# CIVICUS PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE PROGRAMME

# EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

## February, 2010

Submitted to:

**CIVICUS**

By:

**Chiku Malunga**
**Capacity Development Consultants (CADECO)**
**P.O Box 1884**
**Blantyre**
**Malawi**
**Cell:  265 888 868 624**
**Tel: 265 1 915 723**
**Fax: 265 1 915 723**
**E-mail: cadeco@sdnp.org.mw**

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Introduction

CIVICUS commissioned an end of funding phase evaluation for its Participatory Governance (PG) Programme which took place from November 2009 through January 2010.  The overall goal of the evaluation was to assess the effectiveness of the programme in terms of its objectives. The specific objectives were to; (i) establish the extent to which the programme has achieved its stated objectives, (ii) identify the key challenges and constraints faced in the programme and how these were or were not addressed, and to (iii) identify lessons learnt and recommendations for future phases of the programme.

## Methodology

The evaluation process involved a review of key relevant programme documents and reports, an initial meeting with the Participatory Governance Programme Team to clarify expectations, interviews and focus group discussions with the programme participants and stakeholders. Other key evaluation tasks included data analysis, writing and presenting the draft report to the Participatory Governance Programme Team and other CIVICUS staff for feedback, and writing the final report after comments.

The overall evaluation approach was participatory and employed some techniques of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) and Appreciative Inquiry (AI), in particular semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and key informant interviews. A checklist of key questions was developed for each respondent group to ensure that data and information gathered were standard, complementary and comparable, while allowing for open discussion. The data collected were mostly qualitative.

Target groups included CIVICUS staff and partner organisations, participatory governance practitioners, and donors. The evaluation participants were purposefully selected based on their type and levels of involvement in the programme. No randomisation within the respondent groups was done as the numbers of available participants were too limited.

Two analytical tools were used for analysis namely, the 'results chain logic' and the 'levels of complexity model'.

## Key findings and conclusions

The programme was largely effective and managed to considerably achieve its objectives. The programme has achieved a number of important outcomes. For instance, in Latin America, youths have been mobilised and organised to engage actively with government on youth related participatory governance issues. In

South Asia, civil society, government and media practitioners are working together in a network aimed at promoting participatory governance in communities. In West Africa, civil society and government practitioners together with communities are working on a number of local-level participatory governance initiatives while in Southern Africa some practitioners with the help from IDASA have managed to start their own participatory governance initiative building on the initial CIVICUS-supported initiative.

The creation of the practically oriented, user friendly toolkit of 40+ tools and approaches and key resources is a key achievement though it is not yet publicly available. Publishing and dissemination of the book, *'From Political Won't to Political Will'* is filling a large gap in knowledge on PG, especially on key reasons for lack of political will and how to overcome them, on a global scale.

It is too early to comment on the overall global and regional impact of these and the other outcomes achieved. However, a few initial impacts have already been identified.

Compared to the benefits or results achieved, the cost of the programme is justified. Given the amount of resources invested and the capacity within the Participatory Governance programme team on one hand and the results produced on the other, the programme was largely efficient. The programme is potentially sustainable, especially if there would be more efforts to consolidate the current levels of achievement. The 'simplicity' of the programme model and the fact that it has generally yielded positive results in all the regions suggest that it is replicable (at least in similar contexts to the ones in which it is implemented now). The programme is very relevant. Relevance, however, would be enhanced with more extensive involvement of some stakeholders including government practitioners, youths and women in design and implementation.

It can be concluded that while the programme has achieved many of its expected results at the output and outcome levels, its main achievement has been in getting the Participatory Governance team at CIVICUS and the programme model  'organised and established' and building a network of partner organisations and targeted practitioner organisations. The outstanding challenge for the next phase will be to consolidate and scale up the results at outcome and impact levels.

**Key lessons learnt and recommendations**

A number of lessons have been identified. The key ones are:

*General lessons*

1. It is possible to implement a Participatory Governance programme on a large geographical scale with limited staff and resources using the lever of

implementing partners. The regional implementing partners know more about the specific reality the practitioners and their organisations live in and they know better how to communicate and mobilise them in their context. It is important to emphasise the need for an optimum number of staff to ensure adequate capacity for the PG team.

2. With regard to direct operational support, it is more cost-effective, relevant and sustainable to build on already existing projects or initiatives as compared to starting completely new projects or initiatives.

3. The model of skills-building workshops followed by mentorship and innovation grants is a viable one but to be more effective there is need for clearer conceptualisation and guidelines especially with regard to the mentorship component. A clear, logical and conscious link among the three components is important to ensure that they build on each other for more success.

4. Civil society and government practitioners often view each other with suspicion which makes working together difficult. For Civil society - Government collaborations to work well there is need for more consultations and negotiations including thinking through what would motivate both groups to commit and building trust in order to ensure healthy and cooperative relationships between government and civil society actors.

5. Relevance is a central sustainability ingredient for participatory governance programmes. If the implementing partners and practitioner organisations see the programmes as being relevant and adding value to their own organisational goals, they are likely to institutionalise and continue implementing after CIVICUS support has stopped. For example, IDASA is now implementing a 5-year project with the same practitioners that participated in the CIVICUS-supported programme.

### *Designing effective Participatory Governance programmes*

6. Efforts aimed at transforming people's lives require more time. Donors and all stakeholders need to recognise that real tangible benefits may take a long time, often many years, to manifest. It is important therefore to be patient and take the risk of long-term investments for the sake of achieving sustainable results that have benefits far beyond the immediate.

7. Prevalent gender biases and power dynamics constrain the effective participation of women. Targeting women, youths and other marginalised groups in the design phase is not enough if this is not consciously and actively followed through in the implementation and monitoring and evaluation phases of the programme.

### *Implementing effective Participatory Governance Programmes*

8. Healthy relationships among all the players (Participatory Governance Programme staff, the implementing partners and practitioner organisations) evidenced by clarity of roles and responsibilities, a sense of shared vision and purpose, a shared understanding of the concepts and practice of participatory governance, high levels of transparency and reciprocity, clarity of expectations and mutuality of support are critical factor for programme success.

9. Clear goals, simple logistics and appropriate and productive preparation period at all levels (PG team, implementation partner and practitioner organisation) significantly increase satisfaction and chances of success.

The evaluation has come up with several recommendations for CIVICUS, implementing partners, and donors. The main ones are as follows:

### *Recommendations for CIVICUS (and the Participatory Governance Programme)*

1. The PG Team must build its capacity to match the implementation requirements of the partners and other players in the programme. The identified capacity gaps of inadequate personnel and an ineffective monitoring and evaluation system must be budgeted for and included as part of the CIVICUS capacity building plan.

2. Create synergy by consciously working more closely with the other departments of CIVICUS. This can be achieved through joint planning and review processes among others. Inter-departmental reflection and learning sessions would also help in identifying further areas for collaboration and mutual inter-departmental support.

3. Focus in the design stage on the impact and sustainability aspects of the programme. This would mean including aspects of enabling the partner organisations and practitioner organisations to fundraise on their own for continuation of the initiatives, strengthening institutionalisation of the initiatives and providing adequate funding to enable a strong foundation for the partner and practitioner organisations to build on.

4. While the programme design had made provision for participation and involvement of women, youths and other marginalised groups, these were not fully and consciously followed through in implementation especially in Latin America and South Asia (for women). It will be important to make the participation of women, youths and other marginalised groups a central and important aspect of the monitoring and evaluation system to be

developed. The monitoring and evaluation system must ensure that data collected and analysed fully includes and assesses the types and youths and other marginalised groups and that corrective measures are taken immediately to remedy any observed shortfalls. It is important to budget for monitoring and evaluation as a professional practice. Given its critical importance, monitoring and evaluation must be managed by a qualified person and an adequate budget provided to ensure this key programme component gets the attention it deserves.

### *Recommendations for Implementing Partners and Practitioner Organisations*

5. Build the capacity of networking and the networks formed. The sustainability of the programme lies to a great extent on how effective the networking and networks formed will become. Networks are complex forms of organisation and sustaining them is a very difficult effort. To ensure effectiveness it is important to invest in developing their leadership and governance to ensure that they are able to deliver on their core networking process, member contributions need to be prioritised and systems set up to motivate, measure and track their most vital resource – the participation and commitment of the members. In addition to focusing on measuring project outputs same effort should also be put on the developmental task of networking and building member capacity and ownership.

6. Invest more time in building relationships among the different types of practitioners especially with the government practitioners. It is important to understand their fears and motivations and work with these while trying to win their commitment to the programme. For more relevance it is also important to consult more and get the views of both civil society and government practitioners including the implementing partners on programme content and process in the design phase of the programme.

### *Recommendations for Donors*

7. Support the consolidation of the results achieved so far in order to form a stronger foundation for more outcomes and impact. This would be done through increasing the level of funding and the duration of such critical components as mentorship and innovation grants. It is also important to invest more in communication and interaction (networks and networking as leverage for sustainability and scaling up). In addition, it is important to invest in fundraising capacity of the networks as a way of enhancing their sustainability. The Asian Network on Participatory Governance would be a good model to start with.

**ABBREVIATIONS**

CADECO =      Capacity Development Consultants

CIDA =        Canadian International Development Agency

CLUSA =       Cooperative League of the United States

CSO =         Civil Society Organisation

CSW =         Civil Society Watch

DFID =        UK Department for International Development

EU =          European Union

IDASA =       Institute for Democracy in South Africa

MOCASS =      Movement for Collective Associations

NICE =        National Initiative for Civic Education

NGO =         Non-Governmental Organisation

NGOGCN =      NGO Gender Coordination Network

PG =          Participatory Governance

PRA =         Participatory Rural Appraisal

PRIA   =      Participatory Research in Asia

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The evaluation report starts with the purpose and objectives of the evaluation followed by an overview of the CIVICUS Participatory Governance (PG) programme. The evaluation methodology comes next followed by a presentation of the findings under the criteria headings of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and replicability. The report concludes with a set of key lessons and recommendations for improvement. Relevant appendices are provided at the end.

### 1.1 Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

As per the evaluation guidelines of Irish Aid's Civil Society Fund, CIVICUS commissioned an end of funding phase evaluation for its PG programme. The evaluation took place from November 2009 through January, 2010. The overall goal of the evaluation was to assess the effectiveness of the programme in terms of its objectives.

The specific objectives of the evaluation were to:

- Establish the extent to which the programme has achieved its stated objectives
- Identify the key challenges and constraints faced in the programme and how these were or were not addressed
- Identify the lessons learnt and recommendations for future phases of the programme

The evaluation was based the following criteria:

*Relevance:* The extent to which the programme has addressed the needs and priorities of the targeted practitioners. Also how it fits in with the priorities and policies of Irish Aid, CIVICUS and the target stakeholders.

*Effectiveness:* Whether the programme design was the most effective means of achieving the objectives and the extent to which the objectives have been achieved taking into account the relative importance of each objective. The evaluation examined how the inputs (financial, technical and human) contributed or hindered the achievement of the objectives.

*Efficiency:* Whether the cost of the programme can be justified by its results, taking alternatives into account. The evaluation looked at efficiency from different angles. These were: comparison between the general capacity of the PG programme and the results achieved, comparison between the money invested and the results

achieved; and how monitoring and evaluation were designed and carried out in practice.

*Impact:* The long-term effects of the programme, whether these are positive or negative, intended or unintended, and the relation to the overall goal of the project.

*Sustainability:* Whether the programme outcomes and impacts will be sustained without continuing external financial or technical support.

*Replicability:* Whether a successful programme or successful aspects of the project could be replicated.

The principle questions that were explored in the evaluation were:

1. What did the programme seek to achieve in terms of objectives?
2. What was actually achieved or not achieved?
3. What helped the achievement? Why?
4. What hindered the achievement? Why?
5. What key lessons can be learnt for improvement?
6. How can the lessons learnt be practically used to improve practice?

## 1.2 The Participatory Governance Programme

In November 2006, CIVICUS Participatory Governance Programme launched a 3-year programme phase aiming to enhance the capacity of practitioners (both civil society and government actors) to promote participatory and accountable governance of public institutions at local and national levels.  The CIVICUS Participatory Governance Programme team implemented this programme with four regional partners. These are: Polis in Brazil for the Latin America region, CLUSA in Ghana for the West Africa region, PRIA in India for the South Asia region; and IDASA is South Africa for the Southern Africa region. In addition to the work done with the partners, the programme also included a knowledge generation and sharing component (including PG initiatives stocktaking, needs assessment, a global conference, a publication on the theme of building political will or participatory governance and development of an online resource centre, including a PG Toolkit and a learning module).

The programme is built on the recognition that "despite the impressive number of innovations occurring across the globe, many practitioners remain unaware of the experiences, strategies, methods and tools tried and tested by other organisations; and also that in many country contexts participatory governance practices are a recent development and hence linkages and networks are not yet well developed, depriving practitioners of much needed opportunities for peer support and opportunity for information sharing, cross-learning, partnering collective advocacy and joint action". For this purpose the programme phase,

supported by Irish Aid Civil Society Fund, being global in scope (global South) sought to:

• Generate and share knowledge about the theory and practice of participatory governance;

• Help southern practitioners (civil society organisations and government actors) acquire the practical skills and tools they need to promote effective citizen participation in governance processes;

• Build bridges between civil society and government actors and an active "community of practice" among participatory governance practitioners; and

• Promote innovation and sector-wide learning in participatory governance practices by providing direct operational support to strategically selected joint civil society-government initiatives and documenting and sharing operational lessons from these initiatives.

The project aims to directly impact approximately 100 Southern-based civil society organisations through targeted capacity building activities and to indirectly impact up to ten times that number (1,000 organisations) through the establishment of an interactive, web-based resource centre.

The key activities and principal results under each of the objectives were:

Learning and knowledge generation: creation and maintenance of online participatory governance resource centre, creation and maintenance of a dedicated web log; and production of a publication on 'how to build political will for participatory governance'. In implementation, the program has managed to create the online participatory governance resource centre. The dedicated web log has been created though it is not yet launched. The book *'From Political Won't to Political Will'* has been published and disseminated.

The key activities under the skills building and tools development included global stocktaking of participatory governance practices; needs assessment of participatory governance practitioners at local and national levels; creation and maintenance of an online database of participatory governance resources and case studies and toolkit; conducting 4 regional skills building workshops; provision of mentoring services to a select group of workshop participants and the development of a participatory governance learning module. The needs assessment survey of participatory governance practitioners at local and national levels was conducted. The online database and toolkit of PG strategies, methods and tools was created and is waiting to be launched. The four regional skills building workshops were conducted and the mentoring services were provided. The learning module is being finalised.

The key activities under the networking and alliance building included: creation of a global participatory governance working group, organisation of a global participatory governance conference, creation of a global community of practice; and creation of regional sub-groups. The global participatory governance working group has been established. The international conference took place and a report has been written and disseminated. The network consisting of global community of practice members has been created and an online platform for the community is to be launched in April 2010. Regional sub-groups have been established in the form of regional networks.

Key activities under "innovation" included the creation and management of a participatory governance action research 'innovation fund', supporting the design and implementation of 8 innovation pilot participatory governance action research initiatives; and documentation and dissemination of lessons learnt. Fifteen innovation grant initiatives have been implemented in total. Lessons have been documented and shared.

The programme's key guiding principles included:

• Participatory Governance as a right – the programme adopted a rights based approach to development and governance. The programme consciously sought to place special emphasis on the rights of women, children, people with disabilities and other traditionally marginalised groups.

• Social inclusion – ensuring that women, poor people, rural populations, children and people with disabilities and other marginalised or disadvantaged groups are equitably represented and able to participate in governance processes.

• Power sharing - understanding power relations between different stakeholder groups and exploring incentives, strategies and mechanisms that empower weaker and more vulnerable stakeholder groups; preventing abuse of political and social power and promoting equitable terms of engagement between stakeholder groups.

• Emphasis on civil society – government interface – exploring the advantages of participatory governance approaches from the perspectives of civil society and government.

• Exploration of some outstanding questions and challenges

According to the CIVICUS Operational Plan 2009 – 2012, the assumptions relevant to the Participatory Governance programme included: sufficient numbers of potential partners want to participate in the programme, CIVICUS operating environment remains stable, CIVICUS can access sufficient resources to implement programmes on the planned scale; and CIVICUS can deal with some

volatility in international markets/exchange rates to make budgets viable. These assumptions generally proved true except in Latin America and in Ghana where the break out of the H1NI influenza and the 2008 national elections delayed implementation respectively.

The programme specific assumptions according to result area were:

• The majority of the targeted CSOs have internet access. The proposed interactive website and blog will provide targeted CSOs with user-friendly access to global knowledge, reflection and debate on key issues of PG. This assumption did not prove entirely true. Some targeted CSOs did not have access to internet or high speed internet that would make effective online interaction possible. In addition, the PG online toolkit had not been completed by the end of this evaluation.

• Access to case study descriptions, operational manuals, tool descriptions; and skills building events will allow targeted CSOs to enhance their operational skills. The delay in operationalisation of the online toolkit hindered the availability of the case studies, operational manuals and tools. There is evidence however that the skills building events did contribute to the enhancement of the CSOs' operational skills.

• Opportunities for electronic and face to face interactions and exchange provided by the programme will facilitate the creation of networks and alliances among the PG practitioners. Thought there were a lot of challenges with electronic interactions, the face to face interactions played a key role in the formation of a number of PG networks and coalitions.

• The provision of seed funds will enable the selected CSOs to develop and implement innovative practices that seek to address the identified priorities. The innovative grants played a key role in identifying practices to address identified priorities.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

This section outlines the methodology employed in conducting the evaluation.

### 2.1 Evaluation process and time frame

The evaluation process involved review of the key relevant programme documents and reports; phone conversations and meeting with the Participatory Governance Team to clarify expectations; individual interviews, online interviews and focus group discussions with the programme participants; data analysis and draft report writing. The draft report was presented to the CIVICUS Participatory

Governance programme team and staff for feedback before writing the final report. The detailed process and time frame is given in appendix 3.

## 2.2 Evaluation participants and sampling

The list of participants is presented in the appendix 1. Targeted groups included CIVICUS staff; CIVICUS partner organisations, targeted practitioners, and donors. The evaluation participants were purposefully selected depending on their type and levels of involvement in the programme. Ten CIVICUS staff were interviewed. 15 skills building workshop participants were interviewed. Four mentees were interviewed and four innovative grant recipients were interviewed. Other groups that were interviewed included: members of the international advisory group, participants of the international global conference, chapter contributors to the book: *'From Political Won't to Political Will'*; and donors. Relevant data were collected from each of the identified groups.

## 2.3 Instruments and methods of data collection

The overall approach was participatory. The methodology employed some techniques of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) and appreciative inquiry (AI) – in particular semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and key informant interviews. The approaches included:

### a. Review of existing documents to enhance understanding and aid in refining the checklist for information collection

A number of key programme documents were provided by CIVICUS. See the full list of the documents in appendix 6.

### b. Briefing teleconference with the participatory governance programme team and the evaluation management team for this evaluation.

The purpose was to discuss the approach, methodology, tools and checklist and clarify expectations. This also involved agreeing on roles and responsibilities, time schedule and expected outputs.

### c. Semi-structured interviews and discussions.

- With CIVICUS staff (face to face interviews).
- Targeted practitioners and the organisations in which they are working (Civil Society Organisations and Government Institutions) (online surveys)
- With CIVICUS partner organisations (one representative from each of the four regional partners) (face to face interviews during the learning event and online surveys)

- Targeted practitioners (face to face interviews during the learning event and online surveys)
- Donors (online surveys)
- International Advisory Group (online surveys)
- Selected participants to the global conference on "Building Political Will for PG" (online surveys)
- Chapter contributors to the book, "From Political Won't to Political Will" (online surveys)

A checklist of specific key questions was developed for each respondent group to ensure that data and information gathered are standard, complementary and comparable, while allowing for open discussion.

### d. Two in-depth case studies

 Two studies focusing on the impact of the programme on the practitioners, their organisations and their communities were documented. The case studies were developed by using the impact stories method. Templates on the specific information to be collected were developed. These were sent by e-mail to the two selected practitioners who filled them and returned them to the consultant. The two practitioners were purposefully selected. Some of the factors to be considered were geographical representation, where CIVICUS feels the programme is making more impact and where it is not and willingness of the practitioners to participate in the case study.

## 2.4 Data Analysis and interpretation

The data collected were mostly qualitative and two analytical tools were used for analysis. These were the 'results chain logic' and 'the levels of complexity model'. Results chain logic refers to the flow from inputs and activities to results in project implementation. The participants were asked about the activities they were involved in the programme and the results they realised from their involvement in those activities. The results were then assessed as to whether they were at the output, outcome and impact levels.

Outputs refer to immediate or short term results from project activities. An example of an output would be a report from a workshop or specific skills gained from a mentoring session. Outcomes refer to medium term results from the activities or how the outputs are being used. An example would be ability to write successful fundraising proposals after a proposal writing training or communities mobilising themselves to hold power holders accountable after undergoing a social accountability training.  Impact refers to lasting changes in people's lives arising from effective use of the results of the outcomes. These would include: improvement in health and economic indicators and literacy levels of a community.

Explanations of achievement and non achievement of the results were analysed using the levels of complexity model. The 'levels of complexity model' was chosen for four reasons:

- It is an analytical tool that shows that in any project management process and system a problem may have its causes from more than one or more sources (levels).
- It is a guide to the type of interventions that might be undertaken to address the problem. A specific type of intervention addresses each level. For example, lack of funds can be addressed by acquiring more funding from different sources while relationship problems may be solved through team building and conflict management type of interventions.
- It is also an indicator of the amount of effort and energy the organisation needs to address the problems. As one goes deeper the levels it becomes more and more complex to address the problem therefore demanding more and more effort and energy. A donor signing a check can easily resolve lack of adequate funding but lack of shared values needs more comprehensive efforts to address and may not be solved overnight.
- The model also shows where to concentrate efforts when addressing identified problems. Addressing lower level needs like training staff while ignoring higher level needs like a shared vision and mission does not improve programme effectiveness in the long run.

The levels of complexity framework helps to identify programme:

- Strengths to build on
- Problems to tackle
- Weak areas to strengthen
- Blockages to unravel

**Table 1.1: Levels of complexity model**

| Level of complexity | Factor affecting the PG Programme |
| --- | --- |
| Financial and material resources | The financial and material resources needed for the programme. |
| Skills and competences | The skills and competences needed to effectively go through the programme cycle. |
| Policies, systems and procedures | Mechanisms guiding formal decision making and practices among all the players in the programme. |

| Relationships | How well individuals, departments relate with the players involved and their organisations. It also refers to how coordination is done in the programme. |
|---|---|
| Vision and mission | Articulation of the change the programme wants to see as a result of its work and the purpose for its existence. |
| Values | The shared behaviours the programme players must embrace in order to serve its beneficiary effectively. |
| Task environment | The political, economic, socio-cultural and technological factors presenting opportunities and challenges to the programme. |

## 3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1 Relevance

The evaluation assessed the extent to which the programme has addressed the needs and priorities of the different stakeholders. Specifically it assessed how the design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation have enhanced or hindered the relevance of the programme; and how relevant the programme has been to Irish Aid policies and priorities, CIVICUS' mission and outcomes, partner organisations and practitioners and their organisations.

#### 3.1.1 Findings

*Relevance to Irish Aid policies and objectives*

The evaluation results demonstrate that the PG programme has been consistent in contributing to Irish Aid's policies and priorities. Irish overall priority is to ensure that each intervention contributes to the strengthening of civil society organisations and communities which is congruent with the overall aim of the PG programme. Results from all the regions show that the programme has contributed directly to Irish Aid's Civil Society Fund first and second key objectives of strengthening the voice of civil society organisations so that they can influence policy, both at local and national levels. An example is the work with youths in engaging political and policy processes in Latin America; and supporting communities to participate in development at local and national levels, like in the case of the joint initiative between civil society and local government in Ghana. Indirectly the PG programme has made contributions towards the other two objectives: (i) supporting communities to gain access to resources for local development and improvement of essential services, like in the case of programme participants who have managed to source funding from elsewhere using contacts, knowledge and skills gained from the programme; and (ii)

supporting communities to realise human rights especially for women and children though some work still need to be done on this one.

*Relevance to CIVICUS mission and outcomes*

The concept note states that the PG programme contributes explicitly to the CIVICUS mission of *'strengthening citizen action and civil society throughout the world'*. In terms of the CIVICUS organisational outcomes (from the CIVICUS operational plan 2009 – 2012), the PG programme contributed to one or the first of the three main organisational outcome areas. These are:

Outcome area 1:

• Increased knowledge generated and shared among civil society and other stakeholders
• Capacity strengthened within civil society on a range of skills based areas that contribute to the sector's effectiveness
• Active and effective national and international platforms for networking and collaboration within civil society especially south to south collaboration
• Broader and stronger connections and networks established between civil society and other stakeholders, nationally, regionally and internationally
• Enhanced capacity of citizens and civil society actors to participate in decision making processes and increased opportunities at local, national and international levels
• Increased knowledge based actions and evidence based advocacy by civil society actors

The programme activities directly contributed towards these aims. In this case, the PG programme is very relevant to CIVICUS as an organisation.

*Programme design and implementation*

Building on lessons from the previous phases and other CIVICUS initiatives, a lot of thought was invested into the programme design and how the programme would be implemented, monitored and evaluated more effectively. The design and implementation parameters and principles are detailed in the concept note. The main features of the design were: participatory governance as a right, emphasis on social inclusion, sensitivity to power dynamics; and emphasis on civil society and government interface. The participants felt that these principles are very relevant. The involvement of the youths in policy processes in Latin America and the joint civil society and local government initiatives in Ghana are some examples.

In addition, the programme sought to include involvement of women. The participation of women was 35% of the total number of participants in the regional

skills workshops. Given the contextual reality of the programmes, especially in South Asia, Southern Africa and West Africa where the participation of women is generally low in PG processes, this can be considered to be a positive outcome. However, ensuring the equitable participation of women in programme activities remains a challenge, especially in Africa. For example, while capacity development programmes in Latin America and South Asia had 52% had 40% women respectively, the percentage of women participants were 21% in West Africa 21% and 29% in Southern Africa. Future programme activities must give more attention to the cultural gender dynamics of the regions and how to incorporate ways around them in the programme

Government practitioners constituted 50% and 40% in West and Southern Africa respectively. In Latin America it was 12% and in South Asia it was 14%. The differences in the regions have mostly to do with the level of specific targeting, and also reflect different levels of prior relationship and proximity between the CSO and government practitioners.

The main implementation principles included being needs driven and participatory, flexibility, involving multiple stakeholders; and building the capacity of others. The participants, especially the regional skills-building partners felt that these principles were relevant and helpful to the success of the programme. They felt they were given a lot of leeway in choice of points or emphasis or content of the programme according to the issues they are facing in their regions. They also felt that the responsibility entrusted to them was a form of capacity building.

One of the key activities of the programme was to conduct a global survey of the needs of participatory governance practitioners. The subsequent programme activities were designed or modified based on the findings of the survey.

All in all it can be concluded that the programme design helped rather than hindered the relevance of the programme. In order to enhance programme relevance, the design however needs to pay more attention to ensuring enhance of participation of women and government practitioners.

*Relevance to Partner Organisations and practitioner organisations*

The practitioners interviewed were asked to rate the relevance of the different components of the programme (skills building workshops, mentoring and innovation grants) and give reasons for their rating. They rated the programme on a rating scale of 0 – 5 where 0 meant not relevant and 5 meant extremely relevant. They generally felt the programme as a whole was very relevant. They rated the skills building workshop as 4, mentoring as 2 and innovation grants as 4. They rated skills building workshops so highly because they said, it was very relevant as the knowledge the practitioners gained in the workshops was also the knowledge needed by their organisations.

They rated mentoring lowly because there was no application for it in Southern Africa for example, they felt, it was not adequately conceptualised and planned; and that generally the activities to be done under it were insufficient and not always clear.

They rated innovation grants so highly because there were visible and immediate results. For instance in West Africa, as indicated in case study 1, under one innovation grant activity, the market revenue activity went up by 10% when citizens worked together with the market authorities to improve revenue collection and accountability in the use of the revenue collected. In addition, they are using the knowledge and experience gained from this initiative to address education issues in some districts. Some participants observed, "before we got the innovation grants from CIVICUS, district stakeholders had never met to discuss education despite the falling standards. It was a result of the skills building training and the grant that stakeholders met for the first time to discuss the problems in education and to strategise on the issue". One respondent said the innovation grant is "the most concrete and relevant phase".

The four partner organisations also evaluated the overall programme as very relevant: In Latin America, they observed that the programme was very relevant because, "as Polis we share the same aims as CIVICUS Participatory Governance programme. In addition we built the whole programme process together. The programme therefore fits perfectly with our priorities".  In West Africa they noted, "over the past five years promoting participatory approaches in Ghana has been CLUSA's core business. The programme complemented what CLUSA is advocating in Ghana". A series of evaluations conducted by the groups during monitoring visits consistently supported the fact that they found the programme to be very relevant. In Southern Africa they observed, "the programme fits well with our (IDASA's mission). It has helped us to build valuable networks which have assisted us in the implementation of other projects as well". In South Asia, the commented, "PRIA's work aims at making democracy work for all. So the Participatory Governance programme fits well with our work".

Some of the participants observed that, "though it is difficult to say exactly how much has been CIVICUS' contribution the results achieved as the programme activities mostly added value to activities and processes that were already in place, the programme was extremely important as it provided knowledge on tools that the organisations did not have before and promoting public spaces for debate and platform building for civil society and government practitioners to enable the application of knowledge on Participatory Governance tools in their contexts".

In summary, the programme was relevant to the targeted practitioners, their organisations and the partner organisations as well. It was also relevant to CIVICUS as an organisation.

### 3.1.2 Issues

Three main issues were observed under relevance. These are: the need to improve involvement of some groups in the programme, strengthening the mentoring component, and building on the flexible nature of the programme.

Though the design principles recognised the importance of inclusion and involvement of key stakeholders, some participants felt that their involvement was not adequate especially at the design stage. This led to weak government and women involvement mostly in West Africa and Southern Africa (for women) and 12% and 14% (for government practitioners) in Latin America and South Asia respectively.

There is need to think through the mentoring component so that it can provide a stronger link between skills building workshops and the innovation grants. This would strengthen the relevance of the skills building workshops-mentoring-innovation grants model.

Relevance was enhanced by the flexible nature of the programme. Each region and subsequently country was allowed to focus on PG issues relevant to their context.

### 3.1.3 Suggestion for improvement

Programme design should include mechanisms for more involvement of key groups like women, youths and government practitioners to enhance their ownership of the programme. This can also be strengthened through a carefully crafted monitoring and evaluation system that makes tracking the involvement of these groups in programme implementation possible.

Give the mentoring component adequate visibility. Clarify what each of the three components is expected to achieve and each component must be given adequate attention.

## 3.2 Effectiveness

The evaluation assessed the extent to which the programme has achieved its objectives at the outcome level. This was done by comparing the expected achievements and the actual achievements and the nature and importance of the achievements.

### 3.2.1 Findings

The programme's intended outcomes were: 1. approximately 100 Southern based CSOs have greater knowledge about participatory governance, rights, issues and benefits; 2. the organisations have stronger participatory governance skills and improved access to relevant practical information and tools, 3. they are able to network more effectively and build alliances; and 4. they have had experimented with innovative experiments, learnt from them and use the lessons to improve practice. The programme managed to achieve most of its intended outcomes. See Appendix 3 for the specific achieved outcomes under each of the planned outcomes.

The key achievements under each objective were:

- *Approximately 100 Southern based CSOs have greater knowledge about participatory governance rights, issues and benefits.*

This was mostly achieved through the international conference and the skills building workshops. A key outcome of the international conference was the publication of the book, *"From Political Won't to Political Will"*.

In total, 122 practitioners attended the regional skills building workshops (84 from civil society and 38 from government) representing 54 organisations. The key results of the skills building workshops were mostly at output level as they involved formulation of plans of action. But in some instances the participants went on to turn the outputs into outcomes. In Southern Africa the skills building participants used their opportunity to meet and interact in the workshop and the relationship developed with IDASA to apply for and get funding for a three year project on PG. One government practitioner observed, "As a result of attending the skills building workshop, I am now comfortable to engage in any discussion on local government. The training strengthened my interest in local government issues to the effect that I strongly argued for the collaboration of NICE with IDASA on a joint capacity building project for local governance. The project has been accepted by key stakeholders of NICE" (the EU delegation in Malawi and also the National Authorising officer in the Ministry of Finance).

In Latin America the skills building workshop participants developed a strategy on how to implement what they learnt in the skills building training workshop and they are implementing the strategy consciously. In West Africa, Ghana, some participants are using the knowledge gained in the training to engage citizens in five districts to work with local government.

A key outcome under this objective was the enhanced knowledge, skills and ability to network. In all the regions formal and informal networks have been established and are functional.

- *The organisations have stronger participatory governance skills and improved access to relevant practical information and tools.*

This was mostly achieved through the skills building workshops, mentoring and innovation grants components. Twenty organisations received mentoring support. The delay in implementing the on-line toolkit and 'community of practice' hindered the intended outcome on access to relevant practical information and tools. In Latin America, mentees acquired capacity to develop action plans and proposals for grants. In West Africa mentees got skills in proposal writing for innovation grants. In addition to getting grants from CIVICUS, some of them managed to get grants from other sources as well. The mentees also gained observable skills in local governance practice. The intended outcome of networking among the mentees through internet did not take place for a number of reasons. In South Asia, the mentoring component was replicated in other non CIVICUS PG and non-PG activities in the partner organisations and beyond. There was also visible enhanced knowledge, networking and cross learning.

- *They are able to network more effectively and build alliances*

In all the regions networks have been established but it is not easy to report on the effectiveness of these networks as they are still new. The skills building workshops also contributed towards more networking at regional level. One participant stated, "In addition to getting some useful information and knowledge from the skills building workshop, a key value for me was the networking opportunity the workshop offered me. I was able to establish contacts with many practitioners from the region".

- *They have had experimented with innovative experiments, learnt from them and use the lessons to improve practice.*

The programme planned to support at least 8 innovation grants but 15 grants were actually made. The grant activities spread across several sectors including health, education, water and sanitation, gender equality, child rights, youths empowerment, local government and right to information among others. In Southern Africa, in Malawi, the project has succeeded in enhancing citizen awareness of the need for women's participation in local governance and created a conducive environment for enabling women assume political leadership. On a negative note the absence of government representatives reinforced negative perceptions of the community by members about the local councillors and local government.

The other achievements recorded under outcomes would fit better under impacts. They are therefore recorded under the impact section below.

In summary, the programme has managed to achieve six main outcomes. These are:

- Increasing networking among the participant practitioners nationally and regionally. Some of the networks continue to be functional, like in South Asia and Latin America. IDASA is actively using the contacts and networks developed in other projects as well.

- Acquisition of knowledge and tools that communities are actually using in implementing citizen participation activities.  Youths in Latin America are engaging with government officials on policy and advocacy work after receiving training and technical support from PG programme participants. In Ghana, communities have been mobilised to work with local government on governance issues affecting them.  The NGOGCN in Malawi is promoting women's involvement in leadership positions.

- Continuing work beyond the CIVICUS initiative. In Southern Africa, IDASA received funding from the Swiss Development Cooperation and from CIDA to initiate a five year project in Malawi, South Africa, Zambia and Botswana with the same practitioners they were working with on the CIVICUS PG project. Partners in South Asia have used the model in non-CVICUS supported projects. In Sri Lanka, as a result of innovation grant activities, they have incorporated a unit on Participatory Governance as part of the curriculum on governance for local government authorities.

- In India, many organisations are now using participatory governance tools and techniques learnt from the programme in their work.

- Publishing the book –*'From Political Won't to Political Will'*. This book came out as a result of the international conference that took place in Glasgow in June 2008.  One contributor to the book observed, "I was privileged to be invited as a contributor and co-author of one of the chapters. My personal competence in technical writing was vastly improved. The book was used as promotional material and exemplary reference in advancing participatory governance.  The book gave due recognition and encouragement to local champions to be proud and share their (successful) experiences." While the publishing of the book would normally be recorded as an output, it is recorded here as an outcome because of the magnitude of its potential impact.

- An unintended outcome that the programme has achieved is fundraising capacity among the participants and their initiatives. The network in South Asia managed to get funding from DFID, IDASA managed to get a 3 year project from Commonwealth and a participant organisation to the international conference managed to get a grant from EU which was 20 times its normal grants. MOCASS in Ghana was able to get funding from IBIS. They were able to consciously link their capacity to get these grants to their involvement in the CIVICUS Participatory Governance Programme.

Case Study 1 – Skills Building Workshop Case Study

Vuyeliwa Chitimbire works for ZACH and is a member of the National Non Governmental Organisation in Zimbabwe. She has worked for the Ministry of Local Government and National Housing on issues of decentralisation and capacity building for local authorities. Through her involvement with the National Non-Governmental Organisation she was invited to represent her organisation at the Skills Building Workshop organised by IDASA *(.*The training managed to attract senior people from organisations from different countries in Southern Africa. The participant composition enabled a rich process of sharing experiences and learnings.)

The topics covered at the workshop were on governance, decentralisation and democracy. The topics covered concentrated on areas of policy and administration of these policies to strengthen governance structures at all levels of administration and also ways to improve sector capacities to manage these structures. Much emphasis was put on community empowerment for local development. Emphasis was also put on decentralisation and devolution of authority to local people. Reflecting on the usefulness of the skills building workshop, Vuyeliwa observes, "Issues of governance and democracy are still a serious issue in most African countries – the topics covered in the training therefore are crucial for empowerment of communities to take part in participatory governance. They are important to promote the rights of individuals and communities to address their own needs using national structures, policies and guidelines for community development and growth".

When she came back from the training Vuyeliwa convened a debriefing meeting with some members of the board and senior members of staff. After the debriefing session the organisation decided to take some action based on the knowledge gained from the workshop:

The organisation has reviewed its governance structure and strengthen its management structure through training

The organisation has reviewed its management systems

The organisation has managed to source funds to do institutional audits for improved service delivery on the training received.

"With more (organised) follow up, the regional skills training workshops can go a long way in improving participatory governance in the individual countries and the region as a whole. Holding similar trainings at national level would be a good first step", concluded Vuyeliwa

## 3.2.2 Issues

Four main issues affected the achievement of the programme objectives. These are: delay in launching the online resource centre, time allocation and adequacy of resources; and consultation with players.

The greatest setback in the programme has been the delay in launching the online resource centre. The main objective of the resource centre was to support 'on the ground' practitioners to enrich their understanding of PG practices, enhance their access to successful PG tools and approaches and to establish a platform where practitioners can learn collectively from each other's experience and expertise. It would comprise a Toolkit consisting of 40+ tools and selected

key resources; and an online platform for the CoP to share experiences and provide peer support.

In short the online resource centre would give the programme the 'global presence' that it had intended to have right from the design stage.  It is important to mention that a lot of work has been done and what is remaining now is the launch of the resource centre. But for the purpose of this evaluation, the delay represents a lost opportunity as all the gains in the other components could not be fully 'scaled up' to a global level due to the lack of online presence.

The participants generally felt that the time allocated to the programme was inadequate.  A participant observed: "We were very ambitious in planning and not very good in implementing the plans – what we planned was too much in quantity".

The participants felt that the programme was generally well funded in all the activities except for the networking and alliance building, and the innovation grants.  Although the programme managed to organise and conduct the global Participatory Governance conference and regional skills building workshops, subsequent interactions and activities were mostly electronically based. Participants suggested that more face to face meetings would be more effective in strengthening relationships and networking. They said for most of them, though electronic based networking would potentially be more efficient, in their cases they have problems with access to internet and the internet services are poor, making it difficult to participate effectively.  The current programme budget does not allow for such frequent face to face meetings.   In addition, the participants felt that the innovation grants are generally too small to create significant change.   One participant observed that, "we cannot attribute the success (of the innovation grants) to the funding from CIVICUS alone. We had to dig deeper into our pockets which was not supposed to be the case in the first place". While it is understood that the innovation grants were not meant for big initiatives, allocating more money and time to them would be helpful in enhancing the experience gained and its application.


### 3.2.3 Suggestions for improvement

In order to improve the effectiveness of the programme, it is important to allocate realistic and adequate time to the planned activities.   For instance the participants suggested that the innovation grants would be more effective if they were implemented over a period of at least two years as compared to the present six months.  The same also applies to the mentoring component.

Similarly, increasing the amount of money allocated to the specific programme activities like innovation grants would improve the effectiveness of the programme. It is also important to make sure that networking and alliance

building go beyond internet based communication. This too would imply the need to invest more in face to face meetings.

Though the programme did not mean to achieve parity, the level of participation of government practitioners was relatively lower than that of the civil society practitioners. This was very pronounced especially in the Southern Africa region where though government practitioners were well represented at the skills building workshop, it was very difficult to get their involvement when implementing the innovation grants. While in South Asia they have managed to demonstrate that, "it is possible for civil society and government practitioners to work together on Participatory Governance issues", in Southern Africa they observed that for this to happen there must be adequate consultations and negotiations to ensure government buy in. The key issue is cultivation of relationships between the civil society and the government practitioners that would make the consultations effective. It is also important to create opportunities for the participants (both civil society and government practitioners) to network and know each other so that they can work with each other well. There is need therefore to invest more time especially during planning in consulting and negotiating with government practitioners to ensure that they are 'bought in' into the programme. The West African case is a good example on how this can be done and the benefits that can be reaped from the collaboration.

## 3.3 Impact

The evaluation sought to assess the lasting changes in the practitioners and community lives resulting from the work of the programme.

### 3.3.1 Findings

#### Case study 2: The Movement for Collective Associations (MOCAS)

> Braimah Sanjage works with the Movement for Collective Associations as a Project Coordinator. Through their relationship with CLUSA, their organisation was invited to a skills building workshop in 2009 which took place at Aguna Swedru in Ghana. After the workshop they were asked to submit a proposal for mentorship and innovation grant funding based on their district priorities on Participatory Governance issues. The proposal submitted was successful. They were granted Two thousand five Hundred Ghana Cedis only( GHC 2,500)
>
> The innovation grant was used promote activities aimed at promoting citizen and government engagements at local level through revenue mobilisation. At that time the district assembly was in a financial crisis which made the project very relevant to them. As a result of this project MOCAS has made a number of achievements. Among these are:
>
> - Capacity enhancement in participatory governance this has enhanced, as an Organisation it improves the organisational profile and made it attractive in the face of Collaborators and as an individual I have gained skills in organisational management and dynamics
> - More recognition and respect from the district assembly and other development partners.

"We are now called upon by the District Assembly to participate in their planning and agenda setting meetings like in developing the MTDP (Medium term development plans?) public hearings, budgets and fee fixing meetings among others

• Increase in membership size, we had 16 active member Community based and artisan groups with a total number of about 560 people and now the number of groups rose to 41 groups with an average of 33 members in a group.

The changes that have happened in communities include:
• Increase in awareness and interest in the District Assembly operations
• Increase in revenue mobilisation. The records at the assembly show that revenue collections have been increasing since the start of the project. As of now they have gone up by 10%
• Improved relations between the District Assembly and the citizens. At first the communities were apathetic. They perceived the District Assembly to be non-responsive and they did not believe that the Assembly could change. Now there is an increase in the level of participations by the citizens with the Assembly. There is an increase in the number of community based groups registered to be partners with the assembly. There is an increase in the number of women who presented themselves to participate in the 2010 local elections.
• Fifty (50) women now. The District Assembly is also actively involving the citizens in its plans and development agenda setting by consulting and gathering data on the concerns before drawing up the District Medium Term development Plan. this is supposed to be factored into the National development plan ( that is the ideal)

The project has also helped MOCASS to reposition itself and access thirteen thousand Ghana Cedis (GHC 13,000) from IBIS (Ibis is a Danish NGO but I have no knowledge) and also to gain recognition from other Non Governmental Organisations (NGO) (what does NOO mean? NGO) that expressed interest in collaboration for effective citizen government engagement.

MOCASS has made these achievements despite the facts that there was initially reluctance from the communities to participate as they did not believe that the District Assembly could really change in their favour. The change in political environment that saw the District head removed and replaced with another was another major hurdle. In addition to these two main challenges, it was generally felt that the time and money invested in the project were inadequate.

"The District Assembly is now committed, the trust from the citizens is growing and we are also getting recognition and support from other bigger and more experienced civil society organisations. With more capacity building and budgetary support we can do more in the district and we can also extend these Participatory Governance initiatives to other districts," concluded Braimah.

From the interviews, document review and the case study above, the programme has managed to accomplish a number of impacts. The key impacts from the regions include:

West Africa

Enhanced capacity of civic unions to engage district assemblies in dialogue; broadening the space for public involvement in local governance; enhanced citizen awareness and appreciation of key issues; increased potential for municipal revenue generation; increased solidarity among CSOs; building trust between local government and citizens. Grant participants have gained skills and

confidence to facilitate participatory governance processes even without the support of CLUSA (see case study 1 above)

South Asia

Increased scope of citizen participation in urban governance in a Sri Lankan municipality; enhanced capacity of village development councils to engage with citizens in Nepal; enhanced capacity of the media to engage with the state in Bangladesh; enhanced awareness of community members about governance schemes in Panchayant in Kashmir; and increased participation of women and children in West Bengal. In short there is enhanced understanding and capacity/skills to PG principles and tools amongst the participants. There is increased scope and opportunities for networking amongst PG practitioners in the region. A larger scaling up impact has been the incorporation of a course unit of PG as part of the training curriculum for local government agencies in Sri Lanka.

Latin America

Capacities and skills of participants for policy advocacy strengthened. They have used these to create spaces for youth participation in political governance and public policy formulation; secured commitments of public officials to the youth agenda in public policies; consolidated and empowered youth networks; and strengthened trust of the young citizens in the governance process; and increased capacity of the groups to make structured and systematic interventions.

What is not clear though is the magnitude of the impact given the global scope of the programme. At regional level, the participants generally felt the programme was 'spread too thin'. One participant observed, "While we are very happy with our achievements, what we have achieved so far can be seen as soup before the main meal".

The impacts are mostly localised and could not be scaled up to regional and global level because of the delay in the launch of the online resource centre. The achievement at impact level is well summarised by one participant, who observed,

*"The results of the programme have been mixed. The programme has been able to achieve most of its short term objectives. But the very nature of the programme goals require sustained and long term efforts on the part of CIVICUS and the partner organisations. Participatory Governance, though politically most appropriate, need to be pushed proactively in a society where historically participation of a large segment of society has been restricted. Knowledge about the tools of Participatory Governance is important but not sufficient. Results of Participatory Governance would be satisfying only when a large number of*

*people start using these tools to promote Participatory Governance in their communities and local governments. More effort is needed to make Participatory Governance interventions self sustaining. We have not yet reached the threshold, though the current Participatory Governance Programme phase has made a significant contribution in visualising and approaching the threshold".*


### 3.3.2 Issues

Two main issues were observed under impact. These are: how to consolidate the achievements made so far, and how to scale up for regional impact.

A key issue is whether more impact would be achieved by extending the programme to other regions at the same level of investment as in the current regions or to consolidate the work in the current regions by investing more. Both have advantages and disadvantages but at its current level of achievement, the programme still needs to consolidate its foundation. The participants' general feeling is that there is still more work to be done to begin to make significant change and shifts at the regional level. They felt the current scope of targeting regions (with 4 to 5 countries per region) is just about fine. What matters is to use the lessons learnt to make the programme work better at regional level as there is already a foundation at regional level that the programme can build on. They suggested that the programme may not need to expand beyond the 4 or 5 countries per region but rather concentrate on consolidating the foundation already built in the regions from those same countries.

Most importantly there is a need for broader and longer term strategic thinking on how to consciously link local efforts like the one in Ghana and South Asia to national policy work like the one in Brazil to regional efforts and then to global efforts. What benchmark is our work based on – if participatory governance is about creating and claiming closed (political) spaces, how much space does civil society have at the global level (UN, World Bank), regional level (African Union, Nepad) and national levels – how much voice does civil society have in policy formulation, influence and legislation. How much space does civil society have at the local levels? What is our conscious strategy to bring about or to consciously contribute to change at all these levels? How are our current efforts making or contributing to these changes?  These are some of the strategic questions that need to be thought through for future phases of the programme. This means the future work of the programme needs to continue focusing on both local and national governance and explore ways on how to consciously link these to regional and global efforts.

### 3.3.3 Suggestions for improvement

The impact of the programme would be enhanced with more investment in the regions (group of countries within the regions). Concentration of efforts and resources, rather than spreading thin, would ensure more impact. One participant observed that, "in its current form, the programme (at regional level), is too small a project to influence national and regional public policies. Consolidation would be enhanced through more investment in time and money to the same practitioner organisations to ensure a stronger foundation, working closely with the other departments within CIVICUS to ensure synergy; and completion of the community of practice initiative. Scaling up for more impact would be achieved through capacity building among the practitioners, their organisations and networks for fundraising beyond the CIVICUS programme, encouraging replication of approach in other programmes they are involved in; and documentation and dissemination of best practices." If well managed, the greatest lever to consolidate and scale up the impact of the programme is the online resource centre.

Secondly, being a very complex programme especially in terms of geographical scope and the number of players involved, there is need for a more thoroughly thought-through monitoring and evaluation system. This has to do with the Participatory Governance Programme being clear in terms of the baseline conditions on the ground, the outcomes they would like to achieve and the indicators and targets along the way (this is discussed in detail elsewhere).

## 3.4 Efficiency

The evaluation sought to compare between (and justification of) inputs and results and whether the cost of the programme can be justified by its results. The evaluation looked at efficiency from three angles. These were the comparison between the general capacity of the Participatory Governance Programme and the results achieved; the comparison between the money invested and the results achieved; and lastly how monitoring and evaluation was designed and how it was carried out in practice.

### 3.4.1 Findings

*Capacity*

A major input is the general capacity of the entity implementing the programme. One way of assessing an entity's capacity is through the assessment checklist in table 4. The capacity rates in the appendix were arrived at through a self assessment by the Participatory Governance Programme team.  Comparing an

entity's general level of capacity with the results it is achieving in its programme's can give a feel of its efficiency. This can be concretised and validated by taking other specific measures such as cost effectiveness and practices such as monitoring and evaluation.

From the self assessment, the Participatory Governance Programme team's capacity strengths were in strong Participatory Governance skills and competences; clarity of roles and responsibilities between the Participatory Governance team and implementing partners; generally adequate financial and material resources, a well thought-through approach or strategy – working through partners and effective leadership. Key capacity challenges included inadequate numbers of personnel, constraining organisational policies, systems and procedures especially in the areas of: financial, administrative and human resources. The programme does not have an effective monitoring and evaluation system. They are working with the Impact Planning and Learning Framework Department to address this gap in 2010.

By comparing the strong capacity elements with the weak ones on one hand and the outcomes and impacts the programme has managed to achieve it can be concluded that the programme has been efficient.  The key helping factors have been the leverage of working through the partners. In addition, the content of the online resource centre (Toolkit) has also been developed to a large extent jointly with a network of expert organisations and the quality and relevance of the content could not have been achieved through the work of the PG team alone. The planned activities to ensure 'online presence' would provide a great lever in terms of financial and material resources available. Efficiency would also improve with organisational improvements in the identified weak areas.


*Cost effectiveness*

| Activity | Budget | Total expenditure | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|
| International Conference | Euro 135,000 | Euro 42,587 | Euro 92,413 |
| Regional workshops and mentoring | Euro 35, 250 | Euro 42, 603 | Euro - 7353 |
| Innovation grants | Euro 20,000 | Euro 20,000 | Euro 0 |


The data above is based on the year 2 budget and expenditure report. The international conference had the largest budget line but fortunately most participants were able to obtain travel bursaries which resulted in large savings for the programme. It is noted that the cost of innovation grants is less than half that of regional training workshops and mentoring.

Most of the participants interviewed felt that the innovation grants, though they received the least investment, were the most efficient. They felt they were the most efficient because they produced the most concrete results. It is however understood that the results achieved through the innovation grants cannot be isolated from the skills building workshops, mentorship and other activities as these were meant to build on each other.

*Monitoring and evaluation*

Reporting on the progress of activities generally worked well. The implementing partners interacted with the practitioners through telephone conversations and through field visits. They also collected activity reports from the places they could not physically go. In interacting with the district practitioners, they met them in groups. This was helpful because in the groups it would be difficult to present reports on activities that had not been implemented.  The partners then submitted progress reports, after compiling the reports they got from the practitioners, to CIVICUS.

A key issue around monitoring and evaluation has been the need for consistent and conscious tracking of progress based on a functional monitoring and evaluation system.  This in not currently there in CIVICUS and it is just being developed. As a result of this challenge, it was not possible to get reports that consciously report towards the achievement of agreed outcomes and to comment whether those agreed outcomes were still relevant and realistic.  One donor noted, "I don't feel the programme has been strong in communicating on activities (outcomes). I have as a donor received some reports on progress but not much on substantial matters". The participants generally felt that the monitoring and evaluation aspect, though well intended, needed more attention in order to be more effective. For instance, monitoring and evaluation was not sufficiently budgeted for especially at implementing partner and practitioner organisation levels. This made monitoring visits and reporting difficult.

### 3.4.2 Issues

Three main issues arise out of the analysis of the efficiency of the programme. These are the need to address capacity gaps in CIVICUS, the need to invest more in innovation grants as a way of scaling up impact; and need to improve monitoring and evaluation practice.

The capacity gaps mentioned above: inadequate numbers of personnel and need for improvement in organisational policies, systems and procedures especially in the areas of administration, finances and human resource; and monitoring and evaluation constrained the outcomes of the programme. A key principle in the programme was building the capacity of the partners and identified practitioners. It is important to note however that in intending to build the capacity of the other

players in the programme, it is possible that the Participatory Governance team may have forgotten to build its own capacity in the identified capacity gaps. While facilitating the building of capacity of others, it is important not to forget building one's own capacity.

The fulcrum of the programme as far as community impact is concerned rests on the innovation grants. Being pilot projects, they have great potential to spark off other similar activities like the case in Southern Africa where practitioners are engaged together with IDASA in a 3 year project that was inspired by the original innovation grants. Being of such strategic importance, there is need to rethink the investment made into the innovation grants in terms of money and time.

There is need to improve monitoring and evaluation practice especially in tracking the outcomes and impacts of the programme. Data that enables regular comparison of the outcomes realised and the inputs spent would make the assessment of efficiency much easier. There is a need for stronger links and tracking of inputs and outputs, outcome and impacts in monitoring and evaluation from the grassroots to the practitioner organisation, to the partner organisation and to CIVICUS. Key to this is ensuring that the voice of the communities is captured and maintained throughout the process.


### 3.4.3 Suggestions for improvement

In order to ensure more efficiency, it is important to 'put ones money where the mouth is' or to invest where it would cause the greatest shift in terms of results. It is important therefore to invest more in the innovation grants for the reasons stated above. This indirectly implies the need to invest more in the other components, namely skills building workshops, the mentoring also including the online resource centre to ensure that the 'concrete' results from the innovation grants are not an end in themselves but that they reflect that the 'intangible' PG capacities to promote citizen participation are being built.

It is also important to address the identified capacity gaps of need for more personnel, need for a more effective programme and organisation wide monitoring and evaluation system and need to improve policies, systems and procedures. The capacity gaps identified are more organisational than the Participatory Governance programme specific. The capacity gaps identified above therefore could make a useful input to the current organisational development efforts that CIVICUS is going through. They could inform CIVICUS' capacity building plan.  The greatest lever for the programme potentially is the on-line resource centre.

## 3.5 Sustainability

The evaluation assessed the actual or potential sustainability of the programme. It focused on three dimensions of sustainability. These are: financial, institutional and benefits sustainability.

### 3.5.1 Findings

*Financial sustainability* – financial sustainability in this case refers to the ability of the partner organisations and the practitioner organisations to continue financing the PG initiatives after the 'CIVICUS financial support'. Most of the participants felt that it is too early for them to financially sustain the initiatives. They need more financial investment for consolidation of the current activities. The success thus generated may give them a strong basis for fundraising for the continuation of similar activities. IDASA for example, already managed to get a 3 year project funding from Commonwealth Foundation building on the Participatory Governance initiative. Iloilo Caucus of Developmental Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs), Inc, a participant in the International conference, reported that, "more and bigger opportunities for grant assistance have come our way as a result of higher level of confidence resulting from being a conference invitee and participating in the conference. We got a grant fro EU which was 20 times more than our usual grants." This means that the Participatory Governance initiative or the interventions are potentially financially sustainable (where sustainability is understood to mean the ability to get funding from other donors). For the programme, sustainability means ensuring enough resources for all costs and activities during its life time. As stated above, the programme had generally adequate financial resources for activities but not enough for other costs for recruitment if needed personnel.

*Institutional sustainability* – the institutional sustainability of the Participatory Governance activities is greatly linked to the programme's relevance to the partner organisations, practitioner organisations and other stakeholders. As seen from the analysis on relevance above, the programme is seen to be largely relevant to these organisations and the organisations are committed as evidenced by their willingness to commit resources of personnel, time and sometimes money. Since the activities are largely relevant, the organisations are likely to continue implementing them after the programme.

Ensuring that the networks formed are functional and effective is also another way of enhancing the institutional sustainability of the programme.

*Benefits sustainability* – at the current stage and level of investment the benefits of the programme may continue to flow at the local and isolated levels (if the programme stopped). But the benefits have not yet reached a threshold level

where they can create national and regional shifts in policy and practice. There is need to invest more so that a threshold and critical mass is reached.

### 3.5.2 Issues

Three main issues were identified on the sustainability of the programme. These were to do with levels of investment, need to think through how best to ensure regional impact; and need to explore alternative ways of funding and expanding the initiative at local, national and regional levels.

Most of the participants felt that the current amounts of money invested at regional levels are too small to cause a significant shift in policy and practice at national and regional levels. There is a need to scale up the activities to enable such sustainable shifts to happen. One way of ensuring sustainability therefore would be to increase support to the networking activities of the groups formed so that they can expand their sphere of influence and contacts beyond the local to national and regional levels.

There is need for more analysis of Participatory Governance issues that are cross cutting in a particular region and using these as basis for the regional approach to the programme. Building on the regional ethos would create more resonance and commitment in the region. Participants from Latin America for example indicated that some of their initiatives are sustainable because they connected to previously installed political processes shared across the region.

There is a need to build more on the programme's implementation *principle of capacity building* of the partners and practitioner organisations. One critical area for this would be in resource mobilisation and fundraising. There is a need to be more creative at national and regional levels to collaborate and explore new resources to increase the levels of investment.  A number of partners and practitioner organisations have managed to get funding from other donors to support or extend their PG initiatives beyond CIVICUS. The Federation of Sri Lankan Local Government authorities managed to get some funding from the Commonwealth Foundation to organise a study tour of some 20 participatory governance practitioners from Sri Lanka and India. This said, it is also important to expand the understanding of capacity building to go beyond strengthening the technical capacity of the partner, practitioner organisations and the networks formed to include organisational capacity especially in the identified areas of internal governance and management, ability to attract and retain high quality staff or volunteers, enhancing participation levels of the organisations' beneficiaries or rights holders and ensuring that they organisations have clear exit strategies. This would form a strong foundation especially for organisational or institutional sustainability. As it is understood that that mandate of the PG programme is on participatory governance, it may be useful to collaborate with other institutions that provide organisational capacity support.

### 3.5.3 Suggestion for improvement

To ensure sustainability of the programme activities, it will be necessary to consolidate the achievements gained so far so that there is a strong foundation for continuity. Some of the ways of doing this would be:

Increase the amounts of money invested to a level that a threshold for sustaining national and regional shifts is possible. The programme may promote more intensive capacity building activities at national and regional level including more exchange visits and skills building workshops, and sharing of best practices from individual initiatives at regional level. The online resource centre will also provide a great lever in sharing successful experiences at global level.

Strengthen the organisational capacity of the practitioner organisations and the networks formed so that they can carry on after the CIVICUS inputs; and encourage and build capacity for fundraising at the local, national and regional levels. It is worthwhile thinking through how the programme may collaborate with other service providers in organisational capacity building to take care of this aspect while they concentrate on their core business of PG.

## 3.6 Replicability

Despite the identified challenges, the Participatory Governance Programme model (international workshop, regional skills building workshop –mentoring – innovation grants) has generally worked well in all the regions. Starting with the international conference, some participants also attended the regional skills building workshops. The knowledge from the skills building workshops was concretised through the mentoring sessions and applied through the innovation grants. The formation of networks ensured cross learning among the participants. This suggests that the model is replicable in different contexts (at least in similar contexts as the programme is currently being implemented). From the above analyses, the five critical success factors for effective replicability are given below. The lessons and recommendations that follow would also enhance the replication success.

- Sensitivity to the needs of the different contexts and the flexibility to allow the initiative to address the Participatory Governance issues relevant to the particular context. CIVICUS took the whole programme to be a 'capacity building initiative' for the partners and the targeted practitioners and as such recognised the importance of letting the partners a lot of leeway in deciding what issues they wanted to address in their regions. For example in Latin America they concentrated on 'empowering' the youths while in West Africa they concentrated on facilitating dialogue between communities and local government.

- Ensuring efficient and effective relationships among all the players involved (CIVICUS, implementing partners; and targeted practitioners and their organisations. This facilitates communication and mutual learning);

- Increased time frame and amounts for the innovation grants;

- Increased and improved cross-learning among the projects through exchange visits for example;

- More conscious linkages between the regional skills building workshops, mentoring and innovation grants, especially be strengthening the mentoring component;

- The need for a clear exit strategy right at the beginning which would ensure that the initiative focuses on sustainability issues right from the beginning.


## 4. CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the key achievements and challenges of the programme.

### 4.1 Summary of key achievements

The evaluation concludes that the programme was largely effective – it managed to achieve many of its stated objectives. The programme has achieved a number of important outcomes. For instance in Latin America, the youths have been mobilised and organised to engage actively with government on youth related Participatory Governance issues. In South Asia civil society, government and media practitioners are working together in a network aimed at promoting Participatory Governance in communities.  In West Africa, civil society and government practitioners together with communities are working together on a number of Participatory Governance initiatives while in Southern Africa some practitioners with the help from IDASA have managed to start their own Participatory Governance initiative building on the CIVICUS supported initiative.

The creation of the practically oriented, user friendly toolkit of 40+ tools and approaches plus key resources is a key achievement though it is not yet publicly available. Publishing and dissemination of the book, *'From Political Wont to Political Will'* is filling a big gap in knowledge on PG, especially on key reasons for lack of political will and how to overcome them, on a global scale.

It is however important to point out that it is too early to comment on the overall regional and global impact of these and the other outcomes achieved. However, a few initial impacts have already been identified. These include:

West Africa

Enhanced capacity of civic unions to engage district assemblies in dialogue; broadening the space for public involvement in local governance; enhanced citizen awareness and appreciation of key issues; increased potential for municipal revenue generation; increased solidarity among CSOs; building trust between local government and citizens. Grant participants have gained skills and confidence to facilitate participatory governance processes even without the support of CLUSA (see case study 1 above)

South Asia

Increased scope of citizen participation in urban governance in a Sri Lankan municipality enhanced capacity of village development councils to engage with citizens in Nepal; enhanced capacity of the media to engage with the state in Bangladesh; enhanced awareness of community members about governance schemes in Panchayant in Kashmir; and increased participation of women and children in West Bengal. In short there is enhanced understanding and capacity/skills to PG principles and tools amongst the participants. There is increased scope and opportunities for networking amongst PG practitioners in the region. A larger scaling up impact has been the incorporation of a course unit of PG as part of the training curriculum for local government agencies in Sri Lanka.

Latin America

Capacities and skills if participants for policy advocacy strengthened. They have used these to create spaces for youths participation in political governance and public policy formulation; secured commitments of public officials to the youths agenda in public policies; consolidated and empowered youths networks; and strengthened trust of the young citizens in the governance process; and increased capacity of the groups to make structured and systematic interventions.

Compared to the benefits or results achieved, the cost of the programme is justified. Given the amount of resources invested and the capacity within the Participatory Governance Programme, the programme was largely efficient. The programme is potentially sustainable especially if there would be more efforts to consolidate the current levels of achievement. The 'simplicity' of the programme model and the fact that it has generally yielded positive results in all the regions suggest that the programme is replicable. The partners and targeted practitioners found the programme to be very relevant. They however noted that relevance would be enhanced with more extensive involvement of some stakeholders including government practitioners, the youths and women at the design stage.

It can be concluded that while the programme has achieved many of its expected results at the output and outcome levels, a core achievement has been in getting the Participatory Governance team and programme model 'organised and established' and building a network of partner and practitioner organisations. The outstanding challenge for the next phase will be to consolidate and scale up the results at outcome and impact levels.

## 4.2 Summary of key issues

The key issues/challenges that the programme needs to address for improvement are summarised below:

- The need to improve the implementation of the programme in order to ensure that women, youths, government practitioner and other marginalised groups s are explicitly targeted during implementation.

- Need to consolidate achievements made so far and scaling up for regional impact – explore how to link local efforts, to national, regional and global efforts.

- Tightening the model used at regional level to ensure a conscious and systematic build up and continuity from skills building workshops, mentoring and innovation grants.

- Inadequate time and money allocation to a scale that can bring about a shift at regional level.

- Capacity gaps in CIVICUS PG programme.

- Need to develop a more effective monitoring and evaluation system that links up monitoring and evaluation efforts from community to practitioner organisation to regional partner and CIVICUS PG programme and organisation-wide levels.

- Need for more improved cross-learning among the projects through online platforms and other means like exchange visits.

In summary, the PG programme has generally been a successful programme. The key challenge is to consolidate and build on the successes already scored. There are no major design issues that need to be revisited except the need to think through monitoring and evaluation, the need to emphasise synergy with other departments and realistic allocation of time, money and 'thought' to such components as mentoring and innovation grants.

## 5. LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Lessons

A number of lessons can be drawn from the findings, discussions and conclusions above. These include:

*General lessons*

1. It is possible to implement a Participatory Governance programme on a large geographical scale with limited staff and resources using the lever of implementing partners. The implementing partners know more about the specific reality the practitioners and their organisations live in and they know better how to communicate and mobilise them in their context. It is important to emphasise the need for an optimum number of staff to ensure adequate capacity for the PG team.

2. Real and significant impact of large scale Participatory Governance programmes requires large investments of time, money and other resources.

3. With regard to operational support, it is more cost effective, relevant and sustainable to build on already existing projects or initiatives as compared to starting completely new projects or initiatives.

4. The model of skills-building workshops followed by mentorship and innovation grants is viable but to be more effective, there is need for clearer conceptualisation and guidelines especially with regard to the mentorship component. A clear, logical and conscious link among the three components is important to ensure that they build on each other for more success.

5. A global reach is difficult to achieve without online (internet) presence. The delay in launching the online resource centre was a major setback as far as the global effectiveness and impact of the programme are concerned.

6. Civil society and government practitioners often view each other with suspicion which makes working together difficult. This programme has proved that it is possible for civil society and government practitioners to work together. For such collaborations to work well however there is need for more consultations and negotiations including thinking through what would motivate both groups to commit. Trust building is important in ensuring healthy and cooperative relationships between government and civil society actors. The main difference between the success of MOCASS (Ghana) and NGOGCN (Malawi) on one hand and the failure of Participation Joint (South Africa) in bringing civil society and government practitioners to work together, for

example, was in the levels of trust cultivated and nurtured between the two groups.

7. Relevance is a central sustainability ingredient for PG programmes. If the implementing partners and practitioner organisations see the programme as being relevant and adding value to their own organisational goals, they are likely to institutionalise and continue implementing after the CIVICUS supported has stopped. For example IDASA is implementing a 5 year project with the same practitioners after the CIVICUS programme.

8. It is important for donors like Irish Aid to increase their funding levels to ensure more impact, and also for targeted practitioners to raise their own funds for PG initiatives. Increasing funding by the donor therefore should be coupled with efforts to build the fundraising capacity of the practitioners. The programme has already proved effective in helping some partner and practitioner organisations to attract complementary funding.


## Designing effective Participatory Governance programmes

9. Focusing on the practitioners' organisations rather than individuals is essential. This creates ownership that ensures commitment and therefore a basis for continuity of the initiative even if the particular practitioner leaves the organisation. In addition, defining the target group and ensuring appropriate criteria and selection process of the practitioners and their organisations are critical.

10. Investment in efforts aimed at transforming people's lives require more time. Donors and all stakeholders need to recognise that real tangible benefits may take long, often many years to manifest. It is important therefore to be patient and take the risk for the sake of sustainable results that have benefits far beyond the immediate.

11. Making provisions for participants who do not use English as their official language as is the case in Latin America, South Asia and Francophone Africa to enable them to participate more effectively would enhance the relevance of the programme.

12. Prevalent gender biases and power dynamics constrain effective participation of women. Targeting women, the youths and other minorities in the design phase is not enough if this is not consciously and actively followed through in the implementation and monitoring and evaluation phases of the programme.

***Implementing effective Participatory Governance Programmes***

13. In large Participatory Governance programmes, it is important for organisations like CIVICUS, to strike a balance between a hands-on approach and a 'delegation' approach to the implementing partners. The Programme coordinator plays a significant role as the glue that holds together the different components, monitoring progress, pushing and cajoling towards deadlines and lending a guiding hand as and when needed. The coordinator also plays a key role in ensuring that all are moving in a similar direction and accelerating progress towards the desired results. One partner attributed their success to the support they received from the Participatory Governance team. They observed, *"CIVICUS supported us as advisors, monitored the project during all the phases, called our attention to the programme's aims from time to time. We feel the CIVICUS team was always available to discuss any difficulty or detail of the project, helped us make decisions and was very open to negotiation in order to suit both the programme's aims and our expectations as well as the practitioner organisations needs and demands".*

14. Ensuring healthy relationships among all the players (Participatory Governance staff, the implementing partners and practitioner organisations) evidenced by clarity of roles and responsibilities, a sense of shared vision and purpose, a shared understanding of the concepts and practice of Participatory Governance, high levels of transparency and reciprocity, clarity of expectations and mutuality of support are critical for programme success.

15. Clear goals, simple logistics and appropriate and productive preparation period at all levels (PG team, implementation partner and practitioner organisation) significantly increase satisfaction and chances of success.

16. Providing more space (to discuss what they believe should happen in building relationships between civil society and government) provides an opportunity of interacting with other people from different regions of the world to discuss issues, challenges, opportunities and share learning at a global level and within the regions.

17. More involvement of all stakeholders especially at the design stage is important to enhance the relevance of the process and content of the programme.

18. It is important to budget for monitoring and evaluation as a professional practice. Given its critical importance monitoring and evaluation must be managed by a qualified person. An adequate budget and a qualified person ensure monitoring and evaluation gets the attention it deserves.

## 5.2 Recommendations

The evaluation ends with a number of recommendations which include:

### *CIVICUS and Participatory Governance Programme*

1. Build the size and capacity of the core CIVICUS Participatory Governance team to be able to respond to the implementation requirements of the partners and other players in the programme. The identified capacity gaps must be budgeted for and included as part of the CIVICUS capacity building plan.

2. Create synergy by consciously working more closely with the other departments.  This can be achieved through joint planning and review processes among others.  Inter-departmental reflection and learning sessions would also help in identifying further areas for collaboration and mutual inter-departmental support

3. Focus right from the design stage on the long-term impact and sustainability aspect of the programme.  This would mean including aspects of enabling the partner organisations and practitioner organisations to fundraise on their own for continuation of the initiatives, strengthening the institutionalisation of the initiatives and providing adequate funding to provide a strong foundation for the partner and practitioner organisations to build on.

4. The next phase needs to pay more attention on ensuring a effective monitoring and evaluation, learning and knowledge management. It is important for the programme to develop a performance monitoring framework that consolidates the current monitoring and evaluation efforts in the programme and in CIVICUS as an organisation to come up with an effective monitoring and evaluation system. A performance monitoring framework at the Participatory Governance programme level will enable the Participatory Governance team to objectively track and report results (outputs, outcomes and impact) at the Participatory Governance programme, implementing partner, practitioner organisation and community levels. For the innovation grant projects it will be important to have proper benchmark or baseline studies to act as an objective basis for claims of success or failure.  In addition to an effective monitoring and evaluation system, it will be important to ensure that there is an effective knowledge management strategy and system at CIVICUS organisational level. A knowledge management strategy and system will ensure that the lessons learnt from the programme and other sources of learning are being consciously and systematically documented, stored and can be retrieved with ease and are accessible to all within CIVICUS; and most importantly, that they are actually being used to improve practice. An effective performance monitoring framework and a knowledge management strategy and system would enhance CIVICUS capacity as a

learning organisation. It is important to invest more in regular joint reflection and learning sessions both face to face and electronically.

5. While the programme design had made provision for participation and involvement of women, youths and other minorities, these were not fully and consciously followed through in implementation especially in Latin America and South Asia (for women). It will be important to make the participation of women and other minorities a central and important aspect of the monitoring and evaluation system to be developed. The monitoring and evaluation system must ensure that data collected and analysed fully includes and assesses the types and levels of participation of women, youths and other minorities; and that corrective measures are taken immediately to remedy any observed shortfalls.

### *Implementing Partners and Practitioner Organisations*

6. Build the capacity of networking and the networks formed. The sustainability of the programme lies to a great extent on how effective the networking and networks formed will become. Networks are complex forms of organisation and sustaining them is a very difficult effort. To ensure effectiveness it is important to invest in developing their leadership and governance to ensure that they are able to deliver on their core networking process, member contributions need to be prioritised and systems set up to motivate, measure and track their most vital resource – the participation and commitment of the members. In addition to focusing on measuring project outputs same effort should also be put on the developmental task of networking and building member capacity and ownership.

7. Invest more time in building relationships among the different types of practitioners especially with the government practitioners. It is important to understand their fears and motivations and work with these while trying to win their commitment to the programme. For more relevance it is also important to consult and get the views of both civil society and government practitioners including the implementing partners on programme content and process into the design phase of the programme.

8. Re-strategise on mentorship as a component to the current CIVICUS participatory governance programme model. It is important to reflect again on the basic strategic questions: What is mentorship? Why is mentorship necessary in this programme? What are the different ways mentorship is done? Which way is appropriate for us?  What criteria are we going to use to choose our mentees and mentors? What type of support do the mentors and mentees need? How are we going to implement mentorship in our programme? How much is it going to cost us for it to make a significant enough contribution to success?

***Donors***

9. Support the consolidation of the results achieved so far in order to form a stronger foundation for more outcomes and impact. This would be done through increasing the level of funding and the duration of such critical components as mentorship and innovation grants. It is also important to invest more in communication and interaction (networks and networking) especially among the practitioners and practitioner organisations. The Asian Network on Participatory Governance would be a good model to work with.

10. In addition to supporting 'programme activities', it will also be important to support the organisational capacity building efforts for the Participatory Governance Programme and partners identified and implied in this evaluation. A more capacitated Participatory Governance team and partner organisations would provide a better pre-requisite for more success in the subsequent phases of the programme.  It will be important to put a budget line for the PG team to address the capacity issues identified in this evaluation.

11. In order to assess programme results more effectively and consciously draw lessons for improved practice, invest more in the practice monitoring and evaluation; learning and knowledge management

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix 1: List of programme stakeholders interviewed**

**December 2009 Learning and Sharing Event participants**

| *Participant* | *Name of Organisation* | *e-mail address* |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Viviane Nebo | Polis | Viviane@polis.org.br |
| 2. Lizandra Serafim | Polis | Liza@polis.org.br |
| 3. Cecilia Fonseca | Canto Jovem | ceciliafonse@hotmail.com |
| 4. Leila Mucarsel | Red de organizaciones Juveniles de Mendoza | leilamucarsel@gmail.com |
| 5. Alfonso Osegueda | CESEM | chjac@terra.com.mx |
| 6. Beatrix Lopez Pena | CESEM | |
| 7. Manjunath Sadashiva | CIVICUS | msadahiva@yahoo.co.uk |
| 8. Refaat Abdel Karim | CARE Egypt | |
| 9. Mohammed Nada | CARE Egypt | MNada@egypt.care.org |
| 10. Manoj Rai | PRIA | manoj@ pria.org |
| 10. Hemanthi Goonasekera | Federation of Srilankan Government Authorities, Sri Lanka | |
| I2. Julie Thekkudan | PRIA | Julie@pria.org |
| 13. Doung Samphors | Star Kampuchea | Star-deputy@starkampuchea org.kh |
| 14. Chhea Chley Savana | Star Kampuchea | |
| 15. Cebo Taho | Participation Junction | cebo@participationjunction.org.za |
| 16. Khairuzzaman Kamal | Blangladesh Manobadhikar Sangbadik fomm. | bmsf@dhaka.net |
| 17. Braimah Sanjage | MOCASS, Ghana | bsanjage@ yahoo.com |
| 18. Evelyn Arthur | CLUSA, Ghana | evearthur@ yahoo.com |
| 19. Daniel Alimo | CLUSA, Ghana | Alimo17687@hotmail.com |
| 20. Paulina Attah | East Gonja District Assembly, Ghana | attapaulina@yahoo.com |
| 22. Benjy Mautjane | Idasa | bmautjane@idasa.org.za |
| 23. Nico Bezuidenhout | Idasa | nbzuidenhout@idasa.org.za |

## International Advisory Group Members

| Respondent | Organisation | e-mail |
|---|---|---|
| Papa Sene | CLUSA | psene@yahoo.com |
| Manoj Raj | PRIA | manoj@pria.org |
| David Bonbright | Keystone | david@keystoneacccountability.org |

## Regional Partners

| Respondent | Organisation | e-mail |
|---|---|---|
| Daniel Alimo | CLUSA, Ghana | Alimo17687@hotmail.com |
| Evelyn Arthur | CLUSA, Ghana | evearthur@ yahoo.com |
| Benjy Mautjane | IDASA | bmautjane@idasa.org.za |
| Nico Bezuidenhout | IDASA | nbzuidenhout@idasa.org.za |
| Lizandra Serafim | Polis | liza@polis.org.br |
| Viviane Nebo | Polis | Viviane@polis.org.br |
| Julie Thekkudan | PRIA | Julie@pria.org |

## Targeted Practitioners: Workshop Participants

| Respondent | Organisation | e-mail |
|---|---|---|
| Hemanthi Goonasekera | Fed. Of Sri Lankan Local Government | hemanthi@gmail.com |
| Bharati Besra | Society for Disability and Health Awareness | bharatibesra@yahoo.com |
| Luciana Lima | Canto Jovem | Luciana@cantojovem.org.br |
| Juliane Alhayde | Collectivo Leila Dini | Ju.ataide@yahoo.com.br |
| Shireen Amadien | Participatory Junction | shireen@participation.org.za |
| Vuyeliwa Chitimbire | ZACH | chitimbire@zach.org.zw |
| Braima Sanjage | MOCAS | bsanjage@yahoo.com |
| Khairuzzaman Kamal | BMSF | bmsf@shaka.net |
| Dalitso Kubalasa | MEJN | dkubalasa@mejn.mw |
| Jeff Kabondo | National Initiative for Civic Education | jkabondo@nicemw.org |
| Shah Abdus Salam | Development Wheel | dewsalaam@gmail.com |
| Becky Himlin | Planact | becky@planact.org.za |
| Arshinder Kaur | Organic Farming Council of Punjab | arshinderkaur@gmail.com |
| Govind Shrestha | South Asia Partnership Nepal | govindbdrs@gmail.com |
| Mubeena Ramzan | Muslimat Education Trust | mubram@yahoo.co.in |

## Targeted Practitioners: Mentees

| Name | Organisation | e-mail |
|---|---|---|
| Soma Bhowmick | SPMUS | spumus@hotmail.com |
| DA Hamangoda Sama | PALTRA | paltra@slt.lk |
| Khairuzaman Kamal | BMSF | bmsf@shaka.net |
| Mubeena Ramzan | Muslimat Educational Trust | mubram@yahoo.co.in |

## Targeted Practitioners: Innovation Grantees

| Name | Organisation | e-mail |
|---|---|---|
| Cecilia Fonseca | Canto Jovem | ceciliafonseca@yahoo.com |
| Braima Sanjage | MOCAS | bsanjage@yahoo.com |
| Leila Murcasel | MENDOZA | leilamurcasel@gmail.com |
| Khairuzzaman Kamal | BMSF | bmsf@shaka.net |

## International Conference Participants

| Emmanuel Areno | ICODE | icode@skyinet.net |
|---|---|---|
| Vugar Bayramov | Centre for Economic and Social Development | cesd@aztelekom.net |
| Devabrata Charaborty | Ministry of Establishment | Deva_bangla@yahoo.com |

## Members of staff

| Name | Department | e-mail |
|---|---|---|
| Anu Pekkonen | Participatory Governance | Anu.pekkonen@civicus .org |
| Deus Kibamba | Participatory Governance | Deus.Kibamba@civicus.org |
| Katsuji Imata | Deputy Secretary General | Katsuji.imata@civicus .org |
| Adam Nord | CSW Programme | Adam.nord@civicus.org |
| Joyce Tshabalala | Finance | Joyce.tshabalala@civicus.org |
| Judith Seda | Resource Mobilisation | Judith.seda@civicus.org |
| Jessica Hume | Membership Support | Jessica.hume@civicus.org |
| Mark Nowottny | CSI | Mark.nowottny@civicus.org |
| Sebastian Runguma | IPLF | Sebastian.runguma@civicus.org |
| Carmen Malena | Participatory Governance | Carmen.malena@ccapcable.com |

**Appendix 2: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR AN EXTERNAL EVALUATION CIVICUS PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE PROGRAMME, 2006-2009**

**Background information**

Democratic and inclusive governance is seen as key for fighting poverty, achieving sustainable development and social justice. There is now growing consensus that such a system of democratic governance has to involve ample opportunities for citizen and their organizations to engage with government – what is usually termed 'participatory governance'.

However, in reality, such opportunities remain rare and citizens in both the North and the South express growing disillusionment with their governments – citing problems of lack of transparency, responsiveness and accountability. Human and citizen rights are not fully acknowledged nor respected and, as a result, ordinary citizens are largely excluded from governance processes and the making of decisions that directly affect their lives.

Around the world, citizens suffer from a lack of adequate information, lack of awareness and acknowledgement of human and citizen rights and inadequate opportunities for meaningful dialogue and negotiation with public actors. In many countries all over the world, civil society organizations have been at the forefront of advocating for greater citizen participation in public life.

Many courageous and dedicated government actors (at local and national levels) have also initiated efforts to create space and mechanisms for citizen participation in governance processes. The current phase of the CIVICUS Participatory Governance Programme seeks to make a contribution to these efforts through a combined focus on capacity-building, networking and knowledge exchange among participatory governance practitioners in the South.

In November 2006, CIVICUS Participatory Governance Programme launched a 3-year programme phase aiming to enhance the capacity of practitioners (both civil society and government actors) to promote participatory and accountable governance of public institutions at local and national levels. This programme phase, supported by Irish Aid Civil Society Fund, is global in scope (global South). The project seeks to: (i) generate and share knowledge about the theory and practice of participatory governance; (ii) help southern practitioners (civil society organisations and government actors) acquire the practical skills and tools

they need to promote effective citizen participation in governance processes; (iii) build bridges between civil society and government actors and an active "community of practice" among participatory governance practitioners; and (iv) promote innovation and sector-wide learning in participatory governance practices by providing direct operational support to strategically selected joint civil society-government initiatives and documenting and sharing operational lessons from these initiatives.

The project aims to directly impact approximately 100 Southern-based civil society organisations through targeted capacity building activities and to indirectly impact up to ten times that number (1,000 organisations) through the establishment of an interactive, web-based resource centre.


**Goal and objectives of the external evaluation**

At the end of the implementation of this phase of the project (from November 2009 – January 2010), an evaluation will be carried out by an external consultant, preferably an expert in the fields of capacity development and participatory governance. This external evaluation should address relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and replicability of the project as well as lessons learned for future phases of the programme.

Goal:
   An independent external evaluation will be carried out at project end phase to evaluate the effectiveness of the project in terms of its objectives.

Objectives:
   - Establish the extent to which the project has achieved it stated objectives
   - Identify key challenges and constraints faced in the project and how these were addressed
   - Identify lessons learnt and make relevant recommendations for future phases of the project

   The evaluation should address the following criteria:

   *Relevance*
   The evaluation should consider the extent to which the project addresses the needs and priorities of the targeted practitioners.  It should also consider how the project fits in with the priorities and policies of Irish Aid, CIVICUS and the target stakeholders.

   *Effectiveness*

The evaluation should consider if the project design was the most effective means of achieving the objectives and the extent to which the objectives have been achieved taking into account the relative importance of each objective.  The evaluation should examine how the inputs (financial, technical and human) contributed or hindered the achievement of the objectives.

*Efficiency*
The evaluation should assess whether the cost of the project can be justified by its results, taking alternatives into account.

*Impact*
The evaluation should determine the long-term effects of the project, whether these are positive or negative, intended or unintended, and the relation to the overall goal of the project.

*Sustainability*
The evaluation should determine if the project outcomes and impacts will be sustained without continuing external financial or technical support.

*Replicability*
The evaluation should also determine whether a successful project or successful aspects of the project could be replicated.

## 3. Deliverables

The following outputs and services will be expected:
- An evaluation report that describes the evaluation process and puts forward findings and recommendations. The report should be max. 50 pages long excluding annexes.
- The consultant will be expected to prepare and submit a draft report first and thereafter finalize it taking into account feedback provided by CIVICUS and other stakeholders.
- A summary report (no more than 10 pages excluding attachments) for submission to Irish Aid. The summary report should follow the same format as the full report.

A suggested format for the evaluation report and the summary report including expected annexes is provided in Annex I. Both reports should be provided in electronic form (pdf).

## 4. Scope of Work

The evaluator will undertake the following activities:

- Attend a briefing session on the evaluation to be provided by the commissioning party.
- Familiarize with CIVICUS and its work and the PG programme in particular. This will involve reading relevant CIVICUS material.
- Review and analyse existing project documents.
- Prepare data collection instruments and thereafter implement them. This will include conducting interviews with representatives from the partner organisations and targeted practitioners both from civil society and government and CIVICUS staff, management and advisory group members.
- Attend a partners meeting currently planned for 7-8 December, 2009 in Johannesburg, which will provide an opportunity to conduct face-to-face interviews and focus group discussions with programme partners.
- Analyse and interpret the obtained data and subsequently write a detailed evaluation report as well as the summary evaluation report.
- Brief CIVICUS and other identified stakeholders on the main findings and recommendations of the evaluation.

## 5. Methodology

While maintaining independence/neutrality, the evaluation should be carried out using a participatory approach. There should be consultation with a range of stakeholders including partner organisations, targeted practitioners from both civil society and government, staff and management of CIVICUS. Suggested data collection methods include; literature review, interviews, and focus group discussions. The consultant will be expected to come up with an evaluation plan which clearly identifies the methodology to be employed. CIVICUS will have to approve this plan.

## 6. Evaluation Time Frame

From November 2009 – January 2010 for approximately 20 working days in total. A time schedule detailing the days allocated to each activity should be prepared and shared with the commissioning manager in advance.

## Evaluation Budget

10,000 EUR
This includes professional fees and travel to Johannesburg for the partners meeting.

## 7. Required expertise

Key qualifications:
- 5 years experience in project evaluation, preferably of CSO work
- Knowledge of the fields of capacity development and participatory governance
- Knowledge of programming and project cycle management
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills
- Experience in producing high quality written reports
- Fluency in English

Evaluators based in South Africa are strongly encouraged to apply.

## 8.  Management and Support available

This assignment will be supervised by the CIVICUS PG Coordinator, to whom the evaluation report and other deliverables will be submitted. CIVICUS PG Director and PG Coordinator will provide support to the evaluator as necessary/appropriate.

## 9. Application

The full application should include the following:
Cover letter expressing interest in the evaluation (not more than 2 pages)
Detailed resume with contact details of 3 referees
Technical proposal which clearly show the evaluation plan and
    methodology to be employed
Examples of previous evaluation work
Draft budget
3 references

The application should be emailed to anu.pekkonen@civicus.org by 9 September, 2009.

For further information please contact Anu Pekkonen, Programme Coordinator, tel. +27 883 5959 ext 129, email: anu.pekkonen@civicus.org

**Appendix 3: EVALUATION PLAN**

| What | Why | With whom | Method (how) | When and time allocated | Where |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Document review | To get a broader understanding of the programme and its background<br><br>To assess the programme design and plan and its relevance to the desired results<br><br>To refine questions in the checklist<br><br>Pre-test tools and questions to some selected participants | | Checklist of questions to guide the review<br><br><br><br>Online survey | 2 days<br><br>2nd to 6th November | Blantyre |
| Meeting with the Participatory Governance team and the Evaluation team<br><br><br><br>Consultations | Data collection | Participatory governance team<br><br>Civicus staff<br><br><br><br>Participants at the learning event | Focus Group Discussion with CIVICUS staff and individual interviews | 7 - 11 December<br><br>4 day<br><br><br><br>2 days | Johannesburg<br><br><br><br><br>Johannesburg |

| with stakeholders/ data collection | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Case Studies ( 3 Practitioners) | | 3 days 14th to 19th December | Blantyre |
| | | Donor representatives | | 1 day 30th November – 4th December | Blantyre |
| | | International Advisory Group | | 1 day 4th to 8th January 2010 | Blantyre |
| Data analysis | Make meaning of data collected and draw lessons | Consultant | Results chain logic (to analyze efficiency, effectiveness, type and level of results: outputs, outcomes and impact) Levels of complexity model to | 2 days 2nd Week of January 2010 | Blantyre |

| | | | analyze helping and hindering factors | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Report writing | To document the findings and key lessons | Consultant | Report will follow a pre-agreed format with CIVICUS | 3 days<br><br>2$^{nd}$ week of January 2010 | Blantyre |
| Debriefing session | To present the report and get comments and feedback from CIVICUS | Participatory Governance team and CIVICUS staff | Workshop and plenary discussion | 1 day<br>3$^{rd}$ week of January, 2010 | Johannesburg |
| Revision and submission of final report | To incorporate comments from the debriefing session | Consultant | Report will follow a pre-agreed format | 1 day<br>3$^{rd}$ Week of January 2010 | Blantyre |
| **Total number of days** | | | | **22 days** | |

**Appendix 4: Objectives of results assessment matrix**

**Overall aim of the programme:** To promote participatory governance, thus contributing to poverty reduction and achievement of key human development goals.

| Planned outcomes/results | Indicators of success | Achieved / not achieved |
|---|---|---|
| **OVERALL AIM** <br> To promote participatory governance, thus contributing to poverty reduction and the achievement of key human development goals. | | |
| **OBJECTIVE** <br> Enhance the capacity of approximately 100 southern-based CSOs (CIVICUS member organizations and others) to participate in governance processes at the local and national levels. | Targeted CSOs have expanded their participatory governance activities (baseline v. End-phase data). Evaluation results (baseline data v. End-phase data) indicate capacity development. Self-assessment by targeted CSOs indicates capacity development. | Generally achieved |
| **RESULTS** <br> Result #1 – Approximately 100 southern-based CSOs have greater knowledge about participatory governance rights, issues and benefits. | Evaluation results (baseline data v. End-phase data) indicate enhanced knowledge. Self-assessment by targeted CSOs indicates enhanced knowledge. | Achieved to reasonable extent <br> In Southern Africa practitioners implementing more innovative projects. There is continuous engagement with IDASA ensuing from the training workshops in at least 3 countries on which the practitioners and IDASA will be working together for the next 3 years. Using knowledge gained from the outputs some organizations are able to |

| | | access more funding for implementing PG activities (better resourced staff)

In Latin America participants used the skills to develop a strategy which they are consciously using.

In West Africa 5 districts in Ghana using the PG tools to engage citizens |
|---|---|---|
| Result #2 Approximately 100 southern-based CSOs have stronger participatory governance skills and improved access to relevant practical information and tools. | Evaluation results (baseline data v. End-phase data) indicate improved skills and tools. Self-assessment by targeted CSOs indicates improved skills and tools. | In Latin America Mentees acquired capacity to develop action plans and proposals for innovation grants

In West Africa mentoring acted as a catalyst for other activities outside the grant to be organized e.g. East Gonja Water forums, Berekun fee fixing consultations Dangme West School Monitoring. Also Mentees formulated proposals for innovation grants and implemented the grant projects while also enhancing their capacity and skills in participatory local governance

In South Asia replication of mentoring methods in non Civicus PG and non PG activities |
| Result #3 Approximately 100 southern-based CSOs are able to network more effectively and build alliances (with | Evaluation results (baseline data v. End-phase data) indicate more effective networking. | Achieved

In all the regions they have formed PG networks but it's not easy to report |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| participatory governance partners and peers). | Self-assessment by targeted CSOs indicates more effective networking. Regional networks (4) are functional at phase end. | on the effectiveness of these networks as they are just new. |
| Result #4 Innovative experiments with new participatory governance practices (that explicitly seek to address priority challenges) are developed, implemented and learned from. | Eight initiatives (supported by Innovation Grants) are implemented. Lessons learned are documented and disseminated. | Achieved In Southern Africa, in Malawi, the project has succeeded in enhancing citizen awareness on the need for women's participation in local governance and created a conducive environment for enabling women to assume political leadership

In South America, youths demands are included on the political agenda. Through the innovation grants they managed to create spaces for youth participation in political governance and public policy formulation; Secured commitment of public officials to the youth agenda for public policies; consolidated and empowered youth networks; and strengthened the trust of the young citizens in the governance process; and increased capacity of the groups to make structured and systematic interventions

Youths are engaging with politicians/candidates on what they expect from |

| | | them if they win the elections. Youth law will be discussed next year.

In West Africa, there are improved relationships between CSOs/communities and local government institutions Joint revenue mobilisation effort yielded additional 10% local revenue Dangme West has a district action plan on educational improvement Enhanced capacity of civic unions to engage district assemblies in dialogue; broadening the space for public involvement in local governance; enhanced citizen awareness and appreciation of key issues; increased potential for municipal revenue generation; increased solidarity amongst CSOs; and building trust between local government and citizens

In South Asia, there is enhanced participation of targeted communities on PG issues. There is increased scope for citizen participation in urban governance in a Sri Lankan municipality, enhanced capacity of a Village Development Council to engage with citizens in Nepal; |
|---|---|---|

| | | enhanced capacity of the media to engage with the state in Bangladesh; enhanced awareness of community members about government schemes in a Pabchayat in Kashmir; and increased participation of women and children in a West Bengal district. |
| --- | --- | --- |

## Appendix 5: PG Team Capacity Self Assessment
Rating 0 = non-existent, 5 = excellent

| Element | 0 – 5 | Explanation |
|---|---|---|
| Adequacy of financial and material resources | 3.5 | The programme had adequate finances generally. Could be better with more funding to the regional activities especially innovation grants. |
| Adequacy of personnel | 2 | Inadequate funds to recruit for proposed positions. |
| Adequacy of skills and competences | 4 | The people currently in the programme are well qualified and experienced but as expressed above more numbers would help. |
| Policies, systems and procedures | | |
| *Financial* | 3 | We are a little too busy to devote enough time to financial matters. |
| *Administrative* | 2 | This has been one of the least prioritized area by the programme |
| *Human Resource* | 2 | High staff turnover in CIVICUS which in turn affects our work |
| *Communication* | 4 | This is generally effective and efficient |
| *External Communication* | 3.5 | We have a communication plan, and effective mechanisms but we probably have not communicated with external audiences as actively as we should have, due to capacity constraints. |
| Monitoring and evaluation | 2.5 | We don't have a 'conscious' programme monitoring and evaluation system. As a team we have not paid much attention to consistently |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | collect data periodically and using that data to improve practice. The PG team working with the Impact planning and learning framework department are planning to address this gap in 2010 |
| Structure | 3 | PG is seen as silent compared to other programmes because we are perceived as small. We have 'presence' challenges. CIVICUS structure is being reviewed because we recognize the need for more synergy. |
| Roles and responsibilities (support to partners) | 3.5 | It's mostly been hands-off but its been a conscious decision. |
| Relationships and synergy with other departments | 3 | Restructuring efforts underway to address this |
| Strategy | 4 | An international conference, Skills building workshops, mentoring and innovation grants and other support services seem to be working well. This is a unique approach from theory to practice. |
| Leadership | 3.5 | PG programme is recognized as an important player on a global arena e.g global conference on political will. We conducted the first ever global survey of practitioners. Intentionally we did not want to see ourselves as imposing on the partners. |
| Culture, values and norms | 3.0 | CIVICUS as an organization is highly ambitious , lots of ideas but moves slowly. |

**Appendix 6: List of documents reviewed**

| S.N | REFERENCE/DESK REVIEW DOCUMENTS | REMARKS E.g. if given to consultant or pending |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Participatory Governance Programme Concept Note | Given |
| 2 | PG Practitioners Survey | Given |
| 3 | Regional skills-building Programme Concept Note | Given |
| 4 | Skills-building Programme Proposal PRIA | Given |
| 5 | Skills-building Programme Proposal Polis | Given |
| 6 | Skills-building Programme Proposal Idasa | Given |
| 7 | Skills-building Programme Proposal CLUSA | Given |
| 8 | Skills-building Workshop report Idasa | Given |
| 9 | Skills-building Workshop report Polis | Given |
| 10 | Skills-building Workshop report CLUSA | Given |
| 11 | Skills-building Workshop report PRIA | Given |
| 12 | Mid-term report PRIA | Given |
| 13 | Mentoring report PRIA | Given |
| 14 | Mid-term report CLUSA | Given |
| 15 | Final report guidelines | Given |
| 16 | Final report CLUSA | Given |
| 17 | Final report Polis | Given |
| 18 | Final report Idasa | Given |
| 19 | Final report PRIA | Given |
| 20 | Sample partnership agreement (Polis) | Given |
| 21 | Learning and Sharing Event 09 Concept Note | Given |
| 22 | PG Global Conference 08 Concept Note (WA08 Pre-event) | Given |
| 23 | PG Global Conference 08 Report | Given |
| 24 | PG Global Conference 08 Evaluation results | Given |
| 25 | PG Workshop 07 Report | Given |
| 26 | International Advisory Group Terms of Reference | Given |
| 27 | International Advisory Group List of | Given |

| | Members | |
|----|---------|-------|
| 28 | Irish Aid proposal | Given |
| 29 | Irish Aid report Year 1(inc financial) | Given |
| 30 | Irish Aid report Year 2 (inc financial) | Given |
| 31 | Revised Logframe (submitted with Year 2 report) | Given |
| 32 | Publication Concept Note | Given |
| 33 | PG Exchange (Website) Concept Note | Given |
| 34 | Tools List | Given |

**Appendix 7: Evaluation instruments**

**EVALUATION CHECKLIST FOR TARGETED PRACTITIONERS**

**Name:**

**Organisation:**

**Position:**

**Date:**

Part 1**: Workshop participants**

1.  How were you selected to attend the regional skills building workshop?

2.  What were the topics covered in the workshop?

3.  How do you rate the usefulness of each of the topics? Please explain

4.  How do you rate the usefulness of the whole training? Please explain

5.  How did you use the knowledge gained from the training when you came back?

6.  What has changed in you and your organization as a result of using the knowledge gained from the training? What are you able to do now as an individual or organization that you were not able to do before the training?

7.  What are you generally happy with the skills training workshops?

8.  What are you not happy with the skills training workshops?

9.  How can the skills training programmes be improved?

Part 2: **Mentorship**

10. How were you selected for mentorship?

11. What activities were involved in the mentorship?

12. What is your assessment of the relevance and usefulness of each of the activities? Please explain

13. How do you rate the usefulness of the whole mentorship programme? Please explain

14. How did you use the knowledge and experience gained from the mentorship?

15. What has changed in you and your organization as a result of using the knowledge and experience gained from the mentorship? What are you able to do now as an individual or organization that you were not able to do before the mentoring? Please substantiate with concrete evidence

16. How much money did your organization receive for the grant?

17. Compared with the changes achieved, do you feel the money was efficiently used?

18. What are you generally happy with the mentorship?

19. What are you not happy with the mentorship?

20. How can the mentorship be improved?

Part 3: **Grantees**

21. How were you selected as a grantee?

22. How much did you receive for the grant?

23. What has changed in you and in your organization as a result of the grant activities?

24. What has changed in the lives of the people you were working with as a result of the grant activity

25. What was the grant for and what did it include?

26. What are you happy with concerning the grants? Why?

27. What are you not happy with? Why?

Part 4: **Conclusion**

28. What are your reflections on the process (involvement in regional skills building workshop, mentorship and innovation grants) and the accumulated learning from all the 3 components?

29. What key lessons can be learnt for improvement in the future?

**EVALUATION CHECKLIST FOR CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS**

**Name:**

**Organization:**

**Position:**

**Date**

How were you selected to attend the international conference on Participatory Governance?

What were the topics covered in the conference?

How do you rate the usefulness of each of the topics? Please explain

How do you rate the usefulness of the whole conference? Please explain

How did you use the knowledge gained from the conference when you came back?

What has changed in you and your organization as a result of using the knowledge gained from the conference? What are you able to do now as an individual or organization that you were not able to do before the conference?

What is your assessment of the conference in terms of:

Impact – change at your organizational and/or community levels

Efficiency – cost-effectiveness of the conference

Relevance – meeting your organization's real needs

Sustainability –continuity of benefits in your organization arising from attending the conference

Replicability – possibility or necessity of repeating the same or similar conferences in similar or different programmes and settings

Based on the above assessment how could the conference be improved?

**Book contributors' checklist**

Name:

Position:

Organization:

Date:

1. How were you selected to be a contributing author to the book?

2. What has changed in you and in your organization as a result of your involvement in the writing project?

3. What in your opinion would be the contribution of the book to the organization's:

- Effectiveness
- Efficiciency
- Outcomes and impact
- Relevance
- Sustainability and;
- Replicability

4. What are you happy with the book? Why? What are you not happy with? Why?

5. How could the book project maximize the impact of the participatory governance programme?

**Donors Participatory Governance Programme Evaluation Checklist**

*Method: Online survey*

How and why did your organization get involved in this programme?

Were you/your organization engaged in any aspect of its planning? If so, could you share your key observations? For example do you know how the planning was done, who participated and on what conceptual basis the programme's theory was based?

Were you/your organization engaged in any aspect of its implementation? If so, could you share your key observations?

How well do the accountability systems in the programme work? For example, do you receive regular useful reports, or interact with the implementers in any way?

From the information at your disposal, are there any observations you would like to share about how the programme results and how the programme is unfolding?

What would you ideally like to be the results and impact of this programme? What would make the investment worthwhile to you?

Do you consider the merit of supporting individual practitioners as compared to institutional support?

Do you have any observations or reservations about the cost-effectiveness or efficiency of this programme? Are you comfortable with the cost of this programme compared to the results achieved so far?

Do you have any experience of being involved in a similar programme? If so, are there any observations you would like to share that can assist this evaluation?

What would make this evaluation worthwhile for your organization? What are your expectations and key questions you would like to have answered?

How do you expect this evaluation to be used? Is there something I could do to further promote the use of this evaluation or enhance its usefulness?

What else would you like to share that you believe might be valuable to the evaluation at this stage?