



2014:37

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Annica Holmberg
José Jaime Macuane
Padil Salimo

Evaluation of thematic results achieved and demonstrated within the Programa de Acções para uma Governação Inclusiva e Responsável - AGIR

Final Report

Evaluation of thematic results
achieved and demonstrated within
the Programa de Acções para uma
Governança Inclusiva e
Responsável - AGIR

Final Report
September 2014

Annica Holmberg
José Jaime Macuane
with Padil Salimo

Authors: Annica Holmberg, José Jaime Macuane with Padil Salimo

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2014:37

Commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in Mozambique

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: September 2014

Published by Citat 2014

Art. no. Sida61766en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61766en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms	3
Preface.....	5
Executive Summary.....	6
Sumário Executivo.....	10
1 Introduction.....	14
1.1 Scope of the evaluation	14
1.2 Methodology.....	16
1.3 Limitations	20
1.4 Definitions.....	22
1.5 Evaluation team.....	23
2 Findings.....	24
2.1 The shifting roles of civil society	24
2.2 Stock-taking of the thematic sub-programmes	26
2.3 Fitness for purpose of the results frameworks.....	45
2.4 Observations beyond the scope of the evaluation	51
3 Conclusions	53
3.1 Relevance	53
3.2 Effectiveness	55
3.3 Impact.....	57
3.4 Fitness for purpose.....	58
4 Recommendations.....	60
Annex 1 – Terms of Reference.....	63
Annex 2 – Inception Report	72
Annex 3 – AGIR Partners	110
Annex 4 – Consulted Documents	112
Annex 5 – Consulted Stakeholders	116
Annex 6 – Stocktaking of results, thematic programmes	122

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AGIR	Programa de Acções para uma Governação Inclusiva e Responsável
ACAMO	Association of Blind and Partially Sighted of Mozambique
ACDH	Associação Centro de Direitos Humanos
AENA	Associação Nacional de Extensão Rural
AAJC	Associação Assistencia Jurídica
CBO	Community based organisation
CIP	Centro de Integridade Pública
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CTV	Centro Terra Viva
DO	Development Observatory
EoS	Embassy of Sweden
FORCOM	Fórum Nacional das Rádios Comunitárias de Moçambique
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
GMD	Grupo Moçambicano da Dívida
HRBA	Human Rights-Based Approach
ICC	Intermediary Coordination Committee
ICSO	International Civil Society Organisations
IESE	Instituto Estudos Sociais e Económicos
IO	Intermediary organisation
JA	Justiça Ambiental
LCC	Local Consultative Council
LDH	Liga de Direitos Humanos
MASC	Mecanismo de Apoio à Sociedade Civil
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MSC	Most Significant Change
MTR	Mid-Term Review
OE	Observatório Electoral/Electoral Observatory
ORAM	Associação Rural de Ajuda Mútua
PARP	Poverty Reduction Action Plan
PJ	Parlamento Juvenil
PLWHA	People living with HIV and Aids
PME	Planning, monitoring and evaluation
PNDH	Pressão Nacional dos Direitos Humanos
RBM	Results-based management
SRHR	Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNAC	União Nacional de Camponeses
UPCT	União Provincial de Camponeses de Tete

Preface

The Embassy of Sweden in Mozambique commissioned this *Evaluation of thematic results achieved and demonstrated within the Programa de Acções para uma Governação Inclusiva e Re-sponsável – AGIR*, through Sida’s framework agreement for reviews and evaluations.

Indevelop AB (www.indevelop.se) undertook the evaluation between May – September 2014.

This evaluation report was finalised in September 2014 after feedback from the Embassy of Sweden, Embassy of the Netherlands, IBIS, Oxfam Novib, Diakonia and WeEffect on the draft report.

Indevelop’s independent evaluation team consisted of:

- Annica Holmberg, Team Leader, member of Indevelop’s Core Team of Professional Evaluators
- José Jaime Macuane, National Evaluator
- Padil Salimo, National Evaluator

Quality assurance of the evaluation methodology and reports has been provided by Ian Christoplos, Indevelop’s Project Director for the framework agreement. The Project Manager at Indevelop for this evaluation, Jessica Rothman, was responsible for ensuring compliance with Indevelop’s QA system throughout the process, and providing backstopping and coordination.

Claire Smellie was the Evaluation Manager at the Embassy of Sweden.

Executive Summary

This evaluation of the Programa de Acções para uma Governação Inclusiva e Responsável (AGIR) takes stock of the results from four thematic sub-programmes that focus on different accountability areas. AGIR is a five year programme (2010-2014) funded by three donors; Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands. The programme has agreements with four intermediary international organisations; Diakonia, IBIS, Oxfam Novib and We Effect. They currently partner with 58 civil society organisations (CSOs) at national and local level that represent a broad spectra of Mozambican civil society. The evaluation also assesses the fitness-for-purpose of the applied results frameworks in relation to the aggregation of results and monitoring and reporting on contributions to/engagement in policy dialogue. The evaluated period is 2010-2013. At the time of the evaluation the donors were awaiting the submission of proposals from the intermediary organisations that would be appraised and, if found qualitative, relevant, effective and sustainable, trigger the preparation of new decisions on contribution of funds to a second six year phase of AGIR. The assessment took place in a period when the intermediary organisations were formulating new proposals for this new phase.

The overall objective of AGIR is "Active citizens(hip) and a strong, vibrant civil society (that) participates in and influences democratic processes, contributing to more accountable governance, deepened democracy, gender equality and human rights in Mozambique"¹. The sub-programmes cover i) Participation, social and legal accountability, including monitoring of respect for human rights; ii) Social accountability in management of natural resources and community land rights; iii) Transparency, financial and political accountability and, iv) Promotion of access to information.

The analysis of the achievement of the objectives of AGIR is based on a desk review and consultations with almost 150 stakeholders carried out in five provinces; Maputo, Nampula, Niassa, Sofala and Tete. The evaluators interviewed 27 of the partner organisations representing all four sub-programmes. Three of the OECD/DAC principles, namely relevance, effectiveness and impact have been in focus. The evaluation

¹ Evaluation of thematic results achieved and demonstrated within the Programa de Acções para uma Governação Inclusiva e Responsável (AGIR), 31 March 2014, Embassy of Sweden, Mozambique

furthermore applies a human rights-based approach (HRBA) including gender, HIV/Aids and disability perspectives as well as child rights.

The stock-taking of results was mainly based on a desk review of the annual reports to the donors from the intermediary organisations (IOs). These results were discussed with the consulted partner organisations and the IOs. More data on the results were retrieved and some additional results were possible to identify. The evaluators analysed the results as changes in behaviour of rights-holders, duty-bearers and partnering civil society organisations as well as changed relations among these actors. The report includes a comprehensive overview of these changes for the last two years of the evaluated period (2012 and 2013).

AGIR is assessed to be a relevant and much needed support to Mozambican civil society that enables a strategic role for CSOs in advocating for rights, rule of law, accountability and transparency. During the period of implementation of AGIR civil society has strengthened its role as bearer of collective claims on specific rights and on accountability of duty-bearers. The partner organisations have been able to raise evidence based claims, combining the efforts of the more research oriented and the more activist oriented partners. This achievement is assessed to have increased the relevance of AGIR as an accountability programme. To be even more relevant the partner organisations in the programme need to develop their implementation of human rights-based approach further and strengthen their efforts to promote gender equality. This is significant both for internal and external processes. The CSOs' internal processes of increased accountability and transparency as well as the implementation of the principles of non-discrimination and the active and meaningful participation of rights-holders within civil society are important for the relevance of AGIR. Accountability claims on duty-bearers should also reflect a gender and rights-based analysis, particularly taking into account the rights of and the active participation by people living in poverty and discrimination.

The evaluation found that the thematic sub-programmes have achieved many results at output level and that there are visible changes in the behaviour of duty-bearers, civil society itself and to a certain extent at rights-holder level. These changes in most cases represent intermediary results. This means that the four AGIR sub-programmes have contributed to create conditions for change at outcome level. There are also success stories where the partner organisations have contributed to processes that have led to changes in legislation and increased transparency. These changes were assessed to mainly be the results of efforts that started before AGIR, but illustrate that the programme with its core funding approach has contributed to the partner organisations' ability to pursue their advocacy work.

There are examples of positive shifts in the relations between CSOs and the government at different levels and with the Parliament. The increased capacity of civil society to present relevant research and evidence based claims is recognised by duty-bearers, and civil society has managed to improve its coordination of advocacy initia-

tives. The findings also show however, that there have been some serious setbacks in the climate for dialogue during the evaluated period. There are some negative responses by the duty-bearers to the accountability claims, which should be seen as an effect of the development of a more vocal and advocacy oriented civil society. Civil society is no longer just a service provider, but also represents a collective voice claiming space and voice in development processes. These tensions and shifts in the relations between civil society and duty-bearers need to be considered when assessing the effectiveness of a programme like AGIR, and also when defining realistic outcome objectives.

The management of results continues to be a major challenge for the involved actors in the programme. So far, the reporting has been primarily activity oriented, maintaining attention on what is done and how it is done and not the progress of results. There has however been initial improvement in the reporting on results beyond activity level and efforts have been invested in strengthening the monitoring systems of the partner organisations. The sub-programmes still need to develop their systems for documentation and monitoring of results, designing results frameworks that allow the intermediary organisations to capture and aggregate changes at output, intermediary outcome and outcome levels. The results based management would benefit from a more articulated and explicit theory of change that visualises how change is supposed to happen through the policy dialogue. AGIR is a complex programme that deals with social change and it is therefore important to be clear, not only regarding how the partner organisations can stimulate change, but also to clarify the limits of their influence on political and development processes. These are important issues to address in the design of the intervention logic for the second phase of AGIR (2015-2020).

Some of the recommendations to the intermediary organisations are:

- Ensure that the further development of the theory of change and the results framework (in view of AGIR II) connect different levels of interventions.
- Continue to focus on improving the system for monitoring and evaluation and enable a learning focused results based management of AGIR II through investment in capacity development.
- Develop in-house skills in data collection methods and in policy dialogue strategies in order to be a support to the partner organisations, and to provide capacity building to the partners in methods apt to capture changes in behaviour and relations as a result of awareness raising and empowerment initiatives, evidence based research, advocacy and dialogue with duty-bearers and decision makers.
- Promote a holistic approach to issues related to discrimination and power relation, making use of the principles of human rights-based approach. Continue to invest in capacity development in cross-cutting issues, particularly in a gender mainstreaming approach that address both the organisational commitments to gender equality and the gender perspective in advocacy work.
- Stress how inclusive and participatory methods can be strengthened to ensure the active and meaningful participation of rights-holders, both as an end in itself and to enhance the legitimacy of the CSOs.

- Start AGIR II with an overall capacity needs assessment and analyse how different capacity development efforts can be coordinated.
- Develop advocacy training together with the more experienced advocacy organisations leading towards a joint strategy for how to give support to more coordinated/ collective and strategic advocacy, based on power and actors analysis.
- Define realistic objectives (avoid the current high-level objectives of the sub-programmes) attainable within the scope of the programme.
- Ensure that the intervention logic for AGIR II provides clear and consistent guidance and also space to respond to volatility in the broader political, economic and societal context that affect the opportunities and constraints facing Mozambican civil society.

Recommendations to the EoS and partnering donors:

- Engage in dialogue with the IOs already during the assessment of the proposal to AGIR II on: What the expectations are on the role of the IOs in relation to technical support to the more advanced/mature partner organisations; What the expectations are on the development of the key partners in AGIR I; and, How can the support to the different key partners evolve to be in tune with their particular needs? What is the long term strategy of AGIR and how is the future support to civil society in Mozambique envisioned?
- Continue to promote the principles of good donorship among other donors supporting civil society.
- Consider expanding the regular spaces for reflection with all IOs on the progress of the different areas of intervention.

Sumário Executivo

Esta avaliação do Programa de Acções para uma Governação Inclusiva e Responsável (AGIR) faz um levantamento dos resultados provenientes de quatro subprogramas temáticos que focalizam em diferentes áreas de responsabilização e prestação de contas. AGIR é um programa de cinco anos (2010-2014) financiado por três doadores: Suécia, Dinamarca e Holanda. O programa tem acordos com quatro organizações internacionais intermediárias, nomeadamente, Diakonia, IBIS, Oxfam Novib e We Effect. Actualmente estas organizações têm parceria com 58 organizações da sociedade civil (OSC) a nível nacional e local, que representam uma ampla diversidade da sociedade civil moçambicana. A avaliação também analisa a adequação do quadro de resultados aos objectivos definidos, no que concerne à agregação de resultados, monitoria e reporte das contribuições ao envolvimento no diálogo de políticas públicas. O período de avaliação é de 2010 a 2013. No período da avaliação os doadores estavam à espera da submissão das propostas das organizações intermediárias para serem avaliadas e, se fossem consideradas de qualidade, relevantes, efectivas e sustentáveis, desencadeariam a preparação de novas decisões sobre a contribuição de fundos para a segunda fase do AGIR, que é de 6 anos. A avaliação ocorreu quando as organizações intermediárias estavam a formular novas propostas para essa nova fase.

O objectivo geral do AGIR é “uma cidadania activa e forte, uma sociedade civil vibrante que participa e influencia os processos democráticos, contribuindo para uma governação mais responsável, aprofundamento da democracia, igualdade de género e direitos humanos em Moçambique”². Os subprogramas cobrem i) Participação, responsabilização social e legal, incluindo a monitoria do respeito pelos direitos humanos; ii) Responsabilização social na gestão dos recursos naturais e os direitos de terra das comunidades; iii) Transparência e responsabilização financeira e política; e iv) Promoção do acesso à informação.

A análise do alcance dos objectivos do AGIR é baseada numa revisão documental e bibliográfica e consultas com quase 150 “stakeholders”, realizada em cinco províncias: Maputo, Nampula, Niassa, Sofala e Tete. Os avaliadores entrevistaram 27 organizações parceiras representando todos os quatro subprogramas. Estiveram em

² Evaluation of thematic results achieved and demonstrated within the Programa de Acções para uma Governação Inclusiva e Responsável (AGIR), 31 March 2014, Embassy of Sweden, Mozambique

foco três dos princípios da OECD/DAC, nomeadamente, relevância, eficácia e impacto. A avaliação também aplicou a abordagem baseada em direitos humanos, incluindo perspectivas de género, HIV/SIDA e da deficiência, assim como dos direitos da criança.

O levantamento dos resultados foi essencialmente baseado na revisão documental dos relatórios anuais das organizações intermediárias aos doadores. Os resultados foram discutidos com as organizações parceiras consultadas e as internacionais intermediárias. Isso permitiu recuperar mais dados sobre os resultados e identificar novos resultados. Os avaliadores analisaram resultados como mudanças no comportamento dos detentores de direitos, dos portadores de deveres e organizações da sociedade civil parceiras, assim como as mudanças nas relações entre esses actores. O relatório inclui uma visão compreensiva dessas mudanças nos últimos dois anos do período avaliado (2012 e 2013).

O programa AGIR é avaliado como sendo relevante e um apoio necessário à sociedade civil moçambicana, que capacita as OSCs a advogar por direitos, estado de direito, responsabilização e transparência. Durante o período de implementação do AGIR a sociedade civil fortaleceu o seu papel como portadora das reivindicações colectivas sobre direitos específicos e responsabilização dos portadores de deveres. As organizações parceiras foram capazes de apresentar reivindicações com base em evidências, combinando esforços das organizações mais orientadas à pesquisa com as de uma orientação mais activista. Este resultado é avaliado como tendo contribuído para aumentar a relevância do AGIR como um programa de responsabilização. Para serem mais relevantes, as organizações parceiras precisam desenvolver ainda mais a sua implementação da abordagem baseada em direitos humanos e fortalecer os seus esforços de promoção de igualdade de género. Isto é importante tanto para os processos internos como externos. Os processos internos de maior responsabilização e transparência das OSCs, assim como a implementação dos princípios de não-discriminação e participação activa e significativa dos detentores de direitos dentro da sociedade civil são importantes para a relevância do AGIR. Exigências de responsabilização aos detentores de deveres também devem reflectir análises baseadas no género e nos direitos, particularmente tendo em conta os direitos e a participação activa das pessoas que vivem na pobreza e sofrem discriminação.

A avaliação constatou que os programas temáticos alcançaram muitos resultados ao nível dos produtos (outputs) e que existem mudanças visíveis no comportamento dos portadores de deveres, na própria sociedade civil e até certo ponto ao nível dos detentores de direitos. Estas mudanças, na maioria dos casos, representam resultados intermédios. Isto significa que os quatro subprogramas do AGIR contribuíram para criar as condições para uma mudança ao nível dos resultados finais/efeitos (“outcomes”). Existem também histórias de sucesso, como nos casos em que as organizações parceiras contribuíram para processos que levaram à mudanças na legislação e mais transparência. Estas mudanças foram consideradas como tendo sido dos esforços que começaram antes do AGIR, mas que ilustram que o programa, com

a sua abordagem de financiamento institucional, contribuiu para a melhoria da habilidade das organizações parceiras levarem a cabo o seu trabalho de advocacia.

Existem exemplos de mudanças positivas nas relações entre as OSCs e o governo em diferentes níveis e com o Parlamento. A crescente capacidade da sociedade civil de apresentar pesquisa relevante e reivindicações baseadas em evidências é reconhecida pelos portadores de deveres e a sociedade civil conseguiu melhorar a coordenação das suas iniciativas de advocacia. Contudo, a avaliação também constatou que houve recuos sérios no clima de diálogo durante o período avaliado. Existem algumas respostas negativas por parte dos portadores de deveres às exigências de responsabilização, que podem ser vistas como o efeito do desenvolvimento de uma sociedade civil mais assertiva e orientada para a advocacia. A sociedade civil já não é apenas provedora de serviços, mas também representa a voz colectiva dos que reivindicam ter espaço e voz no processo de desenvolvimento. Essas tensões e mudanças nas relações entre a sociedade civil e os portadores de deveres precisa ser considerada quando se avaliar a efectividade de um programa como AGIR e quando se busca definir objectivos realistas dos efeitos esperados.

A gestão dos resultados continua a ser um grande desafio para os actores envolvidos no programa. Até agora, os relatórios têm sido principalmente orientados para actividades, mantendo a atenção no “que” e “como” é feito e não no progresso dos resultados. Contudo, ultimamente tem começado a haver uma melhoria em reportar resultados para além do nível das actividades e está a ser feito um grande esforço para o fortalecimento dos sistemas de monitoria das organizações parceiras. Os subprogramas ainda precisam desenvolver os seus sistemas para documentar e monitorar resultados, desenhando quadros de resultados que permitam às organizações intermediárias capturar e agregar mudanças ao nível de produto, resultados intermédios e resultados finais (ou efeitos). A gestão baseada em resultados poderia beneficiar mais da existência de uma teoria da mudança mais articulada e explícita, que possa visualizar como se espera que as mudanças ocorram através do diálogo de políticas públicas. AGIR é um programa complexo que lida com a mudança social e, conseqüentemente, é importante que seja claro; não apenas no que concerne a como as organizações parceiras podem estimular a mudança, mas também para clarificar os limites da sua influência nos processos político e de desenvolvimento. Estas são questões importantes a levar em conta no desenho da logica de intervenção para a segunda fase do AGIR (2015-2020).

Algumas das recomendações das organizações intermediárias são:

- Garantir que o futuro desenvolvimento da teoria da mudança e do quadro dos resultados (tendo em vista o AGIR II) liga diferentes níveis das intervenções.
- Continuar o foco na melhoria do sistema de monitoria e avaliação e propiciar uma gestão baseada em resultados e aprendizagem no AGIR II através do investimento no desenvolvimento de capacidades.
- Desenvolver habilidades internas de métodos de colecta de dados e de estratégias de diálogo de políticas de modo a apoiar às organizações parceiras

e prover capacitação aos parceiros em métodos que lhes habilitam a capturar mudanças no comportamento e relações, resultantes de iniciativas de consciencialização, empoderamento, pesquisa baseada em evidências, advocacia e diálogo com portadores de deveres e tomadores de decisão;

- Promover uma abordagem holística em relação a questões relacionadas à discriminação e relações de poder, fazendo uso dos princípios da abordagem baseada em direitos humanos. Continuar a investir no desenvolvimento de capacidades em assuntos transversais, particularmente na abordagem de inserção do género que aborda os compromissos organizacionais com a igualdade de género e a perspectiva de género no trabalho de advocacia.
- Enfatizar como os métodos participativos e inclusivos podem ser fortalecidos para garantir uma participação activa e forte dos detentores de direitos, tanto como um fim em si mesmo, assim como para reforçar a legitimidade das OSCs.
- Começar o AGIR II com uma avaliação geral de necessidades de capacitação e analisar como diferentes esforços de desenvolvimento de capacidades podem ser coordenados.
- Desenvolver a formação em advocacia em conjunto com as organizações mais experientes em advocacia, levando à uma estratégia conjunta de como se pode dar apoio para uma advocacia mais coordenada/colectiva e estratégica, baseada numa análise de poder e dos actores.
- Definir objectivos realistas (evitar adoptar objectivos amplos como os dos subprogramas actuais) que possam ser alcançados dentro do âmbito do programa.
- Garantir que a lógica de intervenção do AGIR II tenha uma direcção consistente e clara e também tenha espaço para responder à volatilidade do contexto político, económico e social mais amplo que afecta as oportunidades e constrangimentos enfrentados pela sociedade civil moçambicana.

Recomendações à Embaixada da Suécia e aos doadores parceiros:

- Envolver-se no diálogo com as organizações intermediárias já durante a avaliação da proposta do AGIR II sobre: quais são as expectativas sobre o papel das OIs relativamente ao apoio técnico às organizações parceiras mais avançadas/maduras; quais são as expectativas quanto ao desenvolvimento dos parceiros chave no AGIR I; e como o apoio aos diferentes parceiros chave pode evoluir para estar em sintonia com as suas necessidades específicas? Qual é a estratégia de longo prazo do AGIR e como o apoio futuro à sociedade civil em Moçambique está a ser pensado?
- Continuar a promover o princípio de “good donorship” entre os doadores que apoiam a sociedade civil. Considerar a expansão dos espaços regulares para reflexão com todas as organizações intermediárias sobre o progresso das diferentes áreas de intervenção.

1 Introduction

This result-oriented evaluation of Sweden's support to Mozambican civil society through the Programa de Acções para uma Governação Inclusiva e Responsável (AGIR) was commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden (EoS) in Mozambique. AGIR started in 2010 and the agreement period ends in December 2014. It operates through four international civil society organisations (ICSO). These intermediary organisations (IO) support Mozambican civil society organisations (CSO) through different funding mechanisms (including core funding), capacity building and networking. The evaluation takes stock of results within the different sub-programmes of AGIR and analyses the fitness-for-purpose of the applied results frameworks in the programme.

1.1 SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The Terms of Reference (ToR) specifies a twofold objective of the evaluation:

- 1) Stock-taking of what results were achieved within the key accountabilities and which results level(s) they represent (output, outcome, impact)
- 2) Valuation of the sub-programmes' results frameworks' fitness-for-purpose³ in terms of
 - a) Aggregation of results from numerous and varying key partner organisations
 - b) Monitoring and reporting on contributions to/engagement in policy dialogue and, importantly, demonstrating such results

The evaluation has assessed all sub-programmes, all accountability areas and followed up a representative selection of reported results, focusing on the policy dialogue. The assessment of the results framework includes the overall and sub-programme level, with focus on the latter. The evaluated period is 2010-2013. At the time of the evaluation the donors were awaiting the submission of proposals from the intermediary organisations that would be appraised and, if found qualitative, relevant, effective and sustainable, trigger the preparation of new decisions on contribution of funds to a second six year phase of AGIR

³ Parallel to the evaluation an advisory service to the four intermediaries was provided by the evaluation team, focusing on Results-based and Learning Management and the development of the current results frameworks for the upcoming phase 2.

Although the evaluation encompasses all accountability and thematic areas, the scope of the evaluation as a final programme assessment is relatively narrow. It only looks at reported results within the thematic sub-programmes and whether these are demonstrated through the applied results frameworks. There are thus several components of the programme that are not evaluated. The Mid-Term Review (2013) and partner satisfactory assessments have covered progress related to the overarching framework on the support to organisational and capacity development of the partner organisations and on the promotion of good donorship principles.

The overall objective of AGIR is *“Active citizens(hip) and a strong, vibrant civil society (that) participates in and influences democratic processes, contributing to more accountable governance, deepened democracy, gender equality and human rights in Mozambique”*.

The Embassy of Sweden started the programme with three intermediary organisations, Diakonia, IBIS and Oxfam Novib⁴. We Effect (former Swedish Cooperative Centre) entered the programme in 2011⁵. Sweden is the core donor to AGIR and the four IOs, Denmark supports IBIS and We Effect and the Netherlands supports Oxfam. The IOs each work with partner organisations within a sub-programme focusing on i) Participation, social and legal accountability, including monitoring of respect for human rights; ii) Social accountability in management of natural resources and community land rights; iii) Transparency, financial and political accountability and, iv) Promotion of access to information.

The partner organisations⁶ represent a broad spectrum of civil society, including member-based organisations with a character of social movements to expert research CSOs. Together the partners cover all provinces of the country. Maputo-based CSOs are a majority due to the initial Swedish strategy to give priority to organisations with so called national outreach. Current partners are listed in Annex 3.

Each partnership is regulated in an agreement between the IO and the partner organisation. The IOs are supported to:

- Provide long term core-funding and capacity development support to civil society partner organisations, based on these organisations' own strategic plans

⁴ In continuation referred to as Oxfam.

⁵ All IOs have previously been supporting Mozambican CSOs at national, provincial and local levels.

⁶ Several of the partner organisations had cooperated with one or several of the IOs before.

- Support and facilitate linkages, mutual learning and knowledge and experience sharing between CSOs
- Actively promote the implementation of the Paris Declaration, the Accra Agenda for Action and the Busan Outcome Document in relation to civil society (“good donorship”)

AGIR has one overarching results framework for all IOs’ work with strengthening civil society in Mozambique and separate results frameworks for each sub-programme. The key partner organisations with core support use their own results frameworks and report annually on their strategic plan.

1.2 METHODOLOGY

1.2.1 Evaluation process

The inception period included a desk review⁷ and the first part of processing data on results from the IOs’ annual reports to the EoS. Based on this the evaluation team developed its understanding of the programme’s implicit theory of change⁸ and the different levels of interaction within and between the sub-programmes. Interview guides, an evaluation matrix and an assessment tool for the stock-taking of results were developed. The dialogue on the inception report with the EoS and the IOs helped the evaluators to adjust methods, instruments and the agenda for the field visits.

The data collection took place over a four week period⁹ covering stakeholder consultations in five provinces; Maputo, Nampula, Niassa, Sofala and Tete. The Evaluation Team met with the key stakeholders (the back-donors Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands) and the Intermediary Coordination Committee (ICC) throughout the data collection. The phase was concluded with separate validation sessions with the ICC and the three donor embassies. The Evaluation Team presented some preliminary observations and had the opportunity to discuss outstanding issues.

Nearly 150 stakeholders were consulted mainly through semi-structured interviews with one or a smaller group of respondents. Two mini-workshops, focusing on pro-

⁷ Programme related documentation has been reviewed, including initial proposals, annual reports to donors between 2010-2013, work plans of all the four IOs as well as comments from the EoS on reports and minutes from AGIR meetings, the Revised Operational Guidelines for Partnering with and Supporting Civil Society in Mozambique, and the Mid-Term Review of the AGIR Programme (2012) including the Management Response from the EoS (2013-07-18).

⁸ See inception report for presentation and interpretation of the theories of change, annex 2.

⁹ June 23 – July 18, with some pending interviews with duty-bearers carried out the following week.

cesses of change and the ability to monitor those changes, were also held in Nampula and Beira with a mix of representatives from different organisations. Twenty-seven of the current 58 partner CSOs were consulted through 44 interviews¹⁰. Most interviews lasted approximately two hours¹¹. All consultations were held in Portuguese and in urban settings¹². Nine interviews took place with duty-bearers at different governmental levels and the Parliament. The evaluators also met with all the donors, civil society platforms, other civil society support programmes, media actors and international donors not involved in AGIR.

The findings from the desk review, interviews, workshops and validation sessions with the key stakeholders constituted the basis for the overall analysis. Statements from civil society actors and the IOs were triangulated with other CSOs (AGIR and non-AGIR), with duty-bearers, donors and representatives from the media.

The content of the draft report was discussed in Maputo on 12 August and further written comments were received from the key stakeholders. This valuable input has been addressed as far as possible in the final report¹³.

1.2.2 Approach and central perspectives

The evaluation applies a human rights-based approach (HRBA)¹⁴, including gender, HIV/Aids and disability perspectives as well as child rights¹⁵. Given the limited time for most of the consultations it was not possible to enter into in-depth discussions on each of these subjects. A mix of methods was used to assess the integration of issues related to power relations and the practice of HRBA in the organisations' work. Observations on how processes of change were presented by the respondents were com-

¹⁰ 8 of the 27 CSOs were consulted in two provinces or more.

¹¹ The time restraint for each interview was partly due to the large scope of the evaluation but also due to the limited availability of many organisations. Other parallel external assessments of the CSOs caused somewhat a time conflict between the final evaluation of AGIR and other assessments.

¹² The initial plan to also cover the district level was abandoned since practically no results in the annual reports referred to social change at that level. The evaluators were dependent on this information prior to the data collection to be able to plan the visits. The interviews gave information of some relevant results in the districts but it was not possible to follow up these due to time restraints. Outcome harvesting at district level as part of the inception would have enabled the identification of relevant districts.

¹³ We have tried to respond to as many of the comments as possible in the report. Some comments are however discussed in the separate matrix over the evaluation team's feedback to the comments to the draft report.

¹⁴ The practice of the principles of accountability, transparency, active and meaningful participation and non-discrimination.

¹⁵ The discussions on gender perspective dealt with how policy issues are identified, to what extent they represent gender strategic interest and concern issues and processes that challenge gender inequality in Mozambican society. Child rights, HIV/Aids and disability were addressed in relation to meaningful and active participation and non-discrimination, and in the review of the reported results directly concern issues like stigma, accessibility and the inclusion of children and adolescents in the development process.

bined with a selection of specific questions. The desk-review and discussions with the IOs were helpful to place the responses and observations in a broader setting. Meetings with the IOs were held on several occasions giving a better possibility to discuss how they implement HRBA in the partner dialogue, in the monitoring of results and in the capacity building efforts.

1.2.3 Evaluation questions

In accordance with the inception report the following evaluation questions from the ToR have been in focus:

<i>Relevance</i>	- Are activities and outputs within AGIR sub-programmes consistent with the overall goals of the sub-programmes and the attainment of their objectives? - Are the activities and outputs of AGIR sub-programmes consistent with the intended impacts and effects in policy dialogue (preparation, implementation and monitoring of development policies and plans within respective thematic areas)?
<i>Effectiveness (and impact)</i>	- What results were achieved within the key accountabilities and which results level(s) they represent (output, outcome, impact). - What has happened as a result of the sub-programmes? To what policy change outcomes did the AGIR programme contribute e.g. to new legislation and to compliance with such? - What has happened as a result of the sub-programmes? To what policy change outcomes did the AGIR programme contribute e.g. to new legislation and to compliance with such? - What results are possible to identify in relation to the ✓ coordination and the development of capacities in policy dialogue at partner level ✓ the level of engagement in the processes at district and provincial level ✓ civil society space for policy dialogue. - How is civil society's attribution and contribution to policy changes discussed within AGIR and what is perceived as a demonstrated and valid chain of change? To what extent can reported advocacy/policy dialogue results be attributed only to AGIR? What are the implications of core funding regarding how contribution and attribution of results are demonstrated (particularly in cases where partners have multiple sources of core funding)? - What are the key lessons learnt from the implementation of the programme in its main areas? What are the lessons learnt regarding the management of the programme?

<i>Fitness-for-purpose</i>	Have the employed results frameworks within the sub-programmes been fit-for-purpose? - Have the applied results frameworks within the sub-programmes enabled the aggregation of results from numerous and varying key partner organisations? - Have the applied results frameworks within the sub-programmes enabled the monitoring and evaluation of contributions to/engagement in policy dialogue? - Have the applied results frameworks within the sub-programmes enabled the partner organisations and intermediary organisation to demonstrate results of the policy dialogue efforts? - What are the major factors influencing the demonstration of achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? - How effective is the aggregation of results from numerous and varying partner organisations to show achievement of objectives at higher levels? - How is the theory of change described in the different sub-programmes and to what extent are the results frameworks a) capturing the processes of change in the ToC; b) demonstrating a clear intervention logic consistent with the ToC; c) how the ToC is sensitive to the specificities of the operationalisation of the programme (e.g., four sub-programmes with multiple and diverse implementing partners)?
----------------------------	---

The Evaluation Team also followed up some of the aspects raised in the Mid-Term Review carried out in 2012¹⁶; these were: intensification of joint efforts to improve outcomes in gender and HIV and Aids; how the capacity building of partner organisations has developed in regard to monitoring and evaluation through new and innovative methods and if the response to these measures have had impact on the quality of reporting; revisiting the theory of change and reviewing the results matrix in light of new partners; the support to networks; the skills-oriented capacity building in communication advocacy and campaigning using innovative methods; and the continuation of selecting local partner organisations.

The findings related to the stock-taking of results are based on the following methodology: Results at sub-programme and partner level highlighted in annual reports were analysed and registered in a stock-taking matrix as outcomes at policy level (national, provincial and district), as processes towards policy outcomes (incl. increased dialogue/interaction, increased access to policy makers/implementers) and as improved

¹⁶ Mid-Term Review of the AGIR Programme, Final Report January 2013, K Kelpin et al, Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2013:3

services to rights-holders. The partner organisations' responses to the open questions on "what has changed?" were compared with the results in the matrix.

On a general level the identified results cited in the annual reports were confirmed. The interviews provided more detailed information on the reported results and data on results not mentioned in the annual reports. The statements of the partner organisations were triangulated with respondents within the same organisations; with other CSO which are members of the same or other sub-programmes, with civil society platforms, duty-bearers and media actors. The scope of the evaluation did not include verification of results at rights-holder level or revision of partner organisations' reports or databases. The interviews included, however, questions on the internal M&E systems and on the practices for data collection. Results (understood as behaviour changes in rights-holders, civil society organisations and duty-bearers) presented in the following chapter (and in annex 6) are results that have been verified by multiple actors and/or multiple levels within the same organisation.

The stock-taking focused first on what was stated as results in the annual reports from the IOs to the Embassy of Sweden. Changes that were mentioned in the interviews with partner organisations but not highlighted in the reports were also included. The results were then analysed as changes in behaviour in rights-holders, duty-bearers and civil society organisations or as changed relations between these actors. The changes were registered in the stock-taking matrix regardless of whether or not they fully corresponded with the objectives and the expected results in the results frameworks. The method used meant that results were registered even when the changes in behaviour and relations only indicated progress towards what could be considered as a result according to the agreed results frameworks for the different sub-programmes.

The evaluation was carried out parallel to an advisory service focusing on results based management (RBM) and evaluative thinking. Discussions on the theory of change and the results frameworks with each intermediary organisation were held to prepare a joint workshop. The discussions and the workshop used outcome mapping components as a method to focus on changes at intermediary outcome and outcome levels. Though not within the scope of the evaluation, these sessions have been helpful in informing the analysis of how RBM is being applied in the programme. For further information on the applied methods see the inception report in annex 2.

1.3 LIMITATIONS

The evaluation only assesses a part of this complex civil society support programme. Focus lies on the obtained results within the thematic sub-programmes and how these results have been demonstrated in the applied results frameworks. The stock-taking of results does not include the overarching results framework and its objectives to support the sustainability of the partner organisations, the development of systems for financial management, audit systems, and strengthening of internal governance and accountability, etc. Neither does the evaluation assess the ef-

forts made by the intermediary organisations to promote good donorship among other donors. The evaluation assesses a sample of the reported results within the four sub-programmes and relates these to aspects of relevance and effectiveness. It should however be emphasised that, even though the evaluation does not assess the specific *support* provided to the partner organisations in cross-cutting areas, the evaluation includes assessment of the consulted organisations' understanding and, as far as possible, the application of gender mainstreaming, HIV and Aids perspective and disability and child rights perspectives. The interviews with the partners gave fairly good indications on the level of understanding of specific rights and power perspectives. Some partner organisations also discussed the level of understanding and application of cross-cutting issues in a self-reflective manner.

Also, the rather extensive set of questions raised in the ToR was not entirely consistent with the narrow scope of the evaluation. The Evaluation Team has tried to strike a balance in responding to the rather high expectations on behalf of the Embassy of Sweden on addressing a large number of questions while staying within the intended scope. When relevant information has been raised by stakeholders on the overall programme level or on, for example, the issue of capacity development and organisational assessment of the partner organisations, the evaluators have tried to include such information in the analysis.

There are also some other notable limitations. The stock-taking of results represent a sample of different types of results since the start of AGIR and for most of these results the evaluators only have the annual reports from the IOs as a source of information. Not all aspects could receive the same attention and rigour. The evaluators were dependent on a reflective dialogue with the IOs and the consulted partner organisations. For the programme objectives related to good donorship, donor coordination, the strengthening of the civil society and enabling environment for the civil society, the evaluators were able to cover, in a limited way, the two last objectives.

The availability of duty-bearers was an issue: It was not possible to meet with all listed governmental and parliamentary entities, several meetings with public officials were cancelled at the last minute and it was not always possible to reschedule the meetings. The field visit to Sofala coincided with the visit of the President of the Republic, which made it impossible to meet with local duty-bearers, although the team was able to meet with the Department of Health and the Institute for Legal Assistance. Due to challenges in scheduling the bilateral interviews for the sub-programmes it was not possible to carry out the focus groups discussions as planned. Several group interviews were however realised.

A last limitation worth mentioning is the representation of voices in the data collection. The interviews were made with a high number of key actor respondents such as heads and coordinators, monitoring and programme staff. Who holds these key positions in most of these organisations reflects the male domination in the Mozambican

society. On an overall level few women were interviewed and most of them represented organisations with a gender focus; people living with disabilities were only represented through ACAMO and no youth leaders participated in the consultations. These contextual factors are of course both a finding regarding the nature of Mozambican society, but they also represent a significant limitation to the efforts of the evaluation team to obtain a balanced perspective.

The scope of the evaluation also limited the selection of CSO representatives to staff and board members, which is why no direct rights-holders were included in the discussions.

1.4 DEFINITIONS

The evaluation looks at results frameworks and stock-taking of results and uses M&E terms in the discussions on effectiveness and fitness-for-purpose. Definitions of the core concepts are:

Output	The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes. (OECD/DAC). An output is an immediate, visible, concrete developmental change that is the tangible consequence of project activities (inputs). The output is within the direct sphere of control of the implementing organisation.
Outcome	The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. (OECD/DAC). It reflects medium-term effects and is often the results of a series of achieved outputs. An outcome takes place during the life of the project/programme/strategy. It is within the sphere of influence but not direct control of the implementing organisation. It is usually expressed in terms of a desired change of behaviour, performance, welfare or condition of an organisation/a system/or a group by the end of the implementation period.
Intermediary or bridging outcome	When the achievement of the outcomes for beneficiaries requires the achievement of an intermediary objective directed at <i>another</i> target group e.g. in training and capacity development. The intermediate outcome helps to bridge the gap between the output and outcome level. It is a middle level aimed at helping us plan and monitor contributions where the target group of the contribution are different from the beneficiaries of the contribution (intermediate), or contributions that are very large and complex (component). Bridging objectives frequently captures the change the development intervention hopes to achieve with regard to the target group or organisation. They are generally more short-term than the outcome objective.
Impact	Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. (OECD/DAC) Vision or long-term development goal representing the logical consequence of achieving a combination of outputs and outcomes. Usually measurable after the intervention's life and a change that the intervention alone cannot bring about.

1.5 EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team consisted of one international team leader, Mrs. Annica Holmberg, and two national experts, Dr. José Jaime Macuane and Mr. Padil Salimo. José Jaime Macuane was also a team member of the Mid-Term Review carried out in 2012 which allowed the team to have a deeper understanding of the development of AGIR since the MTR. It also made it possible to follow-up on earlier statements since there were some respondents in the evaluation that also took part in the MTR.

2 Findings

This chapter provides a brief introduction to the shifting relations between Mozambican civil society and the duty-bearers. It presents findings from the stock-taking of results and the analysis of the applied results frameworks in the programme.

2.1 THE SHIFTING ROLES OF CIVIL SOCIETY

The AGIR focus on the accountability of duty-bearers occurs in a context of a changing political and economic realm, with sometimes contradictory and tense processes. This influences the role and space for civil society in governance. Mozambique has had a relatively long democratisation process, with liberalisation initiated in the late 1980s with the opening up of the single party regime, the public discussion and enactment of a new democratic constitution, and the approval of the press and association laws. However, the country has lately experienced a notable deterioration in its governance indicators, such as freedom of the press,¹⁷ access to information, participation and accountability (the country ranks 30th in accountability and 25th in participation in the Mo Ibrahim index).¹⁸ According to Freedom House ratings, the country is currently considered as partially free.¹⁹ The natural resource boom in the country has been hailed as an opportunity for continuation of the already high economic growth rates (of an average of 7% in the last 10 years) and possible development, but at the same time has triggered human rights violations, mainly linked to the resettlement processes (violation of land tenure rights, non-restoration of livelihoods, improper compensation, and even police violent repression in response to community protests and claims) and responding strong social activism.

However, whilst the law of the right to information took nine years in the parliament to be approved²⁰, there have been improvements in access to budget information; the government publishes the budget on its website, and a citizen's budget is produced and published. More recently, the government published the contracts of the extrac-

¹⁷ See http://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/FOTP_2014.pdf. (22.08.2014)

¹⁸ The ranking included 52 countries. <http://www.moibrahimfoundation.org/mozambique> (22.08.2014)

¹⁹ With a score of 3,5 in civil liberties, freedomhouse.org/regions/sub-saharan-africa#.U9uh_mM2aaV

²⁰ It was approved in the generality on August 21st 2014 and still pending the final approval after its specialized analysis.

tive industries. These are substantial changes resulting from civil society advocacy. Nonetheless, the culture of public accountability in Mozambique is still emerging.

Understanding the role of civil society in the promotion of more responsible and accountable governance implies looking at the roles of CSOs in this changing environment. Early in the post-emergency period following the post-civil war (ended in 1992) and the approval of the associations' law in 1991 (law 8/91), the role of CSOs was mainly as service providers, combined with building capacities and awareness of local communities. It was just in recent years that the activist profile has been broadened from a few actors to a wider spectrum of civil society. Civil society as a channel of collective demands, or simply as organisations advocating for chosen objectives (without a broader base of members or constituencies) is thus something rather new. Research-based work of the Centre for Public Integrity (CIP) on public integrity, anti-corruption, public expenditures and natural resources revenues, of the Institute of Economic and Social Studies (IESE) on the discussion of the fiscal regime of mega-projects and of Rural Environment Observatory on rural development issues are some examples of the above referred activism. AGIR started when this process was ongoing, with a relatively limited number of CSOs with longer experiences in claiming accountability of the duty-bearers at different levels.

The change in the roles of civil society has implications for the patterns of relations between government and CSOs. During the latter's focus on service delivery and capacity development of local communities, the relation with duty-bearers was based on a model of partnership that favoured the dissemination of some experiences, such as the 1990s Manica and Nampula initiative of community participation in planning and budgeting. This initiative eventually turned into a national programme and the participatory mechanisms, currently called local consultative councils (LCC), were brought into the de-concentration law (8/2003 of 19 May). A similar experience occurred with the adoption of the Development Observatories (DOs) to monitor the implementation of the poverty reduction programmes, driven by the combination of donors and civil society pressures. Initially, the participation of civil society in these forums was passive, mainly to rubber-stamp the government reports on the implementation of the poverty reduction plan of action. However, when civil society began to present evidence on the level of implementation of the government plans to buttress its claims for better allocation of public resources, the relations with the government came to be seen as conflictive. Also other CSOs advocacy initiatives, such as claims on transparency in extractive industries, expenditure tracking and even human rights, continue to provoke defensive responses on the behalf of the duty-bearers, largely in the form of questioning the watch dog role of the civil society.

The response of the duty-bearers to the increased focus of CSOs as a voice bearer has been to limit the space for activism, as was the case after the protest against the resettlement process in Tete province when organisations were allowed to work and visit in the resettled areas only with government authorisation; reduction of access to information and increasing attempt to align civil society participation mechanisms to its

interests. An example of this latter trend was attempts to discredit civil society provincial forums/platforms, which have lost their past importance as mechanisms of credible representation of civil society positions. Some of them are either being revitalised or have only a formal role of presenting reports in the development observatories. According to a participant in the Sofala workshop, the involvement of CSOs in government initiatives and the openness of the latter to involve the former depends mainly on the interests of the government to legitimise its positions. Openness and involvement of civil society organisations happen when it is on matters that foremost interest the government and not to accommodate CSO points of view.

In some cases, the engagement with duty-bearers has worsened to the point that the work of the CSOs has been restricted. Examples are the prohibition of ESTAMOS in Niassa to carry out expenditure tracking in the districts and of LDH in Sofala to visit areas where military skirmishes between Government and Renamo military forces are occurring to assess human rights violations. There is a proposal of a stricter NGO legislation that, if approved, would follow the negative global trend²¹ of limiting the space for the civil society.

The intermediaries include a contextual analysis in their reports as a backdrop of the progress achieved by the programme and how it influenced its achievement. Statement on Narrative and Financial reports of EoS include an evaluation of external risks related to the achievement of programme results. However, the contextual analyses do not look into how the enforcement of rights and the overall political realm can accelerate or retard the pace of change in the expected direction.

2.2 STOCK-TAKING OF THE THEMATIC SUB-PROGRAMMES

The stock-taking of results was carried out through the desk review and interviews with partner organisations, intermediaries and external actors with knowledge about AGIR. The desk-review of the IO's annual reports primarily gave information on outputs, bridging outcomes and descriptions of what could be understood as steps in processes of change, though not depicted as such.

The stock-taking of the sub-programmes' results is related to the relevance and effectiveness of the achieved results with a focus on intermediary outcomes and out-

²¹ See State of Civil Society 2013: Creating an enabling environment, CIVICUS for information on the different restrictions imposed by new NGO regulations in various countries around the globe. Illustration of this development in Africa are for example Ethiopia, Uganda, Zambia, Sierra Leone, and Zimbabwe.

comes²². The results are viewed from a human rights-based approach and the cross-cutting perspectives of AGIR.

IO	Diakonia	Oxfam	We Effect	IBIS
Accountability areas	- Participation and social accountability - Political accountability and multiparty democracy - Legal accountability incl. human rights	- Transparency and accountability - Access and Interaction with Public Service Providers - Reduction of gender inequality and Gender-based violence - Reduction of the discrimination against the most vulnerable	- Participation and social accountability in natural resources and community land	- Promotion of access to information

Figure 1: Accountability areas of AGIR

The weaknesses of the current system for reporting and demonstrating changes have influenced the exercise of following the results:

- The objectives, the expected results (input, outcome and impact) and their corresponding indicators in the results frameworks have not been stable but shifted in various cases and degrees from year to year and between annual work plans and reports. The stated changes need to be compared with “moving targets”.
- The system is permeated by a lack of clarity on what kind of information is needed to enable reporting on policy dialogue results. This means that there might be data gathered that documents activities but do not support statements on changes in people’s awareness or behaviour or relations between actors.
- The reporting of results at sub-programme level mainly focuses on what was done and not what kind of changes the programme has contributed to. Overall discussions on how far the programme and the sub-programmes have reached the expected outcomes are practically absent in the reports.
- Expected results to the objectives are generally recorded when fully achieved, following a logic of success indicators rather than showing how the organisations manage to *participate and influence* policy processes through their interactions with duty-bearers and support to rights-holders. This intermediary

²² Results at output level such as number of published studies and reports, workshops and civic education, visits to prisons, training for duty bearers and media, etc., are not listed here. Some output level results are recorded in Annex 6.

outcome level is insufficiently connected to the expected outcomes of civil society contributing to *more accountable governance, deepened democracy, gender equality and human rights*²³.

- The IOs have monitoring systems in place and observations from monitoring visits and discussions are recorded. These observations are primarily based on the partner organisations' explanations on what led to the occurred changes. Few of stated changes are backed-up with rights-holders'/duty-bearers' self-assessments, pre- and post-intervention surveys, statistics compared to baseline data or methods like most significant change (MSC)²⁴. We did not find proof of systematic data collection throughout the report chain in the different partnerships within AGIR.

2.2.1 Relevance

The activities and their outputs within AGIR sub-programmes are assessed to be consistent with the overall objectives of the sub-programmes. However, as discussed in section 2.3, the intervention logic on how these activities are translated into actions that lead to the next level (outcomes and intermediary/bridging outcomes) is frequently vague. The evaluators found that the strategies used to raise awareness, to collect evidence and to perform monitoring activities, as well as conducting research, seminars and debates are relevant in processes that aim to increase the policy dialogue and influence the duty-bearers. These actions depend greatly on the overall responsiveness of the duty-bearers to CSO calls for engagement, and they are not always linked to direct dialogue on specific political processes. This is both a matter of how invited spaces are being used and perceived by the civil society and the actual possibilities to engage in more long-term and institutionalised discussions with duty-bearers. Recognising the limitations that exist, a greater use of direct interaction with duty-bearers (institutions and key agents within the institutions) could have further increased the relevance of the sub-programmes. A look at how some sub-programme objectives have been formulated also raise the question of whether they actually are attainable through a civil society accountability programme.

Examples of high set objectives in the sub-programmes:		
	Accountability area	Objectives
Oxfam	Transparency and accountability by the Government	1: Increased poverty reduction due to increased transparency and governmental accountability over policies, means, access and results.
IBIS	Access to infor-	2: Citizens all over Mozambique have access to qualita-

²³ Italics refer to AGIR overall objective as stated in the guidelines from the Embassy of Sweden.

²⁴ Several of the interviewed partner organisations said that they had started to use MSC to collect data. This was also confirmed by the IOs. It was however not clear on how the methodology was applied. A full scale and documented MSC-process would have provided the organisations with demonstrated results.

	mation	tive information from a diversity of means of communication
We Ef- fect	Participation and Social responsibility in the area of natural resources and community land	3: Key actors are able to negotiate partnerships with investors (companies) in the exploration of natural resources, based on mutual benefits and a fair distribution of the gains.

Figure 2: Examples of high-set objectives in the sub-programmes

If we focus on the objectives and the expected results that concern the actual intervention with the duty-bearers and how the claims on accountability are expressed, the question arises if the partner organisations are concentrating enough on the actual policy dialogue? The issue of relevance needs to be related to the Theory of Change and how the sub-programmes and the partner organisations within those visualise how change happens through advocating for rights and accountability.

The data collection showed that the most of the consulted CSOs put insufficient efforts in analysing how the rights issues of their concern are managed in the policy and decision-making processes. The policy dialogue strategies are not clearly linked to actors within the system that could facilitate a more constructive dialogue between the rights-holders, the CSOs and the duty-bearers.

The CSOs' understanding of the need to monitor policy implementation and the compliance with policy decision is assessed by the evaluators to be high and that AGIR has supported the organisations to develop this line of work. The need of producing more evidence based studies that back up citizens' claims is also understood and is a strategy that has been increasingly used by the AGIR partners. This is also something that is recognised and appreciated by the duty-bearers.

The knowledge of different advocacy strategies and how and when to use them is weak in most of the organisations that were consulted. This includes the aspects highlighted above on the need to grasp the nature of different policy processes and how the relation to key actors within the system can be leveraged in advocacy efforts. The ability to identify who "the movers and shakers" are within the system is key to strategic advocacy work. A large number of the consulted national and local partners of AGIR²⁵ also acknowledge having insufficient advocacy skills that enable them to make use of different opportunities of policy dialogue. A challenge that was identified both by the respondents and the evaluators was how to be less reactive and more proactive using planned and more long-term advocacy strategies. The partner organi-

²⁵ For example CTV, ESTAMOS, UPCT, ACAMO, ACABE, AENA,

sations also acknowledged that their advocacy work was not always followed-up²⁶ in a systematic manner. The CSOs see the need to develop target processes rather than only respond to emergent “hot issues”. A more systematic advocacy approach would also entail that the dialogue throughout the policy process is maintained, regardless of whether or not civil society opts for public social protests.

The guidelines for AGIR are partially based on the principles of the human rights-based approach and gender equality. This is aligned with the back-donors’ overall development policies. This relates issues on rights and power relations to the issue of relevance and poses high demands on the partners’ commitments to HRBA. To be fully relevant, the actions of the partner organisation thus need to promote positive change towards increased accountability in a way that regards and hopefully increases democracy and gender equality, as well as child rights, disability rights and rights of people living with HIV and Aids (PLWHA). The commitment to HRBA and the work of the partners should be governed by transparent and accountable processes that allow active and meaningful participation of all concerned rights-holders and an active stand against all forms of discrimination. At least this should include demonstrated progress towards a rights-based approach and an increased integration of the programmatic cross-cutting issues by the CSOs. In short, organisations that do not apply HRBA and/or challenge discriminatory power relations in their internal and external work are less relevant as agents for sustainable and just social change.

Taking into account power relations and aspects of different forms of discrimination is of course not only related to the issue of relevance but also to effectiveness. Deepened democracy, gender equality and human rights will only be achieved through democratic and rights-based processes.

The partner organisations defining themselves as feminist and/or pro gender equality organisations were critical about the achievements of AGIR in promoting gender mainstreaming. They claimed that one could expect more from a programme like AGIR considering the back-donors and the importance of having a clear gender perspective on the policy dialogue. The evaluators found that the level of gender awareness was strikingly low among many partners not specialised on gender issues and that comments on gender tended to be about staff policy, women participants and the

²⁶ In 2012, CTV produced the “Annual Report of Good Governance in the Management of Natural Resource in Mozambique 2010-2011”. This report is seen as an important document that offer to partners working on the issues of natural resource, access to information, human rights, accountability etc., the possibility of identification of issues that require a follow-up through advocacy and/or lobbying for change. However, even after the document was released for a very broad audience, then there were no follow-up activities of the findings and recommendations of the study. (Interview at CTV 26.07.2014)

development of some kind of steering document. The IOs have continued to support the partner organisations with gender mainstreaming capacity development using an external consultant and the expertise of the feminist partner organisations. This approach attempts to promote working with gender from within and outside the organisation. The IOs state that they have seen some positive effects in the partners' plans.

The sub-programme has partners that focus on the rights of specific groups in the Mozambican society such as elderly persons, children, PLWHA and persons with visual impairment²⁷. This is a valid strategy to push forward the rights of these groups. However it does not automatically affect the mainstreaming approach of the programme or the capacity and willingness of other partner organisations to integrate for instance child rights issues or a HIV perspective. The interviews with CSOs not focusing on these rights or perspectives did not give evidence of that kind of mainstreaming taking place.

2.2.2 Effectiveness

We will here give a sample²⁸ of the results we have focused on and relate them:

- changed behaviour due to increased knowledge and awareness (rights-holders);
- changed behaviour among CSOs in relation to capacity building, organisational development and networking for accountability initiatives;
- changed behaviour of duty-bearers due to increased knowledge, awareness achieved through CSO interventions and access to evidence-based reports from the civil society;
- changed behaviour of duty-bearers due to increased dialogue/interaction with civil society and long-term advocacy strategies (consistent use of existing spaces for dialogue and coordination) and increased monitoring of policy compliance and social pressure for accountability and transparency.

Changes in rights-holders

A large group of the partner organisations work with civic education and awareness raising targeting specific groups of rights-holders or communities at large. They also carry out community based social audit activities²⁹. Community based organisations (CBOs) and rights-holder groups participate in the collection of evidence of the per-

²⁷ Forum da Terceira Idade, partner to Oxfam; Rede da Criança, Rede Contra Abuso de Menores, Associação Criança Boa Esperança, partner to Diakonia; Rede Nacional de Associações de Pessoas Vivendo HIV e SIDA, partner to Oxfam.

²⁸ A more detailed overview of the results per sub-programme is presented in Annex 6.

²⁹ Expenditure tracking (involving CIP and Estamos); budget monitoring (GMD, Forum Mulher and others); and Poverty Reduction Action Plan (PARP) monitoring, under the development observatories.

formance of the service provision and the compliance with laws, regulations and policy commitments by the duty-bearers. These initiatives are intended to influence changes in rights-holders leading to greater interaction with the public entities and also their action in the public sphere.

Changed behaviour due to increased knowledge and awareness (rights-holders)

- ✓ Increase in reported cases of human rights abuses by rights-holders, particularly related to gender-based violence (GBV). (LDH, also confirmed by other partners as something they noticed)³⁰
- ✓ Increased demand from rights-holder on support in their particular cases/situation. (LDH, FORCOM, ESTAMOS, PNDH)
- ✓ Increase in the use of freedom of expression: Increased use by rights-holders of “call in” to radio shows to voice their opinion (CAICC, FORCOM, also mentioned by media stakeholder); More people practice their citizenship – demonstrations and increased interest of collective activism, including more women claim to be feminists and more people show up at social mobilisation and support gender equality in social media (Fórum Mulher); More people can publicly show their support for an opposition political party (OE). (I)
- ✓ Loss of fear – a repeated claim by most of the CSOs, an indicator of this is more people in organised demonstrations, and how people make use of spaces to raise their voice. (I - PO)
- ✓ Increased awareness by rights-holders leading to dialogue with forestry companies and local government (contributing to a reduction of land conflicts the last two years); cooperation with local government on delimitation and demarcation of land to the communities. (ORAM)
- ✓ Increased awareness of communities affected by the extractive industries about their rights leading to organisation of collective action to claim their rights (AENA, AAAJC, JA, CTV).
- ✓ Local councils members more aware and active in demanding accountability of district governments (Buzi and Nhamatanda) (PNDH). (I-PO)

In general the current results frameworks do not capture change at rights-holders’ level. In order to do that the partner organisations would need to closely follow up behaviour changes in the rights-holder groups they work with³¹.

³⁰ The examples in the tables are results manifested by respondents in the interviews, both by partner organisations, the IOs and in some cases by duty-bearers. Many of the examples are also reported in the intermediaries’ annual report to the EoS, but not all. When stemming only from interviews the example is marked with (I). When only highlighted by either the partner organisations (PO) or the intermediaries (IO) this is also marked in the table.

Nonetheless, some evidence of changes in rights-holders' behaviour credited to the AGIR partners in specific contexts are identifiable, linked to specific initiatives in the reports or through interviews. For example, communities affected in their livelihoods and land rights by the mining industry relied on the assistance of some organisations, such as AENA, in Nampula, AAAJC, JA and LDH in Tete to mobilise and present their claims in a structured way to the government and the mining companies. However, despite this activism, it is not clear that rights-holders are significantly empowered to mobilise themselves to oppose against policies that are not favourable to them.

Interviews with partners, such as (UPCT, JA, AAJC, CT, PJ, LDH, ESTAMOS), all pointed out that communities lack sufficient capacity and initiative to demand and discuss issues affecting their rights or interests with government, without the support of the CSO. Even some organisations that are supposed to be more proactive in their work, as the political parties, do not demonstrate consistent change of behaviour over time. For example, the Electoral Observatory claimed that their initiatives to capacitate political parties on the electoral laws and sensitise them on political violence have been effective, since it contributed to reducing the violent tone in the political discourse and allowed parties to master the use of the electoral laws. Whilst this can be true regarding political violence, the evidence seems to be weaker concerning the use of electoral laws. Many parties faced problems in the submission of their candidacies for the 2014 elections, showing that their understanding of the electoral law is still deficient.

Interviews with partner organisations confirmed that there are changes in behaviour of the rights-holders stemming from the CSOs' interventions to provide information and knowledge. It is however important to note these changes are not demonstrated in the intermediaries' annual reports to the donors. Illustrations were given on how these interventions had contributed to an increased agency of rights-holders resulting in claims on their rights and democratic governance. However, so far these changes are only reported at the output level (increased knowledge and awareness). The increase of public demonstrations, most of them organised with the contribution of AGIR partners, can be a relevant output, but it is still early to ascertain its implications on a consistent change of behaviour of rights-holders (which could then be assessed as an intermediary outcome). The CSOs have changed their behaviour in recent years in how they articulate their collective action. Given the low direct representativeness of rights-holders (members or constituencies with direct influence over the agendas of

³¹ The partner organisations could for example improve their base line data related to rights-holders agency, using self-assessment tools and methods focusing on personal and local group changes.

the CSOs) in many Mozambican civil society actors, a consistent change in the behaviour of the CSOs cannot automatically be seen as a proxy for consistent behaviour change at rights-holder level.

Changes within civil society organisations

Effectiveness also depends on the type of organisation. For example, the support provided by Diakonia to the human resource development of ACAMO, a membership organisation that deals with a visually impaired persons, was according to the partner organisation instrumental in allowing it to frame strategies of action based on the idea of human rights to influence government services and policies.

Another example of effectiveness has been the support to the platform for community radios, FORCOM. When the organisation became a partner to IBIS within the Access to Information sub-programme struggled with serious institutional challenges.

Through the support to its organisational development, FORCOM described how the organisation has regained its legitimacy and is today able to better fulfil its role in supporting approximately 50 local community radio stations in their work to increase rights' holders access to information on their human rights and possibilities to monitor and influence local policy implementation. FORCOM today has a strategic plan, an established system for M&E which enables them to follow-up changes at local level. One example raised by FORCOM³² is that their provision of legal services to the radio journalists has resulted in more outspoken programmes (less fear of repercussions) on human rights and democracy (content provided by FORCOM to the radios).

As will be discussed in the next sub-section, results-based management (RBM) training has also had some effects on the programme. In the area of gender equality Oxfam has been leading the search for a format for technical support that is congruent with the different IOs' view on how gender mainstreaming should be promoted. Different positions within the ICC on gender mainstreaming approaches has slowed down the progress somewhat in this area. It is still too early to see outcomes on any overall level of the new approach. There was however, apart from various examples from the Oxfam partners, at least one example of a We Effect partner³³ that had opted to use the more in-depth approach of Oxfam.

The combination of legal service provision with advocacy work, used by the Liga de Direitos Humanos, LDH, and Pressão Nacional dos Direitos Humanos, PNDH, (So-

³² Interview with FORCOM's director 07.09.2014.

³³ AENA in Nampula.

fala), proved to be successful according to these partners. The evaluators agree that this seem to be the case. The service delivery work by LDH has for example been used to foster the agenda of human rights with focus on the area of the prisons. This has implications at the central (humanisation of the prisoner's treatment) and local level (authorisations for systematic visits). Service delivery can also support building a relationship that potentially can help the CSOs to influence government policy and the accountability process. For example, the work of N'Weti in Nampula to raise awareness about sexual and reproductive health issues among duty-bearers and rights-holders has stimulated the government to invite this organisation to help in the assistance to the communities and to include sexual and reproductive health in the district plans, often because of demands of the communities due to the awareness-raising they have received. The same happened in the case of PNDH in Sofala, which has a strong cooperation with the district governments (Nhamatanda and Buzi).

Changes within the civil society: networking and advocacy

AGIR has also supported the partners to continue their networking with other civil society actors and enable them to quickly respond to emergent issues through the combination of core funding and flexible funds for campaigns and similar advocacy activities. A large number of the partner organisations have been active in the last years' coordinated social mobilisations. The support to the partners has enabled them to continue to build alliances within civil society³⁴. The programme has also been important in promoting the idea that networking spreads the risk of "attacks" on individual CSOs when dealing with duty-bearers on sensitive issues³⁵. This was something that was raised by the participating partner organisations in the evaluation workshops in Nampula and Beira and the intermediaries also confirmed that the awareness of this important aspect of building alliances has increased within the partner group. The programme has stimulated networking based on the rationale that it would be harder to harass a network of organisations advocating or exerting pressure regarding a certain issue than an isolated organisation.³⁶

³⁴ The core support has enabled the key partner organisations to engage in alliance building that might not have been planned as such, but the partner organisations also raised the importance of access to flexible funds that enable them (and other civil society organisations) to produce campaign materials, cover unexpected coordination costs, or similar expenses.

³⁵ This might not be so much an issue of effectiveness but is crucial to the sustainability for organisations under attack in an environment that is being increasingly repressive towards civil society.

³⁶ For example not giving access to locations for planned activities, direct or indirect threats towards leaders of CSOs, bureaucratic restraints hindering the operations of the organisations or verbal attacks in media.

Change behaviour among CSO in relation to networking for advocacy and accountability initiatives

- ✓ CSOs developed coordinated initiatives to build awareness of rights-holders as a response to the need intervene to protect communities (through a wide dissemination of information and relevant legislation, empowering their participation and providing legal assistance). AAJC, LDH, UPCT, JA
- ✓ More effective monitoring of PARP through a combination of a network of national and local organisations that gather evidence of plan implementation and budget execution to inform the civil society position and advocacy in the development observatories. (GMD and other members of the network)
- ✓ Increased strategic networking of CSOs in order to protect their activism from duty-bearers harassment. (LDH, OE and other CSOs) (I)
- ✓ Reversal of a parliamentary decision on parliamentarians' pension scheme through the campaign "Deputados de Luxo"/Luxury Members of Parliament (FORCOM, Fórum Mulher, LDH, CIP, NWeti, IESE)
- ✓ Human rights abuses related to the extractive industries³⁷ have caused strong reactions among rights-holders and civil society actors and have led to a higher level of understanding the need for CSO to take action. Many organisations dealing with different elements of human rights are members of the natural resources and extractive industries civil society platform.
- ✓ The revision of the Penal Code and the inclusion of provisions threatening women rights have also led some CSOs to act and prevent the Parliament from approving a legal instrument detrimental to women rights.

Three main patterns of networking have emerged through AGIR. The first type is the networking that is directly linked to the programme, which, according to some of the consulted partner organisations, has been much stronger in the sub-programmes than between the sub-programmes. This kind of networking does not necessarily evolve into a network with a formal name, but can stimulate collaborative work and exchange of experiences. For example, Akilizetho and Forum Mulher have been working together to improve the gender mainstreaming of Akilizetho's work, a relation that was boosted because of their participation in the same sub-programme under the same intermediary. The second type of networking has an influence across the sub-programmes, although with a stronger participation of partners of the same sub-programme, as for example the Civil Society Platform for Human Rights, supported by Oxfam. AGIR has contributed to the activation of the existing networks struggling with capacity problems. The Electoral Observatory network, was not registered as a

³⁷ Like for example the case of community members of Cateme (Tete), who was brutally tortured by the police, following the claim of their rights by the loss of land allocated to Vale Mozambique

legal entity until recently and had a weak provincial structure. AGIR supported the registration and professionalisation of this network, which contributed to consolidate its position as an important player in the revision of the electoral law and related regulations, building on its experience of electoral observation. The Right to Information Coalition (DAI), supported by IBIS is another example of a network that benefitted from AGIR support. A third pattern is the networks focusing on specific issues. This form of alliances has increased considerably in the last five years, and has been instrumental to the organisation of some high profile demonstrations, such as the march against kidnappings and for peace in October 2013 (coordinated by LDH), the march against the MPs' pensions system in May 2014 (organised by MASC and some AGIR partners, such as Forum Mulher, N'Weti, FORCOM, CIP) and the March for Peace in June 2014, coordinated by GMD.

A key element of this networking was the collection of evidence to buttress the demonstrations, and although other organisations not involved in AGIR participated³⁸, the role of the programme's partners was key to the organisation, visibility and success of some of these initiatives. In some cases, international networking was used strategically to offset barriers for advocacy at the national level. For example, international networks were activated to question the government positions on the PROSA-VANA in Japan through local organisations, when the president was visiting Japan and discussing this programme with the Japanese government in January 2014. CIP has relied on OXFAM networks to gather information about the company Anadarko's operations in Mozambique, which was not accessible locally, to publicise the gaps related to revenues of the gas operations in Mozambique.

Besides the different patterns mentioned above, coordination and the drivers of activism at central and local level can vary. For example, some national campaigns such as the campaign for peace coordinated by Grupo Moçambicano da Dívida (GMD) have been mere replicates of the national event, asking local organisations (often at short notice) to repeat the campaign in the provinces.

Provincial CSOs also raised the issue of the risks of replicating national interventions at the local level, disregarding the specificities of the context. In some cases, local networks just replicated the public demonstrations made in Maputo, because they were asked or told to do so by their national partners, headquarters or counterparts. This might not be a problem of relevance or even mean that there is a lack of agreement on the importance of the issue, but does indicate a lack of local ownership and

³⁸ MASC (The Civil Society Support Mechanism) participated in the campaigns against the MPs pension scheme and in the March for Peace.

the tendency of top-down processes within the Mozambican civil society. There are also examples of national campaigns that did not reach the local level, either for lack of ownership or weak articulation with local stakeholders. For example, the march against the provisions of the Penal Code threatening women rights was not held on the same day as in Maputo because PNDH received the request to replicate the event in Sofala only one day before the planned date.

Changes in the behaviour of duty-bearers

The data collection gave evidence that the AGIR partners have succeeded in increasing the influence of the civil society in some specific policy processes. Some of the most salient cases of legal reforms of the penal code, responses from duty-bearers involving increase in transparency (e.g. making contracts with the extractive private sector available to the public), are assessed to be the outcomes of advocacy work that was initiated prior to the AGIR. The partner organisations have been able to capitalise on their earlier work³⁹, develop their strategies and coordinate their efforts through the support from AGIR. The core support modality of AGIR, enabling the organisations to implement their long-term strategic plans has according to the interviewed key partners played an important role in the organisations' possibility to pursue their work without having to (only) follow donor priorities. There are also processes that spurred through the direct intervention from AGIR actors, like in the case of the revitalisation of the access to information bill.

The interviews with duty-bearers⁴⁰ confirmed that the increased ability of the civil society to back up their claims with research and evidence from social audits had effect on the dialogue, both in an increased willingness to discuss with the CSOs and in the actual development of proposals and policy implementation. Duty-bearers indicated, for example, that the revised legislation on oil and gas and on corporate social responsibility that was submitted to the parliament is due to the huge and public debate on policy options in relation to natural resource exploitation driven by the CSOs⁴¹.

³⁹ For example, IESE initiated the advocacy on the extractive industries tax regime in 2007. The programme undoubtedly contributed to these results through its support to CIP and IESE and in some cases facilitating linkages to networks with information important for their work not accessible in the country.

⁴⁰ For example the Committee of Public Administration, Local Government and Social Communication Ministry of Planning and Development,

⁴¹ Despite the recognized role of CSOs, AGIR partners complain that the participation in this process was very limited. In response to that the duty-bearers claim advocate that the limited participation on the elaboration of the legislation has to do with the lack of capacity and a weak articulation among CSOs, a situation that is being overcome with the creation of CSO Platform for Natural Resources (Interview at MIREME-ITIE).

CSOs have influenced parliamentary decisions (e.g. law against domestic violence against women) including the electoral law revision and the approval of the anti-corruption package bill (protection of whistle-blowers and public probity laws) under AGIR. Interviewed members of parliament (chairing committees) acknowledge the existence of good partnership with CSOs and the contribution of the latter to influence legislation. However, some judge that civil society is not taking full advantage of the existing space.

Changed behaviour of duty-bearers due to increased knowledge, awareness through CSO interventions and access to evidence-based reports from the civil society

- ✓ Duty-bearers (often at technical level) are showing at CSO events; the fact-based discussions are more relevant (Confirmed by a broad range of CSO, the IOs and duty-bearers) (I-IO)
- ✓ Acceptance of accreditation of human rights observers at the Ministry of Justice to inspect human rights abuses in prisons (LDH, Confirmed by the Ministry of Justice)
- ✓ Acceptance of the accreditations of the election observers and less bureaucracy, national outcome (OE, Committee for Public Administration, Local Government and Social Communication)
- ✓ Political parties more open to discuss their own challenges (due to the dialogue on the OE findings) (OE) (I-PO)
- ✓ Increased understanding and openness by district governments of the Law of Forestry and Wildlife, leading to involvement of ORAM and other CSOs in a constructive dialogue, leading to reduction of land conflict last two years; cooperation with civil society on delimitation and demarcation of land to the communities. (ORAM)
- ✓ Adoption of principles of inclusive education to accommodate the Blind and Partially Sighted Association demands – increase in the enrolment in public universities and INEFP (the Institute for Vocation Training) acquired a software and computers adapted to blind people for training of this group. (ACAMO)
- ✓ Government is more concerned about the accountability on the implementation of the PARP, stimulated by the improvement of civil society evidence-based reports on the implementation of the Economic and Social Plans. Changes in budget allocations based on the inputs provided by civil society. (GMD, civil society platform G20)
- ✓ Government changes in the approach to extractive industries revenue/tax regime application, resulting from research and evidence gathering of civil society about the unfairness and inaccuracies of the current application of the regulations in this area (CIP, IESE)

The changes include diverse areas such as human rights in the penitentiary system, education, electoral registration and policy dialogue. In some cases, this has become part of the regulations – for example, accreditation of the electoral observers and the possibilities for them to vote outside their home districts is part of the electoral regulations. In other cases, these (non-regulatory) changes result from the openness of the person who represents duty-bearers rather than an institutional position. For example, openness of the ministry of justice to allow human rights organisations to oversee the situation of human rights in the penitentiary system has been mainly favoured by the

current minister of justice, who has a record of work with human rights and is said to be a person open for dialogue with civil society. In this case, it was mentioned (by interviewees) that the progress achieved so far could be reversed if a new minister takes over. There are also examples of a procedural change in a governance process, as were the decisions of the government to accommodate civil society proposals to revise the guidelines of participation in the development observatories, and to focus the discussion in these forums to a specific policy area to benefit from more substantial inputs of the rights-holders. Generally, changes of duty-bearers are well-documented. In some cases the sustainability of the changes can be questioned, particularly when they depended on personal decisions or positions of duty-bearer representatives and less on an institutional position, translated into binding instruments as regulations or other formal tools.

Some of the changes listed below are a mix of dialogue and social mobilisation and pressure. The examples show that interaction and systematic advocacy have helped to build confidence between CSOs and duty-bearers at the political and even at the technical level during the implementation of AGIR. But the changes are not necessarily in the same direction.

Changed behaviour of duty-bearers due to increased dialogue/interaction with civil society and long-term advocacy strategies (consistent use of existing spaces for dialogue and coordination)

- ✓ Easier to get access to information, recently got access to the municipal budget for the first time as a results of tracking (ESTAMOS) (I-PO)
- ✓ Consulted AGIR partners active at national level (and Maputo based) confirm that there is a shift towards engagement with parliamentary committees and also technical divisions at different ministries show a tendency to be more open to continuous dialogue and technical coordination. This trend has been ongoing the last five years according to the respondents. Existing mechanism such as the national Development Observatory has improved the last two years as a result of civil society being able to provide relevant data and to focus on one specific subject for the dialogue. On the contrary at local level CSOs claimed that there had been a dilution of policy dialogue spaces⁴² and the quality of dialogue itself. (Provincial Platform of CSO in Tete, Niassa, Nampula,; AAJC, Akilizetho and ESTAMOS) (I-PO)
- ✓ The debate and improvement of the proposed law on access to information/right to information awoke the attention of parliamentarians of the Public Administration, Local Government and Media committee, and there is an expressed commitment by the com-

⁴² In 2011, in Tete only one meeting of DO took place, and in 2014, until August no meeting had been held. In Niassa, and Nampula, the space for debate during the DO has increasingly declined.

- mittee to present the law before the Parliament. (The draft law was submitted to the Parliament in 2005, but initially received little attention; it gained visibility the last two years.) (IBIS was more active in this law following the withdrawal of MISA from AGIR, ACDH was another partner). (I-IO)
- ✓ The Electoral Observatory has been working with the above-mentioned committee and this was an entry point to influence the electoral law. The OE executive director was invited to work with the committee as a consultant in the revision of the electoral law. (OE) (I-PO)
 - ✓ The budget monitoring forum, GMD work on aid effectiveness issues and CIP work on expenditures tracking and extractive industries have attracted the attention and merited the praise of the Budget and Planning Committee of the parliament, which uses their information for budget oversight (GMD, CIP).
 - ✓ The revision of some articles on Penal Code (Type of penalty for rape of women; penalty for environmental crimes).
 - ✓ Legislative production related to gender – provision in the Penal code that protect victims of rape is a result of the effort of organisations dealing with gender issues. These organisations have interacted with relevant committees of the Assembly of the Republic, although to some extent this was not enough to prevent the proposals for the penal code to include provisions that violate women’s rights. (WLSA, AMCJ, Forum Mulher)
 - ✓ A more aggressive response from duty-bearers, as a response on a) the shift of more CSOs acting as bearers of collective voice rather than as service providers; b) the nature of the issues that are brought to the table, and c) the way advocacy is done (confrontational methods), Facilidade; LDH, Parliamentary Commission for HR); (I)
 - ✓ Threats against CSO leaders (Examples known by the key stakeholders⁴³) (I)

Systematic work of partner organisations such as LDH with the Ministry of Justice on human rights, CIP on expenditures tracking and extractive industries, and GMD work on budget monitoring and aid effectiveness have contributed to build some rapport with duty-bearers. This allowed these CSOs to influence policy decisions in the areas they operate. However, there is also evidence of the opposite where the dialogue has not lead to positive response from the duty-bearers. Systematic work and cooperation between duty-bearers in governance in the areas of health, education, water and sanitation were the hallmark of the Nampula successful story of participatory governance. This was pointed out as a good practice in the local governance. Nampula is also credited with the first use of the term “Development Observatories (DOs)”, instead of Poverty Observatories and the creation of a unit to coordinate government, civil society and private sector development efforts, Unidade de Coordenação do Desenvolvimento de Nampula.

⁴³ Due to the fact that the report will be public we choose not to give any specific examples.

The foundation of this good practice was the partnership based on CSOs focused on service delivery and capacity development of communities to participate in local planning processes, which eventually became the local consultative councils that complemented government efforts. The policy dialogue in the thematic platforms (CSOs and government) would be reflected on the positions of the civil society in the development observatories. The perception that DOs and local councils are increasingly captured by the government⁴⁴ and became ineffective spaces of influence and changes in the political and economic context have contributed to the questioning of these “rules of engagement”⁴⁵. The increased focus on advocacy of civil society has challenged what has been understood as the foundations of the partnership by the duty-bearers. Previously this was assumed to be a partnership wherein civil society supports governmental programmes as an implementer and service provider. The new role as a counterpart that monitors the compliance and the performance of the authorities has created tensions. According to the statements of many of the interviewed partners, the government perceives that CSOs are acting as opposition parties and with plans to force political changes through their activism⁴⁶. Whilst long and systematic interactions have contributed to build partnership and cooperation between CSOs and duty-bearers, it had also generated expectations about the former’s role towards the latter. The increasing focus of CSOs on advocacy is changing these relations which provoke, at least in the short term, a negative response from many duty-bearers. AGIR reports do not clearly mention this trend and how the shift in relations can be analysed and addressed.

We return to the issue of the cross-cutting issues, HRBA and RBM, and the bearing they have on the effectiveness of the accountability work. The lack of active and meaningful participation of the rights-holders is a major challenge to most Mozambican organisations. There are AGIR partner organisations that directly represent the rights-holders, for example ACAMO, UNAC and Fórum Mulher, but most partners work towards communities and specific groups. It then becomes vital to their legiti-

⁴⁴ To clarify; the ruling Frelimo party sometimes interferes using its leverage over party members or sympathizers or over local governments to engage with CSOs. The government can also be proactive in this regard, but the original drive is from the party.

⁴⁵ These rules of engagement refer to the continuation of a relation that is detrimental to accountability, where civil society adopts a loyal and subservient position in relation to the government. Such position raises of course issues of legitimacy of CSOs representing citizens’ interests,

⁴⁶ This reasoning is also present in other provinces. For example, Estamos was forbidden to continue its expenditures tracking work in Niassa, despite its long record of good relations with government. Even at the central level, members of the Parliament that consider the contribution of civil society to their work important, have complained about the latest trends of public demonstrations questioning parliament’s decisions, instead of using the existing channels and the relative good relations that CSOs already have with the Parliament.

macy to ensure that they use inclusive and participatory methods and secure that the groups whose rights they claim to defend are able to have an influence over the organisations and to get relevant information on how the work is progressing (i.e. feedback to the communities on the response to the provincial and national advocacy).

The issues of transparency and accountability within the partner organisations should also be linked to responsibilities to other civil society actors, members, communities and/or specific rights-holder groups. The consultations with the CSOs showed that AGIR puts insufficient efforts into discussions on how HRBA is put into practice within civil society and how this also can contribute to increased legitimacy. The cross-cutting issues that concern power relations and how these are manifested in discriminatory behaviour are equally vital for the effectiveness and the sustainability of the outcomes from the advocacy work. If rights issues are raised in a manner that exclude the strategic interest and perspective of parts of the population, civil society will contribute to advocate for change that continues to ignore the discrimination against these parts of the population.

For example, CIP has been active in promoting and advocating for public integrity and transparency, but at the same time it lacked mainstreaming of gender and HIV issues. CTV is a lead organisation in the promotion of community rights in natural resources, but still lacks a sound monitoring system. The intermediaries are still struggling to introduce these cross-cutting issues and approaches in the partner organisations work and system. As mentioned earlier, AGIR feminist and women's rights organisations consider gender mainstreaming in the programme to be weak and mechanical, failing to address the complexity of gender relations, that are not only at the organisational level, but also in the social and personal realm.

Another issue related to effectiveness and possible impact is the progressive inclusion of emerging partners and local organisations within AGIR. The localisation process of the programme is relevant to the representativeness of the mix of partner organisations and to ensure the implementation of AGIR at provincial and district level. The initial focus on national organisations has limited AGIR's outreach to local rights-holders. Some of the sub-programmes insisted however in having provincial partners, and the dialogue with the donors has also led to a process of increased localisation during the implementation of AGIR. This has opened up for more direct connection to rights-holders. The four intermediaries are all working towards a process of including more local partnerships, which will further strengthen the possibilities of rights-holders at different levels to be more directly engaged in the accountability work. The MTR mentioned the delay in decentralisation of funds as one of the obstacles faced

by some local partners. This situation has not change much during the evaluated period. Organisations such as ACAMO and Electoral Observatory in Nampula do not have a decentralised budget⁴⁷.

The advantage of including more local partnerships is not only from a financial point of view. Local organisations are increasingly facing challenges, and in the extractive industries' hot spots of Tete and Cabo Delgado they have to engage with local government and multinational companies. Sometimes national organisations do not have the capacity and knowledge to properly assist and defend local rights-holders. As We Effect put it: instead of outreach the programme should promote an "inreach" to local partners, providing support on their demand, because they know much better the challenges they face and how to intervene.

The existence of local partners improves the possibilities to promote national campaigns at the local level and evidence gathering for advocacy, as mentioned regarding participation in the National Development Observatories and in the latest high profile campaigns for peace and against the members of parliament pensions' scheme. In sum, the inclusion of local partners is contributing to produce outcomes suited to the local context and rights-holders claims.

Some of the consulted organisations stressed the importance that civil society occupies the spaces that are available and uses them in an intelligent manner. The strategy of just using confrontation in the policy dialogue is not viable according to these actors. CSOs must use different and parallel strategies, including both invited and claimed spaces, to achieve objectives⁴⁸.

2.2.3 External perspectives

Donors not involved in AGIR, media and representatives from other civil society support initiatives were also consulted in the evaluation. On an overall level they concurred that a programme like AGIR is important for the development of the advocating and rights-based role of the civil society and that the core funding mechanism is assisting the CSO to grow as actors. The visibility of the programme has slightly increased but is still assessed to be low and several of the respondents said that they would have liked more articulated information on the progress of AGIR results. This was related to the fact that the programme is coming to the end of the first phase and

⁴⁷ There are now efforts made by the intermediary Diakonia to monitor and address the situation, a strategy assessed by the EoS as valid and worth continuing to use.

⁴⁸ Or as ODI puts it: Using advocacy from within by working with decision-makers or from outside by confronting, exposing or challenging decision-makers, *ODI, working paper, Monitoring and evaluation of policy influence and advocacy, 2014*.

that there is a decision to continue with an AGIR II⁴⁹. An exception to this was the sub-programme led by IBIS on access to information, several interviewees recognised the important role the sub-programme had played so far and gave special credit to IBIS. Actors with a little more insight recognised that AGIR is contributing to what they saw as an increased ability of the civil society to engage in coordinated actions in recent years. The support to the evidence based research was mentioned as the role of We Effect with partners directly representing rights-holders living in poverty.

The external stakeholders did of course not only address the specific sub-programmes and their results, but discussed the programme on an overall level. Their comments transcend the more narrow focus of the evaluation. There was a shared concern about the ability of the intermediary organisations' to engage in more partnerships and to expand the scope of the sub-programmes. The strategy to involve more local partnership in the second phase of the programme is appreciated, but the need to improve the coordination with other civil society support was stressed. This was raised as an issue both to avoid overlaps but also to increase the synergies where multiple resources are supporting the same civil society processes⁵⁰.

The most critical voices among the external stakeholders asked how the development of the key partner organisations would be assessed; i.e. what would be considered as a “good enough” progress for continuous core support? How is the commitment to HRBA principles and gender equality valued? One question that was raised was how the quality and the outcomes of the capacity building efforts are assessed considering some of the more visible difficulties that some of the partner organisations have, e.g. Electoral Observatory. It was also stressed by several of the respondents that the donors could be clearer on its expectations on the role of the intermediaries.

2.3 FITNESS FOR PURPOSE OF THE RESULTS FRAMEWORKS

A results framework is an analytical tool for planning, management, monitoring and evaluation. It summarises the expected results of a development intervention and ex-

⁴⁹ What are they success stories of the programme and in what way has AGIR made a difference according to the back-donors were questions that were mentioned by the external stakeholders.

⁵⁰ The EoS informed the team that since the end of last year (2013), Sweden meets together with DFID, the Netherlands and Ireland every two weeks in a CS coordination group. At a donor level there is hence more coordination now than before. At MASC/IPO level there is also more coordination than before with several MOUs between the IPOs and MASC in place, etc. EoS has sought further cooperation with MASC.

*plains how these are to be achieved, including causal relationships and underlying assumptions. It allows for organisations (and donors) to monitor and evaluate results and, thus, enables results based management and reporting.*⁵¹

The rationale for the set-up for the monitoring chain in AGIR was based on good donorship and the principle of harmonisation with the systems of the implementing organisations. Due to the fact that the EoS, in 2008, took the informed decision to adopt a partnership approach rather than a traditional procurement approach when selecting the intermediary organisations for the implementation of the programme⁵² the EoS did not design any overall programme framework, but left to the intermediary partner organisations to develop a common overarching framework and results frameworks for each of the different sub-programmes. The frameworks developed by the intermediaries were not linked to the partner organisations' monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, nor did the intermediaries expect the partners to adapt their reporting to the AGIR planning and monitoring instruments.

This approach is built on the assumption that the partner organisations already have established systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation and that they (from the beginning or over time of the partnership) report on the advancement and fulfilment of the organisation's strategic objectives rather than on project or programme specific objectives. It is also founded on the justification of good donorship and the avoidance of imposing models and practices to partner organisations.

Hence, the AGIR programme did not start in a void. Many of the partner organisations, particularly those labelled key partners with core support to their strategic plans⁵³, had direct support from the intermediary organisations, the EoS and/or other donors, before they were identified as partners to AGIR. So in theory the more experienced organisations that were selected for core funding would have M&E systems in place. The final evaluation found that this was not entirely true, and that the existing systems had been introduced or revised by several partner organisations in 2012 or 2013 (both for key and emerging partners)⁵⁴. Some organisations even acknowledged that they did not have any M&E system in 2013⁵⁵. Others claimed that the

⁵¹ Operational Guidelines for Partnering with and Supporting Civil Society in Mozambique, Embassy of Sweden, May 28, 2014

⁵² Operational Guidelines for Partnering with and Supporting Civil Society in Mozambique, Embassy of Sweden, May 28, 2014, p. 18.

⁵³ The IOs joint selection criteria for AGIR stated that key partners needed to have "Strategic plan in place with clear objectives and a results framework and an annual operational plan" (Diakonia, IBIS and Oxfam applications to AGIR, EoS, March 22, 2010)

⁵⁴ For example LDH, FORCOM and AENA, CIP,

⁵⁵ This was the case of some of the more research oriented partners, like for instance CTV, CESAB,

partnership with the intermediary had been helpful and quite instrumental in getting a system in place. An increased focus on RBM could definitely be noticed and the consulted partner organisations confirmed that the dialogue with the IOs and the provision of capacity building in the area had changed how the organisation was following-up, discussing and analysing results.

The most basic M&E system is one that can tell you at any given time what has been done by the programme, where, when, with whom, what the aim was and what actually happened. More sophisticated M&E systems will also be able to tell you the effects of those actions – how did key actors react? What kinds of changes were observed? What kind of secondary or knock-on effects have been observed – positive or negative? In addition to this, a good M&E system will also provide information on the context within which these activities were conducted or change was observed⁵⁶.

Within the existing system, monitoring of the partnership is done in a systematic manner by all IOs, they follow-up partner reports (twice a year), make field visits and carry out annual partner meeting (per sub-programme). They have instruments for their own follow-up and staff capacity building, including RBM. Training in RBM has been provided to partners and results discussions are also part of the sub-programme annual partner meetings and AGIR forum meetings⁵⁷ with all partners. The current design of the frameworks does however not help the intermediaries and their partners to focus on changes in attitudes, behaviour or relations. The discussion on the strategic plans is, according to the interviewed partners, very much based a bilateral level between the IO and the individual CSO, leaving out the possibility for the partners to see synergies between their work already from the planning phase. There are existing spaces for discussion with the partner organisations on the changing context and strategy planning and these could be further used to support the development of joint strategies for the accountability work.

The standard reporting procedures involve reporting from partner organisations to the intermediaries followed by the monitoring missions that can go up to the beneficiaries levels (e.g. districts). The findings are normally discussed with the partners. In some cases, the linkage between results and the activities of the organisation is not clear or

CIP, WLSA.

⁵⁶ Monitoring and evaluation of policy influence and advocacy Josephine Tsui, Simon Hearn, and John Young, ODI Working Paper, March 2014.

⁵⁷ Though it should be said that respondents in the CSOs did not find that this space was used to its fullest to plan and evaluate desired changes.

properly reported. In the monitoring missions the intermediaries stimulate the partners to produce a narrative that can unveil the contribution to specific results.

Some partner organisations (e.g. N'Weti) stressed that it can be difficult to link the organisations results to the programme objectives and that this partly was due to the interpretation of what line of work these objectives represented. Lack of time of the intermediary to discuss the results with partner organisation was cited as a potential cause for the weak linkages between partner and sub-programme results. The semi-annual and annual reporting from the IOs to the EoS are not systematically shared with the partner organisations. This also limits the understanding of the results achieved in the programme and its linkage with partners' results.

The technical support to partners with no or weak M&E systems have been particularly important for the promotion of assessing results beyond outputs. It was less obvious how the IOs contribute to development of skills in the area of M&E to partners already at a more advanced level, but which still need support to develop their methods for data collection and assessment of social change outcomes. It seems as if the capacity building support on RBM has focused on follow-up of activity plans and short-term reporting and not on how to assess progress in accountability processes and advocacy work. Some partner organisations use relevant methods⁵⁸ to capture complex social changes, but the development and the use of these methods were not said to be a result of the technical support given within AGIR. The methods like case studies and most significant change had not been used long enough to demonstrate results during the evaluated period.

A key issue appears to be the competence and the capacity of the intermediaries in serving as a dialogue partner and support to enhance the analytical level of the monitoring and reporting that is carried out by the partner organisations.

There are still problems of reporting from the partners' level to the intermediaries. The latter acknowledged that reports are still very descriptive. Partner organisations consider the monitoring sessions generally good and relevant, and at the provincial level go up to the district/implementation level. In these missions the intermediaries normally provide feedback on the partner's report. There have been cases of organisations that reported a deficit in the monitoring mission of the intermediaries (e.g. one partner claimed that its intermediary does not go up to the implementation level), other partners complained about delays of the intermediary in providing feedback for the

⁵⁸ For instance Most Significant Change, MSC, storytelling, case studies, external impact evaluations.

reports. A branch of a national partner in Sofala mentioned that there are no feedback sessions and maybe these occur at the central level.

Some of the overall reflections from the partner organisations on progress are:

- The challenge to report to AGIR was also found to be related to the interpretation of what a policy dialogue result at outcome or impact level can be, and the difficulties to attribute a specific process to the support from AGIR. The interviewed CSOs recognise that they had lacked clarity about what and how to report the results of their work.
- Linkage between the strategic plans and annual plans is said to have improved over time (particularly expressed by partner that recently have developed new strategic plans).
- Spaces for reflection exist, but are not used to analyse processes of change, as they are still mostly about the follow-up of the implementation of annual activity plans and what is done. It also seems that the analysis that is carried out does not focus sufficiently on the policy dialogue to enable the organisations to document what kind of changes have taken place. Several of the interviewed organisations said that they had recently started to analyse the monitoring exercises with all involved staff and hoped that this would open up for deeper reflection (for example LDH and FORCOM).
- Systems are in place in several organisations including spaces for reflection and learning, but the interviewed partners with whom the evaluators had time to discuss the M&E systems said that their analyses focus more on keeping track of the activity plans and not so much on the management of results and the implementation of the strategic plan.
- Challenges in the in-house expertise (technical and approach) and staff turnover in some of the IOs, is particularly problematic when partner organisations have more developed competencies, but still need support to develop their methods. It is partly about the capacity of engaging in in-depth M&E discussions but also in the identification of relevant facilitators⁵⁹.
- "Tailor made support" is not sufficiently implemented and there is insufficient follow-up of capacity building efforts.

In relation to the above the evaluators also discussed the following aspects with the intermediary organisations:

- Results at outcome/impact level have been measured mainly through "success" indicators and not progress indicators or intermediary outcomes.

⁵⁹ The IOs acknowledge that the implementation has been slow and that this is partly due to weak training and availability of professionals in the local market with relevant skills.

- The technical capacity to manage and aggregate information from various activities and over the years is still very limited.
- The intermediaries inform that they have seen positive results from the “on the job” training, but this approach would need a special follow-up since it is a method that requires highly qualified facilitators (either from the IOs or external consultants).

The intermediary organisations and many of the 27 consulted partner organisations have however improved their monitoring instruments and attention has been given to how to develop skills in RBM. This is particularly true for the last year of the evaluated period.

The increased focus on what has changed (and not what was done) is also said to have influenced those organisations currently or recently involved in strategic plan processes in how they develop their results frameworks .

Given that these improvements have materialised the last year or two, the results of the changes are still to come. The intermediaries claim however that they already have noticed an improvement in how many of the partner organisations report and that the focus on activities and output has been combined with a greater ability to reflect over processes of change. Another challenge, particularly for those organisations receiving core support, has been what they see as vagueness on what they should report as AGIR results as already mentioned above. Dialogue on this has clarified that even results from other donor-funded programmes are relevant. But in the case of one annual report to all donors this should not be a problem. The challenge rather lies with the intermediary organisation’s capacity to deduct relevant AGIR results from the partner annual report in their strategy plan.

During the implementation of the AGIR programme the donors have raised their expectations on the reporting on outcome level. This is notable when studying the assessment of the sub-programme proposals and early reports compared to the comments from the EoS in 2012 and 2013. One could claim that the weak capacity of the IOs in reporting results in a consistent (with what was planned) and aggregated and demonstrated manner is thus a shared problem. If the donor had been more clear and demanding from the start, some of the problems in the design and the application of the results frameworks could have been mitigated. The revised guidelines⁶⁰ applicable for AGIR II is an improvement of this needed dialogue on clear expectations.

⁶⁰ The Embassy of Sweden’s operational guidelines for partnering with and supporting civil society in Mozambique, Draft, 22th May 2014

The need for being consistent and having clear links between plans and reports was raised early by the EoS in their comments to reports and work plans. The issue of the need to revise the frameworks was also a matter of concern. The EoS statements on the annual work plans and reports of particularly IBIS and Diakonia show that the donor has discussed some fundamental challenges of RBM, but there are also critical comments to Oxfam and We Effect on the lack of outcome reporting. Several work-plans had to be revised various times before approval and many comments relate to the inconsistency in RBM⁶¹. The findings on the shortcoming of the current results frameworks and how they have been applied are thus consistent with many of the observations already made by the EoS, specifically related to the lack of congruence between what is reported against what was planned, and the lack of reporting at outcome and intermediary outcome levels.

The issue of aggregation and the accumulative reporting has not been systematically highlighted in the EoS comments throughout AGIR I, and there are comments that could be interpreted as suggesting that the EoS expect even more details on partner specific level. The evaluators find that this expectation is however now clear to the IOs and that there will be special attention paid to this in the final reporting. The 2013 report from We Effect is a good example of where it is possible to recognise an effort to discuss results on a more aggregated level. The challenges to demonstrate the aggregation with supporting data and to align it to the results framework under the sub-program still remain.

2.4 OBSERVATIONS BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

AGIR II will probably include Danish climate change funds. It will in this case involve the work of the intermediary We Effect. Discussions with the Danish Embassy clarified the expectations that are attached to the funds and it was assessed that several of the We Effect partner organisations are relevant for the fund. When it comes to the area of the extractive industry, the climate funds cannot finance the social and economic justice issues advocated to some CSOs but only aspects on mitigation, adaptation and disaster risk reduction. This seemed to be already clear to We Effect. Another issue was if the partners will also be able to monitor the huge climate funds channelled to the Government; this is worth exploring to see to what extent this is part of the relevant partner organisations' strategic plans. A last observation of im-

⁶¹ EoS statements and comments to the IOs on the 2011, 2012 and 2013 annual work plans and reports. The evaluation has also revised documents referring to 2014 work plans.

portance is the in-house expertise of We Effect on climate change issues in order to provide strategic support to the partners. This is also an aspect that needs to be discussed with the donors.

In accordance with the new entry point values provided to the Embassy of Sweden for the development of a proposed Results Strategy for Mozambique, it is foreseen that AGIR II will also pay increased attention to Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR). The IOs have in their concept note stated that they are willing to increase their focus on SRHR and more particularly, assure that the work that is already being done by some of the partner organisations in the area will be monitored and reported on more closely. The concept note does however not provide much guidance on the approaches to be used to promote SRHR, or if there are any specific rights that will be in focus. This will be further developed in the programme proposals. As with all other issues in AGIR it is important to link SRHR to already governmental commitments and claim accountability on the international, regional and national instruments that protect the rights-holders access to SRHR. The in-house expertise in SRHR in the IOs that will include SRHR is also relevant to explain further.

The coordination between the four intermediaries has been an intensive learning process where the organisations have had to find methods to work together, identify common interests and coordinate different interventions. This coordination is an artefact created by the Embassy of Sweden, but according to the four IOs it has developed into a solid and functional group. The combination of a donor driven coordination and little direction on how to address programme strategic issues⁶² from the donors, in this case particularly from the Embassy of Sweden.. Despite an improved coordination the intermediaries have continued to work in silos to a rather great extent. This is our assessment but a statement that was also confirmed by most of the intermediaries. Despite great effort recently in achieving a joint overarching programme framework for AGIR II, the IOs continue to experience challenges in their coordination. The climate does not sufficiently encourage an open, constructive and self-critical dialogue. Furthermore, the experienced situation of competing over the same resources, and sometimes over partner organisations, is not always the most conducive environment for mutual learning. Here the donors could play a facilitating role by engaging in more discussions on, for example, the enabling context, the content and the strategies of the programmes.

⁶² For example by being more explicit on the expectations on the level of gender mainstreaming the application of the four principles of iHRBA or as a more active dialogue partner to the ICC in discussions on strategic choices, advocacy approaches, innovative method development, etc.t.

3 Conclusions

Recalling the objectives of the evaluation, this exercise was aimed at stock-taking results in various accountability areas and evaluating the programme and sub-programme results' framework in terms of fitness-for-purpose and aggregation of results, and monitoring, reporting and demonstrating results on contribution and engagement in policy dialogue. The chapter will analyse the achievement of the objectives of AGIR from three of the OECD/DAC principles, namely relevance, effectiveness and impact.

3.1 RELEVANCE

AGIR is assessed to be a highly relevant and much needed support to Mozambican civil society that enables a strategic role for the CSOs in advocating for rights, rule of law, accountability and transparency. All areas covered by the sub-programmes and their corresponding partner organisations are assessed to be relevant.

The programme has a holistic approach to the different roles of the CSOs and includes many spectra of the Mozambican civil society. The partner group represents very different types of civil society actors, including some of the most vocal and visible organisations in the country. During the period of implementation of AGIR, civil society has strengthened its role as bearer of collective claims on specific rights and the right to be an active part in national and local development processes. The increased focus on accountability claims against duty-bearers has created tensions and the critical standpoints of CSOs have frequently been questioned. This is not a unique development to Mozambique; when civil society strengthens its ability to not only serve the (often practical) interests of its members and constituencies but also claim space and influence in democratic processes, the CSOs tend to be criticised by duty-bearers.

The focus on accountability in a context where the space for active citizenship and collective action has recently decreased makes AGIR particularly relevant.

The Mid-Term Review and Stakeholder Satisfaction Surveys have confirmed AGIR's contribution to the institutional development of many of the partner organisations, resulting in a more vocal and active civil society acting as a defender of human rights and claimant of accountability and rule of law.

The programme guidelines (former and updated guidelines) highlight the donor principles in the support to civil society, most recently reflected in the Busan Outcome Document (but also in the Istanbul principles of the CSOs effectiveness agenda). AGIR is intended to be a rights-based programme striving for gender equality, with

focus on rights-holders living in discrimination and poverty. Questions about the relevance of AGIR are not so much about the design or the commitments, but about the compliance with these high standards.

The HRBA is a visionary and demanding approach. It is not surprising that it is only partly put into practice within the sub-programmes and the partners' work. One could however expect that HRBA and its principles of *accountability, transparency, (active and meaningful) participation and (active) non-discrimination* would have played a more articulated and salient role in the partner dialogue and capacity building initiatives. It seems to have been treated as one of many cross-cutting issues instead of being the point of departure of AGIR. In a programme where the partner organisations claim accountability of duty-bearers it is essential to also look inwards at the own organisations and the civil society community. Discriminatory structures and insufficient participation of rights-holders need to be actively counteracted. The efforts to increase accountability and transparency towards members, communities and rights-holder groups should be high on the organisations' agenda for organisational development. To increase the legitimacy of the CSOs it is important that they use inclusive and participatory methods, securing that the groups whose rights they claim to defend are able to have an influence over the organisations and that they have access to relevant information on how the work is progressing. The evaluators conclude that there is much room for improvement and that AGIR II needs to step up both the "talk" and the "walk" of a human rights-based approach.

The MTR raised some serious concerns about the progress of gender equality and gender mainstreaming in AGIR. Two years have passed, so is the glass half empty or half full when it comes to promoting gender equality? A programme that aims to challenge non-participatory and non-transparent development processes and to hold people in power accountable should also be able to challenge discriminatory social norms. The call for gender perspective in interventions driven by the civil society is nothing new in Mozambique. Some of the recent achievements of collective action in the country also stem from organisations fighting for women's rights.

It was evident that the intermediaries have tried to address the lack of gender mainstreaming. The ICC have under the leadership of Oxfam tried a new approach. It is important that this strategy is followed through and that the expectations on particularly the key partner organisations are clearly expressed. Capacity development efforts need to be accompanied by open and frank discussions with the management of the partner organisations on how a gender perspective is being implemented.

Striving for gender equality is a condition for partnership in AGIR⁶³. It is important that it is sufficiently clear to all staff in the intermediaries that AGIR is expected to promote a gender perspective that questions biased power relations, alters the standard analysis of what the problem is and how rights should be addressed in the policy dialogue.

The expectations on what is meant by HIV mainstreaming have not been clear to the intermediaries and the partners of the programme according to our analysis. The evaluators conclude that this is part of the problem of the invisibility of the perspective. The findings do not support any evidence of progress since the Mid-term Review. As discussed with IOs it seems the issue is experiencing a backlash in the country. Before another effort to enhance HIV and Aids issues is initiated, it would be good to put the HIV into the context of the HRBA and clarify what is expected of the partners in their internal organisational processes and in their advocacy work.

The above comments also serve as input to how disability and child rights perspectives, and the anti-discrimination work of other marginalised groups, need to be further intensified and strengthened in AGIR II.

3.2 EFFECTIVENESS

The 2010-2013 annual reports from IOs to the AGIR donors show advancement of results at output level. Some of these results have also been translated into outcomes at different levels. These changes refer to rights-holders' increased agency stemming from awareness about their rights, to improved coordination among different civil society actors in their claims of accountability on behalf of the duty-bearers, and a more efficient use of evidence based advocacy. There are also examples of positive shifts in the relations between CSOs and the government at different levels, and some commissions in the Parliament. Some of the examples of improved dialogue, together with stronger advocacy work, have led to what could be perceived as outcome on a rather high, almost visionary, level, such as for examples changes in the Penal Code. It is however difficult to discern major shifts towards sustainable changes in the behaviour of the duty-bearers. This is partly due to the difficulty to follow intended behaviour changes of duty-bearers throughout the reporting during the evaluated period. But is also a reflection of the dependency of changes in single actors' behaviour rather than the behaviour of institutions. This was an issue raised by many of the respondents and is a situation that needs to be addressed with long-term and multiple

⁶³ Gender equality and HRBA are mandatory perspectives in Swedish and Danish aid, as is the gender perspective in Dutch aid.

advocacy strategies. The findings also show that the climate for dialogue has experienced some serious setbacks during the evaluated period. There are other factors that are influencing the accountability of duty bearers, particularly in relation to natural resource extraction, and therefore these processes are inevitably erratic.

Mozambique is in a transitional period in terms of governance accountability, with a change in the political context reflected in the electoral results and in the increasing activism of the citizenry, part of it supported by and with active participation from AGIR partners. In this context, rights-holders, duty-bearers and civil society are also changing and reacting differently to the challenges stemming from the overall context of governance in the country. This changing environment needs to be taken into account when supporting civil society's and rights-holders' claims for accountable governance. This is also a monitoring challenge, as mentioned in the inception report.⁶⁴

The IOs have been sensitive to the governance context in their reporting, identifying relevant elements that affect the progress of the implementation of AGIR. In this context CSOs are changing their focus to advocacy and this has implications for the relation with the duty-bearers, policy dialogue and accountability. Duty-bearers consider these new methods of civil society confrontational, and detrimental to the improving relations with CSOs. This impression has practical implications for the policy dialogue and the space for civil society to contribute to more accountable governance. Cases of impediment to the work of AGIR partners and barriers of access to information are existing challenges that can delay or even reverse the progress of AGIR.

Some of the interviewed parliamentarians claimed that civil society is not making full use of the existing spaces for policy dialogue. The evaluation does not want to endorse a specific advocacy method. But a deeper reflection on how and when to use invited and claimed spaces is deemed necessary, something that the intermediaries could stimulate further. Moreover, it is worth stressing that the understanding of the changing governance context needs refinement beyond the identification of its implications to the implementation progress of AGIR. It is necessary to see how the political context and the incentives, perceptions and interests of the main actors affect the pace, soundness and sustainability of the expected changes. This reflection is an important aspect of the continuous testing and assessment of the relevance of the theory of change, and of the fitness-for-purpose of the activities, outcomes and results of the partners and sub-programmes.

⁶⁴ Monitoring and evaluation of policy influence and advocacy, Josephine Tsui, Simon Hearn, and John Young, ODI Working Paper March 2014.

Related to the effectiveness of the programme are the support modalities used by the donors. A large number of the AGIR partner organisations are supported through core funding and also have access to flexible funds available for short-term and more ad-hoc advocacy activities. This enables them to focus on their own strategies and the political processes they have found most relevant. From a civil society perspective this creates conditions for more focused and strategic accountability work, including the possibility to build and strengthen alliances with domestic and international partners. The combination of a higher degree of institutional financial stability and the access to flexible funds for advocacy activities has enabled the key partner organisations to respond rapidly when opportunities to influence and voice claims have presented themselves.

Given that the evaluation does not cover all components of the programme, such as for example the support to organisational development or strengthened financial and administrative systems, there are most probably other aspects of AGIR that also have contributed to the partner organisations' ability to engage in effective accountability work.

3.3 IMPACT

The evaluators stated already in the inception report that it would not be possible to assess impacts at this stage of the programme. We still insist that this is too early⁶⁵, but would like to point out that there are results of civil society's engagement in the policy dialogue at impact level. If one considers the more long term support by Sweden and the intermediary organisations to some of the key partners, one example of such impact could be the improvement in the penal code in respect to women's rights. Furthermore, the law against domestic violence is partly the result of a more coordinated struggle among women's organisations that started at the beginning of the millennium. Respondents from LDH for example, referred to the increase in reporting of GBV and that more women have access to legal assistance and that the perpetrators are taken to court to a higher degree. One could claim that the actual violence has not decreased, but actions are being taken against the crimes. It is thus neither an AGIR outcome as such, nor an impact produced by the programme. But it illustrates that AGIR acts in a context of continuation and that it has already contributed to translate earlier gains into higher levels of outcomes or even impacts. Similar reference could be made to the electoral process, and the outcomes from the increased awareness around the extractive industries and other investments in forestry and agriculture.

⁶⁵ The evaluation took place before the end of the five year period of AGIR and only covers the first four years (2010-2013).

3.4 FITNESS FOR PURPOSE

The programme has made visible progress in reporting on results and in linking activities and outcomes of partner organisations to the overall AGIR objectives and results. To achieve this, it has resorted to sub-programme reflections, monitoring missions that involve the tracking of narratives of change (Diakonia), of evidence up to the grass-roots/rights-holder levels, case studies (OXFAM) and even specific methods such as Most Significant Change (IBIS) and sex-disaggregated budgeting (We Effect). AGIR strongly promoted capacity development on RBM and stimulated many partner organisations to report on results. Though still leaving room for much improvement, reporting has progressively improved, as acknowledged in the EoS statements on intermediaries' reports.

So have the results frameworks been fit-for-purpose? The brief answer is no. They have not enabled the organisations to focus enough on results that describe processes of change. This mainly, but not exclusively, originates in the unclear articulation of the overall theory of change, the sub-programme theories of change and the partner organisations' strategic plans and interventions, which are not explicitly explained or interlinked in the programme.

The results frameworks have not enabled the different actors involved in AGIR to accumulate and aggregate results related to policy dialogue and policy changes. It should however be noted that this is not only a matter of the design of the frameworks. It is as much a matter of how RBM has been applied throughout the different levels of reporting. Focus has not been on the performance and the achievements of results. The reporting has been activity oriented, maintaining attention on the implementation (what is done and how it is done) and not the progress of results (what happened, are there any changes?).

Fundamental in a results-based management is the analysis of if and how expectations can be met, i.e. is the strategy appropriate to achieve the desired change. It is not enough to once conclude that the causal relation is plausible. The monitoring systems need to show that the assumption was correct and that the strategy is still valid for the shifting reality. The inconsistency between annual working plans and reports have made it difficult to see if what was achieved was the result of agreed plans and if the implementation of the plans was in accordance with the intervention logic of the programme. This situation has made it difficult for intermediary organisations to evaluate the relevance of used methods and strategies, and to assess if the partner organisations are on track.

The evaluators also conclude that the interpretation of good donorship principles in the interaction with partners as "avoidance of interference or imposition" on implementation and even monitoring of activities, following on the Paris Declaration, Accra Agenda for Action and Busan Outcome Document, has had negative effect on the

implementation of RBM. The accuracy of this interpretation is questionable and it is not functional to the need of the programme to report on aggregated results, due to different paces of partners' institutional development, priorities in the implementation of their strategic plans and monitoring methods. Besides, monitoring and evaluation capacities are still weak in many partners, and the adoption of RBM has been slow and with complaints of ineffective training methods and insufficient follow up. In this context, deficiencies of reporting on results by partners have been offset through an intense and challenging hands-on intervention of the intermediaries, sometimes with limited resources and beyond the latter's technical capacities. This has been only partially effective, and despite the improvement in overall reporting, reporting on results is still considered weak.

There is a need to continue to deepen the knowledge on how to plan, monitor and evaluate the results of the policy dialogue. AGIR II needs clarity on what kind of changes are expected and what information is needed to see progress towards these changes. The first period of AGIR has shown that it is not only the partner organisations that struggle with unclear strategies on how change is supposed to happen and inconsistency of the logic of different levels of results. This has also been a major challenge for the intermediary organisations. The design of capacity building efforts in results-based management, targeting both the intermediary organisations and the partner organisations, is thus very important. The RBM system will not improve without in-depth discussions on how data needs to be collected and how the partners in AGIR can support each other in analysing the different sources of evidence. This is not contradictory to good donorship, but aligned with the issue of mutual responsibility.

4 Recommendations

Recommendations to the intermediary organisations:

The main recommendations concern the development of a results-based system that allows learning and evaluative processes and, if possible, a higher degree of joint strategic planning among partner organisations to avoid loss of synergies. The intermediary organisations are recommended to:

1. Ensure that the further development of the theory of change and the results framework (in view of AGIR II) connect different levels of interventions. The strategy to contribute to the outcomes at the next level should be clear in the intervention logic.
2. Continue to focus on improving the system for monitoring and evaluation and enable a learning focused results-based management of AGIR II through investment in capacity building towards both the intermediary and partner organisations. Capacity development in results-based management is recommended to focus on practical and real examples from the AGIR intervention areas and to be coordinated with interventions in order to strengthen interlinkages between the partners and the IOs' results analysis and reporting. It is advisable that the external technical support in results-based management span over a longer period of time to ensure an in-depth learning process.
3. Develop in-house skills in data collection methods and in policy dialogue strategies in order to be a support to the partner organisations, and to provide capacity building to the partners in methods apt to capture changes in behaviour and relations as a result of awareness raising and empowerment initiatives, evidence based research, advocacy and dialogue with duty-bearers and decision-makers.
4. Make sure that regular spaces for reflection on the findings from the monitoring exercises exist and are used to evaluate the progress towards the outcomes. These spaces should serve to discuss if changes are needed in the choice of strategies, how indicators are formulated, and related issues. It would be good to have such a space in each intermediary organisation; together with the partner organisations, and within the ICC. The planned strategy of the IOs of introducing an M&E function at the overall programme level is strongly supported by the evaluators. It is important that that function has a clear mandate and relations to other M&E staff within the programme.
5. Continue with and further diversify the strategy to provide tailor made support to partners' capacity development, ensuring that this support is provided through effective and relevant technical assistance.
6. Continue to promote joint strategic planning among partners within and among the thematic sub-programmes by creating spaces for joint reflection,. This is particularly relevant for partners that attempt to influence the same political processes.

7. Upgrade the contextual analysis as a key monitoring tool in the programme to inform the relevance of the theory of change and the revision of the results frameworks.
8. Make the risk assessment and management plan a natural part of the M&E system. Integrate risk management as a part of the RBM approach. It is also advisable to carry out a risk analysis of the strategy to increase local partnerships considering the increased demand on the IOs human resources to support and coach new partners at local level. It might also be advisable to assess risks related to increased visibility of local actors (harassment, pressure, co-opted strategies, etc.).
9. Take the opportunity of the inception of AGIR II to revisit the partners' commitment to HRBA, gender equality and other cross-cutting issues. Promote a holistic approach to issues related to discrimination and power relation, making use of the principles of HRBA. Continue to invest in capacity development in cross-cutting issues, particularly in a gender mainstreaming approach that address both the organisational commitments to gender equality and the gender perspective in advocacy work.
10. When discussing HRBA with partner organisations stress how inclusive and participatory methods can be strengthened to ensure the active and meaningful participation of rights-holders, both as an end in itself and to enhance the legitimacy of the CSOs. Also discuss how the partners can secure that the groups whose rights they claim to defend are able to have an influence over the organisations and obtain relevant information on how the advocacy work is progressing.
11. Start AGIR II with an overall capacity needs assessment and analyse how different capacity development efforts can be coordinated (for example doing RBM from a HRBA perspective; anti-discrimination as an entry point to put HRBA into practice, etc.).
12. Develop advocacy training together with the more experienced advocacy organisations leading towards a joint strategy for how to give support to more coordinated/ collective and strategic advocacy, based on power and actors analysis.
13. Define realistic objectives (avoid the current high-level objectives of the sub-programmes) attainable within the scope of the programme.
14. Ensure that the intervention logic for AGIR II provides clear and consistent guidance and also space to respond to volatility in the broader political, economic and societal context that affect the opportunities and constraints facing Mozambican civil society.

Recommendations to the EoS and partnering donors:

- Engage in dialogue with the IOs already during the assessment of the proposal to AGIR II on:
 - What the expectations are on the role of the IOs in relation to technical support to the more advanced/mature partner organisations;
 - What the expectations are on the development of the key partners in AGIR I
 - How can the support to the different key partners evolve to be in tune with their particular needs? Discuss with the implementing partners how the pro-

gramme can present a vision about the results expected from the partner organisations as such and not as part of a civil society in general.

- What is the long term strategy of AGIR and how is the future support to civil society in Mozambique envisioned?
- Continue to promote the principles of good donorship among other donors supporting civil society.
- Consider expanding the regular spaces for reflection with all IOs on the progress of the different areas of intervention as part of the joint evaluative and learning analysis of the progress of the programme.
- Since the ICC and its member IOs are not a consortium, but there are expectations on increased coordination between the intermediaries, it is important to have an in-depth discussion on how the Embassy of Sweden as the lead donor of AGIR, but also the other donors, can support the intermediary organisations in defining overall expectations on results and the joint management and coordination of the programme. These discussions could also include a shared vision among the agreement partners on, (a) priorities for organisational and capacity development during AGIR II, (b) the level of coordination between the different sub-programmes and (c) how aggregated results at overall programme level are best reported.

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Terms of reference Evaluation of thematic results achieved and demonstrated within the Programa de Acções para uma Governação Inclu- siva e Responsável (AGIR)

Background

The Swedish support to civil society in Mozambique is structured through a programme called Programa de Acções para uma Governação Inclusiva e Responsável (AGIR) whereby four international CSOs (intermediary organisations) with a common overall objective, support local partner organisations. The programme was created and started in 2010, fully operational in 2011 and has an agreement period ending in December 2014.

The joint overall objective of AGIR is:

“Active citizens(hip) and a strong, vibrant civil society (that) participates in and influences democratic process, contributing to more accountable governance, deepened democracy, gender equality and human rights in Mozambique”

Hence, by strengthening the capacity of local civil society organizations to influence development processes and to demand accountability and respect for human rights of power-holders, the programme is expected to contribute to improved governance and a deeper and more inclusive democracy in Mozambique.

The Embassy of Sweden (EoS) has individual agreements with the four intermediary organisations (IOs), but the programme is seen as a whole and a large part of the reporting is done jointly. The four IOs are IBIS, Oxfam Novib, Diakonia and WeEffect and they implement four different “sub-programmes”, as follows:

Access to Information	IBIS
Financial accountability; participation, and social accountability with focus on underlying causes of discrimination	Oxfam Novib
Political Accountability; participation, social and legal accountability with focus on the legal aspects of human rights	Diakonia

Accountability in natural resources and land management	WeEffect
---	----------

National and local CSO, with indirect cooperation, in the *legal* sense, with the EoS, are organisations whose own strategic plans reflect a *principal*, an *apparent* and a *strategic* focus on demanding one or several of the below key accountabilities. Similarly, the *central* (and widely recognized) role of civil society that these recipient organisations take on is the role as a *collective voice* whereby the voice of citizens is raised to influence Government action and to hold Government to account. The intermediary organisations are responsible for ensuring that national and local organisations, in order to be eligible for funds, have such an inherent focus and pronounced role. A more minor role of the recipient organisations may be the role of *service provider* since it is recognized that many organisations act as both collective voices and organisers of services and the roles may be mutually reinforcing providing increased legitimacy to both the civil society actor concerned and the policy issue it pursues.

There are four key accountabilities:

Social accountability

The responsiveness and performance of the State in terms of its ability to deliver quality public services and goods to citizens, and to meet its obligations of respecting and ensuring the fulfilment of all citizens human rights without any discrimination. Civil society's engagement here involves monitoring the performance and the use of power of the country's leaders, parliament, politicians, public officials and market actors, but also influencing such performance, so as to ensure citizens' human rights are fulfilled and citizens receive what they have been promised/are entitled to.

Financial accountability

Includes the monitoring of the State budget and the Government's financial management of such, the transparency of budgets and public audits, and the parliamentary oversight with an aim of increasing the efficiency and equitable use of public resources.

Legal accountability

Refers to the need to strengthen the rule of law and to ensure that there are proper mechanisms for redress and sanctions when there is malpractice.

Political accountability

Refers to the existence of a multi-party system providing a real choice for voters and the inclusion and diversity of political parties which confers the possibility for citizens to remove non-performing elected representatives through elections.

The core of each of the “sub-programmes” is the establishment of partnerships with a number of local CSO partners active in the specific thematic areas. The IOs, thus, give support to local partner organisations that are working to enhance public participation in development processes, promote access to information, demand accountability from government, fight against corruption, monitor government policies and/or promote the respect for human rights, including gender equality and child rights.

Each partnership is regulated in an agreement between the IO and the partner organisation. The nucleus of these partnerships is core-funding, with a strong focus on capacity development. The IOs are supported to:

- a) Provide long term core-funding and capacity development support to civil society partner organisations, based on these organisations’ own strategic plans.
- b) Support and facilitate linkages, mutual learning and knowledge and experience sharing between civil society organizations.
- c) Actively promote the implementation of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action in relation to civil society (“good donorship”).

Sweden is so far the only core donor to the AGIR programme. Denmark supports two of the intermediaries (IBIS & WeEffect) and the Netherlands supports one intermediary (Oxfam Novib).

The AGIR programme has one overarching results framework for all IOs’ work with strengthening civil society in Mozambique. A lot of effort was, during the first phase, put into developing such a common results framework. The programme, thereafter, has separate results frameworks for each of the sub-programmes’ work within the key accountabilities (there are currently four sub-programmes).

The AGIR programme is now coming to an end, but the EoS has taken a decision to commence the appraisal of a second phase of AGIR. The selected support modality has remained the same since 2010 and it is still assessed to be the modality that best matches the governing objectives and the civil society context of Mozambique. Additionally, the support modality has been externally as well as internally (key partner satisfaction surveys) evaluated to serve its purpose in terms of strengthening civil society in Mozambique⁶⁶. The Mid-Term Evaluation mainly focused on evaluating the support modality that underpins AGIR and the results in terms of organisa-

⁶⁶ *Mid-Term Review of the AGIR Programme, 2013:3 Sida Decentralised Evaluation by In-Development and Medindo a Satisfação das Organizações Parceiras do Programa AGIR, Relatório Global Final, Cristina Azevedo e Fernanda Farinha, Maputo 14 Agosto 2013.*

tional strengthening where results are to be tracked and demonstrated with the help of the overarching results framework.

Experience throughout the first phase of the AGIR programme has, nevertheless, shown that the most challenging issue has been for the IOs and their partners to demonstrate long-term results of influencing democratic processes and contributing to more accountable governance in Mozambique, as well as to aggregate results coupled to accountability/to the thematic areas.

Experience has, also, shown that results based management within the AGIR programme is faced with four sets of complexities; 1) that there are two levels of results frameworks (one overarching and then the underlying ones) that aim to demonstrate different types of results, 2) that the intermediary organisations that are responsible for the sub-programmes are expected to aggregate results from numerous local organisations work within the key accountabilities, 3) that the programme has a main focus on policy dialogue⁶⁷ type of work which frequently involves demonstrating results from lengthy and abstract processes and 4) that the partner organisations in general lack the capacity of results based management. Another complicating factor has been the fact that amendments were made to the programme as time went by based on new insights and lessons learned e.g. a shift from only supporting key partner organisations to also including emerging partners and a shift from only supporting national organisations to also include local organisations.

The IOs have tackled these complexities and continuously addressed them throughout the first phase of the AGIR, which has brought steady improvements to the current set-up of results frameworks.

Objectives and scope

The objective of the evaluation is twofold;

- 3) Stock-taking of what results were achieved within the key accountabilities and which results level(s) they represent (output, outcome, impact).
- 4) Valuation of the sub-programmes' results frameworks' fitness-for-purpose in terms of;

⁶⁷ "Policy Dialogue" is defined as an open and inclusive dialogue on development policies. Development policies and plans are prepared, implemented and monitored by developing country governments, working closely with parliaments and local authorities, and through engagement with CSOs. Hence, policy dialogue includes all the three elements of preparing, implementing and monitoring. Four typical categories of CSOs engagement are advocacy, advisory, activism and lobbying. From the report *Joint Evaluation: Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue, Synthesis Report*, November 2012 by ITAD and COWI. p. 27 & 40

- c) Aggregation of results from numerous and varying key partner organisations;
- d) Monitoring and reporting on contributions to/engagement in policy dialogue and, importantly, *demonstrating* such results.

The evaluation will serve as an important input to the EoS's assessment of the second phase of support to the AGIR programme. The evaluation will be carried out in connection to an advisory assignment, in view of this new phase, aiming to strengthen the IOs' prospects for demonstrating common programme results and thematic results at an aggregated level within the key accountability areas of the civil society support programme AGIR. The evaluation is, hence, expected to serve as the basis for the advisory assignment since the evaluation identifies possible weaknesses which the advisory assignment can assist the intermediary organisations in rectifying and strengths upon which to build.

The main focus for 1) – 2) are the individual results frameworks of the respective intermediary organisations (four in total). However, in order to get the full picture, the overarching results framework of the AGIR programme, including the results reporting on common results within organizational strengthening, will have to be consulted and taken into account.

Methodology

The first part of the evaluation consists of taking stock of results that have been achieved within the key accountability areas / the thematic areas during the period of 2010-2013. The aim is not to present a complete overview of all results achieved within the programme. This is the task of the IOs in connection to their final results reporting due for submission to the donors in 2015. The task is rather to provide the donors **with a representative overview of what results the programme has achieved.**

The second part of the evaluation consists of evaluating ***whether employed results frameworks within the sub-programmes have been and are fit-for-their-purpose.*** The two specific purposes to be evaluated are; a) purpose of aggregating results from numerous and varying key partner organisations within any one of the sub-programmes, and b) purpose of enabling monitoring and evaluation of contributions to / engagement in policy dialogue and, importantly, also demonstrating such results.

For a) it requires assessing the quality of the aggregation of achieved results within the key accountability areas / the thematic areas during the period of 2010-2013. This part is closely linked to stock taking on what level reported results were achieved (output, outcome, impact). The task is to provide the donors with an assessment as to whether aggregation occurred and to what degree the IOs have

managed (have the conditions in place to manage) to report on results from a collection of results from the various key partner organisations.

For b) it requires the identification of the extent to which results from the key partner organisations' engagement in the preparation, implementation and monitoring of development policies and plans⁶⁸ were *demonstrated*. It also requires the identification of factors / aspects in the results frameworks that disenable results demonstration in such regard.

It should be noted that the key partner organisations do not entirely implement development cooperation activities within policy dialogue, but also implement service delivery activities. However, due to the extra complexity that comes with the demonstration of results in more soft abstract areas, the valuation of the results frameworks' fitness-for-purpose in b) shall be primarily focused (but not exclusively) on policy dialogue engagement. The recommendation to development partners (donors and CSO with donor role) to support CSOs with such complexity was made in the *Joint Evaluation Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue, Synthesis Report, November 2012 by ITAD and COWI* and the adherent specific report on Mozambique *Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue, Mozambique Country Report, August 2012 by ITAD and COWI*. These evaluations can with great benefit guide this part of the assignment.

The consultant shall propose a methodological approach to fulfil this task. Some specific requirements (to be reflected in the methodology) include:

- Desk review of key documentation connected to the AGIR programme, civil society situation in Mozambique and civil society's role in policy dialogue (including *Revised Operational Guidelines for Partnering with and Supporting Civil Society in Mozambique, Joint Evaluation Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue, Synthesis Report, November 2012 by ITAD and COWI; Joint Evaluation Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue, Mozambique Country Report, August 2012 by ITAD and COWI; and Mid-Term Review of the AGIR Programme, 2013:3 Sida Decentralised Evaluation by InDevelop*).
- Desk review of reported results and aggregated results against results models from submissions of reports to donors between 2010-2013.
- Desk review of demonstrated results against results models i.e. the extent to which results were demonstrated.
- Field visit including consultation with, at a minimum, the donors, all intermediary organisations and, at a minimum ¼ of the total key partner organisa-

⁶⁸In the four specific thematic areas.

tions per intermediary organisation. Although longer experience within the AGIR presents a greater degree of facility for this assignment, it is also important that there is a consultation with both key partner organisations with longer experience and shorter experience within AGIR. This so as to ensure that provincial based key partner are not excluded from the consultations (they generally entered the programme at a later stage). For the results stock-taking part of the assignment's two-folded objective, meetings may also be necessary with relevant ministries and the Parliament.

- Drafting of a draft and final report.

The methodology must be coherent with and take into account the advisory assignment that will be undertaken in connection to the evaluation.

Evaluation questions

The evaluation questions are connected to three of the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, i.e. the relevance, effectiveness and impact of the programme up to 2014. The below is only some guidance since the main overarching questions of the assignment are referred to in the Objectives and Methodology sections above. The specific questions are expected to be developed as part of the prepared methodology.

Relevance: e.g. are activities and outputs within AGIR sub-programmes consistent with the overall goals of the sub-programmes and the attainment of their objectives? Are the activities and outputs of AGIR sub-programmes consistent with the intended impacts and effects in policy dialogue (preparation, implementation and monitoring of development policies and plans within respective thematic areas).

Effectiveness: e.g. to what extent are objectives likely to be achieved and demonstrated? To what extent are important results likely to be missed vis-à-vis what is demonstrated? What are the major factors influencing achievement or non-achievement and the demonstration of achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? How effective is the aggregation of results from numerous and varying partner organisations to show achievement of objectives at higher levels?

Impact: e.g. what has happened as a result of the sub-programmes? To what policy change outcomes did the AGIR programme contribute e.g. to new legislation and to compliance with such? What difference have the sub-programmes' activities made to beneficiaries? How many people have been affected? What change in impact has the undertaken changes within the programme meant e.g. shift from only key partner organisations to the inclusion of emerging partners, shift from only national organisations to also include local organisations?

The evaluation shall build on any possible relevant findings within the Mid Term Review that was carried out in 2012. It shall include lessons learned and recommendations regarding the continuation of the programme.

Stakeholder involvement

Since there are two objectives for this evaluation the main stakeholders vary. Regarding the first objective of the evaluation the main stakeholders are the EoS and the other donors. The EoS is the lead donor for the AGIR programme. The contact person for the overall assignment at the EoS is Claire Smellie. The programme officers at EoS that handle the cooperation with any one of the IOs in question will be the contact persons for provision of documents and for provision of information in relation to the specific IO.

The second phase of the evaluation is more formative and the primary intended users are the IOs which implement the programme activities. Therefore it is important to involve these stakeholders in this part of the evaluation process and allow opportunities for them to comment on the technical proposal with its described methodology, as well as the findings, conclusions and recommendations in the draft report.

The donors shall be provided with opportunities to comment on the proposal and on the draft report. Briefing sessions with the donors, at a minimum with the EoS but with all donors if their time so allows, are expected to take place via telephone and during field visit. Sweden, as the lead donor, will use the final report as one of the sources for its assessment of the future funding to the programme. It is Sweden that has the overall responsibility for assessing the second phase of the programme as the lead donor and as the sole donor for the entire programme. Denmark and Netherlands are consulted vis-à-vis these preparatory steps of the assessment and will as expected be consulted in connection to the actual assessment.

Workplan and reporting

The evaluation is to be carried out during April-May 2014. The final report shall be submitted at the latest by mid-May 2014 with a first draft report being available prior to the end of April 2014. An initial report outline shall be proposed to the Embassy of Sweden as part of the submitted proposed methodology.

One report shall be delivered not exceeding a maximum of 30 page excluding annexes. The report shall be written in English with a summary in English and Portuguese. The font of the body matter shall be Times New Roman 12 points or equal. The margins shall be 2.5 cm. The report shall be delivered edited, language vetted, and proofread. The report shall be submitted electronically. The report will be formally approved by Sweden as the lead donor.

The evaluation will include one field visit to Mozambique including time in both Maputo and outside Maputo. Half of the key partner organisations consulted should be based in the provinces. The consultant shall in the proposal elaborate on a detailed work plan.

Evaluation team

The evaluation team shall have the following qualifications:

- The team shall have expert knowledge of and experience of conducting evaluations of civil society engagement in soft and abstract thematic areas.
- The team shall have knowledge of support to civil society, a broader understanding about accountability between the citizens and the state, as well as knowledge about civil society methods of engagement in policy dialogue (advocacy, lobbying, evidence-based research, etc.).
- The team shall have significant hands-on experience from working with large international/Swedish civil society organisations that transfer funds to numerous national/local organisations providing them with advisory services and coaching in the sphere of results based management, development of results frameworks for operations including soft and abstract thematic areas, and aggregation of results.
- At least one team member should preferably have ability to conduct interviews, carry out observations, as well as read and write documents in Portuguese.

The evaluation team will ideally have the following experience:

- Knowledge about the context of civil society in Mozambique will be assessed as a strong added value, especially knowledge about organisations that work on governance issues within the key accountability areas of AGIR.
- Experience from similar work with Swedish framework organisations and/or experience from/familiarity with Sida's Joint Evaluation on Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue, or the Mid-term Review of the AGIR Programme.

At least one Senior Consultant needs to be part of the assessment team as an overall Team-Leader for the assignment. He/she has the overall responsibility for ensuring that the overall assignment is carried out and the produced report is in line with the expectations as expressed within these terms of reference. The Team-Leader is, therefore, responsible for the quality assurance of the report, ensuring coherence within the methodology and that the same approach is undertaken vis-à-vis all sub-programmes. The system and process of quality assurance shall be described in the proposal from the consultants.

Annex 2 – Inception Report

1. Assessment of Scope of the Evaluation

1.1 THE ASSIGNMENT

The joint overall objective of AGIR is “*Active citizens (hip) and a strong, vibrant civil society (that) participates in and influences democratic process, contributing to more accountable governance, deepened democracy, gender equality and human rights in Mozambique*”.

The AGIR programme currently has four Intermediary Organisations (IOs) that each works with partner organisations within a sub-programme on one or several of the following accountabilities: social, financial, legal and political accountability. The programmes focus on i) Participation, social and legal accountability, including monitoring of respect for human rights; ii) Social accountability in management of natural resources and community land rights; iii) Transparency, financial and political accountability; and, iv) Promotion of access to information.

The evaluation will serve as an important input to the Embassy of Sweden’s (EoS) assessment of the second phase of support to the AGIR programme. The evaluation will be carried out in connection with an advisory assignment in view of the second phase, which aims to strengthen the IOs’ prospects for demonstrating common programme results and thematic results at an aggregated level within the key accountability areas of the civil society support programme AGIR.

It is foreseen that the sub-programmes will develop a somewhat more stringent thematic focus and that the second phase (AGIR II) will also visualize and capture results in the areas of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) and climate change. This was not raised in the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation, but was discussed during the inception period. The evaluators will, when possible, discuss these changes with the IOs and key partner organisations.

The first phase of the evaluation is expected to identify possible weaknesses in the management and reporting of results where the advisory assignment can assist the intermediary organisations in addressing challenges and identifying strengths upon which to build results framework/s for AGIR II.

The ToR specifies that the objective of the evaluation is twofold;

- 5) Stock-taking of what results were achieved within the key accountabilities and which results level(s) they represent (output, outcome, impact)
- 6) Valuation of the sub-programmes’ results frameworks’ fitness-for-purpose in terms of

- e) Aggregation of results from numerous and varying key partner organisations
- f) Monitoring and reporting on contributions to/engagement in policy dialogue and, importantly, demonstrating such results

The programme is large and rather complex with currently 55 Mozambican partner organisations working at district, provincial and/or national levels; together they represent all provinces of the country. The key partner organisations are provided with core support to their strategic plans. This means that AGIR in principle supports broader spectrum of work than only the advocacy and policy work of the partner organisations, including activities related to service delivery.

The evaluation is expected to assess all sub-programmes, all key accountability areas and follow-up a representative selection of reported and demonstrated results, focusing on the policy dialogue. The assessment of the fitness-for-purpose of the results framework includes both the overall programme level and each sub-programme. The evaluation has a very ambitious scope.

The Evaluation Team consists of three evaluators and the data collection will take place over four weeks which will allow the evaluators to cover all central areas of the assignment. It should however be said that not all aspects and perspectives will receive the same attention and rigour, and the evaluators will have to be clear on the focus and priorities of the assignment in the dialogue with the different stakeholders, the IOs and EoS.

2. Relevance and Evaluability of Evaluation Questions

2.1 EVALUATION QUESTIONS FROM TOR

The evaluation questions are presented from the ToR along with our recommendations for revision. The first two evaluation questions (with their respective follow-up questions) are as follows:

- What results were achieved within the key accountabilities and which results level(s) they represent (output, outcome, impact). (The question is expected to be addressed through a *representative (not a complete) overview of achieved results.*)
- Have the employed results frameworks within the sub-programmes been fit-for-purpose?
 - a) Have the applied results frameworks within the sub-programmes enabled the aggregation of results from numerous and varying key partner organisations?
 - b) Have the applied results frameworks within the sub-programmes enabled the monitoring and evaluation of contributions to/engagement in policy dialogue?

- c) Have the applied results frameworks within the sub-programmes enabled the partner organisations and intermediary organisation to demonstrate results of the policy dialogue efforts?

We do not suggest any alteration on the overall evaluation questions 1 and 2.

The evaluation questions shall relate to three of the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, i.e. *the relevance, effectiveness and impact* of the programme up to 2014. The specific evaluation questions raised in the ToR in relation to these criteria are listed below.

The scope of assessing results at impact level will be limited for all four sub-programmes⁶⁹. The main focus will be on outcome and intermediary outcome levels. Reported policy changes (as a result of the policy dialogue) will be discussed with civil society actors and duty-bearers. The intention will be to assess if the outcomes have resulted in outcomes at civil society level (such as enabling environment, voice, influence and space for civil society actors, increased coordination and/or articulation within the civil society), at rights-holder level (improved access to justice, increased level of awareness, increased participation in social audits, monitoring activities, etc.) or regarding the performance of duty-bearers at different levels and areas.

The specific questions raised in the ToR in relation to OECD-DAC criteria relevance, effectiveness and impact are on an overall level understood by the evaluators to mainly guide the assessment of the results framework and to lesser extent the stock-taking of results. We make specific comments in relation to this below where we find this to be particularly true.

Relevance:

- Are activities and outputs within AGIR sub-programmes consistent with the overall goals of the sub-programmes and the attainment of their objectives?

Comment: *One of the questions that the evaluation will focus on.*

⁶⁹ AGIR is built on a five year agreement which is a relatively long programme. Demands on demonstrating results on an impact level can therefore be expected to be higher. Impacts produced by policy dialogue are however dependent on rather long chains of change and it is important to agree on what the impact level is for a programme such as AGIR. Can EoS and the IOs agree that impact for AGIR in general will be measured at a level that records behaviour changes of decision-makers and public institutions resulting in mechanisms, processes, institutional set-ups and legislation that will enable accountability, transparency and popular participation? Or is the impact level of AGIR only to be understood as when the accountability *per se* has increased and resulted in deepened democracy and secured rights? This will be a central issue when discussing the Theory of Change and the limitations of the current results frameworks with the EoS and the intermediary organisations.

- Are the activities and outputs of AGIR sub-programmes consistent with the intended impacts and effects in policy dialogue (preparation, implementation and monitoring of development policies and plans within respective thematic areas)?

Comment: *Focus question*

Effectiveness:

- To what extent are objectives likely to be achieved and demonstrated? To what extent are important results likely to be missed vis-à-vis what is demonstrated?
Comment: *These questions are speculative and will be addressed based on the informed judgement of the evaluators but may not be fully evidence based. As we understand it these questions relate to the analysis of the fitness-for-purpose of the results frameworks and the underlying theories of change. They will not be part of the stock-taking of achieved results so far. The stock-taking of results will however inform the evaluators to a certain extent on results that seem to be overlooked in the current frameworks.*
- What are the major factors influencing achievement or non-achievement and the demonstration of achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
Comment: *Focus will be on the latter part of the question, on factors influencing the demonstration of achievements/non-achievements.*
- How effective is the aggregation of results from numerous and varying partner organisations to show achievement of objectives at higher levels?
Comment: *Focus questions*

Impact:

- What has happened as a result of the sub-programmes? To what policy change outcomes did the AGIR programme contribute e.g. to new legislation and to compliance with such?
Comment: *As noted above, the possibility to assess impact of the partner organisations' interventions at policy level will be limited. To assess "a result" at impact at sub-programme level will be even harder to do. The first question is too broad and too un-specific for the scope of the evaluation. Focus will be on a sample of policy change **outcomes**. As discussed elsewhere in the report the discussion with the key stakeholders on what can be seen as a policy change at impact and outcome levels will be highly relevant for the evaluation.*

We also suggest that we focus on what results are possible to identify thus far in relation to the

- *coordination and the development of capacities in policy dialogue at partner level*
- *the level of engagement in the processes at district and provincial level*
- *civil society space for policy dialogue.*
- What difference have the sub-programmes' activities made to beneficiaries?

- How many people have been affected?
Comment: *The possibility to assess this will be dependent on how these differences and numbers are reported by the IOs. The stock-taking of results will only present a representative sample. In consistency with HRBA we will conceptualise people benefiting from the programme as rights-holders. The evaluation will only be able to account for differences in rights-holders lives that are described in annual reports and stories of change that stakeholders present in the consultations. We foresee that the evaluation will only be able to capture a few examples, and most probably on an anecdotal level. We do not propose any specific methods for comprehensive impact analysis at rights-holder level.*
- What change in impact has the undertaken changes within the programme meant e.g. shift from only key partner organisations to the inclusion of emerging partners, shift from only national organisations to also include local organisations?
Comment: *This as formulated in the ToR includes a whole causal chain that is not within the reach of the scope of the evaluation. The evaluators will look into how the addition of new and more locally based organisations has affected the civil society coordination and networking within AGIR and how the IOs have managed to include the results of the new partners within the existing results frameworks.*

2.2 ADDITIONAL EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Within the scope of the above evaluation questions more specific questions and indicators will be used (see the **evaluation matrix** and the generic stakeholder questionnaires in the annexes):

In addition to the above questions we suggest that the evaluation also include discussions on the theory of change, or theories of change, and how the contribution versus attribution is understood by the key stakeholders of the evaluation.

How is the **theory of change** described in the different sub-programmes and to what extent are the results frameworks a) capturing the processes of change in the ToC; b) demonstrating a clear intervention logic consistent with the ToC; c) how the ToC is sensitive to the specificities of the operationalisation of the programme (e.g., four sub-programmes with multiple and diverse implementing partners)?

How is civil society's **attribution and contribution** to policy changes discussed within AGIR and what is perceived as a demonstrated and valid chain of change? To what extent can reported advocacy/policy dialogue results be attributed only to AGIR? What are the implications of **core funding** regarding how contribution and attribution of results are demonstrated (particularly in cases where partners have multiple sources of core funding)?

What are the **key lessons learnt** from the implementation of the programme in its main areas? What are the lessons learnt regarding the management of the programme?

3. Proposed Approach and Methodology

This chapter provides a discussion on how results in policy dialogue can be assessed, presents the evaluators' understanding of the programme's theory of change (or theories of change), develops the proposed methods for the data collection and explains the overall evaluation process. An evaluation matrix summarises the approach of the evaluation questions (annex 1).

The concept *key stakeholders* is used in the inception report to refer to the Embassy of Sweden (EoS) and the four intermediary organisations (IO) Diakonia, Ibis, Oxfam Novib and We Effect.

3.1 POLICY DIALOGUE

The EoS uses the following definition (revised guidelines, May 2014) for the AGIR programme: *“An open and inclusive dialogue on development policies. Development policies and plans are prepared, implemented and monitored by developing country governments, working closely with parliaments and local authorities, and through engagement with CSOs. Hence, policy dialogue includes all the three elements of preparing, implementing and monitoring. Four typical categories of CSO engagement are advocacy, advisory, activism and lobbying⁷⁰”*.

Within the development agenda debate there is a strong call for donors to support civil society in its role as enabler of people's voice, claims and advocacy for accountability. There is also a focus on the enabling environment for civil society which involves holding governments accountable of their responsibilities and commitments to the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation.⁷¹ The AGIR programme results should therefore be related to the efforts of the donors' own policy dialogue on enabling environments for the civil society. Discussions with the EoS and the other donors to AGIR on their policy dialogue will be included.

⁷⁰ From the report “Joint Evaluation: Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue, Synthesis Report”, November 2012 by ITAD and COWI. p. 27 & 40.

⁷¹ State of Civil Society 2013: Creating an enabling environment, CIVICUS, Emerging Evaluation Lessons, Evaluation Insight, Number 8 September 2013

Overall methodological challenges when evaluating policy work

”Advocacy and policy interventions face strategic challenges due to shifting goals and allegiances, and tactical challenges due to dense networks and multiple pathways for influence. Many of the results sought by advocacy interventions cannot be predicted ahead of time: the reality of distributed capacities, divergent goals and uncertain change pathways that pervades policy contexts, means that it is often not possible to predefine the course an advocacy activity will follow”.⁷²

Outcomes and particularly impacts from accountability work and policy dialogue efforts often are results of rather slow processes and long chains of change involving multiple actors and interventions. Therefore the issue of spheres of control and influence⁷³ is highly relevant for the assessment of outcomes and impacts in the evaluation and will form part of the core component in the discussion with key stakeholders.

The complexity of what drives policy change is not explicitly dealt with in the theory of change and result frameworks of AGIR. The challenges in how to actually verify that the advocacy activities and engagement in policy processes of citizens and CSOs directly resulted in policy changes or at least contributed to attitude changes among politicians, law and reform processes, institutional changes in governmental structures or improved access to services among rights-holders, will be at the core of the discussions with key stakeholders and key organisations of AGIR.

The discussion on what is seen as a *good (enough) result* given the challenges the partner organisations encounter in different policy contexts will be important for the overall discussion on outcomes driven by policy dialogue. The evaluation cannot compare the reported processes of change that AGIR has contributed to with any parallel “non-AGIR interventions”. A (as far as possible) common understanding on what is possible to define as an AGIR outcome or impact result will therefore be useful for the analysis.

⁷² Monitoring and evaluation of policy influence and advocacy, Josephine Tsui, Simon Hearn, and John Young, ODI Working Paper March 2014

⁷³ The AGIR has many layers of relationships (donor and intermediaries, intermediaries and partner organisations, partner organisations and other civil society actors, partners and rights-holders, partners and duty-bearers, etc.). The possibility for each actor to influence over the progress of the policy dialogue at each level depends on a broad range of factors, particularly on the interdependence on the relationship with so called boundary partners and how directly involved the actor is in the actions at a specific level. The spheres of control and influence are areas and levels of action where a specific actor has a relatively good possibility to control or influence the steps of progress. The concept of spheres help us to identify the outreach of control and influence of the different AGIR partners.

It will also be important to discuss how the different funding mechanisms in AGIR facilitate policy dialogue efforts and how results are connected to core funding vs. for example action-oriented funding.

3.2 THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Description of the evaluation process

The evaluation process consists of the following steps:

The inception period included the desk reviews and the first phase of processing data. Based on this the evaluation team developed its understanding of the programme's theory of change and the different levels of interaction within and between the four sub-programmes. This helped the team to define how the evaluation questions in the ToR should be addressed and what other evaluation questions are needed to enable the evaluators to answer the overall objectives of the assignment.

Programme related documentation has been reviewed, including initial proposals, annual reports to donors between 2010-2013, work plans of all the four IOs as well as comments from the EoS on reports and minutes from AGIR meetings. Other AGIR documents include the Revised Operational Guidelines for Partnering with and Supporting Civil Society in Mozambique, and the Mid-Term Review of the AGIR Programme (carried out in 2012) including the Management Response from the EoS (2013-07-18). The desk review has also included a special study on the reported results and the aggregated results against the used the individual and overall results models.⁷⁴

Based on the management response of the EoS and the study of the revised guidelines for AGIR II, the evaluators assessed which of the recommendations made in the Mid-Term Review (carried out in 2012) are relevant to follow-up with the key stakeholders.

Methods for the different consultations, proposed selection criteria for stakeholders and locations for data collection have been developed and discussed with the EoS and IOs.

⁷⁴ Information on the issue of policy dialogue and the space for civil society engagement in advocacy work has been retrieved from a Joint Evaluation Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue; a Joint Evaluation Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue, a Mozambique Country Report, an ODI Working Paper on Monitoring and Evaluation of Policy Influence and Advocacy and some CIVICUS reports to, mention some of the sources.

The **dialogue regarding the inception report** has helped the evaluation team to adjust methods and the preliminary agenda prior to data collection, but the evaluation team will also do a final adjustment of instruments and plans during the first week of the data collection phase. This will be done in close coordination with the four IOs and the EoS. The evaluators will also contact the EoS and the IOs for assistance in some logistical matters.

The team leader will contact all four IOs prior to the data collection for a first round of discussions on the results frameworks.

This inception report is the output of the inception phase, and serves the purpose of ensuring that there is a common understanding between the evaluation team and the users of the evaluation on how the process will be carried out.

The collection of data will be carried out from the 23rd of June and continue for four weeks. The phase will conclude with separate validation sessions with the four IOs, the Swedish Embassy, and if possible, with the other donors to the AGIR programme. These validation sessions will also allow the Evaluation Team to raise outstanding issues important for the analysis.

The phase will involve several meetings with key stakeholders, including three sessions with the Intermediary Coordination Committee, ICC. The first meeting with ICC will serve as an opportunity to present the methodology of the evaluation and conclude the details for the data collection and to follow-up on consultations made during the desk review on the issue of fitness-for-purpose of the results frameworks; the second meeting will be more of a workshop discussing issues related to the monitoring, demonstration and aggregation of results and the last meeting will have the character of a validation session and feed-back of preliminary findings to the intermediaries.

The evaluation team will keep the EoS and the IOs informed on the progress of the data collection and will depend on support from particularly the IOs for the coordination with the partner organisations at provincial and district level. The evaluators will conduct some interviews as a team and others individually (see more details on the approach to different stakeholder consultations below).

The data collection will be carried out in 5 provinces (Maputo + 4 other provinces) where stakeholders will be consulted through direct interviews and field visits, through focus group discussions and mini-workshops with a mix of respondents from different organisations focusing on how capacity building efforts have (or have not) developed skills for policy dialogue and on the challenges of demonstrating and aggregating results. There will be one or possibly two in-depth studies at provincial level where consultations with partner organisation also involve visits to districts. The district visits will involve consultations with local authorities and members of communities directly affected by specific initiatives under the AGIR programme. The rest

of the consultations will take place in the capital or major urban centres of the visited provinces.

Analysis and presentation of data; findings from the desk reviews, interviews, stakeholder consultations and the validation sessions with the key stakeholders will constitute the basis for the overall analysis. The evaluation team will analyse the data to draw findings and conclusions. The draft report will be submitted to the EoS and the four IOs on the 8th of August. Written feed-back on the draft is due on the 18th of August. We propose that the draft be presented and discussed in Maputo on the 12th of August. This will enable the key stakeholders to get clarifications from the evaluators before submitting their written comments on the draft. The seminar will also help the Evaluation Team to see what needs to be further developed in the report.

Central perspectives for the evaluation

The evaluation will be anchored in a human rights-based approach (HRBA), securing that gender perspectives, child rights, HIV/Aids and disability-perspectives are considered in all stages of the evaluation.

All intermediary organisations claim to apply a (human) rights-based approach and it will therefore be relevant to discuss how the IOs implement HRBA in the partner dialogue, in the monitoring of results and in the capacity building efforts. It will also be relevant to discuss how HRBA is integrated in the policy dialogue of the partner organisations. The evaluators have developed specific questions for this purpose.

The discussions on gender perspectives will go beyond discussions on representation and participation and focus on how policy issues are identified, to what extent they also represent gender strategic interest and concern issues and processes that challenge gender inequality in Mozambican society.

Child rights, HIV and disability will primarily be addressed by the evaluators in relation to meaningful and active participation and non-discrimination, but it will also be important to assess if the reported results directly concern issues like, for example, stigma, accessibility and the inclusion of children and adolescents in the development process.

3.3 THEORY OF CHANGE

The intervention logic of the AGIR programme aiming at the overall objective “*Active citizens(ship) and a strong, vibrant civil society (that) participates in and influences democratic process, contributing to more accountable governance, deepened democracy, gender equality and human rights in Mozambique*” could briefly be described as follows:

- Collective action and citizen’s engagement is perceived as a vital and complementary component of any democratic development. When rights-holders claim their right to participate and exercise influence over policy processes

they contribute to deepening democracy at the same time as they strengthen their own human rights.

- By giving support to the *capacity, skills, actions and voice of civil society organisations* representing the rights-holders, civil society can better fulfil its role in holding duty-bearers accountable. This will contribute to improved governance and a deeper and more inclusive democracy.
1. AGIR provides support to civil society organisations' accountability work as one strategy to promote democratic development. AGIR respects the principles of good donorship, human rights-based approach and civil society as an important development actor in itself.
 2. The support is channelled through intermediary organisations that are assessed to have thematic expertise, experience from policy work and the capacity to select strategic, representative and policy and advocacy oriented partnering CSOs, and the capacity to strengthen and develop the institutional skills and capacities of the partners for an effective and rights-based policy engagement.
 3. Given the local context, specific development areas and accountability focus have been selected due to the impact they have on people's lives in Mozambique: Access to Information, Political Accountability; participation, social and legal accountability with focus on the legal aspects of human rights, Financial accountability; participation, and social accountability with focus on underlying causes of discrimination, natural resources and land management.

The contextual analyses of each sub-programme make references to the prevailing political economy and current development trajectories in Mozambique. It is important to also include how they constrain the possibility for civil society's engagement in policy dialogue and thus influence the logic of the theory of change (ToC).

The ToC at programme level does not include the role of the duty-bearers and the focus is on the demand side of the chain of change. How change happens within and through the policy dialogue between duty-bearers and civil society actors is not explained. What possibilities are there for civil society's influence given the challenges, particularities and dynamics of the different policy areas? What is beyond the control of the AGIR partners and what are the overall limitations of the supported advocacy work?

These are issues that are essential for the understanding of the AGIR programme. The Evaluation Team will discuss how spheres of control and influence in policy dialogue are understood by the EoS, the intermediaries and the key partners of AGIR. These discussions will:

- clarify the logic of the underlying assumptions on how policy dialogue promotes change
- show to what extent the different actors concur in their views on the boundaries of civil society engagement in policy dialogue, and

- demonstrate if they agree on what kind of results can be assessed as "good enough" when promoting deepened democracy and increased human rights through support to civil society organisations' advocacy and policy dialogue given prevailing weak governance, shifts in political power, risks, etc.

The analysis that relates back to the ToC will also explore how the used policy dialogue practices were decided as well as the role of the IOs, the partners, and possibly other stakeholders in the choice of methods and approaches.

Each intermediary organisation has their Theory of Change related to their specific sub-programme. We present the overall ToC. Sub-programme specific ToC are found in annex 2. ***All key stakeholders are asked to give comments on the accuracy of the descriptions given in this inception report.***

All sub-programmes are supported by an overall development of the sections of the civil society supported by AGIR through the achievement of a better organised and coordinated civil society able to act and claim space within different stages of policy processes. This includes the stability of funding for the role as voice bearer and support to an overall enabling environment for the civil society at large (good donorship).

All theories of change build on a lot of trust in capacity building, coalition building and networking. This implies not only institutional capacities and the ability and willingness to put HRBA into practice but that the capacity building is of such **good quality** and allows rights-holders and their representatives to **understand and master the dynamics of policy dialogue**, make **good use of different advocacy techniques and strategies** so that claims cannot be ignored. The evaluation questions do not focus on these aspects but the evaluators will make an effort to also raise these issues in the discussions with the IOs and the key partner organisations.

All sub-programmes focus on shaping a control environment for the duty-bearers where the civil society plays a double role; the role of **watch dog** and **role model** by itself applying the very principles that civil society claims the duty-bearers should follow.

The policy engagement is supposed to happen both through invited spaces (existing and politically decided mechanisms and processes) and claimed spaces. The first is a strategy in itself for accountability since it draws attention to political commitments, while the latter more concerns expanding the space for influence.

Method development

The evaluation will, as much as possible, involve the intermediary organisations and the EoS in the different steps of the data collection and discuss the approaches and methods to be used in the different stakeholder consultations. The first meetings with the EoS and the ICC (scheduled to the 24th of June) will focus on method discussions so that the evaluation process is clear to all end users of the assessment.

All stakeholders will be informed on the purpose and the main focus of the evaluation. It is important that partner organisations understand that evaluators will not evaluate their individual work. The purpose is to discuss the processes behind reported results, to identify results that have not been captured by the monitoring systems and to discuss how they manage to monitor the progress of policy dialogue they are engaged in.

The inception works has resulted in the following proposal of methods, approaches and limitations. The evaluation will follow-up some of the key recommendations from the Mid-Term Review, including the results of the use of the new change-oriented gender training approach. The approach that was used in the MTR on discussions of spheres of control and influence will also be relevant for this evaluation.

The key aspects to look at based on previous recommendations are

- ✓ intensification of joint efforts to improve outcomes in gender and HIV/AIDS;
- ✓ how the capacity building of partner organisations has developed in regard to monitoring and evaluation through new and innovative methods and if the response to these measures have had impact on the quality of reporting;
- ✓ revisiting the theory of change and reviewing the result matrix in light of new partners;
- ✓ the support to networks;
- ✓ the skills-oriented capacity building in communication advocacy and campaigning using innovative methods;
- ✓ the continuation of selecting local partner organisations;

Stock-taking of what results were achieved within the key accountabilities and which results level(s) they represent (output, outcome, and impact) will be done mainly be through the desk review and a joint analysis between the evaluators prior to the data collection. The Evaluation Team have will produce a matrix for each sub-programme. The preliminary stock-taking will be shared with EoS and the IOs for comments and the evaluators will agree on priorities for the follow-up on results in the stakeholder consultations (which include the IOs). An example of the matrix is presented below:

Sub-programme X: Outcomes at policy level (national, provincial and district)						
Area of results	Examples of results	Nat	Pro	Distr	Org contributing to the result	Com
Legislation (new or revised)						
Reversed legislation proposals (due to social protests)						
Institutional reform, new institutions						
Outcomes processes towards policy outcomes (incl. increased dialogue/interaction, increased access to policy makers/implementers)						
Area of results	Examples of results	Nat	Pro	Distr	Orgs	Com
Budget process						
Enabling conditions/structures in place for increased transparency						
Outcomes of services to rights-holders						
Area of results	Examples of results	Nat	Pro	Distr	Orgs	Com
Access to information						
Specific services delivered (change)						

The generic questionnaires (see annex 4) will be revised to ensure that all relevant questions related to the stock-taking of results will be covered by the interviews with the different stakeholders. The first analysis will be discussed with the IOs and they will be asked to comment on the accuracy of the analysis during the first week of the data collection.

Interviews with partner organisations will be the second source for the stock-taking and will help to triangulate the reported data, to understand a sample of the processes of change in more detail and to assess if there were relevant results that were not covered by the reports (which will not only complement the stock-taking but also inform the evaluators on how the current results frameworks manage to cover relevant outcomes).

The analysis of the fitness-for purpose of the overall and sub-programme specific result frameworks (objective 2 of the ToR) will be done through the following steps:

- Desk review of primarily annual reports with particular focus on the reporting on thematic results and policy processes on an aggregated level. The on-going

review will provide the evaluators with information if aggregation has occurred, to what degree this has been done and if there are any type of results from policy dialogue that seem to be easier to capture at an aggregated level.

- The desk review will also inform the evaluators on how the IOs discuss and describe how they have addressed challenges in monitoring the partner organisations' engagement in policy processes and developing a contextualised understanding of the outcomes of the different types of policy dialogue.
- Interviews right after the inception period with the EoS will also clarify what the EoS sees as a good result, what kind of information they are expecting and what could be defined as a good enough achievement from the different forms of policy dialogue.
- The assessment based on the desk review will be discussed with the IOs, individually with each IO and in joint reflections with the ICC. These discussions will have the purpose to validate the preliminary analysis; to deepen the discussion on how results have been monitored and clustered by each IO at an aggregated level, and to understand how the four intermediaries have worked together to find monitoring practices that enable them and the partners to assemble relevant information in order to demonstrate the achieved results.
- The examples of process of change where the IOs and their partners claim that the work has contributed directly to changes in the policy implementation and the compliance with human rights commitments made by the duty-bearers will serve to identify boundaries and possibilities in the results frameworks.
- Consultations with partner organisations will allow the evaluators to discuss the processes behind the reported results, how the organisations have worked to monitor their policy dialogue, but also how they analyse the outcomes of the processes they have been engaged in during the evaluated period and how they have managed to inform the intermediary organisations of these results. These discussions serve the assessment of the two evaluation objectives. Specific to the fitness-for-purpose assessment is a follow-up on the RBM discussions with the intermediary organisations and the usefulness of the mechanisms used to demonstrate results.
- The preliminary findings of this part of the evaluation will inform the advisory service assignment. The discussions on the fitness-for-purpose so far will be enriched by ideas that the key stakeholders have on the development of the frameworks. The identification of any hindrances for the IOs to monitor and report on results and hindrances for aggregation of results from policy dialogue efforts and accountability practices will also inform the advisory service. These ideas will be discussed during the full data collection period as part of the Advisory Service.
- The discussions with the key stakeholders on their expressed expectations on results (intermediary outcomes, outcomes and impact) will be important in the assessment of fitness-for-purpose. (What is a reasonable good level of result?; How far do the good donorship principles lead?, etc.)

- Right after the data collection period a workshop/s as part of the advisory service will be carried out with the IOs in Maputo. The outcome of the workshop discussions will feed into the draft report.
- Finally, when possible, the frameworks' fitness for reporting impacts will be considered, but the main focus of this part of the evaluation will be on outcome and bridging outcome levels, verifying how the monitoring system enable the key partners and the IOs to trace the different steps in the achieved processes of change.

Selection criteria stakeholder consultations

The number of current partnerships (2013 and 2014) is:

No Partners	IO	National	One province	A	B	C	D
13	Diakonia	10	3	10*		3*	
12	Ibis	11	1				12
20	Oxfam	12	8	17**		7	
12	WE	8	4		12		
Total: 57		41	16	27	12	10	12

A, B, C and D stands for the four sub-programmes

*2 both A+C; ** 4 both A+C

According the ToR and the implementation proposal the data collection shall include:

- All four sub-programmes
- Consultations with partners to all four IOs
- Consultations with both key partner organisations with longer experience and shorter experience within AGIR
- Represent both national and provincial organisations
- Represent different levels of action, that is at local/district, provincial and national levels
- Represent a fair number of provinces
- Represent at least 25% of all the partners

We further suggest that the partner organisations to be included in the consultations are selected from the below criteria:

- Representation of partners based and/or working in the North, Centre and South provinces
- The sample of the province should include the two provinces visited in the mid-term review and at least two other provinces, to account for the changes

after the mid-term report and the overall results of the programme at national and local levels.

- 2/3 of the consulted organisations should be national organisations or networks
- The selection of national partner organisations should also represent work at local level and enable the evaluators to observe how the policy dialogue link from national to local, from local to national, representing different realities and levels of intervention
- 1/3 are selected among the organisations that work only at provincial level
- An additional sample of organisations focusing on HIV/Aids and gender will be included to ensure a proper understanding of these issues in the evaluation

Considering the above, the maturity and emerging dynamics of the local civil societies, the number of actual partnerships and representation of national partners at provincial level, we suggest that field visit should be carried out in Tete, Niassa, Nampula and Sofala. Tete and Nampula were included in the mid-term, whilst Niassa and Sofala are new provinces. The selection of the new provinces is based on the existence of a substantial number of partner organisations, which will allow for gains of scale, with the opportunity of contacting and interviewing as much partner organisations as possible. Maputo will also be included in the field visits due to the number of national partner organisations present in the capital.

Sample of Partner Organizations⁷⁵

#	Organisation	Cluster/IO	Territorial level	Criteria for sampling
1.	IESE	D/IBIS	National	Cluster and National
2.	FORCOM	D/IBIS	National (with associates in the provinces and district interventions)	Network, National partner, provincial representation, district interventions and cluster
3.	SNJ	D/IBIS	National (with branches in the provinces)	National, provincial representation, cluster, recent partner
4.	CESAB	D/IBIS	National (based in Maputo)	Cluster and National, new/emergent partner
5.	Akilizetho	OXFAM	Provincial (Nampula)	Provincial organisation
6.	Estamos	A+C/OXFAM	Provincial (Niassa)	Provincial organisation

⁷⁵ The final version of this list will be decided through the on-going dialogue with the IOs..

			and Maputo)	with district interventions
7.	JOINT	A/OXFAM	National	Network, national, cluster, recent partner
8.	National Human Rights Platform (PNDH)	A/OXFAM	Provincial (Sofala)	Network, provincial
9.	GMD	C/OXFAM	Nacional (with focal points in provinces)	Network, national, provincial representation, cluster
10.	CIP	C/OXFAM	National	National partner, cluster
11.	ACABE	A/Diakonia	Provincial (Niassa)	Provincial partner, cluster, district interventions, recent partner
12.	ACAMO	A/Diakonia	National and with 10 delegations, headquarters in Beira, Sofala Province	National partner, district interventions, cluster
13.	Human Rights League (LDH)	A/Diakonia	National with delegations in Sofala, Nampula, Zambézia and Tete	National partner, provincial presence, cluster
14.	Electoral Observatory	A+C/Diakonia	National (with representatives in 10 provinces)	Network, national partner, provincial coverage, cluster
15.	UPCT	B/We Effect	Provincial/district (Tete)	Provincial partner, cluster, district interventions
16.	AAAJC	B/We Effect	Provincial (Tete)	Provincial partner, cluster, district interventions
17.	Centro Terra Viva	B/We Effect	National with branches in 7 provinces (Cabo Delgado, Nampula, Manica, Tete, Gaza, Inhambane and Maputo)	National partner, provincial intervention, cluster, district interventions
18.	AENA	B/We Effect	Provincial (Nampula and Zambézia)	Provincial partner, cluster, district interventions
Summary of sampled organizations according to sampling criteria: total organizations: 18 (IBIS, We Effect, Diakonia – 4 each; OXFAM – 6); National organizations – 11 (61%); provincial organizations – 6 (33.3%); district interventions – at least 7 (38.8%); New organizations/recent partners – 4 (22.2%).				

In addition to the above we suggest the inclusion of the following three organisations due to their focus on gender equality and HIV/Aids.

19.	Fórum Mulher	A/Oxfam	National with branches in all provinces	Focus on cross-cutting issue
-----	--------------	---------	---	------------------------------

20.	N’Weti	A/Oxfam	National with branches in Nampula and Sofala	Focus on cross-cutting issue
21.	WLSA	A/Oxfam	National	Focus on cross-cutting issue

Potential key informants to be consulted

AGIR STAKEHOLDERS

- Donors
 - Sweden – Focal point and programme managers
 - Denmark
 - Holland
- Intermediary organisations: Diakonia, Ibis, Oxfam Novib, We Effect
- Partner organisations (see sample above)
- Partner organizations (not included in the sample) with programme cross-cutting interventions (gender and HIV/Aids)
 - WLSA
 - Fórum Mulher/Women Forum
 - N’Weti
- Organizations (not included in the sample) with intervention at the policy level
 - OMR

NON-AGIR STAKEHOLDERS⁷⁶

OTHER DONORS (civil society funders)

- Civil Society Support Mechanism (MASC) DONORS – DFID, Ireland, USAID, CEP
- Non-state Actors Programme (PAANE) DONOR - European Union

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

- Ministry of Planning and Development (Development Observatory Secretariat)
- Ministry of Mineral Resources and EITI coordination (Extractive Industries)
- Ministry of Justice – Human rights component

⁷⁶ The list includes some new external actors added on the proposal by the IOs during the inception period. Some of the suggestions from the IOs will be discussed with the IOs during the first week of the data collection.

- Ministry of Women and Social Welfare

OTHER INSTITUTIONS AT CENTRAL LEVEL

- Assembly of the Republic (Parliament)
 - Planning and Budget Committee (experience of work with Budget monitoring Forum)
 - Legal, Constitutional and Human Rights Affairs Committee
 - Human Rights National Commission (CNDH)
 - National AIDS Council (CNCS)
- Political parties – Frelimo, Renamo, MDM

OTHER CIVIL SOCIETY ACTORS (MAPUTO)

- Business Associations – CTA, ACIS
- Academia: at least two social scientist experts in civil society
- Media sector – 2 representatives of independent media
- Civil society platforms – one policy (e.g. natural resources and extractive industries) and one service delivery

PROVINCIAL LEVEL

- Provincial Government/Permanent Secretary
- Directorate of Planning and Budget – Provincial Observatory Coordination
- Provincial Assembly
- UCODIN Nampula

CIVIL SOCIETY PROVINCIAL LEVEL

- Provincial business association – Provincial Entrepreneurs Council (CEP)
- Civil society Provincial platform/Forum
- Civil society thematic forum – e.g. governance
- District platform
- District local council members
- Community-based organizations members/beneficiaries/service delivery – e.g. water, health, natural resources committees. School councils

OTHERS

- Executors of partner satisfaction test

Approach for the different key informant consultations

Semi-structured interviews will be used for most consultations (individual meetings with each IO, selection of partner organisations, EoS, donors and duty-bearers, etc.); the interviews will have different foci depending on the actor that is interviewed and the respondent's relation to AGIR. All interviews with the IOs and partner organisations will constitute an opportunity to triangulate data given in the reports (findings from the desk review). The interviews with partner organisations at the end of the data collection phase will also serve as a space for triangulation of data retrieved from interviews made during the first two-three weeks of the data collection.

Two or three 2/3 day evaluation workshops, preliminarily one in Maputo, one in Beira and one in Nampula, are planned. They will have a mixed selection of partner organisations (1-2 representatives from each invited organisation) representing 2-4 of the sub-programmes. The workshops will address issues related to capacity development for policy dialogue, monitoring and aggregating results and lessons learned from networking⁷⁷. The aim is to have at least two of the evaluators facilitating the workshops, the team leader will be present in both.

Approximately 4 focus group discussions (FGD) will be held, one per sub-programme with representatives preferably from different organisational levels (national, provincial and/or local/district). The FGDs will have some questions in common so that all sub-programmes are viewed from the same angle, but also provide a space for specific follow-ups from the stock-taking of results. The FGD will be held by one evaluator in most cases. In addition to the FGDs small group discussions can be applied when possible and practical.

External stakeholders will be consulted through semi-structured individual interviews (by one evaluator). The main purpose of these interviews is twofold: to get an overall picture on how the AGIR programme is perceived as a support to the civil society's engagement in policy dialogue and to get external perspectives on the role that the Mozambican civil society is playing in development and the monitoring of policy processes.

The consultations with key staff at the IOs will be held on numerous occasions.

Division of responsibilities within the Evaluation Team

The members of the Evaluation Team will work closely together throughout the full evaluation process. The Team Leader *Annica Holmberg* has the overall responsibility for method development, data collection, analysis and writing of the report, but the process will be highly interactive within the team taking into account the different areas of expertise of the evaluators. The national evaluator *José Jaime Macuane* will actively participate in all stages of the evaluation. The second national evaluator *Padil Salimo* will primarily focus on the data collection phase but will also give valuable input to the other team members during the inception and analysis phases of the evaluation.

⁷⁷ The workshop agenda will make use of discussions on local – central dimensions on voice and claiming rights; success stories and discussions on what makes policy change happen (spheres of control and influence, internal and external movers and shakers, key agents, etc.), and bridging outcome and impact discussions and lessons learned from being part of the AGIR

The Team Leader will be responsible for the direct dialogue with the EoS throughout the evaluation.

3.4 LIMITATIONS

An overall limitation of the assignment is that the stock-taking of results is supposed to be only a representative sample of different types of results since the start of AGIR. Not all aspects and perspectives will receive the same attention and rigour, and the evaluators will have to be clear on the focus and priorities of the assignment in the dialogue with the different stakeholders.

It is important that the majority of results in focus present the possibility to trace processes of change from action to outcomes, intermediary outcomes and if possible impact. The evaluation team will be dependent of an interactive and reflective dialogue with the IOs and the key partner organisations.

Several of the key partner organisations also work with service delivery. The evaluation will only record the results of this work. Focus will be on discussions on the balance between service delivery and advocacy results, and if/how experiences from the service delivery have bearing on the partner organisations' strategies for policy dialogue.

The first part of the evaluation is expected to assess results at sub-programme level. This implies a limited focus on the overall programme objectives related to the strengthening of the civil society, good donorship, donor coordination and how the enabling environment for the civil society is supported by donors. It is however not possible not take these overall objectives into account since they are strongly inter-linked with the theory of change of the different sub-programmes and the overall programme. The reported and identified achievements within each sub-programme will be put into the wider AGIR context but it is important to keep in mind that it is not the overall programme level that is in focus.

Access to information and people at the local level is critical and requires special attention. The support of both the EoS and IOs will be indispensable.

The availability of key AGIR and external stakeholders is also critical to ensure that the work is done within the allotted time and that the consultations represent a valid and representative sample of the achieved results.

It is foreseen that the sub-programmes will develop a somewhat more stringent thematic focus and that the AGIR II will also capture and visualize results in the areas of SRHR and climate change. This was not raised in the ToR. The evaluators will, when possible, discuss these changes with the IOs and key partner organisations.

4. Coordination between the evaluation and the advisory service assignment

As stated earlier the advisory services on results frameworks to the IOs will be conducted during the same period as the evaluation. The in-depth discussions with the intermediaries on the results framework will inform both the assessment of the fitness-for-purpose of the frameworks and the analysis on how to develop and adjust it.

Some preliminary entry-points to the advisory service are:

On an overall level it is important that all involved actors have clarity on what kind of information they need to collect in order to assess progress and what kind of analysis they need to provide their partners with. It should be information that will:

- ✓ supports the assumption of the need of increased institutional and technical skills in order to plan and perform strategic and effective policy dialogue (i.e. organisations X is now better equipped for social audit, lobbying in relation to proposal of bills in the parliament, etc.)
- ✓ provides data on how the actual policy dialogue is being developed (i.e. progress report on steps taken, at what stages in policy decision-making process the policy engagement normally starts, the level of involvement and engagement of different partners and the response from those duty-bearers that are targeted, for example dialogue with health clinic staff against stigma, dissemination of good example from CSO project and monitoring of the implementation of the provincial health plan)
- ✓ reports on actual outcomes at policy and governmental institutional level (national, provincial and/or district) (i.e. new commitment from provincial school authorities for inclusive education, # schools with visible impaired students and engaged parents group and budget available for governmental project improving accessibility in schools)

This implies a greater focus on the analysis of progress at each level and a capacity of the organisations to aggregate their analysis. The monitoring of progress will serve to feed into the analysis and also identify short-comings in how actions were planned. This will in turn allow the implementing organisations to correct methods but also re-orient their policy dialogue strategies. Advocacy work needs to be highly adaptable to new dialogue opportunities that present themselves and abandon actions that do not lead to access to the decision-makers. The organisations need to monitor the relevance of indicators/progress markers on a regular basis.

Inception report annex 1 – Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation matrix shows how each question will be answered; what indicators will be used to draw conclusions, methods used and sources sought.

Focus questions

Questions raised in ToRs	Indicators to be used in Evaluation	Methods	Sources	Availability and Reliability of Data /comments
Relevance				
Are activities and outputs within AGIR sub-programmes consistent with the overall goals of the sub-programmes and the attainment of their objectives?	(Sufficient) data in reports to prove the intervention logic between activity and outcome levels Account of interventions that focus on the different stages of policy decisions Existence of reflection on the four key principles of HRBA in the different sub-programmes	Focus of the analysis of relevance will be on consistency of the programme elements as such Desk review The Theory(ies) of Change will be used to guide the interviews. HRBA principles integrated in the consultations and the desk reviews Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions Observation on rights discourse pronounced in interviews	Reports and minutes The IOs and the partner organisations will inform us what they see as consistent with the objectives. External views on the programme logic by actors (including duty-bearers) that have a close relation to one or several of the sub-programmes	Data is available and assessed to be fairly reliable
Are the activities and outputs of AGIR sub-programmes consistent with the intended impacts and effects in policy dialogue (preparation, implementation and monitoring of development policies and plans within respective thematic areas)?	How is advocacy and policy dialogue efforts at national and/or provincial level reported to local level/rights-holders?			
Have the employed results frameworks	Evidence that results frameworks within the sub-programmes enable the	Desk review Follow-up interviews	Annual reports and workplans The design of the results framework and	Data available and reliable

within the sub-programmes been fit-for-their-purpose?	aggregation of results from numerous and varying key partner organisations Evidence that the results frameworks within the sub-programmes are anchored in baseline analyses and targets that can provide the basis for monitoring and evaluation of contributions to/engagement in policy dialogue	Working sessions with IOs	their relation to ToC These questions will be responded by the IOs	
(c) Have the applied results frameworks within the sub-programmes enabled the partner organisations and intermediary organisation to demonstrate results of the policy dialogue efforts?	Level of linkage/coherence between what is reported in the results framework and what is claimed as progress Level of linkage/coherence between what is reported in (vis-à-vis) results frameworks and what is planned in terms of expected performance for the period (normally for the year). Type of demonstrated results and what kind of policy dialogue they represent Assessing the quality (effectiveness) of capacity building efforts, training in advocacy strategies/techniques, RBM, HRBA, gender, HIV and Aids, child and disability rights perspectives	Desk review Discussions with IOs Sample of interviews with key stakeholders, possibly through focus group discussion Discussions with EoS	Annual reports and workplans Responses from IOs and key partner organisations	Data available and reliable
Impact				
To what policy change outcomes did the AGIR programme contribute?	Registered changes in policy/legislation/government plans/level of accountability in areas, spheres connected to the sub-programmes Registered and confirmed changes in the quality of policy dialogue (openness of duty-bearers, quality and accommodation of CS input)	Desk review, interviews with IOs, partner organizations and key policy stakeholders, analysis of accountability (access to information, transparency, reporting mechanism) on relevant policy areas.	Reports, AGIR stakeholders, non-AGIR sources	Focus is on outcome and intermediary outcome levels. Only results at impact level included in the reports will part of the analysis. The main challenge of the impact evaluation will be to gather evidence beyond the descriptive nature of reporting. This can be partially offset by a cross-analysis of AGIR and non-AGIR sources of information. Another challenge is the focus on the local level in the last two years, whose impact is realistically unlikely due to the short period of time.

				Focus will be on outcomes and intermediary outcomes rather than impact
What change in impact has the undertaken changes within the programme meant e.g. shift from only key partner organisations to the inclusion of emerging partners, shift from only national organisations to also include local organisations?	Proven linkages between the policy dialogue at different levels with the organisation's direct constituencies The extent the policy dialogue represents real and strategic interests of the rights-holders. Use of evidence from district and provincial level advocacy and policy dialogue efforts Example of successful local advocacy that have been replicated to central levels and vice versa	Assessment of the level of intervention with new partners at different organisational level (and geographical spread), and policy areas within the sub programme themes; Focal group discussions with mixed respondents; Workshop(s) focusing on local – central dimensions on voice and claiming rights; success stories and discussions on what makes policy change happen (spheres of control and influence, internal and external movers and shakers, key agents, etc.)	2013 annual reports IO responses Workshop discussions	The evaluators will look into how the addition of new and more locally based organisations has affected the civil society coordination and networking within AGIR and how the IOs have managed to include the results of the new partners within the existing results frameworks.
Effectiveness				
<i>Overall aspects of effectiveness of the programme</i>	Level of implementation of annual plans Programme objectives achieved Level of achievement of the sub-programmes' objectives Evidence of strategic choices for when at what stage and level to enter in policy dialogue Degree of implementation of the HRBA principles by the key partners within their own organisational structures in relation to advocacy and policy dialogue efforts?	Analysis of AGIR work plans and reports.	Analysis of AGIR work plans and reports.	This analysis will be closely linked to the aggregation of results analysis and fit-for-purpose analysis, because it will “connect the dots”, from activity (plan) level to the result level. It will also be important in detecting potential problems of the “missing middle”; i.e. linkages between outputs, outcomes, results. It is also important to detect possible disconnects between plans as per annual plans and reporting on results frameworks.
What results were achieved within the key accountabilities and which results level(s) they represent (output, outcome,	Account of results such as for example: performance of market actors and duty bearers in public service delivery, human-rights protection and enforcement), capacity of citizens to reward or punish their representatives openness and acces-	Desk review mainly, the findings will inform us what to follow-up in the field visits directly with the partner organisations (that is a sample of reported and relevant results).		

impact).	sibility of budgets and reports, transparency, efficiency and equity in the use of public resources; level of enforcement of the rule of law, quality of mechanism to redress and sanction when there is mal-practice. The extent to which partner organisations have used results from service delivery as evidence in order to strengthen their advocacy work (relevant for those with core support that work with services as well as advocacy) Success stories and examples of coalition building/networking Discernible pattern of coalition building/networking emerging from AGIR	See further result matrix for method to be used,		
	It is here also relevant to explore the linkage between the policy dialogue at different levels with the organisation's direct constituencies and to what extent it represents real and strategic interests of the rights-holders.			
What are the major factors influencing achievement or non-achievement and the demonstration of achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?	Constraints in implementation and monitoring	Discussion about the constraints to the implementation of plans and monitoring Discussions on attribution and contribution when assessing policy change processes	Reports and discussions with IOs	Focus will be on the latter part of the question, on factors influencing the demonstration of achievements/non-achievements.
How effective is the aggregation of results from numerous and varying partner organisations to show achievement of objectives?	Contribution of the plans and objectives achieved to the overall sub programme and programme outcomes/results (aggregation) Reporting methods	A second stage of the desk review by integrating a sample of plans and reports of partner organisations.in the analysis. This analysis is at the core of the aggregation analysis, since it will track how the outputs and out-	Sample of key partner organisations annual plans reports 2012 and 2013 IOs annual reports for the same periods	

tives at higher levels?	Quality of evidences of results	comes of the specific partner organizations contribute to the overall results. Since it is not possible to analyse all the partners a “sample of the sample” of the partner organizations included in the review will be used to provide evidence about the above-mentioned linkages.		
-------------------------	---------------------------------	---	--	--

Evaluation questions from ToR that will be used in the evaluation to lesser extent

What difference have the sub-programmes' activities made to beneficiaries?	Account of stories of change at rights-holder level Results showing rights-holders increased influence in policy processes Registered and confirmed changes at the rights-holder level caused by changes in policies stemming from AGIR action	Interviews and desk reviews, follow-up of results that appear to have had more direct impact on people's lives, by tracing chains of change	Reports and responses from partner organisations and rights-holders	The possibility to assess this will be dependent on how and if these differences and numbers are reported. The stock-taking of results will only present a representative sample. In consistency with HRBA we will conceptualise people benefiting from the programme as rights-holders. The evaluation will only be able to account for differences in rights-holders lives that are described in annual reports and stories of change that stakeholders present in the consultations. We foresee that the evaluation will only be able to capture a few examples, and most probably on an anecdotal level. We do not propose any specific methods for comprehensive impact analysis at rights-holder level.
How many people have been affected?	Number of people affected	Analysis of progress reports and complementary information with interviews with IOs and partner organizations		Quantitative evidence is scattered, scanty and normally at the output level. Most of the sub-programmes' impact indicators are expressed in qualitative terms (e.g. level of...) this will make the gathering of quantitative evidence difficult.
To what extent are objectives likely to be achieved and demonstrated?	Progress up to date against the expected results of the programme	Theory of Change discussions Analysis of progress against expected results. Content analysis of reports at the partners level x analysis of AGIR reports and results framework	Reports and discussions with IOs	These will be somewhat speculative and not rigorously verifiable

Inception report annex 2 – Sub-programmes' Theory of Change

1. All sub-programmes are supported by an overall development of the sections of the civil society supported by AGIR through the achievement of a better organised and coordinated civil society able to act and claim space within different stages of policy processes. This includes the stability of funding for the role as voice bearer and support to an overall enabling environment for the civil society at large (good donorship).
2. All theories of change build on a lot of trust in capacity building, coalition building and networking. This implies not only institutional capacities and the ability and willingness to put HRBA into practice but that the capacity building is of such **good quality** and allows rights-holders and their representatives to **understand and master the dynamics of policy dialogue**, make **good use of different advocacy techniques and strategies** so that claims cannot be ignored.
3. All sub-programmes focus on shaping a control environment for the duty-bearers where the civil society plays double role, the role as **a watch dog** and **a role model** by applying itself the very principles the civil society claims that the duty-bearers should follow.
4. The policy engagement is supposed to happen both through invited spaces (existing and politically decided mechanisms and processes) and claimed spaces. The first is in itself a strategy for accountability since it draw the attention on political commitments while the latter more concerns expanding the space for influence.

Sub-programme Diakonia

Participation, social and legal accountability, including monitoring of respect for Human Rights (A) and Political accountability (C).

1. Long-term, predictable and stable financial and capacity building support is provided to civil society organisation, with a strong representation of and mandate from rights-holders, so that they are able to engage effectively and in a meaningful way with government. *The support will enable*
 - a. Increased awareness among rights-holder on their rights and civically educated people
 - b. Alliance and coalition building for civil society engagement in policy dialogue that will give leverage to individual actions and campaigns
 - c. Citizen's active participation in development issues, at different levels and through different actions, in the monitoring of policies and programmes of the development agenda, will put pressure on the government accountability regarding service delivery, human rights and the rule of law.
 - d. The use of existing policies, mechanisms and processes that provides space for CSO to engage with GoM to demand increased accountability towards its citizens

2. Capacity building initiatives targeting duty-bearers in order to enhance their understanding of their roles and responsibilities and their capacity to be accountable.
3. Through the increased and more effective civil society engagement in policy dialogue government performance and accountability is expected to
 - a. improve in particular service delivery to poor people, women, children and people with special needs
 - b. advance the enforcement of human rights in general and in particular those of women, children and people with disabilities and those affected by HIV/Aids
 - c. improve the access to justice and the advance the rule of law through improved accessibility and monitoring the performance and accountability of the judicial system.
 - d. contribute to the enforcement of a multiparty democracy system that is inclusive, vibrant, transparent and peaceful, meaning that duty bearers at different levels and spheres are kept accountable to the citizens and have improved their capacities, abilities and knowledge to better perform their duties

Sub-programme Ibis

This programme will focus on the area of access to information including the following aspects: - Strengthening freedom of expression - Strengthening access to (public) information - Promoting media pluralism - Promoting citizen participation (nationally and locally) - Promoting citizen demand for public accountability (D)

Access to information is fundamental for all aspects of accountability and is a basic condition for rights-holders to know, claim and exercise their rights.

- Financial, technical and capacity building support is provided to CSOs (media and government representatives are included in trainings), campaigns and networking
- Communicators, social and cultural actors are trained in social communication involving information on rights and civic education
- Information is produced research, investigation and publications, content production) and/or disseminated to citizens through accessible, social, engaging and public channels and methods which
 - a. Improves the awareness among citizens and CSOs of their rights to participate, freedom of expression and information and citizenship *which in turn*
 - b. civil society organisations are dynamic, networked and effective in their advocacy and defence of access to and freedom of information.
 - c. lead to their empowerment of rights-holders and enable them to demand their right to information and to demand accountability from public officials and local and national level
 - d. and to demand public funds for a plural media.
- 3. The increased awareness on the right to information and the improved access to information is expected to result in that citizens' right to public information is respected and supported by a strong legal framework and freedom of expression and of the press is systematically defended by public bodies.

Sub-programme We Effect

Strengthening social accountability in management of natural resources and community land rights (B)

We Effect presents its theory of change in their application.

The theory of change starts with poor women and men at community level, where the first result is to address weak knowledge on sustainable use of natural resources.

1. **Increased knowledge and awareness** will
2. increase the **capacity of organised communities to relate to public and private actors, demand accountability**
3. and **increase their participation in local development forums**

“Knowledge” refers to a wide range of capacities needed for women and men to be able to influence their own situation, including own use of natural resources in small scale agriculture and capacity to analyse natural resource management in the community. Increased capacities will lead to increased voice for community rights, which will

4. **strengthen voice at national level.**
5. This will lead to **increased legitimacy and capacity of national organisations to defend the interests** and rights of the communities, resulting in
6. **increased involvement in/of institutional frameworks**, which will
7. contribute to **increased transparency in decision-making on national level** which will
8. **increase the community ownership and benefit** which leads to
9. **Participatory pro-poor growth**

It should be underlined that this is not only a “transport” of demands and information from local to national level but also to a process of increased internal accountability and more representative structures within civil society. This will strengthen the voice of grass root organisations at national level, in campaigns and advocacy work. The lobby and advocacy work will be more efficient through accessing local level examples and voices. Increased participation of the local level will thereby contribute to improved transparency and influence in policy making, which will result in increased ownership of, and benefit from, natural resources.

To a large extent, this is what the We Effect’s theory of change is all about – to connect the livelihoods issues with efficient lobby and advocacy work to contribute to a structural change.

1. Citizens are empowered to defend their collective and individual right to land and access to natural resources;
2. Key Actors are capable to advocate for sustainable use of natural resources and demand accountability from public and private bodies;

3. Key Actors are able to negotiate partnerships with corporate investors in natural resource exploitation that are based on mutual benefits and fair distribution of income.

Sub-programme Oxfam Novib

Participation, social and legal accountability including monitoring of human rights (A) and Transparency and financial (C).

1. Technical capacity building and financial support to key civil society actors will through the below policy dialogue efforts improve
 - a. the effectiveness and responsiveness in public sector
 - b. the accountability of government and public sector towards citizens
 - c. formal and informal institutions treat women and men more equally
transparency and financial management in public sector, including taxation, and reduces
 - d. citizens access public services without illicit costs, corruption in the public sector

Supported policy dialogue efforts

- 1) They advocate for better governance, creating and using openings for good responsive governance to reduce poverty and enhance accountability on policies, resources, access and results. They undertake evidence-based advocacy to bring about proper basic service delivery, and an accountable public sector, open to women, transparent on financial management and decision-making and free from corruption. They ensure that accountability is both embedded in policies, and implemented in practice.
- 2) They train and support civil leaders to master the democratic systems, use the spaces that are created for consultation and participation, so that they can effectively lobby for their interests and hold the elected and appointed duty bearers accountable. They make sure that citizens, both men and women, have access to public sector documents that affect them, have insight into how the public and private sector work, regularly interact with the public sector's duty bearers at provincial and national level, and regularly liaise with the elected representatives. This facilitates civil participation in accountability platforms.
- 3) They increase respect for gender equity by challenging the underlying causes behind gender discrimination. They dig into gender-based violence, exposing how often it takes place, what the causes are and how they can be addressed. Further they highlight the opportunities for gender equity in school curricula and provincial and national poverty reduction plans. They support men who are active in the struggle against gender discrimination and women who are in leadership roles. In a very practical way they try to influence some of society's structural constraints for gender equity.
- 4) They stage lobbies and campaigns to ensure that the human rights of the most vulnerable and marginalized groups, especially elderly, people with disabilities, people living with HIV and people with different sexual orientation, are respected and that discrimination is eradicated. They for instance lobby for a basic pension scheme for vulnerable, acceptance for people living with HIV at home and in the workforce and

non-discrimination of minorities. This way, they stage practical actions for a more inclusive society.

2. The civil society's effective engagement in policy dialogue will also lead to changes in how
 - a. Men and Women and their organisations have access to public sector information
 - b. Men and women and their organisations have insight and understanding about public sector
 - c. women participate equally in interaction with government and public sector
 - d. Men and women and CSOs interact regularly with public sector in a structured way
 - e. the liaison between CSO and parliamentarians and other elected representatives improve
3. The gender perspective of the sub-programme will support the above and lead to
 - a. reduced gender based violence
 - b. gender stereotypes challenged, women's and men's gender consciousness, knowledge and commitment improved
 - c. men more involved in struggle for gender equity
 - d. female leadership promoted
4. The non-discrimination perspective of the sub-programme will support the above and lead to
 - a. elderly people, PLHIV and other vulnerable people have access to cash transfers, basic income grant and/or pension scheme
 - b. reduced discrimination and stigma of PLHIV and other vulnerable groups like, elderly and children
 - c. reduced discrimination of minorities: they are respected as normal citizens.

The proposed goal aims to reflect a desired positive impact of civil society on:

- governance and development, whereby government and private sector effectively contribute to the reduction of poverty, behave responsibly and are not corrupt, provide quality services, encourage women's participation and are responsive open and transparent to citizens;
- democratic systems and practices; whereby properly organised elections take place on time and in the right circumstances, without intimidation and oppression, where citizens have access to information, understand their rights and obligations and where women participate equally;
- gender equality; where underlying causes and gender stereotypes are challenged, gender based violence is reduced, men support the struggle for gender equity and female leadership is promoted;
- the respect for human rights; where citizens can fully exercise their basic human rights, where abuses are properly and timely discovered and punished, where discrimination is condemned and prosecuted, where the most vulnerable are actively protected by the state and by the citizens;

- accountability and its mutuality; whereby all institutions and individuals understand that they are all duty bearers and able to account for their responsibilities;
- active citizenship, whereby people encourage each other to contribute to the improvement of society and context, for their own and collective development, wellbeing and public affairs, where people have ability and safety to speak-out and demand for accountability. It also aims to capture the importance of the health and abilities of civil society itself to be able to contribute positively to the above described positive impact. To capture the above and to try to be as specific as possible about desired programme outcomes and impact specific objective areas and result areas have been envisaged. The external objectives and result areas are about what civil society intends to undertake to bring about better accountability in Mozambique – they are listed below in section.

Inception report annex 3 – Preliminary work plan

The agenda will be discussed with the IOs and finalised accordingly.

Data collection		
Date	Activity	Location
23/6	Internal team meeting	Maputo
24/6	Meeting with the EoS full AGIR team (morning)	Maputo
	Meeting with the ICC (afternoon)	Maputo
25/6	<i>Independence day</i>	Maputo
26/6	Individual interviews with the IOs	Maputo
	Individual interviews with the IOs	Maputo
26/6	Partner interviews	Maputo area
27/6	Partner interview	Maputo area
Team coordination		
28/6	Travelling to provinces	
29/6	Day off	
30/6	Partner interviews, stakeholder consultations	Provinces
1/7	Partner interviews, stakeholder consultations	Provinces
2/7	Partner interviews, stakeholder consultations	Provinces
3/7	Travelling	Provinces
4/7	Partner interviews, stakeholder consultations	Provinces
5/7	Partner interviews, stakeholder consultations and Team co-ordination	Provinces
6/7	Day off	
7/7	Meeting with the ICC	Maputo
	Partner interviews, stakeholder consultations	Provinces and Maputo
8/7	Partner interviews, stakeholder consultations and/or Travelling	Provinces and Maputo
9/7	Partner interviews, stakeholder consultations	Provinces

10/7	Partner interviews, stakeholder consultations	Provinces
11/7	Partner interviews, stakeholder consultations	Provinces
12/7	Partner interviews, stakeholder consultations Travelling	Provinces
13/7	Day off	
14/7	External stakeholder consultations, duty-bearers and CSOs, media	Maputo
15/7	External stakeholder consultations, duty-bearers and CSOs, media	Maputo
16/7	External stakeholder consultations Team meeting	Maputo
18/7	Feed-back session with the ICC	Maputo

Milestones	
11/8	Submission of Draft Report
15/8	Seminar in Maputo to discuss Draft Report
18/8	Comments sent by stakeholders to Indevelop on Draft Re- port
29/8	Submission of Final Report for EoS approval

Inception report annex 4- Generic interview guides for stakeholder consultations

INTERVIEW GUIDE TO PARTNER'S ORGANIZATIONS

Note: the questions focus only on those elements that either need confirmation after the reading of the relevant and available programme documents, or complement missing information important to respond to the evaluation questions. This guide is based on the evaluation matrix and deliberately skips all the questions whose information can be gathered from the existing documents and does not need clarification from further sources.

The evaluation team will also look into the need of revision of the guide during the first team meeting (23rd of June) and at other team coordination meetings.

OECD Criteria	Evaluation questions	Specific questions to Partner organizations
Relevance	Are activities and outputs within AGIR Sub-programmes consistent with the overall goals of the sub-programmes and the attainment of their	In your point of view what were the criteria used to select your organization to participate in the AGIR programme? Are AGIR objectives and results aligned with the strategic objectives and results of your organization?

OECD Criteria	Evaluation questions	Specific questions to Partner organizations
	objectives?	How the programme of your organization objectives and results are linked to AGIR results?
	Have the employed results frameworks within the sub-programmes been fit-for-their-purpose?	Has the applied results framework of your area of intervention under AGIR enabled you to monitor and evaluate your results and their contribution to the AGIR objectives? Has the results framework particularly allowed you to monitor and evaluate your contributions to/engagement in policy dialogue on a regular and systematic basis from year to year)?
	AGIR overall relevance as a civil society support mechanism	How do you assess the effectiveness of the areas and approaches adopted by AGIR to support civil society? How do you assess the quality/effectiveness of the AGIR approach (ToC) to support civil society and in promoting an enabling environment in comparison to other existing mechanisms?
	Sensitiveness to overall governance and civil society context	To what extent AGIR objectives and expected results are realistic, taking into account the governance context in Mozambique and the situation and capacities of civil society in Mozambique?
Effectiveness		
		The objectives of your organization programme/strategic plan will likely be achieved up to the end of 2014? If so, how your organization will demonstrate these achievements? What influences the achievement of your organization objectives? What are the challenges in the demonstration of the achievement of the objectives? Is your monitoring and evaluation system effective in demonstrating the achievement of the objectives and results? If you are familiar with AGIR results framework do you feel it captures well the results you demonstrate?
		Is there any risk that the achievement of some objectives might not be properly captured and demonstrated in your re-

OECD Criteria	Evaluation questions	Specific questions to Partner organizations
		porting? If so, why? Or in AGIR's aggregation of what you report to AGIR IO? If so why?
	What results were achieved within key accountabilities and which level they represent (output, outcome, impact)	Taking into account your area of intervention, what are the main achievements and results that occurred in accountability because of the implementation of AGIR? If.. Social accountability – state's capacity in service delivery, protection and fulfilment of human rights, social actors, citizens and communities reception of what they are entitled to or have been promised; Financial accountability – access to budget information (budget and execution reports) transparency in the use of public financial resources; efficiency and equity in the use of public funds; Legal – strengthening the rule of law and mechanisms of redress when and sanctions when there is malpractice; Political accountability – quality of multi-party democracy, diversity of political parties, political competition, electoral accountability (capacity of citizens to remove and reward their representatives according to their performance); fairness of electoral processes.
	Question on results specifics to key partner organizations	What are the processes that your organization follows to establish linkages from the activities, through the objectives, up to the outcomes and results? How these processes in the planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation?
		AGIR also aspires to strengthen alliance and coalition building for the policy dialogue efforts of the civil society. In what way, if in any, has this affected how you plan and implement your advocacy work (and similar)?
Impact	To what policy changes and outcomes did the AGIR programme contribute?	Name and describe major policy changes in your area of intervention under AGIR
	What difference have the	Present/describe stories of changes in your

OECD Criteria	Evaluation questions	Specific questions to Partner organizations
	sub-programme activities made to beneficiaries	organization beneficiaries caused or influenced by AGIR interventions.
	How many people have been affected?	Can you provide information of how many people have benefitted from your interventions under AGIR. If so, how these figures are calculated?

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS INTERVIEW GUIDE

Note: Interview with informants not directly linked to AGIR will focus on Relevance and Impact, which are criteria that are easily perceived and accessible by actors external to the programme.

OECD/DAC CRITERIA	ACTOR/INFORMANT	GENERAL QUESTIONS
Relevance	Government/non- AGIR Donors, academics, media	To what extent AGIR is relevant in the current context of governance and civil society role in Mozambique?
	Non- AGIR Donors	To what extent AGIR is a consistent approach to support civil society in comparison to other mechanisms?
	Provincial government, Civil society, local councils	To what extent AGIR contribution (or locally based partner organizations) is Known in policy dialogue and service delivery?
Impact	Government (national and provincial)/non- AGIR Donors/Civil society platforms at national and provincial levels, district local councils	What Policy changes and Changes in policy dialogue are perceived in areas of the AGIR Programme?
	Provincial CSOs, Beneficiary/CBOs (e.g. health and water committees)	Changes in service delivery?
	Provincial	

Annex 3 – AGIR Partners

IBIS partner organisations	
ACDH	Associação Centro de Direitos Humanos
AMCS	Associação da Mulher na Comunicação Social
CAICC	Centro de Apoio à Informação e Comunicação Comunitária
CEC	Centro de Estudos Interdisciplinares de Comunicação
CESC	Centro de Aprendizagem e Capacitação da Sociedade Civil
CESAB	Centro de Estudos Sociais Aquino de Bragança
CODD	Centro de Pesquisa e Promoção da Democracia, Direitos Humanos e Meio Ambiente
FORCOM	Fórum Nacional das Rádios Comunitárias)
GDI	Instituto para a Democracia e Governação
IESE	Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Económicos
KUKUMBI	Organização de Desenvolvimento Rural)
OAM	Ordem dos Advogados de Moçambique

Diakonia partner organisations	
ACABE	Associação Criança Boa Esperança
ACAMO	Associação dos Cegos e Amblíopes de Moçambique
AMA	Associação do Meio Ambiente
AMMCJ	Associação das Mulheres Moçambicanas de Carreira Jurídica
AWEPA	Associação dos Parlamentares Europeus com África
CEDE	Centro de Estudos de Democracia e Desenvolvimento
LDH	Liga dos Direitos Humanos
MULEIDE	Associação Mulher, Lei e Desenvolvimento
OE	Observatório Eleitoral
PJ	Parlamento Juvenil
Rede CAME	Rede Contra Abuso de Menores
Rede da Criança	

Oxfam Novib partner organisations	
Akilizetho	
CEMO	Centro de Estudos Moçambicanos e Internacionais
CIP	Centro de Integridade Publica
ESTAMOS	
Facilidade	
FTI	Forum da Terceira Idade
FM	Forum Mulher
GMD	Grupo Mocambicano da Divida
HOPEM	Rede Homens pela Mudança
JOINT	

LAMBDA	
Magariro	
N'weti	
PNDH	Pressao Nacional dos Direitos Humanos
PSCM-PS	Plataforma da Sociedade Civil Moçambicana para Protecção Social
Rensida	Rede Nacional de Associações de Pessoas Vivendo HIV e SIDA
Ruth	Rede Uthende
Sociedade Aberta	
Wadzafica	
WLSA	Women and Low in Southern Africa/Mulheres e Lei na África Austral

We Effect partner organisations	
AAACJ	Associação de Apoio e Assistência Jurídicas às Comunidades
ABIODES	Associação para o Desenvolvimento Sustentável
AENA	Associação Nacional de Extensão Rural
AMPCM	Associação Moçambicana de Promoção de Cooperativismo Moderno
CTV	Centro Terra Viva
JA!	Justiça Ambiental
Livaningo	
OMR	Observatório sobre o Meio Rural
ORAM	Organização Rural de Ajuda Mútua
UDEBA-LAB	Unidade de Desenvolvimento de Ensino Básico
UNAC	União Nacional de Camponeses
UPTC	União Provincial de Camponeses de Tete

Annex 4 – Consulted Documents

Evaluations and studies

Joint Evaluation Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue, Synthesis Report, November 2012 by ITAD and COWI, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark November 2012

Joint Evaluation Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue, Mozambique Country Report, November 2012, by ITAD and COWI; Joint Evaluation 2013:3, Sida

Mid-Term Review of the AGIR Programme, Final Report, Kevin Kelpin et al., Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2013:3, Sida

Monitoring and evaluation of policy influence and advocacy, Working paper, Josephine Tsui, Simon Hearn, and John Young, March 2014, ODI

State of Civil Society 2013: Creating an enabling environment, CIVICUS

Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sweden

Country strategy for development cooperation with Mozambique, September 2008 – December 2012, Government Offices of Sweden

Ingångsvärden för Sidas framtagande av resultatförslag för Sveriges internationella bistånd till Moçambique 2014-2020, June 2013

Pluralism. Policy for Support to Civil Society in Developing Countries within Swedish Development Cooperation, 2009, Government Offices of Sweden

Swedish Government's Aid Platform, 2014, Government Offices of Sweden

Embassy of Sweden, Maputo

The Embassy of Sweden's operational guidelines for partnering with and supporting civil society in Mozambique, Draft, 22th May 2014, including annexes

The Embassy of Sweden's Management Response to the AGIR Mid-Term Review, 23.07.2013

On the joint reporting by the intermediary organisations:

- Embassy of Sweden's statement on the AGIR semi-annual report 2011, 15.12.2011
- Embassy of Sweden's statement on the AGIR semi-annual report 2012, 21.12.2012
- Embassy of Sweden's statement on the AGIR annual report 2012, 15.06.2012
- Embassy of Sweden's statement on the AGIR semi-annual report 2013, 28.10.2013
- Embassy of Sweden's final and consolidated comments on the AGIR proposed annual work plan and budget 2014, 09.04.2014
- Concept Proposal AGIR II, June 18th 2014, Oxfam Novib, Diakonia, IBIS, We Effect, including annexes
- Minutes from meeting between the Embassy of Sweden and the intermediary partner organisations of the AGIR Programme, Discussion on Results Frameworks and Upcoming Proposals for AGIR II, 7th August 2014

- Draft comments from the Embassy of Sweden on the AGIR 2013 workplans, all intermediaries, no date

On the agreement with Diakonia

- Conclusions on performance Diakonia, 15.07.2013
- Embassy of Sweden's standpoint Diakonia report 2010, 21.04.2011
- Embassy of Sweden's standpoint Diakonia report 2011, 11.06.2012
- Embassy of Sweden's standpoint Diakonia report 2012, 15.07.2013
- Embassy of Sweden's standpoint Diakonia report 2013, 16.05.2014
- Embassy of Sweden's standpoint on the AGIR Diakonia Annual work plan for 2012, 08.02.2012
- Embassy of Sweden's standpoint on the AGIR Diakonia Annual Work plan for 2013, 25.01.2013
- Embassy of Sweden's Statement Diakonia Work plan 2014, 21.04.2014
- Embassy of Sweden's Risk Analysis Diakonia, 09.04.2014

On the agreement with IBIS:

- Conclusions on performance IBIS, 16.07.2013
- Comments to the Ibis proposal for an Access to Information Program in Mozambique, Karin Fällman, Regional Advisor, Swedish Embassy in Lusaka, 16.09.2009
- Embassy of Sweden's standpoint Ibis report 2010, 12.05.2011
- Embassy of Sweden's standpoint Ibis report 2011, 11.06.2012
- Embassy of Sweden's standpoint Ibis report 2012, 15.07.2013
- Embassy of Sweden's comments on Ibis annual work plan 2011, 21.01.2011
- Embassy of Sweden's standpoint on the AGIR IBIS Annual work plan for 2012, 08.02.2012
- Embassy of Sweden's standpoint on the AGIR IBIS Annual Work plan for 2013, 15.03.2013
- Embassy of Sweden's first comments on proposed work plan and budget for 2014, 14.01.2014
- Ibis - Feedback IBIS annual report 2012, sent 16.04.2013, Maputo
- Notes for the file – Ibis Results Framework, 04.12.2013
- Embassy of Sweden's Risk Analysis Ibis, 18.02.2014

On the agreement with Oxfam Novib

- Embassy of Sweden's comments on the AGIR Oxfam Novib Annual Work plan 2011, 21.01.2011
- Embassy of Sweden's final and consolidated comments on the AGIR Oxfam Novib Annual Work plan 2014, 09.04.2014

On the agreement with We Effect

- Embassy of Sweden's standpoint on the AGIR We Effect Annual Work plan 2014, 31.03.2014
- Embassy of Sweden's comment 2011, no date
- Feedback on SCC Annual Narrative & Financial Report and Response from SCC 2012, no date
- Embassy of Sweden's standpoint SCC report 2012, 23.07.2013

Joint reports intermediary organisations

- AGIR Relatório Semi-Anual 2011, 2a versão, Oxfam Novib, Diakonia, IBIS, CCS
- AGIR Relatório Semi-Anual 2012, Oxfam Novib, Diakonia, IBIS, CCS
- AGIR Relatório Anual 2012, Oxfam Novib, Diakonia, IBIS, CCS
- AGIR Relatório Semi-Anual 2013, Oxfam Novib, Diakonia, IBIS, We Effect
- AGIR Relatório Anual 2013, Oxfam Novib, Diakonia, IBIS, We Effect

Diakonia

- Diakonia's Application for Intermediary Role in the Swedish Embassy's Support to Civil Society in Mozambique: Strengthening the Intervention of Civil Society in Democratic Governance Accountability and Human Rights in Mozambique, 22.03.2010
- Diakonia Annual Work Plan 2011
- Diakonia Annual Work Plan 2012
- Diakonia Annual Work Plan 2013
- Diakonia Annual Work Plan 2014
- Diakonia Partners - AGIR Programme 2010-2014, updated 27.05.2014
- Diakonia Relatório Anual 2010
- Diakonia Relatório Anual 2011
- Diakonia Relatório Anual 2012
- Diakonia Relatório Anual 2013
- Diakonia Strategy plan 2010-2012, Mozambique Country Office, A Concept Paper
- Minutes Annual review meeting Diakonia, 19.05.2011
- Minutes Annual review meeting Diakonia, 30.04.2012
- Minutes Annual review meeting Diakonia, 23.04.2013
- Minutes Annual review meeting Diakonia, 27-05-2014
- Reflections about Key Partners for the Future Programme of Diakonia in Mozambique, Maputo, 30th April 2009

IBIS

- IBIS Annual Work Plan 2011
- IBIS Annual Work Plan 2012
- IBIS Annual Work Plan 2013
- IBIS Annual Work Plan 2014
- Ibis proposal for Intermediary Role as part of the Swedish Embassy's support to Mozambican Civil Society Organisations, Strengthening democratic governance and accountability through increased access to information in Mozambique, Maputo, 22nd March 2010
- IBIS Relatório Anual 2010
- IBIS Relatório Anual 2011
- IBIS Relatório Anual 2012
- IBIS Relatório Anual 2013
- Minutes Annual review meeting IBIS, 12.05.2011
- Minutes Annual review meeting IBIS, 23.05.2012
- Minutes Annual review meeting IBIS, 24.04.2013
- Minutes Annual review meeting IBIS, 30.06.2014

Oxfam Novib

- Oxfam Novib's Application to the Embassy of Sweden, Strengthening democratic governance and accountability through participation, social and legal accountability including monitoring of human rights and transparency, financial and political accountability 22nd of March 2010, Maputo
- Oxfam Novib Annual Work Plan 2011
- Oxfam Novib Annual Work Plan 2012
- Oxfam Novib Annual Work Plan 2013
- Oxfam Novib Annual Work Plan 2014
- Oxfam Novib Relatório Anual 2010
- Oxfam Novib Relatório Anual 2011
- Oxfam Novib Relatório Anual 2012
- Oxfam Novib Relatório Anual 2013
- Minutes Annual review meeting Oxfam Novib, 12.05.2011
- Minutes Annual review meeting Oxfam Novib, 26-05.2013
- Minutes Annual review meeting Oxfam Novib, 27.03 2014

We Effect

- SCC Programme proposal 2011-2014 Strengthening Social Accountability in Management of Natural Resources and Community Land Rights in Mozambique, 01.02.2011
- SCC Annual Work Plan 2012
- SCC Annual Work Plan 2013
- We Effect Annual Work Plan 2014
- CCS Relatório Anual 2011
- CCS Novib Relatório Anual 2012
- We Effect Novib Relatório Anual 2013

Annex 5 – Consulted Stakeholders

Alice Mabota, Presidente	Liga de Direitos Humanos	Maputo	<i>Diakonia</i>
Tarcísio Abibo,	Liga de Direitos Humanos	Nampula	<i>Diakonia</i>
João Afonso Semba	Liga de Direitos Humanos	Nampula	<i>Diakonia</i>
Ussene João Amisse, Paralegal	Liga de Direitos Humanos	Lichinga	<i>Diakonia</i>
Hermenegildo Xavier, Paralegal	Liga de Direitos Humanos	Lichinga	<i>Diakonia</i>
Júlio Kalengo	Liga de Direitos Humanos	Tete	<i>Diakonia</i>
Hélder Jafar	LDH, Observatório Eleitoral	Sofala	<i>Diakonia</i>
Rui Vasconcelos Carvalho	Observatório Eleitoral	Tete	<i>Diakonia</i>
Eduardo Tivane	Observatório Eleitoral	Sofala	<i>Diakonia</i>
Guilherme Mbilana, former Executive Director	Observatório eleitoral	Maputo	<i>Diakonia</i>
Augusta Almeida	Observatório eleitoral	Maputo	<i>Diakonia</i>
Arlindo Muririua	Observatório Eleitoral	Nampula	<i>Diakonia</i>
Gregório Manhique	Observatório Eleitoral	Nampula	<i>Diakonia</i>
Artur Colher	Observatório Eleitoral	Nampula	<i>Diakonia</i>
Adamo Bonomar	Observatório Eleitoral	Lichinga	<i>Diakonia</i>
Alexandre Cunhete Secretary	ACAMO	Maputo	<i>Diakonia</i>
Juliao Felizberto, Administrator	ACAMO	Maputo	<i>Diakonia</i>
Isaura Baptista, Treasurer	ACAMO	Maputo	<i>Diakonia</i>
Maria Mussane, Financial Assistant	ACAMO	Maputo	<i>Diakonia</i>
Joaquim Matola, Coordenator	ACAMO	Maputo	<i>Diakonia</i>
Afonso Lima, Delegate	ACAMO	Nampula	<i>Diakonia</i>
Periha Amade, Exec. Secretary	ACAMO	Nampula	<i>Diakonia</i>
José Victor, Treasurer	ACAMO	Nampula	<i>Diakonia</i>
Momado Sharifo	ACAMO	Sofala	<i>Diakonia</i>
Salomão Caliguele	ACAMO	Sofala	<i>Diakonia</i>
Afonso Mutisse	ACAMO	Sofala	<i>Diakonia</i>
Lurdes Conceição	ACAMO	Sofala	<i>Diakonia</i>
Felizardo Manuel Sabão	ACAMO	Sofala	<i>Diakonia</i>
Anissa Bernardo Binare, Delegate	ACAMO	Lichinga	<i>Diakonia</i>
Amido Bonomar, Secretary	ACAMO	Lichinga	<i>Diakonia</i>
Celestino Ozório António, Program Officer	ACAMO	Lichinga	<i>Diakonia</i>
Frederico Dumas Belém,	ACAMO	Lichinga	<i>Diakonia</i>

Field Officer			
Maurício Manuel, Assistant	ACAMO	Lichinga	<i>Diakonia</i>
Basilio Gimo, Provincial Co-ordinator	ACAMO	Tete	<i>Diakonia</i>
Ananilda Jacinto, Accountant	ACAMO	Tete	<i>Diakonia</i>
Avelina Vasco, Secretary	ACAMO	Tete	<i>Diakonia</i>
Victor Maulana, Coordinator	ACABE	Lichinga	<i>Diakonia</i>
Batone Eduardo, Program Officer	ACABE	Lichinga	<i>Diakonia</i>
Chalate Gabriel, Field Officer	ACABE	Lichinga	<i>Diakonia</i>
Carlota Nhamussua, Cordina-tor	MULEIDE	Sofala	<i>Diakonia</i>
Palmira Fernando, Finance	MULEIDE	Sofala	<i>Diakonia</i>
Eunice Samuel, Advis/activist	MULEIDE	Sofala	<i>Diakonia</i>
Berta Cícero, Advis/activist	MULEIDE	Sofala	<i>Diakonia</i>
Aida Cuamba, Advis/activist	MULEIDE	Sofala	<i>Diakonia</i>
Júlia Garrido, Advis/activist	MULEIDE	Sofala	<i>Diakonia</i>
Fernando Songane	Centro Terra Viva	Maputo	<i>We Effect</i>
Matilde Datília, Member	Centro Terra Viva	Maputo	<i>We Effect</i>
Cristina Louro	Centro Terra Viva	Maputo	<i>We Effect</i>
Boris Mafigo	JA – Juntos pelo Ambiente	Tete	<i>We Effect</i>
Rui Vasconcelos Carvalho	AAAJC-Associação de Apoio e Assistência Jurídica às Comunidades	Tete	<i>We Effect</i>
António Germando, Executive Director	UPCT	Tete	<i>We Effect</i>
Dórica Amosse, President	União Provincial de Camponeses de Tete – UPCT	Tete	<i>We Effect</i>
Freita Estiven, Vice-President	UPCT	Tete	<i>We Effect</i>
Ernesto Fernandes de Assis	Plataforma da Sociedade Civil	Tete	
Costa Estêvão, president	União Provincial de Camponeses de Nampula - UPCN	Nampula	<i>We Effect</i>
Danilo Ábaco, Adviser	União Provincial dos Camponeses de Nampula	Nampula	<i>We Effect</i>
Justina Wiriamo, Vice-President	União Provincial dos Camponeses de Nampula	Nampula	<i>We Effect</i>
Jordão Matimula, Exec. Director	AENA	Nampula	<i>We Effect</i>
Félix Cossa, Coordinator	ORAM	Lichinga	<i>We Effect</i>
Leonardo Abílio, Program Officer	ORAM	Lichinga	<i>We Effect</i>
Polly Gaster, Exec. Director	CAICC	Maputo	<i>IBIS</i>
Lázaro Bamo, Specialist	CAICC	Maputo	<i>IBIS</i>

Francisco Noa, Executive Director	CESAB	Maputo	<i>IBIS</i>
João Carlos Trindade, Deputy Director	CESAB	Maputo	<i>IBIS</i>
Salvador Cadete Forquilha, Research Director	IESE-Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Económicos	Maputo	<i>IBIS</i>
Nelsa Massingue da Costa, Planning Director	IESE	Maputo	<i>IBIS</i>
Crescêncio Pereira, Communications Officer	IESE	Maputo	<i>IBIS</i>
Michael Sambo	IESE	Maputo	<i>IBIS</i>
Benilde Nhalevilo, Exec. Director	FORCOM	Maputo	<i>IBIS</i>
José dos Santos Jerónimo	FORCOM	Sofala	<i>IBIS</i>
Stélio Bila	CIP, Budget Monitoring	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Fátima Mimbire	CIP, Natural Resource	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Camilo	Estamos	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Geraldo Filipe Jabo, Field Officer	Estamos	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Sonia Magaia, Field Officer	Estamos	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Celsa Adélia, Assistant	Estamos	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Euclides Nhantumbo, Accountant	Estamos	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Feliciano dos Santos, Director	Estamos	Lichinga	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Teresinha da Silva, Coordinator	WLSA	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Graça Samo, Executive Director	Fórum Mulher	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Ndzira de Deus, Program Director	Fórum Mulher	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Nazira Solange, SHR Officer	Fórum Mulher	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Francisco Joaquim, M&E Officer	Fórum Mulher	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Eufregínia Reis, Executive Director	GMD-Grupo Moçambicano de Dívida	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Humberto Zaqueu, Economist,	GMD	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Eugénio Fernandes, Focal point	GMD	Sofala	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Simão Tila, Executive Director	JOINT	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Sunde Lopes,	JOINT	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Denise Namburete, Executive Director	N'weti	Maputo	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Jamal Ibraímo, Representative	N'weti	Nampula	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Elvira Adolfo, district super-	N'weti	Nampula	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>

visor			
Adélia Pesti, technical officer	N'weti	Nampula	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Pedro Carvalho, Executive Director	Akilizetho	Nampula	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Armando Ali, Executive Director	Facilidade	Nampula	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Momade Bin, Prog. officer	Facilidade	Nampula	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Catarina Artur, Coordinator	PNDH	Sofala	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Dolvina Tomás, Field Officer	PNDH	Sofala	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Francisco Gale, program. Officer	PNDH	Sofala	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Jéssica da Silva, Coordinator	Associação Wadzafrica	Sofala	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Pinto Soberano, Accountant	Associação Wadzafrica	Sofala	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Yara Séris, Programme officer	Associação Wadzafrica	Sofala	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Adelaide Faia, President	Associação Wadzafrica	Sofala	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>
Eurídice Ambrósio, Assistant	Associação Wadzafrica	Sofala	<i>Oxfam Novib</i>

Intermediary organisations

Iraê Baptista Lundin	Diakonia
Danilo Mário Jone	
William Antonio Mulhovo	
Domingos Fumo	
Natalia Zimba	
Anne Hoff	IBIS,
Ericino de Salema	
Selcia Lumbela	
Augusto Uamusse	
Antoinette van Vugt Chilaulem	Oxfam Novib
Assane Macangira	
Carmen Munhequete	
Diamantino Nhampossa	We Effect,
Célia Enosse	
Inácio Timane	

External stakeholders

Amiro Abibo	Provincial Directorate of Health	Sofala
Simão Lourenco	Head of Department Department of Water and Sanitation – Directorate of Public Works and Housing	Nampula
Vicente Paulo	Adviser, Programa de Planificação e Finanças Descentralizadas - PPF	Nampula
Finita Mussaguamual	Human Resources Director, Institute for Legal Assistance – IPAJ	Sofala

Albachir Macassar	Head of the Department for Promotion and Development of Human Rights, Ministry of Justice	Maputo
Evenilde Tamele, Alfredo Mutombene, Júlio Filimone	Ministry of Planning and Development	Maputo
Eneias Comiche	Chair of the Committee of Planning and Budget, Assembly of the Republic	Maputo
Alfredo Gamito	Chair of the Committee of Public Administration, Local Government and Social Communication	Maputo
Teodoro Waty	Chair of the Committee for Legal, Constitutional and Human Rights Affairs, Assembly of the Republic	Maputo
Fernando Lima	CEO, Mediacoop	Maputo
António Muagerene	PPOSC, The Nampula Civil Society Provincial Platform	Nampula
Eduardo Macuácuá	Confederation of Business Associations – CTA	Maputo
Fernanda Farinha	Ciudadanía e Participação, CEP	Maputo
João Pereira	Mecanismo Apoio a Sociedade Civil, MASC	Maputo
Santos Simione	Grupo Africa da Suecia	Maputo
Semente	President, Civil Society Provincial Forum	Sofala
Aunício da Silva	Solidariedade Moçambicana	Nampula
António Mutoua	Solidariedade Moçambicana	Nampula

Donors

Claire Smellie	First Secretary Democracy and Human Rights, Development Cooperation Section	Embassy of Sweden, Maputo
Nito Matavel	National Program Officer Private Sector Development	Embassy of Sweden, Maputo
Jesus Alfredo	National Program Officer Public Sector Reform	Embassy of Sweden, Maputo
Bram Naidoo	National Program Officer HIV/AIDS. Gender	Embassy of Sweden, Maputo
Paulos Berglöf	Former focal point for AGIR at the Swedish Embassy	Sida HQ, Stockholm
Maja Tjernström	Former focal point for AGIR at the Swedish Embassy	Sida HQ, Stockholm
Eleasara Antunes	Programme Officer, Gender,	Embassy of the Nether-

	HIV/Aids, Social Protection	lands, Maputo
Silke Mason West-phal	Counsellor Environment and Climate Change	Embassy of Denmark, Maputo
Andrea Rachele Fiore	Programme Officer, Justice sector	Embassy of Denmark, Maputo
Jørgen Skytte Jensen	Teamleader/DANIDA appraisal	Danida
Inocêncio Macuácuá		Embassy of Ireland, Maputo
Jemima Gordon-Duff		Dfid, Maputo
Teresa Medes		USAID, Maputo
Francesca Di Mauro	Counsellor, Head of Section, Economic Development and Governance	EU Delegation to Mozambique, Maputo

Annex 6 – Stocktaking of results, thematic programmes

The stock-taking focused first on what was stated as results in the annual reports from the IOs to the Embassy of Sweden. Changes that were mentioned in the interviews with partner organisations but not highlighted in the reports were also included. The results were then analysed as changes in behaviour in rights-holders, duty-bearers and civil society organisations or as changed relations between these actors. The changes were registered in the stock-taking matrix below regardless if they fully correspond to the objectives and the expected results in the results frameworks or not. The method used meant that results were registered even when the changes in behaviour and relations only indicated progress towards what could be considered as a result according to the agreed results frameworks for the different sub-programmes.

The following sample of the results from the AGIR programme focuses on results reported for the years 2012 and 2013. The results have been classified by the evaluators as output (OP), outcomes (OC), where outcomes include manifested openness to dialogue with the CS and actions taken as results of the dialogue/interventions/reports with/from CS, on the behalf of the duty-bearers. Changed behaviour in rights-holders as a result of CSO interventions is also classified as an outcome, while changed behaviour within the CSOs and civil society coordination is referred to as under outputs. This is based on the following logic: they are within the sphere of control of the programme and as such can be considered as immediate results of efforts aiming at building capacities, strengthening the development of the organisations and networking. They are seen as steps towards outcomes and intermediary outcomes.

Most of the outcomes are results of processes with many actors involved; AGIR and its partner have *contributed* to the results at outcome level if no special comment on attribution is made. Some of the results classified as outcomes below could also be seen as outputs; those are marked (OC),

The main source of information is the annual reporting from each intermediary organisation and the joint reporting from ICC. Additional results that were part of the findings from the interviews during the data collection are also included. The different sub-programmes are defined by their intermediary in the table: Diakonia (D); IBIS (I); Oxfam Novib (O); We Effect (W); the joint report as ICC. When several sub-programmes have

contributed to the results the example is marked with Multiple (M). The level of intervention, that is national (N), provincial (P) or district (D) is stated when data is available.

IO	Type of result	Result description	Actors with changed behaviour/relations	Partners	Level of intervention and year
W	OC	Approval of the “anteproyecto” of the penal code including environmental crimes	Duty-bearers sensitive to CS claims approving the proposal	CTV	National 2013
M	OC	Approval of the law and the regulations of the resettlement of the communities affected by the extractive industry, some family have already received indenisation from the companies through the state.	Duty-bearers approve regulations protecting the rights of affected rights-holders	Various CSO JA, AAAJC, UPCT, LDH	National 2013
W	OC	National debate on the extractive industry partly as a results of the Government recognition of the problem with the resettlements of populations affected by the Vale mining project in Tete.	Duty-bearers recognize rights-holders rights and identify affected rights-holders	Various	National Provincial 2013
W	OC	Provincial government in Tete abolish the regulation that CSOs needed to present credentials to be allowed to visit the resettlements and localities of carbon exploration.	Improved relation with Direcção Provincial de Agricultura, obstacles for monitoring removed, CS invited to joint planning meetings	Various	Provincial 2013
W	OC	The government started to have regular dialogue with the communities, meetings with the companies and a letter was sent to Vale from the authorities stating sum and number of families that should have compensation. Three resettlement committees were formed to defend the interest of the rights-holders.	Duty-bearers open to dialogue and defend rights-holders claims to the companies; rights-holders organised to defend their interests.	AAAJC	Provincial 2013
W	OC	Development and agreement on Activity plan (2014 and 2015) between MICOA and civil society as a results of dialogue started by We Effect together with environmental CSOs (Plano Conjunto de Acções de seguimento). The dialogue has involved claims on access to the environmental impact reports for investment projects, Claims have been backed by evidence based studies on the consequences of the extractive industry. We Effect had initiated dialogue around the Agenda Ambiental Nacional, which led to the establishment of working groups i) mudanças climáticas; ii) fortalecimento do quadro institucional e legal para o uso sustentável de recursos naturais e manutenção da biodiversidade; iii)	Improved relations with duty-bearers, leading to joint plans and access to information.	ABIODES, UNAC, LIVANINGO, WE EFEC	National 2013

ANNEX 6 – STOCKTAKING OF RESULTS

		educação ambiental e preservação do ambiente nas comunidades; iv) adopção de estratégias de combate a erosão, desflorestamento, queimadas, poluição e disseminação de boas práticas ambientais; v) desenvolvimento de infra-estruturas para aterros sanitários e gestão de resíduos sólidos; e vi) planeamento e ordenamento territorial.			
W	OC	Increased understanding and openness by district governments of the Law of Forestry and Wildlife	Duty-bearers engaged in constructive dialogue with CS	ORAM and others	District 2013
I	OC	Revised proposal Access to Information Law (pending approval in the Parliament)/cooperation with Comissão de Administração Pública, Poder Local e Comunicação Social	Duty-bearers drafting bill, after considering CS proposal, working dialogue with CS, having realised 10 public hearings in 2012	Several partners and IBIS	National 2012 2013/2014
O	OC	De-criminalisation of certain aspects on the legislation on abortion	Duty-bearers adopt changes as partly a result of social pressure from civil society	Various CSO, particularly WCSO partner	2013
O	OC	Approval of the law on the defence and the promotion of rights of elderly persons.	Duty-bearers adopt law as results of dialogue and proposal of CS	Fórum de Terceira Idade	2013
I	OC	Reopening of community radio stations after protests against close-down	Duty-bearers informed by legislation now acting accordingly	FORCOM	District 2013
W	OC	Development and approval by SDEJT of a local curricula on environment and socio-economic aspects in the local context		UDEBA-LAB	District 2013
D	OC	Norms of the Penal Code declared unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court (ruling 04/CC/2013)	Duty-bearers acting upon gathering of 2000 citizens' signature to present a petition to the Constitutional Council	LDH	National 2013
D	OC	Approval of the legislation making penalties for kidnapping more severe	Duty-bearers adopt changes, partly as a result of social pressure from civil society	LDH	National 2013
D	OC	Anti-corruption law approved – Public Probity law (2012, 2013)	Duty-bearers adopt law, partly as a result of social pressure from civil society	CEDE, LDH, OE	National 2013
D	OC	Education sector in Cabo Delgado adopts 20% of contents related to environmental education in three districts	Duty-bearers changes curricula at local level based on CS material	AMA	District 2013
D	OC	Municipality of Maputo increased its investments in the area of children and adolescent after the monitoring of how issues related to these groups are treated in 3 municipal districts	Duty-bearers increase budget for children and adolescent rights-holders	Rede Criança	Municipality 2013
D	OC	National Plan for the Advancement of Children (PNACII) approved by the Council of Ministers	Duty-bearers adopt plan	Rede Came/Rede da Criança	National 2013
D	OC	Sensitization campaigns in Ancuabe, Ibo, Macomia. Mecufi and Quissanga resulted in the inclusion of environmental contents in the	Duty-bearers include environmental topics in curricula	AMA	District 2013

ANNEX 6 – STOCKTAKING OF RESULTS

		education curriculum and building of sanitary dumps (aterros sanitários)			
D	OC	District Government introduced exemptions for Visual impaired in service fees	Duty-bearers improves conditions for visually impaired rights-holders	ACAMO	District 2013
D	(OC)	A module for visual impaired introduced in the training of adult education trainers by the Institute of Adult Training and Education	Duty-bearers respond to claims by visually impaired CS on skills needed by adult teachers	ACAMO	National 2013
D	OC?	Contribution to reduction of electoral conflict, through technical assistance and training of party delegates (parliamentary and non-parliamentary), SCOs, media, Electoral administration bodies (CNE & STAE), Ministry of Justice	Important change in behaviour, however not demonstrated nor confirmed by respondents	OE	National 2013
D	OC	Improved respect of human rights in prisons, police stations stemming from the campaigns and inspection activities of LDH	Duty-bearers improve respect for imprisoned rights-holders	LDH	2012 2013
W	OC	The presence of para-legal and the training they give to communities resulted in various reports of irregularities in different parts of the country,	Rights-holders report irregularities.	CTV	Provincial District 2013
O	OC	Partnership established with local government Direcções Provinciais de Educação, Saúde e Acção Social, with the right to information material on public services (Sofala)	Duty-bearers and CSO cooperation on access to information	Wadzafrica	Provincial 2013
M	OC	Publication of contracts with private sector on the so called mega projects	Duty-bearers increase transparency	Various CSOs and networks	National 2013
O	OC	Dialogue on Open Budget Initiative	Duty-bearers engaged in dialogue with CS on budget issues	CIP	National 2013
M	(OC)	Human rights campaign together with the Ministry of Justice	Duty-bearers and CSO engaged in campaign together	JOINT, LDH, CEMO, CESC, Ministério da Justiça	National 2013
D	OC	Increase in the number of cases of women and children rights solved according to relevant international conventions on violence against women, women's and children's rights ;	Duty-bearers comply with the GBV law; rights-holders rights improved	AMMCJ	National 2013
D	OC	More low income citizens have their rights respected, as a result of continuous legal assistance to their claims (3800 citizens), and advocacy in the Ministry of Justice and in the courts to sensitize about the application of the children and women rights legislation	Duty-bearers improve respect for low income rights-holders rights	AMMCJ	National 2013
D	OC	More visual impaired people are having their pensions from the Ministry of Women and Social Welfare	Duty-bearers improve rights-holders' right to pension	ACAMO	National 2013
M	OC	Reversal of a parliamentary decision on parliamentarians' pension	Duty-bearers react on coordinated social protest and	FORCOM, Fórum	National 2013

ANNEX 6 – STOCKTAKING OF RESULTS

		scheme through the campaign “Deputados de Luxo”/Luxury Members of Parliament	advocacy work.	Mulher, LDH, CIP, NWeti, IESE	
M	OC	Duty-bearers (often at technical level) are showing at CSO events; the fact-based discussions are more relevant (Confirmed by a broad range of CSO, the IOs and duty-bearers)	Duty-bearers actively participating in CS events	Various	National 2012 2013
M	OC	AGIR partners confirm that there is a shift towards engagement with parliamentary committees and also technical divisions at different ministries show a tendency to be more open to continuous dialogue and technical coordination. This trend has been ongoing the last five years according to the respondents. Existing mechanism such as the national Development Observatory has improved the last two years as a result of civil society being able to provide relevant data and to focus on one specific subject for the dialogue. On the contrary at local level CSOs claimed that there had been a dilution of policy dialogue spaces and the quality of dialogue itself.	Improved relations with duty-bearers	Provincial Platform of CSO in Tete, Niassa, Nampula,; AAJC, Akilizetho and ESTAMOS	National and provincial 2012 2013
M	OC	A more aggressive response from duty-bearers, as a response on a) the shift of more CSOs acting as bearers of collective voice rather than as service providers; b) the nature of the issues that are brought to the table, and c) the way advocacy is done (confrontational methods), ,	Duty-bearers respond with repression to CS claims and organisation.	Facilidade; LDH Various	National, provincial and district 2012 2013
O	OC	Rights-holders participating in budget monitoring Cartão de Pontuação da Comunidade	Rights-holders increasing their participation in governance, strategy planning and development plans	Facilidade, SA	Provincial 2013
O	(OC)	Social audit committees established, trained (Majune e Marrupa) leading to social audits in the same districts Formação em Auditoria Social para a intervenção consciente e responsável direccionada aos membros dos Comités de Auditoria Social	Rights-holders trained leading to social audit activities	Estamos	District 2013
D	OC	Broader Electoral Observation, resulting from the increasing capacity development of the OE (2013)	Increased capacity among observers contributing to a broader observatory	OE	National 2012 2013
D	OC	Increasing enrolment of the visually impaired in the schools of Lichinga, Zambézia and some districts in Tete, resulting from the inclusive education and insertion of this group in the labour market after training received.	Rights-holders increased access to inclusive education	ACAMO	Provincial and district 2013
M	OC	Increase in reported cases of human rights abuses by rights-holders, particularly related to gender-based violence, and increased demand from rights-holder on support in their particular cases/situation.	Rights-holder act on their increased awareness	LDH, FORCOM, ESTAMOS, PNDH	National, provincial and district 2012 2013

ANNEX 6 – STOCKTAKING OF RESULTS

M	OC	Increase in the use of freedom of expression: Increased use by rights-holders of “call in” to radio shows to voice their opinion. More people practice their citizenship – demonstrations and increased interest of collective activism, including more women claim to be (feminists and more people show up at social mobilisation and support gender equality in social media.; More people can publicly show their support for an opposition political party.	Rights-holder act on their increased awareness	CAICC, FORCOM, Fórum Mulher ,OE	National, provincial and district 2012 2013
I	OC	Contributing to the Taxation of international mining companies	Duty-bearers adopting regulation, and consequently private sector actors	IESE	National 2012
I	OC	Influencing the process of the development of the Lei da Participação Pública	Duty-bearers open to dialogue with CS	OAM	National 2012
I	OC	IETE approves Mozambique’s report	GoM has reported to IETE as a result of the pressure of CS.	IESE	National 2012
I	(OC)	Invitation by the Council of Ministers to hold lecture on extractive economy	Duty-bearer actively seeking CSO knowledge and closer cooperation as a result of knowledge on quality evidence based studies	IESE	National 2012
I	OC	Increased dialogue with local duty-bearers on budget	Duty-bearers more open to discuss budget	CESC	District 2012
O	(OC)	MoU between JOINT and IPAJ (Manica) for the defence on HRD, partnership signed between JOINT and Ministry of Justice	Duty-bearers in cooperation agreement on human rights issues with CSO	JOINT	National Provincial 2012
O	OC	Improved quality in the attention to survivors of GBV through approval of “Protocolo do atendimento integrado by the Ministers Council, and the establishment of 4 attending offices (2 by the government and 2 by CSOs)	Duty-bearers respond to claims related to GBV and women’s rights	Fórum Mulher	National 2012
O	(OC)	Technical working sessions carried out together with the technical group: Government, Parliament, Sector Private Sector, CSO	Duty-bearers and CS working together on technical matters	GDM	National 2012
O	(OC)	Partnership established with the Ministry of Women and Social Affairs and Plataforma de Protecção Social (PSCM-PS) in the coordinating council for basic social security, PS participation as technical advisor for the National Poverty Observatory through G20	Duty-bearers and CS working together on technical/analytical matters	PSCM-PS	National 2012
O	OC	Basic social protection pension raised from 130 to 250 Mt as a result of joint campaign with the Planning and Budget Commission of the Parliament and the Ministries of Finance and Planning and Development.	Duty-bearers respond to claims and change level of support to rights-holders	PSCM-PS	National 2012
O	OC	Introduction of LGBT issues and human rights in public and private	Duty-bearers aware on the rights allowing LGBT as an	LAMBDA	National 2012

ANNEX 6 – STOCKTAKING OF RESULTS

		curricula (schools)	issue		
D	OC	Council of Minister approved the National Plan for the advancement of Children	Duty-bearers respond to claims and adopt national plan	Rede Criança, Rede Came	National 2012
D	OC	Three district in Zambézia (Mopeia, Maganja da Costa, Gilé) include in their plans elements to address visual deficiency	Duty-bearers respond to claims and adopt improvement fo discriminated righs.holders	ACAMO	District 2012
D	OC	Sensitization campaigns about blindness resulting in rightgs-holder identified; tecnichal support provided to visually impaired students, medical attention and prevention work; enrollment of students to blind parents; (57 children); INEFP introduced methods to train blind people and organized two courses targeted to this group in informatics and human resources management; 20 university students trained in braille informatics after the setting up of in Beira of a center of informatics for visually impaired people..	Duty-bearers improve rights for people living with disabilities, righs-holder increase access to basci rights	ACAMO	National Provincial 2012
W	(OC)	Shift in approach of the signatories of the Project ProSavana	Increased transparency on behalf of the duty-bearers though still difficult to access information	UNAC, ORAM and other	National 2012

IO	Type of result	Result description	Actors with changed behaviour/relations	Partners	Level of intervention and year
W	OP	Data collection and report on the consequences of mining projects in Tete.	Awareness raising towards rights-holders	UPCT, CAFOD	Provincial 2013
W	OP	Awareness raising towards 11 community forums about ProSavana and producers associations, leading to 19 activists ready to monitor ProSavana	Awareness raising towards rights-holders	Livaningo. ADELNA	Provincial 2013
W	OP	3000 simplified brochures over the land legislation produced in local languages (Macua, Xangana e Ndau) and distributed.	Awareness raising towards rights-holders	CFJJ	National 2013
I	OP	Information on the advantages on transparency and access to information to combat corruption, etc.	Awareness raising targeting rights-holders	CODD; Parlamento Juvenil; CESC; CEC; GDI	National, provincial, district 2013
I	OP	The rights to information in local languages	Awareness raising/conference	CEC	2013
M	OP	Popular demonstration against the kidnappings in Mozambique, political-military crisis, with 40k participants	Awareness rising	LDH and others	National 2013
W	OP	Knowledge over land rights increased in the communities, local authori-	Awareness raising targeting rights-holders, duty-	JA, CTV	Provincial

ANNEX 6 – STOCKTAKING OF RESULTS

		ties and civil society more aware about land management.	bearers and civil society		District 2013
I	OP	Distribution of information on legal and institutional aspects of the Access to Information law (if approved) to Election Committees among others	Awareness raising targeting mainly duty-bearers	CODD; Parlamento Juvenil; CESC; CEC; GDI	National, provincial and district 2013
W	OP	7 natura resource committees formed in Topuito, Moma, and Nampula, recognized by the district authorities.			District 2013
W	OP	Land recovery, land registration.		AAJC, ORAM	Provincial District 2013
W	OP	Several demonstrations defending the rights of the communities of Cateme, Moatize, and others in the region of forest exploitation in Nlassa.	Rights-holders protesting manifesting their increased awareness	Several CSOs	2012 2013
W	OP	Agreement to include local development plans in the investment plans of Kenmare in Moma.		AENA	District 2013
W	OP	Increased capacity (more para-legal) to provide legal assistance to communities to defend their land right and natural resources	Rights-holders access to legal support increased.	AAAJC	District 2013
W	OP	The existence, enurance and development of CS plataforms: i) Plataforma Nacional de Recursos Naturais e Indústria Extractiva; ii) Fórum Nacional de Consulta sobre Terras; iii) Plataforma da Sociedade Civil para Mudanças Climáticas; iv) Grupos Temáticos de Discussão sobre o ProSavana	Civil society able to coordinate and advocate through thematic platforms	We Effect	National Provincial 2013 2012
W	OP	Pauta Reivindicativa sobre o ProSavana, presented to the government of Japan which led to delay of the conclusion of the head plan, and increased resistance from local communities in relation to the project.	Civil society engaged in alliances with international, Brazilian and Japanese CSOs, international and national media coverage	UNAC	National Provincial 2012
I	OP	CS input to the revision of the Constitution; Comissão Ad Hoc da Assembleia da República (issues on specific rights, transparency and rule of law)	Input partly considered (not assessed as an outcome yet)	GDI	National 2012-2013
O	OP	Budget tracking public expenses implemented		CIP, Magariro, Estamos, Facilidade	National Provincial 2013
O	OP	Round table discussions on sustainable municipal budget		RUTH	Provincial 2013
O	OP	Budget analysis on the general state budget (Conta Geral do Estado)	Network effort	CIP, Fórum da Monitoria do Orçamento	National 2013
O	OP	Debate on the situation on the civil society (Conferência Nacional das OSC)	Network effort, focus ion CS	JOINT, WLSA	National 2013

ANNEX 6 – STOCKTAKING OF RESULTS

M	OP	Human rights conference	Networking	JOINT, CESC, CEMO, LDH	National 2013
O	OP	Performance study on the Parliament published and distributed		GMD	National 2013
O	OP	Strategy development; Development Observatory Platform, regarding Guião dos Observatórios de Desenvolvimento	Networking, articulation and coordination	GMD	National 2013
O	OP	Seminar on water and sanitation to increase the awareness on the importance of the issue	Networking, awareness raising CS and rights holders	Fórum Mulher	National 2013
O	OP	Participation in provincial and regional civil society platforms	Networking	Magariro, Akilizetho, GMD	Provincial 2013
O	OP	Establishment of six networks DSR, rastreio de de despesas públicas, rede da zona centro, Plataforma Provincial de Nampula, rede de monitoria de protocolos da SADC e da UA, incluindo de direitos humanos e rede de ONGs no Niassa)	Networking	Akilizetho e Facilidade, CIP, Estamos, Magariro, Joint, CEMO	Provincial district 2013
M	OP	Shadow report to African Charter on the Human Rights		JOINT, CESC, CEMO, LDH	National 2013
D	OP	56 teachers in Niassa trained in braille writing to allow them to better interact with blind students		ACAMO	Provincial 2013
D	OP	Contribution to the “Gender, Family and related issues” delivered to the Parliament and included in the constitution revision.		MULEIDE	National 2013
D	OP	Asentinel post created at Hospital José Macamo to monitor the quality of service delivery in the context of the enforcement of the right of access to education	Mechanisms of governance monitoring based on human-rights in the area of fight against corruption and access to health	LDH	District 2013
D	OP	Mechanisms for joint monitoring and local forum to discuss monitoring results established and functioning in 4 districts: Marromeu, Angoche, Jangamo e Zavala.	Monitoring mechanism in place	CEDE	District 2012 2013
D	OP	Mechanism for dialogue Government-youth organizations from districts established in Niassa, resulting from a lobbying exercise.	Mechanism for dialogue in place	PJ	Provincial district 2013
D	OP	Through LFC hotline (Linha Fala Criança), 312 victims assisted, 293 cases received advisory and 83 reported to public authorities (	Service to rights-holders	Rede Came	National 2013
O	OP	Advocacy for submission on report to African Charter on Human Rights		JOINT, PNDH, CEMO	National 2012
I	OP	Impact study on digital migration		FORCOM, CEC	National 2012
I	OP	Increased knowledge among officials on access to information as a human right and their responsibilities in enabling access to information	Awareness raising targeting duty-bearers	AMCS	Provincial 2012
I	OP	First study published in the country on national public and private powers	Awareness raising targeting rights-holders	CESAB	National

ANNEX 6 – STOCKTAKING OF RESULTS

		and bigger companies active in the exploitation of natural resources.			2012
I	OP	Permanent Observatory established for the Judicial Systems	Mechanism that will enable monitoring of the non-formal justice system (affecting 50% of the population)	CESAB	National 2012
I	OP	Monitoring mechanisms established in 6 districts on health and education issues	Increased awareness on their responsibilities among duty-bearers	CESC	District 2012
I	OP	Level of satisfaction of garbage services in municipalities in Maputo assessed	Awareness raising targeting rights-holders	GDI	Municipality 2012
I	OP	Development of “closer coordination strategy” to the LCC and to the provincial assembly of Zambézia		Kukumbi	Provincial District 2012
O	OP	Reports on satisfaction with health service provision, budget monitoring in 12 districts, simplified information material on district budgets.	Awareness raising targeting rights-holders and duty-bearers, production on evidence based data	CIP, GMD	District 2012
M	OP	Parallel studies on the progress of Mozambique in relation to ITIE para discussão com o governo no âmbito da avaliação do progresso de Moçambique no cumprimento do ITIE	Production of evidence based studies for advocacy	CIP, IESE e UNAC	National 2012
O	OP	Coordination of the CS for joint position in relation to DO	Networking	GMD	National 2012
O	OP	Studies published on women in prison, study on SRHR	Evidence based awareness raising	WLSA; CEMO	National 2012
O	OP	Women rights-holders received training on decision-making	Awareness raising targeting rights-holders	Akilizetho	District 2012
O	OP	Study on the level of application of the domestic violence legislation in provincial courts of Maputo Província, Maputo Cidade, Sofala e Cabo Delgado	Evidence based awareness raising	Fórum Mulher	Provincial 2012
O	OP	GBV training to the police, health staff and members of Ministério Público e do Judiciário	Awareness raising targeting duty-bearers	WLSA	National 2012
O	OP	Awareness raising meeting with members of the municipal parliaments (Zambézia, Niassa e Cabo Delgado. Foram sensibilizadas 202 pessoas no total, dos quais 49 mulheres e 153 homens)	Awareness raising targeting duty-bearers	Fórum Mulher	Provincial 2012
O	OP	5 debates on the revision of the constitution in 5 provinces		CEMO	Provincial 2012
O	OP	Manifesto Político das Mulheres elaborated	Advocacy instrument	Various	National 2012
O	OP	Dialogue with communities on HIV and Aids	Awareness raising targeting rights-holders	N'Weti	District 2012
W	OP	Community training of para-legals (Cateme, Capanga em Tete; Sangaje e Topuito em Nampula) contributing to increased capacity to negotiate with investors	Awareness raising towards rights-holders, incipient results	CFJJ	District 2012
O	OP	Dialogue and campaign on	Awareness raising targeting CS, duty-bearers	LAMBDA	National 2012
D	OP	Political parties in Manica more aware of how to transform their electoral manifestos into concrete plans and budgets as the result of training	Awareness raising targeting duty-bearers	AWEPA	Provincial 2012

ANNEX 6 – STOCKTAKING OF RESULTS

D	OP	Members of the planning and budget committee (17) and other committees (14), and committee technical staff (9) involved in the oversight of public and external resources; improved their oversight skills	Awareness raising targeting duty-bearers	AWEPA	National 2012
D	OP	Provincial Government, Assemblies and other political actors more aware about their competencies and roles resulting from two seminar on the interaction between the provincial assemblies and other actors organized by AWEPA	Awareness raising targeting duty-bearers	AWEPA	Provincial 2012
O	OP	Local council established (Povoação, Localidade e Posto Administrativo) able to represent citizens interest and influence the PESOD's	Mechanisms in place for rights-holders influence	Akilizetho	Provincial 2012
D	OP	Quarterly meetings established in the Women and Social Welfare Directorate to discuss the problems of handicapped people	Mechanism in place	ACAMO	Provincial 2012
M	OP	Creation of resettlement commissions in Bairro 25 de Junho, Moatize and commission of the community of Cateme, to voice affected families interests;	Mechanism in place	LDH, AAJC, UPCT	Provincial 2012
W	OP	Community land certificates delivered to 16 communities in Niassa; 16 land and natural resource management committees formed, Simplified land inventory in place covering 77.430,7 hectares of community land. Additional 66.5 hectares for 4 farmer's associations	Increased security and land rights to small holder farmers (increased awareness among farmers rights-holders)	ORAM	District 2012
D	OP	Youth Electoral Manifesto, to supervise the 2013 elections, after seven district conferences on democracy and governance to promote the involvement of the youth in building the democracy		Parlamento Juvenil	National 2012
D	OP	48 teacher trained in Manica and Gaza provinces were trained to be able to deal with blind students		ACAMO	Provincial 2012
W	OP	The first annual report over monitoring good governance of Natural Resource Management in Mozambique.		CTV	National 2012
W	OP	Campanha Terra II, promoting a just, equal and sustainable development, and respect for the Land legislation CEDET		CTV, KUWUKA JDA,	National 2012



Evaluation of thematic results achieved and demonstrated within the Programa de Acções para uma Governação Inclusiva e Responsável - AGIR

AGIR is a five year accountability programme funded by Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands that supports Mozambican civil society. The evaluation takes stock of the results from four thematic sub-programmes and assesses the fitness-for-purpose of the applied results frameworks. The issues of relevance and effectiveness are in focus and these aspects are assessed from a human rights-based approach. The evaluation concludes that AGIR is a relevant and much needed support to Mozambican civil society and that it enables civil society to advocate for rights, accountability and transparency. The thematic sub-programmes have achieved many results at output level but the partnering organisations have had difficulties in demonstrating changes at outcome level. This is partly due to the inapt results frameworks. The management of results has been a major challenge for the involved actors in the programme. The evaluators found that AIR has contributed to create behaviour changes among duty-bearers and thus conditions for future changes at outcome level.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

