaders (most of whom were present during field visits for data collection and spoke positively about CRIs). Local residents now appreciate that, via community broadcasting, their own local languages are indeed legitimate and preferred channels to be used in finding voices to express shared cultural identities.

Sustainability: The evaluation found that the project does display evidence of the potential for sustainability. During field visits, the evaluator found evidence of enthusiasm and an urgent desire by community members to have CRIs survive despite the prevailing circumstances characterized by lack of political will to license CRIs. However, beyond this desire to keep CRIs sustainable, CRIs in Zimbabwe face sustainability and continuity challenges, as they are expected to be sustained by the community they serve to push back the potential patronizing effect of commercial or political sponsorship. As is the case with community media across the world, it is crucial that CRIs continually produce innovative sustainability models.

In the three CRIs visited, it was evident that the communities served by these CRIs are extremely poor, and often struggle with basic necessities such as food. During interviews with AIZ and its partners, a theme that emerged was the difficulty of mobilizing poor community members to attend campaigns for human rights education in advocacy, further attesting to the fact that community members had to make hard choices between either attending their farms for everyday subsistence or attending human rights training. While the evaluator found evidence of some community support (e.g. young volunteers working for the stations and community members providing news) access to resources such as equipment and rental fees remains an albatross to the sustenance of Zimbabwean CRIs.

UNDEF value added: The UNDEF fund was appropriately tailored to intervene on behalf of a very noble cause around freedom of information and access to information among marginalized communities in Zimbabwe. UNDEF contributed to the overall empowerment of CRIs and assisted communities in speaking with informed voices about the need for licensing CRIs. To use a metaphor invoked by one of the community radio advocates during an interview, a seed has been sown, and substantial work has already been done by sowing this idea into people's minds. In addition, it was reported that unlike other donors, working with UNDEF was enjoyable for grantees and beneficiaries alike because of UNDEF's neutrality, its lack of economic interests, and flexibility in managing the project's funding.

Main recommendations are as follows: Should UNDEF or any other organisation wish to conduct such similar projects, the following may be recommended:

- Given that the Zimbabwean government has already made a commitment to issue campus radio licenses across the country, there is a need to foster strong linkages/partnerships between campus radio and community-embedded radio to increase exchanges and better programming;
- In future, a priority should be given to rural-based CRIs to enable them to catch up with the better equipped and capacitated urban CRIs. People in urban communities have relatively fairer access to information and media (even though there still is room for improvement) due to better connectivity infrastructure, such as internet, roads, electricity, and water;
- There may be a need to constitute what may be called CRI ambassadors/patrons (separately from the existing community advocates) in each of the ten provinces. Such influential figures would be given a mandate to, at the very least, take the opportunity to **speak about CRIs a stipulated number of times on an occasion covered by national media as a way to influence policy.**
- It is important to invite editors and/or senior journalists from mainstream media to cover issues about CRIs to allow for better publicity of information related to the licensing of CRIs;
- In addition to advocacy, more resources need to be directed at sustainability issues so that CRIs can run themselves without prospects of liquidation or being captured by powerful centres.

Introduction

Zimbabwe, like Swaziland, does not have licensed CRIs operating on FM. There are 28 community radio stations operating informally in Zimbabwe, however, these are not licensed, despite the country's media legislation allowing for a 3-tier broadcasting system comprised of public, commercial and community broadcasting.

However, since the liberalisation of broadcast media in Africa in the early 2000s, some countries in the sub-region have registered significant milestones in licencing CRIs. For example, South Africa has more than 165 community radio stations broadcasting in a number of languages with diverse content. Johannesburg alone has more than 45 community radio stations. Zambia has about 20 community radio stations (10 of which are church-based) while Mozambique also has about 20 community radio stations. The promotion and development of community radio in Zimbabwe remains largely constricted by restrictive legislation and a lack of willingness by government to license community radios.

In Zimbabwe, the ruling elites have an unfavourable opinion of CRIs because they have potential to empower citizens to see the injustices of the status quo – a development that can weaken the ruling class' grip on power. Arguably as a restrictive measure, licencing and registration fees required of CRIs are prohibitively high and unsustainable for small and financially weak entities such as CRIs.

As such, it is difficult for marginalised communities to find a voice in a public sphere crowded by both commercial broadcasters and government-manipulated state broadcasters. Several minority languages have no access to information critical for their local development, participation in national processes, and actualisation of local identities. This is despite the specific stipulations by the Zimbabwean Constitution which guarantees **freedom of expression and freedom of the media** (Section 61), and **freedom to access information** (Section 62). Since 2001, when the Broadcasting Services Act (BSA) was promulgated, and, despite the Act providing for the licensing of CRIs, none have been licensed to date.

Project Context and Overview

Development context

The project under evaluation advocated for the establishment of community radio stations in Zimbabwe. A baseline study at inception revealed a set of shortcomings cutting across most CRIs in Zimbabwe. The shortcomings identified at the CRIs' level included a lack of operating space, lack of skills and competences for running a community radio effectively, and weak boards. Regarding the general populace, the limited access to information and media along with the exclusion and marginalization of local languages by national media were also identified.

The project was built on a three-pronged approach: a) capacitating of CRIs to meet licencing requirements (through training in content development, governance, monitoring and evaluation, sustainability training and provision of broadcasting technologies to selected stations), b) mobilisation of a vibrant alliance of civil society stakeholders, training of citizen advocates who would champion and amplify grassroots voices through petitions to government and c) lobbying the government and its regulatory entities to reform existing laws and policy to allow for the licensing of CRIs. The following are the ten CRIs that participated in the UNDEF-funded project along with their estimated population reach:

1. Wezhira CRI - 1,500
 2. Budja FM CRI - 500
 3. Vemuganga CRI - 6000
 4. Madziva FM CRI - 500
 5. Radio Dialogue CRI - 6000
 6. Patsaka CRI - 2,500
 7. Kumakomo CRI - 1,500
 8. Ntepe CRI - 500
 9. Hwange FM CRI - 500
 10. Nkabazwe CRI - 1000,
- Total Approximate Population reached: (20, 500)

The three expected outcomes of the project were:

- **Outcome 1:** Strong advocacy and citizen petitions for community radio licensing by civil society stakeholder alliance implemented;
- **Outcome 2:** Policy and regulatory reform towards licensing of community radio institutions achieved;
- **Outcome 3:** Capacity and relevance of the 10 target community radio institutions (CRIs) enhanced in order to apply for licensing.

The project benefited 10 unlicensed CRIs located in Zimbabwe's 10 provinces as well as the communities surrounding these radio stations. An important strategy employed during



Figure 1 Theater performance advocating of CRIs

the advocacy work was the use of drama (see Figure 1 left below) to convey advocacy messages on why it is important to license community radios in Zimbabwe as well as on human rights.

During field interviews, community theatres were described as some of the most effective communication tools that brought to life human rights training on why the licensing of community radio is essential in

modern democracies. In their current programming, CRIs continue to use theatre as a tool for effectively communicating with local audiences.

One critical result of the UNDEF fund was capacity building for CRIs through training on how to produce relevant community radio content that can empower communities as well as the provision of basic broadcast equipment, such as recorders, editing software, and computers to selected CRIs. Project activities took place in the context of an unstable economic environment in Zimbabwe.

Summarised Project Logical Framework *(see Annex 8 for complete log. frame.)*

| Outcomes | Outcome Indicator and results | Planned Outputs and results | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Outcome 1: Strong advocacy and citizen petitions for community radio licensing by civil society stakeholder alliance implemented | <p>1.1: 100% (34,200) of target community members attended the community advocacy activities and demonstrated their understanding on CRs</p> <p>Results: Community members have become aware of CR's importance and needs for licensing. There is also positive change in government attitude towards community broadcasting</p> <p>1.2: 100 % (10,000) of target citizens signed petitions and their commitment statement</p> <p>Results: 7200 members signed before changing the strategy of petitioning (abandoned this as too aggressive as per MPs advice) But at least some of community members who attended the community level events became aware of the importance of CRs and expressed their support</p> | 1.1: Baseline survey of target communities and capacity assessment of 10 CRIs (3.1) - Q1 | | |
| | | Output 1.2: Project launch and stakeholder mobilization workshop – Q1 | | |
| | | Output 1.3: Community and citizen awareness raising materials on community radio and access to information/freedom of expression (Q1-8) | | |
| | | Output 1.4: 10 trainings (one full day each) of 500 community-based radio Advocates (50 in each province, total 500) (Q2-3) | | |
| | | Output 1.5: 10 Roadshows (1 per target community) for at least 6,000 people for building community and citizen awareness and buy-in for community radio licensing (Q4 and Q6) | | |
| | | Output 1.6: 20 public meetings (2 in each province) with at least 300 citizens each (Total 6000) (Q3-6) | | |
| | | Output 1.7: 20 community theatre performances (two in each province) of at least 3,000 participants (Q2-5) | | |
| | | Output 1.8: 10 community petition drives to obtain 10,000 citizen petitions and commitments (Q5-6) | | |
| | | Outcome 2: Policy and Regulatory Reform towards licensing of community radio institutions achieved | <p>2.1: Achievement of coherent Government-wide policy consensus on licensing community radios.</p> <p>Results: Influenced media law reform in ZIM: 1. the Broadcasting Service Act, Amendment Bill 2) the Public Order and Security Act 3) repealing AIPPA 4) CR licensing call (has not been made) including institutions of higher learning and church-based CRs 5) the Broadcasting Authority of ZIM was appointed</p> <p>2.2: At least two significant policy and regulation changes achieved – 1) Establishment and agreement on a community broadcasting legal framework including systematic periodic calls for licensing applications, and 2) At least 80% reduction of CRIs licensing fee requirements. Currently: (a) Application fee initial US\$500 (non-refundable) (b) Basic License Fee for ten years - US\$1 000 per annum (Total US\$10,000)</p> <p>Results: Regulation and policy changes under discussion (Positive shift) but not yet materialized 1) Periodic call for licensing – ZIM government promised to call for licensing in 2019 (not yet happening) Government set aside funding for CRs 2) reduction of licensing fees – still discussion</p> | Output 2.1: One legal and media audit/analysis of the existing community broadcasting legal framework and CRIs licensing including a regional comparative analysis |
| | | | | Output 2.2: A CSO Alliance (of at least 15 CSOs) for CRI licensing established and functioning (Q1 and Q6 and ongoing activities) |
| Output 2.3: One Advocacy Workshop for 44 stakeholder participants (Q3) – M2 (UNDP monitored see MVR2) | | | | |
| Output 2.4: Two Targeted lobbying and advocacy meetings with at least 3 MPs and 3 government representatives (total 6) from responsible Ministry, BAZ and ZMC (Q4 and Q7) | | | | |
| Output 2.5: Three position papers on community broadcasting and licensing of CRIs (Q3-5) 1. Amendments to the Broadcasting Services Act; 2. Enactment of Community Radio regulation & radius of CRs 3. The appointment of the ZIM Broadcasting Authority | | | | |
| Output 2.6: One and half day all stakeholder conference conducted and attended by 80 participants. (Q6) - M3 (see MVR by UNDP) June 2019 w 14 participants | | | | |
| Output 2.7: National campaigns for community broadcasting and CRIs licensing focusing on UN Freedom of Information and Expression Commemorative Days (Seven National Campaign by AIZ/ZACRAS, 20 Community Campaigns by CRIs) (Q2, | | | | |
| Outcome 3: Capacity and relevance of the 10 target community radio institutions (CRIs) enhanced in order to apply for licensing | <p>3.1: 50 % (5) of target CRIs fulfilled requirements for licensing</p> <p>Results: Four CRIs' capacity were enhanced with basic broadcast equipment (voice recorders, editing software, and computers). Beneficiaries CRIs were VeMuganga FM, Hwange FM, Madziwa FM and Radio Dialogue</p> <p>3.2: Five CRIs have applied for license responding to a BAZ call for applications</p> <p>Result: 5 CRIs successfully applied for licensing. These are Hwange FM, Madziwa FM, Ntepe FM, Patsaka FM, and Vemuganga FM.</p> <p>NB: By 17 December 2020 BAZ released a press statement to the effect that Ntepe FM had been awarded a broadcasting license. BAZ announced that consideration of applicants is still ongoing and is expected to be complete beginning of 2021</p> | | | Output 3.1: One Capacity Assessment Study of 10 targeted CRIs. (Q1) – integrated with Baseline survey – combined with Output 1.1 |
| | | | | Output 3.2: Production of One CRI Best Practice Guide – 100 copies (Q1-8) |
| | | | | Output 3.3: Conduct a two-day CRI capacity development workshop for 20 people from 10 target CRIs. (Q4) |
| | | Output 3.4: CRI national exchange visits (by 5 CRIs) and one regional visit (by 4 CRIs) (Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6) | | |
| | | Output 3.5: CRI technical development support provided to four CRIs. (Q1-8) | | |

Evaluation methodology

The evaluation focused on key questions that follow UNDEF's evaluation criteria of effectiveness, sustainability, relevance, efficiency, impact and UNDEF's added value.

The evaluation strategy used a triangulated approach (focus group discussions, key informant interviews (KII), field observations, and desk review). Primary field data (group discussions and station observations) were used for confirming secondary data (desktop review of relevant project documents and annexures). This ensured the gathering of evidence and perspectives from multiple sources and a triangulation of findings. A detailed methodological approach is attached in Annex 1 below.

FINDINGS

A. Relevance

This section analyses the project's relevance, focusing on three aspects: the adequacy of the project objectives and the beneficiaries' needs and priorities, the project's alignment with the main stakeholders' mandate and other interventions, and the project design.

The project was appropriately designed and implemented with objectives that were relevant to the needs of CRIs and their stakeholders. There was also evidence of community rootedness as most CRIs work closely with community structures.

"We work with stakeholders such as the church, councillors, and other community structures such as the police."

**Interview: Vemuganga FM
Coordinator**

The relevance of CRIs became even more pertinent at the peak of COVID-19 transmissions globally and in Zimbabwe ((between March 2020 and September 2020). Zimbabwean CRIs are using local languages to broadcast their content and, interestingly, between March 2020 and September 2020, all CRIs interviewed

stated that they were cascading government communication on COVID-19 using local languages, further buttressing their relevance.

During interviews, community radio advocates stated that their interactions with members of the community showed that there is already some trust that CRIs were serving the interest of communities.

When we talk to them about our community radio, they trust us. They see us as capable of solving even some community problems that they have always faced. So the support is overwhelming. For example, reporting on crime has also helped us to improve relations and build trust between the police and members of the community. (Focus group discussion with community advocates at Vemuganga FM).

The project was very relevant given the culture of government control and the manipulation of official information, lack of access to information, and disempowerment of youth, women, and people living with disabilities in marginalised communities.

Adequacy

Primary Question - Were the objectives of the project in line with the needs and priorities of the target beneficiaries?

Related Question – What were the needs and priorities of the target communities and CSOs?

The evaluator gathered sufficient evidence that there was adequacy of activities and outputs designed to achieve the project's objectives. However, Output 1.8: 10: *Community petition drives to obtain 10, 000 citizen petitions and commitments (Q5, Q6)* would not be completed following formal and informal discussions with members of Parliament who advised that petitions may not be appropriate, as they could be viewed by the government as confrontational and create an impression that the government was not willing to engage.

Overall, the project was able to adequately identify and define a real social problem related to access to information among marginalised communities in Zimbabwe as well as the fact that the restrictive broadcasting licensing regime further curtails freedom of information and expression as guaranteed by Zimbabwe's Constitution (Sections 6 and 62).



Figure 2: Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Information, Media, Publicity and Broadcasting Services Nick Mangwana addresses delegates during a community radio indaba. In attendance at this indaba were the Broadcasting Authority of Zimbabwe Board Chairperson Mr. Charles Manzi Sibanda and other delegates from the Broadcasting Authority of Zimbabwe (BAZ) and the Ministry of Information.

The appointment of the BAZ Board follows various engagements by ZACRAS at different fora with the Minister Information, Publicity and Broadcasting Services, the Ministry's Permanent Secretary and Members of the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee on Information, Publicity and Broadcasting Services on the need to expedite the appointment of a Board so as to ensure the licensing and operationalization of community radios in Zimbabwe. BAZ last had a Board in 2015.

Alignment

Primary Question - Was the project clearly within UNDEF, AIZ, and ZACRAS mandate and congruent with their strategic framework?
Related Questions - How does the project align with the strategic guidelines and priorities of your organisation? Did the project design promote alignment and synergies with a parallel Google-funded project?

The evaluator noted that the project under evaluation is indeed aligned with the mandate and strategic aims of the donor (UNDEF), grantee (AIZ), and local implementing partner (ZACRAS). The project is aligned with UNDEF's overall purpose of "supporting democratisation around the world by supporting projects that strengthen the voice of civil societies, promote human rights, and encourage the participation of all in democratic processes" (UNDEF Terms of Reference). UNDEF's primary purpose is to strengthen the

voice of civil society and ensure the participation of all groups in democratic practices, and countries noted for democratic deficits such as Zimbabwe fall squarely in this category.

The UNDEF fund complements current UN efforts to strengthen and expand democracy worldwide and funds projects that enhance democratic dialogue and support for constitutional processes, civil society empowerment, including the empowerment of women, civic education, and voter registration, citizens' access to information, participation rights, and the rule of law in support of civil society, transparency and integrity.

In addition, the work of the implementing agency; AIZ, is aligned with the work pursued by this project. Amnesty is involved in lobbying governments and other powerful groups to make sure they keep their promises and respect international law. Among its key strategic objectives are the advocacy of freedom of expression, indigenous people's rights, and international justice. AIZ pursues these objectives through research, education, advocacy, training, and broad-based campaigns.

ZACRAS is an umbrella body of community radios in Zimbabwe, and its position makes it perfectly aligned with the objectives of the project under evaluation, further increasing the chances of a high impact. ZACRAS promotes access to information, freedom of expression, and community participation at a community level through community radio platforms. It focuses on capacity strengthening for its members, lobbying and advocating for community radio licensing, as well as advocating for a policy environment conducive to the development of community radio.

The evaluator observed that, collectively, the work of these three organisations is sufficiently in sync with the core objectives of the project.

Project Design

Primary questions – I) Were the project activities/outputs adequate to make progress towards the project outcome? II) Were the risks appropriately identified by the project?

Related questions - Were the outputs well designed to achieve the intended outcomes? Would you change any of these outputs? Was there any verified risk that wasn't initially foreseen?

Overall, the project outputs and activities were well designed and significantly contributed to the successful outcomes. Project activities and outputs were based on the project's three broad objectives which were: implemented strong advocacy and citizen petitions for community radio licensing by civil society stakeholder alliance; advocate for Policy and Regulatory Reform towards licensing of community radio institutions achieved and enhance capacity and relevance building of the 10 target CRIs to help them to apply for licensing.

In terms of the second which surrounded "policy and regulatory reform towards licensing of community radio institutions", the evaluator found the project design to be adequate and sound. Two local reports, one regional analysis and one legal analysis were produced and shared with key stakeholders, which also had some influence on the regulatory framework that was released while a CSO Alliance (of at least 15 CSOs) for CRI licensing was established and implemented throughout the project activities. One advocacy workshop for 44 stakeholder participants was held while 2 targeted lobbying and advocacy meetings with at least 3 MPs and 3 government representatives (a total of

6) from the responsible Ministry, BAZ and ZMC. A stakeholder conference to brainstorm ideas on methods of approaching regulatory authorities was also carried out.

B. Effectiveness

Primary Question - Was the project, as implemented, able to achieve its objectives and goals?

Related Questions - 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?

Based on the assessment and results reported at output level, the evaluator concluded on the outcome effectiveness as follows:

Outcome 1: Strong advocacy and citizen petitions for community radio licensing by civil society stakeholder alliance implemented. The evaluator concluded that the expected results of Outcome 1 were **largely achieved**, even though one component related to petition signing was abandoned prematurely following the advice that a petition would not be successful, as it would be deemed aggressive towards the government. Instead of a petition, engagement through lobby meetings was preferable.

In order to achieve these outcomes, the project conducted community preparedness assessments in 10 provinces, which reached out to 397 out of a targeted 450 community members, which attests to a good capacity assessment. A project launch and stakeholder mobilization workshop were held successfully with an attendance of 161 participants drawn from CRIs, print media, civil society organizations, and academia. Presenters in the workshop included officials from ZACRAS, Amnesty International Zimbabwe, media law experts, CRIs, journalists, the Media Alliance of Zimbabwe and Radio VOP Director.

The lobby and advocacy work by AIZ and ZACRAS managed to bring the community radio agenda into the national media discourse. One of the project's strengths is derived from its alliance with a civil society network composed of 15 CSOs already working around media freedom and democratization of the airwaves in Zimbabwe. Interviews with key stakeholders, namely with the direct beneficiaries of the project in rural communities, reported that establishing this network and the reinforcement of capacity building for CRIs and advocates promoted real empowerment of civil society and high levels of appreciation for community radio in remote communities.

In addition, advocacy training workshops in each of the 10 target provinces were held, attended by 452 people, with 237 being female and 215 male. In addition, 10 roadshows (1 per target community) for at least 6,000 people for building community and raising citizen awareness and buy-in for community radio licensing were held, as well as 20 public meetings (2 in each province) with at least 300 citizens each.

Outcome 2. Policy and regulatory reform towards licensing of community radio institutions achieved. The evaluator concluded that this outcome was **largely successful**. These successes are seen by the significant review of Zimbabwe's stringent media laws such as AIPPA, POSA, and the Broadcasting Services Act which restricted the free flow of media. The Authority made public invitations for potential applicants for community radio licenses, and community radio licensing regulations and allotment plans were published. In addition, a new law—the Freedom of Information Act (FOI)—was also drafted in the period under review, signaling some of the impact caused by AIZ advocacy work. However, licensing conditions such as the license application

fees and annual subscriptions remain significantly high, discriminating against prospective applicants who may not have the required financial muscle.

Outcome 3: Capacity and relevance of the 10 target community radio institutions (CRIs) enhanced in order to apply for licensing.

The evaluator concluded that this outcome was successfully achieved and contributed to the project's overall impact. Most CRIs are deeply rooted in the communities they work, and have strong linkages with ward councilors, local churches and traditional leadership who all showed open support for CRIs during filed visits.

The UNDEF funded project also helped in building capacity and relevance of CRIs in preparation of getting licensed. For



Figure 3 Training of community broadcast content production at Nkabazwe FM, fully equipped with recorders, a computer and editing software.

example, at inception, the project held a community radio capacity assessment which assessed, among other things, existing stations' operating space, level of community rootedness and ownership, level of organizational structure, production capacity and use of social media & ICTs, including innovation.

In addition, local and regional exchange visits were conducted with the intention to capacitate CRIs with adequate skills in community broadcasting. 4 CRIs benefitted from basic broadcast equipment (laptops, recorders and editing software). In all

the 3 CRIs visited during field work, the evaluator noted that the use of ITCs was adopted by CRIs for the production, editing and distribution of content (currently, CRIs under evaluation and not licensed, and they use ICTs to generate and distribute content).

During field community visits, the evaluator had the opportunity to witness a drama staged by community advocates imitating part of their everyday engagement with communities and the delivery of their messages (see photo below).



Figure 4: Drama as a tool for message delivery

During interviews, members of the community expressed satisfaction with the work done by the Vemuganga CRIs, as it spearheaded a successful expose that local cotton companies were paying cotton farmers with cheap groceries instead of money, as is the tradition. In addition, community advocates stated that Vemuganga CRIs focused on creating community awareness on the role of the police in improving relations with residents. Prior to training on good community radio programming, local police and residents often clashed and their

relations were characterized by mistrust and suspicion that the police were out to get community members.

C. Efficiency

Primary Question – To what extent was there a reasonable relationship between resources expended and project impacts?

Related questions – Was there a reasonable relationship between project inputs and project outputs? To what extent did the Implementing Agency foster coordination and achieved synergies with other on-going initiatives?

Project Management

At the inception of the project's evaluation, UNDEF raised concerns about allegations of abuse of finances at AIZ – issues that were reported in both local and international press. It was part of this evaluation's scope to examine the level of efficiency with regard to the management of resources for the project and the impact these allegations may have had on the project.

To begin with, the evaluator established that the project was conducted under a very challenging internal environment (staff movements in the early stages of the project) with challenging external circumstances (wider political and economic dynamics in Zimbabwe). Collectively, these challenges are summarised as follows:

- Departure of AIZ's Director and the Grants Officer in the early stages of the project's inception following the alleged misappropriation of funds at AIZ. The Board appointed an interim manager;
- The unpredictable statutory changes brought about by the introduction of a new currency in Zimbabwe in 2019 as well as the rapid weakening of the value of this recently introduced local currency against the United States Dollar;
- The acute shortages of the local currency (particularly cash for use during programming in most remote CRIs where electronic money has not developed);
- The challenges of doing advocacy work and selling a concept of human rights (human rights are evidently higher-level tertiary needs) within the context of a population largely struggling with primary needs and necessities such as food and farming inputs.
- The political sensitivities generally associated with Zimbabwe during elections (Zimbabwe held general elections in 2018) and the impact that this had on mobilising communities around human rights – a subject viewed by the Zimbabwean authorities as anti-establishment and motivated by desire for "regime change";
- The existence of laws such as POSA and AIPPA, which both made public gatherings difficult and access to information severely limited.

Following the reports of alleged financial misappropriation, Deloitte Zimbabwe who had conducted a forensic audit of AIZ in 2018 was asked by UNDEF to conduct the final project audit to ascertain whether UNDEF's funds were not abused. The audit report assured that there was no mismanagement of the UNDEF grants and many management issues found in the 2018 forensic audit were addressed.

An Interim Director responsible for project implementation oversight was appointed while a Finance and Office Manager took over the responsibilities of the contact person on matters related to partnerships. A Communications and Membership Officer was also recruited.

To ensure accountability and efficient project management, a steering committee to monitor the progress and provide advice on the project was set up, made up of the Executive Director of AIZ (based in Zimbabwe), the Regional Human Rights Education Manager (based in Johannesburg) and the Regional Trusts and Foundations Manager –

African Global Fundraising and Engagement (based in Kenya). To ensure sound project management, this oversight team held virtual meetings to monitor progress and provide advice where necessary. They also monitored how AIZ is meeting and reporting deadlines to UNDEF targets as well as monitoring the production of IEC materials and other productions to make sure that they meet international standards and quality.

Deloitte Zimbabwe also made a string of turnaround recommendations meant to return AIZ to good corporate governance following the fraud allegations. After Deloitte's recommendations, a new Director was appointed in August 2018 to engage in managing the change process at AIZ while two Finance Officers were also engaged in the Finance Department to strengthen financial management. These were all done with findings from AIZ.

These recommendations included a new finance policy, a change of signatories who could access the organization's bank accounts, a new statute document governing AIZ, a new board of directors, new membership policy, creation of a disciplinary authority, and drawing up of a three year strategic plan.

Following extensive discussions with AIZ staff, the evaluator concludes that management of the project was sound and that the departure of the former Director and Grants Officer in 2018 did not affect the flow of project activities and progress.

Value for Money

Overall, the allocation of monetary resources to meet the project's stated objectives reflect that there was value for money. There was a strong relationship between project inputs and outputs despite specific challenges related to policy inconsistencies as well as significant currency instability that have come to characterize Zimbabwe over the years. However, according to the Project Narrative Report (UDF-16-702):

- There were no significant deviations from the original budget;
- The implementing agency, AIZ, funded additional Human Rights Education (HRE) performances upon the realization that a single performance was not adequate to educate people on the need for community broadcasting.
- Instead of the budgeted 10 performances for M1's 20 Human Rights Education performances, 16 performances were carried out, thereby reaching more people in different parts of the provinces;
- For media engagements/press club discussion, AIZ realized that, instead of media advertisements, the money was allocated to 4 CRI initiatives that held media engagements with their local media.

Partnerships and synergies

The partnerships forged by AIZ in the execution of the project under evaluation were certainly relevant and contributed to the overall effectiveness and impact of the project. During interviews, AIZ and ZACRAS were of the view that their partnership significantly contributed to the overall success of the project. AIZ brought its international brand as well as its experience in human rights while ZACRAS brought significant experience in local programming and advocacy work linked to community radios.

Among the 15 member CSO alliance partners was MISA Zimbabwe--a regional organization with chapters in SADC member states. It has immense technical knowledge in advocacy surrounding media freedom, plurality, and diversity in Zimbabwe.

The mandate of one of the partners, Media Monitors, was to provide a space for the purpose of promoting responsible journalism and upholding fundamental liberties that include freedom of the media, freedom of expression, and access to information as well

as accountability through information dissemination. Its mission is to ensure citizens' access to quality information through media monitoring, research, and knowledge management in a sustainable manner. In addition, the Media Alliance of Zimbabwe (MAZ) is an alliance of media support organizations with a vision for a Zimbabwe in which every person enjoys the rights to freedom of expression and access to information through free, diverse and independent communication platforms.

D. Impact

Primary question – To what extent did the project have an impact on the access to information in Zimbabwe in those specific communities?

Related questions - To what extent has the project contributed to enhance the network of local CSOs? To what extent has the project contributed to increase the capacity of local CSOs? To what extent has the project influenced policy and regulatory changes involving media freedom and access to information in specific communities?

Overall, the project had **significant impact** at different levels. The sub-sections below highlight these in specific detail.

Institutional Impact

There is sufficient evidence illustrating that the alliance of CSOs was very fruitful and managed to produce both local and national impact for the project under evaluation. CRI coordinators interviewed during data collection highlighted that the training they received on how to use drama in radio production to produce community-based content had the impact that their radio messaging was now easily understood. **In addition, some radio productions at Vemuganga FM (Chipinge) which had sustained coverage on how local cotton companies were shortchanging cotton farmers by paying them in kind (groceries), had the impact that these companies were now paying farmers in cash, as would have been agreed upon in selling contracts.**

One of the greatest impact was that of capacity and relevance building of the 10 target community radio institutions' (CRIs) enhancement to apply for CRI licensing. In community programming, it is critical that grassroots involvement and buy-in is established early on before the project begins to achieve high impact. AIZ and ZACRAS carried out a capacity assessment of all the 10 CRIs to establish the various capacity strengths and gaps of the Community Radio Initiatives.

Institutionally, CRIs interviewed during assessment expressed confidence that they now had better skills in terms of gathering news relevant to the communities they serve.

Before training, we were just doing everything, anything. And I have a feeling that people didn't really trust our abilities. But after training, we now know what is newsworthy – reporting on things that really affect community members can draw a lot of attention.

Interview with Wezhira FM Station Coordinator

For example, at Wezhira FM in Masvingo, respondents said that the use of citizen journalism practices had seen a drastic drop in cases of open defecation in the bush because people were now afraid of what they termed "**secret photographers,**" in reference to citizen journalists who use their mobile phones to provide content to the radio.

In addition, and in the context of the gender focus of the project, interview respondents stated that cases of domestic violence are widely discussed by CRIs, further helping to encourage men to desist from domestic violence. At Wezhira FM, a ward councilor stated that most men were now scared of having their names broadcasted on the radio if they engaged in domestic violence.

One advocate, Nyasha Chichi Mahwende, (a disabled youth), stated that the training on human rights had given her confidence to speak about disability issues. She conducted a radio talk show on Nkabazwe FM and later posted on the CRI's Facebook page.



Figure 5 Nyasha Chichi Mahwende: A disabled female youth makes her contribution during an FGD at Nkabazwe FM

This resulted in her being spotted by Ivory Coast's *Digital Africa Handi-Talent* and leading to her appointment as an ambassador of the organization in Zimbabwe. In Zimbabwe, she works with Young Voices Disability Zimbabwe

Local Impact

Locally, the project has significantly improved communities' appreciation of their local languages and cultures. At Wezhira

FM, Vemuganga FM, and Nkabazwe FM, community respondents during field interviews confirmed that there is **increased recognition of local ethnic languages**. Before this project, community members had not been confident in using local languages in public spheres because such languages seemed to be subject to systematic exclusion from mainstream national media.

So before training, we didn't really focus much on local languages. We found ourselves falling in the trap on national media which uses English language in programming. We were trained about being relevant.
Interview with programmes officer at Nkabazwe FM

The death of local ethnic languages is exacerbated by the fact that national radio chooses to use the dominant national languages spoken by the significant populations. It is key to note that in Africa – Zimbabwe included – the radio plays a crucial role in setting the agenda at almost all levels of community life, such as in language, culture and identity.

As a sure sign of the increased demand and recognition of local languages, as well as for the work done at the CRI, a former volunteer working at Vemuganga FM was head-hunted by a regional commercial radio station, Diamond FM, to provide broadcast sessions in Ndau (one of the marginalised local languages found in Chipinge). Interviews with the CRI's Station Coordinator revealed that a number of national radio stations sometimes ask for Ndau-English translation services. In Kariba, 4 volunteers working with Patsaka Community Radio have now been head hunted by Nyaminyami FM – one of Zimbabwe's commercial radio stations. This points to the capacity building done by the UNDEF project.

However, a cross cutting theme was also that most community radio premises did not have visible identity banners and/or insignia. It is imperative to note that apart from promoting freedom of information and information flows, one of the hallmarks of community radio is that of an identity marker and constructor. While it is understandable that all of the CRIs that participated in this project are not legally licensed, it is also imperative to note that surrounding communities served by these CRIs already have very strong senses of identity built around these radio stations. Regrettably, they do not have any visible identity marks or insignia to realize their identities.

For example, Vemuganga Community Radio Station operates under the Forum for Young and Community Development Trust (FYCD). During interviews with CRI Coordinators and Community Advocates, a problem that arose out of this scenario was that visibility of the CRI was severely affected (see photos below).



Figure 6 Back and front photos of Vemuganga CRI without identity insignia

National Impact

At the national level, the project under evaluation had a significant impact in that, for the first time in Zimbabwe, the new BAZ board made a public call inviting interested applicants for community radio and commercial television stations. This call invited applicants 10 community radio station licenses, 6 free to air national commercial TV channels and campus radio stations. This follows hard on the heels of the national advocacy conducted by AIZ and its local implementing partner, ZACRAS, for the licensing of community radios. The net effect was that at least 5 out of 10 (50%) CRIs that participated under the UNDEF funding applied for licensing and, and on the 17th of December 2020 (the time of finalizing this report), Ntepe FM had already been awarded a license. Other CRIs that successfully applied for licensing include Hwange FM, Madziwa FM, Patsaka FM, and Vemuganga. By the time of writing this report, the licensing process was still going on and should more CRIs get registered, the overall impact of the project would be further enhanced.

In addition, in one of its press releases, AIZ reported a positive shift in government's stance towards the licensing of community radios in Zimbabwe (see Success Story below).

Success Story

We (AIZ) are happy to report that during the period under review there has been a change in behavior on the part of government regarding licensing of community radios.

We managed to keep the community radio licensing debate fresh and action-demanding through various interventions including commemorations of international days such as the World Radio Day, World Press Freedom Day, and International Day of Universal Access

to Information (IDUAI). We also developed statements and position papers on various issues including responding to government position.

We are happy to report that we are one of the few organizations who have managed to meet the current Minister of Information, Publicity and Broadcasting Services, Hon Monica Mutsvangwa.

During the period under review, the Minister was positive and promised to consider the licensing of community radios during her tenure. She further indicated that as part of her 100 day plan, the Ministry was developing a community radio policy framework on how to regulate the community broadcasting sub-sector in Zimbabwe.

It is through these interventions that the Ministry has pledged and committed to reform the Broadcasting Services Act and Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (AIPPA).

In addition to, and as a result of sustained pressure for the Zimbabwean government to guarantee free access to information, the Freedom of Information Bill also promulgated on 5 July 2019 in the aftermath of the advocacy activities initiated by this project. It was later signed into law on 2 July 2020.

E. Sustainability

Primary Question – To what extent has the project, as designed and implemented, created what is likely to be a continuing impetus towards democratic development?

Related question – Are the involved parties willing and able to continue the project activities on their own after the project conclusion?

The evaluation found that the project shows evidence of sustainability factors which have strong potential to support the continuity of the CRIs even after closure of the grant. However, as is the case with community media across the world, it is crucial (Zimbabwe as no exception) that CRIs continually innovate new sustainability models.

During field visits, the evaluator found evidence of enthusiasm and the will to have CRIs survive despite the prevailing arduous circumstances of lack of political will to license community radio in Zimbabwe. However, beyond such expressed desire to keep CRI sustainable, CRIs the world over face sustainability and continuity challenges as they are expected to be sustained by the community they serve as a way to buffer the patronizing effect of commercial or political sponsorship.

“Sometimes people struggle with top up credit to enable them to send us news using their mobile phones. So these are real challenges that we deal with every day. So while the will is there, there is a reality of widespread poverty which may work against this”

*Interview with Station Coordinator at
Wezhira FM*

In the three CRIs visited by the evaluator, it was evident that the communities served by these CRIs are extremely poor, often struggling with the very basic necessities such as food. During interviews with AIZ and its partners, a cross cutting theme that emerged was the difficulty of mobilizing poor community members to obtain

human rights education.

While human rights are apparently urgent as a way of creating self-conscious citizens with critical agency to challenge and bring authority to account in undemocratic settings, human rights’ rootedness in (elite) higher level of needs cannot be wished away. Implementing partners reported that they faced stiff competition from aid organizations involved in livelihood programming because they would easily mobilize large crowds on

account of their ability to provide food. Human rights are a higher level need that a hungry community may easily regard as not pressing enough to warrant action.

Nevertheless, the CRIs were already in existence before UNDEF funding, albeit lacking in some fundamental areas such as studio and recording equipment, access to modern ICTs, limited to no operating space and level of organization. UNDEF-funded training in these areas was certainly crucial in augmenting these and other capacity issues. What is needed is more training on sustainability and technological issues. Otherwise, the spirit of resilience is already present.

The amount of interest generated by these advocacy activities will live with us forever. A mustard seed has been sown among our communities and I don't see the zeal dying away. People are contributing in little ways they can such as volunteering, contributing news etc

Interview with Community Radio Advocate, Masvingo

For example, one advocate at Wezhira FM in Masvingo stated that community members are contributing to CRIs in the “small ways they can” through voluntary work as well as by contributing news. She also used the biblical metaphor of the “mustard seed” in which she stated that the whole advocacy training had sowed a spirit and love for the local community radio which has potential to grow. All CRIs expressed the confidence that the current levels of community support (mostly through their willingness to provide news via the CRIs dedicated line) was encouraging.

F. UNDEF Value Added

Primary question – 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 the support come from other donors?

Related question – To what extent was this project innovative?

UNDEF's impact has been clearly felt at the level of initiating informed dialogues and discourses about CRI licensing, mostly at the grassroots level in communities surrounding CRIs. AIZ's implementing partner, ZACRAS, stated that UNDEF's added value was also felt because of its neutrality when working with grantees and its non-interference in programme activities. Taking advantage of its position as a champion of human rights and democracy, the UNDEF fund was appropriately tailored to intervene in a very noble cause around freedom of information among marginalised communities.

The project showed innovation by allowing organic partnerships between the implementing partner (AIZ) and local partner (ZACRAS). In addition, a broad-based alliance of CSOs dealing with a similar subject added to the creativity and novelty of the project. During interviews, project partners expressed satisfaction with UNDEF's non-intervention in the selection of partners – a development that they argue departs from other international organizations who may impose preferred partnerships.

During interviews with community advocates, the work that was carried out by CRIs showed serious levels of community involvement and support from major stakeholders. For example, volunteers working for CRIs as well as the community advocates given the mandate to speak on behalf of the marginalized were all drawn from a diverse range of population profiles and demographics. Respondents were drawn from people with disabilities, women, youth, ward councilors, church leaders, and traditional leaders. This level of involvement attests to the commitments to human rights and equality as enshrined in UNDEF's values.

UNDEF funds projects that empower civil society, promote human rights, and encourage the participation of all groups in democratic processes. The large majority of UNDEF funds go to local civil society organizations -- both in the transition and consolidation phases of democratization. UNDEF supports initiatives in the areas of community activism, electoral processes, gender equality, media and freedom of information, rule of law and human rights, strengthening civil society interaction with government, tools for knowledge, and youth engagement.

G. Conclusion and Recommendations

Overall, the evaluator concludes that this project was very successful given the socio-economic and political environment prevailing in Zimbabwe where there is open hostility by the government towards rights-based organizations, and perennial policy inconsistencies (particularly monetary policies) which militate against accounting and reporting standards of grant money. In addition, the fact that there are no licensed CRIs in Zimbabwe is not coincidental. It is a clear and conscious decision by the ruling elite to keep marginalized communities away from alternative information loops so that they rely on propaganda-laced official information. Zimbabwe's ruling elite has survived by patronizing a large constituency of uninformed rural communities.

The evaluator makes the following recommendations:

- Given that the Zimbabwean government has already made a commitment to issue campus radio licenses across the country, future programming needs to foster strong linkages/partnerships between campus radio and community-embedded radio to increase exchanges, better programming and visibility of CRIs;
- It may help to enter into partnerships with local universities training journalism to second student journalists to work for specified periods of time and provides incentives such as certification. This can help not only in capacity building, but also in increasing you people's community service profile and commitment to their own communities;
- In future, a priority should be given to rural-based CRIs to enable them to catch up with the better equipped and capacitated urban CRIs. People in urban communities already have fair access to information and media (even though this still needs improvement) due to better connectivity infrastructure network such as the internet, roads, electricity and water;
- In future, consider introduction of incentives for best performing CRIs to be superintended by local leadership as a way to encourage competition as well as increase local and national visibility of discourses in CRIs.
- There may be needed to constitute what may be called CRIs ambassadors/patrons (who are different from the already existing community advocates) in each of the 10 provinces. Such influential figures will be given a mandate to at least make an opportunity to **speak about CRIs a stipulated number of times on an occasion covered by national media as a way to influence policy.**
- It is important to rope in editors and or senior journalists from mainstream media to cover issues about CRIs to allow for better publicity of information related to the licensing of CRIs;
- In addition to advocacy, more resources need to be directed to sustainability issues so that CRIs can run themselves without prospects of liquidation or being captured by powerful centres.

H. 1. Lessons learned

During project evaluation, a number of key lessons were learned, which could help international organizations, such as UNDEF, which have an interest in funding such projects in Africa, particularly in Zimbabwe. The following cannot be overemphasized:

- During field visits, it was clear that the role of CRIs as bearers of local languages, identities, and cultures is crucial for the growth and recognition of CRIs. Branding can help improve their visibility. With little visible branding, community buy-in might not be as high as that which could be possible;
- Human rights education remains a pertinent area for intervention in Zimbabwe, and community radio is a critical tool for pursuing this noble cause. The Zimbabwean government takes advantage of limited rights knowledge among marginalized communities for political expedience;
- CRIs cannot survive in isolation and detached from broader national structure. It is critical that they foster memoranda of agreement with journalism training universities to sharpen their capacity and benefit from exchanges;
- Currently, there are no existing national platforms such as conferences and symposia, which provide annual or bi-annual spaces to amplify the voices of CRIs.

ANNEX 1: Detailed Summary of Methodology

Focus Group Discussions

Interviews with the selected 3 CRIs and their surrounding community stakeholders were conducted between 14 and 18 September 2020 through face-to-face community hall-style group discussions.



Figure 7: Ward 2 Councillor Mr Dzika (blue shirt) explain the importance of Nkabazwe FM to his constituency during FGDs

Group interviews were made up of trained community advocates, station coordinators, ward councillors, church leaders, traditional leaders, students from local universities, people with disabilities, women, youth and other direct and indirect beneficiaries of the project. On average, at least 20 people within each CRI catchment areas participated in these interviews. Questions were open-ended in nature so as to include relevant questions which may have arisen during the interviews. A focus group interview guide has been

attached at the end of this report.

Survey

While a formative online survey was deployed for a wider number of trained community radio advocates more than a month prior to the actual field mission to access indicative topics for further probing during face-to-face interviews, the response rate was extremely low, and for those who managed to complete the survey, the data did not show evidence of independent interviewer responses. All community advocates did not have access to the internet and laptops at their homes (they are mostly unemployed volunteers), hence the low response. Later, the plan was to have the survey questionnaires completed at CRI premises, but restrictions on movements due to COVID-19 hampered this exercise immensely. As a result, there was no significantly meaningful data obtained from this technique.

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

Key Informant Interviews with AIZ were conducted at AIZ's Harare office while those with CSOs were conducted through Skype, as most CSO alliance partners had not fully returned to work following the COVID-19 lockdown and restriction on movements.

CRI Station Observations

To get an appreciation of the capacity and state of preparedness of CRIs to successfully apply for licensing, as well as how effective AIZ and partners' trainings were, the evaluator toured 3 CRIs (Vemuganga, Wezhira and Nkabazwe) premises. Observations were conducted in the presence of Station Managers and other staff members.

Desk Review

The desk review included the following project documents:

- Project proposal (including approved budget, project indicators);

- Baseline report;
- Mid-term report;
- Milestone verification report;
- The implementation plans;
- Progress reports;
- M&E reports;
- Stories of significant change / human interest stories;
- Project financial reports;

Justification of selected study sites

The Vemuganga CRI was visited because it benefited from 4 laptops bought as part of capacity building for CRIs. Vemuganga serves a community that speaks a minority language (Ndau), which, despite being recognised by the constitution, is never used in mainstream media, including state media. It was also one of the four selected CRIs that participated in the regional exchange visit to Zambia. Wezhira FM was chosen because it serves as predominantly rural population that speaks one of the most marginalised ethnic languages (Karanga). Like Ndau, Karanga is one of the most marginalised languages in Zimbabwe and is not reflected in Zimbabwean media. Nkabazwe CRI was selected because it is one of the more well-established CRIs in the country and it had hosted local exchange visitors, presenting a successful model of CRIs in Zimbabwe. It also serves a predominantly rural population that straddles the predominantly Shona speaking and minority Ndebele population.

Ethical Considerations

Evaluation was undertaken following the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation¹. The evaluation respected freedom to participate. Participants voluntarily gave consent to participate in the evaluation without coercion and deception. Opportunities to ask questions about the nature and implications of their participation were given to participants. Participants had the right to withdraw from the research at any time of the interviews. The recording of names and other identifiers was avoided to guarantee confidentiality.

¹ See <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>.

ANNEX 2: Evaluation Questions

| <u>UNDEF criteria</u> | <u>Key Evaluation Questions</u> | <u>Related sub-questions</u> |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| Relevance | From project formulation, design and implementation, how relevant the project was to the needs of CRIs licensing in Zimbabwe, in the eyes of various stakeholders? | <p>Were the objectives of the project in line with the needs and priorities with the target beneficiaries?</p> <p>Was the project clearly within stakeholders' mandate and congruent with their strategic framework?</p> <p>Were the project activities/outputs adequate to making progress toward the project outcome?</p> <p>Were the challenges accurately identified? How appropriate were the strategies developed to deal with identified challenges?</p> |
| Effectiveness | To what extent was the project able to achieve its objectives and goals? | <p>To what extent have the project's objectives been reached?</p> <p>To what extent was the project implementation successful?</p> <p>What could have detracted the objectives from being achieved?</p> <p>Were the project activities adequate to make progress toward the project objectives?</p> <p>What has the project achieved?</p> |
| Efficiency | To what extent was there a reasonable relationship between available resources and project's results? | <p>Was there a reasonable relationship between project inputs and project outputs?</p> <p>Was the budget designed, and then implemented, in a way that enabled the project to meet its objectives?</p> <p>Were there any deviations of financial use from the original budget?</p> <p>Was the project finished in the projected timeline?</p> |
| Impact | To what extent was the project able to make an impact? How successful has the project been in achieving short-term goals and delivering a long-term influence impact on civic engagement and community involvement in civic processes? | <p>What short-term outcomes can be attributed to project?</p> <p>To what extent has the project brought about changes regarding one's understanding of community involvement in local civic processes?</p> <p>What is impact beyond the directly supported stakeholders?</p> <p>How information dissemination was organized/capacity built across nation?</p> <p>What changes, if any, have been made or proposed in the licensing of CRIs in Zimbabwe as a result of this project?</p> |
| Sustainability | To what extent has the project, as designed and implemented, created a likelihood of continuing pursuit of making a change in communities as part of civic education and civic engagement? | <p>To what extent has the project established processes and systems that are likely to support continued impact?</p> <p>To what extent has the project been able to create opportunities among various stakeholders to maintain interest in civic education and in civic engagement, as well as making a change, among major stakeholders, specifically among youth?</p> <p>To what extent are various participants willing and able to continue the project activities on their own?</p> <p>What might stand in the way of project participants that could prevent them from continuing their community and civic engagement?</p> |
| UNDEF value added | To what extent was the project able to take advantage of UNDEF unique position and of comparative advantage to achieve results that could not have been achieved had support come from other donors? | <p>Did project design and implementing modalities exploit UNDEF's comparative advantage in the form of an explicit mandate to focus on democratization issues?</p> <p>What was UNDEF able to accomplish through the project that it could not have accomplished as well had the project been supported by alternative donors or other stakeholders (Government, NGOs, etc.)?</p> |

ANNEX 3: Survey Instrument

Dear Recipient,

My name is Stanley Tsarwe and I was assigned by the United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF) as an Evaluator of a project titled: “*Advocating for Community Radio Licensing in Zimbabwe*”. This project was implemented by Amnesty International Zimbabwe (AIZ) in partnership with Zimbabwe Association of Community Radio Stations (ZACRAS) through UNDEF funding.

You participated in this project as one of the CSO alliance partners advocating for the licensing of community radios in Zimbabwe.

I kindly seek your objective evaluation of this project to help AIZ and UNDEF to improve project implementation in the future. I have attached a very brief survey questionnaire just to get preliminary indications of areas to focus on in my future interviews with you. In August (2020), I shall ask for a brief opportunity to conduct a short face to face discussion on this project.

I am aware that because of the lock down you may not be working in your offices. To avoid unnecessary expenses, you may only **underline your chosen answer on multiple choice questions given**. On questions requiring you to elaborate your answer, kindly **type your answer in the spaces provided in the answer questionnaire**.

Kindly return completed copies through this same email address which I also insert here again for your convenience: tsarwes@gmail.com

Should you have any problems you may also get in touch with me via my mobile number +263 774 564 637.

Thank you in advance.

Warm regards,

Stanley Tsarwe

Questionnaire for Community Radio Advocates:

Introduction: My name is Stanley Tsarwe and I am conducting an end of project evaluation on Amnesty International Zimbabwe’s (AIZ) project titled: “*Advocating for Community Radio Licensing in Zimbabwe*”. You participated in this project as one of the trained advocates who added their voices advocating for community radio stations in Zimbabwe. I kindly seek your objective evaluation of this project to help AIZ and its funders improve project implementation in the future.

Name of your Community Radio

Station:.....

Instruction: Select your answer by typing it, underlining or highlighting your choice (where multiple choices are given).

100. Since Amnesty International Zimbabwe's launch of the campaign "Advocating for Community Radio Licencing in Zimbabwe", have community members' interest in community radio stations changed? If yes, explain **how**:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

101. After being trained as a community radio advocate, what would you regard as your biggest achievement?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

102. How do you describe community members' willingness to support the call for the licencing of community radio stations in their communities

- 1. They are extremely supportive
- 2. They are less supportive
- 3. They are not supportive

103. What else do you think could have been done in the project "Advocating for Community Radio Licencing in Zimbabwe" to make it more successful?

.....
.....
.....
.....

104. What was the level of participation by ordinary community members in signing the petitions during the advocacy for registering community radio stations?

- 1. Low
- 2. Medium
- 3. High

105. How do you describe the current community support and involvement in the station's everyday operations (e.g. financially, providing news to the station, giving free material goods and services)?

- 1. High
- 2. Medium
- 3. Low
- 4. No support

106. Were the objectives of Amnesty International Zimbabwe's project in line with the needs and priorities of community radio stations in Zimbabwe?

- 1. Yes to a very large extent
- 2. Yes but to a smaller extend
- 3. Not at all

107. Were the advocacy activities conducted by Amnesty International Zimbabwe enough to make progress towards the needs of community radio stations in Zimbabwe?

- 1. They were adequate
- 2. They were partly adequate
- 3. They were not adequate

108. What do you think Amnesty International needs to do to improved prospects of licensing community radio stations in Zimbabwe (stated as many reasons as possible)?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

END OF SURVEY

ANNEX 4: Key Informant Interview Guide

A. RELEVANCE

Main Question:

1. From project formulation, design and implementation, how suitable would you consider the project to be appropriate to the needs of CRIs and their stakeholders?

Sub-Questions:

- i. Were the objectives of the project in line with the needs and priorities with the target beneficiaries?
- ii. Was the project clearly within stakeholders' mandate and congruent with their strategic framework?
- iii. Were the project activities/outputs adequate to make progress towards the project outcome?
- iv. Were risks appropriately identified by the projects? How appropriate are/were the strategies developed to deal with identified risks?

B. EFFECTIVENESS

Main Question:

2. To what extent was the project able to achieve objectives and goals or the likelihood that they will be achieved?

Sub-Questions:

- v. To what extent have the project's objectives been reached?
- vi. To what extent was the project implemented as envisaged by the project document?
- vii. What could have detracted the objectives from being achieved?
- viii. Were the project activities adequate to make progress towards the project objectives?
- ix. What has the project achieved?

C. EFFICIENCY

Main Question:

3. To what extent was there a reasonable relationship between resources expended and project impacts?

Sub-Questions:

- x. Was there a reasonable relationship between project inputs and project outputs?
- xi. Was the budget designed, and then implemented, in a way that enabled the project to meet its objectives?
- xii. Where there any deviations of financial use from the original budget?
- xiii. Was the project finished in the projected timelines?

D. IMPACT

Main Question:

4. Are there any changes already seen in the relatively short term or any potential catalytic effects that would influence the long-term impact of freedom of democracy, expression and gender inclusion in local processes?

Sub-Questions:

- xiv. Have the targeted CRIs and surrounding communities experienced tangible impacts? Which were positive; which were negative?
- xv. To what extent has the project caused changes regarding support from the community, positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen, on democratization?
- xvi. How many CRIs have already applied for licensing?

E. SUSTAINABILITY

Main Question:

5. To what extent has the project, as designed and implemented, created what is likely to be a continuing impetus towards licencing of CRIs, community support and government's attitude towards CRIs?

Sub-Questions:

- xvii. To what extent has the project established processes and systems that are likely to support continued impact?
- xviii. Are community members and CRIs are willing and able to continue the project activities on their own (where applicable)?
- xix. What might stand in the way for CRIs and community members from continuing the project?

F. UNDEF's VALUE

Main Question:

6. 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?

Sub-Questions:

- xx. 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.)?
- xxi. Did project design and implementing modalities exploit UNDEF's comparative advantage in the form of an explicit mandate to focus on democratization issues?

ANNEX 5: Focus Group Interview Guide

G. RELEVANCE

Main Question:

7. From project formulation, design and implementation, how suitable would you consider the project to be appropriate to the needs of CRIs and their stakeholders?

Sub-Questions:

- xxii. Were the objectives of the project in line with the needs and priorities with the target beneficiaries?
- xxiii. Was the project clearly within stakeholders' mandate and congruent with their strategic framework?
- xxiv. Were the project activities/outputs adequate to make progress towards the project outcome?
- xxv. Were risks appropriately identified by the projects? How appropriate are/were the strategies developed to deal with identified risks?

H. EFFECTIVENESS

Main Question:

8. To what extent was the project able to achieve objectives and goals or the likelihood that they will be achieved?

Sub-Questions:

- xxvi. To what extent have the project's objectives been reached?
- xxvii. To what extent was the project implemented as envisaged by the project document?
- xxviii. What could have detracted the objectives from being achieved?
- xxix. Were the project activities adequate to make progress towards the project objectives?
- xxx. What has the project achieved?

I. EFFICIENCY

Main Question:

9. To what extent was there a reasonable relationship between resources expended and project impacts?

Sub-Questions:

- xxxi. Was there a reasonable relationship between project inputs and project outputs?
- xxxii. Was the budget designed, and then implemented, in a way that enabled the project to meet its objectives?
- xxxiii. Where there any deviations of financial use from the original budget?
- xxxiv. Was the project finished in the projected timelines?

J. IMPACT

Main Question:

10. Are there any changes already seen in the relatively short term or any potential catalytic effects that would influence the long-term impact of freedom of democracy, expression and gender inclusion in local processes?

Sub-Questions:

- xxxv. Have the targeted CRIs and surrounding communities experienced tangible impacts? Which were positive; which were negative?
- xxxvi. To what extent has the project caused changes regarding support from the community, positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen, on democratization?
- xxxvii. How many CRIs have already applied for licensing?

K. SUSTAINABILITY

Main Question:

11. To what extent has the project, as designed and implemented, created what is likely to be a continuing impetus towards licencing of CRIs, community support and government's attitude towards CRIs?

Sub-Questions:

- xxxviii. To what extent has the project established processes and systems that are likely to support continued impact?
- xxxix. Are community members and CRIs are willing and able to continue the project activities on their own (where applicable)?
 - xl. What might stand in the way for CRIs and community members from continuing the project?

L. UNDEF's VALUE

Main Question:

12. 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?

Sub-Questions:

- xli. 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.)?
- xlii. Did project design and implementing modalities exploit UNDEF's comparative advantage in the form of an explicit mandate to focus on democratization issues?

ANNEX 6: List of Documents Reviewed

| | |
|----|--|
| 1 | CSO Alliance collaborative work |
| 2 | Community radio best practices |
| 3 | Regional analysis on community broadcasting |
| 4 | Community radios media engagement reports |
| 5 | Sample Memorandum of understanding with Theatre groups |
| 6 | Community Radio regulatory Statutory Instruments |
| 7 | CRI capacity assessment findings/report |
| 8 | Community preparedness assessment tool |
| 9 | CRIs capacity assessment tool. |
| 10 | Project launch report |
| 11 | Broadcasting Authority of Zimbabwe call for license application |
| 12 | Advocacy trainings total reach and location |
| 13 | Community radios advocacy training reports |
| 14 | Human Rights Education statistics on theatre performances |
| 15 | Sample HRE performance pictures |
| 16 | Project Launch attendance registers |
| 17 | Lobby meeting with Minister of Information |
| 18 | AIZ ZACRAS Proposed regulatory framework to the Ministry of information |
| 19 | Posters and brochures |
| 20 | Community Broadcasting Indaba Report |
| 21 | Community broadcasting Indaba Programme |
| 22 | Indaba UNESCO presentation role of CRIs in climate change education and disaster mitigation and recovery |
| 23 | Vernacular posters |
| 24 | Proposed community radio framework presentation- Community broadcasting Indaba |
| 25 | Indaba presentation- Radio and Internet |
| 26 | Local Exchange visit reports |
| 27 | Local exchange visits terms of reference |
| 28 | World Radio Day Commemorations reports and pictures |
| 29 | International Day of Universal Access to Information commemoration report and pictures |
| 30 | Roadshow reports samples |
| 31 | Media reform brief |
| 32 | ZACARS-AIZ Statements/Position paper on the licensing of 40 CRI statement by Ministry |
| 33 | AIZ-ZACRAS Statement/Position paper on the appointment of the Broadcasting Authority of Zimbabwe |
| 34 | Lobby meeting planning report |
| 35 | Community broadcasting conference program |
| 36 | Advocacy toolkit |
| 37 | Regional exchange visits reports and pictures |
| 38 | Stakeholder conference presentations |

| | |
|----|---|
| 39 | Broadcasting Indaba report |
| 40 | Capacity building of CRI Coordinators-reports, pictures and registers |
| 41 | Lobby Meeting with Minister |
| 42 | Media on licensing of community radios |
| 43 | Media engagements sample reports |
| 44 | Government regulatory framework statutory instrument |
| 45 | Position paper to the Ministry |
| 46 | MP influence to lobby for CRI (Video) |
| 47 | IDUAI commemoration report-Radio Chiedza |
| 48 | Legal framework |
| 49 | Banner stakeholders conference |
| 50 | Broadcasting Services Amendments |
| 51 | Regional analysis Advocacy toolkit |
| 52 | Legal framework |
| 53 | Regional exchange visit reports and pictures |
| 54 | Theatre performance Ntepe report |
| 55 | Parly invitation letter |
| 56 | Planning meeting for the lobby meeting with the Portfolio committee |
| 57 | Proposed Regulatory framework |
| 58 | Selection criteria for the CRIs |
| 59 | Summary comparison of AIPPA and the gazetted bill |
| 60 | Email and letter to UNDEF on changes in Amnesty |
| 61 | English poster |
| 62 | Vernacular posters |
| 63 | World Press Freedom Day commemoration |
| 64 | Evaluation feedback form during stakeholders' engagements |
| 65 | HRE report |
| 66 | Advocacy Training-Radio Dialogue |
| 67 | World Radio Day 2018 banner |
| 68 | World Radio Day Statement |
| 69 | Zambia exchange visit |
| 70 | Roadshow-Manicaland |
| 71 | An Analysis of the draft broadcasting bill |
| 72 | All Stakeholders and advocacy program |
| 73 | Disbursement dates |
| 74 | Petition samples from community radios |
| 75 | Community broadcasting all stakeholders |
| 76 | Public meeting report |
| 77 | Testimonies from community members in support for community radio licensing |
| 78 | Podcasts distinguishing community radio from other forms of broadcasting |
| 79 | Discussion Guide on community radios |

| | |
|----|---|
| 80 | Sent Bulk sms |
| 81 | Community radios social media engagements |
| 82 | Project folders sample |
| 83 | T-shirts produced samples |
| 84 | Branded water samples |
| 85 | Banners produced sample |
| 86 | Community radios public engagement meetings reports |
| 87 | Project media coverage links and pictures |
| 88 | Podcasts script |

ANNEX 7: List of KIIs and Focus Group Interviews Conducted

| Key Informant Interviews | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Jessica Pwiti | AIZ | director@amnesty.org.zw |
| Tinashe Mujuru | AIZ | tmujuru@amnesty.org.zw 0778057645 |
| Vivienne Marara | ZACRS | Viviennem@zacraszim.org 0772982134 |
| Mlondolozzi Ndlovu | Young Journalists Association - YOJA (CSO alliance) | politician717@gmail.com 0778351296 |
| Claris Madhuku | Station Coordinator Vemuganga Community radio (Chipinge) | clarismadhuku78@gmail.com 0773010331 |
| Notal Dzika | Ward Concillor: Nkabazwe FM: Gweru | 0773067073 |
| Tobias Saratiel | Station Coordinator Nkabazwe Community radio (Gweru) | saratieltobias1996@gmail.com 0773067073 |
| Wishes Hama | Ward Concillor: Vemuganga FM: Chipinge | 0775879947 |
| Energy Bara | Station Coordinator Wezhira Community radio (Masvingo) | 0775252568 |
| Spiwe Dziva | Ward Councillor: Vemuganga FM, Masvingo | 0775252568 |
| Focus Group Discussions Per CRI | | |
| Station | Total Number of Attendees | Date |
| Nkabazwe FM | 20 | 18 September 2020 |
| Wezhira FM | 20 | 15 September 2020 |
| Wemuganga FM | 25 | 14 September 2020 |

ANNEX 8: Comprehensive Logical Framework

| Outcome 1: Strong advocacy and citizen petitions for community radio licensing by civil society stakeholder alliance implemented | | |
|--|---|---|
| Outputs | Activities | Indicators and Results |
| Output 1.1: Baseline Survey of target communities and Capacity Assessment of 10 CRIs (Q1) | 1.1.1: Conduct baseline survey to understanding community preparedness. 1.1.2: To have 10 meetings with community radios to assess their capacity. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment in ten provinces reached 397 out of a targeted 450 community members. 10 questionnaire-based focus group discussions conducted. |
| Output 1.2 Project launch and stakeholder mobilization workshop (Q1) | 1.2.1: Launch workshop to gather input from stakeholders & use Information to strengthen deliverables of the project 1.2.2: Launch of the community radio alliance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Launch attracted 161 participants from CRIs, print media, civil society, commercial broadcasters, community members, academia, Human Rights Commission, Japanese Embassy among others. Presenters drawn from ZACRAS, AIZ, a media law expert, CRIs, journalists, MAAZ & Radio VOP. |
| Output 1.3: Community and citizen awareness raising materials on community radio and access to information/freedom of expression (Q1-8) | 1.3.1: Internally produce 5-minute audio piece/podcast distinguishing community radio from other forms of broadcasting for awareness disseminated to all 10 target areas. 1.3.2: Produce one training manual (and print 10 copies – one for each target CRI) for training community based Advocates 1.3.3: Produce 500 copies of one discussion guide on CRIs for Advocates training (1.4) and public meeting (1.6) 1.3.4: Produce 500 project folders for trainings sessions with Advocates 1.3.5: Promotional materials (12,000 pamphlets, 5000 posters, 1000 T shirts) for awareness and grassroots advocacy CRIs licensing 1.3.6: Bulk SMS (240,000 SMS credit units) for communicating issues on CRIs and urging citizen participation. 1.3.8: 8 Media statement releases co-signed by CSO Alliance (one every quarter) 1.3.9: Produce CRIs Best practice guides - 100 copies (Output 3.2). 1.3.10: 350 T-Shirts (for CRI reps) and 3500 bottles of branded water for World Commemorative Day events (10 by CRIs and one national by AIZ and ZACRAS) – (Output 2.7). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Five-minute podcast produced in various local languages spoken in areas hosting the 10 CRI. NB. This was not budgeted for, but AIZ & ZACRAS still managed to produce them (1.3.1) 1st milestone: 15000 brochures, 2650 posters, 91 t-shirts for community radio advocates, 500 branded water, 380 t-shirts for distribution at events, 500 folders and 500 brochures 2nd milestone: T-shirts (400) and branded water (400) produced distributed on various activity gatherings (Road shows, public meetings, advocacy meetings). 2 banners produced, 72 branded soccer jerseys produced 3rd milestone: T-shirts (203) and branded water (400) produced and utilized during the International Day for Universal Access to information in October 2019 and Community radio Indaba in December 2019.(1.3.3 – 1.3.5, 1.3.10) 500 copies of one discussion guide produced and used during community advocates training for the 10CRIs.(1.3.3) Bulk SMS units bought & distributed among the 10 CRIs. These were used to send out invitations to public meetings, roadshows and even for community awareness on the importance of CRs and the need for community members to push for their licensing (1.3.6) Media statement releases co-signed by CSO Alliance (one every quarter) were released (1.3.8) |
| Output 1.4: 10 trainings (one full day each) of 500 community based radio Advocates (50 in each province, total 500) (Q2, Q3) - M2 (completion of 10th training) | 1.4.1: CRIs to identify and coordinate 500 community advocates 1.4.1: AIZ and ZACRAS will arrange and deliver Advocacy training in each of the 10 provinces with 50 participants attending at each training. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 full day Advocate training workshops in each of the 10 provinces were held. These were attended by 452 people, with 237 being female and 215 being Male |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Output 1.5: 10 Roadshows (1 per target community) for 6,000 people to build community & citizen awareness and buy-in for CRIs licensing (Q4 and Q6) | 1.5.1: CRIs to conduct 10 road shows, each to be attended by approximately 600-1000 people from target community – total expected minimum reach – 6,000 1.5.3.: Roadshows to educate & highlight the importance of CRIs in local development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implemented in all districts/provinces covered by project • Shows were also accompanied by theatre. • Reached out to 560 people on average per road show |
| Output 1.6: 20 public meetings (2 in each province) with at least 300 citizens each (Q3-6) | 1.6.3: Meeting content to include, 1) What is CRIs? 2) What are the benefits and why communities need CRIs? 3) What needs to be done for the licensing of CRIs, 4) What citizens and communities can do to support CRIs and licensing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 Public meeting carried out by CRIs in community • Engaged local leaders on the need to have CRIs licensed (See annex 83 and 83a sample reports of the public meetings) |
| Output 1.7: 20 community theatre performances (two in each province) for at least 3,000 participants (Q2-5) | 1.7.1: Engage & sign performance contracts with 5 theatre 1.7.2: 5 theatre groups to prepare scripts & plays for performance as per contracts. 1.7.4: Theatre performance to be half-day events attended by 150-200 people each | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project partnered with local theatre organisations to produce plays depicting human rights perspective of community radio and the importance of having the existing initiatives licensed. • 7 MOU's signed between AI Zimbabwe and 7 theatre organisations who performed 39 public plays. • Theatre focused on access to information and other freedoms related to CRIs licensing. |
| Output 1.8: 10 community petition drives to obtain 10,000 citizen petitions and commitments (Q5, Q6) | 1.8.1: Use outputs 1.4-1.6 to mobilize petitions plus Advocates individual mobilization to reach our target of 10,000. 1.8.2: Petitions to coincide with Output 2.6 (all stakeholders' conference) to maximize pressure on duty bearers to reform policy & regulations & license CRIs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petitions utilized road shows, public meetings & theatre performance gatherings to collect signatures (See annex 81,81b 81c 81d, 81e, 81f 81g, 81h, 81i 81j 81k and 81l) • Collected 7200 signatures in the 10 provinces before the abandonment of strategy following formal and informal discussions with members of Parliament who advised that petitions may not be appropriate as they create an impression that government was not willing to engage. |

Outcome 2: Policy and Regulatory Reform towards licensing of community radio institutions achieved

| Outputs | Activities | Indicators and Results |
|---|---|--|
| Output 2.1: One legal and media audit/analysis of the existing community broadcasting legal framework and CRIs licensing including a regional comparative analysis (Q1) | 2.1.2: Identify, select & engage an appropriate legal & media experts. 2.1.3: Legal and media consultants to undertake legal audit/analysis as in TORs 2.1.4: Use the legal and media audit/analysis to prepare project advocacy tools & strategy. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A media regional analysis was carried to compare Zimbabwe community media terrain and that of its neighbours. It showed Zimbabwe is lagging behind in community broadcasting. • These reports were also submitted to the ministry during the lobby meetings and were also presented during the media stakeholders' conference. (See annex 50a) • Findings of this analysis were used to lobby and advocate for CRIs licensing (See annex 1b). See also presentation during stakeholder analysis (Annex 55) |
| Output 2.2: A CSO Alliance (of at least 15 CSOs) for CRI licensing established & functioning (Q1 and Q6 events plus ongoing activities) | 2.2.1: Establish CSO Alliance comprising of the following CSO organizations; AIZ, ZACRAS, MISA – Zimbabwe, VMCZ, Media Monitors, Media Center, Gender Media Connect, ZNFF, Magamba Trust, ZUJ, ZimRights, Women's Coalition, Zimbabwe Human Rights NGO Forum, Zimbabwe Lawyers for Human Rights, and Youth Agenda Trust2 2.2.2: Facilitate & coordinate drafting, signing and delivery of CSO stakeholders' petitions to policy and regulatory bodies. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petitions were originated and signed. • Ccoordinated for signatures from the CSO alliance before submission to Ministry of Information. (See annex 81a,81b, 81c,81d, 81e 81f and 81g) • Petition only reached the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee which then later advised to engage the Ministry and abandon the use of petition since the new government had shown willingness to engage |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | 2.2.4: CSO alliance petition delivered to responsible ministry, BAZ, ZMC, and parliamentary portfolio committee on Media, Information and Broadcasting Services. | |
| Output 2.3 One Advocacy Workshop for 44 stakeholder participants (Q3) | 2.3.1: Organize workshop & invite target participants. Workshop to be timed to coincide with Parliament in session to reduce logistical costs for parliamentarians. 2.3.3: The lobby workshop to address the state of CRIs, policy and regulatory challenges, and present CSO proposals for community broadcasting and licensing. 2.3.4: Present to participants: 1) Legal and media analysis, 3 CSO position papers, CRI best practice documents, and CSO Alliance petition; 2.3.5: Workshop to gather input from MPs and other government representatives. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy workshop and all stakeholder's conference were combined. 98% of members of the portfolio committee from both ZANU PF & MDC were available. • Workshop & conference presented CSO proposals on regulatory and licensing framework for community broadcasting. • CSO's presented their reports on experiences during the local and regional exchange visits • Input from MPs was gathered which made recommendations for future actions. • MPs highlighted that the use of petition was confrontational and had a risk to disturb promising engagement relations between government, AIZ and its partners. They recommended shelving the use petitions. |
| Output 2.4: Two targeted lobbying & advocacy meetings with at least 3 MPs and 3 government representatives (total 6) from responsible Ministry, BAZ & ZMC (Q4 and Q7) | 2.4.1: Organize 2 (at least one hour) meetings (in Q4 and Q7). 2.4.3: Relevant information tools shared at these meetings as further lobby materials for policy change. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had two meetings with MPs • Shared proposed regulatory framework on community, findings of research and regional analysis on community broadcasting and best practices by other regional governments regarding community broadcasting regulation. |
| Output 2.5: Three position papers on community broadcasting and licensing of CRIs (Q3-5) | 2.5.1: Develop papers based on existing and new knowledge from baseline surveys, legal analysis outputs and project activities. 2.5.2: Position paper to be disseminated to policy makers, CRIs, CSO stakeholders. 2.5.3: 5000 posters with summary of position paper content distributed through national newspaper inserts as follows (Herald 2000 posters, Manica post 1000 posters, Chronicle 1000 posters, & Mirror 1000 posters). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three position papers presented proposing amendments of the broadcasting services Act, Enactment of community radio regulations, radius for CRs and the appointment of the Broadcasting Authority of Zimbabwe. • All three position papers were produced and released to various media houses as well as the Ministry of Information. • 1000 produced and translated into local languages and distributed through CRIs. |
| Output 2.6: One and half day all stakeholder conference conducted & attended by 80 participants (Q6) - M3 | 2.6.2: Conference approach will be separate thematic sessions culminating into the plenary and way forward. 2.6.3: Thematic areas will include licensing and regulation, CRI sustainability, CRI Governance, and CRI Capacity. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference held at Jameson Hotel in June 2019 and 14 members of the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee on Information, Publicity and Broadcasting Services were present. • The activity targeted to have 80 participants but ended up having 93 (annex 82) |
| Output 2.7: National campaigns for community broadcasting and CRIs licensing focusing on UN Freedom of Information and Expression Commemorative Days (Seven national campaigns by AIZ/ZACRAS, 20 | 2.7.1: 10 CRIs to generate commemorative ideas for World Radio Day – 13 February each year (total – 20 CRI commemorative events at US\$300 each) that involve local stakeholders including local government, traditional leaders, faith based representatives, and community members 2.7.3: Conduct 7 commemorative events in Harare involving government representatives; media based CSOs, international | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commemorative days used as key moments to upscale the campaign for community broadcasting in Zimbabwe.. • Commemorations were very well supported by government officials and they indicated that CRIs licensing was on their agenda. • 405 t-shirts were allocated and 800 units of branded water these were given to participants during commemorative days. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Community Campaigns by CRIs) (Q2, 3, 4, 5, 7) | NGOs, UN organizations, Human rights CSOs, and the media (total 7 commemorative events at US\$1,500 each). 2.7.5: Produce commemorative day promotional materials (350 T-shirts, and 3,500 Branded mineral water). | |
| Outcome 3: Capacity and relevance of the 10 target community radio institutions (CRIs) enhanced in order to apply for licensing | | |
| Outputs | Activities | Indicators and Results |
| Output 3.1: One Capacity Assessment Study of 10 targeted CRIs (Q1) – integrated with Baseline survey – combined with Output 1.1 | 3.1.1: Use internal expertise for the assessments of all 10 target CRIs by visiting each CRIs and interacting with 12 local CRIs representatives for each of the 10 target CRIs. | • |
| Output 3.2 Production of One CRI Best Practice Guide – 100 copies (Q1-8) | 3.2.1: Conduct desk research & gather relevant information for input into the CRIs best practices document. 3.2.2: Design, develop & produce 100 copies of best practices documents. 3.2.3: Distribute CRIs best practices document to 10 target CRIs and Advocates, policy officials and CSO Alliance partners. 3.2.4: Monitor use of CRI best practices in the target areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carried out a capacity assessment in the early stages of the initiative which sought to establish the capacities of CRI's. • A CRI guide was produced to guide programming a very simplified version which was used by CRIs to produce quality programs |
| Output 3.3: Conduct a two-day CRIs capacity development workshop for 20 people from 10 target CRIs (Q4) | 3.3.1: Organize one CR capacity development workshop for 10 target CRIs. 3.3.3: Workshop agenda to include community broadcasting skills, content development and management, governance and organizational development (including equipment requirements), licensing standards, advocacy and sustainability. 3.3.4: CRIs personnel will learn and cross-exchange knowledge, experience and CRIs management and operational skills. 3.3.5: AIZ and ZACRAS to internally develop a CRI capacity development training manual. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 members with 2 drawn from each CRI underwent a 2-day capacity building training workshop. • Workshop touched on leadership, programming, monitoring and evaluation and sustainability among others. • There was also an evaluation to measure level of understanding during and after the workshop. (Annex 40a and 40b). • The Community radio advocacy tool kit developed during the first milestone was launched on the second day of the training with each CRI getting a copy. An evaluation report was also produced. |
| Output 3.4: CRI national exchange visits (by 5 CRIs) and one regional visit (by 4 CRIs) (Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6) | 3.4.1: identify 5 suitable CRIs exchanges locally and 2 regional exchange visits to Zambia & South Africa. 3.4.2: Engage identified CRIs either locally or in the region and facilitate the exchanges through agreements. 3.4.3: Local exchanges – each selected CRIs will be able to send the Radio Station Manager and the Content Production Coordinator – 2 full days exchange interaction. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local exchange visits done with 10 CRI representatives. (2 CRIs hosted 10 CRIs visits) (22-23 October 2019) • 4 reps from two CRIs from two regions (Ntepe from Gwanda, and Vemuganga from Chipinge) went for regional exchange visits in Zambia and Kenya respectively. • Zambia visit happened between the 15th-18th of May 2019 and the Kenya visit was 23rd-25th April 2019. <p>Annex 37 Local Exchange Visit Report</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>3.4.4: Regional exchanges – each of the 4 selected CRIs will be able to send the Radio Station Manager – total 4 representatives (2 to South Africa and 2 to Zambia) – 2 full days exchange interaction.</p> <p>3.4.5: One ZACRAS representative will accompany the Zambia exchange visit and one AIZ representative will accompany the South Africa Exchange</p> | <p>Annex 75 Zambia Exchange Visit</p> |
| <p>Output 3.5: CRI technical development support provided to four CRIs (Q1-8)</p> | <p>3.5.1: Source basic CRI broadcasting equipment [1) laptop or desktop, 2) 2 or 3 voice recorders, and 3) editing software] for at least four mentioned CRI]</p> <p>3.5.3: ZACRAS will offer technical assistance in use of acquired broadcasting equipment.</p> <p>3.5.4: ZACRAS will provide on-going technical and operational support to maintain standards among CRIs, providing legal support linkages, assisting with CRIs research needs, on- going capacity enhancements, security risks assessments and support, and assisting to develop sustainability strategies.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic broadcasting equipment was bought for 4 CRI. Beneficiary CRIs 3 rural and 1 urban (VeMuganga CRI from Manicaland, Hwange Fm from Hwange, Madziwa Fm from Bindura and Radio Dialogue from Bulawayo). • ZACRAS offered technical support on how to use the laptops • This is the mandate of ZACRAS and they have been continuously formerly and informally building the capacity of CRIs. Some of the capacity building elements like sustainability, research have been covered in the some of the project trainings over the past year |

End of Report

