

An external evaluation of
EISA's programme to enhance
civil society participation in
the African Peer Review Mechanism
(APRM).

By Dugan Fraser

Final Report: 21 November 2011

An external evaluation of the EISA programme to enhance civil society participation in the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM).

Final Report: 21 November 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Background and introduction to the evaluation and EISA's APRM programme

- 1.1 About the evaluation
- 1.2 EISA's APRM Programme and a review of its plans

2. A review of programme performance

- 2.1 Impact level: to enhance the quality of governance practices in Africa by strengthening Civil Society Participation in the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM).
- 2.2 Outcome1: To strengthen the capacity of civil society organisations and national Technical Research Institutions (TRIs)
- 2.3 Outcome 2: To strengthen the capacity of civil society to engage with government in the APRM process of assessing the country's governance quality
- 2.4 Outcome 3: To directly engage with the APR Secretariat, to enhance the capacity of both the Secretariat and of EISA to engage in the APRM process at a continental level.
- 2.5 Effectiveness and sustainability
- 2.6 Efficiency
- 2.7 Programme management
- 2.8 Reporting, Monitoring and Knowledge Management
- 2.9 EISA's institutional capacity and development
- 2.10 General comments: Successes, challenges and lessons

3. Reflections on what a subsequent programme should contain and address

- 3.1 Recommendations:

Appendices:

- ONE:** Terms of Reference for this evaluation
- TWO:** List of people consulted for this evaluation

An external evaluation of the EISA programme to enhance civil society participation in the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM).

Final Report: 21 November 2011

1. Background and introduction to the evaluation and EISA's APRM programme

1.1 About the evaluation

Process:

This evaluation was undertaken by an independent evaluator contracted by the Pretoria office of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. The evaluation assignment made provision for 12 days of professional services which were delivered over a starting in late August 2011 and concluding in September. The evaluation Terms of Reference is attached to this report as Appendix One.

The process followed to undertake the evaluation included:

- Interviews with programme staff and management
- Field visits to Mozambique and Zambia of around two working days each where a range of different stakeholders were interviewed (a list of whom is attached to this report as Appendix Two).
- The circulation of a questionnaire regarding the programme at the EISA Conference held in August in Johannesburg
- Telephone interviews undertaken with respondents in Mauritius and Tanzania
- Key informant interviews undertaken with collegial NGOs and (briefly) with the APRM Secretariat.

Remarks on the evaluation process:

While some interactions were too brief and essentially inadequate to obtain a complete and comprehensive picture of the programme, the overall impression that has been created has been consistent and in the view of the evaluator there do not seem to be serious gaps, contradictions or inconsistencies.

As a result, this evaluation report should be regarded as having limitations but the evaluator stands by and is prepared to defend the conclusions drawn and recommendations made in it.

The evaluator encountered difficulty accessing strategic and reflective information that would suggest that learning and analysis is undertaken and consciously focused upon in the programme, or that such practices have guided its implementation.

The evaluator wishes to acknowledge the assistance and support of the programme staff in undertaking this evaluation. The assistance provided was greatly appreciated.

Recommendation:

As part of ongoing monitoring and evaluation, the programme should make an explicit and adequately resourced commitment to collecting and using strategic information for its own purposes that should then be available for use by evaluators.

Such information should be multi-purpose: it should take the form of evidence to be used in proving performance and the achievement of results and be the inputs and content used to promote learning and improvement.

1.2 EISA's APRM Programme and a review of its plans

About the programme:

The evaluation focused on two distinct components of the same programme:

- A pilot phase and
- Phase One (as it is called in this report).

The following extract from the evaluation Terms of Reference describes the Programme as follows:

"In an attempt to strengthen the capacity of civil society to engage with governments in the APRM process, EISA developed a pilot project, which was implemented in Mozambique and South Africa between October 2006 and May 2008. In South Africa, EISA participated in efforts to coordinate and develop a national strategy which includes both civil society and government actors in the implementation of the South African Programme of Action (POA). In Mozambique, EISA conducted a series of capacity building activities which include a National Civil Society Conference... and a Methodology Workshop for Technical Research Institutes (TRI's).

The pilot phase of the project [was] followed by a second phase of the project (June 2008 – August 2011)... implemented in five countries (Zambia, Tanzania, Mauritius, Mozambique and South Africa). The project targets three main stakeholders of the APRM process, namely: (1) strengthening civil society capacity; (2) strengthening the capacity of national Technical Research Institutions (TRIs); and (3) strengthening the capacity of the APR Secretariat in contributing to the quality of national APRM processes. The fact that the three main stakeholders are addressed by the project is expected to enhance the overall quality of the APRM process and its outcomes and allow the APRM to become a fully inclusive consultative process.

With this intention in mind, the overall goal of the programmes [was] formulated as: 'to enhance the quality of governance practices in Africa by strengthening Civil Society Participation in the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM).' Accordingly, the project has three primary objectives:

- 1. To strengthen the capacity of civil society organisations and national Technical Research Institutions (TRIs) involved in drafting and compiling official reports used in the compilation of a Country Self-Assessment Report (CSAR) in order to complete their work in a timely manner, and to ensure the integrity and high quality of their work.*
- 2. To strengthen the capacity of civil society to engage with government in the APRM process of assessing the country's governance quality.*

3. *To directly engage with the APR Secretariat, to enhance the capacity of both the Secretariat and of EISA to engage in the APRM process at a continental level.”*

This evaluation report is structured around an analysis of the achievement of the overall goal and of the three intended outcomes, as well as a review of a number of strategic areas specified in the Terms of Reference.

Evidence:

In order to develop an understanding of what had been proposed the evaluator reviewed the Programme plans or proposals for both the pilot phase (in Mozambique) and the follow up phase in the four countries targeted.

Findings:

Of concern is the fact that the programme documents do not contain a systematic and detailed analysis of the issues to be addressed by the programme (i.e. no problem or situation analysis) and that there is no proper stakeholder analysis.

As a result of this omission, it is not clear exactly what (issue, problem or situation) is being addressed by the programme, which from an evaluation and programme planning perspective is highly problematic as a “before and after” comparison is not facilitated.

The related concern is the fact that the programme’s intended Theory of Change is not depicted in any way and is not articulated in the planning documents, neither diagrammatically nor in a narrative format. The Programme’s Theory of Action is also not explained or described.

(While it is conceded that the practice of developing Theories of Change is a relatively new one, programme planning equivalents have been in place for some time (in the form of intervention logics etc) and also, the programme implementers were exposed to the technique during implementation and should have applied it.

While the Programme Plan has a very exhaustive and extensive collection of performance indicators attached to the requisite logframe, these are of a rather strange (and distinctly unhelpful) character. Furthermore, none of them have baseline information provided, making them essentially useless. (Also, as noted later in this report, none of these indicators are reported against in progress reports submitted to SDC).

The plan includes few targets and those that are there are not realistic.

As a result of these issues, the overall impression created is that the proposal is a compliance-oriented document rather than a plan intended to provide a real, helpful guide to action.

The poor quality of the planning documents has affected the programme throughout in that a clear picture of “what success would look like” has not been provided, making strategic management (and a fair, realistic performance assessment) of the overall programme difficult to achieve.

Recommendations

Programme documentation should have:

- Detailed problem and stakeholder analyses
- Clear objectives with proper performance indicators and baseline data
- A clear Theory of Change (description of everything that will change) and a similarly clear Theory of Action (an indication of what the implementing agency will do to achieve the intended changes).

Such programme documents should be drawn up in participatory, inclusive processes in which the key stakeholders who will be responsible for activities participate.

2. A review of programme performance

2.1 Impact level: to enhance the quality of governance practices in Africa by strengthening Civil Society Participation in the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM).

Evidence:

In order to assess the achievement of the programme’s intended impact, the evaluator made use of the Programme’s performance reports, interviews with programme participants and also made use of his own knowledge of governance in Africa.

Reference was also made to other information sources including the Mo Ibrahim Index, which provides a useful overview of the state of governance in Africa.

Findings:

The intended programme impact has not been achieved and it is not clear whether the APRM has made a significant contribution to improved governance in Africa.

Feedback during the evaluation highlighted the fact that it was (quite obviously) never an impact the programme thought would be achieved as a directly attributable result of its efforts, but that it was something the programme sought to contribute to.

This argument is entirely valid and appropriate but it must still be noted that no real, distinct effort has been made to assess progress at this level, and it is perhaps time for programmes such as this (and for donors such as SDC) to start reflecting on performance by the APRM in terms of impact at the macro level, to assess what has, in fact, been achieved and to identify which parts work well and those that do

not, so as at the very least to be able to target support to the points or sites in the system where its effects will be optimal.

Recommendations:

Programmes of this nature need to be more modest and realistic in what they set out to achieve in order to ensure that their best efforts are likely to deliver a result that can be appropriately recognised and their accomplishments recognised.

In short, intended programme impacts need to be more modest and realistic, even if they are only results that are to be contributed to.

Programme plans should also indicate more clearly how the processes to be implemented in the programme will lead to the desired outcomes and impacts. This kind of causal pathway analysis can be done using a simple “activity - output – outcome – impact” model or using an Outcome Mapping approach that better recognises the complexity of what is being attempted. Either way, some sort of explication of programme strategies to achieve intended impacts should be attempted.

2.2 Outcome 1: To strengthen the capacity of civil society organisations and national Technical Research Institutions (TRIs)

Evidence:

Evidence to support an assessment of the achievement of this intended outcome was taken from the CSO participants themselves, in the form of information derived from:

- Programme performance reports
- Findings from interviews
- Feedback from the Conference surveys.

It should be noted that despite efforts to do so, these opinions could not be verified or validated by neutral but informed third parties, such as, for example, the APRM Secretariat.

Findings:

EISA has achieved very well in this area, delivering not only a good service, but doing so in a fashion that has built good relationships and cemented ties with in-country institutions.

Good results have been achieved in creating high levels of awareness amongst civil society organisations and sensitising partners to the APRM and its intricacies.

The work done by the programme has contributed to the creation of good indigenous technical anchor institutions and role-players who have gone on to play constructive and useful roles in the overall process.

The low-key and embedded approach taken has succeeded in building the civil society landscape and has avoided the problems often associated with its rival institution which has been accused of failing to build capacity and of adopting an imperial style. EISA's approach, in contrast, has avoided grandstanding and has instead foregrounded local organisations and in so doing, has strengthened and supported them.

It is remarkable that EISA successfully worked in the countries it did, addressing very sensitive and potentially highly flammable issues without causing any resentment or arousing any hostility at all. This alone is an achievement worth noting.

The approach followed by the programme staff and management was widely remarked upon as being extremely professional, supportive, responsive and generally of a very high calibre.

One major concern is that while the processes followed in each of the countries has worked well, they have not been adequately documented and the procedures followed have not been debated and considered.

A more reflective, analytical and considered approach to documenting **how** what was done was achieved would be useful not only to EISA but also to others seeking to work in-country using the same kind of partnership model used in this programme.

Recommendations:

In order to capture and promote its supportive and effective approach, EISA should be required to write up a Process Guide that unpacks how it went about setting up the in-country programmes and identifying the critical success factors that contributed to its successes in this area.

The Guide should be aimed at its own staff and at collegial institutions and peer initiatives undertaking similar kinds of interventions.

2.3 Outcome 2: To strengthen the capacity of civil society to engage with government in the APRM process of assessing the country's governance quality

Evidence:

Evidence used to develop this assessment of the achievement of this Outcome was mainly the Programme performance reports and the interviews undertaken as part of this process.

Findings:

While this Outcome was partially achieved in Mozambique during the pilot Phase of the Programme, it does not appear to have been addressed elsewhere subsequently.

Elsewhere in the programme, the focus has in effect been limited to focusing on content (i.e. how to contribute to the Country Self Assessment process and the development of the National Programme of Action).

The issue of coaching and mentoring Civil Society Organisations in how to engage with state policy makers in order to ensure that policy proposals and recommendations that emerge through the APRM are fed into public policy making processes has not been addressed, despite its inclusion in the programme plan.

The evaluator is of the view that this remains an important area of work and that it would be a valuable contribution for strategies and approaches to be developed to help CSO practitioners ensure that policy proposals are taken up by public policy makers.

This area of work – priming and supporting public policy development – is in fact really the next frontier in this kind of work and the need for it was clearly articulated in many of the engagements undertaken as part of this evaluation.

Recommendations:

EISA should support members of CSOs to improve their ability to provide information and analysis to public policy makers in ways that help their policy agendas make it into formal policy statements and frameworks.

2.4 Outcome 3: To directly engage with the APR Secretariat, to enhance the capacity of both the Secretariat and of EISA to engage in the APRM process at a continental level.
--

Evidence:

Evidence used to develop this assessment of the achievement of this Outcome was primarily the Programme performance reports and the key informant interviews undertaken as part of this process.

Findings:

Although EISA did participate in one country Review Mission, this area of work has not actually been addressed and there has been very limited performance in this regard. The non-performance in this Outcome area is most unfortunate, given that this is really a very pressing area of need and one that needs to be addressed if the Mechanism is to prosper, or indeed survive.

It must be acknowledged that working with the Secretariat for most of the Programme period was more or less impossible as a result of its strange, secretive and problematic culture.

However that time has passed and the possibility for a real engagement with the Secretariat now does seem possible, provided it is carefully approached and sensitively implemented.

Recommendations:

EISA should make a more vigorous and concerted effort to find ways of building a relationship with the APRM Secretariat in order to assist it to build its own capacity and improve its performance.

This should take the form of initiating a proper formal approach to the institution and taking the care and time required to make the overtures successful.

Experience has shown that these kinds of relationships often need to be brokered by senior, trusted intermediaries and a strategy for involving the right kinds of players needs to be developed and implemented.

Once a stronger relationship has been forged, a proper process should be followed to identify what kinds of organisational development interventions the Secretariat would appreciate and could utilise.

2.5 Effectiveness and sustainability

Evidence:

Very little evidence was provided in this regard besides two very short overview summaries requested of and provided by the Programme.

The findings in this section are therefore the evaluator's opinions and should be recognised as such.

Findings:

The programme has been effective – in that it has done remarkably well in building CSO capacity to contribute to and participate in the initial APRM processes - but has been limited in its scope and reach.

EISA has also not really developed a strategic approach to dealing with the fact that capacity development cannot simply focus on training but also needs to provide systems and procedures in which the additional, recently acquired skills and knowledge can be applied.

In effect, it has only affected the organisations it could interact with and has not developed the kinds of knowledge resources (documenting its approach and strategy, for example) that could be useful to others that do not have direct contact with EISA.

There has not been sufficient energy put into documenting and recording what has been learnt from the processes successfully implemented as part of this programme.

Sustainability does not appear to have been reflected upon and the programme's reliance on a narrow donor base is very problematic. While it is clear that donor interest in and support to governance

initiatives in general and the APRM in particular has waned, there has been no clear indication that concerted and sustained efforts to secure additional support have been made.

(The issues encountered while developing and then submitting a revised, comprehensive application to SDC during the programme implementation period are recognised and the negative effect this had is acknowledged, but pursuing and securing additional resources remains a priority that should be addressed.)

Recommendations:

A recommendation in this regard has already been made and relates to the need for EISA to develop a procedure guide or manual on how to go about achieving its good results in mobilising CSO participation in the initial APRM processes.

Such an approach (developing and implementing a strategy that is then documented for dissemination and sharing) should not only be applied to the issue of CSO participation but also, perhaps, in other areas of programme implementation too.

In terms of addressing sustainability, it is clear that initiatives such as this are always going to require donor support and to facilitate this, a comprehensive programme budget should be developed and additional resources sought if necessary.

2.6 Efficiency

Evidence:

The Terms of Reference for this assignment requires that the evaluation “Provide the project with an indication regarding the **efficiency** of the use of its resources, e.g. could the same have been achieved with fewer resources”.

Since the financial reporting is not done on a performance basis (i.e. it does not provide a discrete indication of the cost of delivering each output and each outcome) there is little rigorous evidence that can be drawn on to answer this question. Therefore, as with the section above, the response provided below is the evaluator’s opinion that could be disputed if it can be disproved.

Findings:

The (intuitive) view of the evaluator is that the programme has operated very efficiently but at some cost to programme integrity: much has been achieved by working hard and getting a lot done but things that could have been achieved by operating more deliberately have not.

Very good use has been made of partner organisations and this has been done in a sensitive, non-intrusive way that has allowed these institutions to improve their own performance and practice and operate more effectively and competently.

This is laudable and has much to do with the supportive, approachable and accommodating style adopted during the implementation of programme activities.

The cost however has been that there has been inadequate strategic reflection and knowledge management and as a result, learning that should have been captured has not and practices that could be made available to others have not been shared. This point has been made several times earlier in this report.

Recommendations:

Programme efficiency needs to be buttressed with a strategic, reflective capacity that integrates what is learnt into EISA's overall programme and a proper, systematic learning agenda that includes a dissemination and sharing component.

2.7 Programme management

Evidence:

Little evidence was provided in this area and the consultant had to make use of information gained from the EISA website and its two most recent Annual Reports.

Findings:

The consultant's view is that the programme is not sufficiently well integrated into the work of its division (the Governance Institutions and Processes (GIP) Programme) or of the organisation as a whole. The impression created is that to some extent the Programme has operated as an island or a bubble within the overarching EISA programme and has neither contributed to nor benefited from what is being done elsewhere in the organisation.

This is unfortunate and a missed opportunity as there are clearly synergies between what is being done and achieved in this programme and what is being done elsewhere in GIP and EISA.

Recommendations:

A clearer conceptual and strategic link between what is being done in the APRM programme and what is being done in GIP and EISA as a whole should be identified and programmed into the plans of both the initiative and the organisation as a whole.

Clear and concerted efforts should be made to link what is done in the APRM programme to a larger EISA-owned agenda and progress in delivering on these linkages should be reported upon at least annually if not quarterly.

2.8 Reporting, Monitoring and Knowledge Management

Evidence:

The conclusions reached in this area are based on an analysis of:

- Programme progress reports
- The comprehensive and detailed reports provided to the evaluator on specific events including fact finding missions and key workshops and conferences.
- A book produced by the programme, "*Peering the Peers: Civil society and the African Peer Review Mechanism*", a collection of essays by African civil society and governance experts in which they review the role of civil society in the APRM.

Findings:

Reporting by the programme has been very exhaustive, detailed and comprehensive. Detailed accounts of all activities undertaken during programme implementation have been provided and offer insight into what was done and by whom.

However, while comprehensive and detailed, these reports are not sufficiently strategic and are not analytically oriented but are more verbatim accounts of events and activities. The problem with this kind of non-analytical or reflective reporting is that it is not results-oriented and does not provide insight into progress towards achieving outcomes.

It should also be noted that in the case of some of the progress reports, these are often essentially duplicate reports ("retreads" as they were termed) with little new content added to existing versions, a characteristic that only becomes clear when compared to previous reports: if read alone they would create an incorrect impression of outputs being delivered or results achieved when in fact they were produced in the preceding period.

Another concern is that the Programme's monitoring reports are characterised by the absence of any reference whatsoever to the performance indicators contained in the programme documents, which while problematic, as noted earlier in this report, are at least some conceptual guide to progress in achieving the Programme's intended results.

Most worrying about the programme's monitoring is the absence of a proper, reflective approach to learning, where what has been achieved is captured, reflected upon and shared.

In what is essentially a one-person programme, a reflective, analytical approach to monitoring and reporting could not realistically have been implemented, and this is where the corporate support at either a divisional or organisational level should have been provided but was not.

Recommendations:

A persuasive and use-oriented monitoring and evaluation strategy that links to a knowledge and learning approach implemented EISA-wide should be a key element of the programme.

2.9 EISA's institutional capacity and development

Evidence:

The evaluator was not provided with specific information on the EISA institutional set up or performance and as a result the analysis presented here is based almost exclusively on interaction with EISA and programme staff.

Findings:

Regarding capacity:

While EISA (at the organisational level) on the necessary occasions (such as conferences or big events) has provided additional administrative capacity to support the programme, in practice it has run as a one-person initiative.

This has had the various effects identified above, primarily the absence of a strategic and reflective capacity which has led to an inability to capture experiences and learn from what has been done. It has also contributed to the sporadic nature of performance in the programme.

This is not ideal and additional strategic capacity is required if the programme's outcomes are to be larger than the sum of its outputs.

Regarding strategic orientation:

It is not clear what is meant by this item in the Terms of Reference but if it is taken to mean the strategic orientation of the programme into the overall EISA strategy, it is clear that additional thinking and work is required in this regard.

This is particularly true now that the body of work undertaken in the APRM is no longer about self assessment but about the business of actually implementing governance improvement initiatives. The consultant is of the view that this links very clearly and directly into the work of the organisation as a whole and presents a good opportunity for the APRM programme to link with other components at EISA.

Regarding governance arrangements:

EISA appears to have a competent Board in place and governance and leadership is provided by this structure from an accountability perspective.

However, this is a somewhat distant body far removed from the daily affairs of the programme, which has felt the absence of an advisory structure that could act as a sounding board and provide guidance and support from a strategic and directional perspective.

Regarding stakeholder analysis:

One of the lacuna in the programme approach is an inadequate conceptualisation of all the stakeholders that need to play a role, and what has emerged in the programme has been a natural tendency to stick within a particular comfort zone: the civil society sector, and a reluctance to engage actively and energetically with other players, particularly the state in each country.

The absence of a comprehensive and systematic stakeholder analysis (especially of the states involved) to inform programme activities is a key factor that has shaped the programme and care should now be taken to adopt a bigger-picture analysis that identifies key entry and leverage points.

Recommendations:

Capacity-related:

Additional capacity should be provided to support the more strategic aspects of the programme including the identification of lessons learnt and knowledge management.

Governance and Strategy-related:

There should be some kind of Programme Advisory or Reference Group available to provide guidance on important strategic questions facing the programme and to support decision making.

Stakeholder analysis-related:

A comprehensive and systematic analysis of players involved in implementing the APRM in each country should be undertaken.

Even if this cannot be undertaken at an individual institutional or organisational level, there does at least need to be a more thoroughgoing analysis of the nature and character of each sector and a strategic reflection on what is possible and what should be avoided.

2.10 General comments: Successes, challenges and lessons

Evidence:

These comments are not evidence based but are the opinion of the evaluator.

Findings:

By far the greatest success has been the programme's ability to mobilise in-country organisations to step up and participate meaningfully in a process that could otherwise have proceeded much less fruitfully without their valuable input.

As a result of EISA's catalytic efforts in the countries where it has worked, the Mechanism has been enriched and enlivened and the intention of robust engagements around governance has been better fulfilled. This is a significant achievement. It is important to note that what has characterised EISA's involvement has been a sensitive approach that has been distinctly non-exploitative. This is appropriate and important.

EISA's challenge is to be more conscientious about documenting how it does what it does so that others can learn from its hard-learned lessons and achievements.

A further challenge is to now move out of its comfort zone and to grapple with the very serious issue of how to make state policy makers take policy lessons from non-state actors on board in meaningful and practical ways. This is the challenge facing not just EISA but the whole next generation of APRM processes. However, the self-assessment processes are still important and also need to be focused upon and the solid and useful lessons already learnt need to be systematically shared and conscientiously applied.

As a result of the fact that the programme is based on the hard-working efforts of a single key individual, performance in the programme has essentially been very good but marred by inconsistency – periods when performance suddenly slowed. On the other hand, in general, the programme has generally delivered a high level of performance. This kind of approach is not sustainable and contributes to consequences such as staff burn out and other kinds of human resource problems.

Recommendations:

The lessons learnt in the programme should be properly identified: interactions to date have suggested that there is a wealth of knowledge that has been accumulated through its processes and a proper systematic effort should be made to write these lessons up and to disseminate and share them with others.

An adequate and realistic human resourcing strategy with the necessary capacity should be developed and implemented.

3. Reflections on what a subsequent programme should contain and address

3.1 Recommendations:

1. The proposal and the intended intervention should be preceded by a detailed problem and stakeholder analysis.
2. The proposal should contain clear objectives with proper performance indicators and baseline data.
3. The proposal should contain a clear Theory of Change and a similarly clear Theory of Action for the intended intervention.
4. The process to design the programme should be participatory and include all key stakeholders who will be responsible for implementing activities and achieving intended outcomes.
5. The intended programme results should be clear, modest, realistic and achievable.
6. The programme should build on what has been learnt.
7. The proposed intervention should be innovative and creative.
8. The proposal should make specific provision for learning and knowledge management.
9. The programme should specifically address the issue of how to influence state policy makers?
10. The proposal should make a convincing case for how it will approach working with the Secretariat?
11. The proposal should make provision for the development of a “How To” Guide on mobilising civil society participation in the APRM?

12. The monitoring, reporting and knowledge management / learning component of the programme should be adequately developed and sufficient provision should be made for the human capacity required to implement the necessary activities.
13. There should be an overarching resourcing strategy and other donors should be approached to provide support.
14. There should be a clear (i.e. obvious and visible) link between the proposal and EISA's overarching institutional strategy.
15. The proposal should make provision for a Reference or Advisory Group and provision should be made for any associated costs.

Appendices:

ONE: Terms of Reference for this evaluation

TWO: List of people consulted for this evaluation

APPENDIX ONE:

External Evaluation of the EISA Programme on “Enhancing Civil Society Participation in the APRM”

Terms of Reference

1. Background

The Africa Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) is a continent-wide launched by African states in order to conduct contextual and voluntary assessment of governance in African states. Its purpose is to encourage engagement between the government and civil society of a country, as well as engagement with other like-minded African states that are committed to improving their institutions and governance practices. It aims at improving the state’s institutions and governance practices through shared experiences. The engagement of civil society in assessing the state of governance in a given country is seen an essential component of the peer review process. In practice, however, the APRM process in Africa has been characterised by characterised by human resources and financial constraints and lack of meaningful participation and cohesiveness among various stakeholders.

In an attempt to strengthen the capacity of civil society to engage with governments in the APRM process, EISA developed a pilot project, which was implemented in Mozambique and South Africa between October 2006 and May 2008. In South Africa, EISA participated in efforts to coordinate and develop a national strategy which includes both civil society and government actors in the implementation of the South African Programme of Action (POA). In Mozambique, EISA conducted a series of capacity building activities which include a National Civil Society Conference in collaboration with the Mozambique APRM-Technical Unit (MARPTU) and a Methodology Workshop for Technical Research Institutes (ITR’s). By encouraging local CSOs and institutions to develop their own capacity to both understand and engage in the APRM, EISA achieves the twin goals of fostering national ownership of the APRM as well as developing the internal institutional capacity of its strategic partners. The pilot project also deepened and extended EISA’s experiences, understanding and knowledge of the APRM process. In addition, the pilot project has indicated the need to provide support to key Technical Research Institutions (TRIs) in the APRM survey process, which were previously overlooked.

The pilot phase of the project is followed by a second phase of the project (June 2008 – August 2011), which has been implemented in five countries (Zambia, Tanzania, Mauritius, Mozambique and South Africa). The project targets three main stakeholders of the APRM process, namely: (1) strengthening civil society capacity; (2) strengthening the capacity of national Technical Research Institutions (TRIs); and (3) strengthening the capacity of the APR Secretariat in contributing to the quality of national APRM processes. The fact that the three main stakeholders are addressed by the project is expected to enhance the overall quality of the APRM process and its outcomes and allow the APRM to become a fully inclusive consultative process.

With this intention in mind, the overall goal of the programmes has been formulated as: *‘to enhance the quality of governance practices in Africa by strengthening Civil Society Participation in the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM).’* Accordingly, the project has three primary objectives:

4. To strengthen the capacity of civil society organisations and national Technical Research Institutions (TRIs) involved in drafting and compiling official reports used in the compilation of a Country Self-Assessment Report (CSAR) in order to complete their work in a timely manner, and to ensure the integrity and high quality of their work.
5. To strengthen the capacity of civil society to engage with government in the APRM process of assessing the country's governance quality.
6. To directly engage with the APR Secretariat, to enhance the capacity of both the Secretariat and of EISA to engage in the APRM process at a continental level.

The evaluation will, inter alia, assess the extent to which the programme goals and objectives have been achieved, expected results attained and intended outcomes registered. This evaluation will also serve as a mechanism for EISA to account for the funds received from SDC and receive feedback on its performance (both programmatic and financial) to improve the relevance of its approach and the efficient and effective use of its resources. It will constitute the basis of possible future funding of EISA's regional/continental APRM by SDC. In addition, evaluation will also review the joint proposal developed by EISA and SAIIA in light of its findings. Through this evaluation, lessons shall be learned concerning the most successful approaches and strategic choices but also related to failures. Such lessons shall serve as an input for the successful implementation of the next phase of the cooperation between EISA, SAIIA and SDC.

3. Objectives of the evaluation

The objectives of the external evaluation are threefold:

- 1) Accountability: Provide substance on what has been accomplished by the programme with a reference to: (a) the original and the adjusted objectives; (b) agreed upon work-plans and budgets;
- 2) Learning: Provide insight in what has been learned during the implementation of the project or what can be learned from the experiences. Also look both at the approach and methodology used as to the management of the project.
- 3) Way Forward: Provide an input into the formulation of the next potential phase of the cooperation between EISA, SAIIA and SDC by defining a tentative objective for the next phase and by providing suggestions regarding the approach to be used. On the basis of the recommendations of the evaluation, it will be determined whether the programme continues in its present form, or whether changes have to be effected in both its form and content, particularly on the joint initiative of EISA and SAIIA.

4. Scope of work

The evaluation shall assess the overall results of the project (in terms of output, outcome and impact), comparing original plans with actual implementation. Considerable deviations from the plans should be identified and explanations for deviations shall be provided. More emphasis should be given to the outcome of the project as opposed to the outputs. The following issues shall be addressed:

- a. Evaluate the **relevance** of the chosen project approach and methodology in achieving the intended objectives of the project including:
 - o The selection of target countries;
 - o The selection of partners (global, regional and national);

- The importance fact-finding missions;
 - The importance of capacity-building workshop and activities;
 - The importance of publication;
- b. Evaluate the **effectiveness** and **sustainability** of the project interventions in strengthening the capacity of civil society organisations, Technical Research Institutes (TRIs), the APRM Secretariat and the general public.
 - c. Provide the project with an indication regarding the **efficiency** of the use of its resources, e.g. could the same have been achieved with fewer resources?
 - d. Describe the successes of the project and the challenges encountered and present these as lessons learned
 - e. Examine EISA's institutional capacity and development in relation of the APRM project: This includes EISA's capacity, strategic orientation, governance arrangements, stakeholder analysis, monitoring and evaluation systems, programme management and organisational setup, including the coordination between EISA headquarters and field offices, and country partners and beneficiaries.

In order to improve knowledge management and ensure a result-based approach, SDC would also like to take stock of best practices in its partnerships and identify the level of understanding, use and implication of outcome monitoring and knowledge management. The evaluator is therefore requested to address the following specific questions:

Monitoring:

1. What level is monitored by the project (output, outcome and impact) and how is it done (inclusivity, quality control of collected data, etc)?
2. Is it done for all countries/projects/programmes or for part of them only?
3. Is the monitoring requirement different from donor to donor (if yes, what are the differences and what does it imply for EISA)?
4. What is the use of monitoring in EISA (management purposes, reporting purposes, identification of outcomes, etc)?

Knowledge Management:

1. How is the project experience and information stored/kept in EISA (includes updates of electronic files, archiving of hard copies, etc)
2. Why project information is stored/ kept (is there a well defined purpose such as reducing the impact of staff turn-over)?
3. Who has access to this project information and who uses it?

The evaluator is requested to present its **findings** and **conclusions on which results have been achieved** and provide **recommendations** on how EISA can increase the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and development impact of its capacity building support to its clients and partners in order to deepen democracy and good governance in the region in future.

5. The approach to be used by the evaluation

A. Pre-Mission (2 days)

Desk-study

A brief desk study shall be carried out prior to the evaluation mission, to review the most relevant documentation concerning the project. Documents to be studied include: the original

project proposals, the bi-annual reports, financial reports, work plans of EISA and local partners, assessment reports and capacity building plans, relevant correspondences and any other progress monitoring reports of the two project phases (October 2006 – August 2011). In addition, the draft joint proposal developed by EISA and SAIIA for a potential new phase of the APRM project.

Elaboration of evaluation framework and instruments

On the basis of the desk-study, the evaluator will prepare an evaluation framework that (re)constructs the intervention logic of the project. The evaluator will identify and elaborate appropriate methods, tools and instruments for the data-collection and analysis during the field mission. The evaluator will develop a detailed list of questions to respond to the areas outlined in section 4.

Logistical support

The evaluator shall indicate the support it expects to receive during the mission from EISA. This can relate to required time (for interviews, field visits), organisational support (for field visits, regional/local institutions, etc), logistics (transport, booking accommodation, etc). EISA APRM Project Manager and the evaluator will discuss how these needs can be met.

B. Evaluation Mission (7 days)

Out of the five target countries of the project, the evaluator will conduct a field visit to two countries (Zambia and Mozambique) in order to strike a balance between the pilot and the second phase. Based on the desk study, the evaluator may however decide to select other countries. Dates and mission programme are to be confirmed between the evaluator and EISA

Briefing with EISA Team

On the first day of the mission, the evaluator and the EISA team will meet. During this meeting, the evaluator provides a briefing regarding the mission's approach. The evaluator will take into consideration the suggestions of the EISA team members regarding this approach.

Field visits, data-collection and initial analysis

The team will conduct interviews with local partners, (including relevant CSOs and TRIs) and other local beneficiaries of the project such as media representatives.

Draft reporting, incl. preliminary findings and recommendations

It is expected that the evaluator will first list the opinions of the various stakeholders before drawing conclusions. Towards the end of the mission the evaluator shall have prepared a draft report, which includes preliminary findings and recommendations. The length of the evaluation report should be a maximum of 25 pages single-spaced document before inclusion of appendices typed in Arial using a font size of 12. This will include comments on the draft joint proposal submitted by EISA and SAIIA.

Debriefing with EISA

At the end of the mission the evaluator holds a de-briefing for EISA. Here, the evaluator presents a verbal and written summary of its findings, conclusions and recommendations (ca. 5 pages). The EISA team will be given an opportunity to comment on the evaluator's findings, conclusions and recommendations. The evaluator may consider these comments for the final report.

C. Post-Mission (3 days)

Debriefing with project management

Shortly after the mission, a debriefing of the evaluators with SDC and EISA management will take place, based on the draft report (summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations).

Reporting

Within one week after the end of the mission, the evaluator shall submit a Final Report to the Executive Director of EISA and the Regional Governance Programme Manager of SDC. SDC will check whether requirements are in line with the ToR and quality standards have been met, who shall then give final approval.

6. **Composition of the evaluation Team**

SDC and EISA jointly select an evaluator who has sufficient experience in the field of APRM and Monitoring and Evaluation in the SADC Region. The evaluator shall have significant experience in carrying out evaluations and at least 10 years of relevant experience.

7. **Tentative time schedule (A total of 12 days within 01 – 31 August 2011)**

Activity	Duration
1. Pre-mission:	2 days
Documentation review; elaboration of evaluation framework and instruments; programming of evaluation mission.	2
2. Evaluation mission:	7 days
Briefing by EISA team	1 day
Field visits, data collection and initial analysis	5 days
Draft report and debriefing with EISA	1 day
3. Post-mission:	3 days
Presentation and Debriefing with SDC and EISA management	1 day
Revising and Submission of Final Report	2 days
Acceptance of Final Report by SDC	
Total :	12 days

The evaluation will be undertaken over a period of twelve (12) days spread over four (4) weeks. Payment will be made on the basis of twelve (12) working days. The allocation of the twelve days (12 days) of work could be adjusted in consultation with SDC and EISA. However, the total days of work and payment should not exceed twelve days (12) days.

APPENDIX ONE:

List of people consulted for this evaluation

Arlete Patel Alves	Former Director: APRM National Forum	<i>Maputo Mozambique</i>
Miguel de Bruto	EISA Country Director	<i>Maputo Mozambique</i>
Obby Chibuluma	Information Officer: Southern African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes	<i>Lusaka Zambia</i>
Ebrahim Fakir	Programme Manager: EISA	<i>Johannesburg, South Africa</i>
Albino Maria Francisco	Advocacy and Civil Society Manager: FDC	<i>Maputo Mozambique</i>
Steve Gruzd	Former APRM Programme Manager, South African Institute for International Affairs	<i>Johannesburg South Africa</i>
Lee Habasonda	Director: Southern African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes	<i>Lusaka Zambia</i>
Eugene Kabilika	Programme Specialist: Governance and Human Rights, Caritas	<i>Lusaka Zambia</i>
Sister Kayula	Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection	<i>Lusaka Zambia</i>
Grant Masterson	Senior Programme Officer: EISA	<i>Johannesburg South Africa</i>
Godfrey Mpandikizi	Programme Manager: Legal Human Rights Centre	<i>Dar es Salaam Tanzania</i>
Michelo Mwango	Programme Officer Accountability and Good Governance Programme Southern African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes	<i>Lusaka Zambia</i>

David Mwanza	Programme Officer, Caritas	<i>Lusaka Zambia</i>
Susan Mwape	Coordinator: Civil Society APRM Secretariat	<i>Lusaka Zambia</i>
Hope Mubanga	Programmes Manager: Foundation for Democratic Process	<i>Lusaka Zambia</i>
Ram Nookadee	Director: MACOSS	<i>Mauritius</i>
Chileshe Nsama	Elections Officer: Caritas	<i>Lusaka Zambia</i>
Ephrem Tadesse	Programme Officer: SDC	<i>Pretoria South Africa</i>
Amelia Zambeze	Deputy Chair: APRM National Forum	<i>Maputo, Mozambique</i>