



2014:38

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Alf Persson
Ludmila Ceban
Camille Pellerin

Evaluation of “Leaders Engaged in New Democracies Network (LEND)”

Final Report

Evaluation of “Leaders Engaged in New Democracies Network (LEND)”

**Final Report
August 2014**

**Alf Persson
Ludmila Ceban
Camille Pellerin**

Authors: Alf Persson, Ludmila Ceban and Camille Pellerin

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 2014:38

Commissioned by Sida, Department for International Organisations and Policy Support, Unit for Democracy and Human Rights

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: August 2014

Published by Citat 2014

Art. no. Sida61767en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61767en

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 content

Table of content	6
Abbreviations and Acronyms	8
Preface.....	10
Executive Summary	11
1 Background and method.....	16
2 The evaluated intervention	21
3 Looking back.....	28
4 Conclusions and lessons learned	36
5 Looking ahead	42
Annex 1 – ToR.....	47
Annex 2 – List of documents	51
Annex 3 – List of interviewees.....	52
Annex 4 – Method	55
Annex 5 – CdM Application LFA/Results Matrix	62

Abbreviations and Acronyms

CdM	Club de Madrid [para la Transición y Consolidación Democráticas]
CD	Community of Democracies
F2F	Face-To-Face
LEND	Leaders Engaged in New Democracies
ToR	Terms of Reference

Preface

This evaluation was contracted by Sida through the Framework Agreement for Sida Reviews, Evaluations and Advisory Services on Results Frameworks and conducted by SIPU International. The evaluation team consist of the Team Leader Alf Persson and evaluators Ludmila Ceban and Camille Pellerin.

The findings of the report are entirely the responsibility of the team and cannot be taken as expression of official Sida policies or viewpoints.

Executive Summary

This evaluation has been commissioned by Sida, with the purpose to assess and analyse the achievements of the project, as well as to make recommendations regarding the effectiveness and usefulness of continued support.

LEND, Leaders Engaged in New Democracies, is a pilot initiative implemented by the Club de Madrid and the Community of Democracies, with support from the US State Department, Sida and a specialized Canadian IT company OpenText.

Its idea is to support the democratic transition in new democracies, initially Moldova and Tunisia, by connecting leaders in countries undergoing transition with leaders who have personally navigated the challenges of democratization, through face-to-face meetings and a social networking platform. LEND aims to provide peer advice, peer support and capacity building, through the following outputs.

1. Four (originally three) face-to-face meetings bringing together members of the Club de Madrid and participants of the LEND Network.
2. Development of a private, secure virtual online community of leaders.
3. Integration of tool sets to enable moderation functions and a hybrid of human and machine translation.
4. To provide the context for the creation of an active base of approximately 60 registered users from Tunisia, Moldova and former transition countries mainly in Eastern Europe as well as leaders and domain experts from Western Europe and North America.

The expected outcomes were:

1. Providing the necessary tools and convening power to build a sustainable and self-perpetuating community that operates largely in a virtual setting that is secure, exclusive, and dedicated to the purpose of sharing information about successful democratic transitions.
2. Enabling leaders without a common language to consult one another, seek advice, and exchange shared lessons on democratic transitions.
3. Facilitating leaders in the world's youngest democracies, initially in Tunisia and Moldova, with access to information that will enhance their knowledge and empower them as they seek to build stable, prosperous, democratic societies.

This evaluation covers the first phase of LEND from February 2012 to August 2013. Sida's contribution has been about 1.5 MSEK, about a third of the total cost, and concerned only the face-to-face meetings organized by Club de Madrid. However, the evaluation covers the whole project. A second one year phase is currently on-going with some new types of activities and an improved platform.

The main source of information for the evaluation has been structured interviews online, by telephone and face-to-face with about fifty beneficiaries from Tunisia and Moldova, advisors, experts, invitees, and involved staff from the implementers and donors, plus the limited written documentation available.

The main findings are:

The face-to-face meetings are useful, interesting and relevant, and address pertinent problems of transition in the two countries, not only issues and experiences, but also the practical political process, something which is unusual elsewhere. The participation and exchanges with Club de Madrid members (former presidents and prime ministers) were particularly appreciated and valuable. However, there is a lack of follow up and follow-through in moving from the more general to the more specific and concrete (and ultimately action).

The virtual platform has not lived up to expectations, and has been very little used, partly because of its design, but also because face-to-face interaction is much preferred. The envisaged advance translation tools proved to be unrealistically expensive and were not implemented.

The community (network) as such was considered valuable and useful, as evidence by the fact that almost all wanted to continue to be part of it. It had helped to widen their contacts, and to meet and exchange with world leaders that one ordinarily would rarely meet. Overall, the mix of people was considered good, but to some extent lacking real decision maker (although many advisors are members). There are currently around 30 members each from the two countries, and almost 80 advisors, but of which only some 20 active and involved.

The project management has been adequate, with well-organized meetings and logistics, with dedicated and hard-working staff. However, it could be improved, with better systemization, for example of monitoring, and more proactivity. It has been and still is a learning experience. LEND being a new, untested concept. The management structure is unnecessarily complicated, with somewhat unclear distributions of roles, responsibilities and authority.

Most beneficiaries felt that LEND had been useful to them personally and professionally, making them more effective in their work and action. Many also felt that LEND had contributed to promoting democratic transition, although there were only a few more concrete examples, notably in connection with the drafting of the new Tunisian constitution.

LEND has added value compared to other networks or initiatives. It is the only network specifically bringing together former and current leaders, experienced and inexperienced politicians and transition experts/advisors focusing not on the theory and

issues of transition per se but on the practical political process to address them in concrete and often real-time situations, being neutral and not having any own agenda.

The strong points are the exchanges with the CdM members, mentorship, the uniqueness of the network, and the focus on the practicalities of transition, and the F2F meetings.

The weak points are the platform, limited follow-up of meetings and follow-through on subjects, generality, lack of complementary focused meetings and activities, low frequency of meetings.

On balance, interviewees think that the strong points outweigh the weak points but that the full potential of LEND has yet to be realized. Only one or two respondents did not find LEND useful.

In conclusion:

The **Face-to-Face meetings** are **highly relevant** addressing real problems of transition in productive exchange between experienced and inexperienced practitioners. They are **efficient** in the sense that they have generated tangible benefits to emerging leaders as individuals and to some extent contributed to democratic transition at a cost that is in line with what typical high quality international meetings cost. They are **effective** in that they (as the dominant part of LEND activities) have contributed to **positive outcomes** for the emerging leaders in terms inter alia of increased knowledge and understanding of how to work with transition in practice as a political process; increased confidence and enthusiasm; widened network relationships; and/or better performance in advocating or implementing new ideas. It can be plausibly said that they have had an **immediate impact** in some cases through more direct contributions to the democratic transition.

The **virtual platform** has been only **marginally relevant**. It has **not been efficient** in generating tangible outcomes to LEND members because of the low utilisation and the high costs in comparison to the F2F meetings. This being said, the existence of a platform of some kind is necessary to hold together a network and keeping members updated on what is happening in LEND. The platform has fulfilled this function. It has **not been effective** in brokering advice, contacts and exchange within the LEND network. Beneficiaries much prefer direct contacts, and for virtual contact the media and channels already used daily such as smartphone, email, sms or Facebook.

The **LEND community/network** per se is **highly relevant**. It addresses practical issues and political processes involved in transition, bringing together emerging, inexperienced leaders and actors in transition countries, highly qualified advisors and experts, and experienced very high-level politicians. It is **efficient** in the sense that it only includes beneficiary members that are working directly or indirectly with transition in their countries, and focuses on practical transition and expressed needs of the members. The management cost of the network per se is small. It has been **effective** in gathering relevant and involved people and allowing them to interact positively and constructively in ways that are closely and directly related to practical transition challenges in Moldova and Tunisia.

LEND as a whole (in practice dominated by the F2F meeting component) has demonstrated **clear relevance**, evidenced by the affirmation of continued interest, involvement and appreciation by almost all interviewed members, and by engaging upon request in real-time support in important transition processes (in particular the drafting of the Tunisian constitution). Overall LEND in phase I is **partly efficient**. The F2F meetings are efficient, while the platform currently is not. LEND has been **effective** in strengthening the soft and hard capacity of beneficiary members to work for democratic transition, as evidenced by testimony of many of the interviewees, and to some extent in concretely promoting democratic transition. LEND as such is **not self-sustainable** without significant and indefinitely continued external financial and technical support for management of the network and implementation of activities.

The **outcome sustainability** of actions for democratic transition that LEND has contributed to is moot; in any case LEND does not follow through on them, and whether they succeed or not depends on external factors outside LEND, the vagaries of politics and government actions. This will of course always be the case, but as currently designed, LEND does not effectively contribute to increasing the chances of sustainable success.

In the Team's assessment, the main **lessons learned** are that while the pilot can be said to have achieved 'proof of concept', for LEND to reach its potential, particularly in view of possible extension to additional countries, requires significantly more analysis and study, and that a pilot should be configured to better observe the implementation and capture structured feedback, straight from the very beginning. In particular, the characteristics of the LEND target group, the role and design of the platform, and its relative importance compared to F2F meetings could have been more thoroughly studied early on.

The **main recommendation** for LEND with a view to future extension to other countries is to elaborate a more thorough and complete design based on a 'theory of change' (or intervention logic) that leads on much further on the way to concrete actions on the ground and impact. In addition, project organization steering and management should be more systematic and rationalized, and more unified. The mix and relative importance of face-to-face meetings of various kinds versus virtual channels should be carefully revisited, and the platform concept reviewed on a 'zero basis'. How to increase the involvement of Club de Madrid members and make it more systematic should be explored.

The Team is of the opinion that an application for further support from Sida merits serious consideration, but that a number of aspects need to be considered.

Most importantly, LEND has to provide significant added value to Sida. In the Team's view, this will *only* be the case if LEND in a more structured manner leads to elaboration of concrete support activities that Sida could subsequently support, for example through a grant fund mechanism.

The other recommendations largely reflect the LEND recommendations above, that the design of a future project, which is no longer a pilot, needs more thorough preparation; that a project should be unified with pooled funding; that project steering and management should be unified and rationalized; that some more staff resources are

needed for more proactive involvement with beneficiaries; and that monitoring, particularly of indications of concrete effects on transition, is required.

1 Background and method

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Swedish Government has a Strategy for special initiatives for democratization and freedom of expression that aims to strengthen actors for change working for increased democratization and freedom of expression. This strategy also allows taking risks, for example by supporting innovative approaches.

In January 2012, Sida received a project proposal, passed on from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, from Club de Madrid (CdM) to support a project under the special initiative entitled ‘Leaders Engaged in New Democracies (LEND)’¹, with the specific request to finance initially two, finally four, face-to-face (F2F) meetings bringing together and engaging (as one participant put it) “experienced politicians with inexperienced politicians”, other actors from Moldova and Tunisia, as well as transition experts in various sectors from other countries. Although the request to Sida only concerned the F2F meetings, the project also includes an equally important virtual online social media/workspace or platform² for sustaining and facilitating exchange within a LEND community. The platform has been financed and supported by the US State Department, Office of the Senior Advisor to the Secretary for Civil Society and Emerging Democracies, via the Community of Democracies (CD). In addition, the commercial supplier of the platform, OpenText, has contributed in kind a significant part of the development and maintenance costs.

The subsequently agreed and twice amended Sida support covered the first phase of LEND from February 2012 to the end of August 2013.³ A second one-year phase followed more or less immediately, but without Sida funding. Further continuation is being mooted, possibly including extension to other transition countries.

This evaluation has been commissioned by Sida, with the purpose to assess and analyse the achievements of the project, as well as to make recommendations regarding

¹ Sometimes variously called Leaders Engaged in New Democracies/LEND Platform or LEND Network. Here just the moniker LEND will be used.

² Here the term ‘platform’ will be used

³ With respect to the Sida support, the first phase ended in December 2013 (including no-cost extension), but since the last financed activity took place in August 2013, there is no practical discrepancy.

the effectiveness and usefulness of a continued support. Although Sida only financed the F2F meetings, the CdM application included the whole project. The evaluation commissioned by Sida covers Phase I of the whole project.

Club de Madrid⁴ is an independent non-profit organisation formed in 2001, full members of which are almost 100 democratic former presidents and prime ministers from around the world. It aims to support active leaders in democratic leadership and governance and in responding to crisis and post-crisis situations. A General Secretariat in Madrid manages day-to-day operations.

The **Community of Democracies** is a global intergovernmental coalition founded in 2000 of currently some 100 states bringing together governments, civil society and the private sector to support strengthen democratic rule, norms and institutions around the world. It uses a mechanism of working groups to manage its activities, but since 2009 there is also a permanent secretariat based in Warsaw.⁵

OpenText is a large Canadian company specialised in enterprise information management systems, working around the world. Its roots go back to the 1990s at the University of Waterloo.

The evaluation took place between January and May 2014, and included visits to the CdM secretariat in Madrid as well as to Chisinau and Tunis. An Inception report was submitted to Sida on February 12, 2014. Due to a fortuitous coincidence, it was possible for the Team leader to attend and experience the first F2F meeting of the second phase in Madrid.

1.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The main objectives of the evaluation as per the ToR are:

- i. To assess and analyse the achievements of the project in relation to the outcomes and results framework established. Assess and analyse the outcomes of the project in terms of improvements in capacity, attitudes, relationships and performance of the targeted stakeholders;
- ii. Identify and describe strengths and weaknesses in the strategies/approaches taken and in the planning, implementation and monitoring of the program. Describe problems and solutions to these sought by the program. Summarise lessons.

⁴ Formally Club de Madrid para la Transición y Consolidación Democráticas. Also uses the Brand World Leadership Alliance – Club de Madrid. See www.clubmadrid.org

⁵ See www.community-democracies.org

iii. To assess and issue recommendations regarding the effectiveness and usefulness of a continued support to the project.

The evaluation should also include, but not necessarily be limited to, the issues and questions presented below.

- i. Comment on and analyse sustainability of the impact and outcomes observed. Enabling and disabling factors;
- ii. Comment on and analyse the project's gender equality perspective.

1.3 APPROACH TO EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

Evaluation Objective 1: achievements in relation to the outcomes and results framework.

The LFA matrix in the application and agreement with Sida has defined overall objective/impact and specific objectives/outcomes. The overall objective can be summarised as that leaders in Moldova and Tunisia should be receiving quantifiable assistance, advice and experiences-sharing from those who have previously navigated the challenge of democratisation, through F2F meeting and through the platform.

The specific objectives/outcomes of the project in the LFA and narrative text can be summarised as follows (there is some variation in formulation within the application):

- 1) A sustainable and self-perpetuating community that operates largely in a virtual setting but also in F2F meetings.
- 2) Means for leaders without a common language to consult one another, through a hybrid human/machine and translation system (using 'state of art translation' technologies)
- 3) Provide leaders in the youngest democracies (initially Tunisia and Moldova) with access to information that will enhance their knowledge and empower them to build stable, prosperous and democratic societies

With the corresponding outputs/expected results:

- 1) Four (initially three) F2F meetings bringing together CdM members and LEND participants
- 2) A private, secure virtual online community of leaders
- 3) Integration of tools to enable moderation functions and a hybrid human and machine translation
- 4) An active base of circa 60 users in Tunisia and Moldova, as well as other transition/democratizing countries, together with leaders and domain experts from other countries

From a practical point of view, the evaluation will deal with these as follows:

- The relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and outcome/immediate impact of the F2F meetings
- The relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and outcome/immediate impact of the Platform (including translation)
- The relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of the community per se (within or without the two channels). Although this aspect is not explicitly mentioned in the ToR, we think it is pertinent, as the network is or could be quite distinct from the two channels tried out so far; once contacts have been established they can very well continue through other channels, one-to-one or grouped. Have (all) the right people been invited; are (all) the beneficiaries in the network right people (i.e. leaders, policy makers or influencers) and the advisors/experts pertinent as leaders with relevant own experience or subject knowledge?

Evaluation Objective 2: Strengths and weaknesses in approach and management of LEND.

The CdM application from late 2011 does not mention the CD as a partner, only OpenText, for the simple reason that the CD and its Secretariat only became operationally involved somewhat later in March 2012. Although the agreement with Sida was subsequently amended twice to allow for two additional F2F meetings, the project document was not otherwise revised to reflect this and other significant changes in the project concerning the translation facility. In practice, CD has managed the platform and overall activities, while CdM has organised and managed the F2F meetings. The evaluation has taken this into account, and interviewed both organisations.

Evaluation Objective 3: Assessment and recommendations regarding usefulness of continued support

Phase 2 is ongoing with support mainly from the US State Department. Assuming the impact as evidenced from interviews with beneficiaries is substantial, an important element will be whether this type of network has significant added value that other means of experience sharing do not have.

Questions of particular interest

1. *Sustainability of the impact and outcomes observed.* The beneficiaries in Moldova and Tunisia are involved in various ways in a process to promote a democratic transition, and it is of course not possible at this early stage, if at all, to assess sustainability and outcome in the larger context of democratization. What can be assessed is whether the network is sustainable, dynamic and productive, i.e. can keep participants, attract relevant new ones, supply advice and other support that is perceived as being useful, and show at least anecdotal evidence of concrete achievements pertinent to the democratization process by participants based on the network support.
2. *Gender equality perspective.* This will be looked at from two aspects. The first is about basic balance, i.e. the number of male/female participants, advisors and

other experts, and their respective intensity of involvement. The second is about issues, i.e. to what extent have topics discussed at F2F meetings and/or on the Platform included a gender perspective; and to what extent has gender equality or differential reform impact directly been subject of advice sought or discussion.

1.4 METHOD

The written documentation from LEND phase I is limited. Almost all information for the evaluation has been gathered from interviews, both telephone and (more extensive) direct interviews, using a set of questions as interview guide. All in all some 47 people have been interviewed, beneficiary members in Moldova and Tunisia as well as advisors and experts, CdM members, CD and CdM staff and donor representatives. See Annex 4 for more details.

2 The evaluated intervention

2.1 GENESIS

The starting point for LEND was the realization that activists and emerging new leaders in transition countries did not have any easy and rapid way to identify, make contact with and get advice from counterparts in other countries with real hands-on experience from transitions, and that the rapid development of social media provided a potential means to create and sustain such a network of experienced and inexperienced actors, and channel advice and support rapidly, conveniently and at a low cost. This concept was initially conceived and developed by the US State Department's Office of the Senior Advisor to the Secretary for Civil Society and Emerging Democracies, who initiated discussions with OpenText to design such a virtual platform, and with Club de Madrid to implement the complementary F2F meetings which had the intention to kick-start the network and introduce the platform. The platform was thus originally the key element. In the course of other meetings, Sweden (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) was asked if they might be interested in financing this basically political initiative, with the result that CdM was invited to prepare and submit in November 2011 a project application to Sida originally intended to cover both the platform and the F2F meeting costs. However, Sida was only willing to consider the F2F meeting component costs. In March 2012, the US Secretary of State and the Estonian Foreign Minister announced that they would co-chair a working group within the CD to support LEND. The US State Department took on the financing of the OpenText platform as well as CD LEND management support costs. This evolving initiative/project financing and setup explains the rather unconventional project management arrangements with multiple actors, the effects of which are assessed further below-

2.2 THE PROJECT COMPONENTS

As mentioned above, the overall project in Phase I basically consists of three components, the F2F meetings, the platform (including the translation facility) and the community/network per se.

2.2.1 The F2F meetings

Four F2F meetings were organised in Phase I by CdM, 1 in Chisinau, 2 in Tunis and one in Stockholm.

Each meeting typically lasts 1 or 1.5 days, and brings together a variable number of beneficiaries from Tunisia, Moldova or both, plus typically 2 CdM members and 3-4 experts. There are 3-4 topical sessions with a moderator consisting of a presentation by an expert, followed by comments from the CdM members as respondents, and then comments and questions from the beneficiaries to the CdM members, to the ex-

perts and to colleagues from the other country (as the case may be). Time is also allotted for out-of-plenum informal discussions at breaks, meals and social events. Total number of participants has varied from meeting to meeting, but is typically around 30, with somewhat more than half being actual beneficiary members. The Stockholm meeting have also had live video streaming via Spontania allowing listening in and watching by LEND members at home or even participation in discussions (as was the case in the phase 2 F2F meeting in Madrid). Simultaneous translation services have been provided for participants not sufficiently comfortable with English.

1. In the first meeting in Chisinau in October 2012, the topics discussed where:
 - i. Local Governance
 - ii. Public Administration and Justice Sector Reform
 - iii. Security Sector Reform

Only Moldovan beneficiaries attended.

2. In the **second meeting** in Tunis in January 2013, the topics were:
 - i. Political Reforms and Good Governance
 - ii. Economic Reforms and Social Inclusive Development
 - iii. Transitional Justice

Only Tunisian beneficiaries attended.

3. In the **third meeting** Stockholm in April 2013, the topics were
 - i. The Role of Judiciary Reform and Transitional Justice
 - ii. The role of Democracy in Economic Development
 - iii. Government Change and Coalition Building in crisis situations

Both Moldovan and Tunisian beneficiaries participated.

In addition a session was devoted to debriefing on the LEND platform pilot phase and how to improve it for the users.

This was supposed to be the final meeting, but at request from Tunisian participants a fourth F2F meeting was organised to specifically address priority issues related to the ongoing drafting of the new Tunisian constitution.

4. In the **fourth meeting** in Tunis in August 2013, the topics were:
 - i. Division of competencies and power between the President and Prime Minister
 - ii. Human Rights: How to secure universal principles of Human Rights in the Constitution in light of the International Conventions

- iii. Final Adoption of a Constitution: difficulties, managing conflicts and consensus building

This meeting was attended by Tunisian LEND members as well as invited members and leaders of the main political parties. Three Moldovan LEND members participated as experts.

In addition, during Phase 1 several LEND participants were invited to various events organised or co-organised by CD. In Phase 2 CD started to organise more specialised workshops/seminars/trainings, based on feedback and requests from beneficiaries. The first one was held in Bratislava in November 2013 on the subject of political negotiations in the framework of transitional society changes, with participants from both Moldova and Tunisia, and another one on e-government was held in Tallinn in May 2014. CdM has organised so far one ‘traditional’ F2F meeting in Madrid in January 2014.

2.2.2 The Platform

The first version of the platform was launched in connection with the first F2F meeting in Chisinau in October 2012 and second meeting in Tunis in January 2013. Features were selected based inter alia on a survey of LEND members regarding desired characteristics. OpenText staff were present to introduce, explain and guide participants on the use of the platform.

OpenText has considerable experience in developing and setting up virtual social workspaces, in secure environments (they do it for G20 meetings). The inspiration for the LEND platform has been the Public Service Without Borders, A secure, cloud-enabled collaboration and social media environment especially developed by OpenText together with the Institute of Public Administration of Canada, with the purpose to enable public servants to engage with peers.⁶

The LEND platform which is accessed through login/password on the LEND network website, has a ‘smorgasbord’ of tools that members can use as they wish, including video conferencing facility offered by Spontania⁷. Tools as of end 2013 include blog; calendar; file/document, idea, photo, podcast, video and presentation libraries; wikis; forum; video link; Google translate; status postings. Subsequently, a Facebook page and closed group was created towards the end of phase I and in (in phase 2) webinars introduced using Google YouTube. Newsletters are another addition and are quite

⁶ www.pswb.net

⁷ www.spontania.com, now owned by ClearOne, previously by Dialcom (hence the reference to Dialcom in LEND documents)

frequent (almost 50 issued up to end 2013). There are also 22 ‘communities’ for topical discussions for interested members, such as accountability and governance, constitutional reform, security sector reform etc., as well as a general LEND network one, and special ones for video conferences and F2F meetings.

OpenText emphasizes that the environment is quite secure, unlike many social media, although this may not apply to the same degree to the Google translate, Facebook and YouTube tools.

The originally envisaged ambitious translation facility proved quite early on in 2012 to be highly unrealistic, feasible in principle, but at an exorbitant cost (something like 2-3 times the cost of all the rest of LEND, according to OpenText’s estimate). For this reason it was never implemented, and instead replaced by access to Google translate from the LEND environment (but as mentioned earlier this change was never reflected in the project agreement with Sida).

Based on feedback and suggestions from users, OpenText has for Phase II been developing an improved version 2 of the platform with easier and more convivial access and utilization. This would also include access via smartphones. It is not known at time of writing (May 2014) whether this second version is fully operational.

The Platform is maintained by OpenText, and administered by the CD secretariat. As of early 2014, there were 157 registered users on the platform, consisting of 145 advisers and beneficiaries from Tunisia and Moldova, as well as some CdM members. In addition, the concerned project staff at CdM and CD also have access. See further below regarding the network.

2.2.3 The network

Initially the State Department took the initiative to identify potential members for the network, beneficiaries in Tunisia and Moldova as well as advisers and experts from transition and OECD/non transition countries. US embassies in Eastern Europe and elsewhere were asked to assist in identifying names. Later on both CdM and CD have also used their extensive contacts around the world and in the two target countries to find suitable candidates. CdM also canvassed its membership to identify members who were interested and available to contribute their time and experience. There are, for example, as of April 2014 five candidates from various Tunisian political parties under consideration for membership. It seems there was quite a lot of discussion and reflection on what type of persons, personalities and profiles that would both benefit from and contribute to the network, but the criteria and rationale for selection have not been systematised or documented.

The following is the membership as reflected in registered users of the platform at the end of 2013:

Registered users	Male	Female	Total
CdM members	9	4	13
Advisers from transition countries	42	11	53
Advisers from Western Europe/North America	16	7	23
Target beneficiaries from Tunisia:	25	8	33
• Government	12	3	15
• Civil Society/think tanks/academia	13	5	18
Target beneficiaries from Moldova:	25	10	35
• Government	15	7	22
• Civil Society/think tanks/academia	10	3	13
TOTAL	117	40	157

The 76 advisors come from 21 different countries. However, according to CD only about 20 are “active” and they tend to be from former transition countries in Eastern Europe.

2.3 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

As already hinted, the project management structure is rather complicated. While Sida is engaged as a traditional donor financing a project based on an application, i.e. not involved in the design or implementation per se, the State Department has played a much more active role, particularly in the beginning in relation to network recruitment and specifications for the platform. Even now the State Department (through the US co-chair foreign affairs officer) is actively following and supporting the implementation with ideas and advice to the CD secretariat. At the same time LEND is supposed to be steered by a working group consisting of some 20 members. However, in practice the working group is not involved or active, except individually the two foreign affairs desk officers from the Estonian Foreign Ministry and US State Department representing the US and Estonian co-chairs. At the same time the permanent secretariat under the CD Secretary General is tasked with implementing the project, at least as far as platform administration and non F2F meetings and activities are concerned, reporting to the State Department and the co-chairs.

CD has contracts with OpenText and Spontania, although the arrangements with both companies were made by the State Department. CD receives all its LEND funding from the State Department.

In parallel, the CdM organizes the F2F meetings, receives funding from and reports to Sida.

The respective roles, responsibilities and functions of these various actors are not clearly delineated, codified or documented.

In practice, CdM and CD work closely hand-in-hand with the F2F meetings, in particular concerning the topics, choice of experts and IT/video facilities.

CD has one project officer working full time on LEND since October 2012, and since January 2014 (i.e. in Phase 2) a part-time program coordinator. CdM has had a program coordinator nominally on 1/3 time, an administrative officer on 10% and the Secretary General on 10% as well as inputs from some others, in total equivalent to 55% of a full time post, as budgeted in the application to Sida. But as can be seen below from the budget expenditure, significantly more time has in fact been spent, and there have been both a program coordinator and program officer involved. In phase 2 the overall setup is somewhat clearer. All funding comes from the State Department to CD, and CdM is formally sub-contracted by CD to organize F2F meetings, with a memorandum of understanding describing respective responsibilities.

2.4 PROJECT BUDGET AND EXPENDITURE

According to data from CdM, the total cost of Phase I is about 2.5 MSEK, of which Sida funding amounts to 1.4 MSEK (about 97% of the Sida approved budget) and in-kind contribution by CdM (additional secretariat time) amounts to the 1.1 MSEK.

The average cost of a F2F meeting is thus about 625,000 SEK (or roughly € 71 000). According to data from the co-chairs and CD, the direct cost of the platform and CD project support and management in phase I has been about 1.6 MSEK. In addition, OpenText has estimated that they contributed additionally in kind (staff time) the equivalent of about 40%, or roughly 470 000 SEK for the development and implementation of the platform. The total cost of the platform in phase I is thus of the order of 1.6M SEK (roughly € 180 000). The average cost per target beneficiary in Moldova and Tunisia has thus been about 23 000 SEK (around € 2700).

Spontania provides its closed video rooms and technical services on a pro bono basis (equivalent value not known). Google donated 30 tablets in 2012 for new members of LEND. Facebook has not made any contributions.

All together the cost of phase I has been around 4.6 MSEK (or roughly € 520 000) OpenText is financing the version 2 of the platform in phase 2 on a pro bono basis, as well (so far) the maintenance of the platform. OpenText estimates the annual maintenance cost at about SEK 660 000 (US\$ 100 000)⁸

⁸ Exchange rates 1 € = SEK 8.83 and 1US\$ = SEK 6.56 have been used to convert to SEK as required

3 Looking back

Note: Replies taken into account below are those from beneficiaries, participants, advisors/experts and CdM members; not from project staff or donors (except where noted)

3.1 THE FACE-TO-FACE MEETINGS

All interviewees that took part find the F2F meetings useful, interesting and relevant. With some variation depending on personal subject interest, the four meetings were rated equally (attendance varied, some attended only one meeting, others 2-3 or even all). The choice of topics was generally –but not by all - considered apt, germane and responsive to the needs of the beneficiaries. Some felt that it was unclear how the agenda was set, to what extent the beneficiaries had been consulted and how responsive it was to their needs. By and large the length, format, number of sessions and topics; structure of the sessions; and involvement of experts, respondents and moderators were considered good. Some did however remark that it was impossible to go into sufficient detail for it to be really useful in such a short time. Many said that there was lack of follow up and follow-through to actually help make things happen in practice. Most stressed the importance of giving ample - and more - time to informal discussions one-on-one or ad hoc with a few colleagues and experts/CdM members during breaks or after the formal program. These were considered as useful and constructive as the formal parts of the program. Any tendency to use such time to compensate for time overruns in the plenary program should be resisted.

The involvement of CdM members was uniformly considered to be the highlight of the meetings, for several reasons. Especially for the younger and less experienced participants, the fact of being able to listen ‘live’ to and directly discuss with such personalities, ordinarily very difficult to get in contact with, was a great and enriching experience, both on a personal and professional level. To hear about how experienced politicians at the highest executive levels handled similar problems and issues in real life, considering all the challenges and constraints of practical politics practice, reflecting on what in hindsight went wrong and what worked gave food for thought when thinking on how to act and approach similar issues and situations at home, even though the specific contexts and preferences were different. Several interviewees added that the fact that CdM members took a direct interest and engaged in detailed discussions on how to respond to various situations or issues strengthened their confidence in what and how they themselves were doing to promote democratic transition.

Opinions on the level of generality and specificity of the subjects and discussions varied. While recognising that given the short time and varied interests of participants it is not possible to go into too much detail, many emphasised that there is a need to go further in order to make an impact - in actual political practice the details are very important for success. Many interviewees expressed the wish that LEND would follow-up with specialised more focused (and smaller) meetings on specific topics and sectors just for those working with these. Complementing this, several interviewees commented that intervals between F2F meetings were too long, resulting in loss of momentum and dynamics, and dissipating the enthusiasm generated from the interactions and direct face-to-face contacts at the meetings.

Opinions on the direct usefulness and relevance of mixed attendance with both Moldovan and Tunisian participants or 'one-country' meetings varied, given that they are at different stages of transition and priority issues may not always be the same at a given time. It depends on the subject and context. Only some subjects are of mutual interest. And only in some cases are respective experiences of interest to one or both. *All* interviewees said they preferred face-to-face direct contacts and interaction to virtual contact (on the platform). Virtual contact and exchange could also take place, as a complement or continuation, but only after first having met in person.

3.2 THE PLATFORM

3.2.1 Platform use

All registered users interviewed had basically the same response - most had tried it in the beginning but then used it infrequently, and sometimes not at all. To the extent that it was used, it was often to get news of what was happening in LEND. The most common reason given was that they were very busy people and lacked time, in essence that the time opportunity cost of using the platform was too high; use of the platform took time rather than saved time, for example in starting up the computer and logging in and then having to spend time clicking and searching for rather than receiving targeted information. Other common reasons were that it was not very convivial in its design and operation; had limited interest due to lack of content and activity; was a roundabout way of making contacts and communicating; was not a comfortable and natural way of contacting unknown advisors and users, especially regarding more sensitive subjects; did not use the media and channels they normally used anyway (such as email, sms, telephone, smartphone, Facebook⁹, Twitter, Skype). Some even said it was quicker and easier to ask the CD project staff rather than

⁹ A Facebook group was added at the end of phase 1, as a result of feedback from users.

search for an advisor or expert on the platform. Notwithstanding, some features were used to a certain extent, and appreciated, the document library, the general LEND community group and F2F meeting groups, and the newsletter (delivered by email). Many also liked the webinars (introduced in phase 2). This pattern is reflected in the platform usage statistics; views and visits, i.e. passive activities, dominate by far the (limited) actual usage. Active use, for example uploading/downloading documents, posting feed or comments, are an order of magnitude (or more) fewer, typically only numbering in the tens over about a year and a half.

Very few, almost none, of the beneficiaries had contacted advisors in the network via the platform or interacted with advisors through the platform, and none of the advisors interviewed had been contacted via the platform.

A feature is stressed in the various description of the platform is security, it is a secure environment. However, no interviewee mentioned this aspect spontaneously, and when some were asked whether this was important, the reply was no, convenience of other channels far outweighed lesser security, and in any case really sensitive matters would only be discussed directly face-to-face.

However, nobody suggested that the platform should be scrapped, and several qualified their somewhat negative response with a comment that the platform idea is good, even very good, and could have potential. But all preferred by far F2F and physical meetings and direct contacts, in general but especially for first contacts.

3.2.2 Translation

Nobody was aware of the original idea of a ‘ground-breaking’ document/text translation facility in the platform. Some were aware that Google translate was available via the LEND portal, but in any case this could not be relied on for technical translations. Nobody thought that the lack of this facility in the platform was an issue or problem¹⁰, as they were sufficiently comfortable with English, at least for reading. The only important document translation mentioned concerned the draft Tunisian constitution, which was professionally translated (outside the platform) in order to allow the Moldovan counterparts to comment on it. Translation/interpretation at meetings was useful and needed.

3.3 THE NETWORK

In response to the question whether all or most of the relevant people in Tunisia and Moldova respectively had been invited to join, most thought so, recognising that it

¹⁰ As opposed to translation/interpretation at meetings.

might not be realistic to invite everybody, and also that the mix people was generally good. Some regretted the lack of real decision makers, while recognising that it is difficult to get them to participate without special arrangements, and suggested to also include people at the operational level to facilitate inter-ministerial cooperation in absence of the always busy higher level people. It was also noted by a couple of respondents that people from the private sector, unions and professional associations and the social/education sectors were generally missing. Some also remarked about apparent confusion by some political party invitees at Tunis meetings whether they were there in their own right or just as representatives of their organisations.

Several interviewees mentioned that the network had given them the opportunity to meet interesting, relevant and potentially useful people that they normally or otherwise would not come into contact with, particularly people outside their countries. For some of the younger participants, this also applied to people inside their country. With only one or two exceptions, all interviewed, beneficiaries as well as advisers and experts, were willing to continue with LEND, and several added that extending the network to other transition countries would be positive, particularly to neighbouring ones.

The advisers and experts with whom the beneficiaries from Moldova and Tunisia had been in contact at F2F meetings were generally considered to be good and very knowledgeable in their domains. The fact that many also had own political experience in transition countries was also appreciated. As already mentioned, the involvement of CdM members has uniformly been very highly appreciated and interaction with them has for many, if not most, beneficiaries been the most special and stimulating aspect of the network.

The network has 76 registered advisors, but most (as mentioned above) are not active. Most, indeed almost all, interaction with advisors had taken place at F2F meetings and other events, or through direct contacts outside the platform. Somewhat surprisingly, the advisors interviewed (who had all participated in one or more F2F meetings) had had little or no subsequent contact with beneficiaries outside meetings. Of the six advisors interviewed only two had exchanges with beneficiaries afterwards, but in one case this helped start up other project activities outside LEND.

Beneficiaries and advisors were asked as an ice-breaker how they were recruited, and the answers confirmed the information from project management that initial contacts were made by CdM, CD, State Department or US embassies. Some remarked that they did not know why they had been contacted and on what the criteria people were being invited to join LEND.

3.4 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Concerning logistics and organizations of event, contacts and interaction with CdM and CD staff, most –but not quite all - interviewees were satisfied. Those that did express a more detailed opinion said that CD and CdM staff consulted and interacted

regularly with LEND members, solicited and listened constructively to feedback, and were helpful and attentive. Some participants on meetings had never been directly consulted or contacted subsequently, and were not surprisingly dissatisfied. However, Tunisian members especially appreciated that LEND responded very well and timely to the request for an additional F2F meeting to discuss issues related to the then ongoing drafting of the new constitution. A few thought that the final arrangements for F2F meetings in some cases came a bit late, creating problems for their planning and travel arrangements.

Some interviewees said that they did not fully understand what the ultimate goal of LEND was, and on what criteria members were chosen. Some also felt that there was not enough strategic thinking and direction from LEND management, and that they were understaffed.

Several interviewees remarked on the need for more proactive engagement by project management in identifying needs, designing suitable activities and actively implementing them.

Several interviewees in the project management group thought that the distribution of management roles, responsibilities and who decides what was unclear and confusing, leading to perceptions of micromanagement and frustration at times.

Several also stressed that LEND was an innovative concept and for at least the first phase (and subsequently also to a large extent for the second phase) a pilot exercise to test and refine the approach. It has been and still is a learning experience with elements of trial and error.

The project description and LFA/results matrix in the CdM application to Sida does not seem to have played a role as steering document for LEND as a whole, but just for the CdM F2F meeting part in relation to Sida. Interviewees at CD were it seems not aware of them in any detail.

The monitoring implied in the LFA matrix has not taken place, and in general there is no systematic and documented monitoring. However, both CD and CdM project staff do consult individually or at events with beneficiaries, on activities and meeting topics, on the issues with the platform and act on suggestions and opinions. The revision of the platform for phase 2 is based on feedback from members. Staff also try to ascertain and ask members about how LEND has helped them and contributed to democratic transition. But none of this is systematic and documented.

3.5 GENDER EQUALITY PERSPECTIVE

As illustrated above, there is a reasonable gender representation in the LEND membership, although this varies between categories. The same is valid for attendance at F2F meetings. Judging from what interviewees have experienced or seen, personality

and specific subject interests reflect the degree of involvement of participants in discussions and exchanges.

Gender issues have not been an explicit topic or aspect for the F2F meeting plenary sessions. Some respondents (both male and female) remarked on this and thought that gender issues deserved more prominence.

The interviewees were asked whether they had recollection of gender issues or aspects having been raised in one form or another at the F2F meetings, in or out of plenum, or on the platform.

About a third replied in the negative, the others mentioned that it has mostly taken place in informal settings (at breaks, dinners, social activities) and then mostly one-on-one. In particular, female CdM members (in Stockholm and in Madrid) were asked by female participants about challenges of being a woman leader. Some remember gender being touched upon in the newsletter in general terms. The only instance of gender coming up both in sessions and corridors dealt with female representation in parliament, the pros- and cons- of quotas.

3.6 SUSTAINABILITY OF IMPACT AND OUTCOMES (IN THE LFA MATRIX)

Interviewees were asked whether they would like to continue as members, and virtually all said yes. They were also willing to participate pro bono. This was also the case for the interviewed advisors, within reason and if it does not impact on their remunerated work. Beneficiaries were also asked whether it was realistic to expect that their organizations or countries would be able or willing to finance LEND in whole or part. None thought this realistic in transition circumstances, except perhaps in kind for events organised in-country (venues, staff time).

As mentioned above, several interviewees remarked on the need for more proactive engagement by project management in identifying needs, designing suitable activities and implementing them. Similarly for the platform, where there should be push rather than pull with regard to information, analysis, events etc. Many also remarked that the intervals between F2F meetings and activities have been too long, and that as result the enthusiasm built up loses momentum. I.e. there is a recognition that the network per se, as well as the platform, cannot most likely be self-sustaining, self-perpetuating and self-administering but needs significant external monetary as well as significant ongoing moderation and facilitation in order to continue.

In one or two cases, contacts established through LEND had led to or promoted collaboration outside LEND for projects or initiatives.

3.7 OUTCOME/IMPACT ON BENEFICIARIES AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO DEMOCRATIC TRANSITION

Beneficiaries were asked whether LEND had been useful to them personally and professionally, and if so in what respects. Most said yes, although responses and reasons varied. The usefulness came essentially from the F2F meetings. Many said that it had expanded their network of contacts domestically and internationally through personal interaction that these people could subsequently be approached more easily, and that some had indeed already been contacted. Hearing and discussing with colleagues from other countries and especially former leaders gave new and changed perspective on the problems and situation of their own country, and gave food for thought in reflecting on how to act and what to do. Many mentioned that they had gained new knowledge on various transition topics and better understanding of the challenges and pitfalls in practical political implementation in their areas of interest, something which is not normally easily available elsewhere. Several mentioned increased own confidence in what they were doing, being on the right track, and seeing that they are 'not alone in the world' in confronting similar challenges, and getting a 'boost' of enthusiasm to persevere. Some mentioned better understanding of the importance of pragmatism and the time and patience needed for transition, as well the importance and role of trust in transition. A couple mentioned strengthened negotiation and communication skills, especially on sensitive matters.

They were also asked if they had any concrete examples of how they thought LEND had helped to advance the democratisation process in their country in one way or another. Most considered that LEND had helped, but only some gave any concrete examples. One interviewee remarked in response that it was unclear if and to what extent recommendations provided through LEND were acted upon by decision makers, and wondered how one could monitor this.

Some gave examples of new ideas that they would push for, and which they had been 'tested' through LEND. Some advisors mentioned ideas or points that they would take up in their work with their ministers and sectors, particularly in the justice and security sectors. In a couple of cases (Moldova and in Tunisia) LEND helped to get specific projects inside and outside ministries started that probably would have some effect later on. But effects and impact are still prospective.

Many of the Tunisian beneficiaries interviewed said that the LEND support during the drafting process of the new constitution had been very fruitful and useful. And the most concrete examples of what could be considered actual effect concern the drafting of the new Tunisian constitution. Comments and assessments from Moldovan participants on the draft based on their own experience, as well as comments from other participants (CdM members and experts) were taken up by Tunisian participants who were involved in the drafting, and who cited remarks from some key political leaders directly involved in the drafting that it had helped the process along and that

some of the recommendations discussed had been taken on board in the constitution (though one cannot say whether to what extent LEND contributed). The gathering together of different and opposing political party member to discuss outside the confrontational setting of parliament at the second Tunis F2F meeting has shown that constructive dialogue can be held in spite of often strong political differences. Several of the Tunisian interviewees involved in party politics mentioned that after the personal contacts established at this meeting it became possible to call up and discuss directly with political opponents on friendly and constructive basis outside formal settings. They also thought that the meetings organized at or around the second Tunis F2F meetings helped getting the progress of debate moving after opposition deputies had walked out of the Assembly.

Another area where it seems plausible to expect concrete examples in due course is the electoral process, as both Moldova and Tunisia will hold important elections later this year. But LEND involvement in this mainly belongs to phase 2.

3.8 LEND OVERALL

Interviewees were asked about the strong and weak points of LEND and what, if anything, distinguished LEND or added value compared to the multitude of other networks, conferences, projects and activities to support democratic transitions on offer. All had opinions on these, and while the specific responses varied highlighting this or that aspect, the ‘unique selling point’ and value of LEND can be summarized as follows.

LEND is the only network specifically bringing together former and current leaders, experienced and inexperienced politicians and transition experts/advisors focusing not on the theory and issues of transition per se but on the practical political process to address them in concrete and often real-time situations, being neutral and not having any own agenda.

The strong points are the exchanges with the CdM members, mentorship, the uniqueness of the network, and the focus on the practicalities of transition, and the F2F meetings.

The weak points mentioned are the platform, limited follow-up of meetings and follow-through on subjects, lack of complementary focused meetings and activities, selection of topics not fully based on member needs, generality of topics and discussions and frequency of meetings, absence of real decision makers.

On balance, interviewees think that the strong points outweigh the weak points (which are more in operations than in concept), but that the full potential of LEND has yet to be realized. Only one or two respondents did not find LEND useful.

4 Conclusions and lessons learned

4.1 THE F2F MEETINGS

They are **highly relevant** addressing real problems of transition in productive exchange between experienced and inexperienced practitioners.

They are **efficient** in the sense that they have generated tangible benefits to emerging leaders as individuals and to some extent democratic transition at a cost that is in line with what typical high quality international meetings cost. More efficiency through lower unit cost can be achieved by not increasing the number of big F2F meetings and instead adding on smaller and focused complementary meetings.

They are **effective** in that they (as the dominant part of LEND activities) have contributed to **positive outcomes** for the emerging leaders in terms increased knowledge and understanding of how to work with transition in practice as a political process, confidence and enthusiasm, widened network relationships and/or performance in advocating or implementing new ideas, through direct face-to-face contacts, discussions and exchanges, as assessed and exemplified by the beneficiaries.

It can be plausibly said that they have had an **immediate impact** in some cases through more direct contributions to the democratic transition (chiefly in connection with the drafting of the new Tunisian constitution).

4.2 THE PLATFORM

While relevant in theory (and in principle), it has in practice as conceived and implemented in its phase 1 version been only **marginally relevant**. Although apparently some of the identified weaknesses are or have been addressed in the revised version developed for phase 2, it is moot whether these addresses the root causes (see Lessons learned below).

It has **not been efficient** in generating tangible outcomes to LEND members because of the low utilisation and the high costs (development plus maintenance) in comparison to the F2F meetings. This being said, the existence of a platform of some kind is necessary to hold together a network and keeping members updated on what is happening in LEND. The platform has fulfilled this function.

It has **not been effective** in brokering advice, contacts and exchange within the LEND network. Beneficiaries much prefer direct contacts, and for virtual contact the media and channels already used daily such as smartphone, email, sms or Facebook.

In short, the platform has not lived up to original expectations, which begs the question why. It is not evident that the project has analysed this fully. The reasons for member preference for direct face-to-face exchanges have already been mentioned. But there are also preferences that relate directly to use of virtual platforms. A virtual platform in the context of a network can have two main functions, information (toolbox, resource centre, document library, news compilation and similar) and communication (social media and different channels such as video and voice). In the original LEND concept, the communication aspect appears to have dominated, while the actual preferred use has been for information. Information provision can also be push or pull; the original design was more pull, i.e. the user has to actively go and “pull” out information on the platform. The preferences of LEND members—almost a necessity for busy people—tend more towards “push”, i.e. being fed with filtered, pertinent and timely information, not too much and not too little. Although there were significant consultations during the design and development of the platform, it seems there was an untested assumption that the needs, preferences and constraints of the LEND target group would be similar to those of other professional or activist users, overlooking the implications of the high time opportunity cost for leaders and other truly busy people.

4.3 THE NETWORK

The LEND network is highly **relevant**. It addresses practical issues and political processes involved in transition, bringing together emerging, inexperienced leaders and actors in transition countries, highly qualified advisors and experts, and experienced very high-level politicians with own pertinent experience of transitions (i.e. CdM members).

It is **efficient** in the sense that it only includes beneficiary members that are working directly or indirectly with transition in their countries, and selected advisors/experts with pertinent experience and knowledge, and focuses on practical transition and expressed needs of the members. Although the mix and coverage of beneficiary members are reasonable, especially considering that this has been a pilot phase where the numbers have been deliberately kept down for practical reasons. Participation by national decision makers has been limited – inter alia because of genuine time constraints - but compensated by inclusion of ministerial advisors instead, perhaps in many respects a more efficient way to reach them over time. The management cost of the network per se (i.e. excluding the cost of the F2F meetings and non-vital elements of a platform) is small.

It has been **effective** in gathering relevant and involved people and allowing them to interact positively and constructively in ways that are closely and directly related to practical transition challenges in Moldova and Tunisia. It could be more effective if there were more contacts and interaction outside the F2F and other meetings, and if virtual contacts and exchanges could be made to work better.

The **outcomes** and **immediate impact** have been realised mainly through the F2F and other meetings and not so much by unmediated and direct contacts between members.

4.4 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Activities, in particular the F2F meetings have been well managed to the satisfaction of participants. CdM and CD project staff are dedicated, hard-working, ready to respond to LEND, but probably somewhat overstretched even after the addition of a part-time program coordinator at CD, leaving limited time for other things than keeping the activities running¹¹. This may explain why less attention has been paid to more strategic reflection, more proactive moderation and facilitation, and to systematic – as opposed to informal – monitoring, an important aspect in general, but particularly for what is designated as a pilot period.

The lack of staff resources, especially earlier, may also explain the perceived or real unevenness sometimes in interactions with members and participants. But also the lack of publicised and transparent systems/routines for consultations, feedback, agenda setting and other areas where some interviewees felt that things were not clear or inclusive. Quality control does not seem well-developed in all areas.

The steering mechanism and overall project organisation is unnecessarily complicated, with rather unclear division and understanding of respective roles, functions and authority among co-chairs, working group, donors, CD and CdM secretariats, and this may perhaps at least partly explain why for example monitoring has not been systematic and unified. The reasons are due to the particular genesis of LEND, and while this setup may be liveable in a pilot phase, it is not effective and efficient for a longer term LEND involving more countries.

The hybrid setup may also reflect a more fundamental dichotomy concerning the nature of LEND. Is it primarily a political initiative, which tends to be designed and managed less rigorously, or is it primarily a project, which tends to be prepared more thoroughly and managed and monitored more systematically? Either way is feasible, and none is per se better than the other, but they have different logic and management style. In LEND, CD and the State Department seem to tend more to the initiative style, and CdM and Sida more to the project style.

¹¹ The sometimes surprisingly long times needed to respond to fairly basic requests for documents and information for the evaluation supports this observation. CD and to a lesser extent CdM staff have constantly been away on travel for various activities, having only few opportunities to attend to other matters, despite the best intentions.

The very rigid division of responsibility and accountability to donors between CD and CdM, each one basically having responsibility for one of the two main pillars of LEND, the Platform and the F2F meetings, may have hindered a rebalancing of resources and priority between them to better reflect the manifest preferences of the beneficiaries.

4.5 GENDER EQUALITY

Gender balance in the network and activities is reasonable, and it is evident that project management have strived for this. Whether gender issues should have been given enough prominence and priority as a topic or aspect for discussion at meetings is a primarily a matter for the beneficiaries to assess. This being said, it is often difficult to make room for transversal issues when there are so many other pressing sector challenges, and there might be a need for more proactive involvement to by project management to confirm that transversal issues are not inadvertently neglected.

4.6 SUSTAINABILITY

It is unlikely that LEND can become a sustainable and self-perpetuating community operating largely in a virtual setting. Although virtual interaction could become more prominent, it is unlikely that a network targeting emerging leaders – as opposed to ordinary activists - in transition environments and countries could be effective without a very significant F2F component. It could probably work once transition is over, and it becomes ‘business as usual’ – after all there are lots of examples of successful professional virtual communities. The F2F element would arguably be as important if not more should more transition countries be included. F2F activities are relatively expensive, and it is not realistic to expect countries or individuals in the midst of transition to be able to finance these. External donor finance is necessary.

Very few networks are self-sustaining, moderation and facilitation are needed. In a network like LEND with different countries and different types of members, all truly busy, there is no natural or neutral group that could take on this responsibility. External administrators, moderators and facilitators are needed, which have to be contracted and financed by some external source.

Furthermore, it does not seem realistic that the network could be self-perpetuating in respect of membership, given the fact that advisors need to be identified and vetted to correspond closely to actual needs and demand, that CdM members need to be identified, approached and persuaded. Although beneficiary membership could conceivably be self-perpetuating, or at least locally managed pro bono in each country, this is not possible for the advisors and CdM members.

As the network ages, the question of exit and renewal arises. So far nobody has been excluded formally (deliberately so) even if they are not active, have not been contacted as advisors or do not participate in activities. But sooner or later this has to be ad-

dressed. The group of 76 advisors, of which maybe only a fourth have been meaningfully involved, is perhaps already a case in point.

The **outcome sustainability** of actions for democratic transition that LEND has contributed to is moot; in any case LEND does not follow through on them, and whether they succeed or not depends on external factors outside LEND, the vagaries of politics and government actions. This will of course always be the case, but as currently designed, LEND does not effectively contribute to increasing the chances of sustainable success.

4.7 LEND OVERALL

Overall LEND (in practice dominated by the F2F meeting component) has demonstrated **clear relevance**, evidenced by the affirmation of continued interest, involvement and appreciation by almost all interviewed members, and by engaging upon request in real-time support in important transition processes (in particular the drafting of the Tunisian constitution).

Overall LEND in phase I is **partly efficient**. The F2F meetings are efficient, while the platform currently is not. The latter is not primarily due to the absolute cost, but because of the very low usage. LEND can be inherently efficient if the problems with the platform component are resolved.

LEND has been **effective** in strengthening the soft and hard capacity of beneficiary members to work for democratic transition, as evidenced by testimony of many of the interviewees, and to some extent in concretely promoting democratic transition.

LEND is **not self-sustainable** without significant and indefinitely continued external financial and technical support for management of the network and implementation of activities. Given the so far limited interactions between beneficiaries and other network members outside LEND, it is questionable whether the network per se is sustainable without support. Of course, what the beneficiaries have gained from LEND they will presumably be using in their continued work, but in the course of the rapid and often unexpected changes and new challenges arising during transitions the impact of these gains may have a relatively early ‘best-before-date’. The outcome sustainability of actions for democratic transition that LEND has contributed to is therefore moot.

While it can be said that LEND as a pilot has achieved ‘proof of concept’ of the utility of this type of network, LEND in phase I has not been optimally balanced in its components and has not gone far enough in concreteness and specificity to significantly increase the probability of sustainable outcomes.

4.8 LESSONS LEARNED

In the Team's view there are three main lessons from the phase pilot.

LEND is an innovative initiative, but what is really the key innovation? In the original concept, the key aspects were (a) productively bringing together experienced and inexperienced transition leaders and (b) doing it through a virtual community operating through a secure and exclusive social media platform. Although the network/community is the essence, and the platform just one of many means through which the network can function, the platform seems to have initially become the dominant priority. Branding LEND as a social media/IT initiative rather than as a network dedicated to supporting transition processes is understandable – it is more catchy and exciting, but is risky if it unduly influences the approach to designing and choosing the means.

The target group, leaders engaged in new democracies, often inexperienced but working in challenging transition environments, is presumably rather special, and it is likely that working styles, preferences and constraints differ from other groups. Knowing these in some detail before designing activities and tools can save costs and shorten the trial and error pilot period.

Finally, while the pilot can be said to have achieved 'proof of concept', for LEND to reach its potential, particularly in view of possible extension to additional countries, significantly more analysis and study would have been required, and the pilot configured to better observe the implementation and capture structured feedback, straight from the very beginning.

In short, LEND phase I would have gained by having been designed more rigorously as a pilot, better structuring the inevitable 'trial and error' approach during implementation.

This is of course partly hindsight in the particular context of LEND's genesis. The lesson is primarily for the future, if and when LEND is extended to other transition countries.

5 Looking ahead

5.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CD AND CDM CONCERNING LEND

Improving LEND with a view to future extension to other countries

Note: these recommendations are the Team's but most have also been suggested directly or indirectly by interviewees, though not necessarily in the same way. Several have been or are being addressed in various ways for Phase 2 and/or the envisaged Phase 3.

- Clarify, streamline and document project steering and management arrangements.
- Systematize routines, procedures, criteria for membership, selection of meeting participants and other important management actions, and make them transparent and public to members and participants, perhaps in the form of a FAQ (Frequently asked questions).
- Systematize and document feedback and lessons from the pilot phases.
- Make a 'zero-based' review of the platform concept, including options for a light/minimum platform, with lower annual maintenance costs, taking into considering the opportunity costs in relation to the preferred F2F activities.
- Develop a wider panoply of smaller and less costly face-to-face meeting types to allow for more frequent activities and more specialised discussions, to complement the big F2F meetings (and the seminars introduced in phase 2) and to cater to the strong demand for F2F interaction.
- Develop a concept and system for more proactive moderation and facilitation by the project support team.
- Ensure that transversal issues, in particular gender, are not inadvertently neglected.
- Explore how CdM member involvement can be increased and become more systematic, and perhaps also leveraged in encouraging positive developments.
- Explore how active key decision makers in target countries can be more involved, taking into account their very limited availability, perhaps through very specialised and small meetings involving CdM members (which presum-

ably already often take place, but outside LEND and not linked to the issues at hand).

- Develop a dynamic ‘human resource’ strategy for the network, with documented criteria for membership and ‘leader’, reconfirmation of continued membership and exit, passive and/inactive membership etc.
- Elaborate a more complete ‘theory of change’ to be able to support beneficiaries further along the way to making an impact on transition. LEND now ‘talks the talk’ (subject topics for meetings and activities) and ‘talks the walk’ (advice from experienced leaders and advisors on the process), but only a little ‘walks the talk’ (coaching, mentoring, training/seminars on nuts and bolts to support beneficiaries to implement actions). LEND does not ‘walk the walk’, i.e. directly support implementation. This is not its role, but it could perhaps assist in ‘incubating’ smaller projects or activities that beneficiaries then could seek financing for elsewhere.
- Develop a simple but robust monitoring system to capture evidence of impact on democratic transition that to some extent can plausibly be connected to LEND actions or advice.
- Carefully analyse the practical and design implications of extending LEND to more countries, particularly in relation to when multi-country (in different permutations) meetings are useful and can create synergy, and when they are not.

Blue-sky suggestions for extending the LEND concept

- Consider ‘sectorial’ LENDs for critical transition sectors such as public finance, justice and security, bringing together former ministers of finance, justice, interior and new leaders in these sectors.
- Consider national LEND chapters, with just the national members and possibly also some national experts, that autonomously (but maybe with some minor support from LEND) discuss, delineate and prioritize potential subjects and activities for LEND to consider.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SIDA

5.2.1 Added value for Sida of future support

Given that Sida is not currently supporting LEND, would there be any added value for Sida as a (co-)donor for a possible continuation?

To simplify, there are basically three modes for a donor to support governance reforms (under which most actions supporting democratic transition fall): institutional

capacity building via support to government; support to civil society (including activist groupings); and support to individual well-placed change agents/champions of change. Sida has a long experience with the first two, but they have limitations, even in the best of circumstances. Almost by definition, institutions and organizations are in a state of flux during transitions, which makes it even more challenging to create impact. One can argue that during such periods of flux, committed and well-placed individuals have more potential to create or influence change than during ordinary times. Supporting champions of change directly in their efforts can thus be seen as a useful complement to the other two modes.

LEND does precisely this, but only up to a point. If LEND remains as it is now, there is little added value for Sida as additional donor, and in the Team's view no compelling reason for future support.

However, If LEND follows through with support further along the intervention chain, resulting in proposals for concrete and specific projects or activities that Sida could subsequently support, for example through a (small) grant fund, there is added value, since LEND would arguably 'produce' projects that are relevant, feasible, needed, better anchored, *and* promoted by agents of change/champions of change, in short that have a greater chance of success.

5.2.2 Added value for LEND of future support from Sida

Conversely, one can also ask if there is any added value for LEND of support specifically from Sida. In general, it is positive for a project or initiative to have more than one donor, for the obvious reason that it reduces vulnerability to funding cut-offs not necessarily related to performance, but rather to shifting donor priorities. A second institutional funding source is thus positive per se.

But why specifically Sida (Sweden) rather than some other donor? There would be added value if Sida offered contacts, experience or perspectives not already available or known to CdM and CD. But considering that both CD and CdM already have extensive interactions with Moldova and Tunisia, and with most potential future target countries as well, the added experience from Sida is likely to be marginal. Still, several interviewees did say that they appreciated the few interventions by the Swedish participants at the Stockholm F2F meeting, and regretted that Sida/Sweden did not contribute more to LEND substance.

Sida as a donor also has a reputation for pragmatic flexibility and acceptance of risk-taking in trying out new approaches, and this would be valuable for LEND in responding to rapid and unexpected developments that will invariably occur in transition environments.

To summarize, it can be argued that there is some added value for LEND from specifically Sida support, but in the opinion of the Team this is not significant enough to be a deciding factor for Sida.

5.2.3 Specific recommendations in case of future support

It is of course up to Sida to decide in due course whether or not to support an application for support to a third phase of LEND, should such an application be made. But as stated above, in the Team's view, such an application is only worth considering if LEND in a more structured manner leads to elaboration of concrete support activities that Sida could subsequently finance.

Subject to this condition, given the all in all quite promising results from this new rather experimental pilot, the Team is of the opinion that such an application would merit serious consideration, as LEND has turned out to be quite well-aligned with the Strategy for special initiatives.

If so, the Team recommends that Sida should consider inter alia the following aspects:

- The third phase is not just a pilot continuation, but a normal project.
- Extension to other countries besides Moldova and Tunisia.
- A clear strategy and vision, based on a well-thought out 'theory of change', starting with the network and thereafter with the means.
- A unified project in management and budget.
- Applied and implemented by a consortium/joint venture between CD and CdM, considering that both organizations expertise and contributions are equally important.
- Pooled financing for the whole project.
- Arm's length donor involvement in operations.
- Single steering body.
- Clear management structure.
- A beefed-up project implementation support team at CD and CdM, to allow for more proactivity and 'push' in the network.
- Wide flexibility for implementers at activity level.
- Systematic monitoring focused on outcome and impact in relation to democratic transition.
- A more detailed risk analysis and management.
- Encourage a light system audit or management self-assessment by CD and CdM, to confirm that they indeed have the capacity and systems in place for implementing and reporting the project efficiently.

Concerning the financing of projects flowing from LEND, the grant fund modality seems most suitable. Such a fund could be either part of LEND or separate. On balance, the Team considers that the financing mechanism should be separate. Firstly, because it need not or should not be the only source of financing; viable projects should be able to freely seek financing from any suitable source. Secondly, involving LEND in financing decisions – and subsequent monitoring and reporting - risks destroying the network and ‘mentorship’ character of LEND.

Annex 1 – ToR

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT *LEADERS ENGAGED IN NEW DEMOCRACIES NETWORK* (LEND) 54030302

1 BACKGROUND

On the 10th of January 2012, Sida received a project proposal from Club de Madrid para la Transición y Consolidación Democráticas, hereafter referred to as CdM. CdM is an independent non-profit organization, composed of 87 former Presidents and Prime Ministers representing 60 different countries. Its Secretariat is located in Madrid, Spain, from where the project is administered.

The Swedish Government's Strategy for special initiatives for democratization and freedom of expression (Government decision UF2009127888/UP) aims at strengthening actors for change, targeting intergovernmental organizations, individuals and groups or civil society organizations at local, national, regional and global levels working for increased democratization and freedom of expression. The project is in alignment with these objectives. The Strategy also allows for support to meetings and conference activities which corresponds well to this project's aim to open up and pilot new and innovative solutions for communication between leaders in new democracies.

CdM received financial support in order to arrange two conferences one in Tunisia and one in Moldova, for political leaders and policy makers as well as participants of the network-building project, Leaders Engaged in New Democracies (LEND Network). The initial project request was received by the MFA (UD-UP) and then passed on to Sida. The project was carried out by CdM, in partnership with the U.S. State Department and the Canadian software company OpenText.

The project *Leaders Engaged in New Democracies (LEND) Network*, intends to create a network between political leaders in emerging democracies. The project's three components included:

- i. Two face-to-face meetings of the Network's participants organized by the CdM;
- ii. A secure virtual space for sharing expertise and lessons learned;
- iii. A new groundbreaking transition tool that should enable leaders to communicate in real-time without linguistic barriers.

Sida's support to the project related to the first of the project's three components consisting of the conferences where some 30 participants from Tunisia and Moldavia met, along with selected mentors (former political leaders & CdM's network) from

countries which have undergone a democratic transition processes. The conferences were aimed at supporting the Tunisian and Moldovan political leadership and policy makers in effectively leading their countries' transitions towards democracy, through the connection and exchange with other leaders.

CdM received SEK 1 525 000 and the duration of the project was 12 months; February 1, 2012 - January 31, 2013. The activity period was extended to December 1, 2013 due to unspent funds, which could then be used for one additional meeting in Sweden, in line with the goals of the project. The target group for the contribution had expressed a wish for further meetings. The additional meeting built on the lessons learned from the initial meetings and also aimed at the overarching goals of the contribution.

The validity of the current agreement has been extended to August 31, 2014.

2 PURPOSES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The main objectives of the evaluation are;

- i. To assess and analyse the achievements of the project in relation to the outcomes and results framework established. Assess and analyse the outcomes of the project in terms of improvements in capacity, attitudes, relationships and performance of the targeted stakeholders;
- ii. Identify and describe strengths and weaknesses in the strategies/approaches taken and in the planning, implementation and monitoring of the program. Describe problems and solutions to these sought by the program. Summarise lessons.
- iii. To assess and issue recommendations regarding the effectiveness and usefulness of a continued support to the project.

The evaluation should also include, but not necessarily be limited to, the issues and questions presented below.

- i. Comment on and analyse sustainability of the impact and outcomes observed. Enabling and disabling factors;
- ii. Comment on and analyse the project's gender equality perspective.

The evaluation questions will be refined during the inception phase.

3 METHODOLOGY / EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation shall conform to OECD/DAC's quality standards. Appropriate methodology and methods for the evaluation will be worked out in detail in dialogue with Sida. The evaluation will consist of the following phases:

1. Inception phase: Contains an initial desk review and interviews with the key stakeholders to define the scope of evaluation and refine the evaluation ques-

tions. It will result in an inception paper (maximum 10 pages) with the development of a work plan, methodology for gathering and analysing the data. The inception report shall be approved by Sida within a week after submittal.

2. Data collection and analysis: Review of program documents, including program proposals, Logical Framework Matrix and other relevant documents as well as relevant Sida policies and guidelines. Interviews with CdM staff and project leaders to get an informed opinion of achievements and challenges. Interviews and/or group discussions with relevant targeted participants and stakeholders such as individual female and male policy makers/politicians, institutions/organisations in Tunisia and Moldavia to establish how the project has changed/improved their situation, capacity, attitudes, relationships or performance. Interviews with relevant staff at Sida and UD. The assessment should include a visit to the CdM Secretariat in Madrid as well as possibly Tunisia and Moldavia.
3. Reporting and presentation: A draft report should be prepared for comments by Sida before being finalised. The consultant should present the final report at a meeting with Sida.

Local evaluators shall be used if possible.

Estimated amount of working days: 30

4 REPORT

The evaluation report shall be written in English and should not exceed 30 pages, excluding annexes. The draft report shall be submitted to Sida electronically no later than 28/02/2014. After receiving Sida's comments on the draft report, a final version shall be submitted to Sida.

The report should have the following main headings:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Summary of the evaluation, with particular emphasis on main findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.

BACKGROUND AND METHOD

Presentation of the evaluation's background, purpose, questions and methodology

THE EVALUATED INTERVENTION

Description of the evaluated project and its purpose, logic, history, organisation and stakeholders

LOOKING BACK

Factual evidence, data and observations relevant to the specific questions of the evaluation

CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

General conclusions likely to have potential for future support.

LOOKING AHEAD

Discussion and recommendation on future Sida support, including suggestions to Sida and Club de Madrid on possible improvements in strategies, management, implementation etcetera.

ANNEXES

Terms of reference, methodology for data gathering and analysis, references, persons interviewed etcetera.

Subject to decision by Sida, the report will be published in the series *Sida Evaluations*.

Annex 2 – List of documents

LEND Applicaton by CdM to Sida, Nov 17, 2011
Draft Report Face-to-Face Meeting in Moldova 15-17 October 2012
Draft Report Face-to-Face Meeting in Tunis 21-22 January 2013
Agendas/briefing books/session guidelines/logistics guides (draft or final) for the Face-to-Face meetings, Chisinau, Tunis I, Stockholm, Tunis 2. Also for Madrid F2F meeting and CD Bratislava seminar (phase 2)
Participant lists (draft or final) for the Face-to-Face meetings, Chisinau, Tunis I, Stockholm, Tunis 2 and Madrid (phase 2)
Simple LEND user guide, October 2012
LEND Fact sheet, January 2013
Sida assessments and decisions on CdM support and extensions, as well as related email correspondence between Sida and CdM
LEND related information on CdM website www.clubmadrid.org
LEND related information on CD website www.community-democracies.org

Annex 3 – List of interviewees

Name	Position
MOLDOVA beneficiaries and participants	
Dorina Andreev	Director of Programs, East Europe Foundation
Arcadie Barbarosie	Executive Director, Institute for Public Policy
Octavian Berzan	Deputy Director, Moldovan Investment and Export Promotion Organization
Pavel Burghilea	Advisor to Minister of Justice
Artur Gherman	Director, National Commission for Financial Markets
Leonard Litra	Deputy Director Institute for Development and Social Initiative, currently senior research fellow Institute of World Policy, Kiev
Ion Manole	Director, Promo-Lex Association
Constanta Popescu Mere-acre	Economic Advisor, PM's office/State Chancery
Tudor Ulianoschi	Deputy Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration
3 persons interviewed did not wish to be listed by name	
TUNISIA – beneficiaries and participants (in F2F meetings)	
Ghazi Ben Ahmed	Secretary General, Club de Tunis, Director German Marshall Fund
Hela Aloulou	Advisor to Minister of Interior, Member of Ettakol Executive Board
Neila Brahim (*)	La Voix de la Femme
Moez Ben Dhia	Advisor to Minister of Social Affairs, Member of Political Bureau Ettakol Party
Abdelbasset Ben Hassen	President Arab Institute of Human Rights
Mohamed El May	Member of Parliament
Ahmed Galloul	Advisor to Head of Government
Emna Jebbloui	Project Manager, Tunisian School of Politics, Consultant, Training Center of National Assembly, Advisor to president of constituent assembly
Omezzine Khelifa	Advisor to Minister of Finance

Zied Ladhari (*)	
Najla Bouriel Lemjid	Member of Parliament
Samira Merai Friaa (*)	Member of Parliament
Abdelaziz Sebei (*)	President, Association Tunisienne de Communication Sociale
Advisers/experts	
Matyas Eörsi	Senior Program Advisor, Democracy Report International, former Member of Parliament, State Secretary, Hungary
Liia Hänni	e-Governance Academy, Estonia, former minister and member of parliament
Rasto Kuzel	Executive Director Memo 98, Slovakia
Bálint Magyar	Strategic Advisor Financial Research Institute, former Minister of Education Hungary (inter alia)
Attila Mong	Journalist, Media Transparency expert, Hungary
Dusan Ondrusek	Executive Director, Partners for Democratic Change, Slovakia
Ivar Tallo	e-Governance Academy, Estonia, former member of parliament
Club de Madrid	
Kim Campbell	Member, former Prime Minister of Canada
Petre Roman	Member, former Prime Minister of Romania
Carlos Westendorp	Secretary General
María Elena Agüero	Deputy Secretary General
Rubén Campos	Program Coordinator
Amir Campos	Program Office (Phase 2)
Irene Vergara	Program Officer (Phase 1)
Maram Anbar	Senior Program Officer
Community of Democracies	
Maria Leissner	Secretary General
Kristine Luoma-Overstreet	Program Coordinator (Phase 2)
Andrzej Kostek	LEND Network Coordinator
Donors and others	
Kaie Kork	Foreign Affairs Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Estonia (CD co-chair representative)
Nicolas Miller	Desk Officer, US State Department, Office of the Senior Advisor to the Secretary for Civil Society and Emerging Democracies (CD co-chair representative)
Hugh Ritchie	Director, Government Relations Program, OpenText

Tomas Brundin	Strategic policy relating to democracy and civil society, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden
Sofia Orrebrink	Programme Manager, Civil Society - Special interventions for democratisation and freedom
Ellen Swedenmark	Programme Manager, Sida

Note: Titles and positions may not always be the current ones, due to political changes in Tunisia and Moldova during the course of LEND (for example advisors to ministers may now be former advisors)

(*) not LEND member

Annex 4 – Method

Data sources

Already in the inception report it was noted that there was only limited written documentation available from CdM, apart from the CdM application and Sida correspondence¹², mainly F2F meeting programs, briefing books and participant lists for the F2F meetings, a few participant immediate meeting evaluations, and (draft) narrative reports from the first two F2F meetings in 2012¹³. No written documentation on the platform has been seen except a short introduction, and an initial features list in the application. However, the Team leader was given a demonstration of the platform at the F2F meeting in Madrid. Reports on platform usage envisaged as verification of indicators for the outcomes and results above do not seem to have been produced; basic platform usage statistics were only produced ad hoc by OpenText when requested via CD for this evaluation. However, since the platform has been very little used, these indicators would in any case not have been meaningful. They have not been replaced by other indicators, nor has data been systematically collected and documented in written form on the achieved substance of the indicators, although there appears to have been a fair amount of oral feedback to CD and CdM project staff. See Appendix 2 for the list of documents consulted.

In practice, this has meant that interviews have been the wholly dominant form of data and information gathering. This was structured in three levels, a shorter (10 minute) on-line survey sent out to all registered LEND participants on the platform; telephone interviews (20-30 minutes) with 6-10 selected persons each from the group of advisers/experts/participating CdM members, Tunisian and Moldovan participants respectively, and 5-6 direct interviews (1-2 hours) in Tunis and Chisinau.

In addition, key donor representatives, project staff and management at CdM secretariat, CD secretariat, working group co-chair representatives from Estonia and US, OpenText as well as the donor representatives (State Department, Sida, Ministry of Foreign Affairs) were interviewed directly, by telephone and/or email. See Appendix 3 for the list of people interviewed.

¹² The Team has not asked for documentation related to agreements between US State Department, OpenText and CD.

¹³ According to the amended agreement with Sida, a final report from CdM is due by end of May 2014

Interviewees:

Moldovan beneficiaries	5 directly, 7 by telephone
Tunisian beneficiaries ¹⁴	6 directly, 7 by telephone
Advisers/experts	7 by telephone
CdM members	2 by telephone
Project management/donors	15 in all
Total	47 (20 women, 27 men)

Of the 19 persons (4 women, 15 men) that responded to the on-line survey, 6 were from Tunisia, and 7 from Moldova and 4 were advisers/experts.

Evaluation questions

A list of questions was developed in the inception report. However, since it soon became clear that several of them were not very relevant, particularly in view of limited use of the platform, they were condensed into a shorter set that was used as the basis for the telephone and direct interviews. In the direct interviews the list was more used as a discussion guide than as a questionnaire. An even shorter sub-set was used in the online survey. See below.

Limitations

Note that the selection of participants interviewed is neither random nor fully purposive. In order to respect the privacy of the LEND network, initial contact with participants was mediated by CD and CdM asking whether they would consent to being contacted directly by the evaluation team. CD also sent out the on line survey. Only those who explicitly agreed to participate in telephone or direct interviews could therefore be included in the sample. It is plausible to consider that these are more interested and active than the overall average members and with a more positive appreciation of LEND. With regard to Moldovan and Tunisian beneficiaries, the non-responders are probably a combination of genuinely busy people (then or now in high executive positions), and people who participated only in one F2F meeting more as special invitees than as network members. Despite this, the Team endeavoured to cover a reasonably representative group of beneficiaries and active experts/advisors. There were only 19 responses to the on line survey out of 145. The low response rate is probably due to the same reasons as above, and also because many advisors originally recruited have not been solicited for advice or participated in any of the events,

¹⁴ Although they are not members of the LEND network, a couple of invitees to the F2F meetings in Tunis were included in the sample.

and therefore are only passive members, perhaps not very interested as a result. However, it seems to have been difficult in general to collect structured feedback (as opposed to oral and ad hoc feedback); the response rate to immediate F2F meeting evaluation request from CdM has also been low. Furthermore, the ‘weight’ of opinions expressed cannot be always be considered equal; the opinion of somebody who has only participated in one meeting does not have the same significance as the view of somebody who has (say) participated actively in three or four F2F meetings. The Team has tried to take these limitations into consideration when presenting the results of the interviews, but this invariably introduces some subjectivity. The Team has tried to reflect both the dominant responses as well as the outliers, in order to give as nuanced a picture as possible.

Although the evaluation is supposed only to evaluate the first phase, the actual interviews have taken place during the second phase, and invariably interviewees have not made hard and fast distinction between the phases, which have in any case continued rather seamlessly. Furthermore, both CdM and CD have are implementing other activities and initiatives involving Tunisia and Moldova, and some participants interviewed may not always have been fully clear about what has been a LEND activity and what has been a similar other activity.¹⁵

No	Questions to participants	Criteria ¹⁶
	<u>General questions</u>	
0	May we include your name in the list of people interviewed? (Note: no statements are attributed!)	YES/NO
1	How were you selected to take part in LEND?	REL
2	In what respect would you characterize yourself as leader, policy maker and/or influential in policy debate?	REL
3	In your opinion, have all or most of the relevant persons in your country been invited to join LEND? If not, roughly how many would you say are not yet included?	REL
4	Overall, do you think LEND has been useful to you personally and professionally? If so, in what respects?	IMP

¹⁵ A few actually remarked that they had difficulty in figuring out what was LEND and what was some other activity conducted by CdM, and how these related to each other, especially when they dealt with the same topics.

¹⁶ This column indicates to which DAC criteria the question predominantly refers: EFT– effectiveness, EFF– efficiency, IMP – impact, REL– relevance, SUS – sustainability

5	Can you give any concrete examples of how LEND has helped you to advance the democratisation process in your country?	IMP
6	There are many other channels to make contact with other colleagues and get advice and expert knowledge on the topics covered by LEND. In your opinion does LEND have any special features or added value, not available to you from other sources?	EFT EFF
7	Would you wish to continue to participate in the network in the future in (a) additional phases of the project and/or (b) even without a specific support project?	SUS
11	In your opinion, what are the strong and weak points in the LEND project so far?	EFT EFF
12	In your opinion, what are the strong and weak points in the project management of LEND?	EFT EFF
13	Do you have any suggestions on how LEND could be improved – in content, format, management - to make it more relevant and concretely useful for you?	EFT REL
14	As far as you remember, were there presentations, questions or discussion dealing with any aspect of gender equality in relation to the topics of the Face-to-face meetings or in discussions/material on the Platform? If so, what in particular?	REL
	<u>Face to face meetings</u>	
1	Which face-to-face meetings have you participated in ? If you participated in more than one, were some better than others, and if so in what way? Were there some that you did not participate in, but would have found useful?	EFT EFF
2	Were the different topics discussed at the meetings you attended relevant and useful to you? If so, which ones in particular and in what way?	REL IMP
5	In your opinion and experience, are the LEND face-to-face meetings more or less useful than other meetings, workshops and seminars dealing with similar subjects that you have attended? If so, what aspects in particular?	EFF EFT
7	In your opinion, what are the strong and weak points of the face-to-face meetings?	EFT EFF
8	Do you have any suggestions on how the face-to-face meetings, individually or as a series, could be improved to make them more useful for you personally and to promote the democratization process?	EFT EFF
	<u>The virtual platform</u>	
1	How often have you used the platform? <i>(if little or none, follow-up by asking why?)</i>	EFF

2	How have you used the platform? Which functionalities have you used and why? Please give details.	EFF
3	Have you participated in any of the subject communities on the platform? If so, which ones?	EFF
4	Whom have you had productive contacts with? Advisers, CdM members, other colleagues from your own country and/or the other country? How were they useful? What type of advice or information have you sought? How have you used this advice and information?	EFT IMP
8	Have you used the translation features of the Platform? If so, for what? Would you have wished for or have needed more systematic translation assistance to be able to better access documents and/or exchange with other users?	EFF
9	In your opinion and experience, has the LEND platform and network been more or less useful than other networks and platforms/social media dealing with similar subjects that you have participated in? If so, in what respects?	EFT EFF
11	In your opinion, what are the strong and weak points of virtual platforms in general and the LEND platform in particular? What is your overall assessment of the LEND platform?	EFT
12	Do you have any suggestions on how the LEND platform could be improved to make it more useful for you personally and in promoting the democratisation process?	EFF EFT

ON LINE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Evaluation of "Leaders Engaged in New Democracies Network (LEND)"

General questions regarding LEND

1. Please indicate your country of origin

☐ Tunisia
☐ Moldova
☐ Other

2. Please indicate your gender

☐ Female
☐ Male

3. How is your position/expertise/experience relevant to LEND?

4. How useful has LEND overall been for you personally and professionally?

☐ Highly Useful
☐ Useful
☐ Moderately Useful
☐ Not Useful

Please give examples of how LEND has/has not been useful.

5. Would you continue participating in the network also in the future, even if the external project support (financial support) is terminated?

☐ Yes, I would like to participate in the future
☐ No, I don't want to participate in the future
☐ Yes, I can participate in the future even without external financial support
☐ No, I cannot participate in the future without financial support

Evaluation of "Leaders Engaged in New Democracies Network (LEND)"

6. Were any aspects of "gender" touched upon in LEND (during the face to face meetings or on the Platform)?

☐ Very Often
☐ Regularly
☐ Seldom
☐ Never

If yes, please explain when and how the topic was treated

Questions regarding the face-to-face meetings

7. Please rate the face-to-face meetings in which you have participated.

If you did not participate in any Face-to-Face meetings, please go to question 11.

	Did not participate	Very Relevant	Relevant	Moderately Relevant	Not Relevant
Meeting 1, Chisinau October 2012	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Meeting 2, Tunis January 2013	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Meeting 3, Stockholm April 2013	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Meeting 4, Tunis August 2013	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8. Were any of the topics and discussions at the meetings you attended particularly useful to you?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If yes, please provide details

Evaluation of "Leaders Engaged in New Democracies Network (LEND)"	
9. Please list the strong and weak points of the face-to-face meetings and suggestions for improvement.	12. Whom have you had useful exchanges with? ☐ Advisers ☐ Civil Members ☐ Colleagues from your country ☐ Colleagues from the other country Please specify how the exchanges were useful:
10. If you were an expert at the LEND meetings: Do you have indications that your actual input was concretely useful to the participants from Moldova and Tunisia respectively? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, please provide details:	13. Please list the strong and the weak points of the platform and provide suggestions for improvement
Questions regarding the multi-media platform	
11. How often have you used the LEND platform? ☐ Very often ☐ Regularly ☐ Seldom ☐ Never If very often/regularly, what functions have you used?	14. If you were an adviser on the LEND platform: Do you have indications that the actual advice and information you have provided was concretely useful for the participants? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, please give specific examples:
	15. Is the advice and exchange through the face-to-face meetings more or less effective than those provided by the virtual platform? ☐ More effective ☐ As effective ☐ Less effective Please explain your choice:
Specific questions regarding LEND	

Annex 5 – CdM Application LFA/Results Matrix

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX FOR THE LEADERS ENGAGED IN NEW DEMOCRACIES (LEND) PROJECT

	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions and preconditions
Overall objectives (Impact)	The LEND Network will connect leaders in countries in the midst of democratic transition with leaders who have personally navigated the challenges of the democratization through face-to-face meetings and a social networking site that harnesses ground-breaking translation technologies. Through the LEND Network, senior government leaders from Moldova and Tunisia, two countries in the midst of transitions, will connect with Club de Madrid Members and other current and former leaders, from both government and civil society, that played pivotal roles in the democratic transitions in Poland, Slovakia, Romania, Albania, Colombia, and Mongolia among others.	The beneficiaries and target groups of the project are the leaders in the countries that are in the midst of transition. These stakeholders should be receiving quantifiable assistance from those who have previously navigated the challenges of democratization. This assistance and direction will be facilitated through both face to face meetings and through the use of the secure virtual online social community platform. Leaders in Moldova and Tunisia will be discussing issues with leaders from countries that have undergone democratic transition. These leaders will share experiences, advice and documents with the Moldova and Tunisian leaders.	The secure virtual online community of leaders platform will contain records and history showing that collaboration is taking place between leaders in countries in transition and leaders who have previously navigated the challenges of democratization.	The LEND project is about putting together face to face collaboration meetings and a secure virtual online community collaboration platform and service that will enable collaboration and translation capabilities to the users, including leaders in the evolving democracies and experienced leaders from areas that have recently undergone democratic transition.
Specific Objectives (Outcome)				
1	Build a sustainable and self-perpetuating community that operates largely in a virtual setting that is secure, exclusive, and dedicated to the purpose of sharing information about successful democratic transitions	Successful demonstration and operation of the virtual collaboration platform in face to face meetings and through online interaction.	Reports from the virtual community platform that can show history and document collaboration amongst stakeholders. Internal evaluation of face to face meetings.	Even though an operational platform is implemented it may not be effectively used by the community of users that it is targeted at. This may require promotion to and training of the user community from the implementing organization.

2	Enable leaders without a common language to consult one another, seek advice, and exchange shared lessons on democratic transitions	Successful demonstration of the document and conversation translation capability on the virtual collaboration platform.	Documents from the virtual community platform that have been successfully translated from one language to another language.	Users of the system will need to invoke the translation functions available within the social networking community online system. This may require promotion to and training of the user community from the implementing organization.
3	Provide leaders in the world's youngest democracies, like Tunisia and Moldova, with access to information that will enhance their knowledge and empower them as they seek to build stable, prosperous, and democratic societies.	Users in Tunisia and Moldova will be collaborating with leaders in countries that have already undergone democracy transition. They will be accessing key information, documents and procedures from these experienced leaders via the online virtual platform.	Reports from the virtual community platform that can show history and document collaboration amongst stakeholders. Signs that the procedures and implementations obtained through the social interaction are being implemented within the new democracies.	Action will need to be taken by experienced leaders to populate the virtual platform with useful transitional information and documentation. Leaders in the new democracies will need to access this information and begin using it to implement the transitions.
Expected results				
1	Four face-to-face meetings that will bring together members of the Club of Madrid and participants of the LEND Network.	Four meetings will be scheduled and attended by a selection of the stakeholders.	Four meeting reports will be generated to discuss the results of the face to face meeting.	Stakeholders from the emerging democracies and from the experienced regions will need to commit to attend and participate in the face to face meetings.
2	Development of a private, secure virtual online community of leaders.	The social media platform will be implemented and successfully used by the stakeholders.	Contents of the social media platform will be available to demonstrate the collaboration. History files and documents will be inspected to determine outcomes.	Action will need to be taken by experienced leaders to populate the virtual platform with useful transitional information and documentation. Leaders in the new democracies will need to access this information and begin using it to implement the transitions.

2013
Annex 2 Logical Framework Matrix including Tunisia August 2013

2

3	Integration of tool sets to enable moderation functions and a hybrid of human and machine translation.	A user will be able to right click a document and specify another language that the document will be translated to.	The document will be available in the translated to language.	Users of the system will need to invoke the translation functions available within the virtual community online system.
4	An active base of approximately 60 registered users from Tunisia, Moldova, Poland, Slovakia, Romania, Albania, Colombia, and Mongolia (primary audience), as well as leaders and domain experts from Western Europe and North America	The social media collaboration platform will be implemented and successfully used by the stakeholders.	Reports will be generated using the tool to indicate the number of users on the system, country of origin and typical usage of the platform.	The system will need to operate effectively and efficiently in order to attract users to create a community of users to use the new virtual collaboration platform.



Evaluation of “Leaders Engaged in New Democracies Network (LEND)”

This report presents the findings from the evaluation of LEND, Leaders Engaged in New Democracies, which is a pilot initiative implemented by the Club de Madrid and the Community of Democracies, with support from the US State Department, Sida and a specialized Canadian IT company OpenText. The purpose of the evaluation has been to assess and analyse the achievements of the project, as well as to make recommendations regarding the effectiveness and usefulness of continued support.

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>

