

**AN IMPACT EVALUATION OF A MICRO COMMUNITY - BASED PROJECT:
A CASE STUDY OF NYABUSHOZI COUNTY, MBARARA DISTRICT.**

Impact Evaluation

This is a process to find out the effectiveness, impact, sustainability and relevance of a project in context of the stated objectives over a stated period. It asks the questions, "whether the objectives were realistic and did the program meet the needs of the people, and its impact on specific people or households?".

Impact Evaluation can be carried out at:

- * the end of the initial field-testing phase,
- * at yearly intervals or during the extended test phase,
- * and/or at the request of the donors (midterms review).

The long term worthiness of any project is however not evident for several years afterwards. The impact continues to evolve overtime. Sometimes more impact evaluation may be necessary overtime. Since the project would have ended, additional non-project resources have to be secured for successful evaluation. The main objective is to find out whether incomes and standard of living of the people in the affected project area have improved without damaging the conditions of the life for the host communities.

Indicators of the evaluation can also be used as management tool for improving project performance.

Who undertakes the impact evaluation?

Impact evaluation can be undertaken by program staff, outside consultants, donor agents and beneficiaries. External evaluators can take a fresh look at the program since they are not closely involved with its success or failure, and therefore be more objective in their assessment. However, external evaluators may misinterpret information they collect from program staff, users or direct beneficiaries especially if local staffs (implementors) find external person threatening. It will be more effective when a team comprising external agents, program staff and users carry out the evaluation.

How is it done?

The major steps involved in impact evaluation are:

- a. Planning for the evaluation, which includes:
 - Review the objectives (project long term and immediate objectives) and activities,
 - Review the reasons for the evaluation,
 - Develop evaluation questionnaires to be generated around the objectives and activities,
 - Decide when the evaluation results will be ready;
 - Identify the information source
- b. How the evaluation will be done and by whom?;
 - Decide who will do the evaluation, for who the evaluation results will be useful;
 - Identify the direct and indirect indicators.
- c. Actual carrying out the evaluation:
- d. Analyzing the information and presenting the evaluation to the relevant people.

PROFILE OF THE PROJECT IN NYABUSHOZI COUNTY, MBARARA DISTRICT.

Background to the Project

Private Voluntary Organizations-Non-Government Organizations in Natural Resource Management (PVO-NGO/NRMS) Project is managed by a consortium of three US Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs) including World Learning Inc., CARE and World Wildlife Fund (WWF). The project has worked primarily in Sub-Sahara Africa with NGO consortia since 1989, through core funding provided from U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Cameroon, Madagascar, Mali and Uganda were the focal countries.

In Uganda, World Learning/Support for Natural Resource Management (WL/SUNREM) Project started October 1989 to August 1995. The primary objective of the Project was to strengthen the technical and institutional capabilities of NGOs and CBOs to enable them undertake feasible and appropriate natural resources

management (NRM) activities to benefit local resources users.

To achieve the objectives, WL/SUNREM project specifically supported training, technical assistance, information dissemination, and associated field level activities. Among the beneficiaries from USAID Mission funding were the communities of Nyabushozi. Through a local NGO- Nyabushozi Development Agency, WL/SUNREM assisted the communities to get the much needed water for livestock on cost effective and sustainable basis.

Location of the project:

Nyabushozi is a county located in Mbarara district, south western part of Uganda (**Appendix: Map of Uganda, Mbarara district and location of project areas**). The estimated population of the district is .930 million people(1990) with annual growth rate of 4.1% and is an area of 10,154 sq. km.

Nyabushozi predominantly pastoral area, sparsely populated with about 76,200 people consists of rolling hills supported by woodland intercepted by long valleys. Wildlife roams over the vast savanna area, alongside the Bahima pastoralists who utilize the grassland as grazing ground. There is serious deterioration of rangeland in the area. Soil erosion is rampant and grass cover has become thinner on many ranches. The pressure on the grazing pastures and vegetation has led to disappearance of nutritious pasture species giving room to emergence of poor and less nutritious species. Pasture legumes are nonexistent. There is insufficient grassland for grazing and seasonal watering points for their animals especially in severe drought.

Over 10 valley tanks and 12 dams in the study area were constructed by the government in the 1940-60's. All the valley tanks were unreliable and heavily silted, and out of the 12 dams, only seven had reliable supplies of water. The rest are seasonal. Most farmers have individual farm ponds typically excavated by hand. They are also unreliable because of their shallow depth and inadequate capacity to meet the demand on the farms especially in scarcity of water.

During the dry season, the pastoralists(Bahima) trek long distances in search of pasture and water to Lake Mburo National Park and other areas like Rukai and Masaka. The Park with its

associated wetland lie in the midst of the savannah, and the area around the lake is rich in wildlife. This has led to conflicts between the pastoralists and the park authorities and/or the "Bairu"- the agriculturists' enroute. Most cattle's tracks have developed into ruts that become rills during rain season. This has resulted in soil erosion posing an immediate sedimentation threat to water bodies in the area, and in the long run land productivity is diminished due to loss of top soil and fertility.

Purpose of the project

The primary goal of the project was to promote sustainable natural resource use (water) among the pastoral communities in Nyabushozi aimed at reducing environmental degradation. The short term objective was to provide the nomadic people with the much needed water for the livestock and people. Provision of water to the nomadic people would reduce their transhumant life style i.e seasonal migration to Lake Mburo National Park in search for water and grass for their animals.

The long term objective would therefore be to reduce environmental degradation in the area, especially encroachment on the nearby Lake Mburo National Park and conflicts with Park authorities. The provision of water would enable the nomadic pastoralists settle down to sedentary life.

Project Community participation

USAID Mission - Uganda funding World Learning/Support to Natural Resource Management (WL/SUNREM) Project in 1993 was characterized by committing 50% of the funds to desilting and construction of water facilities in Nyabushozi. The Mission further required the use of participatory methods into the decision making processes to enable sustenance of the water facilities.

The emphasis was therefore, on demand driven approach with full community participation in the management of the project including part contribution towards the cost of implementation and full responsibility for maintenance.

In 1992, the project organized a three day Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) workshop for 60 participants from Nyabushozi county representing seven sub-counties. The objective of the

seminar was to orient the communities of Nyabushozi on the nature and rationale of the PRA methodology to appreciate its full potential in mobilizing the community and strengthening local institutions. **(PRA is a new approach to rural and sustainable development. It emphasizes popular participation in project planning. It incorporates initiatives that local communities can manage and control themselves).**

The identification and selection of the sub-counties was demand driven and considered proximity to Lake Mburu National Park. The communities in all the selected sub-counties had identified water as their priority projects and pinpointed possible dam and/or valley tank locations. Management committees for the projects were also formed.

The period for project execution was one year (November 1993 to November 1994). The earth works were completed five months later. This was due to under estimation of the earth works by the Contractor, and failure of communities to provide unskilled labor. Workers had to be ferried from Mbarara, and Lyantonde. The effect was devastating because they had to work during heavy rains and missed trapping water for that particular season.

Organizations involved and their responsibilities

USAID Mission Kampala funded SUNREM project and was involved in the impact evaluation.

WL/SUNREM) project provided the funds for the projects and played a key role in coordinating, monitoring and implementation of the projects. They were also involved in the evaluation of the project.

HIPPO Technical service LTD. was contracted to rehabilitate and construct the three dams.

Nyabushozi Development Agency (NYDA) - a local NGO in Nyabushozi mobilized the community, and facilitated the collection of community contribution. They played a catalyst in ensuring that part of the money allocated to SUNREM project was for dam rehabilitation/construction in Nyabushozi.

Local Councils, NYDA officials and Water Management committees

were involved in the preliminary field survey and identification of the sites, and mobilized the communities for the meetings and resources.

The Consultant, a Water Engineer from Water Development Directorate main thrust was identification and selection of feasible sites with the communities participation, hydrological evaluation of the sites for reliability runoff, final selection of sites, survey and design of the dams, and watering systems. He was also involved in the supervision of the construction works ensuring timely implementation and following specification.

South Western Integrated Water Project trained communities in the management and maintenance of the watering facilities, water pumps and borehole. They provided maintenance tool kits, and a bicycle to each of the participants.

Once completed, the facilities were owned and managed by the users(communities). At sub-county levels elected water committees were responsible for monitoring and regulation of the facilities, organization and support to user groups and putting in place bye-laws for sustainable management of the facilities.

Projected Costs

Two dams located at Twenyambi and Naama in Keshunga and Kinoni sub-counties were rehabilitated at a cost of US \$ 47,000 and US \$ 25,000 respectively. The third dam at Kyamirabyo, Kikatsi sub-county cost US\$ 55,000. The community contribution which was supposed to be 10% of total cost of each dam in cash was not fulfilled. Their fulfillments were as follows: Naama Dam 2%; Twenyambi 5%; and Kyamirabyo 8%. Each community opened a bank account specifically for the project (dams construction).

Additional funds were raised for the Kikatsi community for motorized pump(US\$ 4000); borehole(US\$ 5600); and training of members of the community in the management and maintenance of the dam, pump and borehole(US\$30,000). During training the participants were given maintenance tool kits for both the borehole and pump. Additional funds were US \$ 39.600. The total cost of the three dams, motorized pump and training were US\$166,000

IMPACT EVALUATION

The purpose of the impact evaluation was to assess the effectiveness and sustainability of the project (dam construction/rehabilitation) in terms of the stated short term objectives and effectiveness of the community in the utilization and management of the water facilities. The long time objective would be evident several years afterwards.

The Logical Framework Approach was used. It structures the main elements in a project, highlighting logical linkages between objectives, intended inputs, planned activities and expected results. It shows both vertical and horizontal logic. The Vertical Logic has four levels in the Framework: The goal - as reason for undertaking the project; Objective/Purpose - a break down of expected achievements; Outputs - specific results the project aimed at producing; Inputs - activities and resources available to produce outputs. Vertical Logical is based on causality in a means-and -end relationship.

IF inputs are provided, THEN activities will take place; IF activities take place then outputs will be produced; IF outputs are produced then immediate objectives will be achieved. In the long run, this will attribute to the fulfillment of the goal.

On the other hand, horizontal logic measures resources and results through identification of objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification.

The uncertainties of the process are explained by external factors (assumptions) at each level. They are outside the direct control of the project. (Attached is Logical Framework showing project expectations)

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK SHOWING PROJECT EXPECTATIONS

Narrative Summary	Objective Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Project Goals: To promote sustainable natural resource use (Water) among the pastoral communities in Nyabushozi</p>	<p>Number of dams desilted, constructed and managed by the communities</p>	<p>Interviews Reports</p>	<p>The attitude of people would be supportive and favorable to change</p>
<p>Project Purpose: -To reduce environmental degradation and encroachment on Lake Mburu National Park. -To create awareness among the people in Nyabushozi of the potential of PRA methods in mobilizing communities and strengthening institutions. -To provide water for livestock on cost effective and sustainable basis.</p>	<p>Decrease in movement of pastoralists and their animals. Training in PRA in methodologies Availability of permanent water for livestock in Nyabushozi</p>	<p>Interview with questionnaires. Reports Observations. Reports of training and their evaluation</p>	<p>The settled communities get constant supply of water. The settled communities are adequately mobilized and trained in management of the water facilities</p>

<p><u>Project Outputs</u> -Training in PRA methods, management and technical skills in water resource use. -Pilot project to serve as demonstrations and model in the use of participatory methodologies</p>	<p>Number of permanent water facilities. Number of people trained in technical and management know how. Initiated community project as a result of spin offs knowledge of PRA training that foster sustainable rural development initiatives with minimal external intervention.</p>	<p>On site visits Quarterly reports Photographs Oral Interviews List of participants completed training in each seminar.</p>	<p>Fund adequate. Reliable water catchment area and run off. Participatory approaches will allow for judicious use of expertise technical know-how. Social, cultural, economic and political environment conducive to participatory approaches.</p>
<p><u>Project Inputs</u> -Funds -PRA -Organizational structures like water committees -Consultants and Experts -Communication</p>	<p>US \$ 166,000 Project Coordinator Water Engineer Water Management Committees</p>	<p>Budget Statement Personal Observation</p>	<p>Donors would provide the funds PRA techniques will enchant activities and the communities would contribute and manage water resources.</p>

FINDINGS IN TERMS OF:

Set Objectives:

The primary objective of the project in the short run was to assist the nomadic people get the much needed water for their livestock, which would in turn reduce their seasonal migration to Lake Mbuoro National Park and ultimately reduce environmental degradation and conflicts with park authorities. The provision of water would resettle the nomadic pastoralists from transhumant to sedentary life.

Although the PRA seminar was not full fledged involving in-class, field data collection, analysis that culminates in the development of an action of plan, the participants put to use some participatory tools, within and outside the projects.

Two months after the seminar, 200 representatives from seven sub-counties met and using some PRA tools (simple ranking), identified and selected three sub-counties on pilot basis for the dam construction/rehabilitation and formed water management committees. Sub-counties selected were at Kikatsi, Keshunga and Sanga. After consultations, Sanga however, changed to schools and Kinoni sub-county was selected in its place.

Two dams at Naama, Kinoni, and Twenyambi at Keshunga were rehabilitated and Kyamirabyo at Kikatsi constructed.

Each of the three dams was fenced, provided with watering troughs outside the fence to reduce silting of the reservoir, and installed with semi-rotary pumps. Water committees were formed for each dam. The dam at Kikatsi was provided with gravity water flow mechanism and a bore-hole to draw water for domestic use.

The communities from Kikatsi and Twenyambi were trained in the management, repair and maintenance of bore holes and water facilities including the pump. They were also provided with tool kits and bicycles for easy mobility.

At a glance, the short term objective of providing water to the community and their livestock was achieved within one year and half (11/2 years) of the project implementation.

BENEFITS/SPIN OFFS TO TARGETED COMMUNITY

USAID Mission gave interim bridge funds to SUNREM project in April 1993, on condition that 50% is used for dam construction in Nyabushozi. USAID Mission expected WL/SUNREM project to use participatory methods to enable community participation in the decision making processes of planning and management of the water facilities. This would ensure proper management and sustainability of the water facilities.

At a glance, the short term objective of providing water to the community and their livestock at the three sites Kikatsi, Twenyambi and Naama was achieved within the one year and half (1 1/2 years) of the project implementation.

The community used some participatory tools to identify and select all the three sub-counties, location of specific sites, mobilize resources, formation of water committees. The process was demand driven.

At Naama, the desilting of the dam was done through Nyabushozi Development Agency without community involvement in the planning. After the PRA seminar, however, the community members were mobilized and planted live fences, and provided unskilled labor during the installation of semi-rotary pumps. The latter were used for watering animals outside the perimeter fencing.

The dam at Kyamirabyo, Kikatsi sub-county was new. The community were involved and participated planning processes. For this site, a gravity water flow mechanism was installed and a borehole provided to draw water for domestic purposes in addition to semi-rotary pumps.

Through consultations, the Kikatsi community resolved to solicit funds for a motorized pump. The SUNREM project therefore, provided a motorized diesel pump (US \$ 4000), and trained pump local pump mechanics. The community contributed 14% in cash towards the cost of the pump, and mobilized resources to maintain it. A management committee was also been put in place.

Kikatsi was a successful story in terms of use and management of the water facilities, subsequent community activities and, in reducing their transhumant life. "Prior to availability of water

through dams construction, all community activities would come to a stand still during dry seasons. Every body including children moved in search of water and pastures for the animals. Bringing water nearer to homes meant that the once transhumant people could settle down and even build permanent houses", as one respondent reported; among many other spin offs.

Based on the above, one would then expect communities to actively take part in management of water projects but it was not so. Discussions with participants attributed this to several factors including:

- a. Lack of transparency, accountability and trust by those involved in community projects. Reasons given for this included leaders personalizing projects and decisions influenced by the rich or politicians who did not care or fulfill their commitments to the community welfare. As a result much of the work is not carried out because the politicians divide the masses making mobilization hard. There was lack of ownership and confidence amongst communities to carry out developmental projects. The scenario is common in resettlement programs. Those entrusted with implementing projects which help target group' reintegrate have "hidden agenda" varying from dishonesty, self-gains, political- name them. In the end they lose confidence in the implementors undermining the success of the projects.
- b. Basing on one respondent comment about the dependency syndrome inherent in the community, **"Some people still have the dependence syndrome hoping to get everything from Government and their attitudes have not changed much."** He cited an example where people could not repair a borehole because they were waiting for the government to do it for them. It is also possible here that the communities in Nyabushozi identified opportunities beyond their means with the assumption that donor assistance would continue to be available. This may also explain why the water management committees of the dams failed when external players withdrew. Sometimes communities prioritize what donors want to hear and not necessarily what their basic needs are. What donors want to hear may not necessarily reflect what the community's real perceived needs are. To reduce dependency

syndrome, donors should be sensitive to communities felt needs and avoid imposing projects to the communities.

c. There were a number of managerial problems which cut across all the project areas: **For example:**

* At Kikatsi, the community failed to use the semi-rotary pump. It would take a hole day to fill the 8,000-liter storage tank. They tried pouring water in the gravity pipe manually from the reservoir, but that also proved difficult. They built mud troughs outside the fence and carried water from reservoir to the troughs, and it turned out cumbersome because of the large cattle herds they had. WL/SUNREM project did not carry out socio-cultural feasibility study to explore other alternatives for watering animals, outside the perimeter fencing, which the community would manage. The assumption was that the beneficiaries would use semi-rotary pumps for pumping water in the storage tanks, then by gravity flow to watering troughs outside the perimeter fencing. The pastoralist nomadic mode of life living in scattered homesteads makes it almost impossible to carry out an activity that requires hard labor like pumping water. This explains why watering animals using semi-rotary pumps failed in all the three areas.

* At Naama, problems also arose because of the conflicts within the water management committees who were suspicious of each other. The patron of NYDA happened to be a member of parliament was also not favored in that particular area by the community who preferred another candidate. They saw the rehabilitation of the dam as a political maneuver.

The laws governing the usage of the dam were therefore not enforced and people resorted to erection of mud troughs within the proximity of the water reservoir. When it rained, the mud troughs were washed into the reservoir thereby silting it. This had an adverse effect on subsequent non-water projects. There was low numbers and inconsistency of community members

coming up for meetings, planning, and consistent implementation. As a result, the few that were motivated bore the burden for the whole community. These were often criticized by the decisions they made and therefore many lost morale.

This undermined the successful mobilization of the community and destroyed the established water management committee and the sustainability of the whole structure.

- * At that point of time in the year, Twenyambi had experienced a four(4) year period of unreliable rainfall pattern, and when it rained the water did not go to the reservoir. Initially it looked like a technical problem on the design of the water channels. However, nine(9) months later the climatic conditions changed and the dam was 3/4 full. The pastoralists who were supposed to use and care for the dam concentrated on water ponds on their farms. This led to temporary abandoning of this dam.

- d. There were also predisposing factors such as prior identification of water as the major problem and USAID obligating funds to SUNREM project if 50% be used for construction of dams in Nyabushozi. The fact that communities were aware of apportioned funds for dams construction prior to PRA training biased the communities in identification of real needs. They also took it for granted that government would do everything for them.

All these factors undermined the effectiveness of powerful PRA tool of problem/solution identification affecting the success and sustainability of the project.

The second expected benefit was to orient Nyabushozi community to the nature and rationale of PRA methodology so as to appreciate its full potential in mobilizing the community and strengthening their local institutions. Since water had already been identified as the major problem in the area, and USAID had apportioned money to the SUNREM project for dam construction, it was also envisaged that the community would use PRA tools in other development

projects in the area besides selecting and management of water points.

They incorporated participatory approach in decision making for institutions and even in households. They did not just sit back but shared with others what they learned and subsequent activities carried out were necessarily not natural resource management related. The community's ability to shift from water project to other activities was an indication, internalization and proper assimilation of PRA process and translation into projects. Spin offs were because of their ability to share. *Most people trained, and interviewed had trained others in the idea of "together we can identify, set priorities and implement".* With the limited knowledge and skills obtained from a mere three days theoretical orientation to PRA rationale and methodology field data collection and analysis, the community's ways of addressing issues beyond the water project was awakened. An example was the Sanga community, who used participatory skills to redefine their priorities from water to schools.

Below are some of the communities' perception about PRA:

"PRA process enabled identification and addressing community problems with minimal external influence, creating a sense of ownership of community development programs."

"People work together, know and love each other, are trained and know what to do."

"PRA unites people and allows them solve their own problems and discourages outsiders imposing their ideas, and encourages community's sense of ownership of their development initiatives."

* Members of the community who participated in PRA seminar used PRA knowledge in other sectors.

For example in Nyakasasara, the sub-county chief used PRA tools in mobilizing the community and together they designed a Community Based Health facility.

The Reverend of Rushere Church said, *"we used the methods in our plan of action and resolving conflicts within the church. For example; the clergy had wanted to use blocks made out of cement*

for building the church and finishing the school blocks on one hand, but the congregation wanted to use small burnt bricks. The clergy (the shepherd) were adamant and did not want to comply with the congregation's (the sheep) decisions. I was asked for advice, and I advised the clergy to have dialogue with the congregation to reach a consensus. My advice was taken and eventually the clergy had to accept the congregation's decision."

"In my family we are 30 out of which 10 are almost the same ages as myself. As a bread winner it was very difficult for me to plan and resolve issues amicably. After the PRA seminar, I have learnt the importance of planning together, and no longer impose decisions on my family.

* Some respondents said that PRA methods were used to mobilize people to come together.

For example communal activities and mobilization of resources, fund raising, brick making, establishment of mechanism for dam management, and building schools gained momentum after the PRA seminar.

Joyce chairperson women Local Council 1 in Kikatsi said, " I mobilized women and youth, and have facilitated them identify problems and solutions and now they have started making bricks as our contribution for the building of the school."

In Kashongi sub-county the Local Council 3 chairman said that in the sub-county there were 18 schools all made out of banana fibre (temporary). After PRA when I mobilized people, we discussed and agreed on how to improve the school standards and ways of mobilizing resources. All the 18 schools have at least one permanent structure each."

The third benefit was in the case of Kyamirabyo, Kikatsi sub-county, Kyebuza village. Children had never sat for Primary 7 Leaving Examination for the last 40 years because the school would close down during the dry season. The long persistent droughts would force people migrate to Lake Mburo National Park, making them unavailable for meetings, and depriving children time for school activities. During this season even school programs are affected as children drop out of school in search of food and water both for domestic use and their animals. Members from the

community area confessed and said, *"the schools have never been opened throughout the year because of the water scarcity. Since the construction of the valley dam this year, our children are going for the first time to sit for Primary 7 Leaving Examinations in forty (40) years.*

One out standing fourth and unexpected benefit of PRA process was the uplifting the status of women. Many of farmers especially women formed groups to tackle specific problems.

Prior to PRA seminar, women from Nyabushozi never took part in decision making processes and in community activities. Most of them never owned property but depended on the men entirely. Responses from those interviewed were that, *"PRA was an eye opener to the women who learnt to work together more systematically and are now organized. They now have access to credit facilities, own property and have formed groups one of which own a grinding mill".*

This was also attributed to earlier statements about building permanent schools, houses due to availability of permanent water source. An indicator of settling down of communities. The only category of people whom were not so involved were the children.

To quote women respondents, "PRA process has improved the status of women and enabled more involvement and participation in the community development activities. As mothers we used to dictate everything in the family. After PRA we invite family members including the children despite their age and gender, and we encourage discussions, contributions and decide as a family what each of us can do."

Lessons Learnt and Relevance of Project to Resettlement Micro projects.

1. The trainees missed out the full-fledged PRA which includes full situation analysis of problems/solutions and development of Community Action Plan. It is important to note that they did not just sit back but shared with others what they learned and also used some of the participatory tools in decision making for institutions and even in households. One can therefore, imply that given an enabling environment and appropriate tools, the communities can properly identify, set priorities collective

problems/solutions and carry out them with small resources. There would be no limit to what they could do.

The shift from water project to other activities is an indicator of conceptualization of PRA process and which enabled translation of what they had learnt into projects managed by the community.

It is important therefore, that methods enabling stake holders(host community, resettlers, development workers, etc) involvement and participation in the planning, design and implementation be employed for effective management, utilization and sustainability of projects. It is also necessary for in-depth training in PRA process for all concerned to fully comprehend and utilize its full potential.

2. To quote some individuals **"Construction of the dams in the area acted as a spring board to construction of small ponds owned and managed by families or few individuals as opposed to communal big dams."** Other alternatives such as small ponds should have been explored based on availability of resources. Could this be an expression of a solution not explored that local people would have preferred and managed sustainably? What implications would this have on the maintenance of the dams during those seasons when private ponds have enough water? Although this may look favorable in terms of management, it does not solve the water crisis and all associated problems especially in severe drought.

When designing communal projects that benefit majority of the target group, projects that benefit individuals should also be explored, because they may be cost effective and easy to manage by the communities in the long run. For example management of communal protected water springs is more complex than individual roof catchment.

3. Nyabushozi people who are predominantly pastoralists, are not used to labor intensive activities like pumping water using semi-rotary pumps, leave alone settling to sedentary life. The use of semi-rotary pumps failed. Provision of permanent water in Nyabushozi meant changing people's life style, culture, attitudes and economic well-being.

When designing projects, people do's and don't should have been put into consideration. Baseline studies including socio-cultural and economic feasibility should be carried out with beneficiaries' participation before developmental activities get underway in the area.

Effective implementation, utilization and sustenance of the projects depends on appreciation, understanding and incorporating the socio-cultural and economic attributes of the people in the area.

4. Although the transhumant and pastoral nature of the people of Nyabushozi made the "coming together" for joint ventures seem futile, the impact of PRA should be measured by its positive impact to the communities in terms of what they are able to implement rather than the ability to gather people in one place. A number of times projects are rated successful because of the number of people drawn unto it. The success any project (resettlement scheme or project) should be measured in terms of target group's ability to internalize the PRA process and translation into projects managed with minimal external support. This is one indicator of successful reintegration in that particular community.
5. Imposing projects on the people seem to cripple their ability to own, adapt, make by laws and enforce them, and sustain the projects. This seems to drive people to look for "their own" things as with private pools and use of mud troughs (Naama) or identify opportunities beyond their means with assumption that donor assistance would continue to be available. This may also explain why the water management committees of some dams failed when external players withdrew. Likewise in resettlement programs, sometimes resettlers and host communities prioritize what donors want to hear and not necessarily what their basic needs are especially if they are aware of funds for a specific project. But also it is true that what donors want to hear may not necessarily reflect what their real perceived needs are. Donors who are not sensitive to these issues may make designs and fail to get full participation they thought they would get which in turn affect the sustainability of the program. Donor Agencies should use methods that enable as

much as possible beneficiaries or stake holders' involvement and participation in the planning, design and implementation of programs. And they should be sensitive to their real needs.

6. Some causes of the community's failure to manage and sustain the water facilities were the predisposing factors i.e., water had been identified as the "problem" and some funds already earmarked for the construction of dams. PRA effectiveness as a tool was therefore compromised. resettlers and host-community participation where possible in all stages of design, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of resettlement and community development projects, and emphasis of what is expected of them is very important. It reduces high expectation, clears suspicions and biases or any wrong perceptions the beneficiaries may harbor. This is very essential if local people are expected to allocate time and other resources to the project.

In conclusion, and based on the above, PRA promises a lot to whoever takes part, its sustenance lies with its positive impact to those involved (in due time). When the beneficiaries realize returns, and on lookers(host communities) see changed lives the message is then carried on. How this is done is not really the issue. As the assumption above, it is only when the resettlers could translate what they have learned to address local issues, then one can clearly say they own the knowledge. The time one should wait to see the positive influence, if any, ranges from immediately to for ever! During planning and implementation it is important to identify, monitor and analyze external factors since they cause project to fail even if it is implemented as planned. In service monitoring and friendly visit is good for the fueling the momentum to the initiated projects. This helps speed up the impact process. However, caution should also be taken not to externally influence the direction of events.

The ultimate objective of providing water to the pastoralists and their animals had an effect of settling people hitherto led transhumant life style to sedentary life. The ability of the communities to change from nomadic life style to sedentary life in terms of building permanent schools and houses, availability of permanent water supply was an indicator of resettlement.

In our evaluation, the above objective was an indicator of positive impact of the project.



This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 License.

To view a copy of the license please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

This is a download from the BLDS Digital Library on OpenDocs

<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/>

A Digitisation Partnership between Makerere University Library and the British Library for
Development Studies

