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Executive summary

1 The Civic Engagement Alliance (CEA), consisting of 6 Dutch organisations (ICCO, Kerk in Aktie, CNV International, Prisma, Wilde Ganzen and Edukans) with ICCO taking the lead, commissioned an external end-term evaluation of the five-year CEA strategic partnership with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2016-2020). The objective of the evaluation was to assess to what extent and how CEA and their in-country implementing partner organisations have progressed in reaching sustainable results as formulated in the Theories of Change of the specific country Pathways of Change during the period 2016-2020.

2 The overall aim of the CEA programme was to strengthen the contribution of civil society to inclusive development and decreasing inequality. An overall Theory of Change (ToC) was developed, consisting of four Pathways of Changes (PW) and with gender and disability inclusion as cross-cutting themes. CEA alliances in the 12 countries and in NL/EU were asked to select the most relevant PWs for their situation, therewith creating room for the necessary contextualisation.

3 **PW 1 - Political space for civil society organisations**: this PW had an aim in itself (L&A for political space) and supported the other three PWs (enhanced L&A capacities). The outcome was to strengthen civil-society organisations (CSOs) to successfully do damage control/ limit intended restrictions, to claim operational and political space/ widen political space, and to implement various effective forms of lobbying and advocacy on issues of interest in their society, and to increase their domestic resource base and public accountability.

4 **PW2 - The right to adequate food**: The CEA programme supported CEA partners to strive for policy change, policy implementation and governance structures that promote the right to adequate food and sustainable food and consumption systems that guarantee access and control over land and other natural resources.

5 **PW3 - Smallholder empowerment and inclusive markets**: this PW aimed at contributing to a supportive policy environment and improved chain governance of value chains, enabling inclusion of marginalised groups (small producers, including women, youth and workers, and their organisations), protecting and promoting workers’ rights and contributing to sustainable and improved incomes and livelihoods.

6 **PW4 - Sustainable private sector**: this PW aimed at contributing to an increased adherence of the private sector to the UN Guiding Principles on Business & Human Rights, to diminish negative impacts of private sector on society (do no harm), in particular on the human rights of citizens and workers, and strengthen the contribution of the private sector to human rights (do good).

7 The CEA programme was implemented in collaboration with partners of the different CEA members, both historical partners and newly identified partners. Per design, the CEA programme complemented existing programmes and projects of partners with a L&A component. In order to create impact, CEA members and their partners aimed at creating and strengthening linkages between the different organisations, groups at community level and larger actors at national and regional levels in order to jointly identify L&A issues and develop strategic L&A interventions. Kerk in Actie and Prisma members could rely on strong networks of faith-based partners. Kerk in Actie, ICCO and Prisma members cooperated with partners representing specific (marginalised) groups, such as women, indigenous communities, organisations of people living with HIV and people with disabilities. CNV International brought in their specific network of trade unions that have members in various economic sectors and are represented in national social dialogue structures. CNV international, Woord en Daad and ICCO could further built on existing linkages with private sector actors, necessary in L&A processes related to Business and Human Rights and inclusive value chain development.
The evaluation was carried out between April and October 2020. The results of the evaluation are based on a desk study of programme documents of all 13 CEA countries involved, and in-depth data-collection in 4 countries (Indonesia, Myanmar, Uganda, Netherlands) through workshops and interviews. Preliminary results have been discussed with CEA members and partners during sense-making workshops at country (four countries) and at global level.

**Effectiveness of the L&A capacity development support**

Capacity building took place through trainings and emerged organically through the implementation of interventions (learning-by-doing and coaching by CEA members, peer learning and exchange of experiences). The CEA programme lacked a comprehensive capacity development strategy, which would have provided more cohesion to in-country activities (including peer learning and training of trainers), underpin explicit and intentional learning trajectories, scale individual skills to the organisational level, and allowed to better monitor partners’ capacities development.

The CEA ICCO teams were assigned with the coordination of the capacity development support interventions provided by the different CEA members, which depended on their presence in-country and/or availability of trainers and advisors. By consequence, the offer of capacity development support interventions varied between the countries, and varied in breadth and depth. Consolidation and follow-up support were not always equally guaranteed.

The CEA capacity development support has contributed to enhancing a set of L&A competencies of staff members of civil society organisations, including of their constituencies and farmer groups. They have contributed to creating and demanding civic space where government, private sector and civil society meet to discuss a variety of challenges in the agricultural sector and find common solutions, moving from more confrontational approaches to the improvement of dialogue among stakeholders. As a result, partners have enhanced their legitimacy before other stakeholders in the sector.

CEA partners also have become more aware regarding inclusion of marginalised groups (women, people with disabilities, youth, indigenous people) in their activities and L&A efforts, and in some cases have developed and adapted policies to diversify their own workplaces. To a lesser extent, CEA programme contributed to enhance the capacity of partners to diversify their funding sources, explained by the lesser attention paid to this area of capacity development.

**Effectiveness of the L&A interventions**

Through technical assistance, capacity building and facilitation of dialogues, CEA partners developed bonds of trust with government agencies working in different policy areas, also product of a strategic alignment between policy priorities and CEA’s targets. CEA partners helped government agencies better reach target groups with their services. CEA programme also contributed to shape critical legislative debates and L&A for legislation to protect farmers’ interests. However, not always CEA’s work materialised in concrete policy and institutional changes, partly explained by factors such as the timing of policy processes, policy makers’ capacities, and the limited government coordination, both vertical and horizontal.

Through the recognition of its importance in strengthening a more inclusive agricultural sector, in several countries CEA partners were able to engage the private sector and make it a regular participant in relevant forums and workshops, and linked it with trade unions, farmers and government stakeholders. By combining a top-down (working with private sector companies) and a bottom-up (working with farmers associations and trade unions)
approach, CEA programme also raised awareness on human rights in business and helped commit companies to improve labour conditions of their employees, though not many significant changes in practices have been identified in this area yet.

15 Broadened civic space and citizens’ voices heard: CEA contributed to an increased understanding of L&A processes among CSOs and more effective engagement of CSOs in L&A activities. Partners referred to an evolution from a confrontational approach towards a dialogue-based approach with government and private sector actors. CEA created new farmer associations and CSO networks and contributed to strengthening access of CSOs in networks and multi-stakeholder platforms, and in facilitating access of farmer groups, women, youth, indigenous people and people with disabilities to relevant lobby fora at local, district, regional and national level. CEA enabled CSOs to navigate under restrictive NGO laws and to lobby for a more conducive environment for civic space.

16 Right to adequate food: In 7 countries, CEA contributed to the inclusion of Food and Nutrition Security in local development plans and/or to CSOs becoming involved in monitoring the implementation of national Food and Nutrition Security plans. CEA partners are collaborating with government agencies to improve their service delivery and bring these closer to the farmers. In some countries CEA contributed to secure land management systems.

17 Small producer empowerment and inclusive markets: In 10 countries, small-scale farmers gained access to resources (e.g. seeds, loans, etc.) and to markets because of improved quality of produce (supported by elaborated quality standards and Good Agricultural Practice certificates), and enhanced linkages with value chain actors. CEA’s targeted commodities have gained priority attention in local and/or national agricultural policies.

18 Sustainable private sector: In 4 countries, CEA contributed to improved understanding of UNGP on Business and Human Rights among private sector actors, government and CSOs. Social dialogue was strengthened. Changed practices are visible among some frontrunners.

Relevance

19 The CEA programme provided relevant responses to the challenges selected value chains were facing, and that were aligned with ongoing policy processes at local, regional and national level. The programme defined a set of relevant lobby targets at the level of commodities, policies and stakeholders, and combined it with an adaptive approach that allowed to react to windows of opportunity. Initially, many country programmes lacked focus as L&A efforts were spread over a variety of topics, commodities, lobby targets and partners. During the second half of the programme implementation, adaptations brought more focus, by downsizing the number of commodities, concentrating in specific geographic areas, and better identifying windows of opportunity for policy change.

20 A relevant and smart mix of L&A strategies have been implemented, with a focus on dialogue, networking and multi-stakeholder processes. Connections between national and international L&A were rather limited. The investment in capacity development support was very relevant, taking into account that L&A was relatively new for many partners (and CEA members). In particularly the focus on enhancing the legitimacy and credibility of CSO was relevant, certainly in cases when civil space is under attack. The combination of capacity development support strategies was relevant but a strategy to develop organisation-specific L&A trajectories was lacking and complicating monitoring thereof.

21 The ToC approach has been helpful in capturing the collective ambitions at country level. The ToC helped implementing partners to think through what they aimed to achieve, to identify accompanying hypotheses, and in being more specific on identifying expected change from lobby trajectories. The flexibility of the ToC approach, the
opportunity to adapt the programme to the context and the space created for collective learning were widely acknowledged.

22 There was some weakness in the design of the ToCs at programme and at country level, such as the lack of synergy between the different PWs and the lack of causal assumptions that could give more insight in the effectiveness of the L&A strategies and support the learning process. The ToC has not guided the actual L&A process (e.g. identifying lobby targets, building relationships and networking, grasping opportunities, collecting relevant data etc.), which, together with the fact that implementing partners were not involved in the initial design, negatively influenced the level of ownership of the country ToC among the partners.

23 Despite a promising complementarity in the selection of partners (in terms of expertise, experience, networks and approaches), siloed work prevailed among partners in the majority of the CEA countries, a result of the top-up approach and combination of CEA members, and the weak synergy between the different PWs.

**Sustainability**

24 Sustainability of the CEA programme results is mixed. Institutional sustainability is high, which is a result from the relevant choice of programme policy topics, strategic choices made, selection of implementing partners, and the attention paid by the programme to build further on existing L&A competencies and capabilities and/or add a L&A component to existing programmes. Up- and out scaling of programme results will depend on the available human and financial resources that can be mobilised by partners in existing or new projects.

25 CEA has influenced changes in government policies and procedures and has laid the ground for future government decision at various levels to consider farmers’ needs. CEA also leaves a legacy of research and toolkits that can become reference for government decision makers, private sector and civil society stakeholders. Financial resources for policy (change) implementation that need to be made available by government and private sector are not always guaranteed. Changes at private sector level are yet to be seen but awareness and knowledge on responsible business has been built and structural collaboration achieved with sector associations, although private companies are still hesitant to invest in business and human rights out of fear of its negative impact on business efficiency.

26 Citizen led L&A is recognised by partners as the most effective and sustainable means of influencing service delivery and inclusive development of policies and practices. The CEA programme was therefore a valuable joint learning experience and capacity building initiative. Implementing partners are determined to continue the approach, as some have incorporated L&A in their strategies and plans for the coming years and several joint fundraising proposals have been presented to donors by CEA members and partners, with different levels of success. These programmes and interventions can build on CEA’s legacy to upscale its results. While CEA leaves a strong connection among stakeholders, especially through multi stakeholder platforms, their sustainability depends on the willingness and interest of its members, and the availability of funding. The collaboration between partners, farmers groups and government stakeholders is in a better position to continue at the local level, where CEA partners have well established presence and connections with communities.

**Efficiency**

27 Its top-up design allowed CEA to build on the strengths of its partners, leverage the L&A potential of other interventions by its partners, and also to expand the outreach of CEA’s actions in terms of farmers’ needs, stakeholders engaged and geographical outreach. This choice proved to be successful as demonstrated by the multiple results realised at country levels and possibilities for continuation and up-scaling of programme results. The
top-up approach also came with a certain cost: as both L&A and the ToC approach were new to many of the implementing partners, time was needed to align efforts, to enhance L&A capacity, to enable partners to make a mental shift (together with their constituencies) from service delivery to lobby and advocacy, and to become familiar with the ToC approach. In most countries, therefore, the programme took off slowly in terms of L&A interventions and results, and came up to speed in the last two years of the programme period.

28 Good governance and programme management procedures were in place to enable effective and efficient management of the CEA programme. No explicit attention was given to measure efficiency, but there was an implicit use of efficiency principles through monitoring, learning and adaptation and relevant measures have been taken to improve efficiency during programme implementation.

29 The management model followed ICCO’s decentralised management structure, which worked well and which was conducive for contextualising operations and establishing short communication lines between ICCO regional office and the CEA country. Roles and responsibilities were clear for all partners, and ICCO’s double role as coordinator and implementer stands out as an innovative practice to support L&A, which has also strengthened the ICCO country offices and allowed it to nurture a network of partners and contacts among farmer groups, government and private sector. Collaboration among partners improved as partners got to know each other better, mainly in the form of information and contacts exchange.

30 A lean M&E system was developed, based on the ToC and combining data-collection on a limited set of indicators with new tools such as lobby logbooks and Stories of Change. The set of indicators and the stories of change have been useful for monitoring progress at programme level and for upward accountability, but have given little insight in how change happens within each project and as such were little used to support learning.

Recommendations

31 A set of recommendations are presented to support the development of future programmes and projects. These relate to the use of the Theory of Change approach, capacity development strategies, enhancing sustainability and efficiency, and can be summarised as follows.

32 **Improve ToC approach:** The ToC has been useful for defining collective ambitions but to a lesser extent for guiding the actual L&A processes. Effectiveness and efficiency will further improve when bringing in more focus in terms of commodities, lobby targets and geographic scope, and more synergy between pathways of change and between national and international L&A. Assumptions need to be explicit on how change will be brought about, on relationships between the different changes and how these mutually relate and influence. An explicit learning agenda can be developed, linked to some of the assumptions. Be clear on the ambitions regarding the private sector and reflect on the need for business cases in convincing private sector actors.

33 **Develop a more comprehensive and integrated capacity development (CD) support strategy:** Training and learning-by-doing have been relevant strategies. CD support was rather supply than demand driven, resulting in a fragmented approach, insufficient contextualisation and follow-up. Improvements can be made on: (i) how to use CD assessments for L&A at organisational level, (ii) how to apply a mix of strategies, including more peer-to-peer learning, (iii) what CD support partners can demand, (iv) role of CEA coordinators in facilitating CD processes, (v) how to monitor CD support, (vi) how to consolidate the pool of trainers and put them in the market.

34 **Further build MEL capacity for L&A:** Efficiency was challenged more because of the fragmented and siloed programme approach than because of the decentralised governance model. Better strategising, stronger integration and improved MEL, supported by cross-programme learning loops will strengthen efficiency. Explore bottlenecks in
using lobby-logbooks and stories of change. Improve validity and reliability of indicators. Explore the use of progress markers for L&A.

Include sustainability strategies in design phase: Partners have embedded L&A in their work, supported by CEA’s legacy of research, guidelines and toolkits. Consolidation and upscaling depend on available resources. Include training on local fundraising in all programmes and explore possibilities of the social enterprise model. Include sustainability strategies already in the design phase.
**List of Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Action by Churches Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of South-East Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Civic Engagement Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community Based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>Committee on world Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIGA</td>
<td>Change the Game Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKN</td>
<td>Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETE</td>
<td>End of term Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>Faith Based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>Global Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDH</td>
<td>IDH Sustainable Trade Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI</td>
<td>Sustainable Spice Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementing Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISG</td>
<td>International Support Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KiA</td>
<td>Kerk in Actie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;A</td>
<td>Lobbying &amp; Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LfW</td>
<td>Light for the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>Mid-Term Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>Multi-Stakeholder Partnership/Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD/DAC</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Pathway Of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>People With Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSPO</td>
<td>Round Table on Sustainable Palm Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACCO</td>
<td>Saving and Credit Cooperative Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUN</td>
<td>Scaling Up Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM</td>
<td>The Leprosy Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToT</td>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGP</td>
<td>United Nations Guiding Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPD</td>
<td>Union Product Database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Introduction

1.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The Civic Engagement Alliance (CEA), consisting of 6 Dutch organisations (ICCO Cooperation, Kerk in Aktie, CNV International, Prisma, Wilde Ganzen and Edukans) with ICCO Cooperation taking the lead, commissioned an external end-term evaluation (ETE) of the five-year CEA strategic partnership with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs under the Dialogue and Dissent programme framework (2016-2020). This end-term evaluation is organised in line with the Partnership Agreement between the Civic Engagement Alliance and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands. The responsibility for this evaluation lies with the CEA and is commissioned by ICCO Cooperation.

The objective of the evaluation is to assess to what extent and how CEA and their in-country implementing partner organisations have progressed in reaching sustainable results as formulated in the Theories of Change of the specific country pathways during the period 2016-2020. In particular, the evaluation seeks to assess the effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and efficiency of the programme, related to changes the programme has contributed to in relation to: (a) capacities for lobbying and advocacy of implementing partner organisations, and (b) agendas, policies and practices of government and market actors.

The evaluation consisted of four phases: (1) an inception stage, (2) a desk study phase, (c) a phase of primary data collection, involving three country case studies and an analysis of the L&A interventions conducted at the Netherlands and EU level, (4) a phase of consolidated analysis, reporting, debriefing and communication.

This report synthesises the findings of the three previous phases of the evaluation, and provides recommendations CEA members to increase the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of future related interventions.

CEA evaluation questions

Relevance: To what extent has the programme been relevant in relation to the country context, needs and priorities of smallholder farmers and workers (incl. women, youth and people living with a disability)?

Effectiveness: To what extent have expected and unexpected outcomes of capacity development activities and L&A interventions been achieved in line or beyond country thematic pathways?

Sustainability: To what degree are the changes with regard to L&A capacity development and with regard to L&A outcome sustainable?

Efficiency: What has the programme done to ensure a proper use of available/limited resources?
## 1.2 METHODOLOGY

**Figure 1. CEA Evaluation process**

The evaluation process comprised four main phases:

### Inception phase:
During this phase, the evaluation team reconstructed the overall ToC and the thematic pathways; developed the conceptual framework (with paramount concepts of lobby and advocacy, civic engagement and capacity development); developed an evaluation framework and evaluation questions, with its sources of information; conducted a first overview analysis of the harvested outcomes; identified potential country case studies; identified additional learning questions; and developed a detailed evaluation plan and final budget. Through workshops and semi-structured interviews, 41 stakeholders were consulted in this phase (30 representatives of CEA member organisations, and 11 representatives of in-country implementing partners). An inception report was submitted at the end of this phase. An elaborated evaluation framework was described in the inception report and is added in annex 2 of this report. This evaluation framework translated the list of evaluation questions from the ToR in four main evaluation questions, for which several sub-questions and pointers were described. Also, a set of specific learning questions was identified during inception phase and included in the evaluation framework. Annex 9 provides a concise overview of the answers to these learning questions based on the data collected. The subjects of these learning questions have been integrated in the analysis of the data on the respective evaluation questions.

### Desk study phase:
During this phase, the evaluation team reconstructed and analysed the operationalisation of the overall ToC in the various country ToCs; collected and preliminary analysed evidence from the implementation of the programme in the 13 countries; reconstructed an overall ToC ‘in use’ for the programme; developed a comparative understanding of the programme in the countries; identified the three countries selected for in-depth assessments (together with NL/EU programme); and presented provisional findings that would be further validated and gaps that would be filled during in-country data collection. The desk study also allowed to fine-tune the methodologies, identify stakeholders that would be consulted and developed the data collection tools that would be used during the country assessments. 28 in-country ICCO-CEA coordinators and representatives of other CEA members with presence in the country or involved in the country programme were interviewed in this phase. In addition, the evaluation team participated in CEA conferences (one in English, and one in Spanish for Latin American partners). A desk study report with additional summary reports per each of the 12 countries was submitted at the end of this phase.

---

**CEA evaluation in numbers**

- 169 stakeholders engaged through interviews and workshops
- 12 workshops
- 7 reports
In-country primary data collection: During this phase, in-depth assessments of CEA in Indonesia, Myanmar, Uganda and The Netherlands were conducted. Highly participatory processes were carried out in the four cases, with the involvement of three national consultants (in each of the first three countries) and in close collaboration with ICCO country offices. Two workshops with implementing partners were organised in each country (one start up and one validation workshop), and semi-structured interviews were conducted with implementing partners and external stakeholders (government, farmers and private sector representatives). 39 stakeholders (CEA members, CEA partners and external stakeholders) were engaged in Indonesia, 32 in Myanmar, 21 in Uganda and 23 for the EU/NL case. Three paradigmatic L&A cases were subject to contribution analysis in each country. Four country reports were submitted at the end of this phase.

Synthesis phase: During this phase, the evaluation team synthesized the findings of the three previous phases of the evaluation, and provided recommendations CEA members to increase the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of future related interventions. One sense making workshop with CEA NL/EU lobby team (with 11 attendants) and one with implementing partners of the 12 countries (with 22 attendants) were conducted. When relevant in this report, the evaluation team refers to findings from the Change the Game Academy evaluation (by Intrac). The present report has been submitted at the end of this phase, together with a two-pager summary document.

CEA evaluation's premises and values

**Induction:** from concrete evidence from case studies, at the global level and in the Netherlands to more general learnings both at the strategic and operational level;

**Collaboration:** in close collaboration with staff members of consortium members and partner organisations,

**Action learning:** geared to lessons learned that can be adopted by stakeholders in the programme and beyond;

**Research quality:** with rigour and meeting standard OECD/DAC criteria for evaluations.

1.3 LIMITATIONS

**Scope of the evaluation:** CEA is a complex programme in terms of a variety of projects and implementing organisations, unfolded in different contexts in terms of political environment, economic development and jurisdiction. Since it is not possible to evaluate all types of outcomes or draw firm conclusions on the programme results in all countries, a case-study approach was adopted (with four in-depth country studies). To deal with the limitations of a country case study approach, findings of case studies have been complemented with findings in desk study analysis of the non-visited country programmes, which enabled evaluators to present an overview of

---

1 In 2020, Wilde Ganzen engaged Intrac to conduct the final evaluation of the CtGA programme. The objectives of this evaluation were: (1) To provide an assessment of the capacity development provided by CtGA to NGOs, Community-Based Organisations (CBOs), Self-Help Groups (SHGs), and other types of informal groups that are working with the CEA. Specifically, to identify the extent to which CtGA contributes to an increase in the capacity to engage in lobby and advocacy and/or raise funds locally. (2) Provide insight into success factors and lessons learned from the implementation of the CtGA 2016-19 and develop recommendations for the future of CtGA and for CEA’s future capacity development activities. The Evaluation involved country studies in Benin, India and Kenya, as well as a review of monitoring data (pre- and post-training assessments) collected from trained participants.
groups of results achieved by the CEA programme and estimate level of success of the entire programme. Naturally, the fewer chances to triangulate information in the countries that were not subject to an in-depth assessment, together with the limited information available regarding areas such as sustainability and efficiency in the programme’s documentation, mean that references to those countries in the corresponding chapters are mainly illustratively complementing the ones pertaining to the countries subject to in-depth assessment.

45 Scope of findings: The top up approach that has oriented CEA programme design and implementation in most of the countries made it challenging to the evaluators (but also to stakeholders consulted) to clearly distinguish when information provided was related only to CEA or other programmes/interventions as well. This was particularly relevant in interviews with external stakeholders, who mostly acknowledge knowing about an intervention or a CEA partner, but not about CEA as a programme. When assessing the level of effectiveness, an assessment of the level of contribution of the CEA interventions to the stated outcomes was done, but this was only systematically done for the three selected cases in each of the four countries that were subject for in-depth assessments.

46 Quality of available documentation: the evaluation team noticed that available documentation for the 13 countries (mainly annual plans and reports, learning workshop reports, stories of change) was of uneven quality, presented gaps when it comes to answer the evaluation questions, and in some cases, evaluators had to rely on existing versions of documents which have not always been the final ones. Regular consultations with ICCO GO throughout the process and with ICCO regional and country offices during in-country data collection, and additional interviews conducted in each phase were strategies that helped fill those gaps.

47 Remote data collection: The outbreak of COVID-19 impeded the conduction of field visits to Indonesia, Myanmar and Uganda. While one international and one national consultant worked together in each case, the involvement of the former in the data collection was more limited than originally envisaged. In the three countries, most of the data collection and validation activities were conducted remotely. Even within the country, the national consultant was only able to hold a few meetings and interviews in presence, while most of them (including both workshops) had to be conducted remotely. The engagement of farmers’ representatives in the evaluation process was highly affected by this scenario (less access to telephone or internet connection).

48 Taking into account the limitations described, the evaluators are of the opinion that the evaluation provides a good picture of the results of the CEA programme. Triangulation was done through the combination of written resources (programme documents, programme outputs) with interviews targeting both internal and external stakeholders, identified by CEA but also by the national consultants. CEA members and partners were requested to complete the information provided during interviews and workshops via mail and written answers to remaining questions that were sent after the interviews and workshops. The main limitation is the lack of first-hand information on the programme results as experienced by the constituencies.

1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

49 Chapter 2 presents a description of the CEA alliance and programme with its main components. Chapters 3 to 6 synthesise the findings regarding each evaluation question: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Chapter 7 presents the overall conclusions and recommendations.
2 Description of the CEA alliance and programme

2.1 THE CEA ALLIANCE

The Civic Engagement Alliance (CEA), a collaboration between Dutch and CSOs in three continents, is one of the 25 Strategic Partnerships of the ‘Dialogue and Dissent’ programme, financed by the Dutch government. CEA is made up of trade unions, education and development organisations and other similar international networks that have a link to (Christian) organisations and constituencies in the Netherlands.

The Civic Engagement Alliance, consists of 6 Dutch organisations (ICCO, Kerk in Actie, CNV International, Prisma, Wilde Ganzen and Edukans) with ICCO Cooperation taking the lead. These organisations have a long-standing relationship of collaboration. The Alliance’s members focus on the agri-food sector, in contributing their expertise in the fields of inclusive development, capacity development, labour rights, lobby & advocacy, strengthening small-scale farmers, vocational training and working with the private sector. The Alliance implements the CEA programme in cooperation with implementing partner organisations in 12 countries and in the Netherlands/at the EU level.

Alliance members in the Netherlands brought in their partners, with whom they often had a long-standing relationship, and who were attracted to implement a certain PW. Horizontal collaboration and alignment of interventions of the different partners, attached to chains of results had to be built. The ToC approach was relatively new for most of the actors involved and there was limited L&A experience within CEA for partners and members to tap from (although this varied from country to country). There was little prior experience to build on influential contacts to use (with the exception of some partners for whom L&A was already in their programmes). It has been a deliberate choice in the programme to work with partners who had a L&A track record and those who didn’t. The latter were in the course of the programme equipped in order to fulfil their roles in creating more civic space and support their constituencies.

ICCO

ICCO is the implementing body of ICCO Cooperation and is responsible for the overall CEA programme management, working from the Global Office in the Netherlands and from five Regional Offices. ICCO’s focus is on four L&A themes: political space for civil society; the Right to Adequate Food; inclusive markets; and business and human rights. The organisation and its partners have expertise and a track record in implementing programmes designed around the two core principles of securing sustainable livelihoods and justice and dignity for all. ICCO also had experience in building L&A capacity of CSOs. Under the CEA programme, the guide 10 step to L&A was made available for the consortium and translated into several languages.

In the period prior to the CEA programme, ICCO had strengthened its programmatic approach with their partners and evolved towards a decentralised way of working with regional and national office having the responsibility for programme management and implementation at regional and national level. The CEA programme had to align with this decentralised way of working. At ICCO Global Office, a small team was coordinating the CEA programme, including a CEA programme manager, PMEL officer and administrative staff. At country level, the programme was managed by local ICCO CEA project teams, that were accountable to the ICCO Regional and Country Coordinator, who played a central role in the management of the CEA programme. The country offices were responsible for the allocations of funds, for the organisation and coordination of capacity development support, and for monitoring & evaluation.
Kerk in Actie

Supports and intensifies the diaconal work of the Protestant Church in the Netherlands, linking southern and northern churches, communities and organizations. KiA focuses on two specific L&A themes: religion and conflict, and child rights. In collaboration with the Stop Labour Coalition, Kerk in Actie is actively involved in lobbying for Child Labour-Free Zones (CLFZ). The organization uses its own funds to support and finance broader programs focusing on political space for CSOs, churches and faith-based organizations (FBOs) in particular, Religion and Conflict and Child Rights. KiA initiated a research project on the role of faith-based organisations in development, which results were taken aboard in the NL/EU lobby.

Prisma

Both Prisma as an association as well as five individual Prisma members participate in the CEA programme. Specific lobbying themes are: religion and development and inclusion of marginalised people. The following Prisma members collaborated in the Alliance:

- Light for the World and Leprazending have unique experience in the inclusion of people living with disabilities (PLWD), both in capacity building activities and L&A.
- Woord en Daad has a strong track record in skills training and the support of smallholder farmers, as well as L&A at various levels. Lobbying activities focus on inclusive economic development and food and nutrition security.
- Red een Kind contributes to L&A for child rights and child-centred community development, using community-based empowerment approaches to equip communities with capacities to claim their rights.
- Tear lobbies for space for and participation of churches and FBOs within broader civil society initiatives and in L&A activities.

Prisma members have a large track record in empowerment of CSOs, FBOs, churches and self-help groups as well. Within the Alliance, these member organisations share experiences and encourage the adoption of best practices in capacity development for L&A.

CNV International

CNV International is the International department of the National Federation of Christian Trade Unions in the Netherlands (CNV). Specific lobbying themes for CNV are: respect for trade union and labour rights and implementation of international labour standards and corporate social responsibility (CSR) principles. Under CEA, CNV International provided knowledge on international labour standards and CSR principles and expertise on strategic L&A, negotiation skills, and effective social dialogue, thereby helping to ensure an enabling environment for CSOs in the programme countries. In the event of systematic violation of labour rights, CNV International could mobilise CNV members, CSOs in the Netherlands and/or consumers to pressure governments or private (international) enterprises to adhere to the core labour conventions.

CNV International was a new partner in the alliance, and contributed to PW 1, PW3 and PW 4, with a focus on strengthening trade unions, the collaboration between trade unions and CSOs, lobbying for the importance of trade unions in the civic space, on respecting labour rights, and more awareness on responsible businesses. Their approach traditionally differed from what the other CEA members were used to, working in partner dialogues, while labour unions tend to work with more targeted interventions, somehow more confrontational. CNV International was active in a small number of countries (Indonesia, Benin, Cambodia, Guatemala and NL/EU). Where ICCO has a track record in capacity development for L&A in the area of the Right to Food, inclusive value chain development and Business and Human Rights, CNV International brought in specific expertise in capacity development of trade
unions and in CSR principles, and provided the necessary specific advice to the CEA partner networks to that regard.

**Edukans**

Edukans has expertise and a track record in education, capacity development and skills development. The organisation focuses on the quality and accessibility of education and skills training, as a foundation for the empowerment of small-scale producers and inclusive market development. Specific lobbying themes: quality and accessibility of skills training, involving the private sector in skills development, and decent work and youth employability. Edukans aims influencing governments and private sector policies to address the need for quality and market-oriented skills training. Following local agenda-setting processes, issues of concern are subsequently brought to the attention of national governments and international actors (for example through the Global Campaign for Education). Edukans brings in expertise on development of foundation skills, like basic literacy and life skills as a prerequisite for self-organisation and empowerment of self-help groups and CSOs at community level.

**Wilde Ganzen**

This CEA member is actively involved in capacity development of Dutch Private Initiatives and their partner organisations, providing advice, training and co-funding. The organisation has developed the ‘Change the Game Academy’ (CtGA), a training methodology for L&A and local fundraising, which is used for capacity development in L&A for partners in the CEA countries.

---

**Box 1: Change the Game Academy**

The Change the Game Academy (CtGA)² aims to empower self-help groups (SHGs), community-based organisations (CBOs) and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) all over the world, but especially in low- and middle-income countries, to mobilise support from a range of stakeholders (through courses on Mobilising Support, with a focus on lobbying and advocacy) and to learn to raise funds locally so as to build local constituencies and reduce their dependence on foreign funding (through courses on Local Fundraising). CtGA modules (Mobilising Support and Local Fundraising) were presented as a choice to the CEA countries where CtGA was carried out.

CtGA uses a blended-learning approach, offering both online and classroom learning. The online learning can be done independently of a classroom course through free downloads of online courses on the CtGA website³. Classroom learning is currently delivered through the cooperation of Wilde Ganzen (WG) with national NGOs in 12 countries.⁴ CtGA training on either Mobilising Support (L&A) or Local Fundraising (to strengthen legitimacy and rootedness of L&A) is generally provided over a six-month period with 2-3 face-to-face workshops held during this period.

Wilde Ganzen and its partners have been developing the Change the Game Academy since 2012, and built on Wilde Ganzen’s Action for Children programme, funded by the Dutch government 2007. The training and coaching involved, among others, making results of research on legislation available to CSOs, as well as sharing best practices, providing digital library, helping to create Communities of Practice and enhancing access to data-collection tools (feeding in to L&A plans).

---

² [https://www.changethegameacademy.org/](https://www.changethegameacademy.org/)
³ [See https://www.changethegameacademy.org/online-courses/](https://www.changethegameacademy.org/online-courses/)
⁴ India, Kenya, Brazil, Tanzania, Uganda, Ethiopia, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Cambodia, Sri Lanka, Nepal and South Africa.
Wilde Ganzen, being a member of the Civic Engagement Alliance, made the CtGA methodology and network of trainers available for the CEA programme. The CtGA training methodology was delivered to NGOs, CBOs and SHGs in 8 CEA countries (Bangladesh, India, Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda, Mali, Benin, Guatemala), of which four of these countries (Benin, Mali, Bangladesh, and Guatemala) had not had experience with the CtGA prior to the CEA programme.

Edukans and Wilde Ganzen were responsible for the capacity building programme under CEA, and contracted local partners to work with. Their interventions come under PW1, supporting the other three PWs. At the start of CEA, the CtGA was already rolled out in India and Kenya, two of the CEA countries, and ICCO country offices in the other CEA countries were invited to join as well. Six other CEA countries joined. Edukans played a role in several agri-skills platforms, supporting local partners in thematic trainings, especially in PW2 and PW3. In addition to the CtGA trainings, Edukans developed the Life Skills for Lobby trainings aiming at strengthening CCSOs in the more personal capabilities for L&A.

The Consortium members cooperate with partners at different levels and scale. In order to create impact, CEA members and their partners aimed at creating and maintaining linkages between organisations and groups at community level and larger actors at national and regional levels, jointly identifying L&A issues and developing strategic L&A agendas. Through their work with CSOs at community level, Prisma members, Wilde Ganzen and Edukans are strongly rooted in their communities and constituencies. All Consortium members also collaborate with partners at national, regional and international levels (ICCO and Kerk in Actie for example, but other Consortium members as well in specific areas or regions) able to build connections between these CSOs and between these different levels.

Working together under CEA facilitated these linkages and also linked specific constituencies and organisations to L&A processes, notably FBOs, trade unions and representatives of specific marginalised groups. Kerk in Actie and Prisma (members) have strong networks of faith-based partners. Kerk in Actie has expertise in involving churches and FBOs in L&A processes, such as ‘Le Mali que nous voulons’ and ‘The Uganda We Want,’ where religious leaders at various levels act as change agents and promoters of a public debate. Prisma and Prisma members have expertise in the area of religion and development and a track record in involving churches and FBOs in L&A processes, such as the Church and Community Mobilisation Approach (Tear). Kerk in Actie, ICCO and Prisma members cooperate with partners representing specific (marginalised) groups, such as women and indigenous communities, organisations of people living with HIV and PLWD. The CEA members and their partners expected to link these partners to L&A processes giving voice to the poorest and most marginalised groups in certain societies. CNV International brings in their specific network of trade unions that have members in various economic sectors and are represented in national social dialogue structures. CNV international, Woord en Daad and ICCO have existing linkages with private sector actors, necessary in L&A processes related to Business and Human Rights and inclusive value chain development. A more detailed description of partners involved are presented in the country case study reports.
2.2 THEORY OF CHANGE FOR THE CEA PROGRAMME

The overall aim of the Alliance was to strengthen the contribution of Civil Society to inclusive development and decreasing inequality. An overall Theory of Change was developed for the design of the CEA programme, consisting of four Pathways of Changes, as visualised in figure 1.

1. Political space for civil society organizations
2. The right to adequate food
3. Smallholder empowerment and inclusive markets
4. Sustainable private sector.

The cross-cutting issues were: gender and disability inclusion.

For each of these Pathways a set of outcomes was identified. Partner alliances in the 12 countries and in the Netherlands were asked to select the most relevant PWs for their situation, therewith creating room for the necessary contextualisation. The outcomes specified have been guiding and inspiring the development of the country programmes. The CEA programme didn’t aim for fundamental changes within a 5 year’s period, that would be quite unrealistic. The impact level of the ToC is far beyond the 5 years period and should be regarded as guiding directions.

The CEA L&A strategy is characterised by the following:

- Independent and deeply rooted in the rights-based approach.
- Partner-based, with a focus on capacity development of, and with a broad network of partner organisations. A particular strength and niche in the CEA alliance is the cooperation with churches and FBOs (Kerk in Actie, Prisma members), associations of PWD (Prisma members Light for the World and Leprazending) and trade unions (CNV International). The legitimacy of CEAs L&A work is anchored in these partner networks and their constituencies.
− Part of a programmatic approach. L&A activities are an integral part of the broader thematic programs with the aim of achieving goals on enhanced justice, dignity, and sustainable livelihoods. Moreover, the L&A interventions are interlinked across the work from grassroots to international levels.
− Evidence-based. A strong representation on the ground ensures that the L&A is informed by actual experiences of different target groups and reinforced by specific research in the contexts where the programs are implemented.

68 Evidence-based L&A, was at the core of the L&A interventions, in the sense of L&A that is owned by participants / beneficiaries. This needs investment in capacity building at first instance, in which ample time has been invested, and which is situated in the lower parts of the ToC. Later on, in the programme implementation more results in the higher levels have become visible. In all countries research was undertaken to create insights and data to support the L&A activities. The topics of these studies were mainly in the Pathway related domains, e.g. deep dives in specific context. Research results and case studies were also used for lobby in The Netherlands and internationally.

69 Capacity development is an important pillar of the CEA programme. Capacity development support was provided for implementing partners, their constituencies and also for several lobby targets (e.g. private sector actors, governments at local, regional and/or national level). A capacity development support strategy was elaborated under each PW, and a mix of capacity development methodologies has been applied: training and joint learning, coaching, sharing inspiring cases and best practices, action research and knowledge sharing, brokering relations and access to L&A networks (achieving scale). In eight countries the Change the Game Academy methodology was implemented (see box 1).

Pathway 1: Political space for civil society

70 According to the CEA programme document, this PW is a stand-alone PW and at the same time supporting the other three PWs, strengthening L&A at all levels that are relevant for civic space to be able to function, and accessible for CEA target audiences. A prerequisite for the programme’s success are strong CSOs which can claim operational and political space/widen political space, who are effective in various forms of L&A on issues of interest in their society (economic, social and political justice and equality), and are capable of increasing their domestic resource base and public accountability, or in some cases are successful in damage control or limiting negative restrictions/regulations. Underlying assumption is that CEA partners have to form coalitions and join forces with other network organisations to broaden their constituencies and strengthen their power in L&A.

71 All 12 CEA countries plus NL/EU are implementing this PW. In Indonesia, Ethiopia and Myanmar, due to the political context, no explicit interventions were undertaken to enhance civic space, however activities have taken place to that end, like facilitating dialogues.

72 Four types of interventions emerged under PW1:

− Capacity development provided to enhance the L&A capacity of CSOs (all countries). This entailed for example: (i) enhancing L&A skills and competencies like developing L&A plans, conduct stakeholder mappings and political context analyses, how to engage with private sector, how to organise a dialogue with policy makers at different policy levels (e.g. explicitly mentioned in the CEA country programmes of Benin, Mali, Guatemala, India); (ii) improving the structure and governance of CSOs so that constituencies are involved in internal decision making and the L&A process (mainly Benin and Mali); (iii) linking to or creating networks and lobby platforms (e.g. explicitly mentioned in Benin, Guatemala, India, Indonesia) and/or (iv) enhancing knowledge on a specific theme e.g. UN guiding principles (e.g. Indonesia) or explaining a specific law (e.g. Uganda, Kenya). In the case of Indonesia, the entire CD programme with the trade union was put under PW4.
In two countries (India and Uganda) specific L&A was addressing restrictive laws that hamper operations of the civil society (e.g. direct tax code; and development of a policy on voluntary organisations in India, or the NGO Act 2016 and several other restrictive laws in Uganda).

In three countries (Bangladesh, Bolivia and Uganda) and in the regional Latin America programme, specific lobby was done for the recognition of marginalised groups and the importance to include these in decision making processes: landless people (Bangladesh), peasant and indigenous groups (Bolivia). In Uganda lobby was done to include people with disabilities in policy making. The forest and people programme in Latin America focused on inclusion of indigenous people in decision making processes. In several countries in South-East Asia, like Myanmar, India and Bangladesh, lobby was done to include PwD in policy making processes, but these interventions were mostly included in other PWs, and not explicitly in PW1.

In five countries (Bangladesh, Bolivia, Mali, Kenya and Uganda), specific thematic L&A trajectories were implemented, linked to other PWs: like lobbying on food and nutrition security in Mali and Kenya (more linked to PW 2), lobby for access to land and facilitating linkages to markets, having impact on increased production and food security in Bangladesh and Uganda (PW 2), lobby for a new public agenda on land and rural development with linkages to nutrition in Bolivia (PW 2), and in Uganda lobby for food and nutrition security as human right (PW2).

73 In the initial CEA proposal, capacity development was proposed as a cross-cutting strategy and included in all PWs. Upon recommendation of the MoFA, it was decided to bring the capacity development support interventions aimed at enhancing L&A capacity under PW 1 aiming at broadening political space for CSOs. By consequence, PW1 has a vertical and horizontal component. The vertical component aims at broadening political space for CSOs, especially in countries where this space is limited. The horizontal components contributed to strengthening L&A capacity, often in relation to specific thematic L&A trajectories, as such enhancing the legitimacy and credibility of the CSOs towards their different lobby targets. The way this PW was translated into the country programmes differs. In some countries both the vertical and horizontal components were included in PW1, in other countries the horizontal component was rather integrated in the other PWs.

Pathway 2: The right to adequate food

74 Under this PW, CEA partners strive for policy change, policy implementation and governance structures with regard to promoting the right to adequate food and sustainable food and consumption systems that guarantee access and control over land and other natural resources. Specific attention is paid to CSOs like women organisations and smallholder farmers organisations.

75 Seven countries, plus NL/EU, are involved in this PW: Bangladesh, Bolivia, India, Mali, Uganda, Kenya and Ethiopia and NL/EU. Interventions target marginalised small-scale farmers, and in most countries especially women, youth and PWD, who have limited access to land and resources, like inputs, training (extension) and transport.

76 Intervention strategies entailed:

- Strengthening of CSOs and CBOs in engaging into policy dialogues, linking them to multi-stakeholder fora and lobby spaces, conducting L&A trajectories, in many cases linking local level lobby to the national level lobby, aimed at influencing food and nutrition policy at all these levels. For example: in Uganda CBOs were trained in L&A, to bring their concerns to government officials. Vice versa smallholder farmers were sensitised about their rights and how they can start a dialogue with government. A similar strategy is seen in Ethiopia: strategies were promoting inclusive and legalized Self-Help Groups/Cluster Level Associations, building their dialogue capacity on identified issues, supporting mobilisation of relevant stakeholders and engage in dialogue. Local groups were strengthened to either directly address issues themselves on a local level, or to start a dialogue with local level duty bearers, based on representation and informed evidence.
Under this PW, there is also ample attention for creating multi-stakeholder platforms and linking CSOs and CBOs to these lobby spaces. For example, in Mali there was attention for the creation of platforms or frameworks for dialogue (multi-actor approach). In the India programme focus was on nutrition, creating a ‘women-led movement of nutritionists’ and linking women associations to multi-stakeholder fora, where grassroots organisations could engage with government and academics.

In some countries there is an explicit focus on lobbying for national food and nutrition policies (where possible linked to local level L&A). For example, in Kenya strategies were developed along value chains and in food policies. Counties acknowledged the human right to food and nutrition (Crops Bill in Kakamega county, Nutrition Action Plan for Busia county). Then this was taken up to the national level with an international endorsement in the Universal Periodic Review. The right is going to be implemented for all of Kenya and CEA partners are pushing for a National Food and Nutrition Policy Council, within the President's Office, international agencies were asked for their support. In India and Bangladesh, L&A on nutrition was linked to the national campaign ‘The Right To Food’, of which ICCO is the vice-chair. The programme monitored the implementation of the national action plan on nutrition, based on evidence-based research and awareness raising on nutrition rights of CSOs, CBOs, ministries and policy makers at divisional or district level.

Pathway 3: Small producer empowerment and inclusive markets

Activities in this pathway aim at contributing to a supportive policy environment and improved chain governance of value chains, enabling inclusion of marginalised groups (small producers, including women, youth and workers, and their organisations) protecting and promoting workers’ rights and contributing to sustainable and improved incomes and livelihoods. Capacitating groups and enabling access to resources, both financial as well as agricultural, and access to markets are part of PW 3 interventions and availability and access to extension services (government / private sector). Inclusive value chain governance (thus influencing decision making in value chains) is key to make a sustainable impact. Furthermore, rules and regulations that promote fair and inclusive trade and investment policies are part of the enabling environment.

Ten countries, plus NL/EU, are implementing PW3: Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Cambodia, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Myanmar, Uganda, and NL/EU. Strategies to achieve results in PW 3 at country level can be grouped in 7 main interventions (most of the time interconnected):

- L&A capacity development (Bangladesh, Benin, India, Myanmar, Uganda). In these countries different stakeholders, like producer- and women groups were trained on how to build relationships with stakeholders and claim rights on behalf of their constituencies (public, private, and others) and lobby for improved access to services (e.g. focus on financial services in Bangladesh, formation of an ‘interprofession’ for shea and cashew in Benin), access to extension services (Uganda).
- Set up of multi-stakeholder platforms and convening stakeholders (Bangladesh, Benin, India). In Bangladesh, workshops with local government, public and private stakeholders, producer organisations, and financial institutions were organised. In Benin, for both value chains (shea and cashew) multi-stakeholder platforms were set up to ensure that these commodities were prioritised by the government. In India the State level Farmer Producer Organisation Forum was established, recognised by the Ministry of Agriculture in Assam, which is lobbying to increase access to government schemes (incl. finance, and access to land).
- Research and analysis (Bangladesh, Benin, Kenya, India, Ethiopia, Indonesia). In several countries research was conducted to support evidence-based L&A; this was explicitly mentioned in Bangladesh, with research on access to finance and other services, in India on Agro based SMEs and Decent work in the small tea gardens sector, in Benin on local taxes and an assessment of government services available in the areas of relevance, in Ethiopia on soil acidity and in Kenya and Uganda identifying skills gaps among small holder farmers, conducted to improve access to markets in value chains.
Mobilisation of stakeholders and campaigns (Bangladesh, Myanmar). In Bangladesh, stakeholders such as producers’ organisations were mobilised to aim their lobby at banks to develop appropriate financial products for small-scale farmers. In Myanmar, a campaign on fair market price on paddy was organised.

Capacity development and sensitisation in several thematic areas (Bangladesh, Bolivia, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Myanmar). Training to enhance thematic knowledge was provided for example in Bolivia (technical training to promote responsible consumption and healthy eating in migrant populations), Cambodia (awareness raising to consumers on product safety), Ethiopia (agri-skill development in the potato and the malt-barley value chain). In Bangladesh and Myanmar training was provided on the inclusion of marginalised groups (PWD, women).

Linking with national-international forums (Myanmar, Uganda). In Myanmar, the programme built on its linkages with complementary initiatives in the region (e.g. through the disability inclusion component and by doing research on ASEAN). Research was also conducted on the impact of EU policies in Myanmar. In Uganda, national lobby for regional seed selection and production was brought to international conferences (Concord) and to the EU.

Combination of PW3 and PW4 (Indonesia, Myanmar). In Indonesia, PWs were combined at an early stage of the programme to apply principles of responsible business within commodity networks. In Myanmar, synergies between both PWs took place at the end of the programme, through the creation of a working group with implementing partners to address inclusive farmer-buyer business models on collaboration with NGOs and collective enterprises.

Pathway 4: Moving towards a sustainable private sector

Focus of PW 4 is on the UN Guiding Principles on Business & Human Rights, implying responsible business, and human rights, especially labour rights, fair wages for women and children’s rights. In this PW, both registered companies with personnel, that are active in the agri-food sector, and plantation owners (tea, palm oil, spices) are addressed, as well as governments in their role of promoting responsible business, e.g. in binding legislation. CEA activities aimed to diminish the negative impacts of companies on society, in particular on the human rights of citizens and workers and to stimulate positive actions/policies and conditions.

Four countries plus NL/EU implement this PW: India, Indonesia, Cambodia, and Myanmar. In two of these four countries collaboration was established with trade unions, through the involvement of CNV International in the programme, as such facilitating access to private sector actors via the trade unions. Also, in Benin and Guatemala, trade unions were involved in the programme, but in these countries this collaboration was included in PW 1 and 3. In Cambodia implementation of PW4 was hampered by the difficult political context being very restrictive for trade unions.

Intervention strategies in PW4 showed certain similarities:

- Trade unions, small-scale producers were trained on CSR, business and human rights, prevention of child labour;
- Research was conducted on the working conditions in several commodities (e.g. tea in India, rice and palm oil in Indonesia) to inform policy development;
- In Indonesia, Myanmar and India, partners have been informing the process of developing a National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights, and relations were explored with the Global Compact Network, which is monitoring implementation of the UN Guiding principles of Business and Human Rights. In all three countries attention was also given to children and business rights.
- In all countries, the programme contributed to enhancing access of implementing partners and/or small-scale producer associations to several multi-stakeholder platforms, such as commodities boards or councils, government working groups and alike;
- Training was also provided to private sector companies on CSR, with a specific focus on working conditions for women and child rights, and to CSO on how to enter into a dialogue with the corporate sector;
− In two countries (India, Myanmar) producer organisations were connected to bigger companies, traders and processors and supported to negotiate for a better price for their produce.

**Integrated pathways of change for the L&A in The Netherlands and at International level**

Activities in The Netherlands and internationally aimed to support actions undertaken in the CEA countries, via influencing and cooperation with Dutch Government, Dutch Embassies, EU Organisations and UN related bodies and networks. These activities concentrated primarily on influencing public policies affecting the enabling environment of CSOs. Priority fields were civic space, food and nutrition security (in particular the position of smallholder) and responsible business.

83 Main strategies were:

− Lobby for space for CSOs: involvement in the Partos Civic Space platform and the network of strategic partners working on civic space, as well as international networks (ACT Alliance, ACT EU, CONCORD, and World Council of Churches), evidence collection from the CEA countries (e.g. study on the role of FBO in development, implemented in Indonesia, Kenya and Ethiopia), evidence-based L&A on the role of FBOs and labour unions in development, , promoting space for diversity of CSOs in civil society.

− EU level lobby for improved position and food security of smallholder farmers in developing countries: lobbying for and contributing to improved tools to measure impact on food and nutrition security and women empowerment at target group level, pilots in several countries, using data for L&A, participating in round table discussions with MFA-IGG and DSO-MO on impact measurement, empowerment and inclusion. Cooperation with NWGN, KIT and WUR/CDI, lobbying for continue attention for FNS on the NL and EU policy agenda (with AgriProFocus, NWGN, foodFIRST, ACT EU and CONCORD), ACT and CONCORD fostered an inclusive dialogue space, bringing together the EU and CSOs to discuss inter alia the agenda of the Committee on World Food Security, promoting various conferences and events.

− Lobby for inclusive and global value chains: continuing attention for smallholders and workers and gender awareness. Lobby at NL (APF, IDH) and EU level (CONCORD).

− Lobby for responsible business and respect of UNGP in the Netherlands: lobby for trade missions that pay attention to CSR risks in the concerning sectors/countries, negotiations CSR covenant food sector, contribution to dialogue about involvement of the private sector in development and lobby for responsible business, organising HUMAN round tables. Influence the process of developing an UPD (Union Product Database). At EU level: promotion of the CONCORD ‘10-point roadmap on private sector in development’, organising discussions and round tables.

− In the Netherlands: strengthening partnership with MFA. Through support of the Building Change, CEA is active in lobby for Policy Coherence for Development. Through the Adopt an SDG-campaign attention was given to Responsible Business Conduct and Sustainable Global Value Chains. Several Building Change messages were reflected in MPs’ contributions in parliamentary debates. In the beginning of 2019, the so-called SDG check for laws and policies was approved by Dutch government.

− Results are recommendations for NL policies on FNS; representatives of political parties are aware of FNS policies and positive/negative effects of current policy implementation on FNS. CEA lobby partners contributed to the discussion on youth employment and skills training and education in Dutch development policy.

84 In 2018, in discussions with the NL CEA members and L&A team, on the basis of the actual implementation and evolution of the ToC, it was decided to integrate pathway 2 and 3 for the NL and EU, and a new set of indicators was developed.
The total CEA programme budget amounts to 34,667,682 EUR for five year.

Table 1: Overview of total CEA budget spent per year (planned for 2020), per country and per PW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>309,517</td>
<td>68,728</td>
<td>4,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>93,517</td>
<td>68,728</td>
<td>4,843</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>18,931</td>
<td>29,954</td>
<td>24,789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethiopia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,862,623</td>
<td>1,372,310</td>
<td>195,639</td>
<td>311,569</td>
<td>497,922</td>
<td>383,683</td>
<td>490,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>893,956</td>
<td>670,542</td>
<td>92,896</td>
<td>110,066</td>
<td>275,437</td>
<td>199,894</td>
<td>223,414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>968,667</td>
<td>701,768</td>
<td>102,743</td>
<td>201,503</td>
<td>222,485</td>
<td>183,789</td>
<td>266,899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,686,330</td>
<td>2,119,510</td>
<td>276,551</td>
<td>462,880</td>
<td>469,217</td>
<td>910,862</td>
<td>566,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>753,536</td>
<td>561,257</td>
<td>87,020</td>
<td>165,588</td>
<td>131,473</td>
<td>177,176</td>
<td>192,279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>526,641</td>
<td>408,542</td>
<td>58,096</td>
<td>99,793</td>
<td>95,322</td>
<td>159,594</td>
<td>118,042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>696,768</td>
<td>595,801</td>
<td>55,959</td>
<td>102,743</td>
<td>222,485</td>
<td>183,789</td>
<td>266,899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indonesia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,235,475</td>
<td>1,431,307</td>
<td>98,549</td>
<td>366,813</td>
<td>311,259</td>
<td>654,686</td>
<td>804,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>839,425</td>
<td>559,474</td>
<td>36,692</td>
<td>110,289</td>
<td>119,631</td>
<td>292,862</td>
<td>279,951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,396,049</td>
<td>871,833</td>
<td>61,857</td>
<td>256,524</td>
<td>191,628</td>
<td>361,824</td>
<td>524,216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kenya</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,080,332</td>
<td>1,360,785</td>
<td>134,768</td>
<td>516,704</td>
<td>271,437</td>
<td>437,876</td>
<td>719,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>879,332</td>
<td>718,431</td>
<td>44,025</td>
<td>323,592</td>
<td>141,173</td>
<td>209,641</td>
<td>160,901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>390,333</td>
<td>185,614</td>
<td>33,231</td>
<td>64,396</td>
<td>33,453</td>
<td>54,534</td>
<td>204,719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>700,667</td>
<td>421,017</td>
<td>57,512</td>
<td>101,733</td>
<td>91,144</td>
<td>170,628</td>
<td>279,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mali</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,681,712</td>
<td>1,841,018</td>
<td>60,944</td>
<td>572,813</td>
<td>475,451</td>
<td>731,810</td>
<td>840,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,568,508</td>
<td>1,017,943</td>
<td>37,248</td>
<td>306,359</td>
<td>247,211</td>
<td>427,125</td>
<td>550,565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,113,204</td>
<td>823,075</td>
<td>23,696</td>
<td>266,454</td>
<td>228,240</td>
<td>304,685</td>
<td>290,129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Myanmar</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,213,007</td>
<td>708,130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>172,708</td>
<td>286,846</td>
<td>248,576</td>
<td>504,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Overview of division of the total budget (EUR) per CEA member per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edukans</td>
<td>2,073,964</td>
<td>215,228</td>
<td>352,007</td>
<td>404,638</td>
<td>503,006</td>
<td>599,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisma</td>
<td>2,666,995</td>
<td>171,121</td>
<td>555,125</td>
<td>717,821</td>
<td>611,681</td>
<td>611,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerk in Actie</td>
<td>2,274,596</td>
<td>74,489</td>
<td>319,771</td>
<td>456,608</td>
<td>647,937</td>
<td>775,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilde Ganzen</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>334,125</td>
<td>880,441</td>
<td>395,792</td>
<td>303,162</td>
<td>586,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNV</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>193,780</td>
<td>434,005</td>
<td>537,497</td>
<td>519,747</td>
<td>314,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>23,152,127</td>
<td>2,756,974</td>
<td>3,636,868</td>
<td>4,230,843</td>
<td>5,837,087</td>
<td>6,690,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,667,682</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,745,717</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,178,217</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,743,199</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,422,620</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,577,929</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LfW</td>
<td>385.000</td>
<td>6.100</td>
<td>72.328</td>
<td>78.374</td>
<td>76.146</td>
<td>152.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM</td>
<td>370.995</td>
<td></td>
<td>101.481</td>
<td>123.863</td>
<td>86.234</td>
<td>59.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tear</td>
<td>583.947</td>
<td>32.074</td>
<td>78.666</td>
<td>207.675</td>
<td>157.339</td>
<td>108.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red een Kind</td>
<td>565.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.500</td>
<td>147.851</td>
<td>134.594</td>
<td>185.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woord en Daad</td>
<td>548.053</td>
<td>18.947</td>
<td>180.148</td>
<td>135.058</td>
<td>132.368</td>
<td>81.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisma</td>
<td>214.000</td>
<td>114.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,666.995</td>
<td>171.121</td>
<td>555.123</td>
<td>717.821</td>
<td>611.681</td>
<td>611.249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 MID-TERM REVIEW

In 2018 an MTR was conducted, based on document study and a limited number of interviews. The MTR report described the slow start of the CEA programme because of the complexity of the programme in defining its boundaries, in the selection of country partners, and in clarifying roles and responsibilities between alliance members and partners. However, in 2018 some first positive results could be assessed in different countries, and the MTR identified several factors of success such as (i) the opportunity to achieve L&A results at lower administrative levels where there is more openness to interact, certainly when constituency groups get organised and get ready to interact with government agencies, (ii) the use of constructive L&A approaches, and (iii) the role of evidence. The MTR further described several challenges and trade-offs that might influence (positively or negatively) the level of effectiveness and efficiency. These have been included in the assessment during this End of Term Evaluation.

- **The added value of being a top-up programme**: the alliance’s strategy has always been to complement existing programmes with a L&A component. The MTR reflected on the implications of this choice, pointing out, for example, that synergy, cooperation and joint activities of partners would only be useful insofar as they are a top-up of the same programme, and much less when they relate to different programmes. This strategic choice also could have an influence on the complexity of coordination of the programme at country level, when CEA was complementing programmes of several CEA members. Compatibility of CEA with strategies in other types of programmes was another issue highlighted. And a related issue was the delimitation of boundaries of L&A in the CEA programme and the need to maintain boundaries in order to keep it as a (capacity building support for) L&A programme.

- **Breadth or Depth**: the MTR observed that country programmes often had started broad and somewhat general (possible because of the first overall ToC), but as they dived deeper into issues, they needed to focus and zoom in. L&A are knowledge-intensive strategies as well as relation-intensive and require a high level of expertise on specific issues. The MTR pointed to the need to look for more focus, including narrowing down the geographical scope or the number of value chains.

- **Local to Global**: In most countries the focus was, at the time of the MTR, on local and national level L&A. There were indications that many CEA country teams appeared to be interested to explore the international side of the issues they were addressing and to explore to what extent it would be relevant and feasible to address issues at the Dutch and EU scene.

- **Capacity development for L&A**: The MTR drew attention to the fact that including partners with limited L&A capacity and/or with weaker organisational capacities would require sufficient time for building L&A capacity and as such it would be less likely that within the timeframe of the programme, L&A results might be expected.

- **Roles of the Dutch organisations (CEA members)**: The MTR described that the role of ICCO as coordinator and as co-implementer of the programme was clear, but the added value of the other CEA members much less (apart from making partners available to the consortium), adding also to complexity in cooperation. The MTR questioned whether the added value out-weighted the complexity in all cases. Other issues such as “Togetherness” and “branding” were presented as dilemmas for CEA members and partners: presenting under the CEA umbrella and promoting it, but on the other hand the need to make endeavours visible for their own organisation.

- **The role of the ministry as strategic partner**: was, during the time of the MTR, seen as relatively invisible.
3 Analysis of relevance

87 This chapter provides an answer to the sub-questions on relevance and legitimacy as formulated in the ToR. Relevance is assessed upon different levels: (i) relevance of the programme in relation to the country context, (ii) in relation to the needs of smallholder farmers and workers and (iii) in relation to gender and inclusiveness. The CEA programme applied a ToC approach, evolving from a generic ToC towards country specific ToCs and programmes. The ToR asked to assess the quality and results of this approach in developing relevant country level strategies (see Annex 2 Evaluation Framework with detailed sub-questions and pointers).

88 In this chapter we present the results of the four judgment criteria as formulated in the evaluation framework. We first assess the ToC approach (3.1) and the extent the ToC approach was helpful in taking relevant strategic choices (3.2), followed by an assessment of the relevance of the programme to the needs of smallholders (3.3), with a specific attention to gender and inclusion (3.4).

3.1 COUNTRY TOC

89 A generic programme ToC was developed for the CEA programme, implemented through country programmes that in practice worked as independent programmes and as such differ in terms of focus, subjects, outcomes, etc. The overall CEA ToC, consisting of four PWs, has been guiding the development of country programmes. The programme was implemented through a decentralised approach, with each country selecting country-relevant PWs (at least two out of four) and envisioned changes.

90 The country programmes are the result of a good situational and context analysis, selected and specified PWs offer a relevant response to the identified challenges with regard to the selected commodities, the position of smallholder farmers, the civic space, and are aligned to ongoing sector reform and/or government policies, as described in the country cases and desk study. The development of the PWs at country level are based on Maine’s interpretation of the ToC approach, making a distinction between several levels of change, referring to output, capacity change, behaviour change, outcome and impact, which are visible in almost all PWs developed at country level. Although the ToC approach was new for most of the IPs, interviews confirmed that the distinction between these levels was helpful for implementing partners to understand the difference between activities, output and outcomes, and in being more specific on identifying expected change from lobby trajectories, with specific attention to what capacity and behaviour change is envisaged. The PWs at country level are formulated in general terms, leaving sufficient room for flexible implementation.

91 In all countries, relevant partners were selected to implement the PWs, shown by their relevant thematic expertise and track record, the networks they are involved in and/or their access to grassroot organisations. As already described in the MTR, specific L&A capacity was varying among the IP, and varying between the CEA countries, with countries that had included partners with specific L&A expertise and countries where overall L&A capacity needed to be built or strengthened.

92 Ownership of the generic ToC and developed PWs at country level by partners is limited, explained by the fact that the partners were not involved during the design phase and because the ToC approach was new for most of them. The partners needed to become familiar with the flexibility that comes with the ToC approach, which is
visible in the evolution of the discussions and adaptations done on the PWs during the consecutive annual learning events. Ownership of the ToC evolved during programme implementation. Furthermore, the partners interviewed confirmed having experienced sufficient autonomy and decision power to adapt the PWs where needed.

As the ToC approach was new for most CEA members and partners, some weaknesses in the design of the ToCs could be noticed. The evaluators observe that the ToC approach at country level was narrowed to a discussion on PWs. The PWs are not sufficiently explicit on how change will be brought about, and/or on the relationships between the different envisioned changes and lobby targets, and how these mutually relate and influence. Furthermore, most country ToCs do not show synergies or alignment between the selected PWs, as shown in following table\(^5\), and in some cases even within a specific PW, in cases PW were further divided in sub-PW (e.g. Benin, Mali, Myanmar, Uganda). Implementing partners were usually assigned to one specific PW, based on their track record and ongoing projects, with partners often operating in different geographic regions and/or involved in different intervention areas and sectors (e.g. Bolivia, Cambodia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Myanmar). This resulted in a rather siloed approach and a project-based way of working (per implementing partners and per CEA member). There was also no alignment between ToC at country and global level, which made linkages between southern and northern L&A less explicit (as also documented in the MTR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong synergy between PWs</th>
<th>Medium synergy between PWs</th>
<th>Weak synergy between PWs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- India</td>
<td>- Bangladesh</td>
<td>- Benin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Indonesia</td>
<td>- Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Uganda</td>
<td>- Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NL/EU</td>
<td>- Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In most cases, the CEA programme was complementing existing programmes and projects – funded by CEA members or other donors - with a lobby component, which has been a deliberate choice and relevant in enhancing the level of effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability (see further in these respective chapters). In five countries\(^7\), the CEA programme was fully integrated in ongoing programmes, funded by CEA members, which turned the dividing line between CEA and other programmes blurred. The MTR also had described that the boundaries between what is and is not CEA was not always clear in these cases. In seven countries\(^8\) the CEA programme added a L&A component to existing projects/programmes of the partners. In Indonesia, the CEA programme funded projects in new sectors or geographic zones but involved collaboration with several existing CEA members’ partners. The NL/EU CEA programme enabled continuation of ongoing L&A interventions that were being implemented by CEA members.

\(^5\) Level of synergy between PW 2, 3 and/or 4 was assessed (not with PW 1 as this was about capacity building and enhancing civic space for CSOs and by nature influencing the other PWs). Criteria to assess the level of synergy were: geographic area of implementation (when relevant for the envisaged changes), choice of thematic topics or commodities, mutual importance of the specific PWs (and the changes obtained) to each other in contributing to envisaged outcomes.

\(^6\) Guatemala not included as only PW 1 was implemented

\(^7\) Bolivia, Cambodia, Central-America, Myanmar, NL/EU

\(^8\) Bangladesh, Benin, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Mali, Uganda,
During the CEA inception workshops, stakeholder analyses were done to identify appropriate implementing partners, not limiting the analysis to the historical CEA partners. However, it has been a deliberate choice of the CEA alliance to implement the CEA programme mainly with historical partners, in particular with church-based partners and trade unions who had built long-lasting relations with constituencies and who were considered to be relevant partners in enhancing civic space and giving voice to their constituencies. It was observed that these historical partners might in some occasions not always have been the most relevant partners for contributing to the envisioned changes of the country ToC (as also demonstrated in the Uganda report). Furthermore, as documented in the MTR, the fact that all CEA members have linked their respective partners to the CEA programme resulted in a sometime loose level of internal coherence of the CEA country programme. In many programmes, also new partners were included in the CEA programme (at the start or during programme implementation). It was observed, in the three selected case study countries, that although being relevant to the specific PW, these IPs were often added to the programme because of the funding opportunity (e.g. Indonesia, Myanmar, Uganda).

During the annual learning workshops (that took place between 2017 and 2019), reflection and adaptations on the PWs were done by CEA members and the IPs, with most of the adaptations situated at the operational level. Discussions on the PW were based on observed changes in the context, analysis of the progress towards the stated outcomes and reflection on the assumptions. Adaptations dealt with the identification of new lobby targets, identification of new activities (like increasing number of workshops), decrease of specific commodities to bring more focus, dropping or adding implementing partners and/or reformulation of the outputs and outcomes making them more precise. In several countries, attempts were made to look for more synergy and a more integrated way of working, with the strongest results visible in India and Uganda. In these countries, the ToC was strategically adapted, looking for more integration of the different PWs, for stronger alignment and coordination between the different IPs and concentration of IP activities in the same intervention region.

By the end of 2018, beginning 2019 more focus was brought to the programme, which enhanced the level of effectiveness and efficiency (see following chapters). For example, in Bangladesh, India, Indonesia and in The Netherlands, the need was raised by CEA members and implementing partners to look for more focus in order to increase the level of effectiveness (pool resources and energies, selecting L&A opportunities where CEA could make a difference, decrease the number of commodities, etc.). In the PWs initially too many commodities or themes had been selected, which was also documented in the MTR, suggesting to bring more focus to the programme (2018).

The assumptions included at country level for each of the PWs are mainly formulated in terms of capacity and willingness of actors (based on capability, motivation and opportunities for behavioural change), but relations between the different actors were not made explicit, and causal relations between expected changes were not formulated. The fact that the ToC approach was new for most of the partners, and L&A experience was rather limited, made it challenging for partners to identify good causal assumptions. During the annual revisions of the ToC (learning workshops), assumptions were adapted but this did not result in getting more insight in relations between actors or in causal relations. The assumptions have also not been guiding an explicit learning agenda (e.g. will the use of a due diligence toolkit on business and human rights contribute to changed behaviour of private sector actors; or will best practices with regard to business and human rights have a positive influence on convincing other companies).

The strengths of the CEA programme and the several L&A practices at country level do not always become visible in the formal ToC process, which demonstrates the limitations of a programme level ToC in guiding actual L&A processes. Relevant instructions were provided by ICCO GO to assist CEA members and partners in developing the country ToC and to support the reflection and adaptations thereof. The consecutive annual learning events provided the opportunity for CEA members and partners to learn more about the ToC approach and the
actual programme implementation. The flexibility of the ToC approach, the opportunity to adapt the programme to the context and the space created for collective learning were widely acknowledged. However, the reflection and learning process, and substantiation of adaptations brought to the PWs were not well captured in the reports of the learning events. A lot of learning and actual adaptations in strategies were often not reflected in the ToC process but have taken place during implementation. Furthermore, the synergy between implementing partners was not captured by the ToC, but taken place in practice (e.g. collaboration between implementing partners emerged during programme implementation as seen in Uganda, some examples in Indonesia). Interviews with partners and CEA members in the four selected case study countries confirmed that the ToC had not really driven the L&A practices (e.g. identifying lobby targets, building relationships and networking, grasping opportunities, etc.) but was seen as helpful in capturing the collective ambitions.

3.2 STRATEGIES AND INTERVENTIONS

Lobby and advocacy

Specific features of the L&A approaches applied in the CEA programme are the investment in the dialogue between civil society, private sector and government (new for most of the IPs involved), the promotion and/or facilitation of networking (at local and national level), and more in particularly, the facilitation of the involvement of IPs and their constituencies in multi-stakeholder platforms at national and local level. In several countries, CEA contributed to enhancing civic space by bringing local government and local CSOs (trade unions, CSO, FBO and CBO) at the table. Furthermore, the CEA programme succeeded in building a bridge between the practice at local level and the national L&A level. When applying the Start and Hovland typology of policy influencing strategies (see figure), the CEA programme can mainly be situated on the inside track, combined with citizen-led and evidence-based advocacy. In several countries, this looking for dialogue was highly appreciated by private sector and government, as the civil society had been often associated with a more confrontational approach (not applying to FBOs). Within CEA, the ‘activism’ strategy was less visible. Collaboration with media actors was noticed in Bangladesh and Uganda.

Figure 3. Typology of L&A strategies according to Start and Hovland (2004)

In the three southern country case studies, the CEA programme focused on key commodities that are of strategic relevance and potential for the communities, the agricultural sector and government policies (including regional and local policies, export policies and/or international market demands). Relevant and effective strategies were applied, based on a sensible political analysis, that focused on creating an enabling environment for smallholder farmers (both those producing for the domestic markets and those involved in agribusiness producing
for domestic and/or foreign markets), with a focus on facilitating the interaction between stakeholders. To mitigate political risks and barriers, in these countries often relevant government representatives were involved in planning and implementation of the programme.

With CEA operating in many countries characterised by a restrictive political environment, an emphasis on dialogue, collaboration and coordination with government officials is indeed a strategic approach to bridge civil society needs with government interests and response. To that end, the complementary expertise of implementing partners often allowed CEA to deploy a comprehensive approach for dialogue and engagement, including the provision of technical support to relevant stakeholders, of research informed recommendations, capacity building of different stakeholders (incl. lobby targets) and/or dialogue through formal and informal meetings.

Evidence-based and evidence informed advocacy was a strong feature in all country programmes. Research evidence was often produced in synergies with other projects and leveraged by CEA through the L&A interventions. It was confirmed during the evaluation that evidence-based L&A was critical to engage with government representatives. Evidence was not only the result of systematic research processes, but resulted also from stakeholder consultations and from practical experience.

Appropriate strategies to engage with private sector were applied, combing dialogue, training, involvement in MSP (in the Netherlands and southern countries) and -where CNV International was present-collaboration with trade unions. In several countries implementing PW3 and PW4, dialogues were initiated with companies and various stakeholders came together, like farmer cooperatives at different levels, factories and companies, suppliers, private traders, brokers etc. depending on the commodity (e.g. establishment of multi-stakeholder platform in the cashew sector "l’interprofession de la filière anacarde in Benin). Platforms were established, strengthened and/or institutionalised. A top-down and bottom-up approach was often applied when targeting private companies, combining lobbying policy change at government level and strengthening of NGOs in monitoring CSR practices of private companies, and the strengthening of trade unions in social dialogue and Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBA) negotiations. The combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches contributed to achieving the envisaged changes in several value chains (mainly in PW3). However, changing practice of companies with regard to respecting UGP BHR and child rights (PW4), the strategies proved to be less successful so far (some effects at the level of frontrunners, difficulties in scaling-out). Explicit strategies on how to work with front runners and how to reach other companies (including SME) on integrating BHR were not elaborated in the ToC, including the opportunity to explore the use of a clear business case to convince businesses to adopt these principles in their policies and practices.

Connections between national and international L&A were sought too, but rather limited and only visible somehow in seven countries (Bangladesh, Central America, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Myanmar and Uganda). Connections between the national and regional L&A were mainly visible in Bolivia and Guatemala. No formal L&A plan was existing to guide the collaboration between the national CEA team (ICCO and IPs) and the CEA lobbyist team at global level, which was also observed during the MTR. Collaboration and information exchange took place on an ad-hoc base.

- Kenya, Ethiopia and Indonesia have been involved with case studies in the research on the role of FBO (published in 2019),
- IPs visiting the Netherlands have been put in contact with MEP or became keynote speaker in a conference (e.g. Edukans partners participating in the “Youth Employment as a Root cause for Migration?” conference in the Hague April 2019),
− IPs from Uganda and Bangladesh joined the October 2019 CFS (Committee on World Food Security) conference in Rome, where the Uganda CEA case on seed provision was presented and discussions organised with Western seed companies,
− Myanmar programme commissioned research on the role of ASEAN in promoting UNGP in agricultural value chains (published in September 2018) and conducted research on the impact of EU policies in Myanmar,
− The establishment of a national chapter of the IDH-Sustainable Spice Initiative in Indonesia, and the input provided by CEA members and IP in the public consultation on the revision of the RSPO standard (2018),
− Central America, representatives from AMPB, working on forest and indigenous people, participated in a tour in Europe on climate change during the COP meeting in 2018, with support of the NL lobby team.
− Lastly, in several countries, CEA facilitated access of IP to national chapters of international networks (e.g. RSPO Indonesia, SUN alliance in Bangladesh).

Capacity development support

The second component of the CEA programme entails CSO capacity development and organisational strengthening for effective L&A. This component is explicitly part of PW1 but also integrated in the other three PWs. Capacity development support aimed at (i) strengthening the L&A capacity of local and national CSOs, (ii) strengthening the voice and claim making power of beneficiary groups, (iii) strengthening local resource mobilisation of local organisations and creating a local support base that contributes to their legitimacy, so that they become less dependent on foreign funding and are stronger positioned in debates that limit the operational space for organisations funded internationally.

Capacity development was implemented through a variety of approaches. It was provided through trainings (CtGA implemented by Wilde Ganzen in 8 countries, 10 steps towards lobby by ICCO and by CNV International, disability inclusion provided by LftW and TLM and by members of Prisma like Tearfund and Help a Child for Eastern Africa, participation in the ACT Advocacy Academy), annual learning workshops (including peer-to-peer learning and expert inputs), exchange visits, coaching (by CEA members and by CtGA) and learning by doing. Where relevant, tools, guidelines and materials were developed by CEA members and IP to support dialogues between CSO, government and/or private sector (e.g. business and human rights due diligence guidelines, company scan to assess respect for Child and Human Rights Business Principles). A Training of Trainers (ToT) approach was applied and included in the CtGA. Also, the disability inclusion training provided by LftW adopted a ToT approach in some countries. Since 2019, Edukans has been complementing the L&A trainings with soft skills training for L&A (Ethiopia, Kenya, Mali, Uganda). At grassroot level, CEA also aimed at promoting, systematising and scaling-up the Self-Help Group approach, building on existing experiences and networks of Edukans and Prisma members.

The investment in CD support is very relevant, taking into account that L&A was relatively new for many IP (and CEA members). And given the growing difficulties of securing funds from foreign donors, coupled with the attempts to restrict funding for advocacy and accountability work specifically, the provision of local fundraising training for partners was also very relevant, though only implemented in a limited number of countries. Local fundraising contributed to addressing accountability, legitimacy, dependency and sustainability challenges of CSOs, which is even more justified in restricting civil society space. (Intrac, 2020)

---

9 CtGA implemented in Bangladesh, Benin, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Kenya, Mali, Uganda
10 Disability inclusion implemented by LftW and/or TLM in Bangladesh, Benin, Cambodia, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Uganda, and Myanmar
The combination of CD support strategies in CEA is relevant. A programme-wide CD support strategy was applied. Topics for trainings, workshops and exchange visits were dominantly proposed by CEA members, though based on consultations with the IPs and the results of the capacity assessments done during annual learning events, identifying common L&A capacity needs. The ToT approaches as applied in the CtGA and – to a certain extent- by Light for the World (disability), adopted a more structured approach in enhancing L&A capacity. The ToT approach has been very relevant in reaching out to the grassroot level. Not only CBOs and grassroot organisations were reached through the ToT approach but also local government officers and extension workers, as shown in Uganda. In countries where CtGA was not rolled-out, the L&A trainings were provided on an ad-hoc base and dependent on the support provided by the CEA member (e.g. with CNV International implementing a lot of CD support interventions). As the IPs differed in L&A competencies and capacity, the development of relevant CD support strategies for all IPs was challenging according to some CEA members interviewed. Organisational characteristics (e.g. leadership, strategies, procedures, human resource policies, etc.) that can have a positive or negative influence on the organisational L&A capacity were not addressed, as the Dialogue and Dissent subsidy framework initially did not allow investments in organisational capacity processes.

Capacity assessment were conducted at organisational level but these were not used for supporting organisational development trajectories (except capacity assessments that were done by LftW), which complicated monitoring of capacity evolutions. Apart from the O- and F- organisational scans, prerequisites for obtaining an ICCO grant, capacity assessments were done of the L&A capacity of all IPs during annual learning events, applying an assessment guide based on an adapted 5C framework. These capacity assessments were not followed by organisation-specific formal capacity development action plans (except for partners of CNV International and LftW), which complicated the monitoring thereof. Monitoring of the contribution to CD processes at organisational level was done during the annual learning events, in some countries by returning to the capacity assessment based on the 5C framework, in other countries monitoring was more descriptive and qualitative. Also, during this evaluation, it was difficult to assess the contribution of CEA to enhanced L&A capacities, as the assessments remained rather superficial and monitoring data was limited.

The evaluation of CtG Academy (Intrac, 2020) concluded that capacity development support provided in the countries studied (Benin, India and Kenya) was relevant, in particularly the focus on enhancing the legitimacy and credibility of CSO when civil space is under attack. The evaluation report further stated that the adaptation of CtGA training content to the priority issues identified by participating organisations further maximised the relevance of the training to local contexts and realities (see Box 2). However, the report also described that despite the overall positive reactions to the courses, there are some areas for improvements, which include the suggestion to review the need for adaptations of the courses, both in terms of training resources and access to resources (online vs offline), levels of language and media (suitable for trainees with low literacy) and features of the local context that may affect local fundraising (Intrac evaluation report). The need for more adaptations of the training courses to the local context was also observed in Myanmar and Uganda, giving the example that through the CtGA training in Uganda the national seed policy had been selected as a relevant lobby trajectory, while that policy already had passed at national level. In the three southern countries case studies, the relevance of the capacity development support provided by CEA was assessed by IPs as relevant, responding to their needs, and of good quality. Annual learning events were seen as an important momentum for learning.
3.3 RESPONDING TO NEEDS AND PRIORITIES OF CSOS, FBOS AND CBOS INVOLVED

In the three country case studies, the ToC and the selected PWs have been acknowledged as relevant for the IPs involved. The envisioned outcomes aligned with the mandates and strategies of the IPs. In all countries, also IPs were selected that work directly with smallholder farmers and workers in the agri-sector. Building on the partners’ extensive knowledge and connections at grassroots level, CEA was able to align the national and local L&A work with farmers’ interests and needs.

While the participation of IP in the design of the ToC was limited, IP’s expertise and experience were broadly incorporated in the design of subsequent interventions. In most countries, IP provided needs-based CD support to their constituencies, based on consultations with farmers and CBOs. The interest of other stakeholders was considered as well, like suggestions made by relevant government departments.

The level of co-creation within the CEA programme is assessed as good by the IPs, except in relation to the regional and global L&A agenda. For example, guidelines and tools were developed in co-creation and tested by the partners. L&A was informed by studies that documented the situation of small-scale farmers and workers, based on surveys and consultations among these target groups. The level of co-creation or decision-making power with regard to the regional and global L&A agenda is assessed as limited. In most cases, IPs were only informed about the international L&A.

3.4 GENDER AND INCLUSIVENESS

CEA alliance adopted a rights-based approach and aimed at supporting people in claiming their rights. However, strategies aimed for inclusiveness have not been included in the country ToCs (few exceptions such as for Myanmar). Specific attention was given to enhance the claim making power of women, youth, indigenous groups and People with Disability (PwDs), which was included in the generic programme ToC, in particularly in the strategies developed for PW 1. The generic PW 1 also emphasised the importance of self-help groups and the need to enhance the basic skills of poor and marginalised groups to be able to speak out for their rights. However, apart from the strategies aimed at building capacity for disability inclusion, no specific CD strategies were developed with regard to inclusiveness of gender, youth and marginalised groups. But in most of the
countries specific attention was given to gender and in several countries also to disability mainstreaming, inclusion of youth and/or indigenous groups.

**Gender**

116 No explicit gender (internal and external) mainstreaming strategies were included in the country ToC but in most programmes, women are among the target groups of the IPs and in several selected commodities, women farmers constitute the majority. Programmes aimed at improving women’s access and control over land, access to quality seeds and extension services, and access to markets. Specific barriers were identified and included in L&A. Several country programmes implemented interventions to combat gender-based violence.11 In Eastern Africa and India, CEA contributed to enhancing the position of women in Self-Help group and/or farmer groups. The CtG Academy also reached out to women grassroot organisations. An elaborated gender strategy was not developed and specific interventions/projects depended on the initiative of the partners. The lack of clear gender focal points and/or specific strategies can explain the limited explicit attention to gender in CEA.

117 At global level, specific attention was paid by the CEA alliance to enhance gender awareness of networks and platforms in which CEA members participate. CEA reports document contributions to strengthen gender policies at IDH, Sustainable Trade Initiative and ACT EU. CEA members developed guidelines, tools and training material that were shared with IDH, the Sustainable Trade Initiative such as (i) a tool to assess supply chains on gender issues, (ii) development of a gender business case in the Ethiopian floriculture sector and (iii) the provision of specific input to the gender policy of IDH.

**Inclusion of PWD**

118 In the countries with presence of LftW and/or TLM, specific disability mainstreaming strategies were implemented and in cooperation between LftW and Wilde Ganzen, the CtGA was made more inclusive and accessible for PWD. Training on disability inclusion was conducted in these countries and a disability advisor supported IPs in institutionalising inclusivity. A comprehensive strategy was applied that included awareness raising, self-diagnosics and development of action plans with clear goals. Some of the IPs have developed internal policies and employed PWDS (e.g. Uganda, Myanmar). In Myanmar and Cambodia, the presence of a disability inclusion advisor as a dedicated resource, made the approach to disability inclusion more systematic. From the case study in Myanmar it can be learned that inclusion at programmatic level (e.g. employment of PwD, enactment of protective policies to empower PWDS to get involved in agricultural activities) was more challenging compared to the organisational level since it required more coordination than just working with implementing partners at the internal level, and also because agricultural practice requires intense physical work and emphasises productivity.

**Youth and indigenous groups**

119 In three countries12 specific strategies and projects were developed to strengthen the voice of youth and in six countries13 child labour was among the topics addressed under PW4. Regarding youth inclusion, the programme in Guatemala was designed specifically to address the unequal access to political participation faced by youth in the country, with one of the partners leading in capacity development provision through its Youth Academy of Socio-political Training, and the programme working to influence relevant laws, debates, and the establishment of

---

11 Indonesia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda (more on women’s rights than gender based violence)
12 Guatemala, Kenya, Mali
13 Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Myanmar
Municipal Offices for Children and Youth at municipal level. Regarding child labour, it was not clear to what extent strategies included strengthening of claim making power of youth/children.

Indigenous groups were among the target groups of partners involved in the programmes in Bolivia, Cambodia, Central-America (including Guatemala), India and Indonesia. Interventions focused on securing access and control over land (mainly Central America, Cambodia), representation of youth from indigenous communities and access to markets (e.g. Indonesia, market for non-timber forest product, Bolivia). In Central America, the programme conducted activities to document and highlight best practices of community forest management, as well as awareness-raising activities and campaigns. More specifically in Guatemala, CEA worked with indigenous communities to strengthen youth organisations in coherence and respect of the cultural pertinent approach.

Based on the desk study it is difficult to present a general assessment of the relevance of the inclusion strategies. It can be stated that the interventions were important for the different target groups as women, PWD, youth and indigenous groups are often excluded from civic spaces and/or face specific challenges in accessing services (partially documented in context analyses). Apart from the disability mainstreaming strategies, implemented in a limited number of CEA countries, the CEA interventions consisted mainly in developing specific actions for specific target groups, which differed between the countries and between projects. Because no interviews could be conducted with the different target groups in this evaluation (see limitations), no information could be obtained about the extent the strategies were responding to the needs and opportunities of these target groups. The selected countries for in-depth assessment did not provide examples that could be illustrative for assessing the practice on gender, youth and indigenous people inclusion.

3.5 CONCLUSION

The country programmes are the result of a good situational and context analysis. The country programmes offer a relevant response to the identified challenges with regard to the selected commodities, the position of smallholder farmers, the civic space, and are aligned to ongoing sector reform and/or government policies.

The ToC approach has been helpful in capturing the collective ambitions at country level. The ToC helped the group of IPs to think through what they aimed to achieve and to identify accompanying hypotheses, the distinction between the different levels of envisaged changes was helpful for IP to understand the difference between activities, output and outcomes, and in being more specific on identifying expected change from lobby trajectories. The flexibility of the ToC approach, the opportunity to adapt the programme to the context and the space created for collective learning were widely acknowledged.

There was some weakness in the design of the ToC at programme level, such as the lack of synergy between the different PWs and the lack of causal assumptions that could give more insight in the strategies and support the learning process. The ToC has not guided the actual L&A process (e.g. identifying lobby targets, building relationships and networking, grasping opportunities, etc.), which, together with the fact that IPs were not involved in the initial design, lowered the level of ownership of the country ToC among the IPs.

The CEA programme was designed to complement a L&A component to ongoing programmes and projects, which was relevant in enhancing effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme.
A relevant and smart mix of L&A strategies have been implemented, with a focus on dialogue, networking and multi-stakeholder processes. Connections between national and international L&A were rather limited. The investment in capacity development support was very relevant, taking into account that L&A was relatively new for many IPs (and CEA members). In particularly the focus on enhancing the legitimacy and credibility of CSO was relevant, certainly in cases when civil space is under attack. The combination of capacity development support strategies was relevant but a strategy to develop organisation-specific L&A trajectories was lacking and complicating monitoring thereof.

The CEA alliance adopted a rights-based approach and aimed at supporting people in claiming their rights, which has been a relevant choice. However, strategies aimed for inclusiveness have not been incorporated in the PWs of the country programmes (few exceptions).

4 Assessment of Effectiveness

This chapter presents the analysis of the level of effectiveness with regard to: (1) changes in capacities for L&A of (Southern) partner organisations, and (2) changes in agendas, policies and practices of government and market actors. The following sections are referring to the different levels of change as described in the generic and country ToCs. The PWs describe several levels of change which can be summarised as follows and which are described in the different sections of this chapter:

- Level 1 - output level of ToC: enhanced knowledge of the citizens and CSOs (on their rights), citizens and CSOs being able to raise their voice, to engage into a (political) dialogue with government and private sector and the expression of opinion is organised, and strengthened local resource mobilisation of local organisations (analysis presented in section 4.1.);
- Level 2 - outcome level of ToC: effective L&A interventions being implemented (advisory, informing, dialogue, claiming, confrontation, engagement in multi-stakeholder fora, mobilising the public/consumers, …) (see section 4.1.)
- Level 3 – outcome level of ToC: emergence of an enabling environment (government and private sector) for fulfilling the rights of the target groups (level of policy and practices change, rules, regulations, sanctions) (see sections 4.2. for government actors and 4.3. for private sector actors).

The ToR also demand to assess how gender and inclusion sensitive the realised outcomes are (see section 4.4.).

In this chapter, an analysis is also included of the validity of following assumptions from the ToC, as requested in the ToR: (1) CEA capacity development activities improve capacities of Southern partners and local end users (communities, smallholders, workers) to carry out L&A activities, (2) CEA capacity development activities improve the capacities of partners and end users to form and maintain relevant partnerships with other civil society actors to strengthen their L&A activities, (3) Research carried out in support of L&A activities contributes to outcomes being achieved, and (4) L&A activities that have been interconnected at different levels (local, regional, international) contribute to outcomes being achieved.
4.1 ENHANCED L&A CAPACITY OF IP AND CSOS

One important component of the CEA programme is the support provided to strengthening lobbying and advocacy capacities of civil society organisations (implementing partners, CBOs, farmer groups, etc.). The envisaged capacity changes, as identified in the programme ToC (all PW) refer to (i) poor and marginalised people are aware of their rights, (ii) poor and marginalised people are empowered and have voice, (iii) civil society is strong, transparent and capable of engaging with decision makers and (iv) citizens are organised, their organisations receive diverse funding, are constituency-based and belong to networks. (CEA, programme document, 2015). These objectives have been translated in all country ToC.

The CEA programme explicitly aimed at strengthening L&A capacity of poor and marginalised people and at organising these groups. These target groups were often already among the target groups of the IPs, of which many had longstanding relations with CEA members and were already implementing programmes in collaboration with communities and parishes. Training was provided by the IP to their own constituencies and network members, when relevant with support from CEA members.

Competencies addressed in trainings and coaching related to: effective L&A (identifying lobby targets, stakeholder mappings, L&A plans, etc.), dialogue with private sector, engagement in multi-stakeholder partnerships, engaging with local, provincial and national governments, monitoring L&A (use of stories of change, logbook, ToC), social dialogue and negotiating with private sector (trade unions), etc. Also, specific thematic knowledge was built with regard to rights of smallholder farmers, inclusive market facilitation, Good Agricultural Practices, UNGP on BHR, international standards, CSR principles, children rights and business principles, gender-based violence, etc.

Because of the lack of formal capacity development plans at organisational level and of monitoring data (apart from data available for CtGA), and the limitations of this evaluation (not being able to interview many grassroots organisations and to conduct organisational visits to IP, limiting triangulation of data), the evaluators have not much information on the effect of the L&A capacity development support at organisational level. There is also not much information on challenges at organisational level that might have (had) a positive or negative influence on building L&A capacity. A qualitative assessment of CD results is presented, which is based on the available data from CEA reports, CtGA evaluation and interviews and workshops conducted during this evaluation.

Capacity changes

The CEA annual reports and interviews with IPs indicate that trainings, complemented with informal learning processes (learning-by-doing) and coaching of CEA members, have been very effective. Before CEA, L&A capacity among IP was uneven. Some of them had more track record on L&A and on organising and developing capacities of farmer organisations, others had extensive reputation and capacity in linking research to policy recommendations, while others did not have specific experience with L&A processes. A further understanding of L&A processes and incorporation of L&A approaches into the work of partners has been widely acknowledged as a result of CEA. The following capacity changes could be identified during interviews and workshops with IP, organised during the country case studies. Results described in the CtGA evaluation report are added in italic. The evaluators have used the CEA adapted 5C framework to analyse capacity changes (as this also had been used for self-assessments during the annual learning events).
### Table 4: Overview of reported capacity changes following the 5C framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacities, competencies and capabilities for L&amp;A (capability to act and commit)</th>
<th>Enhanced competencies of staff to conduct political analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased understanding of the lobby chain, how to identify and define lobby targets, the lobby objective and develop an effective strategy to reach the lobby aims with the particular lobby targets (CtGA evaluation documents that more organisations have developed advocacy plans or actions following the CtGA trainings, using more formal advocacy tools and planning, develop clearer messages and tailor messages to different stakeholders, based on systematic stakeholder mapping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced knowledge of L&amp;A tools and to select appropriate lobby interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced competencies to enter into a dialogue with private sector and with government (also confirmed in CtGA evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced knowledge of specific national laws and policies and of international frameworks such as UNGP on BHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainstreaming marginalised groups’ needs and interests (inclusion, only in countries with presence of LftW and/or TLM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced life skills for L&amp;A like communication, managing emotions, negotiation skills, conflict management and increased self-esteem (only in countries with presence of Edukans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CtGA training also helped build softer skills such as confidence, motivation, and awareness of unjust social practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning internally and adjusting to changing context (Capability to adapt and self-renew)</td>
<td>Enhanced monitoring competencies, by applying lobby logbook ad stories of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular review of advocacy plans (CtGA evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing understanding of the ToC approach, mainly through the annual learning events (mixed results)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources to be able to carry out the L&amp;A activities (Capability to reach development objectives)</td>
<td>Enhanced capacity for local fundraising (limited number of countries with presence of CtGA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased collaboration between CEA members and IP to prepare joint funding proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and maintaining networks with constituents (Capability to relate):</td>
<td>Mechanisms developed to know constituents’ understandings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced capacity to include interests and policy demands from communities in L&amp;A agenda and to create space where local communities and government meet (also confirmed in CtGA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced capacity to empower citizens and bring smallholder farmers to the forefront of the L&amp;A (also confirmed in CtGA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Networks of CBOs created or strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced collaboration between trade unions and CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced joint lobbying and ability to speak with one voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced networking (Increased cohesiveness and collaboration between actors to address common priorities; seeking collaboration with powerful stakeholders in CtGA evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced competencies to engage in multi-stakeholder platforms and networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access gained to policy makers and private sector actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance on L&amp;A issues and implementation (Capability to achieve coherence)</td>
<td>Operational guidelines are in place and used (ToC guidelines, PMEL, inclusion, dialogue with private sector)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many results can be noticed with regard to the ‘capability to act and commit’ and the ‘capability to relate’. IPs and CSOs have gained more knowledge and more ‘technical’ L&A competencies. In all countries subject to in-depth assessment, an evolution is noticed of IPs moving from a more confrontational approach to investing in a dialogue with government and private sector actors, which was also confirmed in the CtGA evaluation. "In Kenya, it
is reported that the CtGA training has enabled CSOs to use dialogue and other softer ways of influencing powerful stakeholders rather than traditional, more combative approaches, and that this softer approach has paid dividends”. (CtGA evaluation, 2020) In many countries, CEA has contributed to creating or demanding civic space where government, private sector and civil society meet. For example, in Myanmar, this meant a change in how stakeholders address the challenges of the agricultural sector: CEA contributed to install “the idea that through coordination and organisation of value chain stakeholders for a common goal can lead to win-win situations” (CEA case, p. 4). Another strong feature of CEA is the establishment or strengthening of local and national networks, and the increased involvement of IPs (and their constituencies) in national networks and national chapters of international networks. This has resulted in increased credibility and legitimacy of IPs, as confirmed in the three countries visited and in the CtGA evaluation: “Trainees’ perceptions that their status and image in the eyes of local authorities has been enhanced is corroborated by responses from local officials interviewed.” (CtGA evaluation, 2020)

CEA contributed to enhancing local fundraising capacities, but strong results have not been achieved yet. Based on the desk study, it is not possible to gain insight in the extent the local support base has been strengthened during CEA programme implementation. Local fundraising has received limited attention in the three southern case study countries, as CtGA was not implemented in Indonesia and Myanmar and the module ‘Local fundraising’ had not been included in the CtGA Uganda. In these countries, CEA members and some of the IPs have been successful in developing joint project proposals that were presented to foreign donors (e.g. Indonesia: partners including ICCO attracting EU funding; In Uganda the four biggest partners were able to develop new proposals and attracted funding), but no information was provided of successful fundraising at local level. In countries with presence of the CtGA, the CtGA evaluation report documented that trained organisations perceived an increase in their ability to raise funds locally (enhanced knowledge of appropriate fundraising techniques and the use of appropriate tools), but that there is not much evidence yet of organisations that have been able to identify new donors or raise money through resource mobilisation initiatives, or when they did, the modest achievements did not match the amount of effort involved (explained by contextual factors in the cases of Benin and India). Beyond the countries studied in the CtGA evaluation, the monitoring data showed that there is an increase in the proportion of organisations reporting national sources as a main source of funding and that local income generation activities include mostly the sale of agricultural products and initiatives to increase membership.

Effectiveness of CD support strategies

As described under the chapter on relevance, different formal CD strategies have been applied in the CEA programme, combined with informal learning, which have mutually strengthened each other, for example, CtGA trainings that have been complemented by CEA coaching and learning-by-doing that was made possible throughout CEA programme implementation.

CD support provided by CEA members has been assessed by IPs interviewed as relevant and effective in its approach, content and methods, but a comprehensive CD support strategy has not always been developed. The combination of formal trainings and learning-by-doing and coaching of CEA members was widely appreciated by people interviewed. In most of the countries, peer learning took place during annual learning workshops. In Guatemala more explicit use was made of peer-to-peer learning in formal trainings, with some processes undertaken by local partners directly. For instance, one of the local partners, SODEJU, was chosen to lead on L&A training as it has vast experience and track-record advancing political dialogues and exchanges with authorities and has its own Academy of Socio-Political Formation. It is further noted by the evaluators that a comprehensive CD support strategy at country level has not been developed, in particularly in the CEA countries where the CtGA was not applied. A different picture emerges for the countries where CtGA was implemented,
where a more systematic and integrated CD approach was visible (with LfTW and Edukans complementing the CtGA trainings with the topics of inclusion and soft skills for L&A).

140 The CtGA applied a ToT approach, but also other CD interventions implemented by Edukans, LfTW and TLM (and also by IP themselves) showed characteristics of a ToT approach in order to enhance L&A capacity of IP and of their constituencies (CBOs, farmer groups, women groups, local CSOs). Both this evaluation and the CtGA evaluation noticed that follow-up of ToT was not always sufficiently guaranteed. In Indonesia (e.g. ToT provided by one of the partners on due-diligence monitoring), CSOs from the partners’ network, requested more follow-up training in applying the due diligence guidelines to monitor practices of palm oil companies. The CtGA evaluation described that “more follow-up and consolidation with groups already in receipt of training might elicit stronger results. In Assam (India), there is a question as to whether the delivery of relatively few training courses to large numbers of organisations might have undermined the impact of the CtGA training.”

141 Because of the learning-by-doing approach, several competencies have been strengthened implicitly, but require further strengthening through a more explicit learning trajectory. IPs have experienced the added value of evidence-based L&A, as demonstrated in Indonesia, Myanmar and Uganda. However, no explicit attention was given by the CEA programme to enhancing competencies of partners to prepare and manage research and develop advocacy messages based on research. CEA country alliances relied on IPs with research experience, which were assigned with this task, and in some cases external consultant were hired. Enhanced competences for conducting evidence-based L&A were not mentioned by IPs interviewed or documented in CEA reports (engaging with researchers, preparing and managing research). Another observation relates to the participation in multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSP). Apart from the facilitation of access to these platforms, the evaluators have not found evidence of specific capacity development interventions aimed at enhancing the understanding of IPs on how MSP operate and/or competencies on how to design and/or facilitate MSP, although in many platforms partners often took a guiding and facilitating role (with exception of the partners supported. Lastly, though several IPs have gained knowledge of international frameworks, such as UNGP (and the UNGP forum on BHR), and of international networks such as ICGN (International Corporate Governance Network) and RSPO (Round Table on Sustainable Palm Oil), access to these international fora was limited to facilitating access to national chapters (exception with Hukatan, Indonesian trade union, becoming member of RSPO international in November 2020), and no specific support was provided on how to bring L&A message to these international fora.

142 Organisational characteristics that can negatively influence L&A capacity were not targeted by the CEA programme, like for example staff turn-over, internal governance issues, weak management structures, weak prioritisation of activities, fragile financial situation and institutional sustainability, etc. Organisational capacity development support could initially not be included in the Dialogue and Dissent programmes, as stated by the MoFA, but was accepted to a certain extent after the MTR of D&D programmes. This dimension did not receive much attention in CEA. A reflection on these factors influencing the effectiveness of CD support did usually not take place, and as such did not enable identification of actions that could have been taken by the organisation at stake or funded by other donors. Also, the CtGA evaluation referred to the need to pay more attention to organisational development skills: “many of the organisations targeted by the CtGA programme have little organisational infrastructure or experience and could benefit from broader training in how to develop stronger organisational foundations, including administrative, HR and financial systems and skills like bookkeeping.” In some countries, specific attention was given to the formalisation and registration of CBOs, such as the support provided in Myanmar to structure farmer associations.
CEA capacity development support focused on enhancing knowledge and competencies of individual staff members, but did not give explicit attention on how to share knowledge and competencies gained within the organisation (except in a few CtGA trajectories). Nonetheless the lack of such an explicit strategy, efforts were done to involve leadership of IPs in trainings and programme implementation, and several IPs have developed an internal ToT approach to disseminate internally the acquired knowledge and competencies (e.g. Uganda and Indonesia, and in Myanmar in particular regarding disability inclusion).

4.2 CHANGES AT THE LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT ACTORS

What follows presents results related to different levels of change: enhanced dialogue, awareness raising, debates being shaped, and policy changes, as well as an analysis of some of the enabling factors and barriers.

CEA contributed to expand civic space and improve the working relationship and collaboration between NGOs and government. Through dialogues conducted especially at the regional level, the CEA programme brought together government actors and CSOs in Myanmar, Indonesia and Uganda. Moreover, in Uganda, the dialogues and sensitisation about the NGO Act 2016 and POM Act 2013 led by one of the partners clarified the roles and responsibilities of the different agencies of government and NGOs, which led to the establishment of the District NGO Monitoring Committees (DNMCs) in 2018, a mechanism for ensuring harmony and partnerships between district local government and NGOs in development interventions. In Guatemala, for example, the creation of the National Youth Front was an important milestone as it provided a meeting place for the majority of youth organizations in Guatemala.

Through the recurrent organisation of dialogues and consultations and the organisation of visits to the field, CEA and its partners generated spaces for engagement between government representatives and farmers, especially at the regional level, and heightened policy makers awareness and understanding of farmers’ reality. CEA programme set up and facilitated regular policy dialogues and consultations on agricultural sector challenges, between farmers, government and private sector representatives. These events gave policy makers the possibility to know and connect with new organisations in the ground. In Uganda and Myanmar, several regional dialogues were attended by representatives of relevant national ministries as well (e.g.: in 2018, the Vice President of Myanmar attended a workshop led by one CEA partner). In Indonesia, CEA was successful in convincing different ministries to consider forest spices as an important commodity that contributes to village development. CEA also brought government representatives to the field to learn about farmers’ processes. All these encounters were unique opportunities for policy makers to learn directly from farmers about their needs. An interesting outcome of these engagements took place in Uganda, where representatives of smallholder farmers were involved in district and sub-county planning and budgeting committees and have influenced budget allocation for delivery of extension services.

Through a variety of strategies, CEA partners engaged with government representatives at national, regional and local level. Through technical assistance, capacity building and facilitating dialogues, CEA developed bonds of trust with government agencies working in different policy areas, and in different level (from national to local). For instance, engagement with representatives of the Department of Agriculture of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation in Myanmar led to the establishment of Good Agricultural Practices certificates at the regional level allowing farmers to demonstrate the quality of their products. In Indonesia, CEA partners assisted the National Apic Board and the Ministry of Agriculture in the development of SOPs for nutmeg, pepper and cinnamon spices, and trained the Ministries of Economy, Human Rights and Cooperative on business and human rights and provided technical recommendations to be included in National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights. In
Uganda, CEA partners supported the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries with dissemination of the national seed policy at regional levels. In Ethiopia, CEA partners supported government regarding soil acidity and the use of limestone. In Bolivia, one of the main achievements of the programme was an agreement with the Ministry of Education that recognizes the Manq’a model as a reference in technical education and that is intended to be replicated in Alternative Education Centres at the national level.

CEA programme also established relationships with governments at the local level in Indonesia (to inform local governments on their role in promoting Good Agricultural Practices, UNGP and respect for child rights, among others), in Myanmar and Uganda to promote the adoption of measures for farmers to access and produce quality products, and in Kenya regarding County Integrated Development Plans. In Bolivia, the Ministry of Health and Sports in one municipality agreed to implement capacity building to promote healthy eating based on policy proposals presented by the collective of young Manq’a to the Youth Unit Offices.

In the Netherlands, CEA members have provided input to the MoFA with regard to the development of a result and indicator framework for Food and Nutrition Security (2019). In 2018 MEPs were approached and advised to adopt SDGs, and requested supportive information to CEA members. CEA together with other organisations initiated in 2019 a conference on youth unemployment as an alleged root cause for migration, which brought in evidence form CEA countries, and influenced the policy brief of the MFA on this issue.

CEA contributed to and shaped critical legislative debates and L&A for legislation to protect farmers’ interests. In Myanmar, CEA partners were invited to participate in the first ever consultative process on the negative effects of pesticide use taking place in the Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries Affairs Committee in both chambers, in which recommendations such as the need for a stronger enforcement of the pesticide law and a wider implementation of GAP practices and certification standards were shared, among others. In Uganda, CEA organised regional and national dialogues in which recommendations to amend the Market Act, leading to the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries proposal of the Agriculture Produce Regulatory Bill that would provide a platform through which farmers and produce dealers will be able to negotiate with regards to the quality and competitive prices of the producers. In Uganda too, CEA partners provided technical input in the amendment of the Persons with Disability Act 2006 to conform to the principles of UN Convention on the Rights of PWDs, whose new version came into force in 2019. Successful contribution to and shaping legislative debates that protect farmer’s interests are also documented for Kenya and Ethiopia.

At both international and the Netherlands level, CEA members have participated in several public consultation processes. In the Netherlands this has resulted in the adoption of CEA recommendations in the new subsidy framework for strengthening CSOs in the South, in the new youth policy of MoFA and in the new Dutch Food Security Policy (see separate NL/EU case study report). At EU level this resulted in the inclusion of small holders in the monitoring of the FNS Policy Framework of the European Commission, and in the European Consensus on Development explicit attention was put on agro-ecology issues in developing countries.

CEA supported government agencies to better reach target groups with their services, which in cases required logistical and resources provision. Not only CEA partners advocated for government agencies to strengthen their role as service providers and regulatory entity, but it also guided farmers in understanding government interventions in agriculture and how the smallholder farmers could benefit (e.g.: the tractor hire programme to support agricultural mechanization or access to agricultural credit in Uganda). Moreover, in Myanmar CEA programme covered logistic costs for representatives of the Department of Agriculture to conduct visits to regional and local levels related to quality processes and supported the Ministry of Commerce in developing and publishing a market guide which was distributed among farmers. In Uganda, the dialogues organised by CEA partners at district levels contributed to the creation of linkages between extension workers with farmer groups to
revitalise the agricultural extension service delivery by the ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries after several years of absence of such service. In Uganda too, CEA partners supported the government in the dissemination of national policies at regional level, helping bridge the gap between the national level and the regions in the North and North-East the CEA group could fill this gap (being recognised in a MoU to be signed by the end of 2020 between four partners and the Ministry of Agriculture, where partners are featured as a consortium for implementing national policies in the region). In India, the implementation of nutri-gardens at the Aungawadi centres in several districts in Assam, and the support of the local horticulture departments have become the state and national level policies. Support provided by CEA partners to government agencies is also reported for Kenya in regard to the media campaign on negative effects of child labour.

Quality standards were one of the main L&A and collaboration areas for CEA and government. To support national farmers to overcome to restrictions to commercialize products in foreign markets (e.g.: Europe in the case of Indonesia and Myanmar, and India in the case of Myanmar), CEA partners conducted L&A to establish quality standards certificates for different crops to increase their market opportunities. In Myanmar, CEA partners worked collaboratively with the Department of Agriculture to establish the first ever Good Agricultural Practices certificates for mung bean regional farmers, and also influence the Parliament to increase in the number of food safety testing labs in the regions. In Indonesia, CEA partners offered technical support to the General Directorates for Quality and Standardisation and Plantation of the Ministry of Agriculture and the National Spice Board for the development of the SOP for quality management of nutmeg and pepper commodities and supported the development of a digital traceability system in post-harvest handling, which were approved and implemented at regional level. In Uganda, CEA partners worked in several regions to catalyse the district local governments to take action towards realising the intentions of the National Seed Policy, more precisely to ensure that smallholder farmers have access to quality seeds (e.g.: supporting districts to develop by-laws to support the regulation of seed business). Contribution to quality standards is also documented in reports for Ethiopia, in regard to potato and malt barley value chains.

Several contextual factors affected CEA’s capacity to achieve further concrete policy and institutional changes. The long time it takes for policy changes to materialise, policy makers’ capacities, and limited vertical and horizontal government coordination were critical factors in Myanmar. In Indonesia, the main hindering factors were government’s slow response and uptake, the changes of government officials after the 2019 elections, and the power dynamics within the different ministries (e.g.: the coexistence of two strong positions regarding then enforcement of a human right approach to business, one that rely on national current laws and another one that want to stick to global principles like UNGP). Although CEA’s L&A has not always translated into concrete changes at policy level, in many cases it laid the ground for future actions (e.g.: CEA programme’s contribution to the report on the assessment of negative side effects of pesticides residue and to mitigate the negative side in the agriculture sector in Myanmar, published by the Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture, Livestock and Fishery Affairs, and shared it in Union Parliament Assembly).

The recognition of CEA and its partners as legitimate stakeholders in the agricultural sector respond to a range of factors (both contextual and internal to CEA). In Myanmar, it was indicated that the political environment in the last five years, while still challenging, has been more open to open to collaboration. In Indonesia, Myanmar and Uganda, through the selection of partners, CEA partners have also demonstrated capacity to reach out to community and mobilise their participation, which increased government representatives’ interest in their work and needs. Also, CEA programme targeted issues that were aligned with the government agenda for the agricultural sector (e.g.: the Agricultural Development Strategy in Myanmar, or the promotion of village development programmes through the development of agriculture and forestry commodities, and the promotion of child friendly villages at local level in Indonesia), which created interest from policy makers in CEA alliance and its partners’ work. CEA alliance also benefited from the reputation of partners with trajectory in the field, which gave CEA partners access to policy makers at different levels.
4.3 CHANGES AT THE LEVEL OF VALUE CHAINS AND PRIVATE SECTOR ACTORS

CEA introduced a new concept of multi-stakeholder dialogue on inclusive agricultural value chain development, contributing to the evolution from confrontation towards improved dialogue between private sector and farmers, and helping identify synergies for mutual benefit. CEA programme contributed to install “the idea that through coordination and organisation of value chain stakeholders for a common goal can lead to win-win situations” (Myanmar CEA case, p. 4). This has meant a change of behaviours for private sector. Through the recognition of its importance in strengthening a more inclusive agricultural sector, in Myanmar, Indonesia and Uganda CEA partners were able to engage the private sector and make it a regular participant in relevant forums and workshops, and linked it with farmers and government stakeholders. For example, in Indonesia, one CEA member became the co-chair of the business and child rights working group, having government and private sector representatives as co-chairs. Also in Indonesia, CEA programme established the national chapter of the IDH-Sustainable Spice Initiative (CEA alliance also being a member of IDH and IDH SSI at international level). With regard to the engagement of CEA members with private sector in MSP in the Netherlands, CEA members are only involved in the food covenant and in IDH. CNV International is in a process of becoming member of RSPO.

Strong involvement of CEA partners in MSP is also seen in Kenya, with participation in multi-stakeholder platforms at regional level, bringing together partners from all sectors working on nutrition to develop a Country Nutrition Action Plan. New value chain platforms were built in the sectors of potato and malt barley, also with international links to companies. In Benin, interprofessional platforms with government, CSOs, private sector representatives were formed in the cashew and shea sectors.

CEA raised awareness on human rights in business and helped commit companies to improve labour conditions of their employees, but with differences among countries. In Indonesia and Kenya, CEA partners contributed to enhance awareness on the UNGP on BHR and/or child rights among government and private sector, provided input in the NAP on BHR and/or supported private sector in applying the UNGP and changing their practice. In Indonesia, UNGP guidelines and a toolkit on child rights and business principles have been developed by CEA programme and shared with GAPKI, the employers’ association in the palm oil sector who started to promote these among their members. A grassroot network was trained to monitor UNGP implementation by local palm oil companies and the PKPA network of local CSOs was trained in monitoring child labour. It is too early to see already changes in practices. In Myanmar, L&A actions to promote the adoption of UNGP were more limited, and focused on research production and participation in a few forums, but strong bonds with private companies were difficult to build and there are no signal of private companies embedding a human rights approach in their practices.

With the involvement of CNV International in the CEA programme (in Benin, Indonesia, Cambodia and Guatemala), trade unions were strengthened in conducting the social dialogue and negotiating improvement of labour conditions. A strong result of the programme is the establishment of the Japbusi network in Indonesia, that will enable capacity building of the Japbusi trade union members on the one hand, and creates a space for dialogue at sector level between the employers’ association and a more unified trade union network on the other hand. Moreover, CEA has also contributed to the cooperation between CSOs and trade unions to reach results, which has not been seen before. It is too early to document results of the social dialogue at sector level.

CEA combined top-down (working with private sector companies) and bottom-up (working with farmers associations and unions) approaches to maximise the results of its L&A actions. In Indonesia, CEA partners engaged with companies in the palm oil sector and conducted L&A actions and trainings to commit them to adapt their practices, including the development of toolkits. At the same time, CEA partners trained trade unions with presence in palm oil plantations to defend workers’ interest and look for solutions through dialogue. In Myanmar, CEA programme was instrumental in bringing together private banks and farmers’ associations to negotiate the
provision of low interest rate loans to farmers, which was also a consequence of CEA’s contribution to the organisation of farmers (not only through formal registration, but also through trainings on collective bargaining and negotiation). In Uganda in Abim district, there has been efforts to link the micro-finance support centre in Moroto to the farmers’ network comprising of about 500 smallholder farmers. In preparation for provision of credit, the micro-finance support centre in 2018 trained farmers in how to establish Savings and Credit Cooperative Organisations (SACCO) for the farmers’ network, management of SACCO, entrepreneurship, savings and record keeping. This will enable farmers in the district to access start-up capital for bulking produce and investing in farm enterprises. In Bangladesh, CEA brought farmers producer’s organizations together with banks to allow group loans at low interest

Where dialogue was not conducive to positive changes, the assumption that there is willingness of private sector actors to adhere to the UNGP guidelines was not confirmed, CEA also relied on dissent approaches. Not always the improved relationships between private sector and farmers resulted in a change of conditions for workers or in better deals for farmers. In those cases, CEA also applied more confrontational approaches. In Indonesia, this approach relied on research findings demonstrating violations of labour rights and human rights at palm oil plantations and putting pressure on the companies to take appropriate measures. In Myanmar, in some cases the provision of loans required further L&A efforts by CEA and farmers, including bringing farmers to union level to advocate decision makers in Ministry of Planning and Finance. In Uganda, CEA conducted L&A for regulatory mechanisms for agro-input leaders to be established at the district level, which in cases involved farmers in the monitoring and reporting of suspicious agro-input dealers, in order to improve business environment and increased business volume for genuine and quality input (including seed) suppliers.

Despite work conducted to raise awareness on UNGP BHR, child labour and women workers situation among private companies, no significant results have been seen in this area yet. Both in Myanmar and Indonesia, CEA partners led or participated in working groups dealing with child rights and child labour. In Indonesia, CEA worked with two large palm oil companies that committed to creating more sustainable supply chains and applying the Child Rights and Business Principles toolkit, developed by one CEA partner, to improve their own practice. In Myanmar too, a few declarative commitments were achieved in this area. But in both cases, there’s no evidence of concrete changes in companies’ practices. In Indonesia, research was conducted on the situation of women workers in palm oil plantations and a booklet on how to prevent and mitigate gender-based violence was developed and distributed among farmers networks, and one company started to create women workers committees at their plantations. In Guatemala, the practice of women’s participation in the commission in one CEA partner union has progressed to gender parity, and a gender policy was developed. The same union has incorporated the principle of participation of the youth in coordinating bodies, given the chance to young people to be actors and strengthen their organisations.

4.4 CHANGES AT THE LEVEL OF TARGET GROUPS

Through its various activities, CEA strengthened the capacities and confidence of farmers in several countries to conduct L&A and engage strategically in the public sphere, and gained access to government and private stakeholders. In many cases, like in Myanmar, Uganda and Ethiopia, CEA programme was a response to the limited civic space that smallholder farmers enjoyed in their countries. Capacities in this area were developed both through trainings, meetings, workshops, and by accompanying L&A processes. For instance, in Myanmar CEA programme used the 10-step approach to train more than 70 farmer groups (regional, township and village level), women groups and labour groups, which developed L&A plans, and received coaching by CEA members to explore and articulate their messages to regional departments of agriculture and other government agencies. In Myanmar too, as result of L&A by farmers organised in regional forums, a successful L&A campaign
was conducted which led to the establishment of a floor price for paddy the first time in the country. In several countries (Indonesia, Myanmar, Uganda, Ethiopia, Kenya), farmers were frequently exposed to government officials of different hierarchies and private sector representatives in forums and organised dialogues, where they were able to share their needs and demands. These opportunities for dialogue and engagement also contributed to increase collaboration between farmers and relevant stakeholders in the agricultural sector, and access to government and private sector services and opportunities (e.g.: access to private bank loans in Myanmar, or to extension services in Uganda).

Farmers and workers in several countries have developed stronger bonds, sometimes formalising in new networks or associations, together with their bargaining and negotiation skills, what strengthened their position in value chains. In Myanmar, CEA programme supported the registration and formalisation of regional farmer development associations, also as a result of a strategic L&A to relevant Parliamentary Committees to support these developments. Although they need more support to further develop a business mindset, through trainings on bargaining and negotiation skills, these associations are now more aware of market demand and developed bargaining to get a fairer trade of crops, and can now play an important coordination role linking farmers with private sector. Among other things, as a consequence of collective action, farmers in Myanmar got more convenient loans from banks. In Indonesia too, CEA programme supported the formal establishment of a network representing more than 500,000 palm oil workers of eight pre-existing federations, which also received training on collective bargaining and labour rights, allowing to unify voices and promote social dialogue at farm and sector level. Furthermore, local CSO networks were created and/or strengthened to monitor the implementation of UNGP and Child Rights in local palm oil plantations. In Uganda, CEA programme helped organise and mobilise smallholder farmers, and develop their capacity to analyse their development needs, prioritise issues for their L&A agenda and engage the duty bearers at various levels to influence solutions to their specific needs. This citizen led approach is more sustainable in L&A as the farmers are likely to invoke a quicker response from the duty bearers than CSOs. Overall, within the CEA programme, local organisations have strengthened their L&A competencies as described in 4.1. Establishing and/or strengthening CSO networks is a feature in almost all CEA countries.

Reduced discrimination of women, youth and PWDs due to increased awareness creation and change of attitudes, and increased security of these groups on land. In Uganda and Myanmar, the sensitisation activities on inclusion led by Light for the World and The Leprosy Mission, and in Ethiopia the work of Tearfund and LftW, resulted on increased awareness about these groups rights and how they have been systematically discriminated and excluded from development initiatives. In Uganda, targeted existing farmer groups were reconfigured to be inclusive of women, youth and PwDs, whose inclusion in CEA’s L&A agenda consequently increased their access to services including extension, agro-inputs and output markets. Some CEA partners in Uganda deliberately provided employment opportunities for PwDs, and in Myanmar some of them adapted their organisational policies to be more inclusive. In Myanmar CEA interventions incorporated a disability inclusion lens (e.g.: in research processes or stakeholders’ consultations), and PwD were also trained on L&A, though results in terms of improved livelihoods are not tangible yet. At the government level, Lira District in Uganda earmarked a vote to facilitate mobilisation and sensitisation of PwDs to benefit from general government programs. Moreover, in Uganda CEA supported and strengthened the customary land management system (through land committees) to guarantee the right to land by women, youth and PwDs in tandem with the land law in Uganda, which has led to amicable and systematically documented resolution of numerous land related disputes involving these groups, who were previously large deprived of access to land. In Myanmar, a factor that has prevented CEA programme from achieving further results in this area is that the inclusion of PwD in the agricultural practice is less prevalent among farmers since it requires intense physical work and emphasises productivity. In India, with support of VANI and LftW, CSOs adapted internal policies to become more inclusive (could not be validated as India was not included in the country case studies).
In Guatemala, at national level, youth leaders as well as youth organizations from urban and rural contexts strengthened their participation and organisation in the context of the National Youth Front in order to influence political actors to advance youth agenda of social inclusion, with a special emphasis on the approval of Youth Law. This legislation was promoted through different L&A strategies, including the ‘Being young is a right’. As a result, National Youth Front has gained legitimacy as valid interlocutor for youth voices and claim within Congress in Guatemala. Specifically, the Congress has approved that two spaces in the Congressional Commission on Youth Rights will be allocated to two members of the National Youth Front. At local level main results include the consolidation and political strengthening of the indigenous Poqomchi Youth Coordinator, a regional youth-led organization at inter-municipal level, with a cultural pertinent approach and representation of youths coming from communities.

4.5 ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND CEA CONTRIBUTION

During the evaluation, eleven cases were selected for a more in-depth analysis, including a contribution analysis. Performance stories are described in the country reports. For 11 cases, selected in the four country case studies, a contribution analysis was done. The contribution analysis methodology supports the analysis of the L&A trajectories and the collection of evidence of several factors that have contributed to the stated outcomes, so to assess the relative contribution of the programme under evaluation. To the extent possible, evidence of rival explanations was collected. As documented in the case study reports, in 5 cases the contribution of the CEA programme was assessed as high (CEA partners being the main drivers of change), in 6 cases as medium (CEA partners contributing meaningfully, along other actors and factors). In all cases, the CEA programme has been necessary in bringing about the change. CEA partners provided relevant and state of the art technical inputs to policy development processes, trained government and private sector actors, took up a facilitator role and/or accelerated debates and the implementation of national policies at local level. In all cases, CEA partners were crucial in bringing smallholder farmers’ interest under the attention.

Following table presents an overview of the validated outcomes and the assessment of the contribution of CEA to the outcomes (see annex 6 for framework used to assess the level of outcome). More detailed information (including performance stories) can be found in the country case study reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>National Action Plan on Human Rights</td>
<td>Through trainings, CEA enhanced knowledge on Business and Human Rights among different ministries and provided technical recommendations to be included in the National Action Plan on Human Rights.</td>
<td>Debates being shaped</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Trade union network created</td>
<td>CEA supported the formal establishment of a network, Japbusi, representing more than 500,000 palm oil workers of eight pre-existing federations, allowing to unify voices and promote social dialogue at farm and sector level.</td>
<td>Heightened awareness</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>National Spice Board</td>
<td>CEA contributed to the development of the SOP and a digital traceability system for quality standards procedures.</td>
<td>Policy change implemented</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>L&amp;A campaign for paddy fair market price</td>
<td>CEA participated in the first ever consultative process on the negative effects of pesticide use taking place in Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries Affairs Committee in both chambers, and a report with recommendations was submitted to the Union Parliament.</td>
<td>Debates being shaped</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>L&amp;A for Good Agricultural Practices certificates at regional level</td>
<td>CEA facilitated coordination among government, private sector and farmers to establish Good Agricultural Practices certification processes at regional level.</td>
<td>Policy change implemented</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>L&amp;A on food safety in Parliament Committees</td>
<td>CEA participated in the campaign of the Regional Farmer Forum, which advocated the definition of paddy floor price, achieved for the first time in Myanmar in 2018.</td>
<td>Policy change implemented</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Enhancing access to agricultural extension</td>
<td>CEA contributed to the revitalization of the agricultural extension service delivery by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries after several years of absence, through the strengthening of linkages between extension workers and farmer groups in dialogues organised by CEA at district levels.</td>
<td>Reaching target groups</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Provision of seeds and seedlings</td>
<td>CEA worked in several regions to catalyse the district local governments to take action towards implementing the National Seed Policy, in particular to ensure that smallholder farmers have access to quality seeds, locally adapted</td>
<td>Policy change implemented</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Land grabbing</td>
<td>CEA strengthened the capacity of the cultural land committees and increased credibility and trust in the cultural land management system in three regions, to prevent land grabbing and guarantee the rights of vulnerable members of the community (especially the widows, girls, and orphans).</td>
<td>Reaching target groups</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>CEA has contributed to increased awareness and knowledge among MEP, MoFA and NGOs, on the role of FBOs in development, and to a changing discourse at policy level within MoFA. This has resulted in the inclusion of “Freedom of religion” in the 2021 budget and actions taken to increase religious literacy within MoFA.</td>
<td>Debates being shaped / Policy change implemented</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands and the European Union</td>
<td>FNS</td>
<td>CEA members together with other organisation have influenced both nationally as well internationally policy on FNS. CEA lobbied for 3 themes: FNS, position of smallholders and agroecology issues in developing countries.</td>
<td>Debates being shaped, public awareness raising</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 CONCLUSIONS

Civic space (PW1): CEA contributed in creating and strengthening civic space at all levels and in strengthening networking and multi-stakeholder platforms. An important result is the evolution among partners from a confrontational to a dialogue approach, which was welcomed by government and private sector actors and in several countries, implementing partners have informed CSOs on (changing) NGO laws, supported CSOs in complying with these laws and/or have amended these laws in those cases where civic space was under threat.

Right to adequate food (PW2): issues of concern with regard to food and nutrition security have been included in local development plans and, in a limited number of countries, CEA also contributed to new nutrition and food policies, more so at the local level though sometimes also taken up to the national level, and with an international endorsement in the universal periodic review. CEA also has contributed to enhancing service provision by training government extension workers and bringing services to the farmers, and to supporting (local) government in applying existing regulatory frameworks. The application of national plans on nutrition are currently being monitored by trained CEA partners and their constituencies. In several countries, CEA also lobbied for securing land rights and was able to influence and strengthen the cultural land management system to be more sensitive to the needs of women/girls, orphans and to guarantee their rights on the land.

Small producer empowerment and inclusive markets (PW3): CEA contributed to install the idea that coordination and organisation of value chain stakeholders for a common goal can lead to win-win situations. This has meant a change of behaviours for private sector, but also from CSOs and farmers groups. CEA and partners facilitated in linking various stakeholders, like farmer cooperatives at different levels, factories and companies, suppliers, private traders, brokers, financial institutions, etc. depending on the commodity. Platforms were established, strengthened and/or institutionalised. Farmers gained access to resources (financial and agricultural) and markets. In several countries, CEA was able to bring specific commodities of concern of the smallholder farmers under the attention of government, resulting in the inclusion of these commodities among the priorities in national agricultural policies in several countries. CEA has also contributed to enhance the quality of the produce of small-scale farmers, through the development of quality standards for specific commodities and the implementation of GAP certificates, which enhanced access of farmers to national and international markets.

Sustainable private sector (PW4): In a limited number of countries, the CEA programme was also successful in enhancing awareness among government and private actors regarding the need to adopt international recognised operating standards and principles at national level in the value chains targeted by the programme, in putting the international due diligence on business and human rights on the agenda, in providing technical input for the development of such standards at national level and in making tools available to support government and private sector actors to take action, both at district and national level. These processes are ongoing. Trade unions improved their capacities to negotiate and engage in the social dialogue and were able to negotiate CBAs aimed at improving working conditions of workers, with specific attention to the rights of women. Real change in practice of private sector is yet to be seen. CEA achieved to attract at least the collaboration of employers’ associations and some frontrunners. A clear business case is currently lacking to convince businesses to adopt the UNGP principles in their policies and practices.

CEA trainings, complemented with learning developed through the implementation of interventions, have been effective to strengthening lobbying and advocacy capacities of civil society organisations, including CEA partners and farmer groups. They have contributed to creating and demanding civic space where government, private sector and civil society meet to discuss a variety of challenges in the agricultural sector and find common solutions, moving from more confrontational approaches to the improvement of dialogue among stakeholders. As a result, partners
have enhanced their legitimacy before other stakeholders in the sector. CEA partners are now more aware regarding inclusion of marginalised groups (women, people with disabilities, youth, indigenous people) in their activities and L&A efforts, and in cases have developed and adapted policies to diversity their own workplaces.

172 Despite these achievements, CEA programme lacked a comprehensive capacity development strategy, especially in countries where the Change the Game Academy was not implemented, which would have provided more cohesion to in-country activities (including peer learning and training of trainers), underpin explicit and intentional learning trajectories, scale individual skills to the organisational level, and allowed to better monitor partners’ capacities development. CEA programme has also contributed to organising and strengthening farmers groups, local and national networks, and trade unions, raising awareness of their rights and empowering their voices, thus generating further capacity to engage with decision makers in their communities and sectors, and better working conditions. CEA programme also contributed to reduce discrimination of women, people with disabilities, youth and indigenous people in the agricultural sector, especially at the community level, where processes and mechanisms to ensure their rights (for instance, access to land) were supported.

173 Through technical assistance, capacity building and facilitation of dialogues, CEA partners developed bonds of trust with government agencies working in different policy areas, also product of a strategic alignment between policy priorities and CEA’s targets. CEA partners helped government agencies better reach target groups with their services. CEA programme also contributed to shape critical legislative debates and L&A for legislation to protect farmers’ interests (regarding the negative use of pesticides, certification standards, competitive prices, and disability inclusion, among other issues), also at the Netherlands and European Union level. However, not always CEA’s work materialised in concrete policy and institutional changes, partly explained by factors such as the time that change in policy processes as a result of L&A trajectories require to materialize, timing of policy processes, policy makers’ capacities, and the limited government coordination, both vertical and horizontal.

174 As it did with government and farmers, CEA programme also introduced a new concept of dialogue on inclusive agricultural value chain development, contributing to improve dialogue between private sector and unions, helping identify synergies for mutual benefit. Through the recognition of its importance in strengthening a more inclusive agricultural sector, in several countries CEA partners were able to engage the private sector and make it a regular participant in relevant forums and workshops, and linked it with unions, farmers and government stakeholders. By combining a top-down (working with private sector companies) and a bottom-up (working with farmers associations and unions) approach, CEA programme also raised awareness on human rights in business and helped commit companies to improve labour conditions of their employees, though no significant changes in practices have been identified in this area.
5 Analysis of efficiency

In the ToR for this end evaluation, efficiency was defined as follows: (1) To what extent have the CEA outcomes resulted from economic use of resources (programme, budget)? And (2) Were monitoring tools provided used to define ‘economic use’? Assessing a link between programme results and costs incurred is difficult for L&A processes: L&A results are characterised by fuzzy causal relationships and contribution is often difficult to establish, effects over time are unpredictable or take place with a time delay and sometimes L&A fails, it is hard to quantify and monetise L&A interventions, resource allocation to differentiated results is complex.

To assess economic use of resources, a qualitative assessment has been done of the processes and management procedures in place to monitor efficient use of resources (time, energy, financial resources) in realising programme outcomes, which is described under the headings organisational (section 5.1.) and programmatic efficiency (5.2.). Further the M&E system was evaluated, with a specific attention to if and how efficiency was monitored (5.3.).

5.1 ORGANISATION EFFICIENCY

The CEA programme was implemented through a decentralised governance structure, aligned to the decentralised and programmatic way of working at ICCO, and appropriate procedures were put in place to balance well between central steering and local flexibility and to maximise efficiency. At ICCO Global office, a small team was coordinating the CEA programme, including a CEA programme manager, PMEL officer and administrative staff. At country level, the programme was managed by local ICCO CEA project teams, that were accountable to the ICCO Regional Manager or ICCO Country Manager; the CEA Country Coordinator played a central role in the management of the CEA programme. The country office was responsible for the allocations of funds, for the organisation and coordination of capacity development support, and for monitoring & evaluation. In the countries studied, the CEA Country Coordinators (ICCO CCEAs) had a strong position in guiding the implementing partners and showed good leadership in managing the CEA programme. In the Netherlands a lobby team, with lobbyists and thematic specialist, under the coordination of the CEA Programme Manager, was responsible for facilitating cooperation in L&A of the Netherlands based CEA members. Finally, the CEA Supervisory Board (Directors of the CEA members in The Netherlands) had end responsibility on all decisions. The CEA Programme Manager was accountable to this Board.

Strategic management of the CEA programme was the responsibility of the CEA Programme Manager at Global office. ICCO CMs and RMs had regular contacts with ICCO GO. ICCO GO as well as Alliance representatives paid (joint) field visits related to PMEL, for instance co-organised and participated in annual reflection and learning workshops, and in the guidance of reporting and the use of monitoring tools. Country and regional coordinators participated in annual learning workshops in the Netherlands. In 2018 monthly Skype calls were introduced to have a quicker and smoother contact, between ICCO both global and in-country and Alliance members to inform each other and to solve problems arising in the implementation. Through these Skype conversations Country Offices were able to obtain quick feedback from the Global Office Specialists. These contacts forged stronger horizontal connections between CEA members in supporting the implementation process and resulted in an increased responsiveness of members to situations and questions from IPs.
The CEA country programmes were complex to manage, in terms of relations with CEA members in the Netherlands and with the implementing partners, in terms of the budget repartition between partners and accountability lines between CEA members and their partners. This was generally well done by the country CEA-ICCO teams, paying attention to relationship building and partnership management. At country level, programme management structures varied between the countries, with some countries having established a formal steering group including CEA members and IP at the start of the programme (e.g. Bangladesh, India, Myanmar), other countries that had started to formalise partner and CEA member meetings during programme implementation (e.g. Benin), and other countries (e.g. Indonesia, Mali, Uganda) that did not work with a formal CEA steering group but organised regularly partner meetings (ones, twice or four times a year). In several countries (e.g. Indonesia, Uganda, Kenya) a WhatsApp group was created for informal exchanges between IPs, where they informed each other about activities and quick info updates, and also photos and short videos were shared.

In some CEA countries like Myanmar and Indonesia, ICCO CO had also a role as co-implementer, and took part in L&A interventions, which explains the substantial part of the programme budget spent by the ICCO country offices, like working in communities, identifying L&A opportunities, building connections, participation in multi-stakeholder partnerships, convener of meetings, contribution in development of tools and guidelines, broker of relations, and linking the CEA programme to complementary initiatives in the region and to the L&A agenda in the Netherlands and EU. The ICCO COs were also responsible for capacity development and acted as facilitators of capacity development support for all IPs: facilitating capacity development assessments, engaging in a dialogue on capacity needs and evolutions, provision of capacity development support and linking to CEA members Wilde Ganzen, Edukans, LftW, and to other providers on national level. The joint planning and co-implementation role were new for some CEA-ICCO coordinators, which can explain the difference in roles assumed by the CEA coordinators. This co-implementing role was conducive for enhancing L&A capacity, for facilitating access to national and international networks, and sometimes even for facilitating access to government officers. Taking up an active role in L&A, however, comes with a risk. CEA-ICCO coordinators can be accused by government officials of defending a foreign agenda (see example Indonesia).

Organisational efficiency was further challenged because of the varying presence of programmes of CEA members in the different countries, not all having presence at country level and all supporting specific local partners. However, appropriate management solutions were found that were conducive to efficient programme management. In some countries only a limited number of CEA members was present through their partners, in other countries like Uganda almost all CEA members were present, including four Prisma members and two CEA members that had a regional advisor present (Edukans, Light for the World). These regional advisors were hosted by the ICCO RO. In Myanmar a regional advisor from TLM was present (covering Myanmar and Cambodia). These regional advisors report a good collaboration with IPs. Their position was different, but their technical advice and support was smoothly integrated in ongoing activities and appreciated.

Contract management at IP level is managed by the ICCO country office and arranged via annual or bi-annual contracts, and this system worked well. Funds were disbursed twice a year (e.g. Indonesia) or once a year (Uganda), after signing the contract and after the periodic financial reports were approved. ICCO is the main contracting partner and most IPs have bilateral agreements with ICCO. In some cases, contractual arrangements were made with the CEA member. For CNV, contract management was done by the CNV office in the Netherlands. For releasing funds also tripartite agreements were designed to reflect the implementing partner, ICCO and the CEA member that is affiliated to the IP. One of the reasons given was to have a track record documented for future proposals.
There was no shared decision power on the allocation of the budget. The allocation of budgets for the five years was decided upon in the Netherlands, by the CEA Supervisory Board, for all CEA members for their work in the Netherlands and the country budgets. In meetings of the Supervisory Board, annual adaptations could be made. Based on this division of funds, country budgets were allocated to the CEA country teams. At country level, decisions were taken on the allocation of annual budgets to the IPs, under consensus of the Alliance members participating in the country programme. Thus, yearly budgets were decided upon by the ICCO Country Office in consultation with the CEA members. Every IP submitted their own yearly work plan that was basically informed by the overall CEA Plan for the country. The yearly allocation depended much on the ability of the implementing partner in terms of the plan shared with ICCO. Budget management was organised according to the guidelines of the ICCO country offices, which could differ between countries. Flexibility in the budget management system was perceived differently. In Uganda for instance receiving the budget for the entire year was appreciated as appropriate for managing L&A projects, with unpredictable time frames and results. In countries like Ethiopia and Indonesia budgets were released per half year and a remaining budget had to be reimbursed. In other countries (Uganda) any left-over balance from one contract was carried over to next year’s contract, and used in the subsequent year. Overspending by partners was not covered by the CEA programme.

Despite CEA’s complexity and the varied relationships to be managed in the Netherlands and in partner countries, roles and responsibilities were clear to the partners at country level. Furthermore, implementing partners confirm that once the programme was on speed, and roles and responsibilities were clear, there was sufficient room for co-creation and co-decision. In 2019, in several countries a power analysis was done, making the level of co-decision power more explicit. Interviewees in Indonesia confirmed that CEA members and partners had become more aware of existing power imbalances, e.g. between well-established and weaker or smaller CSOs, between urban and rural based organisations, between CEA members and partners. Insights from these analyses were incorporated in the preparations of the new CEA II programme proposal.

Programme management procedures and accountability requirements are assessed by implementing partners as clear and lean and were to a large extent respected. Budget were released timely. Delays were reported by ICCO staff interviewed, with regard to financial reports and completion of lobby logbooks (and as such delays in financial disbursements from ICCO to partners) caused by unfamiliarity with the instrument, with its use and purpose in L&A trajectories, delays in the implementation of the lobby trajectories (explained by internal factors but also because of contextual factors), but in most cases these have not affected negatively efficiency (not requiring more time, human resources or budget for implementation of activities).

The process of developing country ToCs in the inception year 2016 took place without fully understanding the programme philosophy. Working with a ToC approach was new for almost all IPs as well as for ICCO and CEA members; all were used to log frames or similar frames. Working with a ToC approach was a requirement from the MoFA, and not so much a balanced choice by the CEA Alliance. Contextualisation of the general ToC in each CEA country was done by ICCO staff, together with country partners in the inception or base line workshops of 2016, although partners were not equally familiar with the requirements, which affected the ownership of partners with the CEA programme, and also the so-called Southern leadership of interventions to be developed. However, a steep learning curve of both partners as well as CEA members was mentioned. The idea of responding to emerging changes in the context, to have flexibility in expenditures, and not being limited by a log frame and determined activities, was more and more appreciated by partners and they got more familiar to it. The approach led to the inclusion of more actors, and voices when the programme took shape. Especially the (bi)annual reflection & learning workshops and partner meetings from 2018 onwards at country level were considered useful platforms to discuss changes, look into assumptions and plan accordingly for the next year. These workshops were also useful for new staff from IPs who were introduced to the approach.
In the first years of the programme, partners tend to operate in silos, in two ways: (1) in silos with their European ally, and (2) in silos per PW. CEA members continued financing their partners in CEA countries, next to the CEA programme. This finance enabled partners continuation of their ongoing projects aimed at service delivery to communities, while positioning L&A activities. This strategy offered opportunities for linking L&A to existing programme activities and contacts, however horizontal collaboration within the group of CEA IPs was missing, as also documented in the MTR as a challenge. During programme implementation more synergy was looked for which resulted in some case in the development of more integrated programmes (e.g. Uganda, India) and/or the organisation of joint activities like workshops and lobby interventions (e.g. Indonesia). In countries like for instance Myanmar, Cambodia, Guatemala and Bolivia the silo approach continued to exist as IPs were active in different intervention areas and sectors. At the start of the programme compartmentalisation in PWs, with different partners per PW operating in the same region, resulted in some cases in duplication of efforts, for instance in convening regional dialogues (Uganda), and insufficient complementarities of partners (Myanmar).

More horizontal collaboration emerged in countries like Benin, Cambodia, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia (limited), Kenya and Uganda, after 2017 through learning workshops and partner meetings. Also, in the NL lobby team horizontal collaboration was sought in thematic areas. When IPs got to know better about each other’s work and role in the programme, more coherence was established between interventions. In Uganda, gradually activities in PW2 and PW3 were combined, as these PWs were linked in aim and target audience, concerning the same value chains, from production to marketing. In the case of Myanmar, in 2019 working groups were created, to pool expertise of partners in different PWs and link to each other’s networks, though only one of these groups started its work but was stopped due to the pandemic outbreak.

In most countries the CEA programme had a slow and sometimes difficult start, for various reasons. IPs were in a standing (financial dependant) relationship with partners in the Netherlands and felt in the first place accountable to them. CEA members had to discuss and negotiate several issues before they could align with their partners. Partnerships between CEA members and implementing partners were in many CEA countries a continuation of other programmes, which framed expectations of both IPs in the CEA country as well as of CEA members. In some countries new partners came to the table and a possible collaboration had to be explored first, scarcity of human resources to get the CEA programme up and running was reported (e.g.: in Myanmar). In Ethiopia, Kenya and Mali, delays were due to difficulties in attracting a new country coordinator. In India a delay occurred because of the initial start of the CEA programme in the entire country. After bringing all CEA activities together in one state (Assam), and with new IPs the programme became more effective. In other countries, delays can be explained by contextual situations or challenges, like elections (e.g. Indonesia) or shrinking civic space not allowing for public meetings (e.g. Uganda), insecurity and unsafety (e.g. Mali, Guatemala and other countries in central America).

In several countries, staff turnover at ICCO coordinating office and at implementing partners also slowed down programme implementation. This was mentioned by IPs in e.g. Myanmar and Ethiopia; regular staff changes didn’t help developing the programme and its interventions. In some case there was no hand over of information and contacts to a successor which affected especially the L&A activities and relation building.

In the countries where the Dutch government was represented through an HRH Embassy insight from the programme from quarterly or biannual review meetings were shared with Embassy staff. In some cases, a specific staff member for the Strategic Partnership programmes was present at HM Embassy, who was invited for meetings and events. The overall impression is that there was little active interest from the side of the Embassies in the programme. However, CEA lobbyists in the Netherlands reported that government officers at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in The Hague were well informed about the programme, especially for countries like Uganda, Indonesia, Ethiopia and Myanmar. Early 2020 MFA paid field visits to CEA countries and had face-to-face meetings.
with IPs to know more about results and the overall impact from the CEA Programme on its key stakeholders and identification of scalable interventions. ICCO COs facilitated these visits. However, in general there was no or limited collaboration with the Embassies or alignment between programmes implemented by the Embassies.

5.2 PROGRAMMATIC EFFICIENCY

There was no clear strategy on efficiency monitoring, which is understandable taking into account the challenges to measure efficiency as described in the introduction of this chapter. However, there was an implicit use of efficiency principles through monitoring, learning and adaptation. Process efficiency was monitored by using indicators for progress, and in the reflection and learning workshops the activity planning based on the ToC and outcomes, also on process level, was discussed and integrated in next year's planning. The use of indicators was adapted in the second year of programme implementation, in order to come with a relevant and more limited set of indicators to report on. Several strategies were used to improve the efficiency of programme implementation, as described in the following.

Several actions were undertaken to increase the knowledge and skills of IPs in working with the new ToC approach. ICCO GO organised regional workshops in Spring 2016 in Kampala and in Bali with regional ICCO officers, as part of the MFSII programme, for sharing of lessons learned from the programme evaluations during this programme. In those workshops, a session was organised about the use of a ToC approach and a general ToC for ICCO. PMEL officers of ICCO GO participated in the course of 2017 in a working group on Strategic Partnerships under the umbrella of development network organisation Partos in the Netherlands, discussing the introduction of the ToC approach in the Partnership programmes and the use for CSOs. Ideas and experiences sharing inspired and supported the guidance from GO to the ROs and COs in the CEA programme ICCO officers used this capacity building for coaching of the IPs. Extra investment was done by ICCO PMEL and country office to explain the use of the logbooks and Stories of Change, which resulted in gradually a more efficient time investment by partners in working with these tools. IPs took more and more initiatives to build a knowledge basis together, for instance by integrating capacity building in the reflection and learning workshops (Myanmar, Kenya) or by inviting resource persons to be updated on a relevant thematic issue (Uganda). The purpose was to bring partners up to speed on an issue as to empower partners with the knowledge and skills that support the programme's L&A agenda.

In several countries the scope of the interventions was narrowed down to become more effective, in terms of human and financial resources. By decreasing the number of commodities to be worked on (e.g. Indonesia), concentrating interventions in one geographic area (e.g. India), being more selective in the number of networks to invest in considering the added value of the network for the country programme (e.g. Ethiopia, Indonesia).

In all countries the CEA programme was designed as a top-up programme, positioning CEA as a L&A supporting intervention for other operations of CEA members in the country and programmes, funded by CEA members or other donors (e.g.: Danida, DFID, UNICEF). The connection with other programmes was in most cases a deliberate choice and had an amplifying effect, though at the same time creating difficulties in identifying the added value and contribution of the CEA programme, as well as its visibility. Another strategy to create a better scale of operation was by seeking inclusion of a wide range of stakeholders with interest and motivations to improve value chains, where CEA partnered with or engaged in multi-stakeholder platforms and linked with private companies. Creating linkages and collaboration with private companies requested an investment of resources in building trust and finding common ground for L&A purposes, especially when it concerned sensitive issues, e.g. labour rights, human rights (e.g. Benin, Indonesia, Myanmar). Collaboration with other (inter)national organisations was another strategy, resulting in pooling of funding and networks to reach scale (e.g. Myanmar,
Indonesia, Ethiopia) and to extend the life span of CEA activities. Another example is the choice of creating and strengthening local networks of CSOs (e.g. Indonesia) or teaming up with network organisations of NGOs and CSOs (e.g. Indonesia, Uganda) as these networks will be involved in up- and out scaling programme results.

There were also a number of factors that affected programme efficiency negatively, such as the selection of IPs, the aforementioned unfamiliarity with the ToC approach, lack of synergies between partners and pathways planned from the design stage, tension between L&A and service delivery, disconnection between national and international lobby and upward accountability. This was mostly noted in the first years of the programme and solutions were looked for during programme implementation to enhance efficiency.

In none of the countries the CEA programme started on the basis of a competitive selection of partners matching the focus of the programme on L&A interventions. This was a deliberate choice fitting within the strategy of most CEA members, to invest in long lasting relationships with partners. It was also a deliberate choice of CEA to support both IPs with strong L&A expertise and IPs with less L&A expertise. IPs without expertise nor experience in L&A had to be equipped to play their role in the CEA programme, and results of L&A could only emerge later during programme implementation (also announced in the MTR). Furthermore, in countries like in Ethiopia, Indonesia, Myanmar new partners entered the country alliance in the course of programme implementation. And in a few cases, partners left because of e.g. perceived low budgets allocated (e.g. Myanmar, Cambodia, Bangladesh) or were made to leave, like in Uganda, because of irregularities in management of CEA funds. Managing these partner relations and making them familiar with the programme demanded extra (time) investment of CEA ICCO country teams.

The use of a ToC approach was in the first half of the programme difficult. Partners were not used to this way of working and continued in the ‘old’ way they were used to from previous programmes, with a fixed activity programme per partner and without an overall picture of the change to be accomplished, nor the connections between interventions and underlying assumptions. No ex-ante assessment was done of alternative approaches during ToC development, so to look for opportunities for collaboration, or reflect on the most appropriate and efficient strategies. Reflections on the assumptions and monitoring results did not result in substantial adaptations of the PWs, the assumptions and related work plans, especially during the first years of the programme. The fact the programme was implemented in a fragmented manner hampered the joint reflection and discussion on assumptions among IPs as well. Learning a new approach takes time. Gradually partners became more familiar with the approach. Good reflections on assumptions became part of the yearly reviews when IPs got more used to the ToC approach and the flexibility allowed.

During the first years, in several countries, there was a tension between L&A interventions and the ongoing programmes of the IP focusing on service delivery. The CEA programme focused on L&A of CSOs to express their needs and get into dialogue with duty bearers. This new “mental model” had to be integrated by partners in their ongoing activities, like service delivery improving livelihoods of their constituencies. This strategy, however effective building on existing connections, appeared to be a difficult one in terms of bringing L&A into the processes. Over the years when lobby issues became clearer, as well as the way of operating and first results were achieved, linkages and synergies emerged from the new approach with existing activities in a solid foundation in target audiences and beneficiaries.

Despite the ambitions formulated in the baseline document for the overall CEA programme, there was a disconnect between the lobby interventions conducted at global level and at country level. The fact that there were no integrated ToCs at country level and no clear CEA lobby vision that could guide the connection between national and international lobby might explain this loose link between national and international L&A. Instead information from the CEA countries was used as input for an “evidence based” L&A for influencing policies
in the Netherlands and at EU level and representatives of IPs were invited to events in Europe. Evidence-informed could be a better term for CEA’s efforts influencing international policy making.14

5.3 BUDGET PHASING AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

The overall picture is that programme expenditures increased over the years, demonstrating that programme implementation came up to speed during 2018 and 2019. 2020 appears to be an exceptional year, when due to the covid-19 restrictions activity plans could not be implemented. The first years of programme implementation were used for inception studies, training, enhancing knowledge of implementing partners, investing in relation building, development of toolboxes and guidelines.

To assess efficient use of the budget in this evaluation essential information is missing, like detailed planned budgets. Indicative country budgets can be found in the programme document (2015) and at that time country programmes were not yet elaborated. More detailed budgets are available from 2017 onwards. Differences with the 2015 budget can be explained by several factors, e.g. new countries were added (Myanmar, which was first included under a ‘Mekong’ programme together with Cambodia) and some of the CEA members having their focus of activities especially on Africa, like Prisma, Kerk in Aktie, Edukans and Wilde Ganzen were allocated a larger budget for these countries. The choice to allocate more budget was made during the inception phase of the programme.

Following tables present an overview of the division of the budget over the different PWS and over the different continents. For all countries, 2016 was the start-up year. From 2017 onwards, when programme implementation came on speed, the total annual sum of expenditures was increasing. In most countries, an expected increase of expenditures for 2020, the last year of implementation, is noted, which normally could be regarded as a consolidation year (might be explained by the fact that CEA alliance and partners were expecting a second phase of CEA).

As CEA members have long standing relationships of collaboration with partners in especially Eastern Africa, 45% of the budget was spent in these countries, compared to 38% in Asian countries. Overall, for the 12 CEA countries, two third of the budget was spent in PW 1 and 3.

14 www.nature.com/palcomms see article entitled: Using evidence to influence policy: Oxfam’s experience, by Mayne, Green et. al.; DOI: 10.1057/s41599-018-0176-7.
### Table 6: Overview of the total CEA budget per PW, for the 12 southern CEA countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26.191.484</td>
<td>18.723.855</td>
<td>1.983.533</td>
<td>4.879.328</td>
<td>5.194.173</td>
<td>6.683.323</td>
<td>7.467.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.763.410</td>
<td>7.120.366</td>
<td>825.075</td>
<td>1.968.035</td>
<td>2.381.680</td>
<td>2.643.044</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.198.118</td>
<td>3.495.820</td>
<td>403.919</td>
<td>939.705</td>
<td>969.701</td>
<td>1.702.298</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.919.073</td>
<td>5.967.329</td>
<td>573.698</td>
<td>1.451.539</td>
<td>2.197.861</td>
<td>1.951.744</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.310.883</td>
<td>2.140.340</td>
<td>180.841</td>
<td>526.036</td>
<td>913.414</td>
<td>1.170.543</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Netherlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8.476.198</td>
<td>6.365.902</td>
<td>1.778.688</td>
<td>1.298.889</td>
<td>1.549.027</td>
<td>1.739.298</td>
<td>2.110.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.350.118</td>
<td>2.594.535</td>
<td>679.563</td>
<td>604.595</td>
<td>721.928</td>
<td>588.449</td>
<td>755.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.401.178</td>
<td>1.046.169</td>
<td>294.704</td>
<td>227.932</td>
<td>318.735</td>
<td>355.009</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.752.979</td>
<td>1.362.080</td>
<td>409.844</td>
<td>190.375</td>
<td>319.592</td>
<td>442.269</td>
<td>390.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.971.923</td>
<td>1.363.118</td>
<td>394.578</td>
<td>275.985</td>
<td>302.710</td>
<td>389.845</td>
<td>608.805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Continent 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26.191.482</td>
<td>18.723.854</td>
<td>1.983.531</td>
<td>4.879.328</td>
<td>5.194.173</td>
<td>6.683.323</td>
<td>7.467.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>9.837.349</td>
<td>6.862.857</td>
<td>685.159</td>
<td>1.682.910</td>
<td>1.728.685</td>
<td>2.766.102</td>
<td>2.974.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L America</td>
<td>4.676.450</td>
<td>3.418.462</td>
<td>646.767</td>
<td>651.755</td>
<td>1.061.456</td>
<td>1.058.483</td>
<td>1.257.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>11.677.683</td>
<td>8.442.535</td>
<td>651.605</td>
<td>2.544.663</td>
<td>2.404.032</td>
<td>2.858.738</td>
<td>3.235.148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

15 Asia: Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Myanmar; Latin America: Bolivia, Guatemala, Central America; Africa: Benin, Kenya, Ethiopia, Mali, Uganda
ICCO CO financial staff confirms that there was an under spending at the start of the programme, which might indicate that not much attention was given to budget phasing, with a generally smaller budget provision at the start and an increasing budget towards the end of a project. This lack of phasing is reflected by the budget in the programme proposal and was continued in the country budgets. On the other hand, there was enough flexibility to move budgets from year to year.

Several financial management procedures were in place and a clear procurement policy existed aiming at reducing costs and making as much money as possible available to the programme. In order to reduce costs sometimes IPs organised joint events and put resources together, be it in kind (venues, transport) or funds (Indonesia, Uganda, Myanmar). Collaboration with CBOs' created ownership of events and processes. IPs submitted audit reports, financial and narrative reports, quarterly monitoring lobby logbooks and a detailed activity and budget plan (annual or bi-annual) upon which ICCO was able to transfer funds to their accounts. These funds were wired from Global Office directly to the organisation accounts. When partners fulfilled the requirements of adequate reporting, funds were released on time for an entire year or for 6 months. For some partners this was new; they were not used to funds released for the entire year at once. This provided freedom for planning execution of activities, and also taking advantage of opportunities that might emerge with minimal constraints. CEA members received a certain sum per year, to cover costs in the Netherlands, and for monitoring and reporting. The other portion of the budget, allocated to CEA members, was managed and administered by ICCO RO, responsible for contracts with IPs and money transfers to partners, including reporting. Expenses for in-country advisors for skills and disability inclusion were also paid from these CEA members’ country budgets (Edukans, Prisma members), and managed by ICCO RO. ICCO COs and CEA members worked with 3 categories of expenses: IPs budgets, co-implementation (direct and indirect program costs, including staff costs of CEA members for L&A, organising meetings, contributions to networks, research costs) and overhead, around 10% of the annual budget. Expenses for overhead are those not covered by the other two already mentioned, for instance expenses for financial administration, drivers, secretaries.

5.4 MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING

The M&E system for the CEA programme was centrally steered and similar for all CEA countries. A Theory of Change approach can be a useful tool for reflecting on the implementation of interventions and is related to learning, critical thinking about assumptions and transformational development, supporting system change. As already mentioned, the uptake of a ToC approach took some time. Subsequently M&E in the first years showed partners were used to tools and processes from a programmatic approach with log frames, objectives and indicators; reporting was the main purpose. To articulate outcome levels appeared to be difficult for partners who were used to formulating expected outputs. Only later in the implementation period, with support from ICCO GO the reflection and learning took more shape. Partners started appreciating the new perspective on evaluating changes resulting from their work. Partners called this a valuable learning process for their staff and they intend to continue this way of working in future operations.

An appropriate mix of monitoring tools was made available to the IPs, and their use improved over the years, as such the CEA programme also contributed to strengthening their M&E capacity of L&A. Tools include lobby logbooks, stories of change, peer feedback, indicator matrix, reflection tools and informal sharing and learning.
Lobby logbooks

209 For the CEA programme, new monitoring tools were introduced such as a lobby logbook. During annual learning events, specific sessions were dedicated to explaining the use and importance of the lobby-logbooks. Throughout programme implementation, considerable time was invested by ICCO PMEL officer and ICCO country staff in completing lobby logbooks.

210 The use of a lobby logbook was a new tool and time was needed for partners to take ownership of the logbooks and to understand the more strategic thinking about L&A. The relevance of lobby logbooks was acknowledged in building relationships, monitoring contacts and following up, and building arguments for the lobby process. However, in some countries the ICCO team reported that keeping records was an unusual habit, “not all partners were diligent in keeping track of the lobby logbooks” and reports were often quite delayed. Concerns were voiced about reliance on local partners to do their own M&E, and to report in a complete and timely manner. In the end, lobby logbooks were more used as reporting than to improve L&A.

Stories of Change

211 Another instrument used in MEL were the Stories of Change (SoC). Also, in the case of the SoC, similar to the lobby logbooks, partners had to become familiar with the purpose and use of this instrument. The SoC have mainly been used to assess progress at programme level, e.g. there is a clear link between the SoC and the outcomes reported in the annual report, but less to support monitoring and learning at project/partner level. The quality of the SoC is varying among partners, not consistently used and sometimes SoC were drafted by ICCO or staff of CEA members and not by the implementing partner. SoCs were important because of their qualitative approach, capturing results in a strategic and valuable way, however information presented several gaps in the L&A trajectory. SoCs were an important mechanism to rapidly identify perceived results, including for this evaluation, although some SoCs had to be complemented to get a more comprehensive understanding of the advocacy process. In addition to SoCs, for communication purpose also popularized stories were published on the CEA website.

Peer feedback & learning

212 Regular partner meetings and annual learning events had added value for partners. In some countries like in Uganda, Benin, Myanmar, Bangladesh, Kenya ICCO RO introduced instruments for peer feedback where partners commented and gave suggestions to colleagues on specific activities and questions, creating a more conducive environment for learning from each other’s experiences, writing Stories of Change and becoming more flexible in moving along changes in the context, tracking emerging developments and grasping opportunities. These meetings were not only used for exchange on strategies but also for harmonisation of strategies by implementing partners and for planning purpose. Partners would agree on the indicators of the different interventions. A framework for generating evidence was used and the lower level indicators were measured by the implementing partners. This made the M&E participatory, bringing about learnings and was appreciated by partners.

213 In Asia and Latin America cross-country exchanges were organised for an exchange on strategies. And CEA Programme Officers participated in learning events in other countries.

Indicator matrix

214 At the start of the programme an indicator matrix was shared with partners, based on discussions with the PO (and they with IPs) to come up with indicators fitting the PWs selected, and to report annually on these indicators for monitoring implementation. During the second year, CEA country teams were asked by ICCO GO to revise the
initial set of indicators and maintain only the most relevant indicators, which has been an appropriate measure - also from efficiency perspective - downsizing the workload in collecting monitoring data.

In general indicators were linked to the country ToC and contextualised, and therefore in principle useful for informing adequately the implementation of the programme. However, the set of indicators gave little insight in the strategies, in what is happening on the ground within each PW and within each project. The indicators combine quantitative and qualitative data, with a dominant attention for quantitative data. Qualitative data was expected to come from the lobby logbooks. The distinction between reach indicators (e.g.: number of stakeholders trained) and capacity indicators (e.g.: skills and knowledge developed) is difficult to establish and often a similar number is given. It is not clear how acquired skills and knowledge among CSOs, government and private sector actors is measured. POs were asked what signals could be of enhanced skills and knowledge. These signals were monitored and ideally incorporated in indicator reference sheets. For example, for government actors these would be: asking for more information, providing support, asking for research and finally a difference in statements or a different action.

The indicator system served mainly upward accountability and was less supportive for learning ownership of these monitoring data among the implementing partners. Once more familiar with the ToC approach IPs expressed their confusion about the use and meaning of the numbers (e.g.: if they refer to the number of meetings, or the changes coming from the meetings). Stories of Change were introduced, based on principles of Outcome Harvesting (Ricardo Wilson-Grau, various publications 2012-2018), and used in tracing progress, also on process level, although less informative to support strategic decisions.

Reflection tools

In the annual reflection and learning events, various tools were used to assess progress, like the spider diagram, rich pictures and stakeholder mapping, which made the reflection on the programme more practical. LfW shared specific tools used for tracking of disability targeting, like the Disability Inclusion Score Card (DISC). Stakeholder analysis, including power analysis, was introduced for the first time in the inception workshops of 2016, reviewed in the reflection and learning workshops in the following years, on national level, and furthers elaborated by partners for local and district level.

Informal sharing & learning

WhatsApp groups were created for CEA coordinators and partners, to inform each other, and partners were showing with pictures and short messages what they were doing while they were out in the field. This was much appreciated by partner staff and created an informal peer learning platform. Informal contacts with ICCO COs, and the availability of ICCO coordinators for advice and support was overall much appreciated and valued. Field visits by the coordinators and ICCO staff, and informal gatherings helped in the sharing between partner staff about their work and best practices.

5.5 CONCLUSIONS

The CEA programme was implemented through a decentralised governance structure and appropriate procedures were put in place. Programme management structures varied between the countries. The varying presence of CEA members in the different countries, was challenging, however, appropriate management solutions were found. CEA members Edukans en Prisma (Light for the World and The Leprosy Mission) had regional advisors present in Africa and Asia, hosted by ICCO ROs, whose technical advice and support was smoothly integrated in ongoing activities.
and appreciated. Roles and responsibilities were clear. When the programme was on speed, there was sufficient room for co-creation and co-decision.

220 In all CEA countries ICCO CO had also a role as co-implementer, and took part in L&A interventions, which explains the substantial part of the programme budget spent by these ICCO country offices. ICCO COs were also responsible for capacity development and acted as facilitators of capacity development support for all IPs. The joint planning and co-implementation role were new for some CEA-ICCO coordinators.

221 The system of contract management at partner level, managed by the ICCO country office for all partners (except for partners of CNV International), worked well. In some cases, contractual arrangements were also made with the CEA member and also tripartite agreements were designed between partners, its affiliated CEA member and ICCO. The allocation of budgets to partners was decided at country level, in consensus between CEA members, on the basis of an annual work plan that was basically informed by the overall CEA plan for the country. Flexibility in the budget management system was overall appreciated as appropriate for managing L&A projects, with unpredictable time frames and results. Accountability requirements were assessed by IPs as clear and lean and were to a large extent respected. Budgets were released timely.

222 The process of developing country programme during inception phase took place without fully understanding the programme philosophy and the ToC approach. This resulted in the first years of programme implementation in a fragmented and siloed approach that sometimes resulted in duplication of efforts and a too broad focus (spreading available resource thinly over the various lobby trajectories). When partners got more familiar with the ToC approach, and knew better each other’s work and role in the programme, more synergy and alignment was established between interventions.

223 In most countries the CEA programme had a slow and sometimes difficult start, for various reasons. IPs were in a standing (financial dependant) relationship with partners in the Netherlands and felt in the first place accountable to them. In some countries collaboration with new partners had to be explored first, and also scarcity of human resources to get the CEA programme up and running was reported. Delays were due to difficulties in an over ambitious programme, to contextual situations or challenges, like elections or shrinking civic space not allowing for public meetings, as well as situations of insecurity and unsafety. In several countries, staff turn-over slowed down programme implementation.

224 A lean M&E system was developed, based on the ToC and combining data-collection on a limited set of indicators with new tools such as lobby logbooks and Stories of Change. The set of indicators and the Stories of Change have been useful for monitoring progress at programme level and for upward accountability, but have given little insight in how change happens within each project and as such were little used to support learning about effective L&A strategies. The learning workshops were used for sharing of info and experiences, rather feeding into the planning in the next year than for adapting L&A strategies.

225 As the CEA programme was designed as a top-up programme, the connection with other programmes had an amplifying effect, though at the same time creating difficulties in identifying the added value and contribution of the CEA programme, as well as its visibility.
6 Analysis of sustainability

In line with the overall objectives of CEA programme and the ToR, the sustainability of changes is assessed along two levels: (i) sustainability of the changes in L&A capacity of CSOs, trade unions, FBOs, CBOs; and (ii) sustainability of the changes in agenda, policies and practices of government and private sector. For each of these actor groups, sustainability has been assessed along different dimensions such institutional (section 6.1.), programmatic (section 6.2.), financial (section 6.3.) and social sustainability (section 6.4). It should be noted that varying degrees of sustainability might be expected, taking into account the relatively short duration of the programme and the characteristic of L&A processes often yielding success at the longer term. A specific question in the ToR refers to the existence of exit-strategies which is described in section 6.5. Specific indicators for assessing these different dimensions are included in the evaluation framework (see annex 2).

A specific feature of the CEA programme was the fact that several CEA interventions were aligned to on-going programmes, that are/were being implemented by the partners in the various thematic domains of the CEA programme. The ToR questions whether linkages with these programmes or other programmes enhance sustainability of the CEA interventions.

The sustainability of changes resulting from CEA’s work, as well as the strategies that the programme and its partners have designed to enable that sustainability, can only be analysed for the countries subject to in-depth assessment. In cases, this analysis is complemented with information from the CtGA evaluation). It was indeed not possible to identify elements of sustainability through the desk study since information regarding sustainability strategies was rather limited in the CEA reports.

6.1 INSTITUTIONAL SUSTAINABILITY

Institutional sustainability of the programme results is assessed as high, as the CEA programme aligns to mission, strategies and policies of stakeholders involved (NGOs, government and to a certain extent also private sector -at least the frontrunners), research and toolkits have been made available that are used as reference by the different stakeholders.

CEA partners were able to strengthen and embed L&A approaches in their organisations and activities. Generally, CEA has selected implementing partners that had the capacity and competences compatible with the ambitions of the programme. Through several training opportunities and the implementation of strategies to advocate changes at policy and market level, L&A knowledge and competencies have been further strengthened, partners have incorporated L&A tools and methodologies, and a L&A lens and practice has been embedded in partners sectorial programmes and expertise areas. Partners in Indonesia, Myanmar and Uganda have acknowledged that the strengthened L&A approach will be useful in other current and future interventions, for developing proposals, and also to scale-up and scale-out of changes achieved under CEA. To support this work, partners count on a legacy of resources produced and circulated within CEA, which in some cases have been translated to local languages (the L&A 10-steps guidelines was translated in several languages e.g. to Burmese in Myanmar and into Bahassa in Indonesia).
231 **Disability and gender inclusion have also been incorporated in organisational policies and staff training.** In Myanmar, institutional changes have also been seen in the area of disability and gender, where partners indicated making their internal procedures more inclusive (e.g.: human resources recruitment, and incorporating an inclusion lens in their research design (e.g.: by including PwD in data collection) or considering quotas for PwD in activities. In Myanmar too, a Burmese toolkit for mainstreaming inclusion in organization was developed to serve as an inclusion resource beyond the CEA project. In Uganda, partners have also embedded these approaches in their strategic plans and some have hired staff with a disability.

232 **Building also in their previous trajectory, in the past years CEA partners saw their legitimacy enhanced through an increasing demand for participation in events and technical advice by policy makers, stronger linkages to target groups, the recognition to speak on behalf of beneficiaries and the conduction of solid evidence-informed work.** Partners also became more recognised in their spheres of work, which put them in a better position to continue doing L&A. They have gained access to networks and multi-stakeholder platforms, as well as to relevant government agencies at national, regional and local level. CEA leaves a legacy of strengthened farmer associations and groups, but more support is needed for them to become fully operational and self-sustainable. They were trained in L&A issues, as well as gained access and strengthened linkages with government offices that they can continue reaching out to. In Myanmar, CEA partners contributed to organise, formalise and register new farmer associations at regional level, which will be there to support farmers’ needs in the future. While these associations have received additional training on L&A and organisational development (finances, fundraising, management, transparency), and gained access to bank loans, it was acknowledged that more support is needed for them to become more independent and self-reliable institutions. In Uganda, partners continue working with community leaders interfacing with duty bearers at sub-county and district level.

233 **CEA partners have influenced relevant changes in government approaches and procedures, and has also laid the ground for future government decisions at various levels to consider farmers and workers’ needs.** In Indonesia, toolkits and technical inputs are being integrated in government policies, e.g. the SOPs for nutmeg (pepper and cinnamon were in the pipeline) being rolled out at provincial level, CEA partners’ involvement in the trial phase of a traceability system in collaboration with the Agriculture Office of North Maluku Province, Business Human Rights Due Diligence guideline and L&A on National Action Plan Business Human Rights raises interest among the Sub-Directorate of Human Rights Cooperation of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights to develop a similar document for government officials. In Myanmar, the main signal of sustainability can be found in the repetition of Good Agricultural Practices certificates processes and its gradual expansion to other regions, led by the Department of Agriculture, (and with ongoing support of CEA partners as part of other projects), which indicates an incipient institutionalisation of these processes to support the quality of production by farmers. In Uganda too, CEA lobby issues have been included in sub-county development plans and budgets, and partners have established good working relationships with political leaders at district and sub-county level, anticipating upcoming elections next year, e.g.: there are ongoing discussions to include farmers’ issues in manifestos of election candidates, supported by evidence and arguments developed during the CEA programme, with a focus on communities’ agriculture, health and education.

234 **In general, when CEA programme has not materialised in concrete changes at policy level, the programme has laid the ground for future actions to be taken, especially in those countries where new government administrations are starting.** In Indonesia, strategic partnerships have been built between NGOs and government to support policy development and policy implementation, like the Business and Child Rights Working Group, the SDG2 Working Group, or the partnership with the Ministry of Law and Human Rights to continue developing the UNGP training module. In Myanmar, the L&A conducted with the Parliament’s Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries Affairs Committee ended up with a set of recommendations to improve food safety, which are expected to be taken forward by the new administration.
Sustainability of CEA achievements regarding private sector culture varies across countries, being stronger in Indonesia. In Indonesia, CEA alliance is recognised by the employer’s association in the palm oil sector as a relevant and legitimate partner to collaborate with in the search for improving Corporate Social Responsibility and sustainability practices of its members. With CEA’s support, including the development of toolkits and documentaries, the focus on business and human rights is integrated in the sustainability and CSR programmes of the larger palm oil companies. Awareness materials (e.g.: a documentary on the added value of investing in a social dialogue, showcasing one company, or educational material to address gender-based violence at the workplace), will continue being used by CEA partners to further advocate for business and human rights in their context. In the country, and despite CEA’s strategic work with the Ministry for SME and cooperatives and with the association of SME in the palm oil sector, more work is needed to further integrate respect for business and human rights at the level of SME, but the CEA programme has contributed to create CSO networks who will be critical to monitor whether or not businesses are effectively improving the practice in the plantations and other areas. In Myanmar, CEA partners’ efforts to promote a culture of responsible business among the private sector achieved less results: while CEA partners were able to raise awareness among a set of private companies, more work is needed for private companies to further understand what means to do responsible business in practice and how they can achieve it, as well as how to create more inclusive businesses models.

6.2 PROGRAMMATIC SUSTAINABILITY

Programmatic sustainability is assessed as high, consequence of CEA being the top-up of earlier or ongoing donor funded projects, experience gained and relationships built.

CEA’s goals and activities are well aligned to the mission, strategies and other programmes that partners are implementing, contributing to the sustainability of the programme’s legacy. CEA programme’s efforts are already embedded in the programmes of most of the implementing partners. While the CEA programme benefited with cross-fertilization with pre-existing programmes, likewise these and new interventions will be enriched with CEA programme lessons (in terms of L&A strategies and new relationships). For instance, in Myanmar the support that CEA partners have provided to the Department of Agriculture to promote Good Agricultural Practices at regional level built on previous work of one partner which will continue providing support to the same government agency as part of other projects of the organisation, contributing to the sustainability and further expansion of the process. In Uganda, the creation of space for civil society (PW 1) is within one of the partners’ mandate, and another partner hosts the Sustainability Development Goals platform where issues from PW 2 and PW 3 are addressed.

Similar observations can be made for the Indonesian programme. CEA programme topics are at the core of the implementing partners’ vision and strategies. The programme builds further on the capacity development of the trade unions in the palm oil sector and on the work done with regard to child rights by one of the partners. There are some sustainability risks for the continuation of interventions in the selected commodities, in those cases where the selected ones were new for the implementing partners (e.g. palm oil being new for NGO Council and PKPA; spice sector new for Penabulu).

Upscaling of CEA results is largely dependent on other stakeholders’ interest and behaviour, but the top up with other programmes implemented by partners can continue supporting previous processes. No explicit up-scaling strategies were developed at country level to ensure upscaling of CEA programme achievements, which largely depends of private sector and/or government initiative and financing. For instance, while the Business and Human Rights due diligence and the Child Rights and Business Principles toolkits were developed in Indonesia, their role-out is now on the hands of the companies. However, as indicated above, in many countries some
elements of an up-scaling strategy have been included in existing or new projects, e.g.: the expansion of Good Agricultural Practices to other regions or the organisation and registration of new regional farmers associations based on lessons from CEA programme in Myanmar. Moreover, the model of regional farmer development associations in Myanmar is replicable in other regions, and new programmes with which CEA alliance established collaboration in 2020 include a component of farmers association formation in new townships. In Uganda, all implementing partners are members or work with the Participatory Ecological Land Use Management (PELUM) and have indicated that Farmers' Manifestos will be shared with this platform for scaling up purposes. Moreover, partners in Uganda intend to mobilise nine to be elected district governments (in February 2021 elections) to formulate ordinances on counterfeit seeds and other issues addressed in other districts during CEA.

**240** A sustainable contribution of CEA has been to encourage collaborative linkages among stakeholders, especially through multi stakeholder platforms, but their sustainability depends on the willingness and interest of its members, and the availability of funding. While some relationships that took place at country level during CEA pre-existed the programme, some of them were strengthen in the past five years, and others flourished at the local or national level, or with the private sector. Creating or joining multi-stakeholder platforms was a major strategy pursued by the CEA programme to enable dialogue at country level. However, while some relationships between partners and stakeholders might continue on a bilateral basis, the sustainability of the functioning of some multi-stakeholder platforms is not always ensured, especially those at national level. For instance, the Business and Child Rights Working group and the IDH-SSI platform in Indonesia depend on the contributions (human and financial resources, and in-kind) of its members, though currently there is sufficient commitment of a meaningful group of members to make these multi-stakeholder platforms work. Platforms operating regional or local level are better placed to continue performing since they benefit from funding beyond CEA programme, and more embedded in partners’ ongoing work.

**241** The formation of new regional farmer associations and CSO networks has been an important contribution to the continuation of CEA’s objectives, but they will need further training and support to perform their tasks. In Myanmar, newly created regional farmer development associations will further serve farmers’ needs and will also be allies of CEA partners in the implementation of new projects. However, these associations are not yet fully independent and self-reliable. In Indonesia too, newly created CSO networks still need further training and support to carry-out their assigned monitoring and awareness raising tasks. While in both countries CEA partners have presence at national and provincial level and are able to provide hands-on support to these groups, continuation will depend on the opportunities provided in ongoing or new projects to integrate CEA interventions. In Uganda, the continuation of Life Skills for Lobby training for farmers in ensured through collaboration with Edukans, linkages between farmers groups and government extension officers were strengthened and will continue beyond CEA programme, and members of disability networks have been invited to platforms and existing fora at sub-county level.

**242** CEA also leaves a legacy of research production and toolkits that can become references for government decision makers, private sector and civil society stakeholders. In Myanmar, in particular, CEA’s contributions incorporated in the report on reduction of negative impacts of residual effects of agrochemical elaborated in parliament committees constitute a reference for future government to advance a development agenda in the rural sector. In Indonesia, toolkits developed to support business and human rights approaches in the private sector are available. Research conducted on the situation of workers’ rights in two large palm oil companies and on the situation of women workers in the palm oil industry still can be used as a reference for monitoring progress and dialogue, and even used in discussions at RSPO level. In several CEA countries studies were done in value chains (maize, millet and cassava in Uganda; potato and malt-barley in Ethiopia; chicken, maize, sorghum and soya beans in Kenya), on agri-skills (Kenya, Uganda) and also research was undertaken on the status of CSOs (in Kenya, and
in Uganda about the awareness of two laws on public space and CSOs and NGOs) and on the constraints for smallholders in access to county government officials (Kenya, Uganda).

Through ToT in different areas, CEA laid the ground for new individuals and groups to benefit from further training, although the continuation of this work is difficult to anticipate. For instance, in Myanmar through TLM Myanmar’s work, one partner has been able to integrate and facilitate a session on disability inclusion in its trainings with rural communities. Moreover, people with disabilities trained by TLM Myanmar on L&A issues are now advocating for inclusive workspaces among private stakeholders. In Indonesia, a ToT was applied to train members of CSO networks in monitoring due diligence compliance of palm oil companies. CSOs interviewed referred to the need for more training and support, which will depend on available funding (see also financial sustainability). A ToT approach was also applied in Uganda, at least for one partner to be better equipped to continue delivering the CtGA.

The current pandemic represented challenges to the sustainability of achievements and continuation of CEA’s objectives. It will affect both government and donors’ priorities. The uncertainty associated with the post-pandemic would require CEA partners to develop scenarios that consider the needs of farmers and government agencies and explore opportunities to continue supporting them through other projects and collaboration with other stakeholders. CEA partners have invested in capacities of CSOs and CBOs and several examples were reported that local and regional governments rely on these organisations and network to implement Covid-19 measures (e.g. India, Uganda), and in Uganda partners are participating in Covid-19 steering groups on regional level.

Implementing partners see potential in continuing working together, and some have already submitted joint proposals, but these efforts most likely will take place outside the CEA umbrella. The sustainability of the alliance as a unit was not a goal of CEA in itself, being mostly seen as a temporary alliance. Moreover, CEA alliance was not promoted or branded as an alliance before other stakeholders (government agencies and private sector, among others). However, after collaborating for years under the CEA umbrella, and before in previous programmes, most of the partners have shared that the continuation of joint efforts to achieve changes in the agricultural sector is needed, and in some countries joint follow-up proposals have been submitted or are being discussed. Partners in Uganda, most of whom knew each other from the MFSII programme and continued their collaboration under CEA, are working on a Memorandum of Understanding with the Ministry of Agriculture, presenting the consortium as a structure for disseminating national policies to local level in the northern area of the country. Moreover, partners in Uganda have expressed that they will make efforts for CEA partners to be integrated in their organisational projects (e.g.: in multi-stakeholder platforms).

6.3 FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

Financial sustainability of the programme results is rather mixed, both at the level of the implementing partners and at the level of government and private sector.

Provision of training and tools for partners to innovate in their funding models was uneven across countries. The CtGA was implemented in eight countries (Bangladesh, Benin, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Kenya, Mali and Uganda) but not in all countries the module on Local Fundraising was implemented. As described in the chapter on effectiveness, the CtGA evaluation documented that trained organisations perceived an increase in their ability to raise funds locally, but that there is not much evidence yet of organisations that have been able to identify new donors or raise money through resource mobilisation initiatives, or when they did, the modest achievements did not match the amount of effort involved. In Uganda partners were trained in local fund raising. Some of the larger
partners have good experiences in submitting proposals for funding and they have standing relationships with some of the donors operating on national as well on regional scale. These partners are currently taking the lead in the writing and submission of new proposals for when the CEA programme ends. In countries such as Myanmar and Indonesia, CEA programme has not explicitly contributed to strengthening the financial sustainability and resource mobilisation capacity of the implementing partners. However, for some partners in these countries, their work for the CEA programme has been beneficial to attract extra donor funding (e.g.: EU funding in Indonesia, Danida funding in Myanmar), and there is also the possibility for many of these partners to continue working with CEA members as part of other projects as well as with FBOs, which also constitute sources or can facilitate access to funding sources.

248 Despite efforts to ensure access to funds by newly created farmer associations, further support is needed to develop new funding sources and further capacity to manage them. In Myanmar and Bangladesh, an important contribution to the financial sustainability of regional farmer associations has been the creation of linkages with private banks. Although training on managing new funding sources was also provided, these associations are far from being self-sustainable, and their actual capacity to do L&A might be affected due to the lack of financial resources they can devote to that end.

249 Government policy implementation is often hampered by the lack of sufficient financial and human resources. Moreover, in the countries subject to in-depth assessment, CEA partners supported the government, financially and with human resources, in implementing its policies (e.g. provision of training, provision of services to farmers). Policy implementation at provincial and village level seems more guaranteed since CEA partners’ work is well rooted in communities from where they can continue doing L&A to support sustainability of changes.

250 Private companies are hesitant to invest in business and human rights out of fear of its negative impact on business efficiency. A substantiated business case has not been developed to convince management and owners of the opposite. In Indonesia, CEA managed to collaborate with the so-called frontrunners or large companies that feel international pressure to invest in business and human rights.

6.4 SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

251 While CEA has influenced the discourse and attitudes on L&A, smallholder farmers’ needs, business and human rights, disability inclusion, and other themes addressed by the programme, it was not possible within the boundaries of this evaluation to assess the sustainability of these changes beyond implementing partners’ practices. In Myanmar, besides changes seen at the partners’ level regarding disability inclusion (e.g.: organisational and programmatic integration), the existence of cultural barriers to incorporate diverse groups in the agricultural practice have been acknowledged. In Indonesia, the most pro-active attitude in favour of business and human rights is visible within the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, but less visible in other ministries like Ministry of Economy, or Ministry of Labour. In Uganda, CEA programme contributed to strengthen the customary land management system through land committees that will help resolve land disputes, especially guaranteeing the right to land by women, youth and PwDs.
6.5 EXIT STRATEGIES

In absence of an exit strategy in the design of CEA programme, partners come up with a variety of organisational approaches to ensure sustainability of the programmes’ legacy. During the Global face to face meeting in 2019, CEA members and partners paid attention to sustainability and exit strategies, and country coordinators took this issue back to their country learning meetings. This topic was also included in the annual country plans 2020. In Indonesia, Myanmar and Uganda, most of the partners have indicated not being aware of any exit strategy for the CEA programme. No exit strategy or similar considerations were formally part of the programme design, nor discussed as such during programme implementation. This is in part explained by the fact that the CEA programme was initially planned to have two phases, which would have allowed to continue activities, consolidate achievements and scale up, with the development of the exit-strategy taking place during the second phase of the programme. However, partners are considering different strategies to ensure continuation of CEA’s work, from linking L&A interventions with other programmes, linking existing farmer organisations with L&A platforms from where they can continue doing L&A, or developing multiannual organisational L&A plans building on CEA’s work (Myanmar), to planning exit meetings with their contacts in each district to reflect on what was accomplished and looking forward into future engagements (Uganda).

6.6 CONCLUSIONS

CEA programme was able to promote and support sustainable changes at the institutional level, building on the alignment between the programme and the mission, strategies and policies of stakeholders. CEA partners were able to strengthen and embed L&A and inclusion approaches in their organisations and activities, and they also count on a legacy of resources produced within the CEA programme to support these efforts. The involvement in the CEA programme has also contributed to enhance the legitimacy of partners, who have seen increasing demand for participation in events and technical advice by policy makers. While, the provision of training and tools for partners to innovate in their funding models was uneven across countries, in some cases they were able to attract new funding from donors, and the continuity of collaboration with CEA members also constitute an opportunity for partners to access new funds.

CEA also leaves a legacy of strengthened farmer associations and groups that can continue advocating for the rights of their constituencies as well as collaborating with CEA partners, but more support is needed for them to become fully operational and self-sustainable, including ensuring additional financial support.

At the level of government, CEA has influenced relevant changes in government approaches and procedures, especially in the areas of food safety and quality and the promotion of a human rights culture in the private sector, and has also laid the ground for future government decisions at various levels to consider farmers’ needs, though these decisions and its implementation will depend on financial and human resources availability. At the private sector level, the sustainability of changes achieved varies across countries: awareness has been raised and resources have been designed to support companies to incorporate a human rights approach, but follow-up and monitoring from civil society and government will be needed to underpin effective changes, including making an effective case of the need to invest in business and human rights.

At the programmatic level, sustainability of CEA’s work and achievements benefits from the top-up of earlier or ongoing donor funded projects, as well as experience gained and relationships built by partners and other stakeholders. CEA’s goals and activities are well aligned to the mission, strategies and other programmes that partners are implementing, contributing to the sustainability of the programme’s legacy. These programmes and
interventions can build on CEA’s legacy to upscale its results by continue influencing the interest and behaviour of the government and private sector. While CEA leaves a strong connection among stakeholders, especially through multi stakeholder platforms, their sustainability depends on the willingness and interest of its members, and the availability of funding. The collaboration between partners, farmers groups and government stakeholders is in a better position to continue at the local level, where CEA partners have well stablished presence and connections with communities.
7 Conclusion and recommendations

7.1 CONCLUSIONS

The CEA alliance has used the Strategic Partnership framework as an opportunity to add a L&A component to ongoing or new programmes, implemented in collaboration with a variety of partners in the south. Its design allowed CEA to build on the strengths of its partners, make synergies and leverage the L&A potential of other interventions by its partners, and also to expand the outreach of CEA’s actions in terms of farmers’ and workers’ needs, stakeholders engaged and geographical outreach. This choice proved to be successful as demonstrated by the multiple results realised at country levels and possibilities for continuation and up-scaling of programme results. Linking a L&A component to broader programmes also came with a certain cost: as both L&A and the ToC approach were new to many of the implementing partners, time was needed to align efforts, to enhance L&A capacity, to enable partner to make a mental shift (together with their constituencies) from service delivery to lobby and advocacy, and to become familiar with the ToC approach. In most countries, therefore, the programme took off slowly in terms of L&A interventions and results, and came up to speed in the last two years of the programme period.

The CEA programme shows several strong features, such as (i) the focus on broadening civic space and linking CSOs to government actors at local, regional and national level; (ii) the investment in creating or strengthening networking and multi-stakeholder processes, including government and private sector; (iii) citizen-led advocacy, based on research or information obtained from small-scale farmers and workers, and by mobilising farmers, workers and citizen groups to do L&A; (iv) the application of a smart mix of L&A strategies with a focus on insider L&A strategies (dialogue, provision of advice, training of lobby targets, etc.); (v) the continuous learning and adaptations of the operational strategies during programme implementation, (vi) the combination of CEA members (including the trade union) and of implementing partners.

Relevant programme, but fragmented and siloed implementation

The CEA programme provided relevant responses to the challenges selected value chains are facing, that were aligned with ongoing policy processes at local, regional and national level. The programme defined a set of relevant lobby targets at the level of commodities, policies and stakeholders, and combined it with an adaptive approach that allowed to react to windows of opportunity. Initially, many country programmes lacked focus as L&A efforts were spread over a variety of topics, commodities, lobby targets and partners. During the second half of the programme implementation, adaptations brought more focus, by downsizing the number of commodities, concentrating in specific geographic areas, and better identifying windows of opportunity for policy change.

There was some weakness in the design of the ToC at programme and at country level, such as the lack of synergy between the different PWs and the lack of causal assumptions that could give more insight in the strategies and support the learning process. The ToC has not guided the actual L&A process (e.g. identifying lobby targets, building relationships and networking, grasping opportunities, etc.), which, together with the fact that IPs were not involved in the initial design, lowered the level of ownership of the country ToC among the IPs. Relevant country PWs were developed and adapted that have, above all, been helpful in capturing the collective ambitions of the country alliances and in identifying opportunities for synergy and collaboration throughout implementation. However, the strengths of the CEA programme, the actual L&A practices and learning thereof did not become visible in the formal ToC process. Assumptions linked to the PWs were discussed during the annual learning events, though not
supported by an explicit learning agenda. It seems that mainly first order learning took place during the learning events (are we doing the things right?) and to a lesser extent second order learning (are we doing the right things?) of triple loop learning (questioning the assumptions behind the ToC).

Implementing partners were selected based on their former relationship with CEA members in the Netherlands. New partners were added to the programme in various countries during programme implementation, but not always as a result of a clear analysis of the ToC and their comparative advantage to contribute to the envisaged changes (but often because of the funding opportunity). Despite a promising complementarity in the selection of partners (in terms of expertise, experience, networks and approaches), siloed work prevailed among partners in the majority of the CEA countries, a result of the top-up approach and combination of CEA members, and the weak synergy between the different PWs (and as such the lack of a country ToC).

The link between national and global L&A is rather limited and fragmented, which can be explained by the fact that a clear vision and strategy to that end had not been developed and an effective global value chain perspective was not adopted or included in the ToC.

Relevant capacity development support provided through training and learning-by-doing, but a comprehensive strategy at programme and at partner level was lacking

A programme-wide capacity development support strategy was developed at CEA level, targeting implementing partners and their constituencies. Capacity building took place through trainings and emerged organically through the implementation of interventions (learning-by-doing and coaching by CEA members). Topics and content of trainings were decided by CEA members, but based on needs assessments of partners, though content and resources (offline and online) were not always adapted to the context or to the specific needs of partners and their constituencies, and some L&A competencies were not sufficiently addressed.

A ToT approach was applied in the different training trajectories (CtGA, Edukans, LftW), involving ICCO staff and some implementing partners to act as trainers, with varying results in terms of quality of trainers, quality of and/or provision of follow-up support. The CEO ICCO teams were assigned with the coordination of the capacity development support interventions provided by the different CEA members, which depended on their presence in-country and/or availability of trainers and advisors. By consequence, the offer of capacity development support interventions varied between the countries, and varied in breadth and depth. Consolidation and follow-up support were not always equally guaranteed.

A monitoring system was developed separately for each of the different training trajectories provided (CtGA, Edukans, LftW), but a comprehensive capacity development with clear goals at programme or at partner level was not developed, which complicated monitoring and assessing results. No dialogue has taken place to support reflection at organisational level on what L&A capacity is about, and how this aligns to the existing organisational processes that can strengthen or hamper effective L&A implementation.

Stronger civil society and citizen voice heard

Partners indicated they have strengthened their understanding of L&A processes and are now better able to incorporate L&A approaches into their work, which have allowed them to engage more effectively in L&A activities. The inclusion of PwD had a prominent role in the CEA design (but not implemented in all countries), and partners acknowledged having embedded a disability inclusion lens in their organisations (adapting or promoting new internal policies and trainings) and their interventions. In some countries, youth and indigenous people were supported and organised to raise their voices. Local fundraising capacity development remained limited (few
countries, few partners). Partners acquired more knowledge of appropriate fundraising techniques and tools, but results are said to remain limited and did not match the amount of effort involved.

268 CEA also strengthened farmers groups’ L&A capacities, by supporting organisation and registration of (new) farmers’ groups, associations and self-help groups, and/or by providing training on L&A and enhancing networking. Their capacity to negotiate and bargain with traders, and to do L&A with policy makers and private sector has increased, although they will need more support to consolidate their work. CEA partners were able to bring the voices and needs of farmers to the dialogues at local, regional and national level (through research, and facilitation of access of farmers and grassroot organisations to the negotiation tables).

269 Through the promotion of the concept of multi-stakeholder collaboration on inclusive agricultural value chain development, CEA brought together farmers groups, trade unions, CSOs, government stakeholders and private sector representatives. This collaborative approach in the search of solutions to the challenges of the sector supposed a change of behaviour for most stakeholders, especially in countries with more restrictive political environments. At the same time, it allowed CEA to position itself as a recognised facilitator of dialogues, farmers and workers to access policy makers and traders, policy makers to learn about farmers’ and workers’ needs on the ground, and private sector and farmers/workers to identify synergies for mutual benefit. These dialogues were also informed by research conducted by CEA partners and/or produced in synergies with other programmes.

270 The role and added value of FBOs and trade unions in broadening civic space and engaging into dialogue with government and other value chain actors was emphasised in the CEA programme and documented through research. CEA contributed to a changing discourse in the Netherlands among MEP, MoFA and other NGOs, turning the negative image of FBOs (and of trade unions) into a more positive one, based on research and evidence from CEA countries.

CEA has successfully contributed to changed policies, laws, regulations and institutional practices at local, district and national level.

271 While structural changes at the national policy level were often difficult to achieve, CEA (in synergy with other interventions) achieved important benefits for farmers/workers to strengthen their position in the value chain. Several results have been reported at local and district level, and to a varying degree also at national level. It is not possible to give a complete overview of the type of results achieved as these differ between countries, PW and commodities. Following results have been documented in several -but not always in all - countries. A selection of these results has been validated through case studies, including triangulation of data (see country case study reports).

272 Civic space (PW1): CEA contributed in creating and strengthening civic space at all levels and in strengthening networking and multi-stakeholder platforms. An important result is the evolution among partners from a confrontational to a dialogue approach, which was welcomed by government and private sector actors. In several countries, implementing partners have informed CSOs on (changing) NGO laws, supported CSOs in complying with these laws and/or have amended these laws in those cases where civic space was under threat.

273 Right to adequate food (PW2): issues of concern with regard to food and nutrition security have been included in local development plans and, in a limited number of countries, CEA also contributed to new nutrition and food policies, more so at the local level though sometimes also taken up to the national level, and with an international endorsement in the universal periodic review. CEA also has contributed to enhancing service provision by training government extension workers and bringing services to the farmers, and to supporting (local) government in applying existing regulatory frameworks. The application of national plans on nutrition are currently being monitored.
by trained CEA partners and their constituencies. In several countries, CEA also lobbied for securing land rights and
was able to influence and strengthen the cultural land management system to be more sensitive to the needs of
women/girls, orphans and to guarantee their rights on the land.

274 Small producer empowerment and inclusive markets (PW3): CEA contributed to install the idea that coordination
and organisation of value chain stakeholders for a common goal can lead to win-win situations. This has meant a
change of behaviours for private sector, but also from CSOs, workers and farmers groups. CEA and partners
facilitated in linking various stakeholders, like farmer cooperatives at different levels, factories and companies,
suppliers, private traders, brokers, financial institutions, etc. depending on the commodity. Platforms were
established, strengthened and/or institutionalised. Farmers gained access to resources (financial and agricultural)
and markets. In several countries, CEA was able to bring specific commodities of concern of the smallholder
farmers under the attention of government, resulting in the inclusion of these commodities among the priorities in
national agricultural policies in several countries. CEA has also contributed to enhance the quality of the produce of
small-scale farmers, through the development of quality standards for specific commodities and the implementation
of GAP certificates, which enhanced access of farmers to national and international markets.

275 Sustainable private sector (PW4): In a limited number of countries, the CEA programme was also successful in
enhancing awareness among government and private actors regarding the need to adopt international recognised
operating standards and principles at national level in the value chains targeted by the programme, in putting the
international due diligence on business and human rights on the agenda, in providing technical input for the
development of such standards at national level and in making tools available to support government and private
sector actors to take action, both at district and national level. These processes are ongoing. Trade unions improved
their capacities to negotiate and engage in the social dialogue and were able to negotiate CBAs aimed at improving
working conditions of workers, with specific attention to the rights of women. Real change in practice of private
sector is yet to be seen. CEA achieved to attract at least the collaboration of employers’ associations and some
frontrunners. A clear business case is currently lacking to convince businesses to adopt the UNGP principles in their
policies and practices.

276 In several countries, an evolution was visible of a stronger integration of the different PWs. The focus was put on
improving the production capacity and quality of small-scale farmers so to become credible suppliers of markets,
strengthening of farmers’ organisations, linking farmers to markers and facilitating interactions between the various
stakeholders in the value chain. Less emphasis was put on creating an inclusive and sustainable business climate
and responsible business practices (with a few exceptions).

Efficiency

277 Governance and programme management procedures were in place to enable effective and efficient management
of the CEA programme. No explicit attention was given to measure efficiency, which is understandable taking into
account the difficulties in measuring efficiency of L&A processes, i.e. fuzzy causal relationships, delayed or
unpredictable effects and complex resource allocation to differentiated results. But there was an implicit use of
efficiency principles through monitoring, learning and adaptation and relevant measures have been taken to
improve efficiency during programme implementation.

278 The management model followed ICCO’s decentralised management structure with a global office, 5 regional
offices and country offices. It worked well for the country CEA programmes, to contextualise operations and for
short communication lines between ICCO regional office and the CEA country. Overall, programme expenditures
increased over the years, as programme implementation came to speed. Financial procedures were clear to all
partners and were the same for all countries in terms of budgeting and reporting. Budgets were released timely,
once or twice year, and were allocated per PW, allowing some flexibility, appropriate for L&A taking advantage of opportunities that might emerge with minimal constraints.

279 Roles and responsibilities were clear for all partners, and ICCO’s double role as coordinator and implementer stands out as an innovative practice to support L&A, which has also strengthened the ICCO country offices and allowed it to nurture a network of partners and contacts among farmer groups, government and private sector. Ad hoc collaboration among partners improved as partners got to know each other better, mainly in the form of information and contacts’ exchange.

280 A lean M&E system was developed, based on the ToC and combining data-collection on a limited set of indicators with new tools such as lobby logbooks and Stories of Change. The set of indicators and the stories of change have been useful for monitoring progress at programme level and for upward accountability, but have given little insight in how change happens within each project and as such were little used to support learning.

Institutional sustainability is strong, mixed results regarding financial sustainability

281 Sustainability of the CEA programme results is mixed. Institutional sustainability is high, which is a result from the relevant choice of programme policy topics, strategic choices made, selection of implementing partners, and the attention paid by the programme to build further on existing L&A competencies and capabilities and/or add a L&A component to existing programmes. Up- and out-scaling of programme results will depend on the available human and financial resources that can be mobilised by partners in existing or new projects. Financial resources that can be made available by government and private sector are not always guaranteed.

282 Citizen led L&A is recognised by partners as the most effective and sustainable means of influencing service delivery and inclusive development of policies and practices. The CEA programme was therefore a valuable joint learning experience and capacity building initiative. Implementing partners are determined to continue the approach, as some have incorporated L&A in their strategies and plans for the coming years and several joint fundraising proposals have been presented to donors by CEA members and partners, with different levels of success. At all levels, continuation of capacity development support is needed, in order to consolidate the obtained results.

283 CEA has influenced changes in government policies and procedures and has laid the ground for future government decision at various levels to consider farmers’ and workers’ needs. CEA also leaves a legacy of research and toolkits that can become reference for government decision makers, private sector and civil society stakeholders. Changes at private sector level are yet to be seen but awareness and knowledge on responsible business has been built and structural collaboration achieved with sector associations, although private companies are still hesitant to invest in business and human rights out of fear of its negative impact on business efficiency.
7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Use the ToC approach to develop a more integrated and focused programme and a stronger learning agenda

During programme implementation, CEA members and partners realised that the country programmes needed more focus in terms of commodities, lobby targets and geographic scope and that more synergy between PWs needed to be looked for. Some evolutions to that end became visible but this integration process could have been stronger when developing a real country ToC, instead of focusing on developing separate PWs. Furthermore, the PWs were not sufficiently explicit on how change would be brought about, and/or on the relationships between the different envisioned changes and lobby targets, and how these mutually relate and influence. Lastly, there was little alignment between ToC/PWs at country and global level, which made linkages between southern and northern L&A less explicit.

Recommendation 1.1: The experience gained with the ToC approach needs to be further developed. Country ToCs need to be developed, that are based on more focused and elaborated PWs that give insight in how change will take place and how different changes and actors will relate to each other, that also inform on other or alternative strategies that might be needed (and implemented by other actors, not CEA), that give insight in how local, national and international strategies will relate, and that are supported by relevant assumptions that can be linked to a learning agenda (see also 2.4).

Recommendation 1.2: Leadership of southern partners can be strengthened by including implementing partners in the design phase of the programme and/or putting partners in the lead. The evaluators acknowledge that the modalities of the subsidy framework D&D were not conducive for enhancing southern leadership by demanding elaborated ToCs already in the programme proposal. Furthermore, CEA members are invited to look more actively for new partners that can have an added value to the country alliances and to reflect on the roles of southern partners in the programme. Apart from the implementation role, other roles are also possible, as demonstrated in some cases, such as (i) IPs being involved in capacity development interventions, as trainer, advisor or as coach based on their respective expertise; (ii) IPs taking the lead in developing project proposals presented at other donors, with CEA members in a secondary role; (iii) IP taking the lead in regional or international L&A trajectories, (iv) IPs also taking up a coordinating role of the country alliances (e.g. working with rotating presidency of steering groups). (v) IPs can also receive more decision power on the programme budget. A few Strategic Partnerships have experimented with local programme management structures and decision-making processes that aimed at strengthen (financial) decision power of southern partners (e.g. Right Here, Right Now Alliance).

2. Develop a more comprehensive and integrated capacity development support strategy

A clear vision and comprehensive strategy on how capacity development support would be provided in the CEA programme was lacking. The capacity development support approach was mainly based on a combination of existing trainings and tools available within the CEA alliance and mostly supply-driven (though based on needs assessments but with the decision power at the side of CEA members). Contents were not always adapted to the context or to the specific needs of partners and their constituencies, and some L&A competencies were not sufficiently addressed. Consolidation and follow-up support were not always equally guaranteed.

Recommendation 2.1: A comprehensive capacity development support strategy and vision needs to be developed at programme level and translated at country level. This vision should include following elements: vision on how L&A capacity evolves, added value and role of capacity assessments (at organisational or programme level), how to implement or facilitate capacity assessments (e.g. if organisations have done such assessments in one way or
another, there is no need to replicate/duplicate), the possibility to develop organisational CD trajectories, the mix of tools and strategies (including peer-to-peer learning), how and what CD support partners can demand, what role CEA ICCO coordinators take up in facilitating and monitoring capacity development processes (this includes also reflection on organisational characteristics that have an influence on effective L&A), how to monitor CD support, etc.

**Recommendation 2.2:** A strategy can be developed to further improve and consolidate the ToT approaches. More attention needs to be paid to follow-up support, combining training and coaching. Furthermore, in fact CEA implicitly aimed at creating a pool of local ‘trainers’ or ‘capacity development support advisors’, with expertise in supporting L&A capacity and local fundraising. Within CEA a discussion is needed how to consolidate the achievements. A reflection can also take place on how to put these ‘trainers’ more ‘in the market’ so that the trainings become self-sustainable.

**Recommendation 2.3:** The SC framework is an interesting tool for assessing and evaluating capacity evolutions but less appropriate for monitoring capacity development support. Monitoring of CD support can be improved by setting clear targets at organisational level (at short and medium term) with regard to L&A competencies and capabilities.

**Recommendation 2.4:** Specific learning trajectories can be developed to explore a number of assumptions linked to the ToC during programme implementation and document what works and what not. Implementing partners that are interested can join one or more of these specific learning trajectories (that do not need to be organised only at country level).

3. Better ToC with more integrated Pathways of Change will also demand further reflection on the strategies targeting private sector

In several countries, an evolution was visible of a stronger integration of the different PWs. The strategies combine a focus on improving the production capacity and quality of small-scale farmers so to become credible suppliers of markets, strengthening of farmers’ organisations, linking farmers to markets and facilitating interactions between the various stakeholders in the value chain. Less emphasis was put on creating an inclusive and sustainable business climate and responsible business practices (with a few exceptions).

**Recommendation 3.1:** It is recommended to set clear ambitions with regard to behaviour change of private sector actors (small-scale processors, traders, exporters and large-scale companies employing farmers) and include integrated PW in the country ToCs to that end. The focus on smallholders can be complemented with L&A for a more inclusive and sustainable private sector climate. Training of CSOs on how to engage in a dialogue with private sector and enhancing collaboration with private sector associations need to be continued, as well as the collaboration with trade unions. Assumptions need to be specified about how the programme thinks that companies will change behaviour. The use of business cases can be explored.

4. Sustainability can be enhanced through the development of sustainability strategies

Sustainability of the results at the level of partners is on average strong (strong at institutional level, mixed at financial level), consequence of the top-up programme approach and the capacity development support provided. Also, the collaboration with membership-based organisations such as trade unions, farmer groups and self-help groups, and with churches is a leverage to sustainability, as they often can continue implementing interventions with limited resources. Programmatic and financial sustainability of the implementing partners can be enhanced through the development of sustainability strategies. The business canvas model introduced during the last year of CEA in some countries is a good start. Sustainability of the results at government and private sector level is mixed, as is the continuation of ToT approaches. Upscaling of programme results is a challenge in several countries.
Recommendation 4.1: Develop sustainability and exit strategies during the design of a programme. One sustainability strategy that can be taken into consideration relates to the social enterprise model. The evaluators see opportunities for positioning several implementing partners as a social enterprise (less relevant for trade unions). It can be explored how the ToT but also developed toolkits can be put in the market, and/or whether it is relevant to sell advisory services to the public and/or private sector. Several partners are acknowledged by government as legitimate partners. Partners can proactively sell their services to support government in policy implementation. Furthermore, strategies to monitor policy implementation and/or upscaling of good practices need to be developed. These might require collaboration with new partners or networks.

Recommendation 4.2: Include training on local fundraising in all country programmes, that are adapted to the local context.

5. Overall, CEA programme’s efficiency was strong, though there can be some efficiency gains.

Efficiency was challenged more because of the fragmented and siloed programme approach than because of the decentralised governance model. The development of more integrated ToGs at programme and at country level (see recommendation 1) will have a positive effect on efficiency. M&E can be further improved so to enhance downward accountability and learning.

Recommendation 5.1: Stronger joint strategizing, stronger M&E across decentralised units/programmes, and stronger integration supported by cross-programme learning loops, trajectories or communities of practice will strengthen efficiency.

Recommendation 5.2: Further build M&E capacity for L&A. Discussions can be organised with implementing partners on how to use monitoring tools for L&A. It must be explored what the bottlenecks were in developing Stories of Change and in using the lobby logbooks. Furthermore, it can be explored whether or not it would be relevant to monitor results of L&A interventions through a set of progress markers (expect to see, like to see, love to see). The quality of indicators can be further improved so to enhance their validity and reliability.
8 Annexes

8.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE (EXTRACT)

1. Introduction

What is the role of Lobby & Advocacy in complex programs? How do we implement these programs as a coalition and with (Southern) ownership? How do we work with a ToC as program design? These questions and others are part of this Terms of Reference (ToR), written for the end evaluation of the strategic partnership of the Civic Engagement Alliance (CEA) as part of the ‘Dialogue and Dissent’ framework (2016 - 2020) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFa).

After 3.5 years working on the Convening and Convincing program CEA carries out this end evaluation\(^\text{16}\) to get an external opinion on its Theory of Change (ToC) the implementation and the actual results in Lobby and Advocacy (L&A) as well as capacity building for L&A as compared to the ToC. The results will be used in the formulation of future L&A programs and for the L&A components of other ongoing programs implemented and complementary to the CEA program. They will also be inputs for our accountability to MoFa.

2. Background

The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, relevant embassies and civil society organizations jointly implement a Strategic Partnership ‘Dialogue and Dissent’. This partnership with civil society organizations (CSOs) and civil society at large aims to contribute to decrease inequality and injustice in societies and to work towards inclusive development through lobby and advocacy.

The Civic Engagement Alliance, a collaboration\(^\text{17}\) between Dutch and Southern CSOs, is one of the 25 Strategic Partnerships of the ‘Dialogue and Dissent’ program. CEA is made up of trade unions, education and development organizations and other similar international networks that have a link to (Christian) organizations and constituencies in the Netherlands. The Alliance’s members focus on the agri-food sector, in contributing their expertise in the fields of inclusive development, capacity development, labor rights, lobby & advocacy\(^\text{18}\), strengthening small-scale farmers, vocational training and working with the private sector.

\(^\text{16}\) the end evaluation is part of the formal subsidy agreement (art.4.2, subsidy agreement MoFa)

\(^\text{17}\) CEA consists of 6 Dutch organizations (ICCO Cooperation (lead), Kerk in Aktie, CNV Internationaal, Prisma, Wilde Ganzen and Edukans)

\(^\text{18}\) The program builds on ICCO Cooperation Lobbying and Advocacy Policy (2012), and the L&A expertise of Alliance members and their Southern partners
The Alliance implements the CEA program in cooperation with a number of Southern implementing organizations in 12 countries in the Global South and in the Netherlands/at the EU level (further in this ToR counted as 13 countries).

The overall aim of the Alliance is to strengthen the contribution of Civil Society to inclusive development and decreasing inequality. This is elaborated in a program ToC in 4 Pathways:

1. Political space for civil society organizations
2. The right to adequate food
3. Smallholder empowerment and inclusive markets and
4. Sustainable private sector.

The cross-cutting issues are: gender and disability inclusion.

The main implementation strategies of the program are: capacity development for Lobby and Advocacy and Lobby and Advocacy itself, whereas the former strategy is also a means to be able to do Lobby and Advocacy.

This overall ToC has thereafter been contextualized by the 13 implementing countries (see annex 2). All southern implementing partners were involved in this process as well. Steps taken were: selection of the relevant pathways (with mostly 2-3 of the 4 pathways) and putting up of ToCs per pathway with definition of the specific objectives, formulation of the problematic per country, selection of lobby targets and lobby issues and a set of country specific indicators.

In the first year, 2016, a baseline study was carried out and documented in all countries consisting of TOC crucial analyses (stakeholder analysis, power analysis, gender analysis and institutional analysis). Furthermore several studies have been carried out mainly in the first two years of implementation (an overview of research carried out is available in Google drive). The topics of these studies were mainly in the Pathway related domains, e.g. deep dives in specific context.

For most countries, 2017 was the first full year of program implementation. During implementation, the country ToCs have, at least yearly, been reviewed since they are considered to be dynamic instruments. Each country uses the same set of instruments to monitor its progress, among which are lobby logbooks and stories of change (see annex 3 for tools in use). Halfway through the program period a MidTerm (see annex 4 for the main findings) was carried out, based on a desk study. Its results have been discussed in all CEA implementing countries.

---

19 The CEA program was initially called the Convening and Convincing program.

20 Convening and Convincing Program Document, October 2015

21 The CEA ToC is in line with the result chain of the policy framework Dialogue and Dissent of MoFa

22 The CEA indicators are partly to the 6 indicators MoFa has formulated in the areas: Civil Society Strengthening (capacity & legitimacy), Civil Society Engagement (political participation, mobilisation, activation); Towards improved laws, policies, norms, attitudes and practices (agenda setting, influencing the debate and creating space to engage); Improved laws, policies, norms, attitudes and practices (adoption, improvement, blocking)

23 For all countries country and baseline documents have been written
3. Purpose, objective and focus of the evaluation

3.1. Purpose

This evaluation’s purpose is to:

1. Account for the results reached with the CEA program which can be used by MinBuza for their synthesis report (2021) on the D&D framework to parliament;
2. Learn as consortium on the implementation of both capacity building for L&A and L&A activities itself (on various levels of CEA24) and based on this organization learning get entry points for strategizing and steering;25
3. Get an insight into the relevance of the country ToCs in relation to the identified problem statements;

To summarize: this end evaluation gives equal attention to the accountability and the learning component of evaluation.

The evaluation results are used to communicate on results reached by the CEA in the CEA program and indicate where and how CEA has implemented capacity building for L&A and L&A activities effectively; serve as input for lessons / best practices on capacity building for L&A and L&A activities itself.

3.2 scope

The CEA program is implemented in 13 countries, with pathways selected according to the contexts and dynamics in the space for civil society. In the countries selected for field work, the chosen pathways will serve as guiding ToC. Budgetwise the evaluation can only be carried out in a selection of maximum 3-4 countries. Furthermore we opt to carry out fieldwork in those countries where the program has been implemented continuously26 for the 3 years of implementation, assuming that here outcomes of the CEA program could best be observed.

The proposal is to do a purposeful selection with the following criteria: 3-4 countries; existence L&A results; a good representation of the 4 pathways and Alliance members; focus on the African and Asean countries and the work done in NL /EU. The final selection of countries will be made in close cooperation with the evaluators during the inception phase of the evaluation.

24 The levels are: CEA overall level directed to the Steering Committee, the CEA program lead, the various lobbyists and the PMEL officer; CEA implementation level directed to regional/ country levels by the Southern partner organizations, the staff of ICCO ROs/ country offices engaged in the CEA program; staff of the Northern coalition partners responsible for CEA programs in Southern countries

25 It is assumed that this organizational learning also entails MinBuZa itself as an important partner in the D&D strategic partnership of CEA

26 There are some countries in which the implementation has lagged behind because of a) staffing reasons (Ethiopia, Kenya), b) the situation in-country and staffing issues (Cambodia, Central America), c) situation in-country (Mali). Those countries will not be selected (proposal), but are part of the inception phase and final analysis

By CEA initially proposed countries for the evaluation are: Myanmar, Uganda and Benin and NL /EU.
3.3 Objective

The objective of the evaluation is to gain insights in the results (both expected and unexpected) of the CEA program until now, and especially the role and function of the two implementation strategies for the C&C program, capacity building for L&A and L&A activities. How and in what ways did the program contribute to the results? To identify the factors that enable or hamper reaching results. To define in what ways and how gender and inclusion were integrated in the program implementation. And to understand if and how the sustainability of the results reached was taken into account.

Summarizing: the evaluation help to understand the way L&A as an intervention could effectively support CSOs, NGOs and CBOs to fight for smallholder farmers and workers to realize a decent living and in the end lead to a sustainable livelihood.

The overall evaluation question is: “To assess to what extent and how CEA and their Southern partner organisations have progressed in reaching sustainable results as formulated in the ToCs of the specific country pathways during the period 2016-2019”.

In line with the objective the overall evaluation question is translated in evaluation questions. The evaluation questions are operationalized according to the DAC OECD criteria relevance, efficiency, effectiveness (and contribution to change) and sustainability. In this end evaluation the focus is on effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the CEA program.

4. Evaluation questions

The main questions are stated below. The evaluators are asked to further elaborate an evaluation framework with evaluation questions and judgement criteria during the inception phase.

Relevance and legitimacy

❖ To what extent have country specific outcomes and interventions (capacity development and L&A) been relevant in relation to the country context, needs and priorities of smallholder farmers and workers, in particular in relation to gender and inclusiveness issues?
❖ To what extent did Southern partners have a role in the design, strategic guidance and adaptation of country TOCs and programs, in order to increase the relevance of interventions for the above mentioned end-users?
❖ Given the need to be responsive in relation to contexts, needs and priorities of end users, what are what are the implications for a generic ToC formulation?
❖ To what extent have capacitated CSOs and CBOs brought forward the issues of local communities, in particular those of the above mentioned end users?

---


relevance: extent to which achievements suit the priorities and policies of stakeholders (about significance); effectiveness: the degree to which intended changes were achieved; sustainability: likeliness of continuation of changes brought about by the program; efficiency: relation of cost of achieving outputs and outcome to the outputs and outcomes of a program
Effectiveness (and contribution to change)

❖ To what extent have expected and unexpected outcomes of capacity development activities and L&A interventions been achieved in line or beyond country thematic pathways? What has been the contribution of CEA (CSOs, CBOs, labour union, northern CEA partners):
   ➢ What were most effective and country specific strategies and interventions and what strategies and interventions were redundant?
   ➢ What were enabling factors and/or obstacles?
   ➢ How gender and inclusion sensitive are these outcomes?

❖ To what extent are the following interlinkages/assumptions in the ToCs valid?
   ➢ CEA capacity development activities improve capacities of Southern partners and local end users (communities, smallholders, workers) to carry out L&A activities.
   ➢ CEA capacity development activities improve the capacities of partners and end users to form and maintain relevant partnerships with other civil society actors to strengthen their L&A activities.
   ➢ Research carried out in support of L&A activities contributes to outcomes being achieved;
   ➢ Do L&A activities that have been interconnected at different levels (local, regional, international) contribute to outcomes being achieved?

Efficiency

❖ To what extent have the CEA outcomes resulted from economic use of resources (program; budget)? Were monitoring tools provided used to define ‘economic use’?

Sustainability

❖ To what extent are the results of the capacity development activities for L&A sustainable; what are factors supporting sustainability and what are factors opposing sustainability?
❖ To what extent are the results of the L&A activities sustainable?; what are factors supporting sustainability and what are factors against sustainability (sustainability)?; have exit strategies been implemented? Are any links to other programs sought to enhance sustainability?

5. Methodology

The CEA program with its two implementations strategies (capacity building for L&A and L&A activities) is an example of a multi-faceted and dynamic program. Complex since e.g it is implemented in 13 countries; it works with an overall Theory of Change (consisting of the 4 pathways) contextualized into country program theories; countries have chosen various pathways to be contextualized; within the countries there is a variable number of CEA stakeholders, both Northern and Southern based. Dynamic because the program theory in use is a Theory of Change based theory, which is being adapted according to the changing country’s context, so are its assumptions, and even the indicators used.

---

28 Activities under the Change the Game Academy (trainings on lobby and advocacy and on local fund raising) and other interventions such as trainings on the ‘10 steps of lobby.’
Given the two qualifications, complex and dynamic, a qualitative evaluation and if possible a participative method is suggested to be used (fitting the evaluation focus and nature of the CEA program best). Most preferably the contribution analysis approach is to be used to classify the contribution of CEA partners to an observed change. In the whole evaluation process the evaluators should be open to ‘surprises’ and unintended effects (both positive and negative) of the CEA program.

The more elaborate evaluation design is to be developed by the evaluators in the inception phase, as elaboration of the initial proposal.

The evaluation is divided into 4 phases.

**Phase one: Inception report**

In this phase the ToR is further elaborated, including finalization of the research questions, the evaluation approach and method to be used, as well as the proposed country selection (based on an overview of the overall CEA program). Result of this phase is an inception report. This report contains a detailed mode of operation and overview of proposed methodologies to be used, a detailed time schedule and final budget and a well motivated proposal for selection criteria for countries (including selection of pathways) to be included in the evaluation. The inception report will be discussed with the External Reference Group (ERG) and the Coordination Group (CG) and – if necessary – adjusted accordingly. When approved by the ERG, the second phase of the evaluation study starts.

**Phase two: Desk study**

The second phase is an analysis of the CEA overall ToC and the operationalisation in various country ToCs (with their pathways). Input are the program documents. The desk study includes an in depth study of the countries selected for the field research, including methodology and tool development. Also (Skype) interviews with selected CEA staff and other relevant informants are part of this phase.

Based on the information gathered, the researchers will design the field research. The desk study report gives the first, provisional findings. Furthermore the report points out in more detail what information is to be gathered locally including a fine tuned field study outline.

---

29 A combination of various qualitative methods like desk study, interviews and focus group type methodologies, case studies, contribution analysis.

30 There are however also indicators for each country on country program level; including baseline figures.


32 The various program documents are: the overall CEA program document, the country documents, the country baselines, the reports of the various rounds of learning workshops, the annual plans, annual reports, the annual indicator sheets and the Mid Term Review. Furthermore there are also several study carried out in the countries, and other country based material which is to be used for the countries selected for the field study

33 This report could comprise several components for the final evaluation report.
Phase three: Field study

The field study phase results in separate reports (status working documents) on the countries visited, in which the relevant research questions will be answered. In each country there will be a validation workshop on the preliminary evaluation results with involved stakeholders of the country program.

Phase four: Final analysis and synthesis report

In phase four the information of the previous phases is merged in a final synthesis report; the research questions are explicitly answered (weighing field study results and the opinion on the overall program formed in the other phases of the evaluation). The draft final report is presented to the CG and the ERG by (the leader of) the evaluation team. Both will give their comments, which will be taken into account by the evaluation team. The evaluation team is supposed to finalize the synthesis report within ten working days. A presentation of the final results of the evaluation to the CEA Supervisory Board belongs to the possibilities.

The evaluation needs to meet the standards set out by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB, version 2019), an independent body of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (see annex 5).

6. Deliverables

The following final products have to be presented in English:

1. A detailed inception report (including a detailed final budget and an argued proposal for the field study)
2. A desk study report (could be part of the synthesis report)
3. Country reports, that are considered to be internal working documents
4. A draft synthesis report; to be submitted mid August 2020 latest.
5. A final synthesis report (max 40 pages), excluding annexes. The report is delivered in electronic version and in hard copy (5 copies). The final report should be submitted within 10 days after receiving CEA’s comments on the draft report.
6. Presentation of the final report to the CEA Supervisory Board

7. Process, roles and responsibilities

The responsibility for monitoring the evaluation process lies with Dieneke de Groot (the PMEL unit of the Strategy and Program Support department of ICCO). She works in close cooperation with Elly Urban, the program lead of the CEA program.

The evaluation is supported by a small internal coordination group (CG) which gives advice on strategic moments (finalization of the ToR, inception report, draft final report). The CG is supported with methodological advice by an external reference group (consisting of three external experts), who also give advice on these crucial moments, but in any case on the ToR and the draft final report.

ICCO’s PMEL unit staff member will make all necessary data and information available to the evaluation team and will be available for answering questions from stakeholders involved in the evaluation process.

8. Planning

The evaluation is carried out from October 2019 - November 2020

The following planning for the evaluation is foreseen:
### Phase of the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 (portfolio analysis/ inception report)</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>When (planning)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2 desk study</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td></td>
<td>End of March 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3 field work</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid March, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk study report</td>
<td></td>
<td>End of April 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 4 report writing/ presentation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field work</td>
<td></td>
<td>May - June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including workshops in countries)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis &amp; synthesis report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>July - August 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                             |                         |                 |
| Submission draft synthesis report (team)    |                         | Mid August 2020 |
| Finalisation synthesis report               |                         | End of September, 2020 |
| Final report presented to ICCO Cooperation  |                         | End of September 2020 |

Starting inception phase lead time for evaluation is about 9 months.
8.2 EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

EQ. 1. To what extent the programme has been relevant in relation to the country context, needs and priorities of smallholder farmers and workers (incl. women, youth and people living with a disability)? (relevance)

Rationale
This EQ relates to the sub-questions on relevance and legitimacy as formulated in the ToR. Relevance needs to be assessed upon different levels: relevance of the programme in relation to the country context, needs of smallholder farmers and workers and in relation to gender and inclusiveness. The approach adopted in the CEA programme is the ToC approach, evolving from a generic ToC towards country specific ToCs and programmes. The ToR ask to assess the quality and results of this approach in developing relevant country level interventions.

The question of relevance is also closely linked with ‘civic engagement’ as central feature of this programme. The core of the matter is how the programme supports CSOs, FBOs and CBOs to act as key agents of change who drive their own processes of development, set their own goals, claim their rights and fulfil their responsibilities. The relevance of the programme will be stronger the more the various aspects of L&A agenda and policy influencing (such as agenda setting, generation of evidence, engagement in policy dialogue and in multi-stakeholder platforms; and so on) are firmly grounded in the reality of citizens’ aspirations and their claims to rights, but equally so in fulfilling their obligations.

Judgement criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pointers/sub-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Country ToCs are relevant to country context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― Generic ToC is sufficiently contextualised by implementing partners (and CSOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― Intermittent adaptations to programme and country ToC and strategies, and subsequent changes in the L&amp;A strategies or implementation plans as indicator of responsiveness to external developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― Quality of participation of implementing partners in developing and revising country specific ToC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― Lessons learned from applying CEA generic ToC in country context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Strategies and interventions are relevant in contributing to the envisaged objectives of L&amp;A at different institutional levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― Smart mix of L&amp;A strategies (insider- outsider/dialogue-dissent) implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― Demand driven and relevant capacity development strategies implemented that reinforce civic engagement for L&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― Quality of participation of implementing partners in developing demand driven and relevant capacity development strategies and roles given to that end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― Adaptations/changes to strategy made in response to new insights in context/power shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Identified outcomes respond to the needs and priorities of the CSOs, FBOs and CBOs involved in programme implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― Evidence of co-creation of L&amp;A strategies and approaches led by aspirations of CSOs, FBOs and CBOs and their claims to rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― The extent the CSOs, FBOs and CBOs are involved in the research agenda setting, research planning and implementation, generation and use of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― The extent that CSOs, FBOs and CBOs are rooted in and/or aligned with the action of citizens (target groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― Appreciation of CSOs, FBOs and CBOs and their constituencies of the extent the strategic choices made by the programme are relevant in contributing to improvement of their livelihoods (in terms of access to food, land, finance, natural resources, decent work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>― ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4. Gender and inclusiveness

- Gender and disability lens in initial design and actual implementation, adaptation to the ToCs, in evidence generation, agenda setting, policy dialogue, multi-stakeholder platforms, …
- Gender and disability being addressed in capacity development interventions
- Inclusiveness in operational teams (internal integration)

Information sources:
- Study of documents (programme and project proposals, annual plans, monitoring reports, policy documents of partners, reports of joint activities that have taken place)
- Workshops with country-based partners (incl. reconstruction of ToC)
- Semi-structured interviews with partners in NL and partner countries
- Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders and external stakeholders
- Sense-making workshop in-country (restitution) and consolidated at programme level

Specific learning questions:
- What approach yields, Dialogue or Dissent, what if dialogue fails?
- What is the added value of FBOs in L&A, especially in restrictive environments?\(^{34}\)
- How does an explicit profile as organisations from a Christian culture affects alliances at the country level?
- How can marginalised groups (women, youth, people with disabilities) have a say in CEA decision making?
- How have the different PoC mutual reinforced to achieve results? PoC 2 and 3 in some countries focus on different target groups, have they strengthened each other? How do economic activities lead to increasing or creating civic space?

EQ 2: To what extent have expected and unexpected outcomes of capacity development activities and L&A interventions been achieved in line or beyond country thematic pathways? (effectiveness)

**Rationale**

This EQ relates to the changes the programme has contributed to with regard to: (1) changes in capacities for lobby and advocacy of (Southern) partner organisations, (2) changes in agendas, policies and practices of government and market actors. We will explore the degree to which these changes took place and the contribution of the different type of partner organisations (in North and South) to these changes (see further under Methodology). It follows the rationale and critically interrogates the CEA ToC, including the country thematic pathways defined.

Pathways 2 to 4 describe several levels of change which can be summarised as follows: (level 1 - output level) enhanced knowledge of the citizens and CSOs (on their rights), citizens and CSOs being able to raise their voice, to engage into a (political) dialogue with government and private sector and the expression of opinion is organised (see JC 2.1. and 2.2.); (level 2 - outcome level) effective L&A interventions being implemented (advisory, informing, dialogue, claiming, confrontation, engagement in multi-stakeholder fora, mobilising the public/consumers, …) (see JC 2.1. and 2.2.); (level 3 – outcome level) emergence of an enabling environment (government and private sector) for fulfilling the rights of the target groups (level of policy and practices change, rules, regulations, sanctions) (see JC 2.3. and 2.4.).

The ToR demand to assess also (1) what the most effective and country specific strategies and interventions were and what strategies and interventions were redundant (analytical question), (2) what enabling factors and/or obstacles were (added to each JC) and (3) how gender and inclusion sensitive the realised outcomes are (see JC 2.5. and as pointers in 2.3. and 2.4).
Pathway 1 relates both to enhancing political space for CSO (similar levels of change are described as for the other PoC) and refers also to enhancing capacity for effective lobby and advocacy. Regarding the latter, three interconnected objectives for capacity development support are described: (1) capacity development support of local and national CSOs (see JC 2.1.), (2) capacity strengthening of beneficiaries groups at local and where possible at national level through empowerment, increased voice and agency (see JC 2.2.), (3) strengthening local resource mobilisation of local organisations (see JC 2.1. and 2.2.). As described in chapter 1, several CEA members and several approaches were applied to enhance L&A capacities of implementing partners, CSOs and citizen groups.

In the analysis, an assessment will also be made of the validity of following assumptions in the ToC, as requested in the ToR: (1) CEA capacity development activities improve capacities of Southern partners and local end users (communities, smallholders, workers) to carry out L&A activities, (2) CEA capacity development activities improve the capacities of partners and end users to form and maintain relevant partnerships with other civil society actors to strengthen their L&A activities, (3) Research carried out in support of L&A activities contributes to outcomes being achieved, and (4) L&A activities that have been interconnected at different levels (local, regional, international) contribute to outcomes being achieved. Some elements are included in pointers, others are more analytical questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Pointers/sub-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 Changes with regard to L&A capacities and local fundraising of partner organisations (national and local CSOs/FBOs) | − Evidence of enhanced L&A capacities and competencies (stakeholder analysis, power influence analysis, political economy analysis, negotiation skills, participation in networking, conducting and/or using research, conducting public or media campaigns, soft skills such as self-confidence, able to speak for groups, etc.).  
− Enhanced legitimacy of partner organisations for L&A, advice and input requested from CEA partners by policy makers, private sector actors or MSP  
− Evidence of enhanced local fundraising capacities (initiatives, volume of resources mobilised)  
− Appreciation of partner organisations of the quality and relevance of capacity development support provided the CEA programme  
− Contributing factors and obstacles (internal and external)  
− … |
| 2.2 Changes at the level of CBOs and citizen groups (local and end-users) with regard to L&A capacities and local fundraising | − Evidence of improved knowledge on their rights, increased capacity to raise their voices, engage into dialogues with government and/or private sector, enhanced negotiation skills, use of research/evidence, enhanced participation in decision making at household and community level, participation in networks, …  
− Enhanced legitimacy of CBOs and citizen groups for L&A, advice and input requested by policy makers, private sector actors or MSP  
− Evidence of enhanced local fundraising capacities (initiatives, volume of resources mobilised)  
− Appreciation of CBOs and citizen groups of the quality and relevance of capacity development support provided by the CEA programme and implementing partners  
− Contributing factors and obstacles (internal and external)  
− … |
| 2.3 Changes at the level of government actors | − Evidence of agenda setting, engagement in critical dialogue with CSOs and MSP, political will, policy change, practice change  
− Evidence of the role of civil society and its influence on public actors in the observed policy development processes and procedures  
− Evidence of the inclusion of the topics raised by women, youth and people living with a disability in the policy outcomes realised  
− Contribution of evidence to the observed changes |
## Changes at the level of value chains and private companies assuring inclusive and sustainable agri-food production

- Evidence of agenda setting, engagement in critical dialogue with CSOs and MSP, entrepreneurial attitude/will in favour of envisaged changes, policy change, practice change
- Smallholder producers (f/m) selling to companies on fair conditions; inclusion of producers and labourers in agricultural production and markets.
- Evidence of the role of civil society and its influence on value chain actors in the observed policy development processes and procedures
- Evidence of the inclusion of the topics raised by women, youth and people living with a disability in the policy outcomes realised
- Contribution of evidence to the observed changes
- Contribution of L&A activities that have been interconnected at different levels (local, national, regional, international) to the observed changes
- Contributing factors and obstacles (internal and external)

## Changes at the level of the different target groups such as women, youth and people with disabilities (inclusiveness)

- Changes related to different target groups in the context of the CEA programme: women, youth and people with disabilities able to raise their voice, increasing their access to skills, services and markets, ...
- Evidence of increased participation of women, youth, disabled people in L&A processes and related MSPs, in social dialogue, negotiation committees, ...
- Evidence of initiatives and strategies of partners to include gender and disability in their L&A and in their organisation
- Contributing factors and obstacles (internal and external)

### Information sources:
- Study of documents (programme and project proposals, annual plans, monitoring reports, policy documents of partners, reports of joint activities that have taken place)
- Workshops with country-based partners with timeline and process tracing / contribution analysis
- Semi-structured interviews with partners in NL and partner countries
- Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders and external stakeholders
- Sense-making workshop in-country (restitution workshop) and consolidated at programme level

### Specific learning questions:
- How does capacity development work when it takes place through training of trainers?
- How can CEA develop a more focused L&A agenda?
- What is the role of NGOs vs grassroot organisations in broadening the civic space?
- How can the link between local, national and international lobby be strengthened? And how can grassroot advocacy feet into national L&A? How should CEA balance this, where should efforts go?
- What level should CEA continue to focus on: local, regional, national level; vertical or horizontal upscaling or out-scaling?
- What makes linkages between Northern and Southern partners effective?
- How can CEA improve L&A so to obtain more results (ex. inclusion related to food security policies)?

EQ.3. To what degree are the changes with regard to L&A capacity development and with regard to L&A outcome sustainable? (sustainability)
In line with the overall objectives of CEA programme and the ToR, the sustainability of changes will also be assessed along two levels:

- Sustainability of the changes in L&A capacity of CSOs, FBOs, CBOs and citizen groups,
- Sustainability of the changes in agenda, policies and practices of government and private sector.

The extent to which changes can or will be sustained is in principle related to ability of key actors to consolidate over time what has been achieved in terms of capacity development or in policy development and implementation.

Therefore, the assessment of sustainability is focused on actor-groups, notably government actors, market actors, civil society and citizen groups. Where applicable for the above-mentioned groups, sustainability will be assessed along different dimensions such social, institutional, and financial. In addition, it will be assessed what factors may affect sustainability. It should be noted that varying degrees of sustainability might be expected, taking into account the relatively short duration of the programme and the characteristic of L&A processes often yielding success at the longer term.

A specific question in the ToR refers to the existence of exit-strategies.

A specific feature of the CEA programme is the fact that several CEA interventions are aligned to on-going programmes, that are/were being implemented by the partners in the various thematic domains of the CEA programme. The ToR questions whether linkages with these programmes or other programmes enhance sustainability of the CEA interventions.

### Judgement criteria vs Pointers/sub-questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Pointers/sub-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1. Changes at the level of participating organisations (results of capacity development support) | - Institutional: support from leadership, adequate HR to follow up policy changes and lobby for policy implementation, L&A policy embedded in organisational set-up and strategy, coherence between L&A practice and other strategies of the organisation  
- Programmatic – whether functioning and impact of Civic Engagement stretches beyond the programme logic (not affected by ‘Stop & Go’ mechanisms) and stays alive past the present programme cycle; idem for the level of collaboration between CEA members and partners and with other networks  
- Financial: implementing partners and CSOs have sufficient financial resources available to continue implementing L&A strategies.  
- Social: shared vision, strategies and values regarding L&A at organisational level  
- Explicative factors  
- … |
| 3.2. Changes at the level of CBOs and citizen’s groups (results of capacity development support) | - Institutional: proof of programme support that has shifted from mobilising communities to organising CBOs and citizen groups as agents of change (with lead agencies and CSOs acting as facilitators and enablers rather than implementers)  
- Programmatic – whether functioning and impact of Civic Engagement stretches beyond the programme logic (not affected by ‘Stop & Go’ mechanisms) and stays alive past the present programme cycle  
- Financial: CBOs and citizen’s initiatives increasingly funded through local resource mobilisation and/or diversification of funding base  
- Social: shared vision, strategies and values regarding L&A  
- Explicative factors  
- … |
| 3.3. Changes at the level of government actors | - Institutional changes: evidence of the willingness of public actors to adhere to and implement new or revised policies, procedures, or regulations that contribute to the different thematic domains of CEA  
- Financial changes: evidence of adequate resource allocation (in terms of investment, availability of resources and (training) facilities / services |
3.4. Changes at the level of private sector organisations

- Institutional changes: private sector pro-active engagement in multi-actor platforms and other initiatives for the development and implementation of policies and regulations regarding business and human rights; and/or inclusive value chains
- Financial changes: private sector investments enable implementing of CSR policies (CSR3.0) and business and human rights principles
- Social: positive discourse and attitude of entrepreneurs in favour of adopting business and human rights in their practice
- Explicative factors
- ....

3.4. Exit strategies in place

- Implementing partners are aware of exit strategy (finances, timing)
- Implementing partners have linked L&A interventions into other programmes/sources to ensure capacity development and additional resources for L&A
- Exit strategies was formally part of the programme design and/or discussed during programme implementation
- ....

Information sources:
- Study of documents (monitoring reports, policy documents of partners, annual reports, ...)
- Workshops with country-based partners
- Semi-structured interviews with partners in NL and partner countries
- Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders and external stakeholders
- Sense-making workshop in-country (restitution) and consolidated at programme level

Specific learning questions
- How can CEA create a network for L&A that goes beyond CEA members and partners, and integrate others?
- How can local structures of citizen groups contribute to a sustainable L&A context?

EQ. 4. What has the programme done to ensure a proper use of available/limited resources? (efficiency)

Rationale
This EQ reference to the two questions formulated in the ToR on efficiency:

1. To what extent have the CEA outcomes resulted from economic use of resources (programme, budget)?
2. Were monitoring tools provided used to define 'economic use'?

It is very difficult to establish a link between programme effects and the costs incurred. The evaluators will follow the IOB criteria on efficiency, which are mainly qualitative (see JC 4.2). Only the IOB criteria on whether the programme was efficient compared to other programmes with similar aims, is difficult to measure. It is unlikely that a level 2 analysis, that compares efficiency of the entire programme with alternative options or benchmarks, will be feasible because of limited availability of comparative data and of time and resource limitations within this evaluation.

The evaluators also propose to conduct an organisational efficiency analysis applying the Theory of Efficiency approach (see chapter 2). This will give information on the extent governance, programme management procedures
and processes have influenced programme implementation and affected economic use in time, energy and financial resources.

Specific feature of this programme is the presence of country offices by several of the CEA members, with the ICCO local offices having been assigned the role and responsibility of managing and coordinating the programmes at country level. How this agreement affected the governance of the programme, and as such also the efficiency, will be included in the reconstruction and analysis of the Theory of Efficiency for CEA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment criteria</th>
<th>Pointers/sub-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.1 Organisational Efficiency | – Programme management procedures and accountability requirements are clear, lean and respected and pay attention to efficiency considerations  
– Evidence of efficiency considerations in decision making  
– Mechanisms to monitor efficiency of interventions in place  
– Evidence of compliance or deviation from procedures and how deviations were handled (new or adapted procedures?)  
– Roles and responsibilities of all CEA members are clear to all  
– Assessment of the quality of the partnership relationships between CEA coalition members and implementing partners |
| 4.2 Assessing programme efficiency | – Evidence that inputs were used in the least costly way  
– Evidence of activities being implemented in a simple way (appreciation by CSOs and evaluators)  
– Evidence that overhead costs were kept to a minimum  
– Evidence that unnecessary duplication was avoided  
– Complementarity of roles of CEA members and partners in contributing to observed changes  
– Level of collaboration between CEA members and implementing partners, to avoid duplication and enhance efficient use of resources and obtain results  
– Examples of implementation dissonance/ conflicts that were avoided/solved in a timely manner? |
| 4.3 Functional M&E system in place | – Monitoring tools helpful to define economic use of resources  
– Roles, responsibilities, procedures with regard to M&E, tools and reporting requirements are clear for all implementing partners  
– Data-collection capacity and reliability of data collected  
– M&E supporting learning processes within the CEA alliance  
– Appreciation of CEA members and partners of the M&E tools (like stories of change, lobby logbooks) and requirements of the project |

Information sources:
– Programme documents (programme and project proposals, annual reports, monitoring reports, financial data, etc)  
– Findings and observations collected in case study research  
– Semi-structured interviews with senior programme staff at ICCO HQ and local offices, and CEA programme staff at HQ and local offices (where existing)  
– Workshops with partners at country level

Specific evaluation questions:

35 During desk study phase the evaluators will inform CEA what documents with financial data are needed for these analyses.
- What different roles can be given to NL and the Southern countries?
- What was the balance between Northern leadership (ministry of foreign affairs, Northern partners, ICCO offices) and Southern leadership in the programme?
- How can the governance structure guarantee that synergies among the expertise of the partners are being created?
- Has the decentralised management approach of ICCO resulted in better results?
- How were decisions regarding the budget expenses made?
### DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Inception report</th>
<th>Annual plans</th>
<th>Annual reports</th>
<th>Reports learning workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019&lt;sup&gt;36&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018 (idem Mali)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019 (idem Mali)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>20017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>20017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>20017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019&lt;sup&gt;39&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2019&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>20017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018 (idem Benin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019 (idem Benin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>20017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>36</sup> Only in overall CEA plan 2020<br>
<sup>37</sup> Only in overall CEA report 2019<br>
<sup>38</sup> Only in overall CEA report 2019<br>
<sup>39</sup> Only in overall CEA plan 2019<br>
<sup>40</sup> Only in overall CEA report 2018
- Indicator sheets (Excel) for Benin, Bolivia, Cambodia, Central America, Indonesia, Mali, Myanmar, Uganda
- All stories of change provided by different country teams
- Notes from monthly skype calls for Indonesia, Myanmar and Uganda

Additional documents, including external resources are listed in the separate country case evaluation reports.
## 8.4 LIST OF PEOPLE CONSULTED DURING INCEPTION AND DESK STUDY PHASE

### People consulted during inception phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Elly Urban</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>CEA programme manager at ICCO HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Dieneke de Groot</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>PMEL advisor at ICCO HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Esther Meester</td>
<td>Wilde Ganzen</td>
<td>programme coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Marijke De Graaf</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Food and nutrition security policy advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Dicky de Morrée</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Lobby and policy advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Helen Collinson</td>
<td>INTRAC</td>
<td>Consultant for Intrac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar/Spain</td>
<td>Katie Riley</td>
<td>The Leprosy Mission</td>
<td>Disability Inclusion advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Nwe Si Win</td>
<td>The Leprosy Mission</td>
<td>Project coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangla Desh</td>
<td>Jitha Boiragee</td>
<td>The Leprosy Mission</td>
<td>Project coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Paul Mbalia</td>
<td>Light for the World</td>
<td>Business developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Murali Padmanabhan</td>
<td>Light for the World</td>
<td>Project coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia/UK</td>
<td>David Curtis</td>
<td>Light for the World</td>
<td>Project coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Virak Kheng</td>
<td>Light for the World</td>
<td>Project coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Ambrose Murangira</td>
<td>Light for the World</td>
<td>Project coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Manuel Voorowind</td>
<td>Prisma</td>
<td>L&amp;A expert/lobbyist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL/Israel</td>
<td>Sietse Blom</td>
<td>Edukans</td>
<td>Lobbyist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Brigitte Cerfontaine</td>
<td>Edukans</td>
<td>Skills expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Gonda de Haan</td>
<td>Kerk in Aktie</td>
<td>Project coordinator for CEA, in NL&amp;A team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Piet Posthumus</td>
<td>KIA/ICCO</td>
<td>specialist civic engagement &amp; FBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Jacob van der Duijm Schouten</td>
<td>Woord en Daad</td>
<td>lobbyist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Eddie Krooneman</td>
<td>Woord en Daad</td>
<td>lobbyist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Anne Dankert</td>
<td>CNV Internationaal</td>
<td>lobbyist and CEA coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Imron Sahetapy</td>
<td>CNV Internationaal</td>
<td>PME coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Hanneke Smidts</td>
<td>CNV Internationaal</td>
<td>Regional coordinator Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Marjolein Groenewegen</td>
<td>CNV Internationaal</td>
<td>Regional coordinator Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Nicola Mathot</td>
<td>CNV Internationaal</td>
<td>Regional coordinator Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Caspar Waalewijn</td>
<td>Tearfund</td>
<td>former country lead Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Willem Klaassen</td>
<td>Tearfund</td>
<td>country lead Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Tiny Biewinga</td>
<td>Help a Child</td>
<td>Institutional fundraising and CEA coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Jane Mugure</td>
<td>Help a Child</td>
<td>Communication officer HaC Kenya office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Richard otiene</td>
<td>Help a Child</td>
<td>Head of programmes HaC Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Seng Pin</td>
<td>Center for Economic and Social Development</td>
<td>Senior Program Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Sithu Htun</td>
<td>Network Activities Group</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Pedro Llontop</td>
<td>Movimiento de Trabajadores del Campo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Victor Gudiel</td>
<td>Sociedad para el Desarrollo de la Juventud</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### People consulted during desk study phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Abul Azad</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>CEA Coordinator</td>
<td>June 22 (group interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farhana</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>ICCO PMEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahe</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>CEA staff, Support enterprises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mukul Maniruzzaman</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>CEA Field Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mukmin Mohajjan</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>CEA Advocacy and Inclusiveness Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin / Mali</td>
<td>Sebastien Dohou</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>June 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>John Larrea</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator Latin America</td>
<td>June 17 (group interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sergio Urquizo</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Fundraising Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ximena Zambrana</td>
<td>Edukans</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Jelmer Klinkenberg</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>June 15 (group interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sinat Hin</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veasna Nuon</td>
<td>CNV International</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Deriba Mekonnen</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Country Coordinator</td>
<td>June 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>José Antonio Sauceda</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>June 18 (group interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Guzmán</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Program Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Ravi Kumar Agarwal</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Deputy Director and CEA Coordinator</td>
<td>June 16 (group interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nirju Bharali</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Murali</td>
<td>Light for the World</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Kiswa Santi</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Country Coordinator</td>
<td>June 18 (group interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amalia Falah Alam</td>
<td>CNV</td>
<td>Representative CNV Netherlands South East Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Susan Githaiga</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Country Coordinator</td>
<td>June 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Bram Peters</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Programme Officer Inclusion &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>June 17 (group interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khin Myint</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Country Programme Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katie Riley</td>
<td>TLM</td>
<td>Advisory Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Emilian Manishimwe*</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Regional Coordinator</td>
<td>*June 16 and July 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rose Namutebi*</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Country Coordinator</td>
<td>**June 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Kaheru**</td>
<td>Edukans</td>
<td>Deputy Director and CEA Coordinator</td>
<td>***July 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambrose Murangira**</td>
<td>Light for the World</td>
<td>Disability Inclusion Advisor</td>
<td>(group interviews)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People consulted during country-case data-collection are listed in the separate country evaluation reports.
### 8.5 OVERVIEW OF CEA COUNTRIES, CEA MEMBERS AND PWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country /CEA members</th>
<th>PW1</th>
<th>PW2</th>
<th>PW3</th>
<th>PW4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bangladesh</strong>&lt;br&gt;ICCO, Kerk in Actie, Leprazending, Light for the World, Wilde Ganzen</td>
<td>access to land</td>
<td>access to food &amp; nutrition</td>
<td>empowering smallholder farmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benin</strong>&lt;br&gt;ICCO, Woord en Daad, CNV, Edukans, Wilde Ganzen</td>
<td>civic space</td>
<td></td>
<td>smallholder farmers shea/cashew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bolivia</strong>&lt;br&gt;ICCO, Kerk in Actie, Edukans</td>
<td>civic space</td>
<td>nutritious food</td>
<td>empowering indigenous farmers (youth)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cambodia</strong>&lt;br&gt;ICCO, Kerk in Actie, CNV, Leprazending</td>
<td>civic space</td>
<td></td>
<td>locally produced safe vegetables</td>
<td>responsible business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAM Guatemala</strong>&lt;br&gt;ICCO, Kerk in Actie, CNV, Wilde Ganzen</td>
<td>youth participation, indigenous land management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>youth labor rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethiopia</strong>&lt;br&gt;ICCO, Tear, Edukans, Light for the World, Wilde Ganzen</td>
<td></td>
<td>food &amp; nutrition security</td>
<td>economic empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong>&lt;br&gt;ICCO, Kerk in Actie, Light for the World, Wilde Ganzen</td>
<td>civic space</td>
<td>nutrition</td>
<td>smallholder empowerment</td>
<td>responsible business (tea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indonesia</strong>&lt;br&gt;ICCO, Kerk in Actie, CNV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agricultural sector (spices, rice, palm oil)</td>
<td>labour/child rights UNGP (palm oil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kenya</strong>&lt;br&gt;ICCO, Kerk in Actie, Red een Kind, Edukans, Wilde Ganzen</td>
<td>civic space</td>
<td>food &amp; nutrition security (youth child rights)</td>
<td>small holder empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>Civic Space</td>
<td>Food &amp; Nutrition Security</td>
<td>Empowerment Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>ICCO, Kerk in Actie, Edukans, Wilde Ganzen</td>
<td>civic space</td>
<td>food &amp; nutrition security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>ICCO, Kerk in Actie, Leprazending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>empowerment farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL/EU</td>
<td>ICCO, Kerk in Actie, Prisma, Woord en Daad, CNV, Edukans, Wilde Ganzen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>ICCO, Edukans, Tear, Woord en Daad, Red een Kind, Kerk in Actie, Light for the World, Wilde Ganzen</td>
<td>civic space</td>
<td>nutrition security</td>
<td>smallholder empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.6 TYPOLOGY OF INFLUENCING ACTIVITIES

*(taken from Jones, 2011 and Start and Hovland, 2004)*

|----------|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------|
| I. Advice | • National and international policy discourses/debates  
  • Formal and informal meetings | • Research and analysis, dissemination of ‘good practice’  
  • Evidence-based arguments  
  • Providing advisory support  
  • Developing and piloting new policy approaches | • Collaborate: focus on working together and learning |
| II. Advocacy | • Public and political debates in developing countries  
  • Public meetings, speeches, presentations | • Television, newspapers, radio and other media  
  • Public communications and campaigns  
  • ‘Public education’, awareness raising | • Pressure: aimed at forcing change |
| III. Lobbying | • Formal meetings  
  • Semi-formal and informal channels  
  • Membership and participation in boards and committees | • Face-to-face meetings and discussions  
  • Relationships and trust  
  • Direct incentives and diplomacy | • Persuade: focus on associates |
| IV. Activism | • Public campaigns | • Strikes  
  • Rallies and demonstrations  
  • Sit ins | • Attack: aimed at weakening the target or gaining a better negotiating position |
8.7 FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING LEVELS OF OUTCOME OF L&A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome - Impact</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Positive change in people’s life</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy/institutional change implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy/institutional change effected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Debates being shaped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution to debate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Reaching target groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heightened awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution Effective Rules</th>
<th>Low ↔ High</th>
<th>Low ↔ High</th>
<th>Low ↔ High</th>
<th>Low ↔ High</th>
<th>Low ↔ High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National policy (decision) makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International policy makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contribution of target specific programme components
8.8 COUNTRY CASE STUDY REPORTS

See separate files:

- Indonesia
- Myanmar
- Uganda
- Netherlands/EU
### 8.9 OVERVIEW RESPONSES TO LEARNING QUESTIONS IDENTIFIED DURING INCEPTION PHASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What approach yields, Dialogue or Dissent, what if dialogue fails?    | - Importance of the dialogue approach is described and assessed in chapter 3 relevance and chapter 4 effectiveness  
- No evidence of dissent approaches in countries studied. Only one example of a case in Indonesia: research demonstrating violations of labour and human rights at Wilmar was conducive for establishing a dialogue between CNV, Hukatan and Wilmar (see Indonesia report) |
| 2. What is the added value of FBOs in L&A?                               | - This was subject of the research conducted during CEA programme implementation and well described; in general FBOs are well connected to grass level organisations and are trusted by the communities, which is conducive for L&A processes as described in the research.  
- Not much additional evidence collected during this evaluation. Myanmar and Indonesia CEA partners not showing an explicit profile of FBO. In Uganda under restrictive law for NGOs FBOs had more room to manoeuvre. Some church authorities are well connected to authorities and could be of help in L&A interventions. (see Uganda report)  
- Added value of FBO in L&A in the Netherlands. CEA alliance having easier access to Christian political parties that are part of the government. See NL/EU report. |
| 3. How does an explicit profile as organisations from a Christian culture affects alliances at the country level? | - During data-collection in countries visited no evidence was delivered of any problem with the Christian profile of partners in alliances. However, no in-depth research was done on this matter. |
| 4. How can marginalised groups (women, youth, people with disabilities) have a say in CEA decision making? | - See chapter 5 efficiency: CEA decision making took place during annual CEA learning workshops, at ICCO country offices and ICCO GO. Only representatives of IPs are represented. If the IPs represented women, youth and PWD, their voice was indirectly represented at the decision making spaces.  
- This question relates to Southern leadership and inclusion. Recommendation made regarding Southern leadership.  
- Country studies provided only evidence on inclusion of PWD, focus on internal mainstreaming. Some good results reported in countries where LfW or TLM were active (see country reports Uganda and Myanmar) |
| 5. How have the different PoC mutual reinforced to achieve results? PoC 2 and 3 in some countries focus on different target groups, have they strengthened each other? | - See chapter 3 relevance  
- Generally lack of synergy between PW2, 3 and 4, for example because of involvement of different partners, different geographic zones, ... In some cases this resulted in duplication of efforts or weak coordination in approaching similar lobby targets. Results obtained in one PWs had not much influence on obtaining results in another PWs, especially when operating in different regions, different value chains, etc. Mutual reinforcement was limited to knowledge exchange.  
- In some countries, like in Uganda and in NL, PWs 2 and 3 were integrated during programme implementation, which was conducive for concentrating resources and interventions and contributing to L&A results.  
- Horizontal integration (focus on CD) between PW 1 and the other PWs presents a diffuse picture and is sometimes confusing. In some country programmes, capacity development support strategies are included in PW 1 and at the same time in other PWs. Sometimes PW1 is targeting different partners than those involved in the other PWs |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. How does capacity development work when it takes place through training of trainers?</td>
<td>See recommendation 1 on the need for better developed ToC, with more integrated PWs. See chapter 4 effectiveness. ToT approach was effective to a certain extent but generally lacked sufficient follow-up. See recommendation 2 with regard to the need to develop a comprehensive capacity development support strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How can CEA develop a more focused L&amp;A agenda?</td>
<td>See recommendation 1 on the importance of improving the ToC approach, which will result in bringing more focus to the programme. See chapter 4 effectiveness. ToT approach was effective to a certain extent but generally lacked sufficient follow-up. See recommendation 2 with regard to the need to develop a comprehensive capacity development support strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What is the role of NGOs vs grassroot organisations in broadening the civic space?</td>
<td>See chapter 4 effectiveness. The strength of CEA was to strengthen L&amp;A capacity of grassroot organisations (including legitimacy) and linking them to political spaces. Bringing the voice of grassroot communities to the political debate proved to be effective. The role of NGOs consisted in the strengthening of L&amp;A capacity of grassroot organisations (among others through PW1). The choice of working mainly through grassroot organisations or though NGOs depends on strategic choices made in the ToC; and on the collaboration and donor modalities in working with grassroot organisations (like the possibility of direct funding of grassroot organisations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How can the link between local, national and international lobby be strengthened? And how can grassroot advocacy feet into national L&amp;A? How should CEA balance this, where should efforts go?</td>
<td>See chapter 3 relevance and chapter 4 effectiveness. See recommendation 1: a ToC should be clear on how and when local, national and international L&amp;A can be linked (including assumptions). See also learning questions 8 and 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What level should CEA continue to focus on: local, regional, national level; vertical or horizontal upscaling or out-scaling?</td>
<td>Where to put the focus depends on the topic and country, and L&amp;A opportunities. It was noted that many results could be achieved at local/district level; but also results at national level were observed. (see chapter 4 effectiveness) In most of the CEA country programmes, when policy change was being achieved, roll-out of policies had just started. Upscaling depends on the level of results achieved so far at country level and differs between countries. In the countries visited vertical or horizontal upscaling strategies were being developed (where relevant). Upscaling of CEA results is largely dependent on other stakeholders' interest and behaviour, but the top up with other programmes implemented by partners can continue supporting previous processes. See chapter 6 sustainability. See recommendation 1 on the need for improvements in the ToC and recommendation 4 on sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What makes linkages between Northern and Southern partners effective?</td>
<td>There is no evidence of effective linkages between Northern and Southern partners, except the direct partner relations between CEA members and their partners. The latter are based on historical partner relation and donor dynamics. There were only very few examples of Southern partners getting involved in northern L&amp;A. (see chapter 4 effectiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How can CEA improve L&amp;A so to obtain more results (ex. inclusion related to food security policies)?</td>
<td>See recommendations 1 and 3: Improve ToC approach (focus, strategies, gaining insight in relations between different stakeholders, etc.) and further expand strategies targeting private sector. See recommendation 2: Further enhancing L&amp;A capacity of CSOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13. How can CEA create a network for L&A that goes beyond CEA members and partners, and integrate others? | - A strong feature of CEA programme is the involvement of CEA partners in networks and MSP. These always included other organisations and was very effective (see chapter 4 effectiveness).  
- It was no objective to build a CEA alliance and position it as a brand. CEA alliance was seen as a temporary alliance.  
- Implementing partners were identified through stakeholder mappings but most often selected among the partner network of CEA members. The evaluators did not analyse the historical relations between CEA members and all IPs. Almost all partners interviewed during country studies had been engaged with CEA members in the past. |
| 14. How can local structures of citizen groups contribute to a sustainable L&A context? | - See also question 8  
- See chapter 6 sustainability: local structures are well rooted in local communities and conducive for sustainability. They continue implementing L&A with limited resources |
| 15. What different roles can be given to NL and the Southern countries? | - New recommendation (included in recommendation 1.2.) added on this subject: different roles can be assigned to Northern and Southern partners. |
| 16. What was the balance between Northern leadership (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Northern partners, ICCO offices) and Southern leadership in the programme? | - Southern leadership in this programme was rather limited.  
- See chapter 3 relevance: ToC provided flexibility to adapt the CEA programme; but strategic decisions had been taken in the Netherlands  
- Southern leadership difficult to realise under the requirements of the D&D subsidy framework, with an elaborated ToC expected in programme proposal.  
- See recommendation 1 on involvement of southern partners in ToC design |
| 17. How can the governance structure guarantee that synergies among the expertise of the partners are being created? | - See chapter 5 efficiency  
- Governance structure was conducive for programme implementation. Roles and responsibilities clear and respected. At country level, CEA steering groups or working groups were created that facilitated exchange and coordination.  
- The lack of a ToC based on synergy between PWs and by consequence between IPs was the main explanation of lack of synergy among the expertise of IPs  
- See recommendation 1 on improvements of ToC approach |
| 18. Has the decentralised management approach of ICCO resulted in better results? | - See chapter 5 efficiency  
- The management model followed ICCO’s decentralised management structure and worked well for the country CEA programmes, to contextualise operations and for short communication lines between ICCO regional office and the CEA country.  
- It is difficult to assess to what extent this decentralised approach resulted in better results, but it certainly had a positive effect on efficiency.  
- In countries visited, local ICCO-CEA staff played a crucial role in linking IPs to lobby spaces and networks. |
| 19. How were decisions regarding the budget expenses made? | - Described in chapter 5 efficiency |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCRWG</td>
<td>Business Child and Rights Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUMDES</td>
<td>Badan Usaha Milik Desa (Village-Owned Company)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Civic Engagement Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAKOTA</td>
<td>Data Komoditas Terpadu (Integrated Commodity Data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRI</td>
<td>Dewan Rempah Indonesia (National Spice Board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKN</td>
<td>Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>Faith Based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAPKI</td>
<td>Gabungan Pengusaha Kelapa Sawit Indonesia (The Association of Indonesian Palm Oil Entrepreneurs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAR</td>
<td>Golden Agri Resources group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>Global office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBCSD</td>
<td>Indonesia Business Council for Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDH-SSI</td>
<td>IDH, Sustainable Trade Initiative – Sustainable Spice Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGCN</td>
<td>Indonesian Global Compact Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIA</td>
<td>Kerk In Actie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPSHK</td>
<td>Konsorsium Pendukung Sistem Hutan Kerakyatan (Consortium for Supporting Community-Based Forest System)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;A</td>
<td>Lobby &amp; Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>Multi-Stakeholder Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPBHR</td>
<td>National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD/DAC</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKPA</td>
<td>Pusat Kajian dan Perlindungan Anak (Center for Child Study and Protection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Pathway of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBF</td>
<td>Responsible Business Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSEA</td>
<td>Regional Office South-East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSPO</td>
<td>Round Table Sustainable Palm Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPKS</td>
<td>Serikat Petani Kelapa Sawit (Palm Oil Farmers Union)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>Sustainable Rice Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGP</td>
<td>United Nations Guiding Principles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

Objectives of the evaluation

The objective of the evaluation of the CEA programme is to assess to what extent and how CEA and their Southern partner organisations have progressed in reaching sustainable results as formulated in the Theories of Change of the specific country pathways during the period 2016-2020. In particular, the evaluation seeks to assess the effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and efficiency of the programme, related to changes the programme has contributed to in relation to: (a) capacities for lobbying and advocacy of Southern partner organisations, and (b) agendas, policies and practices of government and market actors.

The evaluation consists of four phases: (1) an inception stage, (2) a desk study phase, (c) a phase of primary data collection, involving three country case studies and an analysis of the L&A interventions conducted at the Netherlands and EU level, (4) a phase of consolidated analysis, reporting, debriefing and communication. This report presents the findings of the evaluation in Indonesia.

Methodology

Figure 1. CEA Myanmar Evaluation process

The evaluation process comprised seven main activity components:

**Desk research**: Relevant documentation related to CEA programme in Indonesia has been consulted. Desk research also allowed to identify the cases to conduct a more focused contribution analysis. Documents are listed in annex 2.

During desk study phase, three specific cases have been selected to be subject of a contribution analysis. A contribution analysis consists of a systematic approach including a reconstruction of the ToC, process tracing (time line), evidence collection, development of performance stories and exploring rival causal explanations (through interviews with external stakeholders or documents).
Following selection criteria were used to select the cases to be subject of the contribution analysis: (i) involvement of variety of implementing partners; (ii) importance of the case for the entire country programme, (iii) relevant commodities represented, (iv) tangible results realised and (v) variation of results achieved at local, district, and national level, and when relevant including linkages to international L&A. The outcomes described in the stories of change and in the annual reports were used as a base for the selection. Most of these stories of change were linked to the involvement of implementing partners in multi-stakeholder platforms. For the contribution analysis, the contribution of partners to following three multi-stakeholder processes were selected:

1. National Action Plan on Human Rights (NGO coalition)
2. Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (Hukatan)
3. National Spice Board (ICCO and Penabulu)

**Virtual kick-off workshop:** a 2.5 hours virtual workshop took place on August 12, aimed at introducing the evaluation, creating partners’ ownership for the evaluation, and conducting a first joint overall assessment of the CEA country programme. Twenty-one participants from 11 organisations attended (including ICCO Indonesia staff). The agenda and participants list are provided in annexes 1.

**Bilateral meetings with CEA partners:** Implementing partners have been involved in the data-collection to a varying degree: all implementing partners have been involved in the kick-off workshop and for the restitution workshop. A selection of the implementing partners was also (virtually) consulted. Priority was given to implementing partners that have contributed to policy changes that had been selected as case for contribution analysis. Time did not allow to interview all implementing partners bilaterally or to visit each of their constituencies. Six bilateral meetings were conducted with CEA Indonesia partners (including ICCO and CNV). All meetings involved more than one representative of the partner organisation. The meetings aimed at understanding implementing partner’s involvement in the programme, L&A results and the contribution to capacity development. List of participants of these meetings in annex 1.

**Contribution analysis for selected cases:** Contribution analysis for the three cases were conducted with input from involved partners, including the reconstruction of a timeline. The contribution analysis also involved interviews with external stakeholders related to each case. Three performance stories were produced for these cases.

**Interviews with external stakeholders:** 19 remote interviews with external stakeholders were conducted to complement the reconstruction of the L&A trajectory of the selected cases and collect perspectives on the contribution of CEA and its partners: (i) members of networks/multi-stakeholder fora CEA has contributed to; (ii) representatives of government institutions; (iii) representatives of private sector actors; (iv) international organisations (like ILO, UNICEF) and international NGOs (like Save the Children, Rikolto). The list of interviewees is available in annex 1.

**Restitution workshop:** a 3 hours virtual workshop took place on August 28, aimed at presenting preliminary high-level findings of the assessment of the CEA country programme, and jointly reflect, discuss and validate them. Seventeen participants from 11 organisations attended (including ICCO staff and CNV coordinator in Indonesia).
**Country report:** This presents the findings of the evaluation in relation to the evaluation framework defined in the inception phase, and presents recommendations for ICCO, other members of CEA alliance and partners in Indonesia, to increase the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of future related interventions.

**Limitations**

Originally, field visits were planned for May-June 2020. The outbreak of COVID-19 has affected international development assignments in many ways. One of them was the difficulty of conducting field visits due to travel bans or in-country health safety considerations (e.g.: possibility of visiting areas outside the capital city, or the possibility to hold meetings in closed spaces). This situation has impacted the evaluation in different aspects:

- While a team of two evaluators has been assembled (one international, one national), the international evaluator was not able to travel, having to conduct workshops, meetings and interviews remotely. This not only represents a disadvantage at the time of collecting qualitative data, but it has also affected the co-implementation approach originally envisaged.
- Even within the country, the national consultant was not able to hold meetings and interviews in presence. These (including both workshops) had to be conducted remotely (applying the zoom platform or by phone). The engagement of farmers’ representatives in the evaluation process was highly affected by this scenario. It has not been possible to interview representatives of the different constituencies of the implementing partners.
- Workshops were designed as a critical milestone to activate collective intelligence in the reconstruction and analysis of CEA programme. However, at the moment of convening participants, it was considered that a face to face workshop was not a safe option and would not make participants feel comfortable. While workshops were conducted in Zoom and the methodology was consequently adapted, they were shorter than originally envisaged (thus not allowing to cover all the topics) and not all participants could participate in the same way due to the challenges of technology and the different atmosphere that virtual participation supposes. Despite translation took place (thanks to the efforts of ICCO staff and the national consultant), the use of English to present most of the information was another challenge to the active participation of partners during workshops.
- Due to the impossibility to meet in person, a number of interviews with CEA partners and most of external stakeholders’ interviews were conducted by phone, a channel with which most of stakeholders consulted feel more comfortable compared to Zoom or Skype. This meant that the international consultant was not able to join these meetings.
- The time difference of six-hours between Indonesia and the location of the international travel was another challenge to the participation of the latter in the interviews and meetings. It was agreed that the international consultant would participate in the bilateral interviews with ICCO and CNV and with the implementing partners that were involved in the selected cases. These meetings were planned in the afternoon Indonesian time (morning Belgian time). The other interviews were conducted solely by the national consultant. From each interview a full transcript was made.
- The time that can be spent on online meetings is limited, as is the participation of staff members of each organisation. This made it difficult to fully assess the transfer of acquired
or strengthened L&A competencies at organisational level. No sufficient triangulation could be done to validate results of capacity development support provided by the programme.

Because of national elections that had taken place in Indonesia during CEA programme implementation (2019), there have been multiple changes at government ministries and institutions, with whom not yet contacts were established or who were not yet informed on the CEA programme interventions, which limited the list of political decision makers that could be interviewed.

Taking into account the limitations described, the evaluators are of the opinion that the evaluation provides a good picture of the results of the CEA programme in Indonesia. Triangulation was done through the combination of written resources (programme documents, programme outputs) with interviews targeting both internal and external stakeholders, identified by CEA but also by the national consultant. CEA members and partners were requested to complete the information provided during interviews and workshops via mail and written answers to remaining questions that were sent after the interviews and workshops. The main limitation is the lack of first-hand information on the programme results as experienced by the constituencies. Their views are not represented in this evaluation and by consequence the specific sub-questions of the evaluation framework referring to results at the levels of the targets groups could not be answered (see inception report, evaluation framework: sub-question under relevance “Appreciation of CSOs, FBOs and CBOs and their constituencies of the extent the strategic choices made by the programme are relevant in contributing to improvement of their livelihoods” and under effectiveness “Changes at the level of the different target groups such as women, youth and people with disabilities (inclusiveness)”).

2. Brief description of CEA programme Indonesia

Brief context

CSOs in Indonesia find themselves in an era where there will potentially be more control due to Law No. 17 of 2013 on Societal Organisations (Organisasi Kemasyarakatan). The Indonesian law does not restrict an NGO from participating in the political process by lobbying officials, endorsing or opposing candidates, or otherwise. However, the Law on Societal Organisations clearly prohibits foreign foundations and foundations founded by foreign entities to engage in political activities. Civic space in Indonesia is under pressure but NGOs have room to act and influence, though specific communities and activists, such as the LGBTI communities and minority faith communities faced certain incidents. The Indonesian government became more restrictive in allowing financial support to CSOs from countries that are suspected from connections with terrorist networks.

1 Based on CEA inception report and annual reports 2018 and 2019
Historically, Indonesian agriculture has performed well, and contributed significantly to Indonesia’s growth, bringing with it significant increases in employment and a remarkable reduction of poverty. This is done by focusing on the staple food crops such as rice. However, with productivity gains of most food crops slowing down significantly and with the majority of farmers operating with 0.5 to 2 ha of land, such crops provide less potential for generating additional employment and income growth.

Rice is the staple food of all classes in Indonesian diet. Indonesian is the third largest rice producer in the world after China and India. Due to a growing population, almost all rice production is well absorbed and consumed internally. To ensure food security, the government fills the gap between supply and demand through rice importation from neighbouring countries in Southeast Asia.

In the past, Indonesia attracted merchants from all over the globe seeking possibilities to make fortune in the international spice trade. The archipelago is still one of the world’s largest spice-producing countries, having earned the reputation of ‘the Spice Island country’. Indonesia has world market shares of 75% in the production and exports of both products.

Commodities selected for the CEA programme, such as spices and rice, face several similar challenges, such as: (i) limited ability of local CSO’s to build capacity of smallholder farmers, (ii) lack of integrated and reliable data on commodities lead to price volatility. Every department and institution has their different data for their own interest. There is no data integration and single data management that could verify data along the supply chain. (iii) Debatable import/export policy of the Indonesian government. On the one hand, the government needs imports to meet the increasing demand for high products and to keep their prices down. Yet, on the other hand, the government does not want to jeopardize the local sectors. With a complex set of importation rules for agricultural products the government justifies its policy on the ground to protect its local horticultural industry, especially smallholder farmers and producers. (iv) The missing middle in Indonesia at the macro and micro economic level has become a challenging factor. This is partly caused by policies that are neither pro-poor nor pro-small enterprise. Small and medium agricultural enterprises and farmers / producers encounter difficulties in accessing financial services. Lack of access to the local market or national/regional market is also a problem for smallholder farmers and producers.

With regard to the palm oil industry, from 2020 onwards the government might become less interested in the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) of the palm oil sector because of the priority shifts from the export to the domestic market. Indonesia would be aiming to consume domestically while it will decrease the attention to social – environmental as the effect of a massive palm oil plantation and industries. The Indonesia government has set an ambition to replace 100% fossil-based fuels with B100, i.e. diesel fuel, 100% based on vegetable oils and/or animal fats. The Indonesia government ambition to replace 100% fossil-based fuels is taken as concern of the big companies who see European countries, China and USA as main market of palm oil as cooking and energy. Domestic market is considered to be high in volume but low in price; while in contrary the export market has high volume and competitive price.

Land and natural resources conflicts between marginalised groups and indigenous people with government or companies are at high rate in Indonesia. The disputes directly affect the livelihood
of marginalised groups like small agricultural producers, labourers and their families. The subsequent resistance of people and communities has resulted in violations of human rights and less political space for civil society.

With regard to the UNGP on Business and Human Rights, the context for the UNGP implementation has become more open and supportive in 2017, and attention for the importance of responsible business is growing within government and the private sector. However, the private sector still has limited knowledge on how to respect human rights, including labour and children’s rights, in their business operations and/or supply chain. Few companies in Indonesia use CSR to create sustainable development programmes that sustainable impact the area where they are operating.

The attention for Business and Human Rights is increasing. A National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights (NAP) has been launched in 2017 by the National Commission for Human Rights. Also special attention for palm oil social sustainability aspects is increasing as a result of Amsterdam Declaration, ILO, Amnesty, CNV Internationaal reports, EU policy on palm oil and EU palm oil mappings currently being done in palm oil as well as the EU-Indonesia trade developments.

In general there were no major changes in the political context in 2016 to 2018. Civic space in Indonesia is under pressure but organisations have room to act and influence. The Ministry of Law and Human Rights is still working on the NAPHR. Lack of coordination between key ministries involved is one of the challenges. The year of 2019 was a political year for Indonesia when there were president and parliament direct elections. It means there were changes in terms of people who are sitting in ministries, parliament and its staff. There were no significant physical attacks on fundamental civil society rights but Indonesia released the draft of Omnibus Law, in order to reduce investment restriction. Furthermore, one of the laws that is being revised is the Labour Law which is called “Employment Opportunity Creation bill”. The tension raised since the bill had stipulations that reduce the rights of workers including the contract, minimum wage, and more flexible working hours. Strike and rally happened in provinces by the trade unions against the bill.

**Summary of the country ToC**

The CEA programme aims at enhancing L&A capacity of CEA members, implementing partners and of a variety of stakeholders within civil society, government and private sector, and at strengthening evidence-based L&A.

The CEA programme in Indonesia builds further on former and current programmes, implemented by partners and supported by CEA members, ICCO, Kerk in Actie (KiA) and CNV, or by other donors. These programmes have been/are focussing on empowering smallholder farmers in various value chains, improving agricultural practices and enhancing access to markets; in fighting child labour and establishing child labour free zones; and in strengthening trade union’s capacity to represent its members and negotiate better working conditions. These activities aligned well with the PW 3 and 4 of the generic ToC. The CEA programme provided the opportunity to complement these interventions with a specific L&A agenda.

The CEA programme in Indonesia aims at contributing to favourable policies that enable inclusive and sustainable market access in four commodities (spices, rice, horticulture and tea), later on downsized to two commodities, spices and rice (PW 3) and at contributing to the development of the National Action plan on Business and Human Rights (NAP BHR) and enhanced knowledge on
the United Nations Guiding Principles (UNGP) among government, private sector and CSOs so that private sector respect human rights in their business operations and CSOs are able to hold private sector and government accountable for human rights compliance (PW 4). Respect for human rights, from local to national level, and by small-scale farmers to large multinationals, is a focus in both PW. PW 3 focuses on small producer empowerment whereas PW 4 focus on a sustainable private sector.

The CEA programme responds to the challenges in the selected commodities identified during design phase. Challenges in the spices sector relate to low quality and low production of spices, limited good seed and adequate technology and inefficient trading system for spices, lack of integrated and reliable data on commodities lead to price volatility, debatable import-export policy of the Indonesian government; and the lack of pro-poor of pro-small enterprise policies to support inclusion of small holder farmers and enterprises in the value chains. Challenges in the palm oil sector relate to violation of freedom of association, child labour and labour rights violations (like low wages, temporary contracts), gender based violence, lack of labour inspection and lack of implementation of labour laws. Furthermore, it was documented that the private sector and government have limited knowledge on how to respect human rights, including labour and children’s rights, in their business operations and/or supply chain.

PW 3 describes envisaged changes in capacity and behaviour of CSOs on the one hand and of commodity boards, private sector and government on the other hand, with regard to inclusive market facilitation, standardized commodities production, organisational development and Good Agricultural Practices (GAP). The direct outcome reads as “CSOs and commodity boards apply the knowledge for L&A in inclusive market to support farmer groups and represent interest of small-scale producers-entrepreneurs for inclusive market participation. CSOs and commodity boards engage in L&A, decision making and policy dialogue in the selected commodities”.

PW 4 applies a similar logic, focusing on enhanced knowledge of UNGP and CSR and implementation thereof by government and private sector. The engagement of CSOs and private sector as strategic partner in implementing the UNGP and formulating the National Action plan on Business and Human Rights is among the envisaged outcomes.

A visual of the ToC is added in separate annex.

Presentation of implementing partners

The programme has started with four implementing partners, namely Penabulu (PW 3 and existing partner of ICCO), NGO Council (PW 4, new partner of ICCO), PKPA (PW 4, existing partner of ICCO and KiA) and the trade union Hukatan (PW 4, beneficiary of the former TUCP programme of CNV, through its membership of the confederation KSBSI). In 2019 three other partners were added to the programme, and two consultancy contracts were signed with ELSAM and Atma Jaya university.

Penabulu (www.penabulufoundation.org): Penabulu Foundation was founded in Jakarta in 2002. Penabulu supports the work of civil society organisations in Indonesia. Penabulu works on 10 strategic issues, including inclusive development, sustainable market, ICT and knowledge management. Penabulu has 13 branch offices in 12 provinces.
Under PW 3, Penabulu focused on spice standard development and Dakota development and implementation. Dakota is an IT system for integrating spice commodity data and supporting commodity traceability. Penabulu collaborated with relevant stakeholders such as Directorate General of Plantation of the Ministry of Agriculture, Indonesian Spice Board, and the Agriculture Office of North Maluku Province. Penabulu also facilitated workshops on Human Rights Due Diligence for Village Development Committees and business (linkages to PW 4), and coordinated several studies in the spice sector under the CEA program.

KpSHK (www.kpshk.org): KpSHK (Konsorsium pendukung Sistem Hutan Kerakyatan, Consortium to support Community Forestry System) is a network organisation founded in 1997 on the initiative of several NGOs, indigenous people’s organisations, researchers and individuals concerned with issues of natural resources, particularly forests in Indonesia. Since its establishment, KpSHK has been positioned as a motor of the movement that supports systematically forest management methods that have been developed from generation to generation by indigenous people and local communities in and around the forest. Right now, there are 37 organisations members of KpSHK.

Under PW 3, KpSHK was contracted in 2019 to carry out a market research on ‘Supporting Business Development in Sistem Hutan Kerakyatan units’. The research was carried out in 5 locations spread over 5 provinces: Jambi, Bengkulu, South-East Sulawesi, West Kalimantan and East Java, demonstrating the importance of forest spices in community-based forest management. The result of the study was used in L&A with local governments and relevant ministries.

KRKP (www.kedaulatanpangan.org): The People's Coalition for Food Sovereignty (KRKP) was established in 2003. KRKP is a strategic coalition formed by farmer organisations, NGOs, NGO networks that are concerned with issues of agriculture, farmers and food. KRKP aims to coordinate a movement that focusses on people’s food sovereignty and promotes collaboration and exchange of knowledge and experiences between various grassroots organisations, NGOs and their networks, government institutions, and other stakeholders to realize food sovereignty in Indonesia. Forty-nine organisations and initiatives are member of the KRKP network.

Under PW 3, KRKP became involved in the Sustainable Rice Platform (SRP) in 2019, developed a policy paper on rice, participated in a multi-stakeholder workshop and the SRP national seminar.

ELSAM (www.elsam.or.id): ELSAM (Lembaga Studi dan Advokasi Masyarakat, The Institute for Policy Research and Advocacy) is a human rights organisation, based in Jakarta, established since August 1993. ELSAM aims at contributing to the development, promotion and protection of civil and political rights and other human rights, as mandated by the 1945 Constitution and Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR).

Before joining CEA program, Elsam and the Komnas HAM (National Commission of Human Rights) developed a National Action plan on Business and Human Rights. Under PW 3 & 4, ELSAM was contracted in 2019 to conduct a study (and upcoming workshop) entitled “Fact Check of UNGP Implementation in Palm Oil, Rice, and Spice Commodity Sectors.”

Atma Jaya University: Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya is a Catholic university in Jakarta, established by a group of young Catholic scholars on June 1, 1960, with support from the bishops. The Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya has eight faculties with twenty-one study programmes for undergraduate level and a postgraduate programme with seven master programmes.
Under PW 4, The Faculty of Law, The Faculty of Psychology, and The Institute of Public Policy of Atma Jaya collaborated to develop ‘Tools To Measure Economic and Social Rights Fulfilment’ for palm oil stakeholders, with specific attention to small-scale farmers. A tool, training module, policy paper, and dissemination plan were developed and will be completed by the end of October 2020.

NGO Council (www.konsillsm.or.id): Konsil LSM Indonesia (Indonesian NGO Council) was established in 2010 by 93 NGOs in Jakarta, as the umbrella organisation for NGOs in Indonesia. Konsil LSM aims at creating political space for enables civil society organisations to operate in a free, democratic political and legal environment that is based on the rule of law, accountability principles and mechanisms and aims at building public trust and support towards civil society organizations. Currently, Konsil LSM has 113 member organisations operating in 19 provinces in Indonesia. Members work across a range of social, legal and environmental issues and contribute to sustainable development. Konsil LSM’s secretariat is based in Jakarta.

Under PW 4, NGO Council participated in the process of developing the NAP BHR, developed the Business and Human Rights Due Diligence Guidelines for palm oil industry, established Kobisa-HAM (NGO coalition for BHR), provide training using BHR Due Diligence Guideline for NGOs (mostly Kobisa-HAM members), and assisted the Sub Directorate of HR Cooperation of Ministry of Law and HR in developing dissemination modules and ToT modules on business and human rights in the palm oil industry for government officials.

PKPA (www.pkpaindonesia.org), Center for Child Study and Protection (Pusat Kajian dan Perlindungan Anak, PKPA), was established in 1996 in Medan, North Sumatera. PKPA defends the interests of children by advocating for policies that are needed to improve children’s welfare and protection and uphold children’s rights. The working areas are the provinces of North Sumatera and Aceh.

Under PW 4, PKPA developed the Child Rights and Business Principles Toolkit (CRBP) for the oil palm industry, and supported 30 CSOs to use the toolkit in monitoring the compliance of oil palm business with the CRBP. PKPA carried out researches on children living in small-scale palm oil plantations. PKPA is also actively involved in child rights L&A at local (villages, district and province) and national level. PKPA has become the co – chair of the Indonesian Business and Child Rights Working Group.

Hukatan (www.hukatan.org) was established in October 1997 and is member of the confederation KSBSI (Konfederasi Serikat Buruh Sejahtera Indonesia, Confederation of Prosperous Labour Unions of Indonesia). Hukatan represents workers in the forestry, general industry, timber, agriculture and plantation sectors. Hukatan has 166,000 members in 27 provinces. Hukatan is one of the many trade unions that is represented in the palm oil industry. Currently palm oil is the largest plantation industry in Indonesia with a workforce of 4.42 million people.

Under PW 4, Hukatan promoted the ‘social dialogue’ between palm oil workers, companies, and government, developed a Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) document model, carried out CBA training for trade unions and companies, negotiated and signed a CBA with Wilmar and PT Lonsum, and was involved in field research on the situation of women workers in the palm oil plantations. Based on the research result, Hukatan developed a booklet on the rights of woman workers in the palm oil industry. Hukatan was also actively involved in the establishment of Japbusi (Jaringan Serikat Pekerja dan Serikat Buruh Sawit Indonesia) in 2019, which is a network of 9 trade unions with more than one million members, and holds the secretariat of Japbusi.
SPKS ([www.spks.or.id](http://www.spks.or.id)) The National SPKS was established in 2012 through the decision of the National Forum Deliberation in Jakarta which was attended by SPKS administrators and farmers from 8 districts. SPKS, being a trade union in the palm oil sector, gives services to palm oil farmers with regard to farmers’ data collection, farmers organisational development, trainings, certifications, sustainable palm oil village initiations, forest and peat soil protection, cooperation assessment with government programmes, palm oil rejuvenation program, and advocacy.

*Under PW 4, SPKS developed Human Rights assessment tools for members*(before signing the planting contract in their farm)*.

### 3. Relevance

**Relevant country ToC**

A strategic political context analysis and baseline study were done, resulting in a relevant programme responding to identified challenges in the context with regard to the selected commodities, and aligning to ongoing interventions of the implementing partners. The CEA interventions in the selected commodities are also aligned to ongoing government policy processes and programmes, like the promotion of child friendly districts and villages programme, the development of Standard Operating Procedures for spices, and the government’s Gratieks programme.²

The CEA inception report, including the ToC (version October 2016), was developed by the CEA members, but based on consultations with the implementing partners,³ and socialised in the kick-off workshop of March 2017 (including involvement of CSOs, government and state agencies, business associations, trade unions and university). The PW are formulated in rather general terms, leaving sufficient room for flexible implementation. During the annual learning workshops of 2018 and 2019, reflection and adaptations on the ToC were done by CEA members and the implementing partners. Discussions on the ToC were based on changes in the context, progress towards the stated outcome and reflection on the assumptions.⁴ Evolutions in the context were monitored so to enable identification of L&A opportunities (e.g. evolutions in the development of the NAP BHR, evolutions in the role of provincial and local government), and identification of new lobby targets (e.g. targeting the Ministry of economy).

The ToC did not change fundamentally, adaptations were mainly done at operational level. For example, interventions in PW 3 took off slowly, mainly caused by unclarity on whether or not and how to engage with the commodity boards, which showed different dynamics for the four identified commodities. This resulted in the decision in 2018 to narrow the focus and drop two of the four commodities (horticulture and tea, because of slow progress in these value chains and less active commodity boards), a decision also inspired by a recommendation of the CEA MTR conducted in 2018. The annual report 2018 also refers to the decision to decrease the interventions in the rice sector (political sensitive with less L&A opportunities). Narrowing the scope of the programme has

---

² Gratieks programme is for agricultural sector, the objective is to increase export by on-farm intensification, better post-harvest, and the use of information technology.
³ Documented in annual report 2016 and confirmed in interviews
⁴ Source: reports of annual learning workshops and interviews
been a relevant decision as it enabled pooling funding and interventions on a limited number of commodities, and at the same time grasping political momentum in specific value chains that offered opportunities for L&A. In 2019, the decision was taken to add two additional implementing partners to complement the interventions in PW 3. In 2019, the need was expressed to make the linkages between PW 3 and 4 more explicit, but it is not clear how this was done. It was acknowledged that both PW show similarities in themes and approaches, such as attention given in both PWS to enhancing market access for smallholders, CSR, business and human rights, child rights and linking village level L&A to national level L&A. It was further stated that results in PW 4 would have positive effects on PW 3. However, the relation between both PWS is not further elaborated in the ToC, or supported by specific interventions (except joint trainings). The report of the learning workshop 2019 states that some assumptions were changed or added, but this is not visible in the narrative (no changes seen between the ToC 2018 and 2019). Initial identified assumptions, as described in the inception report, seem to have been changed during the kick off workshop as they differ from the assumptions that were being discussed during the annual learning workshops of 2018 and 2019.

Implementing partners experienced co-decision power during important decision-making moments regarding CEA implementation in Indonesia, confirmed in interviews and also internally documented. In Indonesia, explicit attention was given to balancing northern and southern relationships and the connected power balances. In 2020, ICCO and Penabulu co-decided to join the Community of Practice on Power Awareness Tool.

The ToC approach was based on Maine’s interpretation of the ToC approach, making a distinction between several levels of change, referring to output, capacity change, behaviour change, outcome and impact. Interviews confirmed that the distinction between these levels was helpful for implementing partners to understand the difference between activities, output and outcomes, and in being more specific on identifying expected change from lobby trajectories, with specific attention to what capacity and behaviour change is envisaged.

According to the evaluators, relevant instructions were provided by ICCO GO to assist CEA members and partners in developing the country ToC and to support the reflection and adaptations thereof. The ToC was a new approach for many CEA members and implementing partners and it took time to become familiar with the approach. The consecutive annual learning events provided the opportunity for CEA members and partners to learn more about the ToC approach. The flexibility of the ToC approach, the opportunity to adapt the programme to the context and the space created for collective learning were widely acknowledged. However, the reflection and learning process, and substantiation of adaptations brought to the ToC are not well captured in the reports of the

5 Source: report annual learning workshop 2019

6 An interesting feature of CEA Indonesia is the explicit attention given to building awareness on existing power relations within the CEA alliance. A scoring tool was applied by ICCO Indonesia team, to assess the level of participation of CEA members and partners during several decision making moments in the period 2017-2020. One of the results confirmed that CEA members and partners agreed that there has been co-decision power with regard to the revision of the ToC during the annual learning workshops.
learning events. It is observed that the strengths of the CEA programme and the several L&A practices do not always become visible in the formal ToC process. A lot of learning and actual adaptations in strategies might not be reflected in the ToC process but has taken place during implementation. The synergy between implementing partners is not captured by the TOC, but is taken place in practice. It is not clear for the evaluators to what extent the ToC actually has driven the L&A practices of the implementing partners, e.g. identifying lobby targets, building relationships and networking, grasping opportunities (where is the energy), etc. The ToC seems to have been above all helpful in capturing the collective ambitions.

Relevant strategies and interventions

Specific features of the L&A approaches applied in the CEA programme are the investment in the dialogue between civil society, private sector and government (new for most of the stakeholders involved), the promotion and/or facilitation of networking (at local and national level), which is also visible in the relevant choice of implementing partners, and more in particularly, and the facilitation of the involvement of implementing partners in multi-stakeholder platforms at national and local level. Several stakeholders interviewed confirm that investing in a dialogue between civil society and private sector was an innovative feature of the CEA programme, and an important leverage for finding solutions for the challenges at stake. Furthermore, stakeholders interviewed confirmed that CEA implementing partners contributed meaningfully in multi-stakeholder platform by bringing in specific knowledge and expertise, including attention for smallholder farmers and workers. The CEA programme succeeded in building a bridge between the practice at local level and the national L&A level.

Mainly insider L&A strategies have been applied, looking for dialogue and combining formal and informal lobby. This was highly appreciated by private sector and government, as the civil society was often associated with a more confrontational approach. L&A interventions were supported by evidence. The CEA programme invested in building awareness and knowledge on the rights of smallholder farmers (in spices, palm oil) among a variety of stakeholders, through the development of documentaries, study reports and toolkits or guidelines on how to improve the current practice.

Capacity development support was provided through trainings, annual learning workshops (including training on ICCO’s 10 steps to lobby, peer-to-peer learning and expert inputs), exchange visits, coaching (by both ICCO and CNV) and learning by doing. Trainings and workshops enabled implementing partners to strengthen their competencies in engaging with lobby targets, and in contributing meaningfully to the multi-stakeholder platforms. Tools, guidelines and materials were developed to support these dialogues (e.g. business and human rights due diligence guidelines, company scan to assess respect for Child and human rights business principles). L&A practices were strengthened also through learning by doing, which was complemented with a coaching role of ICCO and CNV. Annual learning events were assessed by implementing partners as important momentum for learning.

7 CSO networks have been created at national (NGO-Council – Kobisa Ham) and local level (CSO networks of Penabulu), to monitor implementation of business and human rights by companies at their plantations
8 NGO Council becoming part of the Joint Secretariat for the development of the NAP BHR; PKPA becoming the co-chair of the ICGN working group on Children’s rights; Hukatan becoming a member of RSPO Indonesia.
9 Based on interviews with implementing partners
Apart from the traditional O- and F-scan, prerequisites for obtaining an ICCO grant, a specific capacity assessment was done on the L&A capacity of the implementing partners (2018 and 2019). This assessment, however, was not followed up by a specific formal capacity development action plan. As often is the case in these kinds of assessments, not much weaknesses were identified, except the “capability of staff to understand the full lobby results chain”. Capacity needs were more often identified during bilateral contacts between ICCO or CNV and their implementing partners. Topics for training were proposed both by ICCO and CNV and the implementing partners. A Training of Trainers (ToT) approach was applied in Indonesia, with CEA ICCO and CNV teams training the implementing partners, that at their turn are training CSOs and CBOs from their networks and constituencies. Overall, the relevance of the capacity development support provided by CEA was assessed by implementing partners as relevant, responding to their needs, and of good quality. In Indonesia, there was no implementation of the Change the Game Academy (Wilde Ganzen), Soft Skills training (Edukans) or on disability inclusion (Light for the World). Because the CEA programme is implemented through a decentralized approach, with country ToC, the link between national and global L&A is not made explicit, nor in the Indonesia country ToC, the Netherlands ToC or the generic ToC. The two selected national commodities (spices and palm oil) are also global commodities, demanding for a combination of local, national and international L&A. The CEA programme established linkages between global multi-stakeholder platforms and their national chapters, e.g. accelerating the establishment of national chapters (e.g. IDH Sustainable Spice Initiative in Indonesia), or facilitating access of implementing partners to national chapters of international networks (e.g. Hukatan becoming a member of RSPO Indonesia, PKPA becoming co-chair of the IGCN Children rights working group in Indonesia). Alignment between national and global L&A was hampered – or slowed down- because of the sensitivity of the topics (export of spices and palm oil, dynamics of the international markets), with a government questioning whose interest CEA programme is defending (e.g. SSI promoting spice export, DRI and the national spice board prioritizing domestic use). Within the available political space, it has been a relevant choice to look for collaboration with government institutions and agencies in order to build relations of trust, which has been successful to a certain extent (see further under effectiveness). No formal L&A plan was existing to guide the collaboration between the national CEA team (ICCO and implementing partners) and the CEA lobbyist team at global level. Collaboration and information exchange took place on an ad-hoc base.

10 Power dynamics between donor and partners have an influence on scoring capacity, scoring often is rather positive when applying a scoring tool for the first time and reflects more the reality after relations of trust have been built and organisations have gained more knowledge about capacity dynamics (report learning workshop 2018).
11 For example: Hukatan training other trade unions that are member of Japbusi, the newly created trade union network in the palm oil sector; NGO Council training the members of the newly created network Kobisa Ham, active in monitoring business and human rights in palm oil plantations at local level; PKPA training 30 local CSOs in three districts in L&A on business and human rights in palm oil sector.
12 Confirmed in interviews
13 Only a four-hour short training was given on disability inclusion, but with no follow-up plan
Programme responding to the needs and priorities of CSO involved

Collaboration was established with relevant NGOs, that collaborate with CBOs and farmer groups, and the federation of local trade unions that are active in the palm oil sector. The CEA programme introduced the focus on L&A, whereas in former and existing programmes focus was/is rather put on enhancing good agricultural practices, facilitating access to credits and loans and to markets, and on the traditional trade union strengthening (membership, labour rights, social dialogue). The value chain approach adopted for PW 3, and the focus on business and human rights prominent in both pathways are rather new themes, introduced by CEA members. The implementing partners and the few CBOs, farmer groups and trade unions interviewed confirmed that these new perspectives were relevant in bringing about sector change, in particular the introduced tools, guidelines and dialogue approaches.

The level of co-creation within the CEA programme is assessed as good by the implementing partners. The scoring tool confirmed that partners have co-decision power with regard to the choice of project location, developing L&A strategies, defining lobby targets, developing action plans and looking for synergy with existing programmes. Guidelines and tools were developed in co-creation and tested by the partners (e.g. due diligence guidelines, digital DAKOTA platform for traceability of spices). L&A was informed by studies that documented the situation of small-scale farmers and workers, based on surveys and consultations among these target groups. The level of co-creation or decision-making power with regard to the regional and global L&A agenda is assessed in the scoring tool as limited. Implementing partners are only informed about the international L&A.

Gender and inclusiveness

No specific attention was given in the CEA Indonesia programme to inclusiveness (gender, marginalised groups and people living with disabilities). “We rather use the inequality issue as part of a perspective and analysis, instead of separate/affirmative action. For example, we promote attention for the female workers in the agriculture sector.” (Annual report 2019). However, all implementing partners address the needs of specific target groups: members of the NGO Council target marginalised groups, women, children; Penabulu collaborates with CSOs at local level that defend the rights of marginalised groups and indigenous groups; PKPA collaborates with local CSOs that work on issues of children and women, Hukatan is a federation of trade unions that are also active in the palm oil sector, a sector with a majority of female workers.

Internal mainstreaming of inclusiveness was not explicitly on the agenda, but there are examples of several external mainstreaming interventions, mainly with regard to women rights and children rights. (i) In palm oil, a specific intervention (research, development of guidelines how to address gender-based violence) was implemented to raise awareness on gender-based violence in palm oil plantations (CNV and Hukatan). (ii) ICCO and Penabulu have influenced seven companies that are member of the IBCSD, the Indonesian Business Council for Sustainable Development, to sign a pledge of commitment towards food system transformation in Indonesia at the responsible Business Forum in Jakarta 2019 (co-organised by CEA and IBCSD). In this commitment, specific attention is given to smallholder farmers and in particularly female farmers. (iii) Eradication of child labour was a specific field of work for KiA and its partners, already before the CEA programme and was continued under CEA. PKPA (ICCO partner), the Centre for Child Study and Protection, has relevant expertise to that end. During the CEA programme, a toolkit on Child Rights and Business
Principles was developed and piloted in three districts (Langkat, Deli Serdang and Serdang Bedagai). On inclusion of people with disabilities, no specific attention or interventions were found.

Conclusion

The CEA programme Indonesia is a relevant programme that aligns with ongoing government policy processes and aligns with mission and strategies of implementing partners, complementing existing projects and programmes with a L&A component. The programme provides appropriate answers to the identified challenges in the selected commodities. A good mix of L&A strategies was applied, with a focus on enhancing dialogue, evidence-based lobby, networking and participation in multi-stakeholder processes.

The newly introduced ToC approach was helpful in defining collective ambitions, conducive for managing complexity of the L&A processes and supportive for adaptive management of the programme.

4. Effectiveness

Changes at the level of implementing partners

The CEA annual reports and the interviews with the implementing partners confirm that trainings, complemented with informal learning processes and coaching of ICCO and CNV, have been very effective. Competencies addressed in trainings and coaching related to: effective L&A (10 steps for L&A, stakeholder mapping, etc.), dialogue with private sector (for NGOs), multi-stakeholder partnerships, engage with local and provincial governments, monitoring L&A (use of stories of change, logbook, ToC), social dialogue and negotiating with private sector (trade unions), etc. Also, specific thematic knowledge was built with regard UNGP, international standards, CSR principles, children rights and business principles, inclusive market facilitation, Good Agricultural practices, gender-based violence.

Relevant knowledge was built and L&A competencies strengthened. It was stated in the annual reports that implementing partners had been selected because of their solid organisational capacity and L&A expertise, which was confirmed by the formal capacity assessments (2018 and 2019). Mainly evolutions in M&E capacity for L&A were reported (annual learning event 2019). However, interviewees also confirm that they have improved their L&A competencies, in particularly with regard to identifying the right lobby targets (e.g. PKPA now using a stakeholder register document, a tool adapted from the Lobby Logbook), the importance of networking, participation in multi-stakeholder platforms, and engagement with private sector actors. The latter being acknowledged by private companies interviewed that stated that dialogue with CSOs has improved considerably since the engagement in CEA. Furthermore, because of their involvement in CEA, several of the implementing partners have gained legitimacy in the eyes of government and private sector, in advocating for the rights of smallholder farmers and for business and human rights: NGO Council was invited by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights to coordinate the UNGP training module development team, PKPA has become the co-chair of the IGCN children’s rights working group (2018) and Hukatan has become a member of RSPO (2019).
During the capacity assessments 2018 and 2019, it was indicated that L&A competencies for systemic change were among the weaker competencies. The second measurement in 2019 did not show yet much evolution to that regard. Partners acknowledge that more experience needs to be gained in engaging with multi-stakeholder platforms and furthermore indicated that networking is difficult in the Indonesian context, showing fragmentation of civil society. However, the CEA programme has contributed a lot in strengthening networking: (i) NGO Council created the KOBISA Ham network, consisting of 38 members and non-members that will become involved in monitoring the respect for business and human rights in palm oil plantations in North Sumatera and West Kalimantan. (ii) PKPA supported a network of 30 CBOs that is monitoring the respect for Children Rights and Business Principles (CRBP) in palm oil plantations. (iii) Hukatan, together with CNV and ILO, has created the Japbusi network, bringing together trade unions and their federations operating in the palm oil sector. In all cases, a similar approach was adopted, namely mapping relevant CSOs operating in the region, meetings to prepare the establishment of the network, training of the network members. As the networks are still young, it is too soon to assess their effectiveness. It has also not been possible to interview sufficient members of these networks during the evaluation (see 1.3. limitations).

Another strong feature of the CEA programme is the choice for evidence-based L&A, a competence that was already existing at the implementing partners (more so among the NGOs than at the trade union). CEA research was coordinated by ICCO and CNV. Collaboration was looked for with local research institutes (e.g. Atmajaya University on Measurement Tool on Economic and Social Rights Fulfilment) or NGOs with research capacity (e.g. ELSAM on HR principles implementation on 3 commodities: rice, pepper and palm oil ). Research results were strategically used for the lobby trajectories, for example: (i) research on quality standards and criteria for nutmeg has informed the development of the Standard operating procedure (SOP for nutmeg), (ii) the SOMO research\(^\text{14}\) on labour rights violations I palm oil sector put pressure on companies to enter into a dialogue with Hukatan, (iii) The study on Human Rights Compliance of market standards was used to lobby the Indonesian National Standard Agency, and as baseline data for the NAP NVHR process (correct?). Competencies to conduct evidence-based L&A were further strengthened. CEA provided funding for research, implementing partners were involved in the development of the ToR for the research, facilitated access to smallholder farmers for data-collection and used the evidence in their lobby trajectories.

Limited attention was given to strengthen local fundraising, as compared to other CEA countries where strengthening local resource mobilisation was part of the capacity development support provided (mainly through the Change the Game Academy of Wilde Ganzen). Only in 2019 a short training (4 hrs) was organised in Ubud, and in a partner meeting, the business canvas model was introduced. Following these meetings several unsuccessful attempts were done to develop joint project proposals (e.g. ICCO, PKPA and Penabulu answering a USAID call, ICCO and KPSHK presenting a proposal on climate friendly, non-timber forest products).

The link between national and international L&A received attention during the annual learning events, but this was rather limited to information exchange. Not much attention was given to enable access of implementing partners to international L&A spaces. Mainly ICCO members were involved in international L&A.

In order to contribute to strengthening L&A capacity at organisational level, leadership of the implementing partners was involved in the trainings, a ToT approach was applied so that implementing partners could disseminate trainings within their own organisations and constituencies, and ICCO successfully advocated for creating the position of ‘lobbyist’ at management level. No formal capacity development plans have been developed, but monitoring of capacity evolutions at organisational level was done by the ICCO and CNV teams (informally, not documented). Because of the lack of formal capacity development plans and monitoring data, and the limitations of this evaluations, the evaluators have not much information on the effect of the L&A capacity development support at organisational level. There is no information on challenges at organisational level that might have (had) a positive or negative influence on building L&A capacity.

Changes at the level of CBOs (other than Implementing Partners)

The CEA implementing partners were well identified, enabling access to the grassroot level and conducive in bringing the interest of small-scale farmers and workers to the negotiation tables at local, provincial and national level. Training was provided by the implementing partners to their own constituencies and network members, when relevant with support from ICCO and/or CNV. The ICCO L&A manual was translated into Bahasa Indonesia.

No extensive survey could be done on the increased L&A capacity at the level of CBOs and farmer groups (see 1.3. limitations). Several stories of change have documented the effects of the programme at the level of CBOs, validated through the interviews with implementing partners and limited number of CBOs.

For PW 3: CEA programme complements projects that invest in enhancing knowledge of farmers and farmer groups in good agricultural practices and market facilitation. Penabulu promotes a public-private partnership approach and supports farmer groups and farmer associations in engaging with government (provincial agricultural offices) and private sector (incl. participation in provincial spice boards). Within the CEA programme, small-scale farmers have been consulted during the development of the SOP in nutmeg, pepper and cinnamon, and were involved in the testing of the SOPs. Penabulu developed the nutmeg farmer profile (including data on smallholder nutmeg plantations, cultivation patterns, post-harvest patterns), which has been used for the preparation of the SOP and as a reference for evidence-based L&A. Trainings were given to small-scale farmers, suppliers of the members of the national spice board. It was said that farmer groups have gained knowledge on the SOPs for their spice commodity, and are improving their practices so to comply with these SOP, which is assumed to result in improved (international) market access and a better price for the produce (too soon to be validated with evidence).

For PW 4: The networks created like Kobisa Ham (38 members), Japbusi (9 trade union members), PKPA CSO network (30 CSOs members) seem to be functional. Kobisa Ham - A toolkit on due diligence was developed to support CSOs to monitor compliance of palm oil companies with business and human rights. CSOs have been trained, roll-out is just starting. After the training, CSOs organised meeting with several stakeholders in their areas (relevant local government services,
palm oil companies and local NGOs), to raise awareness on BHR in the palm oil industry. Interviewees indicated that several CSOs request more due diligence training and further support from the implementing partners. Japbusi: Palm oil companies interviewed confirmed that social dialogue at their plantations has been improving, at least in those plantations with presence of Japbusi members. In 2019, CBAs have been negotiated at three palm oil plantations (correct?). PKPA network of 30 local CSOs in 3 districts (Langkat, Deli Serdang and Serdang Bedagai): the Stories of Change document that CSOs supported by PKPA are able to use the CRBP toolkit to monitor company compliance with CSR and human rights of palm oil plantations in their villages and to engage with village government to include strategies for improvement of children and business rights in their village development plans (inclusive palm oil plantation villages).

Changes at the level of government actors

Aligned to the general CEA ToC, the envisaged outputs and outcomes from the country ToC aim at creating awareness and enhancing knowledge of government actors (labelled as capacity changes in the ToC) with regard to the importance of standards for commodity production aligned to international standards (PW 3), and the importance for UNGP implementation and development of the NAP on BHR (PW 4) (labelled as behaviour changes and direct outcomes). The CEA programme was effective in realising these outputs and outcomes, both at national level and at provincial and village level.

National level

ICCO and implementing partners successfully engaged with national ministries, like the Ministry of agriculture (spices), Ministry of forestry (spices), Ministry of economy (UNGP), Ministry of human rights (UNGP) in enhancing their knowledge on CEA topics. CEA members and partners provided technical support for policy development and advocated for increased attention for the interest of smallholder farmers:

- **Penabulu** (PW3) assisted the national spice board and the Ministry of agriculture in the development of SOP for nutmeg, pepper and cinnamon spices. Specific attention was given to align the SOP to the practices of smallholder farmers. The SOP for nutmeg has been endorsed by the Ministry and the national spice board, who are showing commitment to disseminate the SOP and implement a training programme for farmers (see performance story in box p.22). This technical support was complemented with the development of a digital traceability system, called DAKOTA, that was also endorsed by the Ministry of agriculture. DAKOTA still is in the pilot phase (coordinated by ICCO) and not yet handed over to the Ministry. In August 2020, DAKOTA was selected as one of 30 most inspiring digital innovation by The Spindle, supported by PARTOS.15

- **KPSHK** (PW 3) claims to have convinced different ministries (agriculture, forestry, environment, village development) to consider forest spices as an important commodity that contributes to village development (could not be validated during the evaluation).
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15https://thespindle.org/2020/07/20/all-60-applications-for-the-30-most-inspiring-digital-innovations-2020/
- **ICCO and Penabulu (PW 3)** obtained the permission of the Ministry of agriculture to establish a national chapter of the IDH Sustainable Spice Initiative, with active involvement of the Ministry of agriculture (as chair of the board of SSI).

- **The NGO Council (PW 4)** has given training to the Ministry of economy, Ministry of human rights and the Ministry of cooperative on the UNGP, business and human rights and has contributed to the process of developing the NAP on HR (see performance story in box p.23). The expertise of the NGO Council is recognised by the Ministry of law and human rights who has invited the NGO council to coordinate the UNGP training module development team.

- **NGO Council (PW 4)**: The Ministry of law and human rights showed willingness to use the HR Due diligence audit toolkit, developed by the NGO Council, when new plantations are requesting their permit.16 (could not be validated during the evaluation)

- **PKPA (PW 4)** has contributed to raising awareness on CRBP among government, civil society and private sector, through their involvement as co-chair in the Business and Child Rights Working Group, in which also the employers (APSAI) and the government (KPAI) participate.

The L&A strategy adopted by CEA shows similarities in the different cases: evidence-based L&A17 is supporting the interactions (formal and informal) between CEA and government actors, complemented with trainings or seminars organised by CEA targeting government actors. This combination of interventions has proven to be effective.

L&A results are hampered by the slow response and uptake of government, the changes of government officials after the 2019 elections, and the power dynamics within the different ministries. Several interviewees refer to the limited knowledge and ignorance on the importance of business and human rights that still is existing within the different ministries. Actually, there are two mainstream ideas with regard to business and human rights: the legally binding group and the UNGP group. There is a dominant group of politicians and government officers, supported by business actors that demands that Indonesia should rely on current laws and its enforcement, while there are also actors within government and the business sector that are of the opinion that the global principles like UNGP should also be applied in the business sector, which is contested by the first group that thinks that global principles will disturb business efficiency. The first group seems to be dominant at the moment. For example, it was said that the new labour law adopted in 2020 does not pay much attention to labour rights.

16 Also with contribution of Komnas Ham, the national Human Rights Council, and the Dutch embassy in Indonesia

17 The evaluators have knowledge of 8 research studies conducted by CEA.
In 2016, the Ministry of agriculture had started the process of developing standard operating procedures (SOP) for spices, as a response to the fact that exported spices could not enter the European market because of non-compliance with the international quality standards. The rejection and return of Indonesian spices are closely related to traceability in post-harvest handling. The government had not yet the tools to monitor and record the quality of the Indonesian spice products. CEA seized this momentum and enhanced its collaboration with the Ministry of agriculture, and more particularly with the Directorate General for quality and standardisation and the Directorate General Plantation of the Ministry of agriculture, and with the national spice board (since 2018). A consultant of PSNI, a former ICCO partner, was attracted to support the project.

ICCO and Penabulu offered technical support for the development of the SOP for spices, and suggested to develop as well a digital traceability system. Becoming involved in the SOP development process, created opportunities to create awareness on the specific situation of smallholder farmers and their challenges in meeting quality standards. The lobby trajectory combined research, informal and formal lobby and workshops. Five milestones can be identified in the lobby process.

- In the period March-May 2018, Penabulu has been lobbying the national spice board (DRI) and the DG Plantation on the development of SOP for spices. DG Plantation had taken the decision to review the regulations and standards. Penabulu referred to the results of the CEA study conducted on the compliance of the Indonesian standards with international standards and UNGP. Penabulu also participated in a multi-stakeholder focus group discussion on the implementation of a Nutmeg Quality Assurance System.
- In the period October-December 2018, Penabulu met with DG Plantation to discuss the need to develop a policy on the application of technical standards to improve Nutmeg quality, which was agreed upon in December 2018.
- In the period July-August 2019: an agreement was made between Penabulu, DRI and DG plantation to develop SOP for quality management of nutmeg and pepper commodities. Two private companies (PT CAN and PT Alamsari Interbuana) showed interest in the development of a product traceability system. From that moment onwards, Penabulu organised multi-stakeholder consultations that informed the development of the SOP. The PSNI consultant, and two traders that understand the needs of the global market, provided technical input to the spice board. ICCO and Penabulu also developed the DAKOTA system, an Integrated Commodity Data Platform, as a tool to ensure the application of the SOPs at the level of farmers, small traders and exporters.
- In December 2019, the SOP for nutmeg was finalised and approved by the national spice board (DRI) and DG Plantation. Also, the DAKOTA tool was presented at the spice board. In January 2020, a workshop was organised to familiarise farmers with the SOP.
- In July 2020, after an audience with the governor of North Maluku and the provincial agricultural service, the application of SOP for nutmeg and the use of DAKOTA was approved. Training of farmers has started and DAKOTA system is being piloted in two regions, with collaboration of traders that are member of the national spice board the Agricultural Office of North Maluku Province.

The contribution of the CEA programme, through Penabulu and ICCO, to the development of the SOP and the DAKOTA system and the inclusion of attention for smallholder farmers in these quality standards
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18 The national spice board is composed of government representatives, different farmer associations (nutmeg association, pepper exporter association, herbs association, ...) and traders. Spice boards also exist at regional level.
procedures and tools is assessed as high, confirmed by the national spice council (DRI). CEA programme partners took on an important supporting role. Penabulu and ICCO are the only partners of the spice board that were able to provide high level technical input to the process. The CEA’s added value was also the access of Penabulu to smallholder farmers so to involve them in the consultation process and inform them on the SOP, and the knowledge of the international quality requirements. The contribution of the CEA programme has been necessary and sufficient in realising a SOP that includes the rights of smallholder farmers.

Performance story – NGO Council and ICCO’s contribution to the NAP BHR

United Nations Guiding Principle on Business and Human Rights (UNGP) were internationally agreed upon in 2012. Indonesia produced the 2015-2019 NAP-HR, a process led by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights. However, the 2015-2019 NAP-HR did not clearly state the components of business and human rights. For this reason, ELSAM worked with Komnas HAM (National Commission on Human Rights) to compile the NAP-BHR whose documents were completed in 2017. In the drafting process, both ELSAM and Komnas HAM conducted public consultations with various stakeholders, including NGOs and the government. The public consultation process ran smoothly and stakeholders - including government elements - welcomed the production of the NAP-BHR document.

However, when the document was submitted to the Government, there was rejection because it was deemed not to have gone through an adequate political process. Komnas HAM, although funded by the government, is not considered a representative of the government. The government then formed a Joint Secretariat which contained Bappenas (National Development Plan Body), the Ministry of Social Affairs, the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Ministry of Law and Human Rights to prepare NAP-HR 2020-2024.

In 2018, the Human Rights Working Group, consisting of NGOs and HR activists (in which NGO Council, ICCO and ELSAM participate), lobbied the government to transfer the lead for developing a NAP BHR from the National Commission on HR to the Ministry Economy. In December 2018, the government appointed the Ministry for Economic Affairs (in collaboration with UNDP) as the focal point for formulating the roadmap to BHR. However, in August 2020, the focal point was transferred again to the Ministry of Law and Human Rights.

In the period 2017-2018, through its involvement in CEA, the NGO Council gained knowledge about UNGP, Business and human rights, with specific attention for SME. NGO Council, supported by ICCO, delivered due diligence training for SMEs in 2018. Among the participants were government officials from the Ministry of Cooperative and Ministry of Law and Human Rights. In 2019, NGO Council and ICCO participated in hearing and consultation organised by the Komnas HAM, Ministry of Law and HR on the NAP HR and BHR Roadmap process.

Since the government decided not to have NAP BHR, NGO Council and ICCO focused the L&A to the BHR action on business clusters. The business cluster chosen was the palm oil industry. NGO Council, supported by ICCO, developed BHR Due Diligence Guideline and used this guideline for NGOs training in order to improve their L&A capacity in the palm oil industry. The Sub-Directorate of Human Rights Cooperation was interested in the due diligence and training of the NGO Council and decided to develop a similar training package for government officials and formed a committee to develop the training and dissemination modules. NGO Council was invited as member and supervisor of this committee.

The contribution of CEA programme, through NGO Council and ICCO, to the development of the NAP HR and the BHR roadmap is assessed as medium. The NGO Council and ICCO had a meaningful role in
enhancing knowledge on BHR among the different ministries involved and provided concrete and technical recommendations to be included in the NAP. The L&A of the NGO Council and ICCO has also been important as there is a lot of hesitation within the different ministries to give priority to business and human rights. The change process is difficult and slow. The interventions of the NGO Council were necessary to accelerate the development process of the NAP and include attention for small-scale farmers, but not sufficient in itself. Also, other actors contributed to this process, such as UNDP, the child rights working group of IGCN (that includes also business actors), the NGO Human Rights Working Group, and some officers at the Ministry of Law and Human Rights. The combination of these interventions was not yet sufficient as a NAP on BHR has not been developed yet.

**Local level (provincial, district, village)**

Implementing partners are also engaging with local governments, at provincial, district or village level, in order to gain permission for research but also to inform local governments on their role in promoting GAP, SOP and DAKOTA, UNGP and respect for child rights. Interventions align to existing policies like the promotion of village development programmes through the development of agriculture and forestry commodities, and the government programme promoting child friendly villages. Implementing partners are well rooted in the local communities and had already good relationships with local authorities prior to the CEA programme.

The evaluation was not able to gain a complete overview of changes realised at local level, which could also not be validated through field visits. Interviewees and reports refer to following results:

- **Penabulu (PW 3):** The North Maluku, Provincial Agriculture Office established a relationship with Penabulu in June 2020. Previously, the Agriculture Office had known that Penabulu was working to improve nutmeg standards in North Halmahera and Ternate City. Starting in July 2020, with the permission of the Agriculture Office, Penabulu conducted a trial of using Dakota in Ternate City with 53 nutmeg farmers as sample. The agriculture office also committed to support farmers training on SOP (could not be validated). North Maluku Province has 28,000 nutmeg farmers, 80% of which are targeted to enter the Dakota system.

- **PKPA (PW 4):** In North Sumatra, in three districts (Langkat, Deli Serdang and Serdang Bedagai) local governments were trained on child friendly villages and convinced to include CSR initiatives in the village development funds. PKPA also provided support to strengthen the capacity of the BUMDES (village owned companies) with regard to management and budgeting. PKPA also trained local governments to build networks among government agencies so to establish coordinated actions in eliminating child labour.

**Changes at the level of value chains and private sector actors**

L&A targeting private sector actors combines dialogue and dissent approaches. Dialogue is looked for with both individual companies (e.g. GAR Sinarmas and Wilmar) and employers’ associations (GAPKI). CEA partners participate in multi-stakeholder platforms where business, government and
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19 Complemented with interventions under EU funded RESBOUND programme
CSOs meet (e.g. RSPO, IGCN Child Rights working group, IDH-SSI, SDG2 working group). Dissent approaches (mainly PW 4) concern mainly the confrontation of private sector actors with research results, demonstrating violations of labour rights and human rights at plantations and putting pressure on the companies to take appropriate measures. Furthermore, a due diligence toolkit (NGO Council) and a toolkit on Child Rights and Business Principles (PKPA) have been developed that can support businesses in developing sustainable practices, but that also will be used by CSO networks (Kobisa HAM and the PKPA CSO network) to monitor respect for human rights and child rights in palm oil sector.

A top-down and bottom-up approach is applied by CEA. ICCO, NGO Council and PKPA are engaging with sector associations, are putting pressure on large scale companies, are developing tools and contributing to policies (top-down). Hukatan and the Japbusi network train the trade unions that are present at the palm oil plantations to defend workers’ interest and look for solutions through the social dialogue (bottom-up).

The effectiveness of the combination of these approaches still has to be proven. It was confirmed by interviewees that knowledge on business and human rights has been built among a variety of stakeholders involved in the palm oil value chain. The toolkits themselves are yet to be rolled-out. From the pilot phase of the CRBP toolkit, it was learned that the toolkit was not well received among private sector actors, mainly because a feedback mechanism was not included (annual report 2018, confirmed by interviews). The approach is based on the assumption that there is willingness of private sector actors to adhere to the UNGP guidelines. This assumption is not yet proven, e.g. interviewees from private sector actors referring to the difficulties in convincing palm oil companies (both large, medium and small-scale, private and state owned) to adhere to the UNGP on BHR.

Dialogue with private companies

CEA achieved to build good relations with two large palm oil companies, the Golden Agri Resource group (GAR), and in particular with Sinarmas (part of GAR, a family owned Indonesian palm oil company, registered in Singapore) and Wilmar (a multi-national palm oil company, registered in Indonesia, having an office in the Netherlands). Both companies are member of RSPO, and Wilmar-Head Quarter is also member of IGCN. Both companies aim at enhancing sustainability of the palm oil sector (and employ a large number of sustainability officer at the company).

- **GAR** showed interest in engaging with CEA, as the programme aligns to their own sustainability programme. Evidence collected by CEA on workers’ rights violations convinced the GAR group to collaborate with the CEA programme, and as such participated in the development of the CRBP toolkit. GAR is committed to convince their suppliers (incl. small-scale farmers) in creating more sustainable supply chains and in applying the CRBP toolkit to improve the own practice. Apart from Sinarmas, there is no info yet on the action taken by the other members of the GAR group. From the interviews it is learned that business actors are waiting for the toolkit feedback mechanism.

- **Wilmar** also has a sustainability programme and has been collaborating with CNV already before the CEA programme. In 2017, Wilmar gave permission to SOMO (engaged by CEA) to conduct a study on the labour rights conditions at their plantations (the study also
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20 RSPO does not involve government
documented labour rights violations at another company, Sime Darby). The study was presented at the Human Rights forum of Gapki and followed up by meetings between CNV, Hukatan, Wilmar and Sime Darby. Some improvements have been done by the two companies but according to the trade unions, response is slow and not satisfying yet.

**Improved social dialogue**

CNV has invested in strengthening knowledge and competencies of Hukatan and the Japbusi network in collective bargaining, social dialogue, labour rights, etc. as described under 4.1. and 4.2. According to the interviews with Hukatan and Gapki, this has resulted in improved social dialogue in several plantations and the signing of CBA, e.g. at Wilmar a first CBA was signed in 2019). Gapki, the employer association, welcomed the establishment of the Japbusi network, having one interlocutor to discuss workers’ rights at the palm oil plantations (see performance story on p. 28).

**Dialogue with business associations**

CEA engages with several business associations that show goodwill to improve labour conditions in the palm oil sector.

- The relationships between Gapki, the employers’ association in palm oil sector, representing 30% of the palm oil companies, and Hukatan/CNV improved during the CEA programme, because of the evolution from confrontational towards dialogue approaches of the trade union. Also, the SOMO study on the palm industry (2017) convinced Gapki to enhance its collaboration with Hukatan. This resulted in a collaborative process, which is not common in Indonesia and still contested by several of Gapki’s members who question the collaboration with the trade union. Gapki is promoting the model of social dialogue among its members. The documentary produced by CEA, CNV and Hukatan, on the added value of social dialogue in palm oil plantations (also shown at the RSPO conference in Paris in 2019) is being used as promotion material. Furthermore, Gapki and Hukatan are implementing a gender project. A research was conducted on the situation of women workers in palm oil plantations (2019) and a booklet developed on how to prevent and mitigate gender-based violence. The booklets are being distributed among Japbusi members and Gapki members. Wilmar, for example, has started to create women workers committees at their plantations.

- The five biggest international companies involved in the palm oil sector had created the ‘Decent Work Rural Initiative’ (DRLI) aimed at improving labour conditions and CSR policies in the palm oil sector. The DWRI became on the radar of CEA in 2018. The results of the SOMO research (2017) and the Hukatan documentary (produced by CEA and CNV International, 2019) have accelerated the internal debates of DWRI. DRLI was interested in a collaboration with CEA for the implementation of specific projects to improve labour conditions. Some meetings have taken place and a joint workshop was organised to discuss the development of a multi-company CBA for South Sumatra, where the five companies all have many plantations. The collaboration between the five international companies has

slowed down since January 2020, after the Forum for the Future, the organisation that was facilitating the DRLI had ended its contract.

Involvement in Multi-Stakeholder Platforms

CEA members and partners participate in multi-stakeholder platforms to bring the interest of smallholder farmers and workers to the forefront as described under 4.1. This resulted in following outcomes:

- **RSPO**: A broad public consultation was organised for the revision of the international RSPO standard in 2018. CEA has provided inputs under coordination of PKPA. CEA members claim that attention for business and human rights and attention for smallholder farmers received more attention in the revised standard (could not be validated). At the moment of the evaluation, the national interpretation of the international RSPO standard is ongoing. Hukatan is member of the RSPO working group assigned with that task. Discussions are ongoing as the national RSPO standard needs to align to the national regulations and policies that are less ambitious. In 2011, an Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (IPSO) was developed, being less ambitious but which resulted in the withdrawal of Gapki from RSPO. However, many Gapki members still are part of RSPO. The international market, but also national value chain actors like banks, put pressure on palm oil companies to adhere to the more ambitious RSPO standard. Furthermore, Hukatan is member of two other RSPO working groups (human rights and shared responsibility). CEA (CNV, ICCO, PKPA, NGO Council) also participates in the RSPO-NGO forum.

- **PKPA** has the co-chair of the Business and Child Rights working group. The working group was established in 2016 but has not been very active and was re-activated in 2017 when new co-chairs were appointed: PKPA, KPAI, Indonesian Commission of Child protection and The Indonesian Association for Child Friendly Companies. PKPA represents the civil society and is one of the active members. During workshops organised by this working group, awareness is being created on business and human rights and child rights. The working group is also considering an action plan to establish provincial chapters of the Indonesian Association of Child Friendly Companies.

- **IDH-SSI**: CEA Indonesia has put pressure on IDH-SSI to establish a national chapter of the IDH-Sustainable Spice initiative. Several of the IDH-SSI members at international level have collaborated to establish the national chapter (e.g. ICCO, Verstegen Spices). CEA Indonesia has supported this process, including the provision of start-up financing (like the organisation of the expert meeting in October 2018), lobbying the Ministry of agriculture (who will become the president of the board of SSI) and contributing to the spice roadmap 2020 – 2025 (action plan for SSI Indonesia). The government showed interested and demanded that SSI would become a legal entity. In September 2020, SSI Indonesia has been established as an association, with ICCO holding the secretariat. ICCO also participates in one of the working groups that addresses social issues such as gender, female farmer
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22 Gapki considering RSPO having less added value as the IPSO standard is the only mandatory standard.

23 Technical advisory support is provided by IGCN, UNICEF and Save the Children.
empowerment, child labour and due diligence. SSI Indonesia might come in competition with the national spice board, as both are similar multi-stakeholder platforms operating in the same value chain, but with different interests (focus on export versus domestic use of spices), which will require diplomatic balancing CEA involvement in both multi-stakeholder platforms.

- **SDG 2 working group**: CEA (ICCO, Penabulu, KRKP) and IBCSD, the Indonesian Business Council for Sustainable Development, have collaborated to co-host the Responsible Business Forum 2019 ‘Innovating Food and Nutrition System to Achieve SDGs’, which was hosted by the National Development Agency of Indonesia. Nine companies signed a pledge to look for sustainable food system transformation and took the initiative to create an SDG 2 working group to advocate for coherent and consistent policies that protect smallholder farmers and to lobby the national action plan on SDG 2.

### Performance story - Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil

Hukatan is the federation of Forestry, Plantation and Agriculture Trade Union, member of the confederation SBSI. A large variety of different trade unions are existing in the palm oil sector at national, provincial, district and factory levels. A lack of collaboration between the trade unions has been hindering social dialogue and joint action to address serious labour rights violations. This fragmentation triggered competition and disputes between trade unions, which harmed the position of the workers as well as of the trade unions. Trade unions lacked knowledge and competencies to become engaged in a constructive social dialogue and applied mainly confrontational approaches, which resulted in difficult relations with the employers and the Indonesian palm oil association.

In 2017, CNV International and ILO joined forces to unify the trade union movement and enhance the social dialogue. Based on a mapping study, knowledge was gained on the number and presence of trade unions in palm oil sector. Results of the mapping were presented to the trade unions in a seminar, where the idea of creating a network was launched. In 2017-2018, eight trainings were organised for trade unions on social dialogue, labour rights, negotiation skills, business and human rights and child rights. Additionally, several network meetings were facilitated by ILO and CNV to set up the Japbusi network. In December 2018, Japbusi was formally established, representing more than 500,000 palm oil workers. The network incorporates eight federations (belonging to 4 confederations in Indonesia). Hukatan holds the secretariat of the network. Hukatan promotes the use of the social dialogue by the Japbusi members at the farms they are represented.

In the same period, Hukatan enhanced its collaboration with GAPKI, the Indonesian Palm Oil Association, among others as a result of the SOMO research that had been shared with GAPKI. GAPKI welcomed the establishment of the Japbusi network, having as such one interlocutor to discuss worker’s rights in the palm oil sector. GAPKI is convinced of the importance of the social dialogue and contributed to the trainings provided by CNV and ILO on enhancing skills for social dialogue. GAPKI also promotes the social dialogue among its members. Currently, Japbusi and GAPKI are preparing a model CBA that can be used for negotiations at farm level. GAPKI was also engaged in the research conducted by Hukatan on women workers’ rights and gender-based violence at palm oil plantations. In collaboration between GAPKI and Hukatan, a simple guideline on gender-based violence was developed and two booklets on how to prevent and mitigate violence against women workers, to be disseminated among Hukatan members and Gapki members.

The establishment of the Japbusi network is an important milestone in the palm oil sector as it aims at unifying voices and promoting social dialogue at farm and sector level. The contribution of the CEA programme is assessed as high, meanwhile acknowledging the contribution of ILO as well. The CEA
programme enabled access to the largest federation represented in the palm oil sector, which was complementing the ILO network. CNV and Hukatan took up the role of facilitator, trainer, supporter. Moreover, establishing a social dialogue in the palm oil sector proved to be difficult. There was a lot of mutual mistrust between trade unions and palm oil companies. The latter often intimidating workers that were involved in trade union activities (like the workers that were participating in the research conducted by Hukatan at the start of CEA). The contribution of the CEA programme was necessary to realise the change, but not sufficient in its own. Other factors also contributed to the enhanced social dialogue, such as the willingness of GAPKI to promote the social dialogue among its members, and the support provided by ILO.

Changes at the level of final target groups

It is too early to assess the results of the CEA programme at the level of the final target groups. Focus has been on policy development, awareness raising and development of toolkits targeting national and provincial governments and private sector actors. Policies and toolkits are yet to be implemented.

Conclusion

The CEA programme was effective in realising the envisaged output and outcomes. At the level of the implementing partners, relevant L&A capacity was enhanced with regard to organising L&A trajectories and identifying relevant lobby targets, networking, engaging in multi-stakeholder platforms, conducting a dialogue with private sector and with regard to monitoring L&A processes. This has contributed to enhancing the legitimacy of the CEA partners in the eyes of government institutions and private sector actors. Relevant CSOs networks have been created and trained in L&A that are becoming operational at local and provincial level.

At government level, CEA contributed to enhancing awareness and knowledge of government actors with regard to the situation of small-scale farmers in the identified commodities and with regard to business and human rights principles. The combination of evidence-based L&A, formal and informal L&A, trainings and seminars have contributed to these results. Behaviour change is being noticed at the Ministry of economy who is developing a training module that includes business and human rights, and at the Ministry of agriculture that has shown commitment to roll-out the SOP for spices, including the provision of training for farmers. Effective implementation is still to be seen. Stronger results with regard to effective policy implementation are visible at provincial and village level, where local governments have shown commitment to participate in pilot projects (e.g. SOP, DAKOTA), to promote child friendly villages and to include forest spices as an important commodity in local development plans.

With regard to private sector actors, CEA partners have strengthened their relations with important employers’ associations in the palm oil sector, the association of SME and with a number of large palm oil companies. Frontrunners are showing commitment to improve working conditions at the palm oil plantations and to eliminate child labour. Downwards in the value chains, changes are still more difficult to establish. The combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches seem to be effective and relevant.
5. Efficiency

In the ToR, efficiency was defined as follows: (1) To what extent have the CEA outcomes resulted from economic use of resources (programme, budget)? (2) Were monitoring tools provided used to define ‘economic use’? It is not asked to establish a link between programme effects and costs incurred, which is difficult for L&A processes: L&A results are characterised by fuzzy causal relationships and contribution is often difficult to establish, effects are unpredictable or take place with a time delay and sometimes L&A fails, it is hard to quantify and monetise L&A interventions, resource allocation to differentiated results is complex.

To assess economic use of resources, a qualitative assessment has been done of the processes and management procedures in place to monitor efficient use of resources (time, energy, financial resources) in realising programme outcomes, which is described under the headings organisational and programmatic efficiency. Further the M&E system was evaluated, with a specific attention to if and how efficiency was being monitored.

Organisational efficiency

Description of governance systems and programme management procedures

The CEA programme is implemented through a decentralised governance structure, aligned to the decentralised and programmatic way of working at ICCO. At ICCO Global office, a small team is coordinating the CEA programme, including a CEA programme manager, PMEL officer and administrative staff. At country level, the programme is managed by the local ICCO CEA project teams, that are accountable to the regional ICCO manager. The Indonesia CEA team at the ICCO country office is composed of 2 persons, supported by 4 persons from the ICCO office that provide back-stopping support to the CEA programme: a CEA programme manager (in Indonesia taken up by the ICCO country coordinator), supported by the ICCO food security programme manager and ICCO private sector officer, and a CEA finance and grant officer, supported by the ICCO finance and administration officer and the regional finance controller for ROSEA region. The regional ICCO manager supervises the regional office and is responsible for human resources, finances, contract management and strategic management. Strategic management of the CEA programme is the responsibility of the CEA programme manager at Global office.

The ICCO office in Indonesia is responsible for the coordination of the CEA country programme and management of the CEA budgets assigned by ICCO and KiA. CNV, being the third CEA member in Indonesia, manages directly the CEA interventions and budget, which is done by the country officer Indonesia at CNV office in the Netherlands and the CNV country representative in Indonesia, in close cooperation with ICCO Indonesia. The CNV country representative and ICCO CEA manager Indonesia have monthly coordinating meetings, and more informal contact when needed.

No formal steering group was established for the management of the CEA programme in Indonesia. Implementing partners only met formally twice a year, during the semi-annual partner meeting and at the annual learning events, however a WhatsApp group was created for informal exchanges between CEA partners. CEA programme progress was discussed during bilateral contacts between ICCO and the partners of ICCO and KiA, and between CNV and Hukatan, that took place quarterly and more when needed. Monthly skype calls are organised to discuss CEA country progress and exchange information, involving the CEA team at ICCO GO, the CNV country manager and the ICCO
CEA programme manager of Indonesia. Similar skype calls are organised between the financial officers at global office and at country office.

Contract management at partner level (for ICCO and KiA) is managed by the ICCO country office and arranged via annual or bi-annual contracts. Project management tools entail a detailed activity and budget plan (annual or bi-annual), an annual narrative report, six-monthly financial reports, and quarterly monitoring lobby logbooks. For the CEA programme, new monitoring tools were introduced such as a lobby logbook and stories of change (quarterly). Funds are disbursed twice a year, after signing the contract and after the periodic financial reports have been approved. For the CNV partner, contract management is done by the CNV office in the Netherlands.

Both ICCO and CNV take up multiple roles: project management (incl. M&E, communication, managing partner relations), funder, implementor (participation in multi-stakeholder partnerships, convener of meetings, contribution in development of tools and guidelines), broker of relations, and convener of meetings, contribution in development of tools and guidelines), broker of relations, and facilitator of capacity development support (facilitating capacity development assessments, engaging in a dialogue on capacity needs and evolutions, provision of capacity development support).

**Influence on efficiency**

Programme management procedures and accountability requirements are assessed by implementing partners as clear and lean and to a large extent respected. Delays were reported by ICCO staff interviewed, with regard to financial reports and completion of lobby logbooks (and as such delays in financial disbursements from ICCO to partners) caused by delays in the implementation of the lobby trajectories, but these have not affected negatively efficiency (not requiring more time, human resources or budget for implementation of activities).

During annual learning events, specific sessions needed to be dedicated to explaining the use and importance of the lobby-logbooks and the development of Stories of Change. Throughout programme implementation, considerable time was invested by ICCO PMEL officer, ICCO and CNV country staff and implementing staff in completing lobby logbooks and producing the SoC. The use of a lobby logbook was a new tool and time was needed for partners to take ownership of the logbooks, but its relevance was widely acknowledged. The added value of the Stories of Change (SoC) is less clear. The SoC have mainly been used to assess progress at programme level, e.g. there is a clear link between the SoC and the outcomes reported in the annual report, but less to support monitoring at project/partner level. The quality of the SoC is varying among partners, not consistently used and sometimes SoC were drafted by ICCO/CNV officers and not by the implementing partner.

Roles and responsibilities are clear for all parties involved, and also clearly described in the partner contracts. The combination of roles taken on by ICCO and CNV, being at the same time a funder and co-implementor, was not perceived as a problem for implementing partners. Moreover, partners liked to see an active and implementing role of ICCO, complementing and uplifting their own L&A work, which justifies the large share of the budget spent by the ICCO team (see further 6.2.). Moreover, ICCO and CNV have been an important broker in linking implementing partners to networks and multi-stakeholder platforms. Partners have also appreciated the training provided by ICCO and CNV, and have further disseminated the trainings received among their own constituencies.
Implementing partners confirm that there was sufficient room for co-creation and co-decision, as also documented in the internal assessment conducted by ICCO Indonesia. The co-decision power varies between the CEA members and partners. ICCO and Penabulu obtained the highest score, explained by their level of involvement in the CEA programme (linked to one or both PW, number of activities) and stronger alignment with the own agenda and programmes. Older partners experience more co-decision power than the newly added partners like KpSHK. Partners experienced the strongest co-decision power for the identification of venues, the decision on lobby targets and events and the revision of the ToC during the annual learning events. The way of working with regard to programme management was assessed by partners as good and time efficient. There was no felt need to have a steering committee involving all partners, as partners are implementing their own specific projects, often in different intervention zones. Also, ICCO and CNV staff confirmed that the way of working was efficient, with flexible management structures that guaranteed smooth information exchange and communication flows.

**Programmatic efficiency**

No explicit attention was given in the programme management systems, including the M&E system, to monitor and measure efficiency, which is understandable taking into account the challenges to measure efficiency as described in the introduction of this chapter. However, there was an implicit use of efficiency principles through monitoring, learning and adaptation, and the CEA programme in Indonesia showed its ability for adaptive management.

**Following measures were taken to improve efficiency during programme implementation:**

- The decision was taken at the annual learning event of 2018 to narrow down the number of commodities under PW 3 from four to two (spices and rice) as not sufficiently progress was being realised and because of uncertainty of the effectiveness of the strategy to work with the commodity boards in all four sectors. Later on, it was also decided to decrease the interventions in the rice sector as the sector was considered too political sensitive with limited room for effective policy influencing.
- The use of indicators was adapted in the second year of programme implementation, in order to come with a relevant and more limited set of indicators to report on.
- Extra investment was done by ICCO PMEL and country office to explain the use of the logbooks and SoC, which resulted in gradually decrease of time invested by partners in working with these tools.
- At ICCO country level, it was discussed in how many networks to engage, taking into account the required time investment and added value of the network for the country programme (e.g. ICCO Indonesia not engaging in the IGCN network in Indonesia). It was mentioned that clear guidelines are needed to support this reflection at ICCO level.
- Collaboration was looked for with other international organisations, resulting in pooling of funding (e.g. ICCO and UNICEF) and pooling of networks to reach scale (e.g. collaboration between CNV and ILO).
- Lobby strategies were adapted to the nature of the lobby target, in order to enhance effectiveness and making optimal use of energy, staff time and budgets. Engaging with some companies required more investment in relation and trust building compared to others (e.g. Sinarmas GAR vs Wilmar). Similarly, different approaches needed to be developed for targeting International companies, state owned companies, or local SME involved in palm oil sector.
Applying context sensitive approaches: because business and human rights are a political sensitive concept, it was decided to use the concept of ‘Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)’ as entry door in engagements with private sector.

Efficiency is also linked to institutional sustainability. For example, the choice of creating and strengthening local networks of CSOs (e.g. KOBISA HAM, Penabulu network, NGO Council) is an efficient choice as these networks will be involved in up- and outscaling programme results.

Roles of ICCO in engaging with private sector were clearly demarcated and limited to dialogue and brokering relations (and not the provision of services to private sector companies or acting as a trading agency).

Annual global face-to-face meetings, bringing all CEA programme managers to the GO, were combined with L&A interventions in the Netherlands and/or at EU level, so to make optimal use of available knowledge, experiences and first-hand testimonies.

Efficiency was looked for at operational level, for example by making use of local transport, pooling funding in organising joint meetings and workshops and by combining budgets form different projects (e.g. PKPA using CEA funding in combination with UNICEF funding).

A few inefficiencies were identified, such as:

- The CEA Indonesia programme is implemented through a variety of projects that, although all contributing to the shared outcomes as defined in the PWs, do not show linkages or synergies. The partners implement their specific projects, within their own timeframes, activities and budgets. There is not much alignment between the different projects (between intervention regions, target groups and lobby targets). It is not clear how projects results have reinforced each other, and if pooling funding and bringing in more focus would have had more effect.

- By consequence, the complementarity of partners might not have been sufficiently valorised. A few examples were given: Hukatan and PKPA have shared information with NGO Council who was lobbying the National Action Plan on Business and Human rights. Trade Unions (Hukatan and the members of the Japbusi network) have become familiar with the work CSOs are doing in the field of human rights, which might result in collaboration at local level (no evidence yet). NGO Council and PKPA have given training to Penabulu on business and human rights.

- During the learning event of 2019, it was stated that results of PW 4 will have a positive influence on results in PW 3, but this linkage was not operationalised.

- There is also a disconnect between the lobby interventions conducted at global level and at country level. The monthly skype calls between global and country office created the opportunity for information sharing. But there was no joint planning or co-decision power. The fact that there was no ToC that could guide this connection might explain this loose link between national and international L&A. There was also a disconnect with the lobby interventions conducted by CEA members at EU level, e.g. ICCO Indonesia was not aware of the lobby CEA members and/or ACT EU was conducting on the negotiations between the EU and Indonesia on the free trade agreement, CEPA.

- During annual learning events, external visits were planned to specific good practices, pilot projects or companies for the entire group of participants. It is not clear how these visits were embedded in a learning trajectory or capacity development plan of each of the participants, and how follow-up was given to these visits.
- Some regional exchange visits have been organised (e.g. Stop child labour Coalition). Follow-up given to these exchange visits is not entirely clear.
- No ex-ante assessment was done of alternative approaches during ToC development, so to look for opportunities for collaboration, or reflect on the most appropriate and efficient strategies. E.g. Within PW 3 several challenges were experienced with the functioning of the commodity boards (also the spice board) and with the Ministry of agriculture not being very active. Alternative approaches were not fully explored, except the example of Penabulu deciding to invest more in collaborating with local governments.
- There was no involvement of the Dutch embassy in Indonesia (due to lack of interest from the side of the embassy), although the embassy was supporting the GoI with the development of the national action plan on business and human rights.

Efficient use of the budget

Programme expenditure increased over the years, demonstrating that programme implementation comes at speed during the last two years of implementation, which is often the case in this kind of five-year funded projects. The first years were used for inception studies, training, enhancing knowledge of implementing partners, investing in relation building, development of toolboxes and guidelines. Budget increase is mainly explained by new partners joining the programme from 2019 onwards, the increase of the ICCO share (staff expenses doubled in 2019\(^\text{24}\)), and the increase of the budget for Penabulu in 2020 (doubled) and NGO Council in 2019 (almost doubled).

The absorption capacity of the implementing partners seems guaranteed as the budgets per partner over the years do not show much fluctuations.

It was an explicit choice of ICCO to implement the CEA programme in collaboration with partners, though a large share of the budget was spent directly by the ICCO team (48% of the total ICCO-KiA budget for PW 3 and 58% of the total ICCO-KiA budget for PW 4). Partners felt comfortable with a bigger involvement of ICCO in the programme and were hesitant to manage larger budgets themselves for L&A interventions. The ICCO team consisted of well-experienced staff that remained consistent during programme implementation, contributing to building and maintaining relations of trust with the different lobby targets. ICCO and CNV staff have contributed meaningfully to realising results both with regard to capacity strengthening as in realising lobby results. However, a reflection is needed of the prominent role the ICCO team has taken on with regard to L&A. When it comes to political sensitive issues, ICCO’s contribution can be perceived by government as foreign interference in domestic policy processes.

\(^{24}\) A programme officer was added to support PW three and additional time for admin/finance colleagues to support the activities ICCO was directly implementing. In general, ICCO staff wrote more time compared to the previous years as implementation accelerated and required more support and investment from ICCO staff.
Table 1: Overview of the CEA programme budget spent per year (budgeted for 2020), per PW and per partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In EUR</th>
<th>Spent 2016</th>
<th>Spent 2017</th>
<th>Spent 2018</th>
<th>Spent 2019</th>
<th>Budget 2020</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total PW 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>923,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>36,692</td>
<td>70,440</td>
<td>83,370</td>
<td>117,072</td>
<td>136,533</td>
<td>444,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners 25</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>36,260</td>
<td>175,790</td>
<td>227,625</td>
<td>479,675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PW 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>853,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>37,747</td>
<td>79,446</td>
<td>78,329</td>
<td>136,468</td>
<td>154,335</td>
<td>486,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners 26</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,494</td>
<td>70,857</td>
<td>48,421</td>
<td>159,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIA</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3,066</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>8,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partners 27</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>57,962</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>62,059</td>
<td>79,075</td>
<td>199,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ICCO/KIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,832,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partners 28</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>41,616</td>
<td>65,102</td>
<td>63,616</td>
<td>47,116</td>
<td>207,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CEA programme ICCO-KIA-CNV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no maximum budgets imposed per partner (ICCO and KIA), but ICCO staff confirmed that partners proposed project proposals with reasonable budgets (budgets coherent with project activities). There was no shared decision power on the allocation of the budget. At ICCO office Indonesia, a flexible budget management system is not in place, what might be more appropriate for managing L&A projects, with unpredictable time frames and results. Budgets were allocated annually and could not be easily transferred from one year to another. In case of underspending, remaining budget needed to be reimbursed (and could be reallocated through a new contract). Overspending by partners was not covered by the CEA programme. This limited flexible planning and budgeting comes with a certain transaction cost. Furthermore, ICCO financial staff confirmed that there was an underspending at the start of the programme, which might indicate that not much attention was given to budget phasing, with a generally smaller budget provision at the start and an increasing budget towards the end of a project.

Internal assessment of most efficient strategies

The table below shows the top-5 efficient activities according to the implementing partners. There was no uniform pattern among implementing partners in looking at which activity was the most efficient, which is logical considering the peculiarities of the way of work of each implementing partner.

Public consultation, multi-stakeholder lobby and research are considered as top efficient activities. Penabulu has put multi-stakeholder lobby and research as top two, NGO Council has put lobby and coordination with government and business at the second, Hukatan and PKPA also put research at the second. This indicates that implementing partners valorise the evidence-based L&A as an efficient approach. Training, national networking and lobby, and document development and

---

25 Penabulu and since 2019 also KRKP, KpSHK, Elsam, Almajaya  
26 NGO Council and since 2019 also SPKS  
27 PKPA  
28 Hukatan and in 2019 also budget spent by Japbusi
release are assessed to be less efficient. Usually these kinds of activity, are considered as effective rather than efficient (more costly).

**Table 3: Top 5 of interventions considered being the most efficient**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penabulu</th>
<th>NGO Council</th>
<th>Hukatan</th>
<th>PKPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Multi-stakeholder lobby</td>
<td>Coverage and press releases on websites, social media and mass media</td>
<td>CBA negotiation</td>
<td>Public Consultation Seminar between Local Government (Serdang Bedagai) and BCRWG on the formation of a Child Friendly Business World Association Forum at the District Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 National Rice Actor Research</td>
<td>Lobby and Coordination to the government and business sector</td>
<td>Research together with research organization on GBV and women workers</td>
<td>Study on the Situation and Condition of Children Living in Palm Oil Plantations, Especially in Small Scale Palm Oil Plantation Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Story of Change Writing Training</td>
<td>Story of Change Writing Training</td>
<td>CBA training</td>
<td>Child-friendly village assistance in plantation villages and plantation circles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Partner Meeting and Learning Event</td>
<td>Actively involved in the National CSO network for human rights activists, UNGPs, and CRBP</td>
<td>National lobby for daily workers to improve their situation (contracts, hours, days, holidays, etc.)</td>
<td>CRBP toolkit development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Issuance of SOPs and SOP posters for the Quality Management of Spice Commodities</td>
<td>Virtual meeting (seminar, FGD, and Training).</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Strengthening the BCRWG forum in Jakarta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monitoring and evaluation**

The M&E system for the CEA programme was clear for all parties involved. The M&E system was centrally steered and similar for all CEA countries. Partners were requested to identify indicators and report annually on these indicators. Lobby logbooks and Stories of Change served to capture L&A results and were requested quarterly. Annual reports were sent to the ICCO global office. Annual learning events were organised to discuss and reflect on progress of programme implementation at country level. Specific learning sessions were organised during these annual learning events (e.g. on how to develop Stories of Change, on the use of assumptions, on how to talk to business, etc.). M&E at country level was the responsibility of the ICCO CEA programme...
manager. At country level, the central M&E system was complemented with project management arrangements such as the bilateral visits to partners, the six-monthly financial report and informal meetings.

The M&E system was based on the ToC and a small set of indicators was identified, closely linked to the changes described in the ToC. The M&E system served mainly upward accountability and was less supportive for learning, though sufficient learning has taken place during programme implementation. It should be acknowledged that not much staff time and resources were available at country level to support monitoring and learning.

During the second year, CEA country teams were asked by global office to revise the initial set of indicators and maintain only the most relevant indicators, which has been an appropriate measure - also from efficiency perspective - downsizing the workload in collecting monitoring data. The evaluators have following observations on the indicators:

- The indicators combine quantitative and qualitative data, with a dominant attention for quantitative data.
- As the indicators are linked to the ToC, which provides a rather general guidance for programme interventions (see chapter on relevance), the indicators are also less informative to support strategic decisions.
- Relevancy of some indicators can be improved. e.g. indicators for PW 3 refer to ‘the establishment of commodity boards’, whereas the project is not about the establishment of the commodity board but rather aims at supporting the (spice) commodity board in some of its activities (like the development of SOP). An indicator for PW 4 refers to ‘the number of CSOs who advocate for Indonesian NAP formulation’. The question is how relevant this number is as the envisaged change might be realised because of the lobby work of just one CSO or network.
- The distinction between reach indicators (number of stakeholders trained) and capacity indicators (having skills and knowledge) is difficult to establish and often a similar number is given. It is not clear how acquired skills and knowledge among CSOs, government and private sector actors is measured. There might be an assumption that training automatically leads to enhanced skills and knowledge.
- Some effect indicators are difficult to measure: e.g. for PW 4, ‘number of local palm oil companies that implement responsible business policies in accordance to UNGP standards’. It is not clear how this is being monitored. The evaluators understand that the due diligence guidelines still have to be rolled-out, a tool that also can be used by the Kobisa HAM network to monitor respect for business and human rights in palm oil plantations (but not yet available to collect data on the indicator). Are the data referring to number of companies reached.

The set of indicators is useful for monitoring progress at programme level, but gives little insight in the strategies, in what is happening on the ground within each PW and within each project. The data can serve (upward) accountability but are less useful to support learning. Data are provided by the ICCO team, based on the reporting of partners. There is not much ownership of these monitoring data among the implementing partners.
To manage limitations related to monitoring for (upward) accountability purposes and to support learning, other monitoring tools and procedures were developed, like the lobby logbooks (to gain insight in progress in specific lobby trajectories) and the Stories of Change (to capture expected and unexpected results). As these were new tools, time was needed for partners to become familiar with the tools and see their added value. The way these tools have been used can be improved, in particular by paying more attention to the analysis of the processes needed to bring about change. The way the SoC approach has been developed shows an emphasis on delivering the product, namely the story (often complemented, corrected or drafted by the ICCO, CNV coordinators). The SoC’s do not always give much insight in the strategies applied, the factors that were leverage for success and the challenges faced, the progress in the lobby trajectory, etc. The lobby logbooks are not always filled out well and analysis of the data in the lobby logbooks did not take place. Taking into account these limitations, it is not clear how progress of specific lobby trajectories is monitored and analysed (e.g. to gain insight in expected intermediate steps and changes towards the envisaged effect).

The annual learning events provide space for learning at programme level. Relevant guiding questions have been formulated to support the reflections on the ToC, though, as described in the chapter on relevance, the reports of the annual learning events do not provide the answers on these guiding questions. As such it is difficult to assess what learning has taken place during these events. It is also observed that no explicit learning agenda was developed in relation to some of the assumptions identified in the ToC.

**Conclusion**

Efficient programme management procedures and governance structure were in place and the programme showed ability for adaptive management. There was an implicit use of efficiency principles through monitoring, learning and adaptation that looked for efficiency gains.

Efficiency was negatively affected because of the project-based approach, limited alignment and synergy between project intervention regions, target groups and lobby targets and limited coordination between national and global L&A.

The budget is coherent to the activities implemented but there was limited flexible planning and budgeting. It was noticed that a large share of the CEA budget was used for activities implemented by the ICCO office, including a relatively large overhead.

A lean and mean M&E system was in place but served mainly upward accountability. The M&E system was less supportive for learning, though sufficient learning has taken place during programme implementation. It should be acknowledged that not much staff time and resources were available at country level to support monitoring and learning. Validity and measurability of the indicators can be improved, as is the analysis and consolidation of lobby-logbooks and Stories of Change. Within CEA this is acknowledged as an on-going learning process.
6. Sustainability

Institutional sustainability

Institutional sustainability of the programme results is assessed as high, as the programme aligns to mission, strategies and policies of stakeholders involved (NGOs, government and to a certain extent also private sector -at least the frontrunners), research and toolkits have been made available that are used as reference by the different stakeholders.

The CEA programme has selected implementing partners that had the capacity, competences and capabilities that are compatible with the ambitions of the programme. The selection process resulted in implementing partners with a fairly mature organisational structure, a relevant track record and access to stakeholders that are relevant to the programme. L&A knowledge and competencies have been further strengthened and toolkits made available. Partners were involved in collecting field evidence that is vital for future L&A. L&A is well embedded within each organisation, involving management and senior staff and coherent to the entire partner portfolio. The legitimacy and positioning of the implementing partners have been further strengthened during programme implementation. Implementing partners have gained access to networks and multi-stakeholder platforms and are asked by the government for technical advice.

CEA has engaged with government at both national and local level (provincial, district and village level), aligning to existing policies or policy development, e.g. with regard to child friendly villages, village development funds, social forestry, agricultural standard development and business and human rights. Toolkits and technical inputs are being integrated in government policies: e.g. the SOPs for nutmeg (pepper and cinnamon are in the pipeline) being rolled out at provincial level, CEA’s involvement in the trial phase of the Dakota system in collaboration with the Agriculture Office of North Maluku Province, BHR Due Diligence guideline of the NGO Council and L&A on NAP BHR has attracted the Sub-Directorate of Human Rights Cooperation of the Ministry of Law and Huma Rights to develop a similar document for government officials. Moreover, strategic partnerships have been built between NGOs and government to support policy development and policy implementation, like the Business and Child Rights Working group (PKPA), the strategic partnership between NGO Council and the Ministry of Law and Human Rights on the UNGP training module development, the SDG2 Working group (including ICCO and Penabulu). CSO networks have been built and trained that will continue monitoring policy implementation, like KOBISA HAM and the PKPA CSO network.

CEA managed to engage with private sector as well. CEA is recognised by Gapki, the employers association in the palm oil sector, as relevant and legitimate partner to collaborate with in the search for improving CSR and sustainability practices of its members. The focus on business and human rights is integrated in the sustainability and CSR programmes of the larger palm oil companies, but as CEA research had shown, still a lot of improvements are needed. Companies showing willingness to improve their practices have welcomed the toolkits, but are waiting for feedback mechanisms and support in developing action plans so that the toolkit becomes a more

29 PKPA has CRBP toolkit, NGO Council has BHR Due Diligence Guideline, Penabulu works with the spice standard and Dakota, and Hukatan with CBA document and booklet on women workers’ rights
hands-on practical tool. The documentary on the added value of investing in a social dialogue (showcasing Wilmar) will be further used to sensitize Gapki members on the need for collaboration with trade unions, as is the educational material developed by Hukatan and Gapki to address gender-based violence at the workplace.

Mayor challenges regarding respect for business and human rights are existing at the level of SME. CEA engaged meaningfully with the Ministry for SME and cooperatives and with the association of SME in palm oil sector. Knowledge has been built within the Ministry and training modules on UNGP are being developed to be rolled out by the Ministry. The CEA created networks like KOBISA HAM, PKPA CSO network and Japbusi have been capacitated to monitor implementation of UNGP at local level and to invest in the social dialogue at local level. These networks, though newly created, are built on existing memberships (NGO Council- KOBISA HAM) and relations (PKPA) and are well embedded within the implementing partners (all, e.g. Hukatan holding the secretariat of Japbusi).

**Programmatic sustainability**

As the CEA programme is well aligned to the mission, strategies and other programmes that partners are implementing, programmatic sustainability is guaranteed to a certain degree. It became clear that the newly created CSO networks still need further training and support to carry-out their assigned monitoring and awareness raising tasks. Not all CSO members are operational yet. CEA partners have presence at national and provincial level and are able to provide hands-on support to the CSOs and trade unions that are member of their networks. Continuation will depend on the opportunities provided in ongoing or new projects to integrate CEA interventions. This seems guaranteed at the moment. There might be the risk that new projects will select other intervention areas, e.g. spice sector was a new area for Penabulu, palm oil new for NGO Council and PKPA. Interviewees also referred to the fact that capacity of the CSO networks needs further strengthening, which comes with a certain cost (see also financial sustainability).

Upscaling of the CEA results might be challenging. An explicit up-scaling strategy was not developed and is largely dependent on private sector and/or government initiative and financing, i.e. rolling-out the SOP and DAKOTA for spices (after the pilot phase), rolling-out the BHR due diligence toolkit and the CRBP toolkit. However, some elements of an up-scaling strategies have been included in existing projects or new projects (like the EU RESBOUND project, the Spice Up programme, etc.).

Sustainability of the functioning of some multi-stakeholder platforms is at risk, like the Business and Child Rights Working group and the IDH-SSI platform, and dependent on the contributions (human and financial resources, in-kind contributions) of its members. However, currently there is sufficient commitment of a meaningful group of members to make these multi-stakeholder platforms work.

The CEA alliance has gained recognition and legitimacy among government and business partners, but CEA was not promoted or branded as an alliance. Complementarity and synergy between CEA partners became visible during programme implementation but has not been the point of departure or one of the objectives of the CEA programme. There was no specific alliance building strategy. A clear sustainability strategy for CEA is not existing, or at least not clear for the CEA members who see this alliance as a temporary alliance.
Financial sustainability

The selected implementing partners are well established organisations that have access to a variety of donors (Penabulu, PKPA), that can rely on membership fees (Hukatan\textsuperscript{30}, NGO Council) or that have a strong record in local resource mobilisation (e.g. Penabulu who has also a foundation and attracts social investors), with Penabulu having the strongest financial security and Hukatan, the trade union, being the most vulnerable. \textsuperscript{31} CEA programme has not explicitly contributed to strengthening the financial sustainability and resource mobilisation capacity of the implementing partners. However, participation in CEA has been beneficial to attract extra donor funding, i.e. some partners (Penabulu and PKP in collaboration with ICCO) have attracted EU funding to continue parts of the CEA programme, and other opportunities might emerge. In 2019, the business canvas model was introduced to assist the partner to position itself in the market and develop sustainability strategies. It is not clear to the evaluators to what extent the business canvas model has been applied yet. It looks like a missed opportunity, not having engaged Penabulu in strengthening local resource mobilisation capacity of the other alliance members. As described in 6.2., continuation of CEA interventions will depend on the possibility of integration in other donor funded projects. The funding of the activities of the newly established networks seems challenging.

Government policy implementation is hampered by the lack of sufficient financial and human resources. Policy implementation at provincial and village level seems more guaranteed and justifies the focus put by CEA partners to engage with local governments (spices, child rights), rather than the national government.

At the level of private sector, it was shared by several interviewees that many companies, and in particularly SME, are hesitant to invest in business and human rights out of fear of its negative impact on business efficiency. A substantiated business case has not been developed to convince management and owners of the opposite. CEA managed to collaborate with the so-called frontrunners or large companies that feel international pressure to invest in business and human rights. These companies have the opportunity to integrate CEA interventions and tools in the programmes of their sustainability departments (e.g. GAR having more than 200 staff working on sustainability issues). The monitoring of the CSO networks is important to control whether or not businesses are effectively improving the practice in the plantations, also downward in the value chain.

Social sustainability

CEA programme has contributed to enhancing knowledge of implementing partners with regard to UNGP, business and human rights, child rights and CSR, and the position of small-scale farmers, to strengthening L&A competencies and strengthening competencies to engage with private sector actors. Collaboration between CSOs and trade unions has been strengthened. A common language

\textsuperscript{30} Most of trade unions only receive membership fee if the company deduct the salary of workers, e.g IDR 10.000 per month, it’s called Check Out System. However, not all companies have willingness to do so. Most of the time, the membership fee is collected manually, only cover the operation at plantation level or district level, and are not even transfered to the central level of Hukatan.

\textsuperscript{31} Based on info from the websites (and for PKPA from the audit report)
and discourse have been developed among implementing partners and their CSO networks. L&A is integral part of the core business of the implementing partners.

It was not possible within the boundaries of this evaluation to assess the nature of the discourse and attitudes with regard to human rights and child rights among government officials, businesses and local communities. From the interviews, it is learned that at government level, the most pro-active attitude in favour of business and human rights is visible within the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, but less visible in other ministries like Ministry of Economy, or Ministry of Labour, which is evidenced by the absence of willingness to develop a separate national action plan on business and human rights and by the new labour law not paying attention to human rights.

**Exit strategy**

No exit-strategy was developed as it was initially planned to have two phases of the CEA programme, with the development of the exit-strategy taking place during the second phase of the programme. With the ending of phase one, partners were asked to include a sustainability plan in the annual plan 2020, which is not evident when taking place late in programme implementation. An elaborated sustainability plan and strategy, including up- and outscaling of programme results, could not be found by the evaluators in the 2020 annual plan.

**Conclusion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
<th>Implementing partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>High (fronrunners)</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>low (others)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmatic</strong></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial</strong></td>
<td>low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As summarised in the table in the above, sustainability of the CEA programme results is mixed. Institutional sustainability is high, resulting from the relevant choice of programme policy topics, strategic choices made, selection of implementing partners, and the attention paid by the programme to build further on existing L&A competencies and capabilities. Up- and outscaling of programme results will depend on the available human and financial resources that can be mobilised by partners in existing or new projects. An explicit upscaling strategy was not developed and dependent on private sector and/or government initiatives. Some private companies and local governments have shown commitment to roll-out CEA programme results and pilots are starting. Financial resources that can be made available by government and private sector are not guaranteed.
7. Conclusions and recommendations

The CEA programme in Indonesia shows several strong features such as (i) the focus on the dialogue with a variety of private sector actors, combined with dissent approaches where needed, (ii) the focus on a limited number of commodities, which enabled building sector expertise and targeted focus in the selected value chains, (iii) the continuous attention for small-scale farmers throughout all interventions, (iv) the investment in network building and multi-stakeholder platforms, (v) the application of a smart mix of L&A strategies with a focus on insider L&A strategies and evidence based L&A, (vi) the continuous learning and adaptations of the operational strategies during programme implementation. Following, we present the main conclusions with regard to relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and efficiency and a set of concrete recommendations for future programming.

Relevant programme

The CEA programme is a relevant response to the challenges the selected value chains are facing in Indonesia, aligns to ongoing policy processes and adds an L&A component to the existing programmes of the implementing partners. Relevant partners have been selected that have access to the grassroot level and that are able to bring voices of small-scale farmers to the national advocacy fora. A relevant ToC was developed that has been helpful in capturing the collective ambitions of the alliance and in identifying opportunities for synergy and collaboration. However, the ToC has not been used by the implementing partners to guide the actual L&A process. The strengths of the CEA programme, the L&A practices and learning thereof do not become visible in the formal ToC process. Assumptions in the ToC were discussed during the annual learning events, though not supported by an explicit learning agenda. It seems that mainly first order learning took place during the learning events (are we doing the things right?) and to a lesser extent second order learning (are we doing the right things?) of triple loop learning (questioning the assumptions behind the ToC).

Recommendations:

R1 - Improve the ToC approach: The ToC was introduced as a new approach and a lot of learning in applying the ToC has taken place. There is momentum to further improve the ToC approach and develop a country ToC, which is different from developing PWs, for example by (1) identifying assumptions that refer to relations between different actors and adding causal assumptions; (2) making linkages between several PW (including PW of international L&A) more explicit; (3) exploring alternative PW that contribute to the envisaged change or making these more explicit so to identify opportunities of collaboration with other actors/programmes.

Lessons learned from applying a generic ToC in country context

The ToC is built on a linear understanding of causal change, assuming that enhanced knowledge and skills result in behaviour change. However, the practice showed that more incentives are needed to convince private sector to adopt the principles of business and human rights. Alternative pathways of changes (or strategies) to bring about change are not explored or made explicit in the ToC.

The ToC does not give insight in the other actors that contribute to envisaged change and how CEA partners can relate to these actors.
The ToC is not sufficient explicit on the relations between the different actors: CSOs, large- and small-scale businesses, business groups or associations, commodity boards, government agencies, ministries, etc. They are all listed at each level in the PW without clarifying the relationships of influence or cooperation.

The linkages between the two PWs are not made explicit, not the expected or assumed synergy between the implementing partners.

A strong feature is the attempt to identify several assumptions, linked to the different levels of change. Assumptions are mainly formulated in terms of capacity and willingness of actors, which are relevant. Assumptions referring to the relation between the different actors could be made more explicit. Assumptions about causal relations between expected changes were not formulated. The inception report describes several assumptions (result of the power cube methodology), which might be relevant to inspire the formulation of causal assumptions.

Some of the assumptions could be subject of an explicit learning agenda: e.g. will the use of the due diligence guidelines toolbox result in changed behaviour of private sector (link between enhanced knowledge and behaviour)?; How to engage into a dialogue with private sector? Will best practices have a positive influence on convincing other companies? To name a few possible learning topics.

R2 – develop a more explicit learning agenda: A more explicit learning agenda can be developed, based on the identified assumptions in the ToC. Implementing partners can decide whether or not to participate in a specific learning trajectory. For example, it might be interesting to develop a learning trajectory on the use and results of the due diligence toolkit. This is based on the implicit assumption that companies in the palm oil sector are interested in ‘shared value creation’. The evaluation indicates that there is resistance among companies in adopting CRBP or in complying with due diligence requirements. Maybe other interventions are also needed, for example the development of a good business case, not only based on a human rights narrative but on hard economic data.

Relevant L&A capacity strengthened

A relevant mix of strategies to support capacity development process was applied, which were based on the needs of the implementing partners with regard to enhancing knowledge on the CEA topics and enhancing specific L&A competencies. Relevant knowledge was acquired with regard to SOP (spices), CSR, business and human rights, child rights and business principles, and the international debates thereof and relevant competencies were built with regard to engaging into a dialogue with private sector, networking, participation in multi-stakeholder platforms and monitoring of L&A.

Monitoring of the contribution of CEA to the capacity development processes of implementing partners can be improved. Formal capacity assessments were done, but only during the annual learning events and as such only involving a small number of staff members. No explicit capacity development plans have been developed, complicating the monitoring of capacity development support provided. No dialogue has taken place to support reflection at organisational level on

32 The concept of shared value creation can be defined as policies and operating practices that enhance the competitiveness of a company while simultaneously advancing the economic and social conditions in which it operates (Porter & Kramer, HBR, January 2011)
what L&A capacity is about, and how this aligns to the existing organisational processes that can strengthen or hamper effective L&A implementation.

Relevant CSO networks have been established or strengthened. A ToT approach was applied to strengthen L&A capacity of members of these networks, but implementation of the ToT approach requires further support (follow-up or coaching from implementing partners, budget).

Recommendations:

**R3 – Develop an explicit capacity strengthening trajectory:** A more explicit capacity strengthening trajectory might be beneficial to identify capacity needs at organisational level, to increase understanding of L&A capacity within the organisation, to develop a tailor-made action plan (incl. identification of contributing or hampering factors) at organisational level and the monitoring thereof. This demands for enhancing specific competencies at the level of the CEA members, i.e. facilitating a dialogue with organisations to discuss L&A capacity, coaching or mentoring of capacity development processes, etc.

**R4 – Invest more in building capacity on the functioning of multi-stakeholder platforms:** As participation in multi-stakeholder platforms is a key strategy in the CEA programme in Indonesia, more attention can be given to increase understanding of characteristics of MSP, how MSP function (in particular also MSP involving private sector), possible roles of members, and in case CEA partners take up a leading role, how to design and facilitate MSP.

**Effective local to global L&A**

A smart mix of L&A approaches was applied, combining top-down and bottom-up approaches, evidence-based L&A, formal and informal lobby approaches. The CEA programme was successful in enhancing awareness among government and private actors regarding the need to adopt international recognised operating standards and principles at national level in the value chains targeted by the programme, in putting the international due diligence on business and human rights on the agenda, in providing technical input for the development of such standards at national level and in making tools available to support government and private sector actors to take action, both at provincial and national level. These processes are ongoing. Dissemination of SOP, tools and guidelines just has started. The CEA alliance has gained legitimacy among government and private sector actors, resulting in increased dialogue and collaboration.

The link between national and global L&A is rather limited and fragmented (input in the revision of the RSPO international standard, the establishment of the national chapter of the IDH Sustainable Spice Initiative, provision of testimonies from local level in international L&A fora, putting pressure on international palm oil companies), mainly involving ICCO and CNV, and to a lesser extent the implementing partners. An effective global value chain approach was not adopted or included in the ToC.

Recommendations:

**R5 – Further reflect on and expand strategies how to convince private sector actors in adopting CRBP and UNGP principles:** A differentiated approach might be needed to convince private sector actors to adopt the CRBP and the business and human rights principles. Multi-national palm oil
companies, national private companies, state owned companies and SME require different approaches. Strategies need to be developed to accompany the application of the CRBP and due diligence toolkits, that might include feedback mechanisms, the provision of specific services, dissemination of good practices (e.g. documentary on the added value of investing in a social dialogue at Wilmar) or business cases, exploring incentives to motivate companies (e.g. award system, publicity) and a vision is needed how to evolve from the early adopters to the large group of palm oil companies. The toolkits can become living documents that are complemented with suggestions and good practices promoted by private actors.

R6 – Include strategies to link local-national and global L&A in the ToC: The alignment between local, national and global L&A might be strengthened through the development of a joint ToC. It can be further analysed whether the project-based approach is having a negative influence on strengthening collaboration and alignment between different CEA members and partners at national and global level.

Efficiency

Governance and programme management procedures were in place to enable effective and efficient management of the CEA programme. No explicit attention was given to measure efficiency, which is understandable taking into account the difficulties in measuring efficiency of L&A processes, i.e. fuzzy causal relationships, delayed or unpredictable effects and complex resource allocation to differentiated results. But there was an implicit use of efficiency principles through monitoring, learning and adaptation and relevant measures have been taken to improve efficiency during programme implementation.

A lean M&E system was developed, based on the ToC and combining data-collection on a limited set of indicators with new tools such as lobby logbooks and Stories of Change. The latter tools were appreciated by the implementing partners but its use could be improved. The set of indicators is useful for monitoring progress at programme level and for upward accountability, but gives little insight in the strategies and progress within each project.

Recommendations:

R7 – Further build the M&A capacity for L&A: For future programming, further discussions can be organised with implementing partners on how to use monitoring tools for L&A. It must be explored what the bottlenecks are in developing stories of change and in using the lobby logbooks. Further it can be explored whether or not it would be relevant to monitor the results of L&A interventions through a set of progress markers (expect to see, like to see, love to see).

R8 – Reflect on how to monitor more explicitly efficiency: The Partos efficiency labs in the Netherlands\(^\text{33}\) have analysed several tools that can be helpful in reflecting on efficiency, in particular assessing efficiency of different intervention strategies. The evaluators have good

---

\(^{33}\) Reference is made to The Spindle Efficiency Lab of PARTOS (https://thespindle.org/project/efficiency-2/) for background information on efficiency analysis – see also The Efficiency Lab: Lessons Learned. A guide to analysing efficiency of development interventions. Published by The Spindle, the innovation platform of Partos, the Netherlands.
experience in applying the ‘Multi-Attribute Decision Making’ method that supports critical reflection on efficient use of intervention strategies. It is suggested to experiment with this tool (or other tools) with partners showing interest in learning more about efficiency measurement.

Sustainability

Sustainability of the CEA programme results is mixed. Institutional sustainability is high, resulting from the relevant choice of programme policy topics, strategic choices made, selection of implementing partners, and the attention paid by the programme to build further on existing L&A competencies and capabilities. Up- and outscaling of programme results will depend on the available human and financial resources that can be mobilised by partners in existing or new projects. An explicit upscaling strategy was not developed and dependent on private sector and/or government initiatives. Financial resources that can be made available by government and private sector are not guaranteed.

Recommendations:

R9 – Develop sustainability strategies, right at the design phase of a programme: programmatic and financial sustainability of the implementing partners can be enhanced through the development of sustainability strategies. The business canvas model introduced during the last year of CEA is a good start. The evaluators see opportunities for positioning several implementing partners as a social enterprise (less relevant for trade unions). It can be explored how products like the Dakota tool, the CRBP and due diligence toolkits can be put in the market, and/or whether it is relevant to sell advisory services to the private sector. Several partners are acknowledged by government as legitimate partners. Partners can proactively propose their services to support government in policy implementation.
## List of people consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kiswara Santi</td>
<td>ICCO Indonesia</td>
<td>August 12 (kick-off meeting), August 19 (bilateral), August 28 (restitution), September 3 (Kiswara and Kuntoro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Priyo Budi Asmoro</td>
<td>ICCO Indonesia</td>
<td>August 12 (kick-off meeting), August 19 (bilateral), August 28 (restitution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Triayu Kodrat</td>
<td>ICCO Indonesia</td>
<td>August 12 (kick-off meeting), August 13 (bilateral), August 28 (restitution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kuntoro Adi Sutikno</td>
<td>ICCO Regional manager</td>
<td>August 12 (kick-off meeting), August 19 (bilateral), August 28 (restitution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>CNV</td>
<td>August 12 (kick-off meeting), August 28 (restitution), September 1 (bilateral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>PKPA</td>
<td>August 12 (kick-off meeting), August 13 (bilateral), August 28 (restitution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>Penabulu</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 12 (kick-off meeting), August 13 (bilateral), August 28 (restitution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dewan Rempah Indonesia (Indonesia Spice Council)</td>
<td>August 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>PSNI (partner of Penabulu)</td>
<td>August 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Directorate General of Plantation of The Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>August 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>KPSHK</td>
<td>August 12 (kick-off meeting), August 13 (bilateral), August 28 (restitution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>GAPKI</td>
<td>August 14 and August 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Konsil LSM Indonesia (Indonesia NGO Council)</td>
<td>August 12 (kick-off meeting), August 14 (bilateral), August 28 (restitution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hukatan, Japbusi</td>
<td>August 12 (kick-off meeting), August 18 (bilateral), August 28 (restitution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atmajaya University</td>
<td>August 12 (kick-off meeting), August 28 (restitution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>KRKP</td>
<td>August 12 (kick-off meeting), August 28 (restitution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>GAR</td>
<td>August 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilmar</td>
<td>August 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>RSPO</td>
<td>August 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>IBCSD</td>
<td>August 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>MV Foundation India</td>
<td>August 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>August 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELSAM</td>
<td>August 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save The Children</td>
<td>August 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. Lobby Logbook.
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4. Lobby Logbook
5. Hand Book of Standard Operating Procedure of Nutmeg Quality Handling in Farmer Level'
6. Internet links
   - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NbUP1TonQ-Q&feature=youtu.be
   - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bxrq66rFykQ&feature=youtu.be
**NGO Council**
2. Pelatihan Uji Tuntas HAM Merubah Strategi Advokasi LSM di sektor Bisnis. Training report 2019
3. Modul Training ‘Mendorong Bisnis yang Bertanggung Jawab di UMKM’ 2018
7. Narrative Report 2018
8. Narrative Report 2019
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**CNV**

**ICCO**
2. CEA narrative reports 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019
4. Report Learning Event 2019
5. Capacity Development Tool.
6. CEA Partner’s Contracts & Approved Budgets
7. Stories of Change
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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADS</td>
<td>Agricultural Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTSEAN Burma</td>
<td>Alternative ASEAN Network on Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of South East Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community Based Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Civic Engagement Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESD</td>
<td>Centre for Economic and Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>Department of Agricultural Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Disability inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIA</td>
<td>Disability inclusion advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC A</td>
<td>Directorate of Investment and Company Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoA</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRD</td>
<td>Department of Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
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<td>FDA</td>
<td>Farmer Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA</td>
<td>Food and Drug Administration</td>
</tr>
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<td>FSWG</td>
<td>Food Security Working Group</td>
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<tr>
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<td>GO</td>
<td>Global Office (ICCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation</td>
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<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organisation</td>
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<td>Kerk in Actie</td>
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<td>Karuna Mission Social Solidarity Yangon</td>
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<td>MCRB</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFPD</td>
<td>Myanmar Federation of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRF</td>
<td>Myanmar Rice Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRL</td>
<td>Maximum Residue Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAG</td>
<td>Network Activities Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCRPD</td>
<td>National Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>National League for Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>Radanar Ayar Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFDA</td>
<td>Regional Farmer Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMO</td>
<td>Ratana Metta Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PwD</td>
<td>People with Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Pulses, People, Planet and Profit Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoC</td>
<td>Story of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFDA</td>
<td>Township Farmer Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLMMM</td>
<td>The Leprosy Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPD</td>
<td>Department of Trade Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWG-CL</td>
<td>Technical Working Group on Child Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMFCCI</td>
<td>Union of Myanmar Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGP</td>
<td>United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEF</td>
<td>World Economic Forum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

Objectives of the evaluation

The objective of the evaluation of the CEA programme is to assess to what extent and how CEA and their in-country implementing partner organisations have progressed in reaching sustainable results as formulated in the Theories of Change of the specific country pathways during the period 2016-2020. In particular, the evaluation seeks to assess the effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and efficiency of the programme, related to changes the programme has contributed to in relation to: (a) capacities for lobbying and advocacy of Southern partner organisations, and (b) agendas, policies and practices of government and market actors.

The evaluation consists of four phases: (1) an inception stage, (2) a desk study phase, (c) a phase of primary data collection, involving three country case studies and an analysis of the L&A interventions conducted at the Netherlands and EU level, (4) a phase of consolidated analysis, reporting, debriefing and communication. This report presents the findings of the evaluation in Myanmar.

Methodology

Figure 1. CEA Myanmar Evaluation process

The evaluation process comprised seven main activity components:

- **Desk research**: During the desk study phase, relevant documentation related to CEA programme in Myanmar has been consulted. During this phase, three specific cases have been selected to be subject of a contribution analysis.

- **Virtual kick-off workshop**: A 2.5 hours virtual workshop took place in July 28 aimed at introducing the evaluation, creating partners’ ownership for the evaluation, and conducting a first joint overall assessment of the country programme. 12 participants from 7 organisations attended (including ICCO Myanmar staff). The agenda and participants lists are provided in Annexes 2 and 3.

- **Bilateral meetings with CEA partners**: 7 bilateral meetings (involving 15 participants) were conducted with CEA Myanmar’s partners (including ICCO). 2 took place face to face, and 5 were remote. Some meetings involved more than one representative of the partner organisations, while others involved only one member. The meetings aimed at understanding partners’ involvement in the programme, L&A results and the contribution to capacity development. In those cases, in which the implementing partner was involved
in one of the cases selected for contribution analysis, the second half the meeting was devoted to discuss that process. A list of participants of these meetings is provided in Annex 2.

- **Contribution analysis for selected cases:** during desk research phase, three cases have been selected to be subject of a contribution analysis, aimed at identifying the contribution an intervention has made to a change or set of changes. The following selection criteria were applied to select the cases: (i) involvement of variety of implementing partners; (ii) importance of case for the entire country programme, (iii) relevant commodities represented, (iv) tangible results realised, and (v) variation of results achieved at local, district, national level, and linkages to international L&A. Contribution analysis for the three cases were conducted with input from involved partners, including the production of a timeline, and entailed interviews with external stakeholders related to each case. The three cases were subject to a contribution analysis were: 1. L&A for GAP certificates at regional level; 2. L&A on food safety in Parliament; and 3. L&A campaign for paddy fair market price. These cases are presented as performance stories in the Effectiveness chapter.

- **Interviews with external stakeholders:** 15 interviews with external stakeholders were conducted to complement the reconstruction of the L&A trajectory of the selected cases and collect perspectives on the contribution of CEA and its partners. These stakeholders were members of networks/multi-stakeholder fora CEA has contributed to, representatives of government institutions, and representatives of the private sector, among others. The list of interviewees is available in Annex 2.

- **Restitution workshop:** A 2.5 hours virtual workshop took place in September 1 aimed at present preliminary high-level findings of the assessment of the CEA country programme, and jointly reflect, discuss and validate them. 12 participants from 6 organisations attended (including ICCO Myanmar staff). The agenda and participants list are provided in Annexes 2 and 3.

- **Country report:** this report presents the findings of the evaluation in relation to the evaluation framework defined in the inception phase, and offers recommendations for ICCO, other members of CEA alliance and partners in Myanmar, to increase the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of future related interventions.

**Limitations**

The following factors have represented limits to the data collection process which in cases resulted in the lack of substantial evidence to support achievements affirmed by stakeholders, and in gaps in data analysis and in the presentation of findings.

- Originally, field visits were planned for May-June 2020. The outbreak of COVID-19 has affected international development assignments in many ways. One of them is the possibility of conducting field visits due to travel bans or in-country health safety considerations (e.g.: possibility of visiting areas outside the capital city, or the possibility to hold meetings in closed spaces). This situation has impacted the evaluation in different aspects:
  - While a team of two evaluators has been assembled (one international, one national), the international evaluator was not able to travel, having to conduct workshops, meetings and interviews remotely. This not only represents a disadvantage at the time of collecting qualitative data, but it has also affected the co-implementation approach originally envisaged.
  - Even within the country, the national consultant was only able to hold a few meetings and interviews in presence, while most of them (including both workshops) had to be conducted remotely, mostly by phone. The engagement of farmers’ representatives in the evaluation process was highly affected by this scenario.
Workshops were designed as a critical milestone to activate collective intelligence in the reconstruction and analysis of CEA programme. However, at the moment of convening participants, it was considered that a face to face workshop was not a safe option and would not make participants feel comfortable. While workshops were conducted in Zoom and the methodology was consequently adapted, they were shorter than originally envisaged (thus not allowing to cover all the topics of relevance) and not all participants could participate in the same way due to the challenges of technology and the different atmosphere that virtual participation supposes. Despite translation took place (thanks to the efforts of ICCO staff and the national consultant), the use of English to present most of the information was another challenge to the active participation of partners during workshops.

Due to the impossibility to meet in person, a number of interviews with CEA partners and most of external stakeholders’ interviews were conducted by phone, a channel with which most of stakeholders consulted feel more comfortable compared to Zoom or Skype. This meant that the international consultant was not able to join these meetings.

After one trial, it was agreed that remote and virtual interviews would be more agile and effective if conducted by the nationals consultant in Burmese, rather than in English, with which many stakeholders consulted did not feel equally comfortable and required a time-consuming process of translation. In practice, this meant that the international consultant was not able to join interviews in Burmese, which were the majority of interviews with partners, and all the interviews with external stakeholders.

The 10.30 hours difference between Myanmar and the location of the international consultant was another challenge to the participation of the latter in the interviews and meetings. While a few exceptions took place, which meant working at dawn (both workshops, strategic meetings with ICCO staff, and the first interviews with partners), the international evaluator was not able to join interviews and meeting conducted during Myanmar’s office hours.

Despite the efforts to reconstruct the L&A trajectory of CEA programme in Myanmar, and of the cases in particular, through the views of stakeholders involved (both CEA partners and external stakeholders), in many cases the person consulted was not originally involved in the CEA programme or related interventions, thus having very partial or limited knowledge to inform the evaluation. In some cases, or organisations, the person consulted was a replacement of former CEA focal points or contacts, and had not quality information about the programme due to lack of internal documentation and knowledge management related to the programme.

While the diagnostic sought to involve a broad range of external stakeholders related to the cases, there were four key limitations to this:

- For some cases, the stakeholders suggested by CEA partners were scarce.
- Difficulties in coordinating interviews with stakeholders due to time availability or lack of interest and willingness to be interviewed.
- The already mentioned lack of knowledge related to CEA and related interventions of some of these stakeholders, sometimes due to staff turnover.
- Most of the external stakeholder involved in data collection were male.

The top up approach that has oriented CEA programme design and implementation in Myanmar made it very challenging to the evaluators (but also to stakeholders consulted) to clearly distinguish when information provided was related only to CEA or other programmes/interventions as well. This was particularly relevant in interviews with external stakeholders, who mostly acknowledge knowing about an intervention or a CEA partner, but not about CEA as a programme.

CEA Myanmar included two new partners by late 2019, as part of a top up strategy with a project supported by Danida. The new project, its partners and its activities have not been referred in the data collection process nor they are mentioned in available programme
documentation. In addition, ICCO officers indicated that related activities have recently started. Consequently, while a few references are included in the evaluation report, the activities conducted by these new partners were not assessed in this evaluation.

Taking into account the limitations described, the evaluators consider that the evaluation provides a reliable picture of the results of the CEA programme in Myanmar. Triangulation was done through the combination of written resources (programme documents and outputs) with interviews targeting both internal and external stakeholders, identified by CEA partners but also by the national consultant. CEA partners had a chance to validate and complement preliminary findings in the restitution workshop, as well as provided feedback to the draft of this report. Moreover, CEA partners were requested to provide additional information to answer remaining questions and fill identified gaps after conducting interviews and workshops, which were provided via email and written answers. The main limitation is the lack of first-hand information on the programme results as experienced by the constituencies.

2. Brief description of the country programme

Context

Myanmar’s population of 54.82 million consists of more than 130 ethnic groups. More than 60% are Burmans whereas none of the other individual ethnic groups make up more than 10% of the population, and many make up less than 1% of the population. The country is 145 out of 189 countries on the Human Development Index in 2019 (UNDP), and its GDP was 6.8% in 2018.

Under the socialist government from 1962 to 1988, large associations were created for groups, including farmers, workers and youth, which were tightly controlled by the state. Formation of CSOs was not allowed legally at that time. In the 1990s and 2000s, CBOs and NGOs proliferated from within ethnic communities, especially in areas where the central government had weak control. Youth groups, women’s organisations, environmental and sustainable development-focused groups, among others, arose to meet community needs and address critical social issues. In 2008, the devastation caused by Cyclone Nargis provided the opportunity for the formation of CSOs to support recovery work.

Only after the 2010 elections, Myanmar opened to democratisation and external influences. Since then there is more space for CSOs to pursue their objectives, but the civic space is still restricted. Legal and practical restrictions remain in many areas, where authorities continue to view civil society activity with suspicion. While civil society stakeholders are increasingly working with and coordinating activities with the government at the levels of villages, townships, states and regions, and national/union levels, some topics are still very hard to discuss with the Myanmar government officials particularly in the areas of peacebuilding, new citizenship laws, land rights and freedom of voice.

With rice, pulses are one of Myanmar’s most valuable agricultural export. The sown area of pulses in Myanmar is 21.2% of its total cultivated area. While there is a high pulses production potential in Myanmar, small-scale producers in the pulses sector are not able to benefit from it in terms of an increase in income, and as a consequence stay entrapped in chronic poverty. This problem is caused by the low productivity and product quality (due to limited access: to improved seed varieties; to and right use of agrochemicals; to technical advice like GAP; to appropriate financial services; among others), lack of access to more diversified markets, lack of organisation to deal with buyers and do collective marketing and increase joint negotiation power, and lack of policies to stimulate inclusive market systems and value chain development. Moreover, farmers are still hesitant to work together

---

1 This section summarises, updates and complements with relevant information the three sections in the country programme report that describe the situation and problem to be addressed under each PW.

2 Department of Population, Myanmar.
in cooperatives or associations due to a history with mismanaged and co-opted government-run cooperatives. Similarly, many small and medium-sized enterprises have been focused on doing business informally and keeping information sharing to a minimum to protect their interests. Also, marginalized groups are rarely represented by farmers groups and CSOs that support them.

Myanmar is experiencing significant changes to the legal environment for business, especially in areas related to labour rights, land and environment. While Myanmar has signed onto various conventions such as related to labour, harmonisation and implementation of these laws is lacking. There remains a lack of clarity on a major number of these issues, including minimum wage and other labour conditions, child labour, inclusion of PwD, and land rights. Trade unions were only legalized in Myanmar in 2012. The capacity to support this change, including among workers, government officials and trade unions themselves, is not yet in place. Child labour is a widespread phenomenon in Myanmar. According to ILO’s 2015 Labour Force Survey Report $^3$ 1,13 million children aged 5 to 17 years – or 9.3% of the child population– are in child labour, with over half of them trapped in hazardous work likely to harm their physical, mental or moral development. Key sectors were child labour occurs are Agriculture (60.5%), Manufacture (12%) and wholesales and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles etc. (11%). While Myanmar has a set of laws that protects children, there is no specific law about child labour in the country.

According to the population and housing census in 2014, PwD represent the 4.6% of total population in Myanmar, and 58% of them live in rural areas. An inter censal survey in 2019 that included a broader set of disability questions revealed an updated number of 12.8% PwD in Myanmar. They experience lower literacy rates, higher drop-out rates from school, lower participation in the labour force, being women with disabilities the most marginalized. While the government of Myanmar has endorsed national and international commitments to support PwD, they do not get full protection and they face stigma and discrimination in their society.

As it happens with PwD, Myanmar has ratified international policy initiatives to improve the situation of women, including the CEDAW in 1997. Myanmar has also developed a National Strategic Plan for Advancement of Women (NSPAW). But gender and cultural norms put barriers to the exercise of women political, social and economic rights. In the 2018 gender inequality index, Myanmar ranked as 148 of 189 countries. Despite their significant contribution to the agricultural sector, women farmers are often excluded from access to resources for production and training, and usually invisible in policy design.

**Introduction of the ToC and PWs**

The Myanmar inception country programme (2016) indicates an initial interest in PWs 1, 3 and 4. While PW1 was later discarded (Annual report 2016), the goal of supporting and strengthening CSOs will remain as a cross-cutting ambition. As a result, the programme focused on PWs 3 and 4. While the wording of the goals has been changing since they were defined in the country programme report, one of the more recent programme documents$^4$ indicates the following:

- **PW3**: Smallholder producer empowerment. The overall goal was: “Stronger position of smallholder farmers, in value chains, and inclusion of women, youth and people with disabilities in their organisations.”
  - Corresponding outcome was formulated as: “Favorable policies, policy frameworks, regulations, practices (enforcement, standard operating procedures (SOPs)) and

---


support from government, private sector and farmers/labour associations targeted at smallholder farmers, including women, youth and PWD” (ToC, March 2019)

- PW4: Towards an inclusive private sector. The overall goal was: “Adherence to responsibility to protect and respect human rights by governments and companies (e.g: UNGP)”
  - Corresponding outcome was formulated as: “Government, companies and associations implement Responsible (agri)Business standards in their National Action Plan and business models” (ToC, March 2019)

The empowerment of smallholders under PW3 forms the basis of an inclusive, sustainable and climate-smart pulses value chain in Myanmar. Related issues that CEA sought to address under PW3 were farmers’ organisation, land registration, access to good quality seeds, access to markets, climate smart agriculture, inclusive business practices. Under the concept of responsible and inclusive business practices in PW4, CEA sought to focus mainly on fair labour conditions, child protection in agricultural value chains, inclusiveness of PWD, and compliance with land rights.

A first ToC only for PW4 appeared in the country programme. A more consolidated version of two ToCs appeared in the 2017 Learning Workshop report, later adapted in 2019 Learning Workshop (see Annex 3). These are almost two identical stand-alone ToCs, and no explicit reference to the linkages between them. Except for their desired impact and outcomes, the rest of the ToC components (behavioural and capacity desired changes, outputs and intervention strategies) are the same.

**Presentation of partners involved**

CEA international members involved in Myanmar programme include ICCO, KiA and coPrisma. ICCO had a coordinating and implementing role, and it also contracted most national implementing partners. KiA supported PW4 by managing contract with one national partner. coPrisma supported disability inclusion work by managing contract with TLMM.

The national implementing partners involved in CEA were:

- **Centre for Economic and Social Development (CESD):** Independent and non-political think tank supporting evidence-based policy making. It undertakes policy research across the following areas: Food security, Migration, Research systems and higher education.
  - CESD was mainly involved in PW3 through policy research on pulses value chain and national export strategy, and facilitation of stakeholder relations.

- **Karuna Mission Social Solidarity Yangon (KMSS):** KMSS is a network of 16 Diocesan Offices (Dos) and a Yangon-based National Office (NO). The DOs play the key role in implementing multi-sectoral programming, while the NO provides a technical support and coordination role.
  - KMSS Yangon was involved in PW3 and PW4, with a focus on Good Agricultural Practices, land tenure rights, market and production constraints of farmer organizations in Bago region.

- **Network Activities Group (NAG):** National NGO that mobilizes communities, supports local governments, and facilitates linkages between the private sector and local producers. It builds the capacity of people and CBOs/CSOs, creates economic opportunities and promotes good governance in several areas.
  - NAG was involved in PW3 through L&A capacity building for farmer organisations, women organisations, and casual laborers in Magway/Yangon regions, as well as lobbying to regional and national level DoAs and parliamentary committees.

---

5 In the report, they are referred as CEA members.

6 In the report, they are referred as CEA partners.
• **Radanar Ayar Development Association (RDA):** Enhances the capacity of rural people against extreme poverty and hunger; empowers local civil society institutionalize itself and network for the regional cooperation mechanism that support integrated rural developments; engages in development programmes that contribute towards positive change in rural people.
  
  o RDA was involved in PW3, with a focus on quality seed systems (rice and pulses), and regional development strategies in Ayeyarwaddy and Bago.

• **Ratana Metta Organization (RMO):** Provides preventions, treatment, care and support for people living with HIV/AIDS and promotes the lives of PLHA and their families; promotes and creates good environment for the physical and mental development of children; provides livelihood support for farming, livestock breeding and micro finance to alleviate poverty; provides supports and protection for the rights of vulnerable women; implements development projects for the community for peace building.
  
  o RMO was involved in PW4, focusing on child protection and labour in agricultural sector.

• **The Leprosy Mission Myanmar (TLMM):** Active in Myanmar since 1898, its aim is that people affected by leprosy and disability overcome barriers such as delayed access to health services, lack of access to private and public spaces, and discrimination that prevent their full participation and acceptance in society.
  
  o TLMM performed as DIA and trainer in both PW3 and PW4.

In addition to these six main implementing partners, other supporting partners that also actively participated in regular CEA learning events were:

• **Myanmar Agricultural Network (MAN):** Multi-stakeholder partnership platform that brings together companies, government agencies, CSO, farmer groups, and financial institutions to link smallholder farmers to the market. Its goal is increasing farmers’ profits and productivity, while improving the environmental sustainability of their farms. MAN is the Myanmar Country Partnership of Grow Asia, a regional network established by the WEF in collaboration with the ASEAN Secretariat.

• **Food Security Working Group (FSWG):** Professional network of local, INGOs, CBOs and individuals who are working and interested in food security related issues in Myanmar. It addresses cross-cutting social, economic, ethnic, and environmental issues in food security through capacity building, managing knowledge and information, and advocacy, through effective network collaboration, communication, M&E, and organisational performance.

3. **Relevance**

*Country ToC*

Overall, the CEA programme in Myanmar has been a relevant response to the identified contextual challenges and accompanied relevant processes in the agricultural sector, by focusing on topics such as farmers’ organisation, land rights, food safety and quality, good agricultural practices and certification accessible quality seed, pesticide and chemical use, and export and monitoring import restrictions, among others. Moreover, some to of the areas and topics targeted by CEA started to see interesting developments through the years: the launch and adoption of the ADS by MoALI in January 2018, sustainable development (with the launching in 2018 of the Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan), inclusion of PwD (with the creation in 2017 of NCRPD after the Myanmar Law on the Rights of PwD was enacted in 2015), contract farming, pesticide law amendments, inclusive business (with the establishment of DICA and Impact Investment Steering Group with support of former DFID), child rights, among others. This is a signal that CEA targeted and accompanied relevant developments in the agricultural sector in the country (see Effectiveness for an analysis of those processes to which CEA has contributed).
While the ToCs captured and expressed the programme’s general ambitions, they were not developed through a collaborative approach, ownership by partners was limited, and ToCs played a limited role during implementation. Most of the partners consulted have indicated that ToCs have not driven the programme nor performed as the main reference in the design and implementation of interventions: “The ToC was not a very important guidance, we have revisited it a couple of times, but was not really used” (CEA partner). One factor that helps explain this passive use of the ToC is that its design in 2016 lacked inputs by the national partners, who were not yet selected at the time. According to interviews, implementing partners were not defined until the inception workshop that took place in March 2017. This is explained, among other factors, by the fact that CEA Myanmar has a late start, as it was first planned to be a ‘Mekong’ programme CEA together with Cambodia (CEA Mid Term Review, 2018). Although inputs to the ToC were received afterward (especially during programme meetings and learning workshops), this is a gap when it comes to incorporate partners’ expertise in the design of the ToC, and helps explain their limited ownership. In practice, the ToC was mostly useful for coordination purposes rather than for guiding implementation efforts: “The ToC guided at the coordination level [for ICCO], but not at the partners level” (CEA partner). However, while the participation in the design of ToC was limited, partners’ expertise was broadly incorporated in the design of subsequent interventions.

While the programme demonstrated adaptability to a changing context or emerging L&A opportunities, ToCs saw limited adaptation throughout the project. The learning workshops or team meetings were an important space to review the programme and discuss adaptations (of objectives and strategies), but except for some wording changes announced in annual reports and plans or in learning workshop reports, adaptation took place mainly at operational and activity level, in response to the opportunities in the local context, and as implementing partners contributed their work, insights and progress on what seemed to work.

In order to increase its relevance (along with its effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability), CEA programme in Myanmar was designed with a top up approach, with CEA as a L&A supporting intervention for other ICCO operations in the country and programmes funded by other donors (e.g.: Danida, DfID, KfW): “we realised that the CEA was an L&A trajectory ‘next to’ the ‘backbone work’ that ICCO is already doing in-country” (Annual Report 2016, p. 2); “We also feel more and more comfortable of “using” the CEA as an opportunity to do L&A along the lines of our backbone projects” (Annual Plan 2018, p. 2). The 2017 Annual Report pointed to the importance of synergies from a relevance perspective: “Other activities of ICCO in Myanmar, like interviews, meetings and workshops with public and private stakeholders, keep this intervention informed, in terms of what are the key issues, and who are involved that are potential lobby targets and allies” (p. 12).

Due to its aligned objectives, the synergies established with P4 project are a paradigmatic example of this complementary approach: P4 helped CEA develop more evidence-based L&A, and CEA strengthened P4’s L&A output. As indicated in Annual Report 2017, “rather than implementing CEA in isolation, it is “stacked” as one dedicated intervention under the P4 program of ICCO in Myanmar. The CEA component, responsible for 1 of 5 outputs of the project, implements activities like capacity – building of Farmers Development Associations (FDAs) to do L&A on issues facing the mungbean industry” (p. 4). Both programmes mutually benefited from their actions and outputs: “P4 reinforced the content of the L&A and CEA helped leverage the efforts of P4” (CEA member). For instance, this complementarity took place in the revision of pesticides regulations and law.
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7 P4 is a consortium project implemented by ICCO, NAG and East-West Seed, with support of DaNa Facility and UK aid: “The key objectives of the P4 project are to improve the enabling environment for the mungbean value chain in Myanmar by proposing policy and regulatory reforms; to increase the volume of mungbeans purchased by premium market buyers from farmer groups by enhancing access to support services on GAPs, Climate Smart Agriculture and collective marketing; and to increase the mungbean farmer productivity and quality of produce by enhancing access to support services and good quality mungbean seeds”. Retrieved from www.icco-cooperation.org/en/project/pulses-people-planet-and-profit-p4-icco-co-funding-nag/
mainly as part of P4, and the L&A conducted to influence them, mainly under CEA. Synergies also took place with other programmes implemented by partners, for which “CEA or L&A was an interesting adding” (CEA member): “Before CEA, [partner] had previous project with the same community and [partner] understood the situation. This is an advantage for implementing CEA programme” (CEA partner). Another partner indicated: “Actions of a previous projects of [partner], e.g. social auditing, coordination meetings, farmer forums, were enabling factors to implement CEA smoothly” (CEA partner).

In practice, this approach turned the dividing line between CEA and other programmes also run by CEA partners blurred, especially when it comes to attribute achievement. In the same line, the Mid Term Review stated that “CEA in Myanmar is well integrated with other programmes, so much so that the boundaries between what is and is not CEA are not always clear” (2018, p. 21).

The selection of partners looked for a strategic complementarity of expertise, experience, networks and approaches, but synergies were limited in practice. The alliance in Myanmar gathered research expertise (CESD), grassroots linkages and capacity to mobilize stakeholders (NAG, KMSS), policy networks (FSWG, MAN), and thematic expertise relevant to the objectives of the programme (pulses, GAP, DI, child labour). The ToCs presented in the 2017 Learning Workshop Report provided more detail on how partners’ expertise would help achieve desired changes by stating their responsibility in concrete interventions (e.g.: “CESD submit policy recommendations to count decision makers that reflect core topics” in PW3 ToC, or “NAG Conduct PGS workshop by inclusive model” in PW4 ToC). However, in practice, the approach was less cohesive, with each partner acting in their own sphere of influence and interest, and with limited synergies beyond some ad hoc and specific collaborations (although efforts to change this situation took place per mid-2019 through the set-up of working groups within the alliance, see Efficiency chapter).

Strategies and interventions

In response to the identified challenges in the agricultural sector, CEA programme defined a set of relevant lobby targets at the level of crops, policies and stakeholders. The programme focused on key crops, of strategic relevance and potential for the agricultural sector, such as pulses (second priority crop in Myanmar), oilseeds and rice. CEA worked to identify and position alternative options for pulses sector in response to changes in export policy and the international market demand (e.g.: mung bean), or to provide stability to paddy price. Accordingly, a set of key policies and strategies were targeted by CEA: ADS, National Export Strategy, National Pulses Strategy, seed, fertilizer and pesticide laws and regulations, among others. One partner stated: “CEA’s L&A activities and government policy and strategies are very much aligned” (CEA partner). In particular, the ADS was paramount for CEA, which helped CEA partners match their own expertise and priorities with policy goals: “most of the participant organisations have been involved in L&A activities aiming to contribute towards the ADS” (Learning Workshop Report 2017, p.6). Among the stakeholders, MoALI, DoA, DAR, MoC, and regional MPs (PW3), and MoALI, MoC, local authorities trade associations, agribusiness companies (PW4) stood out.

CEA strategically combined clear targets with adaptability and reaction to windows of opportunity, but some efforts spreaded thin. Some of those targets (stakeholders, policies and crops) were included as such in the ToCs, while other were incorporated as targets through implementation of the programme. As indicated, the fact that both ToCs and PWs performed as broad ambitions, provided the programme with flexibility and capacity to adapt throughout implementation, as L&A opportunities were identified. According to one of the stakeholders consulted, this has generated some trade-offs throughout the programme: “There’s a tension between adaptability of CEA and having defined clear targets, sometimes I felt we were not enough focused” (CEA member).

A relevant and effective strategy, product of a sensible political analysis, was to focused on enabling an environment for agribusiness, with a focus on facilitating interaction between
stakeholders for critical issues to be addressed. This is aligned with ICCO’s country strategic plan, and was anticipated in the country programme report. To mitigate political risks and barriers associated with Myanmar context, the document indicated that relevant government departments and staff would be involved during the planning and implementation “in order to create an environment of cooperation and mutual trust” (Country Programme Report, p.12). In a restrictive political environment such as Myanmar, an emphasis on dialogue, collaboration and coordination with government officials of concerned departments, and facilitation as L&A approaches is indeed a strategic proposal to bridge civil society needs with government interests and response.

The main strategy to do this was positioning the programme and its partners as facilitators of multi-stakeholder processes, enabling the dialogue among different stakeholders in the sector and “raising awareness among public and private sector of the importance of inclusive development of the pulse sector” (CEA member). One government representative indicated that “[CEA] considers all stakeholder in the chain broadly. They applied a holistic approach” (external stakeholder, government representative). This approach represented a change in the way public issues are addressed in the agricultural sector: “In Myanmar this model of stakeholder collaboration is quite new” (CEA member).

This approach has required the strategic balance between more visible L&A methods and low profile L&A, implemented through a mix of strategies (technical assistance, research production, capacity building, facilitation). The complementary expertise of partners has allowed CEA to deploy a comprehensive L&A approach, which balanced technical support to relevant stakeholders (e.g: RFDAs), research-informed recommendations (e.g.: to relevant committees in Parliament), capacity building (e.g: to RFDAs), or dialogue through formal and informal meetings (e.g: DoA, MPs, private sector). The process of sharing recommendations from the mungbean value chain research provided to the Amyotha Hluttaw Parliamentary Committee on negative effects of pesticides illustrates this comprehensive approach: “The fact that ICCO and NAG were invited to this hearing is both a testament to the good work being done in P4 project (which is being noticed by Members of Parliament from Magway Region) as well as the strategic use of various L&A methods: evidence-based research, cultivating personal connections through the programme managers networks, identifying the role of UNDP, and a generally constructive approach to dialogue and sharing of insights” (Annual Report 2018, p. 1).

A constructive approach was also underpinned by the emphasis on the inclusion of a wide range of stakeholders with interest and motivations to improve value chains: “A constructive approach toward DOA and companies to collaborate and find win-win situation” (CEA member). CEA partnered with or engaged in multi-stakeholder platforms (such as MAN, FSWG, APF, Regional Farmer Forum, ALTSEAN Burma, MFPD): “keeping in good contact with network organisations (…) has given us good entry points to increase the outreach of our activities and hear more about what is happening regarding the topics that we find important” (2018 Annual report p. 12).

This approach also allowed CEA to promote joint policy dialogues at the same time it broadened its outreach: “The project focused not only on production but also on inclusion of all stakeholders (MPs, government departments, private sector)” (external stakeholder, farmers representative). Moreover, CEA recognised the critical role that the private sector has in promoting development in the agricultural sector and consequently established strategic linkages with companies: “I like this project (…) They highlighted the role of private sector in value chain” (external stakeholder, private sector). The 2018 Annual report acknowledged the results of this collaborative approach: “Due to being able to share evidence, share results from interventions, and bring local organisations and groups to multi-stakeholder settings, the contributions of CEA partners is perceived as more valuable” (p. 12).

8 In facilitating the consultation process for the Parliamentary committee.
Research evidence was also produced in synergies with other projects (e.g.: P4), and CEA leveraged it through L&A. Because of its think tank profile, CESD contributed to increase the research capacity of the programme. RMO also conducted research on child labour in agriculture in three townships (Shwekyin, Kayan, and Thonegwa), and KMSS on return on investment for farmers. Evidence informed L&A was critical to engage government representatives: “If [CEA partners] cannot give evidence-based stories to member of parliaments and government officials, they will never accept what they say” (CEA member). Evidence did not only come from systematic research processes, but also from stakeholders consultations to “collect policy recommendations and bring to government for policy change” (CEA member), and from on the practical experience: “CEA linked on the ground results through development projects (farmers group formation, seed access, income improvements) with lobby messages”.

Trying new approaches at local level to inform L&A at national level was a recurrent strategy in CEA Myanmar. In the same line, strategic bonds have been established with local governments representatives, representatives of national government in the local level (DoA township), and regional MPs. However, a revision of the ToC assumptions in Annual Report 2018, indicated that the capacity to establish linkages between local, national and international, was affected by issues such as “the limited outreach beyond national level of the ADS, and the disconnect between experiences at the village level and the national level regarding land policy” (Annual Report, 2018, p. 10).

Connections with an international L&A agenda were sought too but have been limited in practice. CEA followed and tried to integrate trends and opportunities at the international level in its work. For instance by seeking market alternatives after India’s announcement of import restrictions on pulses and beans from Myanmar, by commissioning research on role of ASEAN in promoting UNGPs in agricultural value chains (published in September 2018), by conducting research on the impact of EU policies in Myanmar, and through interactions with the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Yangon established in 2013, which gave CEA regular updates on the situation in the country, and any new policies and regulations in the field of agriculture. Available reports also showed a periodical monitoring of how international, Dutch and Asian developments would affect the programme in the country. However, in practice, the linkages between an international agenda were limited, and CEA in Myanmar focus more on the domestic sphere.

L&A capacity building of partners was a core strategy to achieve CEA’s goals, and it was conducted through a combination of trainings and implementation of interventions, but the programme lacked an overall strategy to guide its efforts. A first assessment was conducted in the 2017 Learning Workshop, using the five core capabilities (5C) identified by Baser at al. (2008), adapted to L&A. L&A plans per partner were also produced as part of the Workshop, but there’s no information on whether they have guided interventions or if they have been monitored. There’s no indication of an overall capacity development strategy (with defined outcomes per area, specific objectives, a mix of methodologies, a pool of trainers, and a MEL plan, among other components) that has been implemented throughout the programme. Instead, capacity development seems to have been an ongoing process and emerged organically through other activities of the programme taking place through workshops and trainings but also and through implementation of interventions under CEA: “[CEA] combined training on L&A with identification of key issues that can be translated into high priorities for all stakeholders in the agricultural value chain” (CEA member). Regarding the former, while the 10-steps for L&A training was conducted and refreshed at different moments throughout the programme, partners have not pointed to any other specific training. Capacity self-
assessments were conducted in 2018 learning workshop, with each partner elaborating on some of the remarkable issues, and repeated in 2019 learning workshop.

**Programme responding to the needs and priorities of CBOs involved**

Overall, partners indicated that CEA programme and its L&A agenda were aligned with their mission, strategies, and ongoing projects. For them, CEA represented an opportunity to further advocate their institutional and programmatic agendas. NAG, KMSS, and RDA found in CEA another platform from where to strengthen farmers’ work at regional and local level, as well as to conduct L&A with DoA and related agencies. In particular, NAG had a recognised trajectory in GAP processes. CESD was able to conduct research in food security, one of its core areas. TLMM was able to deploy its capital knowledge on DI both at the organisational and programmatic level, under the innovative role of DIA. For other partners, such as RMO, CEA was an opportunity to contribute with their experience in child rights in the agricultural sector. In particular, the ADS and its goals were an opportunity for CEA partners to match their own expertise, working context, and priorities with policy goals. Likewise, CEA built on partners’ experience and networks to work towards its goals. Moreover, most of the partners have indicated that CEA legacy and achievements will constitute a steppingstone in which to continue enacting their agendas.

**Building on its partners extensive knowledge and connections at the grassroots level, CEA in Myanmar has made efforts to align its work with farmers’ needs and interests.** According to interviews, implementing partners were selected by ICCO and TLMM after conducting stakeholder analysis. They had some L&A expertise combined with clear connection to the ground level: “They looked for organisations who work directly with farmers (...) The partners selected have a direct link to the field, while TLMM and ICCO have a link to national level” (CEA partner). Since no actively strong Farmer Associations in place to partner with directly were identified, implementing partners’ ground level linkages would helped bridge CEA with farmers.

**Understanding farmers’ needs to design relevant capacity development activities was also key, but some signals of little adaptation to local context were shared.** Partners have emphasized CEA’s efforts to learn about farmers situation and integrate that knowledge in the design of interventions: “Before conducting training, we identified farmers’ needs in coordination meetings with farmer groups” (CEA partner), “and suggestions and voices of community and CBOs have been included in project design” (CEA partner). However, one farmer representative indicated that training would have required further adaptation to local context: “[Partner] provided various trainings for building up capacity of farmers for sustainability development. But training design and approaches are a bit boring for persons having low educational level (mostly lecture type). These trainings are not much effective due to training design” (external stakeholder, farmer representative). Moreover, even though the L&A 10-steps approach guidelines were translated into Burmese, one partner has indicated that the tool itself is “too ambitious for farmer level”: “it is more theoretical, uses a lot of jargons, and it is a direct translation of English to Myanmar without considering context” (CEA partner).

A paradigmatic example was the focus on mung bean. While CEA’s decision to focus on mung bean respond to the reduction of black gram demand from India and Myanmar DTP interest in supporting mung bean production as a substitute crop, interviewees in Magway region have indicated pointed to a few characteristics that make it a less suitable crop for the region. Not only mung bean is a labour intensive crop, particularly in harvesting time, and labour scarcity is an issue in the region, but it is also difficult to control moisture content. These features make mung bean less sustainable for the region in the long term: “The project put much effort on production of GAP mung bean in this region. As a result, farmers received GAP certificates. But mung bean is not much suitable for Magway region. Sesame is more suitable and they [farmers] change to grow sesame in the next 11
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11 With support of Tear Fund, MCRB and ILO.
season” (external stakeholder, government). However, it has to be acknowledged that the knowledge of applying GAP to a certain agricultural production might as well be transferred to another crop (e.g: mung bean to sesame).

The interests and needs of other relevant stakeholders at regional level was considered as well: “[Capacity building] is also based on suggestion of relevant government departments” (CEA partner). According to one interviewee, CEA L&A model bridged community needs and policy decisions: “We find out the gaps and challenges from the ground situation and then we bring it to policy makers” (CEA member). Coordination with stakeholders at the local level took place too: “By coordinating with parties such as healthcare NGOs, local village leaders, business owners and police, [partner] is able to reach a better understanding of the implications and follow-up needed” (CEA partner). Topics and qualified trainers were selected accordingly. In addition, one strategy that helped develop L&A capacity among farmers were the exchange visits, organised by CEA partners, in which organisations from one region visit their peers from others. This peer-to-peer approach was pointed as an important factor that explains achievements in this area: “If we would have missed participating in CEA, we would have missed the opportunity for farmers to learn from farmers, and strengthen the organisational network” (CEA partner).

Several workshops with farmers and relevant stakeholders were conducted (by KMSS, NAG, and CESD, among others): “[We] have annual review meetings for participatory review upon the project. All stakeholders (traders, farmers, supplier, etc) were involved in the review process. In the review meeting, stakeholders reviews on achievement, lessons, challenges and discuss on future plan based on lessons learnt. Project design has been amended based on feedback of stakeholders” (CEA partner). An effort to encourage, support and advocate for farmer led business models was at the core of CEA Myanmar.

Farmers participated as sources of information in research processes led by CEA partners. KMSS, RMO and RDA have indicated that CBOs and farmers were involved as sources of information in research efforts (e.g.: through interviews): “CBOs provided inputs in research process and we used findings of research as advocacy tools” (CEA partner). Research findings were also shared with farmers in validation consultations: “For the formulation of ADS, [we] facilitated a series of consultation with various stakeholders in Bago region. In designing CEA programme, farmers’ issues in ADS have been used as references” (CEA partner).

Gender and inclusiveness

The inclusion of PwD had a prominent role in the design of CEA Myanmar, and was encouraged both at the organisational and programmatic level. While it has been shared that Myanmar has an interesting legal framework regarding DI, which includes the NCRPD, “the challenge is implementation and visibility of what exists” (CEA partner). This is particularly relevant for the agricultural sector, where “PwD are usually forgotten” (CEA partner). PwD inclusion was explicitly referenced in both ToCs/PWs. In the ToC, inclusion was addressed through what is defined as a “twin track approach”, which in practice means working both with partners and with communities: “The twin track approach was brought in by TLMM to CEA, to have a more holistically approach to. In CEA, we work on the former [partners] and tried to achieve the latter [work with communities] through partners” (CEA partner). For this purpose, TLMM performed as DIA, working with ICCO and with partners to guarantee that considerations about PwD inclusion informed L&A interventions. Rather than being treated as a separate component, inclusion was a cross-cutting element of CEA Myanmar, integrated both at the organisational and programmatic level.

Due to the presence of the DIA as a dedicated resource, the inclusion capacity building aspect was more systematic and present than the L&A capacity building aspect. After the introductory workshops for all partners to establish a foundational understanding of inclusion and disability, capacity building for inclusion was very much individualized and tailored for each organisation’s goals. A self-diagnostic was also conducted using a scorecard developed by LftW, and based on the
results, inclusion goals were set for each organisation, which were monitored over the years. At various points over the years, partners requested TOTs based on their needs and goals, some requested coaching for designing an inclusive project because they had an application coming up, some wanted to focus on their HR policies and internal hiring practices, integrating disability data collection into their projects, etc. “That’s one of the reasons why TLMM work was effective: partners have freedom to work and TLMM has flexibility to support them in what they want” (CEA partner). Capacity building was also provided by PwD themselves.

An interest in DI at the organisational level prevailed, while integrating DI at a programmatic level was more challenging. Since agriculture is home to the largest workforce in the country, it means a great potential for improved livelihoods of PwD in Myanmar. An initial stakeholder analysis was conducted with CSOs representing PwD in the sector. The DIA also provided support in disability equality awareness, employment for PwD, and enactment of protective policies to empower PwD to get involved in agriculture activities. TLMM also developed DI awareness training to farmers and farmer organisations, and advice CEA partners on specific activities during implementation, such as the inclusion of DI question in focus groups to collect data about PwD, or the incorporation of facilities (for mobility, translations, etc) in CEA trainings. TLMM also worked closely with MFPD, considered the governing body of PwD in Myanmar, “to ensure that as many decisions and actions as possible are made in partnership with people with disabilities themselves (...) they are invited to many CEA events to ensure that the voices of people with disabilities are heard in our planning and discussion” (Annual report 2017, p. 4). In the CEA kick-off meeting that took place in March 2017, MFPD provided inputs on the disability perspective in CEA partner’s L&A planning, and also benefited from CEA’s L&A training. However, despite these efforts, it was acknowledged that DI work at the programmatic level was more challenging compared to the organisational level: “The inclusion work related to CEA was more complicated, it required more coordination” (CEA partner).

CEA and TLMM also develop capacity of PwD. In order to uphold the motto of the global disability movement, “nothing about us, without us!” in partnership with the Dutch organisation Enablement, TLMM conducted a 10-day ToT to build capacity of ten people with disabilities and/or affected by leprosy to become Disability Awareness, Advocacy, and Action Master Trainers, using the A.D.V.O.C.A.T.E. method12. As a result of these trainings, two of those Master Trainers with disabilities were hired by TLMM to co-facilitate a two-day Disability Awareness, Advocacy, and Action Course to CEA Myanmar stakeholders (Annual Report 2017).

Gender issues were deserved less attention, if compared with DI. In the absence of a clear focal point like TLMM for PwD, “the gender aspect was mostly absent” (CEA partner). When possible, gender was integrated as a layer of DI. However, it was also acknowledged that the gender agenda in partner organisations was relatively more developed. Some partners, are members of gender inclusion and women empowerment networks, and target women as part of micro-finance projects, or embed a gender lens in research: “In questionnaires’ development, gender related questions are included, such as questions about wages differential between men and women” (CEA partner).

Youth and children inclusion was addressed as part of PW4. It was led by RMO, which meant a new experience for the organisation, since they had no previous experience working in the agricultural sector. The issue was addressed under PW4 and the focus was on child labour. However, RMO worked mostly within the spheres of its interventions. Its role was not a cross-cutting like the one TLMM performed for DI: “RMO is not specialised in youth inclusion, they are not advisors” (CEA partner). RMO raised awareness and led trainings in topics such as child rights, labour law, and child law, for village level authorities and business owners. Skills and short vocational training for youth were conducted too. A number of events were organised with AgriProFocus on youth engagement in agriculture, with the active participation of CEA partners.

---

12 Assess the situation, Define the problems, Value the power of stakeholders, Opportunities and rights at stake, Choosing objectives, Advocacy strategies, and Track progress & Evaluate.
Conclusion

CEA in Myanmar has been a relevant response to the identified contextual challenges and accompanied relevant processes in the agricultural sector. While the ToC captured and expressed the programme’s general ambitions, it played a limited role during implementation. CEA programme in Myanmar was designed with a top up approach, with CEA as a L&A supporting intervention for other operations. In practice, this approach turned the dividing line between CEA and other programmes also run by CEA partners blurred, especially when it comes to attribute achievement. The selection of partners looked for a strategic complementarity of expertise, experience, networks and approaches, but synergies were limited in practice.

CEA programme defined a set of relevant lobby targets at the level of crops, policies and stakeholders. While clear targets were combined clear targets with adaptability and reaction to windows of opportunity, but some efforts spread thin. A relevant strategy was to focus on enabling an environment for inclusive agribusiness, by facilitating interaction between stakeholders. This approach has required the strategic balance between more visible L&A methods and low profile L&A, implemented through a mix of strategies (technical assistance, research production, capacity building, facilitation), as well as the inclusion of a wide range of stakeholders with interest and motivations to improve value chains. Capacity building of partners was a core strategy, but it lacked an overall strategy to guide its efforts.

Building on its partners extensive knowledge and connections at the grassroots level, CEA in Myanmar has made efforts to align its work with farmers’ needs and interests. Lessons from implementing projects at local and regional level were connected with L&A at national level. Understanding farmers’ needs to design relevant capacity development activities was also key, but some signals of little adaptation to local context were shared.

The inclusion of PwD had a prominent role in the design of CEA Myanmar, and was encouraged both at the organisational and programmatic level. An interest in DI at the organisational level prevailed, being more challenging to incorporate DI at the programmatic level. Gender considerations deserved more attention during the programme.

4. Effectiveness

Three overarching considerations are important when discussing effectiveness of CEA in Myanmar context, which altogether suggest the lack of clear boundaries between CEA and other interventions in terms of results. First, as it was already indicated, a substantial part of CEA L&A achievements are the result of the complementarity and cross-fertilization with other programmes as part of a top-up approach and synergies with other interventions by partners. Second, and linked to the first consideration, due to the lack of strong bonds between partners at the programmatic level, a significant part of the achievements have been reported as a result of the work of one partner, sometimes two or more, and very rarely as a result of CEA as a whole intervention. External stakeholders also associate interventions with the partners, and have less knowledge about CEA. Third, achievements at the policy level must consider the variety of stakeholders that seek to influence debate and decisions affecting the Myanmar agricultural sector. It is important to keep this in mind while going through the achievements presented in this section.

Changes at the level of implementing partners

A further understanding of L&A processes and incorporation of L&A approaches into the work of partners has been widely acknowledged as a result of CEA. Before CEA, L&A capacity among partners was uneven. Some of them had more track record on L&A through organising and developing capacities of farmer organisations, others had extensive reputation and capacity in linking research to policy recommendations, while others did not have specific experience with L&A processes. In the first workshop conducted as part of this evaluation, partners were asked what the added value added of CEA to their organisation was and what they would have missed without
Participating in CEA. The vast majority pointed to the strengthening of L&A capacity and the engagement in L&A processes: “[The added value was] to merge L&A as an integrated and effective strategy in agricultural sector development projects” (CEA member).

Partners acknowledged that after CEA they can now engage more effectively in L&A activities, and also gained independence in the election of their L&A path: “We can decide appropriate L&A tools without insistence from donor” (CEA partner). One partner also indicated that a further understanding of L&A processes has meant they can better bridge communities’ needs with government’s agenda: “If we would have not joined CEA, community issues could not reach to policy makers” (CEA partner). For organisations like TLMM and RMO, CEA supposed an opportunity to engage in L&A in the agricultural sector, a new territory for them: “it was an experience to explore how RMO could use their structure to work on a new sector” (CEA member).

CEA allowed partners to work in alliance. CEA helped connect organisations, some of who had contacts in the past, but had not had a chance to worked together in a sustained way. Among the benefits of working in alliance, partners highlighted: “Building partnership helps us feel connected, inspires new ideas and creativity, and an increasing understanding of important issues in Myanmar” (CEA partner). These allowed CEA partners to learn through the interaction with others: “[Through CEA we] got a sense that working in alliance and network is better than doing a standalone project. An alliance has synergy effect” (CEA partner). This approach injected strength to partners regular work: “Supporting the most marginalised is impossible alone. CEA has increased the impact of our work through partnership” (CEA partner). CEA has organically allowed peer-to-peer learning through its regular partners meetings but also through collaboration on the ground, for example, by attending events and meetings organised by other CEA partners: “attending these events is a way of motivation and capacity building for [partner] staff” (CEA partner).

Engaging in multi-stakeholder alliances was one of the most appreciated opportunities by partners. One partner indicated that the added value of CEA to the organisation was the opportunity to “create learning and sharing platforms with other stakeholders” (CEA partner). Getting to work with policy makers and private sector representatives was especially acknowledged by partner: “Through CEA programme [partner] got larger access to stakeholders in child labour and agricultural sector” (CEA member). CEA also allowed partners to build networks at the local level: “partners also gained experience in L&A through organising the community and conducting research to capture what’s happening on the ground” (CEA member).

CEA partners gained understanding of DI and implemented strategies to embed DI in their organisations’ policies and practices. Partners broadly acknowledged CEA’s contribution in this area: “When CEA started, partners didn’t see a lot of relevance for DI in farming. But gradually they started to see the importance, as CEA started to include farmers with disabilities, especially those who have had an accident while doing their work” (CEA partner). Capacity building on DI, led by TLMM, has been systematic. It took place at group level (with trainings and sharing tools) and with partners individually. In 2018, a DI ToT with 30 NAG staff took place, allowing NAG to integrate and facilitate a session on DI in their monthly Project Cycle Management Training, which they have offered for more than 300 young members from rural communities. Moreover, staff members of MoALI regularly joined these trainings as it was hosted at the Ministry’s offices. Other CEA partners have also begun to embed disability and gender inclusion into their organisations (e.g.: M&E frameworks, HR policies): KMSS indicated having included one module on DI in staff orientation sessions. In early 2020, RMO developed a PwD and gender non-discrimination policy. RDA also has a DI policy. Overall, as indicated in Relevance chapter, partners have become more interested in developing capacity of their staff: “This is the low hanging fruit, easy to do quickly” (CEA member). One partner stated: “DI is at the stage of awareness but not in practice up to now” (CEA partner).

Embedding a DI lens in partners’ projects and activities has been more difficult: “The challenge is that if you haven’t considered inclusion from the very beginning, then it’s very difficult to include it
afterwards, because usually it starts with data collection” (CEA partner). However, interesting results started to flourish in this area as well, and partners generally acknowledged being now more alerted to the inclusion of PwD in agricultural sector. For instance, one partner shared that although the organisation’s “core target is the poorest of the poor, we did not have a definite strategy to include them” (CEA partner). Due to DI awareness by TLMM, a partner asked the DIA support to include a disability lens in a proposal for an emergency response project. A partner also acknowledged having prioritised he management of cases of children with disabilities. Two partners indicated they now include a DI lens in data collection, and one partner started to engage PwD in their research processes, and conducted research on farmers with disability. The working group formed by TLMM, CESD and RMO in 2019 also sought to include DI as part of their responsible business project.

Building also in their previous trajectory, in the past years CEA partners saw their legitimacy enhanced through and increasing demand for participation in events, advice and input by policy makers. As indicated by an interviewee: “Due to effective advocacy to MPs and government departments, [CEA] got recognition from MPs and government departments” (external stakeholder, farmers representative). Among the recognitions that CEA experimented from the government sector, a few of them stand out:

- Country Director of TLMM Myanmar was invited to have a seat on the NCRPD, which has its inaugural meeting in December 2017.
- ICCO and NAG have been invited regularly to events organised by DoA and MoC to give presentations on the RFDA mungbean business cases, and the process, lessons and opportunities of mungbean value chain collaboration between farmers, companies and the public sector, which has been considered “an important example of successful public private partnerships in agriculture” (Annual Report 2019, p. 2)\(^\text{13}\).
- In early 2019, ICCO and NAG were invited to present their recommendations in the first ever policy consultative process on the negative effects of pesticides in agricultural sector organised by the Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries Affairs Committee.
- In 2019, RMO was invited to present at the World Day against Child Labour.
- In 2020, RMO was represented at the TWG-CL, led by ILO and MoLIP, which is an important mechanism for collaboration between ministries to implement the National Action Plan on Child Labour and on further promoting the Child Rights Law.
- EuroCham invited CEA partners (CESD in 2019 and ICCO in 2020) to speak at EU Myanmar trade conferences as NGO/CSO representatives.

**Changes at the level of CBOs**

Farmers representatives and partners have indicated that, through its various activities, CEA strengthened the capacities of farmers and of CBOs who support and represent them to engage in the public sphere. CEA’s work was a direct response to the limited civic space that small holder farmers enjoyed in Myanmar. Capacities in this area were developed both through trainings, meetings, workshops, and by accompanying L&A processes. For instance, in partnership with P4 project, CEA used the 10-step approach to train more than 70 Farmer groups (regional, township and village level), women groups and labour groups, which developed 38 L&A plans, and received coaching by P4 and CEA to explore and articulate their messages to regional DoA and other government agencies.

According to farmers representatives and partners farmers also gained a further understanding of policy process and gained confidence to do L&A: “CEA trained farmers to get capacity to identify root causes and issues and potential solution in livelihood sector, and important and influential stakeholders in this sector” (CEA partner). CEA also built farmers’ capacities to do direct advocacy

\(^{13}\) Six examples of presentations in conferences and events are included in Annual Report 2019.
to decision makers, allowing them to develop self-confidence to deal with government: “In the past, they are afraid to go government department. Now, they got confident to communicate with government officers if they have issues.” (external stakeholder, farmer representative). A farmer representative indicated being personally involved in L&A action to MPs regarding pesticides law: “As a chair of regional farmer development association, I participated in lobby process. In my lobby talk, I mentioned the importance of dryer to maintain moisture specification in mung bean and the importance of food safety labs. As a result, DoA established labs in regional level” (external stakeholder, farmers representative).

**Knowledge and capacity to protect children among farmers was increased.** RMO indicated having trained more than 2000 community members in the area of child labour. Trainings have provided communities with further knowledge: “[Farmers] are now aware on rights and legal instruments, and they can use this knowledge when they deal with government departments and business owners” (CEA partner). But it also produced a change of mindset: “In the past, communities have very few knowledge related to child labour. Due to trainings and workshops provided by the project, community got awareness and formed youth groups and women groups. Youth groups are working on establishment of village library and support for non-formal education” (CEA partner). RMO also presented concrete instruments to farmers to do L&A: “The project developed contact information book for legal issues if community face right violation cases and circulated to beneficiaries” (CEA partner), as well as raised awareness in local communities about support available in DSW.

**CEA supported the registration and formalisation of RFDAs, in strong synergies with P4, through L&A to government level, and technical and financial support.** According to one interviewee, “In the context of Myanmar, farmer association are very rare (...) Together with our partners, we contribute to [install] the idea of strong farmer associations across the sector” (CEA member). RFDAs can now play an important coordination role linking farmers with private sector. New farmer associations were established and registered in Magway, Bago and Yangon (e.g.: Aya Yadanar and Yaadanar Shwe Te Farmer Development Associations were established in Ayeyawaddy and Bago regions respectively), which “play a role in fulfilling the needs of small farmers” (CEA partner). These new associations gathered “thousands of farmers”, and have been recognised by MoALI and the regional governments: “government shows respect to this association and invited them to some government events” (CEA partner). The formation of these new associations was underpinned by a strategic L&A to relevant Parliamentary Committees to support these developments. According to a regional government representative, the registration of new associations is “the most outstanding achievement of this project” (external stakeholder, government).

**In order to support these new organisations and previous constituted farmer groups, CEA also provided training in a range or organisational aspects: leadership, business and financial management, accountability and transparency.** These organisational development trainings aimed at strengthening their sustainability beyond the programme timeframe. However, a private sector representative has indicated that further work is needed to help farmers association leaders a business mindset, and one farmer representative suggested that, while registered, associations are not very active yet.

**According to the implementing partners and stakeholders interviewed, as a consequence of L&A capacity building and the new associations created, farmers’ position in value chains have been strengthened, including negotiation and bargaining power.** Farmers are now more aware of market demand and developed bargaining to get a fairer trade of crops (and “escape from brokers’ exploitation”: “In the past, farmers understood just only crop production. They were not aware of market dynamics. They did not have negotiation nor bargaining power and they got the price fixed by traders” (external stakeholder, private sector representative). One government representative also highlighted this contribution by CEA: “[partner] trained farmer to work in collective manner instead of individual approach in order to solve the issues. In the past, farmers sold their products individually and they faced exploitation of trader on market price (...) Farmers gained confidence
and bargaining power to deal with private sector” (external stakeholder, government representative). Among other things, ask a consequence of this collective action farmers got more convenient loans from banks: “Bank assessment for issuing loan was based on collective selling of farmers, on how much they are well organise in collective manner” (CEA partner).

Other forms in which CEA provided support to improve farmers’ position in value chains was through funding for paddy dryer and paddy seed (in collaboration with KMSS), through support to production of market promising products (e.g.: mung bean), and the reduction of chemical in crops for the development of ecological and economic quality products (through GAPs).

**CEA created opportunities for dialogue and engagement and contributed to increase collaboration between farmers and relevant stakeholders in the agricultural sector.** An example of this approach was the third and fourth farmer forums organised by KMSS in Bago Region, where “farmer representatives gained opportunities of 1) raising questions to and solicitation of answers from technicians from government departments, private businesses and other peer farmers, 2) collectively presenting farmers’ needs to be supported by the government and 3) gaining ideas on future collaboration and networking among different stakeholders” (KMSS, 2018, p. 12). One of these regional forums also led to an important achievement of CEA (see Performance story 1) A partner also indicated that “farmers organisations were not used to work together, nor to work with government or private sector” (CEA partner). Not only CEA “created market linkages between farmers and traders/buyers” (external stakeholder, farmers representative), but also created opportunities for dialogue and engagement. This has also been confirmed by a private sector representative: “In the past, farmers and traders were like enemies. Now, farmers can create good relationship with traders, and they have good collaboration” (external stakeholder, private sector representative).

---

**Performance story 1 - L&A campaign for paddy fair market price**

Paddy is staple food for Myanmar and occupies the highest sown area. Through research conducted by KMSS on the condition of the paddy market in Myanmar, it was identified that associated traders monopolised the paddy market, affecting farmers’ capacity to get a fair price based on their production. At the same time, farmers lack of an organised approach to advocate for a fairer paddy price.

To raise awareness on these challenges, KMSS participated in the campaign of the Regional Farmer Forum, which lasted two days, and in which findings of the research were presented to 156 farmer representatives from 10 townships in Bago and Ayarwaddy region. Farmers convened in the forum jointly identified and prioritised lobby issues and targets. They came up with a set of six recommendations to improve market conditions for farmers, including the definition of paddy floor price. The Forum decided to lobby MoALI, chief officers of DoA and MPs in Bago Region.

Other stakeholders also strongly pushed for this measure to be passes, among them the MRF, UMFCCI, MoC, and MoALI. This recommendation was presented to MoALI, the Chief Officer of DoA, the TPD, 27 township officers of DoA and other government sectors, 12 CSO/NGO representatives and three representatives from MRF. A farmer channel conducted an interview with farmers and produced a video to further disseminate the six recommendations from the forum statement to a broader audience.

Weeks after the presentation of recommendations, Myanmar’s State Counselor announced a new floor price for paddy, set at MMK 500,000 per 100 baskets of rice for paddy production season 2018. This was the first time in Myanmar that a floor price for locally harvested rice is set.

In December 2019, a new farmer forum was organised to assess the benefits that farmers obtained as a result of previous L&A efforts. It was found that paddy price fluctuation still takes place at village level although the price has been fixed at policy level.

CEA (through KMSS) has partially contributed to accelerate the establishment of a floor price for paddy, by joining a myriad of complementary L&A efforts by other stakeholders in the farmer forum. This contribution is assessed as necessary but not sufficient, since L&A by other stakeholders was also critical.
Performing as an enabler of dialogue, CEA contributed to an important behavioral change in the sector: “It appeared that on the ToC result level of ‘behavioral change’, quite a few actors were active in the result area ‘CSOs, L&A representatives and farmers are sustainably connected to relevant stakeholders in public and private sector, for receiving support services’. This is especially so in PW3, as it appeared many CEA partners were trying to facilitate connections between the public sector, private sector and CSOs” (2019 Learning Workshop Report, p. 8). The visits from DoA regional representatives to Magway Region to learn from and oversight quality processes is an example of CEA’s performing as an enabler for dialogue and learning between stakeholders (see Performance story 2). Moreover, in alliance with P4 project, CEA facilitated the linkages between farmers and banks\textsuperscript{14} and, as a result, “farmers gain more access to credit/loans with low interest rate” (CEA partner) (see Changes at the level of value chains and private sector actors).

Performance story 2 - L&A for GAP certificates at regional level

Pulses and oilseeds are the second priority crops in Myanmar, after rice. India is the main buyer and market for Myanmar beans and pulses. However, India has established import restrictions to protect their local farmers production and sells. The restriction to import went from originally 500,000 MT to 200,000 MT in 2017, and the price was particularly considerable low for pigeon pea and black gram. In 2018, Myanmar government formed beans and pulses export Coordination Committee to address the problem of low export volume and price, and negotiate to export 150K MT for black gram, 150K MT for mung bean and 200K MT for pegion pea.

Recently, Myanmar was able to access the EU as a new market for mung bean, being able to export around 5000K MT in 2017. This amount is still a small volume and it accounts for only 1% of total production of the country. However, the price is higher than other markets like India. However, in order to export to EU market, Myanmar products have to comply with food safety standards. Myanmar’s mung bean sprout rate is 95% and shelf-life is also short compared to China’s mung bean. Likewise, Japan market also requires not only quality but also good hygienic practices. Myanmar farmers need support to produce mung bean for export in line with buyers’ safety standards.

Aware of that situation and to address farmers’ needs, and building on NAG’s pioneer expertise in GAP, in 2016 CEA (mainly ICCO and NAG) in convergence with P4 project initiated a series of L&A trainings of farmers in Magway region and series of advocacy actions towards regional stakeholders including Regional Agricultural Minister, MPs, Regional Departmental officers, traders and suppliers in Regional Level Social Audit, to promote the importance of initiating GAP processes. In addition, the programme conducted research on enabling environment of mungbean value chain and climate smart agriculture, and through trainings it raised awareness of GAP concept to farmer groups.

In 2017, CEA developed GAP checklist form, distributed them among farmers, developed the action plan for GAP programme and validated it with a wide range of stakeholders in Magway. CEA also organised a meeting with DoA’s officer for providing GAP training to farmers, which they have continued doing in a regular basis. In 2018, CEA partner, NAG, invited DoA officers to join field visits together to supervise farmers’ work and oversight the certification process. CEA also organised a GAP ToT for farmers with the support of DoA.

In 2018 and 2019, the harvested mung bean grains were tested on heavy metal presence in DOA’s Plant Protection lab for mung bean GAP certificate for farmers in Yangon region. Crops’ chemical residue testing was conducted at OMIC lab in Bangkok to comply with buyer requirements, with results that indicated that metal presence was not detected. In 2018, two participatory guarantee system (PGS)

\textsuperscript{14} P4 project, which involves ICCO, NAG and East-West Seed Company, implemented a model to help farmer associations access banks’ support. The model consisted of six stages: 1. A bank offers working capital in a direct contract with P4 farmer groups, 2. A bank offers input capital to input suppliers for the farmers, 3. The RFDAs manage the working capital and distribute to the collective marketing farmer members, 4. Together with RFDAs and MMTW company, farmers sell their products collectively, 5. The collector (MMTW) facilitates collective selling to the market, and deducts credit from final sales, and repays a bank with interest (P4 project case study, p. 12).
workshops were replicated with farmer organisations leaders and MMTW company (a buyer for GAP crop products in Magway region).

In 2018, for the first time Myanmar mungbean farmers in Min Bu and Magway Townships in Magway Region received GAP group certification from DoA. A GAP certificate granting ceremony was organised with the presence of MPs, Township officers of General Administrative Department, members of Agriculture Coordination Committee and farmers. The process of grant certification was repeated in 2019, indicating a gradual institutionalization of the practice. Moreover, due to advocacy by NAG, MPs from Magway region shared the GAP experience in the Parliament and proposed to implement the process in other state and regions. According to one MP consulted, MPs from other regions became interested, and NAG and ICCO were invited to the Agriculture, Livestock and Rural Development Parliamentary Committee to share the GAP experience. In response to the success of these experiences, MoALI increased the budget for GAP under DoA for the period 2018-2019, and GAP processes were extended to other regions, such as Yangon.

In total 531 farming households, mostly in Magway and a few in Yangon have now accessed official GAP certificates demonstrating the quality of their products. As a result, farmers can show they produce quality products, getting better prices and increasing market opportunities. However, a private sector representative indicated that “the price gap between GAP crop and non-GAP crop is not much significant” (external stakeholder, traders’ representative).

CEA partners made a high, necessary and sufficient contribution to the grant of GAP certificates by DoA in Magway and Yangon regions. CEA plays an important role as facilitator of the process. As indicated by one regional government representative: “[CEA partners] built good coordination among government, private sector and farmers. That is a key point of achieving GAP certificate in Mung Bean in Magway region”. In addition, CEA’s research on mung bean has informed the intervention and the advocacy messages, and capacity building provided to farmers on GAPs have enhanced their understanding of the process. The direct involvement of DoA representatives (for instance, through field visits and oversight of quality process), and the articulation with private companies were right guesses as well. The contribution of NAG’s experience in the area, which precedes CEA, and the synergies with P4 project must be acknowledged as well25. Moreover, the sustainability and potential scaling-up of the achievement is assured through the ongoing support that NAG provides to DoA for GAP promotion as part of other projects of the organisation. A consideration for the future could be to expand the process to other crops beyond mung bean, considering local existing capacity and sustainability of the production.

Changes at the level of government actors

Through the recurrent organisation of policy dialogues and consultations, CEA and its partners were able to fill an advocacy space at regional and township level, and provided a space for engagement between government representatives and farmers (especially in Yangon, Magway, and Bago). CEA set up and facilitated regular policy dialogues and consultations on agricultural sector challenge, between farmers associations, government and private sector: “Farmers also need to envision possible problems in planting replacement crops and find solution together with relevant ministries...” (Vice President of Myanmar, cited in Annual report 2018, p. 3). Also, CEA gave policy makers the possibility to know and connect with organisations in the ground that they were not aware of. Among others, in October 2019 FSWG and ICCO facilitated a public consultation of the ADS in Bago.

Building on their legitimacy from previous work, CEA partners engaged government representatives at different levels in their interventions, thus strengthening collaboration and mutual trust, building a fertile ground for uptake. Among the recurrent government counterparts for CEA, the following stand out: DoA and DAR (MoALI), TPD (MoC), MoLIP, DSW, and MPs and Parliamentary Committees. There has been an active and frequent participation of government representatives in CEA activities and projects through the years, in workshops and forums (e.g.: Vice

25 Magway RFDA was already supported by NAG before P4 project.
President attended an advocacy workshop on the beans and pulses value-chain development at the UMFCCI) but also in developing farmers’ capacities. A government representative attributed this participation to CEA partners lobby and organizing skills: “Due to lobbying and organizing skill of [partner], the Chair of Parliamentary Committee always attend workshops and meetings organized by [partner]” (external stakeholder, government representative).

As a consequence of CEA’s L&A strategy of connecting stakeholders, partners have indicated that policy makers further understand farmers’ needs and are now in a better position to incorporate them in the design of policies, although data collection has not allowed to establish those connections. Government representatives learned about them in CEA learning events and trainings, and through access to farmers’ processes. In that regard, the 2019 Learning Workshop Report affirmed: “The example of the granting of GAPs group certification from the DoA to a number of FDA in Magway was in part due to actively bringing DoA agents to the field to see how GAP trainings were given, and to do soil analysis and GAP procedure checks together” (p. 8) (see Performance story 2). Also, an advocacy workshop on the beans and pulses value-chain development at the UMFCCI, facilitated by CESD in 2018, and which was attended by government dignitaries, “resulted in the government having a change of approach by recognizing the importance of keeping stakeholders well-informed” (Annual report 2018, p. 3). In the workshop, the Vice President of Myanmar stated: “Only when the farmers knew the situation of exporting Matpe [black gram] and Toor Whole [pigeon pea] to India, they can plant alternative crops” (idem).

CEA supported government agencies to better reach farmers. Not only it advocated for departments such as DoA to strengthen its role as service provider and regulatory entity, but it also helped it cover logistic costs to reach farmers. One representative of DoA at township level indicated: “Promoting farmers to practice GAP is responsibility of DOA. But, DOA has limited human resources and financial resources. This project filled the gap and requirement and support the cost used in this process collaborate with DOA” (external stakeholder government representative). A government representative also indicated that CEA supported the MoC with developing and publishing a market guide which it wouldn’t have been possible to do to due to limited budget. The guide was distributed among farmers: “Knowledge sharing for farmers has been done successfully through collaboration between government department and [partner]” (external stakeholder, government representative).

CEA has influenced and accompanied the debates at the government sphere in critical areas for the agricultural sector, sometimes achieving commitment from government representatives to address different issues, thus laying the ground for further measures in these areas. The most paradigmatic example in this regard has been the invitation made to CEA (ICCO and NAG) in 2019 by Amyotha Hluttaw (Lower House) Parliamentary Committee on Negative Effects of Pesticides to participate in a hearing session, being the first time such a consultative process on pesticide policy issues was organised by the Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries Affairs Committee. In that occasion, CEA partners provided strategic advice based on research conducted on the mungbean value chain, influencing the large discussions in the area (see Performance story 3).

Changes in policy makers’ knowledge (through awareness and access farmers) and behaviour (through a more collaborative approach with stakeholders) did not always translated in concrete changes at policy level, but laid the ground for future actions: “There has been more impact at the implementing partners and community level, but not so much at the policy level” (CEA partner). The timeframe for policy changes is important to consider. One government representative indicated: “Even though laws related with farmers cannot be amended within short duration, Parliamentary Committee is aware on weakness of laws and points to be considered to be amended. This is one of the success through L&A approach of [partner]” (external stakeholder, government representative).
In that sense, one interviewee indicated that in the past five years CEA has laid the ground for the upcoming government\textsuperscript{16} to further address challenges in the agricultural sector.

**Among some concrete achievements in terms of policy decisions to which CEA has contributed to the establishment of a floor price for locally harvested rice for the first time in Myanmar and the increase in the number of food safety testing labs in Myanmar stand out.** One farmer representative, who personally participated in advocacy meetings with MPs, attributed the establishment of safety labs in Magway region to L&A supported by CEA: “DoA (Head office) provided dryer to township DoA office to support crop drying process of farmers. Now the lab from Magway can provide service for measuring soil pH [values]” (external stakeholder, farmers representative).

**The recognition of CEA and its partners as legitimate stakeholders in the agricultural sector respond to a range of factors.** First, it was indicated that the political environment in the last five years, while still challenging, has been more open to open to collaboration: “Current government shows more interest on development of intervention of NGOs and creates a favorable environment for project intervention. In previous government regime, it was too difficult to collaborate with government departments” (CEA partner). Second, CEA’s capacity to reach out to community and mobilise their participation increased government representatives’ interest in their work and needs, in particular regional government departments. Third, as indicated in the Relevance chapter, CEA targeted issues that were aligned with the government agenda for the agricultural sector, which created interest from policy makers in CEA and its partners work. Fourth, CEA benefited from the reputation of partners with trajectory in the field and from the legitimacy of related programmes such as P4, which gave CEA access to policy makers at different levels.

**One factor pointed as an obstacle in achieving further results at the policy level was policy makers’ capacities, and CEA’s work to address that gap was limited and outside of its scope.** The 2019 Learning Workshop Report stated: “It appeared that while CEA partners might be able to show research results or do activities for L&A, this might have limited impact due to the lack of capacity and decision-making power of especially lower-level government agents” (p. 9). However, despite some technical advice and isolated activities, CEA was not designed for nor equipped with the right skills to address this capacity gap in a systematic way, which if in place might have led to better results. Among those actions, RMO worked closely with the DSW to raise awareness and develop staff capacity in the area of child labour, which “became an enabling factor in the smoothness of project implementation” (CEA partner). Also, as part of NAG’s monthly batch of Project Cycle Management training, 36 staff of the DRD received training on DI.

**Limited vertical and horizontal government coordination have affected CEA’s capacity to achieve changes at policy level.** While the design of the programme assumed that there would be “an overall consistency in government policy from the village level up to the national/union level”, implementation showed “The limited outreach beyond national level of the ADS, and the disconnect between experiences at the village level and the national level regarding land policy” (p. 10). This disconnection between levels has affected the L&A efforts of CEA partners. In words of a partner: “government upper level officers like Regional Minister, Director and Parliament showed interest in our advocacy but lower level officers who are directly implemented at field level did not appear so willing to change. Besides, those senior officers often do not follow up and monitor their instructions. Therefore, our advocacy progress was slow and delayed” (Ibidem, p. 10). Regarding horizontal government coordination, while the ADS was a key document that helped create a platform for discussion with policy makers and implementers, it turned out less effective as a rallying point and mechanism to actually implement changes as the Myanmar government failed to align respective ministries and free up budget to implement its recommendations.

\textsuperscript{16} General elections are scheduled to be held in Myanmar on 8 November 2020
Performance story 3 - L&A on food safety in Parliament Committees

In Myanmar, rice is the major crop, followed by pulses, of which mung bean is one of the most important commodities destined for export, due to high international demand. However, indiscriminate application of numerous pesticides (of often dubious origin) make it difficult to catch up to this opportunity. Farmers’ limited knowledge and resources do not allow them to guarantee a high-quality process, which has generated that some foreign countries restricted pulses importation from Myanmar to protect consumers. As a result of these factors, Myanmar’s pulses industry, especially mung bean, is not moving forward and it is difficult to access premium price at the premium market.

Aware of this disadvantageous situation for farmers, and through synergies with P4 project, CEA engaged in a series of activities to generate evidence about food safety and discuss it with relevant stakeholders in the sector. In 2018, CEA provided L&A trainings to farmer groups in Yangon and Magway regions and facilitated a conversation regarding the pesticide law to identify their main concerns. At the same time, ICCO and NAG conducted research studies on Enabling Environment for mung bean value chain, and Climate Smart Agriculture in mung bean together with DaNa Facility and East West Seed company. In addition, GIZ-EU provided food safety training for CEA partners to increase awareness on the topic.

In June 2019, CEA and FSWG jointly organised a high-level L&A event regarding food safety and trade policy in the capital Nay Pyi Taw. It was attended by MPs of Parliamentary Committees, DoA, TPD, MPs from States and regions, representatives from RDFAs and from the private sector. After that event, the Chair of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries Committee suggested the General Director of DoA to further discuss with CEA partners the importance of food safety labs to support quality production.

Upon the invitation and request from MP from Magway region, CEA and FSWG organised a L&A event in Magway regarding safe production of pulses and oil seed crop to promote domestic consumption and trade. CEA also organised stakeholder meeting on alternative strategies for highly hazardous pesticide in November 2019. In February 2020, CEA organised a Learning Event on Food Safety Compliance for Premium Market and the Prospect of the Value Added Products with MAN and FSWG.

During 2019, through connections with UNDP, ICCO and NAG were invited to participate in hearings on the negative effects of pesticide use taking place in respective parliamentary committees in both Amyotha Hluttaw (lower house) and Pyithu Hluttaw (upper house). Evidence accumulated from previous research and consultation work was instrumental to bring recommendations to the committees. Among them, the following stood out: the importance of regulating private sector practices and environmental impacts; the need for a stronger enforcement of the pesticide law; the creation of an authority to strengthen government’s capacity of inspection, supported by a nation-wide laboratory network to reduce pesticide residue issues; and a wider implementation of GAP practices and certification standards.

In July 2020, the Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture, Livestock and Fishery Affairs of Amyotha Hluttaw published a report of “the assessment of negative side effects of pesticides residue and to mitigate the negative side in the Agriculture Sector in Myanmar” and shared it in Union Parliament Assembly. Among other recommendations, the report included: DoA’s recognition and promotion of food safety experts and the inclusion of a workforce plan, FDA’s leadership in the formulation of food safety policy in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, the identification of MRL in line with ASEAN standard and GAP, and further public awareness raising, including the collaboration between DoA and Education Department to include lessons in curriculum and the development of a farmer field school curriculum with responsibilities of farmers for food safety. The report, which was finally approved by Union Parliament (Pyidaungsu Hluttaw), highlighted the contribution of ICCO and NAG programme officers (in the representation of CEA), among other stakeholders. The report lays the ground for the next government to materialize by the President Office’s coordination and concerned Ministries these recommendations into concrete actions to enhance food safety and export promotion in Myanmar agricultural products.

From this story, it can be concluded that CEA and its partners have a made a partial and neccessary contribution to the large debates on food safety and the pesticides law mainly through a timely provision of technical support/expertise. Having chosen relevant topics, aligned with farmers’ needs, and addressed through a variety of actions (research, stakeholders’ consultation, participation in multi-
Changes at the level of value chains and private sector actors

CEA introduced a new concept of multi-stakeholder collaboration on inclusive agricultural value chain development, supporting private sector and farmers identify synergies for mutual benefit.

CEA contributed to install “the idea that through coordination and organisation of value chain stakeholders for a common goal can lead to win-win situations” (CEA case, p. 4). This has supposed a change of behaviors for private sector. One government representative stated that: “Most of the projects neglected roles of private sector in the project implementation but [partner] recognized the role of private sector and they linkage between farmers and private sector” (external stakeholder, government representative). And one partner added: “In the beginning companies were sceptical of working with ICCO and other partners” (CEA member). Thus, through the recognition of its importance in strengthening a more inclusive agricultural sector, CEA was able to engage the private sector and make it a regular participant in relevant forums and workshops, and link it with farmers and government stakeholders. As indicated by one private sector representative, linkages with farmers association and traders have also shifted towards a more collaborative work: “Farmers and traders on the same boat now and can seek win-win situations. Traders share knowledge to farmers related with quality to get good market price. Farmers gained knowledge on business and marketing. Farmer and traders can create synergistic action. Their relationship is based on transparency and accountability and honesty” (external stakeholder, private sector representative). But as indicated by one farmers representative, these linkages did not always resulted in better deals for farmers.

CEA supported the provision by private banks of low interest rate loans to farmers. CEA was instrumental in bringing together private banks and farmers’ associations to negotiate loans. According to one interviewee, 4300 farmers received agri loans from private banks, for an amount equivalent to 1 billion kyat. Moreover, as indicated above, this achievement was a consequence of the CEA’s contribution to the organisation of farmers. In some cases, the provision of loans required further L&A efforts by CEA and farmers “In 2020, A bank informed them they could not deliver loan. So CEA brought farmers to union level to advocate decision makers in Ministry of Planning and Finance. Minister for Ministry of Planning and Finance reviewed on repayment performance of these farmers in 2019 and he gave commitment to deliver loans in 2020” (external stakeholder, farmer representative). However, it was indicated that due to COVID, this measure was postponed.

Although it was a relevant component under PW4, L&A actions to promote the adoption of UNGP were limited and mostly explored in the last period of the programme. When it comes to L&A with the private sector, it has to be acknowledged that PW4 has represented a smaller component of CEA in Myanmar compared to PW3, in terms of budget, partners involved, and, consequently, in its interventions. The Learning Workshop Report 2019 indicates that this engagement was still limited according to the expectation of CEA partners: “Under PW4, it was seen that engagement with private sector parties was still not something that the partners were actively doing. While some partners work with agribusinesses through farmer organisations, there were limited examples materialising where CSOs are giving inputs to companies to change their policies” (p. 8). Among these efforts, the following can be highlighted: in 2018, ICCO and a consultant produced a report on the role of ASEAN in promoting UNGPs in agricultural value chains; in 2019 and 2020, ICCO and CESD participated and presented at the EuroCham Agro-Business Forum; the incorporation of two new
partners under the ACTIOM project by the end of 2019 (see Efficiency), supported by Danida, presented an opportunity to further advocate for RBC, and one chain wide learning workshop for various agribusinesses was organised in early 2020 with the MCRB.

Despite work conducted to raise awareness among child labour among private companies, there are no signals of implementation of a more holistic approach to fight child labour in private sector by CEA partners. At the most, a few declarative commitments were achieved in this area. According to one partner “three business owners gave commitment that they will not hire child labour anymore in the future” (CEA partner). Moreover, ICCO and CESD contributed to brainstorming at the Annual General Meeting of the MPBSSMA where strategies to become more inclusive and promote decent work practices in the agricultural sector were discussed.

Changes at the level of different target groups

No concrete and significant changes have been reported at the level of PwD, youth and women. The evaluation has only gathered anecdotic information in this regard, which is shared below.

On a general level, CEA has accompanied the debates and events promoting a more inclusive agricultural sector in Myanmar: “We have been happy to see more attention for women, youth and PWD in agriculture, from photo exhibitions in Yangon to explicit donor requirements like the new DaNa Facility by DFID/UK Aid from which both ICCO as well as TLMMM received funding in 2017 for agri-related projects. We do not want to go that far by saying that we can attribute this to the CEA, but we feel we are definitely part of the ‘critical mass’ in Myanmar to consistently and continuously emphasize the rights of women, youth and PWD in agricultural value chains” (Annual Plan 2018, p.1).

Several partners have indicated facing challenges in including PwD in their projects’ interventions, since the agricultural practice requires intense physical work and emphasises productivity. For instance, TLMM conducted a survey to understand the needs of farmers with disabilities with the intention of creating tools to do farming with their capacities, “but farmers preferred to do other work because it’s too hard to do farming” (CEA partner).

The Relevance chapter stated that women were a relatively small target of CEA’s work, and gender considerations were mainly integrated as part of work with PwD. For instance, one of the two Master Trainers that trained CEA partners on DI was a woman, who also co-facilitated DI workshops with township-level authorities in Kyauktaga and Taungoo. After that, in 2018, “she was hired to become a Job Placement Coach and began going door to door, reaching out to local business owners to raise awareness and promote the employment of people with disabilities” (2019 Learning Workshop Report, p. 12). In addition, RMO conducted short vocational trainings for women, and some of them “have been elected as village administrators” (CEA partner). Also, RMO made synergies with a previous project to include women in CEA L&A trainings, with interesting results: “[A woman] got confidence to speak in public through capacity building trainings of this project [CEA]. Now, she got political space in (NLD) political party in Shwekyin township due to her improved capacity and she is working as chairperson of women affair in NLD party” (CEA partner).

Conclusion

CEA has contributed to a further understanding of L&A processes and incorporation of L&A approaches into the work of partners, which have allowed them to engage more effectively in L&A activities. CEA also allowed partners to engage in multi-stakeholder alliances. CEA partners gained understanding of DI and implemented strategies to embed DI in their organisations’ policies and practices, but doing so in their projects and activities has been more difficult. In the past years CEA partners saw their legitimacy enhanced through and increasing demand for participation in events, advice and input by policy makers.
Through its various activities, CEA strengthened the capacities of farmers to engage in the public sphere, who gained a further understanding of policy process and confidence to do L&A. CEA also supported the registration and formalisation of RFDAs, and provided training in a range of organisational aspects. As a consequence, farmers’ position in value chains have been strengthened, including negotiation and bargaining power. CEA also created opportunities for dialogue and engagement and contributed to increase collaboration between farmers and relevant stakeholders in the agricultural sector. Performing as an enabler of dialogue, CEA contributed to an important behavioral change in the sector.

Through the recurrent organisation of policy dialogues and consultations, CEA and its partners were able to fill an advocacy space at regional and township level, and provided a space for engagement between government representatives and farmers. CEA also supported government agencies better reach farmers, and gained understanding of their needs. CEA has influenced and accompanied the debates at the government sphere in critical areas for the agricultural sector. However, changes in policy makers’ knowledge and behaviour did not always translated in concrete changes at policy level, but laid the ground for future actions. One factor pointed as an obstacle in achieving further results at the policy level was policy makers’ capacities, and CEA’s work to address that gap was limited. Despite CEA’s wide efforts to bridge local, regional and national L&A, the distance between national and local policy also affected CEA’s achievements at policy level.

CEA introduced a new concept of multi-stakeholder collaboration on inclusive agricultural value chain development, supporting private sector and farmers identify synergies for mutual benefit. CEA supported the provision by private banks of low interest rate loans to farmers. Although it was a relevant component under PW4, L&A actions to promote the adoption of UNGP were limited and mostly explored in the last year of the programme. Despite work conducted to raise awareness among child labour among private companies, there are no signals of implementation of a more holistic approach to fight child labour in private sector by CEA partners.

5. Efficiency

Organisational efficiency

Foundational delays and gaps have affected programme ToC ownership. The annual report 2016 indicates that CEA Myanmar had a late start “because human resources were scarce in the first half of 2016, and because KiA was not sure yet to join as a partner” (p. 4). Moreover, it was first envisaged to be a Mekong programme. In addition, the process of developing the ToC took place “without yet fully understanding the ‘philosophy’ of the CEA” (p. 2). While in the end KiA supported PW4 and selected partners had a chance to provide input to the ToC in the CEA kick-off meeting of March 2017, these foundational challenges would influence implementation. Moreover, the ToC was designed by ICCO staff who no longer work at Myanmar office (although proper handover with the new Program Officer took place). All this indicated that those who developed the ToC were not involved in the programme during the bulk of its implementation. In addition, it was suggested that it took time until partners understood the programme: “In the beginning, partners who were invited to CEA had not clarity about CEA and their involvement” (CEA member). The result has been a lack of ownership of the ToC by partners. In addition, some partners have expressed they have limited knowledge on the ToC approach to develop interventions “As a local organisation, we tried a lot to understand and it was not much clear for us” (CEA partners).

Roles and responsibilities were clear for all partners. One partner described this clarity of roles and responsibilities: “ICCO is in the leading role, TLMM has and advisory role in DI, and other partners took advocacy role in their own regions” (CEA partner). In its coordination role, ICCO was the main contractual counterpart for all partners, which also strengthens the coordination role of ICCO and reduce administrative burden of other CEA members. KiA’s involvement was very limited, focused on “linking and networking for RMO” (CEA member), including at the regional level, where KiA has
more presence (e.g. in India and Indonesia). For the coordination of the programme, ICCO worked closely with TLMM, with regular communication and joint planning.

**ICCO's double role as coordinator and implementer stands out as an innovative practice to support L&A.** In CEA Myanmar ICCO has a “double-hat role”, which combines coordination of the programme and co-implementation of interventions. This double role was the result of ICCO trajectory in the country: “Before 2016 ICCO was considered as donor essentially, distributing previous funding from the Netherlands government among partners. As ICCO had to redesign itself towards the end of previous funding, it gradually moved to a co-implementer role, working more in the communities, collaborating more on the ground, identifying L&A opportunities, building connections. It happened gradually through implementation” (CEA member). ICCO also built on its linkages to complementary initiatives in the region, and was the link to wider L&A agendas taking place in the Netherlands and other countries in Southeast Asia.

A focus on “value for money” was encouraged and matches in the use of resources were sought during implementation. Interviewees provided examples of this approach: “When they [partners] organise events, they work directly with the communities, to increase ownership, but also save costs by using their facilities (not fancy venues). If we spend less in the logistics, we can invest more in the programme itself” (CEA member). In addition, ICCO has policies in procurement process that partners have to follow in organising activities (e.g.: related to venues). The synergies with partners’ resources were also encouraged during L&A interventions: “Working together with partners imply also sharing the costs” (CEA member). For instance, synergies were sought through the organisation of joint events in which several partners presented their research, “thus combining efficiency and effectiveness” (CEA member). Examples of this approach were a high-level policy maker meeting in Nay Pyi Taw organised by FSWG and CEA, in which research from the programme was presented, and a series of learning workshops organised with MAN.

**Staff turnover among partners was recurrent and, to a lesser extent, has affected ownership, programme monitoring and learning.** Two partners’ representatives indicated that because they were relatively new to the programme, they did not understand the ToC. For one organization, interviewees were only able to provide very limited information since previous staff related to CEA did not leave sufficient information in the transition. Other organisations that regularly collaborated with CEA also faced staff turnover and funding challenges, such as FSWG, MAN and AgriProfocus, which affected their capacity to maintain operations. Staff turnover at ICCO has not impacted in this regards.

**Programmatic efficiency**

**CEA’s top up approach was a high-level strategy to ensure efficiency at the programmatic level, but linkages between PWs were limited.** The Annual Report 2017 provides a justification for this: “CEA has very limited resources. To overcome this and to make the activities more effective, CEA can be integrated with other programs being implemented in the country” (p. 5). According to partners, synergies with other programmes took place at different levels: “Human resources from other projects contribute to CEA programme, and some budget has also been contributed” (CEA partner). Synergies with P4 project also contributed to the efficiency “from the management side” (CEA member). The top up approach also helped optimise resources to expand the scope of the interventions (and its results): “Synergies helped reach more farmer with more benefits, rather than working in a few communities” (CEA member). Linkages between PWs were limited. The 2016 Annual Report already anticipated this challenge: “We have already identified that a continuous linkage between agriculture (ICCO), disability inclusion (TLMMM) and child labour (KiA) will be difficult, so we should be more flexible about this to avoid projects that look interesting on paper but that do not work in practice” (p. 4).

**Despite a promising a complementarity, siloed work prevailed among partners.** The Annual Report indicated “The task and expertise divisions between the CEA partners is useful: one organisation is
better in research, while another has more to say on regional ASEAN dynamics, and someone else brings experiences on mobilising farmers. This complementarity means that there enough topics that partners can link up on” (p. 12). But while on paper the partners gathered complementary expertise, except for some ad hoc collaboration, siloed work prevailed during most of the programme, with organisations leading in different intervention areas: “At the beginning it was not an alliance, partners worked very siloed” (CEA partner), “There were so many skills among partners, which were not connected in the beginning” (CEA member). Moreover, one partner indicated that diversity was actually a detrimental factor towards efficiency: “Too much diversity with the nature of each organisation causes less effectiveness and efficiency in proceeding the work” (CEA partner).

The late start of the programme generated a situation in which the objectives of the programme were disconnected of the potential L&A synergies between selected partners, which only come up in the last year: “From the beginning, partners had no relationship with each other. Trust didn’t arrive until last year. At the beginning, each organisation developed a L&A plan, the idea was that they could support each other, but it didn’t happen” (CEA partner). According to one partner: “If CEA programme would have been well organised with CEA partners in design stage it would have been more effective and stronger in collaboration, because of topping up on the different organisation with different targeted projects” (CEA partner). However, it needs to be considered that convenors, ICCO and TLMM, did not have the network in Myanmar at the time to bring together a closely connected group to shape the programme from the beginning.

Although working in alliance was pointed as a major contribution of CEA, partners felt more could have been done to establish stronger bonds among them. This challenge became evident with the course of implementation of the programme. The Annual report 2018 pointed to it under the section “substantial problems you faced in the implementation”: “Integration and collaborative cooperation among all pathways partners under CEA interventions can be improved. Sometimes there is a lack of collaboration and information sharing of all partners of under CEA pathways working, hampering the potential to work together on shared aims” (p. 11). Partners consulted during the evaluation also noticed poor collaboration within the alliance: “Improvement in the area of collaboration among CEA partners is needed. Partners should get a chance to share information of own activities in order to avoid duplication and gaps in project intervention” (CEA partner). Another partner shared: “Member organisations are not aware of the work of other organisations in the alliance. I feel organisations are working alone, not collectively. There’s limited value added to other organisations’ results. L&A plans should be feed by all organisations in the alliance as part of a collective effort” (CEA partner).

Ad hoc collaboration among partners improved as partners got to know each other better, mainly in the form of information and contacts exchange. It was also indicated that “with time, partners gained more clarity [about CEA], as relationships became stronger, people got more involved in the project, and got to know each other through meetings” (CEA member). Indeed, as partner got to know each other, they started to collaborate more in and outside CEA, for instance inviting each other to their events: “that didn’t happen in the beginning” (CEA member). The same Annual Report 2018 noticed this progress as well: “In the past months the CEA meetings have increasingly become more content and goal-oriented beyond learning. This positive dynamic comes from partners being more comfortable with each other, inviting each other to workshops and meetings, and seeing how partner’s activities contribute to own activities” (p. 11). For instance, RMO coordinated with KMSS for activities in Shwekyin township, RMO tapped into NAG’s networks at township level for collecting data on child labour in Khayan and Thonekwa townships, ICCO liaised CESD with CBOs at regional level for conducting research and workshops, and RDA and FSWG organised a joint advocacy meeting in Bago region.

The setup of working groups was a promising response to the lack of synergies, but timeframe and the pandemic didn’t help in their take-off. The Annual Plan 2019 still acknowledged the challenge of working together: “Looking ahead to 2019, we seek to bring in more pro-activity
and energy in the group, and work toward stronger common policy asks” (p. 3). Indeed, after the 2019 learning workshop, and approaching the end of the programme in 2020, partners came up with a concrete strategy to revert siloes and establish cross-over synergies. Three working groups were established, each with a broad focal area under which they will develop collaborative L&A objectives: one in PW3 (with NAG and ICCO, on agro policies and standards), one in PW4 (with RMO, TLMM and CESD, on responsible and inclusive agribusiness practices), and one in a combined PW3 and 4 (with ICCO, MAN and KMSS Yangon, on inclusive farmer-buyer business models on collaboration with NGOs / collective enterprises). Working groups would also allow partners to tap into each other’s networks. However, only WG2 was able to design a collaborative proposal to work on PW4 (in particular, in the pulses sector), but interviewees indicated that this progress was delayed because of the pandemic outbreak. Thus, while working groups were “a nice strategy to bring these skills together” (CEA member), it was also suggested that “for the future, this strategy can be designed from the beginning” (CEA member).

**Budget was mostly devoted to PW3.** Of a total of EUR 1.163.007 allocated between 2017 and 2020, the 75% went to PW3 (84% contributed by ICCO Country Office and 16% by Prisma) and the other 25% went to PW4 (51% by ICCO, 29% by KiA, and 20% by Prisma). This emphasis in PW3 has its correlate in the number of partners working in it compared to PW4 (RMO and TLMM), as it was presented in section 2 of this report. OH represented a total of 16% for PW3 and 22% for PW4. Although it remained mostly in the same amounts through the years, due to the underspending (see following paragraph), in the first years of the programme OH represented a high portion of the budget, particularly in the first year of PW3 (32%), and the first three years of PW4 (41%, 34% and 29%).

**Underspending is seen through the years.** For both PWs, the total budget has increased year by year (except between 2018 and 2019 in PW3, where it decreased around EUR 20,000). However, the total adjusted budget in 2020 shows an abrupt jump compared to previous years: compared to 2019, there’s an increase of 75% in PW3 and 175% in PW4, which correspond to budget not being realized in previous years (e.g.: due to the three expected working groups not being realised). The only budget that shows little variation through years is the one contributed by Prisma to TLMM under PW3.

**The portion of the budget received by each partner was relatively low.** In this regard, one interviewee indicated: “Some of the partners have not received a lot of funding” (CEA member). Perceived lows budgets caused that at least one original partner has dropped from the alliance: “one of the partners we wanted to involve dropped out of the alliance, even after writing a quite elaborate draft of its action plan. According to this organization, the resources available for the contract with this organization were not enough to do its work properly” (Annual report 2017, p. 4).

**As part of CEA’s top up approach, two new partners were included under PW3 in 2020, increasing fragmentation from a programmatic perspective, but also providing continuity to CEA approach beyond the programme timeframe.** DEAR Myanmar and WorldVeg, have joined CEA as part of synergies between the programme and ACTIOM project, supported by the Danida, which is expected to end in late 2023. These new partners will help CEA emphasise responsible business within the mungbean value chain support, the formation of new farmer groups in new townships, and support DAR conduct seed testing and introduce new seed varieties. It is also worth noting that despite its recent incorporation, altogether the new partners received 36% of the budget managed by CEA in PW3, which is explained by the underspending of previous years and new partners’ checked stronger capacity to manage larger funds.

*Table 1. Budget per pathway (EUR)*

---

17 As indicated under Limitations, due to its recent starting and the lack of references during data collection and in the programme documentation, these activities have not been assessed in this evaluation report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICCO RO</td>
<td>730.920</td>
<td>94.326</td>
<td>183.745</td>
<td>164.906</td>
<td>287.943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.075</td>
<td>105.372</td>
<td>70.443</td>
<td>121.630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.187</td>
<td>5.674</td>
<td>8.215</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expense</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.089</td>
<td>42.934</td>
<td>56.875</td>
<td>53.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.975</td>
<td>29.765</td>
<td>29.373</td>
<td>28.313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coPrisma (Leprazending/TLM)</td>
<td>136.610</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>28.980</td>
<td>32.200</td>
<td>41.430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Pathway 3</td>
<td>867.530</td>
<td>128.326</td>
<td>212.725</td>
<td>197.106</td>
<td>329.373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCO RO</td>
<td>150.693</td>
<td>19.000</td>
<td>22.936</td>
<td>28.985</td>
<td>79.772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>3.473</td>
<td>4.387</td>
<td>41.334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expense</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.560</td>
<td>11.728</td>
<td>16.221</td>
<td>29.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.775</td>
<td>7.735</td>
<td>8.377</td>
<td>9.438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coPrisma (Leprazending/TLM)</td>
<td>59.170</td>
<td>22.500</td>
<td>19.320</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>3.350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerk in Actie</td>
<td>85.614</td>
<td>2.881</td>
<td>28.548</td>
<td>8.485</td>
<td>45.700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.184</td>
<td>16.700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expense</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.763</td>
<td>8.485</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>29.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Pathway 4</td>
<td>295.477</td>
<td>44.381</td>
<td>70.804</td>
<td>51.470</td>
<td>128.822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.163.007</td>
<td>172.707</td>
<td>283.529</td>
<td>248.577</td>
<td>458.194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Budget by CEA member**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium Members name</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Realized 2016</th>
<th>Realized 2017</th>
<th>Realized 2018</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget 2019</th>
<th>Adjusted budget 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICCO RO</td>
<td>881.613</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>113.326</td>
<td>206.681</td>
<td>193.891</td>
<td>367.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coPrisma</td>
<td>195.780</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56.500</td>
<td>48.300</td>
<td>46.200</td>
<td>44.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.163.007</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>172.707</strong></td>
<td><strong>283.529</strong></td>
<td><strong>248.577</strong></td>
<td><strong>458.194</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning**

A combination of tools and processes were implemented to monitor, evaluate and learn about CEA in Myanmar, but programme learning through these tools was limited. Skype meetings, lobby logbook, stories of change, annual learning events, partner meetings/regular learning sessions/quarterly working sessions, and annual reporting were tried out throughout the programme to gather data about achievements.

At the level of CEA members, regular skype meetings were the main reporting channel from ICCO in Myanmar to ICCO GO. They convened staff from both ICCO offices, and in some cases also TLMM and KiA. Available documentation suggests that 13 skype meetings took place between end of 2018 and 2020.
The usage of lobby logbooks has been inconsistent among partners, and an accountability approach prevailed over learning. It was indicated that “not all the partners were diligent in keeping track of the lobby logbooks” (CEA member), and reports were often quite delayed. Concerns about partners’ CEA monitoring was expressed in Annual Plan 2018: “Our main challenges in the monitoring of the CEA program is the reliance we have on our local partners to do their own M&E, and to report to us in a complete and timely manner” (p. 4). In addition, partners reported that they would like more training on the logbooks, and the suggestion of periodically using CEA partner meetings to fill up the logbooks (together with ICCO and TLMM). In the end, lobby logbooks “were more used as reporting than to improve L&A (...) many of them [partners] saw it more as an accountability but not for use” (CEA member). It was suggested that one challenge in relation to the lobby logbooks was that partners’ personnel “who filled them did not have the capacity to make decisions based on that” (CEA member).

Other reporting requirements were indicated as “quite light”. Considering the concerns with capacity to do monitoring, the light approach to reporting was intentional: “It was a good approach to let partners focused on the goals and not the reporting, leaving that for the CEA members” (CEA member). As a consequence, most of the programme available documentation (e.g.: annual plan and reports) has the seal of ICCO. Also, as a reflection of the siloes in the implementation of CEA, results are reported by partner organisation rather than as a consequence of the programme actions.

The alliance kept in frequent contact through regular partners meetings. ICCO encouraged partners to take ownership of the learning events: “responsibility in organising meetings and contributing to the agenda was allocated to partners” (CEA member). Thus, the agenda varied between meetings, sometimes including guest speakers, or DI and gender awareness sessions, or discussion of L&A approaches to specific laws/policies, or interactive sharing and exchanging exercises. In 2019, these meetings evolved from regular learning sessions into quarterly working sessions, with the goal of creating more synergy for L&A not only within CEA but also outside for their own work / other programmes.

Learning workshops provided the richest platform to discuss lessons adapt the programme, including the ToC. Learning workshops took place in 2018 and 2019. Whereas the 2017 event focused on L&A capacity, complementarities of partners, and joint understanding, the 2019 workshop focused on reviewing experiences, capturing results already achieved or on the horizon, and strengthening linkages for future work. In 2017 partners were asked to reflect “if the interventions and outputs mentioned there represent or look similar to their existing work and resulted outputs” (2017 Learning Workshop Report, p. 8). Learning workshops were also an opportunity for partners to take a self-assessment of L&A skills. This exercise was conducted in both learning workshops, and the 2019 report shows a comparison of the progress of the capacities between both years. Learning workshops also allowed partners to discuss new ways of working together: “The idea of the working groups emerged during learning workshops” (CEA member).

SoCs were pointed as the most strategic and valuable way of capturing results of the programme, but information presented several gaps in the L&A trajectory. “[In SoCs] partners could tell what they achieved and how they did it (...) why they did it, why it was useful, etc” (CEA member). In 2017, a strong emphasis on writing SoCs took place through a comments session by the partners on each other’s written stories. The 2019 Learning Workshop report includes five SoCs by partners. SoCs were an important mechanism to rapidly identify perceived results, including for this evaluation, although some SoCs had to be complemented to get a more comprehensive understanding of the advocacy process. In addition to SoCs, stories to be published in the CEA website were also produced.

Indicators were treated more as a reporting tool to higher levels of CEA coordination and monitoring, than for learning. An overview of the indicators suggest that they are well aligned with
the ToCs. However, they are mostly output indicators, which are useful for monitoring progress at programme level, but gives little insight in the strategies, and in what is happening on the ground within each PW and within each project. Measurability of indicators appears more feasible at the level of activities and individuals and organisations reached out, but more difficult at the level of identifying cases of L&A success. There’s a good distribution of indicators for each of the two PWs. Generally, indicators for PW4 have been less reported, especially in the first three years of the programme. For the majority of the indicators, especially those of PW3, the target was met or exceeded. In terms of indicators usage, no CEA members or partners in Myanmar have made references to them.

Conclusion

Foundational delays and gaps have affected programme ToC ownership by partners. Roles and responsibilities were clear for all partners, and ICCO ‘s double role as coordinator and implementer stands out as an innovative practice to support L&A. A focus on “value for money” was encouraged and synergies in resources was sought during implementation. Staff turnover among partners was recurrent and, to a lesser extent, has affected ownership, programme monitoring and learning.

CEA’s top up approach was a high-level strategy to ensure efficiency at the programmatic level, but linkages between PWs were limited. Despite a promising a complementarity, siloed work prevailed among partners. The late start of the programme generated a situation in which the objectives of the programme were disconnected of the potential L&A synergies between selected partners, which only come up in the last year. Ad hoc collaboration among partners improved as partners got to know each other better and trust among them was developed, mainly in the form of information and contacts exchange. The setup of working groups was a promising response to the lack of synergies, but timeframe and the pandemic didn’t help in their take-off.

CEA budget was mostly devoted to PW3. Underspending is seen through the years. The portion of the budget received by each partner was relatively low. As part of CEA’s top up approach, two new partners were included under PW3 in 2020, increasing fragmentation from a programmatic perspective but also providing continuity to CEA approach beyond the programme timeframe.

A combination of tools and processes were implemented to monitor, evaluate and learn about CEA in Myanmar, but programme learning through these tools was limited and a reporting approach prevailed.

6. Sustainability

Institutional sustainability

CEA partners were able to embed L&A approaches in their work, and to a lesser extent a DI lens. Through several training opportunities and the implementation of strategies to advocate changes at policy level, not only partners have incorporated tools and methodologies (e.g.: the 10-steps approach), but they developed a lens and practice of L&A which many of them recognised is being and will be useful in other interventions, and for developing proposals as well: “We will apply our strong L&A experiences and practices in future projects” (CEA partner) Partners also became more recognised in their spheres of work, which put them in a better position to continue doing L&A. Institutional changes have also been seen in the area of DI, where partners indicated making their internal procedures more inclusive, and incorporating an inclusion lens in their research design (e.g.: by including PwD in data collection) or considering quotas for PwD in activities.

To support the adoption of L&A approaches and other components of the programme, CEA leaves a legacy of resources that have been translated into Burmese for further circulation and adoption among partners and their stakeholders. Not only the L&A 10-steps guidelines were translated, but also the former DIA created a Burmese toolkit for mainstreaming inclusion in organisation “to serve as an inclusion resource beyond the CEA project” (CEA partner).
ICCO has been strengthened as a country office, has nurtured a network of partners and contacts in the government and the private sector, and has been recognised by partners and other stakeholders as a relevant player in the agricultural sector. A distinctive note deserves ICCO’s experience in leading CEA. This was the first programme implemented by ICCO as a country office in Myanmar. Several changes took place along the way, among which the changing from a regional to a country programme and staff turnover represented important challenges. ICCO was not only able to develop a programme which incrementally gained its own identity, but was also able to empower a team that today is recognised as focal points for partners.

The organisation, formalisation and registration of new RFDAs is an important to contribution to their sustainability, but more support is needed for them to become active in L&A: “Farmer associations are institutions that can support farmer needs in future” (CEA partner). One partner indicated that “Two farmer enterprises are now independent and self-reliance institutions and they are running by their own efforts” (CEA partner). Not only CEA supported the registration of RFDAs, but also strengthened their organisational development through trainings: “In the past, most of the CBOs were not sustainable due to weak organisational development. So the project focused on organisational development in terms of transparency, accountability, financial management” (CEA partner). CEA, with P4, also facilitated access to bank loans. However, these RFDAs are still at ‘spoon-feeding stage’, and they will need more support to further capitalise on their formalisation and scale up changes.

At the level of government stakeholders, the main signal of sustainability can be found in the repetition of GAP certificates processes and its gradual expansion to other regions (Magway first, Yangon later), led by DoA, and with ongoing support of NAG as part of other projects, which indicates an incipient institutionalisation of these processes to support the quality of production by farmers.

CEA’s efforts to promote a culture of responsible business among the private sector were scarce. While CEA was able to raise awareness among a set of private companies, it has been shared that more work is needed for private companies to further understand what means to do responsible business in practice and how they can achieve it, as well as how to create more inclusive businesses models.

Programmatic sustainability

Most of the partners have indicated that lessons and achievements of CEA will help them in their future programmes. While CEA benefited with cross-fertilization with preexisting programmes, likewise new interventions will be enriched with CEA lessons: “Previous [partner]’s efforts were a foundation for implementation of CEA programme. The results of CEA programme will be a stepping-stone for implementation of future and existing programmes. Other [partner]’s projects are very similar with P4 project and the results of CEA can be applied well in these projects” (CEA partner). A paradigmatic example is the support that CEA has provided to DOA to promote GAP practices among farmers in Magway region: through the continuous support that NAG provides to DOA for GAP promotion as part of other projects of the organization, the process becomes sustainable and presents potential for further expansion.

In a restrictive environment, a sustainable contribution of CEA has been to create collaborative linkages among stakeholders. Working in alliance with other stakeholders has been pointed as a major lesson for CEA partners. While many of the relationships that took place during CEA preexisted the programme, some of them were strengthened in the past five years, and others flourished at the local or national level, or with the private sector: “We have good collaboration with other stakeholder to do collective actions in L&A” (CEA partner).

Through ToT in different areas (DI, GAP processes), CEA laid the ground for new individuals and groups to benefit from further training, although the continuation if this work is difficult to
anticipate. For instance, through TLMM’s work, NAG has been able to integrate and facilitate a session on DI in their trainings with rural communities. Moreover, other PwD trained by TLMM on L&A issues are now advocating for inclusive workspaces among private stakeholders.

The formation of RDFA’s has been pointed as a major milestone for the continuation of CEA’s objectives: “That kind of association are very important for sustainability of the achievements” (external stakeholder, government). One partner indicates that “Ongoing and future projects will use RDFAs to fulfill the needs of farmers” (CEA partner). Partners also expect to build on these associations for implementation of new projects: “CEA left strong community support groups and these groups will be stand as sustainable institutions for implementation of ongoing and future projects” (CEA partner). Because of CEA’s participatory approach to project implementation, these groups have “ownership sense on their results (...) and they are aware of ways of doing L&A” (CEA partner). Moreover, the model of RDFAs is replicable in other regions. Indeed, new programmes with which CEA established collaboration in 2020, like the ACTIOM project, supported by Danida, include a component of RDFAs’ formation, based on the P4 model, but in new townships, which provides continuity to CEA approach beyond the programme timeframe.

In terms of research and knowledge production, CEA also leaves a legacy of policy papers and research pieces (on mung beans, on climate smart agriculture, on pesticides, among others) that can become references for decision makers and stakeholders. In particular, CEA’s contributions incorporated in the report on reduction of negative impacts of residual effects of agrochemical elaborated in parliament committees constitute a reference for future government to advance a development agenda in the rural sector.

Staff turnover and the current pandemic represented challenges to the sustainability of achievements and continuation of CEA’s objectives. In addition, the current pandemic will affect both government and donors’ priorities. The uncertainty associated with the post-pandemic would require CEA partners to develop scenarios that consider the needs of farmers and government agencies and explore opportunities to continue supporting them through other projects and collaboration with other stakeholders.

Financial sustainability

One important gap in CEA implementation has been the provision of training and tools for partners to innovate in their funding models and mobilize new resources. One of the tools that CEA had for this, the Change the Game Academy, has not been implemented in Myanmar. While there was an intention to conduct these trainings in the second half of 2020, the pandemic scenario might have affected those plans. At the same time, one partner has acknowledged financial constraints that can affect long-term sustainability. Indeed, as indicated in the Efficiency chapter, regular collaborators of CEA have already faced funding challenges that affected their capacity to maintain operations.

An important contribution to the financial sustainability of RFDA’s has been the creation of linkages with private banks, although further support is needed to develop new funding sources and further capacity to manage them. Tapping into the financial model proposed by P4, CEA helped established relationships between farmers and banks, and the practice of managing new funding sources represent a step forward towards self-sustainability. One farmer representative has indicated that it would be important to further strengthen linkages with private sector before the projects ends. In that line, by the end of October 2020, P4 together with CEA will organise a ‘Capitalisation and Scaling Workshop’ with key stakeholders and donors, inviting also RFDA leaders to explore matchmaking. Moreover, although it was acknowledged that farmers increased their L&A understanding, their actual capacity to do L&A might be affected to the lack of financial resources they can devote to that end.
Social sustainability

The main challenge in terms of social sustainability is found in the area of inclusion. While the general challenge of including diverse groups in the agricultural sector was addressed in the Effectiveness chapter, it is important to highlight that stakeholders consulted see these barriers as exceeding the agricultural sector: “Myanmar has cultural barriers related with PWD, aged person, LGBT and this is a big challenge to mainstream PwD” (CEA partner).

Exit strategies

In absence of an exit strategy for CEA, partners come up with variety of organisational approaches to ensure sustainability of the programmes’ legacy, with top up actions as the preference. Most of partners have indicated not being aware of any exit strategy for CEA. No exit strategy or similar considerations were formally part of the programme design, nor discussed as such during programme implementation. For most of partners, sustainability will be achieved by linking L&A interventions with other programmes: “The spirit of CEA can continue through a project supported by Danida, also focused on L&A” (CEA member). Linking existing farmer organisations with L&A platforms from where they can continue doing L&A, is another exit strategy that partners visualise. Others think the best strategy is to ensure funds to continue doing capacity development of RFDAs: “One strategy of sustainability is to strengthen existing farmer organisations and increase registered organisations, and provide them small grants” (CEA partner). One partner has suggested that each partner could elaborate an L&A plan “for the next two or three years”.

The pandemic has affected some closure activities by CEA and its transition to the post-programme. It has to be acknowledged that CEA had planned a set of activities for this final year, some of them with the intention to strengthen networking among stakeholders, which have to be canceled or postponed due to the pandemic situation. This would have helped in the transition to the post-programme.

While partners indicate interest in continue working together, it is not clear whether the alliance formed under CEA will stand beyond the end of the programme. Even though the sustainability of the alliance as a unit was not a goal of CEA in itself, after collaborating for years under the CEA umbrella, most of the partners have shared that the continuation of joint efforts to achieve changes in the agricultural sector is needed: “For sustainability, we need to maintain the common goal among CEA partners” (CEA partner), “The most important activity is ‘keep share, inform, dialogue, and collaborate’ among CEA partners after CEA programme” (CEA partner). While where there is value in cooperation and synergies to be found it is expected that partners will continue exploring collaboration, these efforts most likely will take place outside the CEA umbrella.

Conclusion

CEA partners were able to embed L&A approaches in their work, and to a lesser extent a DI lens, which can be consolidated with CEA’s a legacy of resources. ICCO has been strengthened as a country office, has nurtured a network of partners and contacts in the government and the private sector, and has been recognised by partners and other stakeholders as a relevant player in the agricultural sector.

The organisation, formalisation and registration of new RFDAs is an important to contribution to their sustainability, but more support is needed for them to become active in L&A. At the level of government stakeholders, the main signal of sustainability can be found in the repetition of GAP certificates processes and its gradual expansion to other regions. CEA’s efforts to promote a culture of responsible business among the private sector were scarce.

Lessons and achievements of CEA will help them in their future programmes. In a restrictive environment, a sustainable contribution of CEA has been to create collaborative linkages among stakeholders. The formation of RDFA’s has been pointed as a major milestone for the continuation
of CEA’s objectives. CEA also leaves a legacy of policy papers and research pieces. Staff turnover and the current pandemic represents challenges to the sustainability of achievements and continuation of CEA’s objectives.

One important gap in CEA implementation has been the provision of training and tools for partners to innovate in their funding models and mobilize new resources. An important contribution to the financial sustainability of RFDA’s has been the creation of linkages with private banks, although further support is needed to develop new funding sources and further capacity to manage them.

In absence of an exit strategy for CEA, partners come up with variety of organisational approaches to ensure sustainability of the programmes’ legacy, with top up actions as the preference. While interest in continuing doing L&A together prevails among partners, these efforts most likely will take place outside the alliance as a unit.
7. Overall conclusion

CEA in Myanmar has been a relevant response to the identified contextual challenges and accompanied relevant processes in the agricultural sector. CEA programme defined a set of relevant lobby targets at the level of crops, policies and stakeholders, and combined it with an adaptive approach that allow to react to windows of opportunity, but some efforts spread thin.

Its top up design allowed CEA to make synergies and leverage the L&A potential of other interventions by its partners, and also expand the outreach of CEA’s actions in terms of farmers’, needs, stakeholders engaged and geographical outreach, though not always in a cohesive way. This approach allowed CEA to link L&A at local, regional and national level, but factors such as vertical coordination between government agencies hindered the programme from achieving further results at policy level. At the same time, the top up approach turned the dividing line between CEA and other programmes blurry, especially when it comes to attribute achievement.

Despite a promising complementarity in the selection of partners (in terms of expertise, experience, networks and approaches), siloed work prevailed among partners. Foundational delays in the programme affected partners’ ownership of the ToC and synergies between pathways, and efforts to address this gap took place only towards the final stage of the programme, with limited results.

Through the promotion of the concept of multi-stakeholder collaboration on inclusive agricultural value chain development, implemented through policy dialogues and consultations at policy level, CEA brought together farmers groups, government stakeholders and private sector representatives. This collaborative approach in the search of solutions to the challenges of the sector supposed a change of behaviour for most stakeholders. At the same time, it allowed CEA to position itself as a recognised facilitator of dialogues, farmers to access policy makers and traders, policy makers to learn about from farmers’ needs on the ground, and private sector and farmers identify synergies for mutual benefit. These dialogues were also informed by research produced in synergies with other programmes.

CEA lacked a capacity building strategy for L&A that articulated interventions towards an end goal, and that allowed monitoring and assess the results in this regard. Capacity building took place through trainings and emerged organically through the implementation of interventions. Partners indicated they have strengthened their understanding of L&A processes and are now able to incorporate L&A approaches into their work, which have allowed them to engage more effectively in L&A activities. The inclusion of PwD had a prominent role in the CEA design, and partners acknowledged having embedded a disability inclusion lens in their organisations (adapting or promoting new internal policies and trainings) and their interventions. An important gap in capacity building of partners has been the provision of training and tools to innovate in their funding models and mobilize new resources.

CEA also strengthen farmers groups capacities to do L&A, by supporting organisation and registration of new regional farmers development associations and providing training on L&A and management issues, although they will need more support to consolidate their work. Their capacity to negotiate and bargain with traders, and to do L&A with policy makers and private sector has increased. While structural changes at the policy level were difficult to achieve, CEA (in synergy with other interventions) achieved important benefits for farmers to strengthen their position in the value chain: a floor price for paddy (although fluctuation still exists at local level), the implementation of GAPs certificates process with allowed them to improve the quality of their products, and a stronger positioning of the government to address the negative effects of pesticides, and low rate loans from banks. The inclusion of PwD and women in L&A processes and achievements in this area were mostly absent.

Among the main gaps in CEA’s achievements, the limited promotion of the adoption of UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the concept of responsible business among the private
sector stand out. While efforts were conducted to raise awareness on child labour among private sector, they were not supported by a holistic approach to achieve change in this area.

Roles and responsibilities were clear for all partners, and ICCO’s double role as coordinator and implementer stands out as an innovative practice to support L&A, which has also strengthened the country office and allowed it to nurture a network of partners and contacts among farmer groups, government and private sector. Ad hoc collaboration among partners improved as partners got to know each other better, mainly in the form of information and contacts exchange. ICCO managed the big shared of the budget, which was devoted mostly to PW3. Underspending is seen through the years, and the portion of the budget received by each partner was relatively low. A combination of tools and processes were implemented to monitor, evaluate and learn about CEA in Myanmar, but programme learning through these tools was limited and a reporting approach prevailed.

In absence of an exit strategy for CEA, partners are coming up with a variety of organisational approaches to ensure sustainability of the programmes’ legacy, with top up actions as the preference. While interest in continuing doing L&A together prevails among partners, these efforts most likely will take place outside the alliance as a unit.
8. Recommendations

Relevance

*Engage partners in the design of the programme since the very beginning.* While the late start of CEA in Myanmar and its consequent challenges are acknowledged, a new initiative (or a continuation of CEA’s efforts) would benefit from the inclusion of all implementing partners in the design of the ToC and other foundational documents and guidelines of the programme. This will strengthen the sense of ownership by all partners involved and will be an opportunity to visualise synergies among partners’ interests, L&A targets and partnerships, and start working jointly in early stages of the programme.

*Consolidate and enrich an overall capacity development strategy to increase impact.* Through its members and partners, CEA has developed or has access to a varied, relevant and useful set of resources, methodologies and experiences that can help partners working in the agricultural sector strengthen their L&A capacities. However, during CEA, these set of resources were not integrated under an overall capacity development strategy, being implemented in respond to demand or according to availability. The design of a comprehensive capacity development strategy would be more focused, with fewer activities, and better timing, aligned with the overall and systemic changes that CEA wants to promote; combine demand-driven activities (by partners) with a menu of supply-driven capacity development activities that partners can opt in to; strengthen mechanisms to ensure active engagement, agency, and responsibility from partners; establish a right mix of capacity building modalities (including peer learning); combine both a theoretical and practical approach (e.g.: with the analysis of concrete experiences in which CEA’s members and partners were involved, as well as experiences in other countries); consider a dedicated resource to strategise and coordinate capacity development activities.

*Continue refining an intervention model that departs from farmers’ needs and considers the potential of the target selected.* Participatory assessments of farmer’s needs should continue, with a focus on selecting targets (crops, services to be advocated) with a sustainable potential that allow farmers of overcome short term cycle of benefits. Target selection should consider farmers’ needs, interests, resources (knowledge, labour force, social capital, environmental, financial) as well as potential for the engagement of supportive stakeholders. Likewise, advocacy messages as well as SoCs collected through the implementation of the programme should build further on farmers’ own experiences to enhance ownership and provide a picture of the problematics and its potential solutions that its strongly linked to on the ground trajectories.

Effectiveness

*Continue strengthening and refining the multi-stakeholder collaborative approach to address common challenges at the regional level.* A collaborative approach that engages diverse stakeholders linked to a problematic to co-create solutions has been a distinctive seal of CEA, and it has been recognised as innovative and effective in Myanmar context. Building further on this approach means continuing providing incentives to the emerging alliances to continue working together, engaging new relevant stakeholders that would add value to the addressed problematics, and identifying new challenges and co-exploring solutions, among others.

*Combine adaptability and reaction to L&A opportunities with a more strategic L&A planning.* At the beginning of the programme, bring together all partners to identify the main political, business, union, academic and civil society milestones in the agricultural sector, and anticipate what type of strategy could be carried out and what type of products could be developed to contribute in these instances. As done in the Learning Workshop 2017, planning can be materialized in L&A plans per partners, linked to the ToC. For instance, the need for a Covid recovery plan and a food security strategy on mitigating effects of Covid response measures offer an entry point to continue positioning CEA and partners as legitimate interlocutors in the agricultural sector.
Strengthen linkages between local, national and international L&A. CEA can build on its strategic connection with the Netherlands (and the EU) and regional (ASEAN) agendas to continue identifying relevant opportunities for Myanmar agricultural sector, L&A gaps to work on and also funding opportunities for its partners. Support interested partners to join and connect with relevant existing platforms and stakeholders: GrowAsia, ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR), the Sustainable Trade Initiative (IDH) in Asian countries, at the regional level, or Eurocham Agro L&A group, ACT Alliance Global and regional, and multilateral organisations (e.g.: ILO for child labour) at the international level, are a few examples. Moreover, CEA could further capitalise its experience in other countries in the region to build stronger connection among partners, facilitate peer learning and support the identification of joint L&A agendas. CEA could help connect partners and RFDAs, with the international arena (e.g: support their participation in relevant conferences).

Develop a proactive communication strategy to enhance the visibility of the CEA and its achievements in Myanmar. While CEA’s main website works as an interesting repository to know about the programme work in different countries, the country programme could have their own communication channels that are relevant in Myanmar context, thus allowing more visibility of its actions among relevant local stakeholders. A more strategic communication of CEA’s work and achievements would also help CEA members and partners in its fundraising efforts.

Efficiency

Prioritise flagship L&A targets (policies, practices, and stakeholders) based on a careful analysis of the context and the programme’s capacity to manage them. In the past years, and following a tacit principle of adaptability, CEA covered a complex and variable myriad of policies, practices and relationships with stakeholders, also at different jurisdictional levels. To avoid spreading thin, the programme could focus on three or four flagship issues in the agricultural sector (based on relevance for the sector, and interest and expertise of partners), based on its real capacity to manage them, and strengthen their L&A messages. CEA could also narrow down its geographic focus and center its work in a set of relevant regions that present more potential for the programmes’ goals, and replicate and scale-up once achievements have been consolidated.

Promote synergies among partners since the inception of the programme and create incentives for joint work. If possible, CEA could convene partners that have previous experience working together, which will accelerate the process of getting to know each other and build trust. Sessions devoted to exploring potential for synergies among partners (in terms of interests, expertise, targets and networks, among others) can be included in learning workshops or other regular encounters. Strategies such as the working groups to combine partners’ expertise to address a defined topic can be set up in early stages. Like it was done with the working groups, a small budget can be set aside to which partners can jointly apply with a proposal to conduct a joint intervention related to the goals of the programme (an agile assessment process could be set up to make decisions on it). In person exchange and collaboration could be complemented with social media tools to help partners be in touch beyond the meetings of the programme.

Further build on the ToC as a tool for planning, participation, and continuous learning to orient the programme and its interventions towards the original desired changes. This can be done incrementally and integrating adaptability as a principle, with regular feedback loops (six months or annually), and adjusting activities, partnerships and budgets accordingly. At the same time, incorporate early trainings and mentoring on MEL skills for partners, so they can provide more relevant and timely information about their work, and allocate monitoring responsibility to a member of ICCO team to do meta monitoring and provide support to partners. Also, invest more in the learning aspect and use lessons from the implementation to improve the relevance effectiveness and sustainability of the programme.

Generate evidence on the impact of the processes and policies in which CEA has played an important role. It would be important to move further along the line of contribution to changes in practices
and policies in the agricultural sector to understand the impact of those practices and policies in which CEA has been engaged. This can help understand how CEA’s contribution plays out on the field to solve rural development challenges, what is working and what is not. Assuming stakeholders themselves (RFDAs, government agencies, private sector) would be reluctant to implement MEL strategies (due to time availability, no interest, capacity, others), CEA could think about alternative methods to strengthen its impact assessment, both prior to and post implementation efforts.

**Sustainability**

*By consultation with all partners, elaborate an exit strategy for the programme.* Together with promoting sustainability through its programmatic achievements and the continuation of work by its partners, CEA’s legacy would benefit from a conscious and participatory exit strategy that considers different scenarios (and a set of aspects: organizational, programmatic, financial) for the aftermath of the programme and iteratively incorporate concrete actions and responsibilities as the programme and the context evolves. This exit strategy should be monitored together with other components of the programme. It should consider the impact of the pandemic on CEA’s legacy, as well as the needs of its partners, farmers’ groups and government stakeholders in that context. Exit interviews with staff who might not continue working in the partners will also help build a knowledge repository about the programme.

*Strengthen partners connections with relevant networks and stakeholders.* In its last months, CEA could invest effort in bridging partners with networks and stakeholders that would provide them a platform to continue learning about L&A in the agricultural and conduct joint L&A strategies. Support interested partners to organise meetings with critical stakeholders (e.g. one with government, another with private sector, another with other CSOs or farmer group) to share their current and future agenda, receive feedback, identify synergies, etc.

*Support the already registered RFDAs in their collective efforts and help set up associations at the township level.* CEA has contributed to organise and register a group of RFDAs in different regions that can advocate for better opportunities for farmers. However, it is not clear to what extent these associations are connected to each other. Helping establish those connections and nurturing those bonds would facilitate peer learning and promote joint L&A efforts. Partners representatives can perform as focal points to help connect these RFDAs. Moreover, CEA can help these RFDAs become members of MAN, or liaise them with trade associations like UMFCCI and MPBSSMA. RFDAs could also join CEA or another alliance that can emerge from the continuity of work by partners. Supporting the organization and set up of farmers associations at the township level that then liaise with the regional level would help promote opportunities for most marginalized groups.

*Articulate the L&A legacy to extend the reach of its ideas and the lessons that emerge from its innovative practices.* After four years of work, CEA counts with a valuable knowledge base, solid network of partners (among the civil society, but also at the government and private sector level) and a pool of relevant experiences in engaging with rural policies and practices at different levels. CEA could strategically document what it knows and has learned so that its direct partners but also others working in similar fields/challenges can benefit from its legacy and expand its potential contribution to positive change. For instance, CEA could document the model of multi-stakeholder dialogue and collaboration in the agricultural sector to facilitate its replication in similar processes to be led by CEA partners as well as other interested organisations.

*Incorporate training and mentoring on fundraising and funding models to help partners grow and expand their work in the long-term.* Whether it is the Change the Game Academy or other approaches, incorporate a component of strengthening partners’ fundraising capacity and expose them to innovative funding models that can work well in Myanmar context. Partners can receive training and support to develop business plans that are aligned with their missions. CEA could also explore support partners co-develop new proposals or to access other potential funders.
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## Annex 1. Stakeholders consulted

### Kick-off workshop, July 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bram Peters</td>
<td>Programme Officer Inclusion and Innovation</td>
<td>ICCO Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Khin Win Myint</td>
<td>Country Programme Officer</td>
<td>ICCO Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Seng Pin</td>
<td>Senior Coordinator</td>
<td>CESD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Thiri Wah Wah</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>CESD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Thomas Kyaw Naing</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>KMSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Gregory Phyo Wai Hpoo</td>
<td>MEAL officer</td>
<td>KMSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Sithu Htun</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>NAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Thura Aung</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>RDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Htun Htun Naing</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>RMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Naing Win</td>
<td>Supervisor (focal Person)</td>
<td>RMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Zin Mar Theint</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Manager</td>
<td>TLMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Riley</td>
<td>DI Advisor</td>
<td>TLMM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bilateral meetings with partners

#### CEA programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bram Peters</td>
<td>Programme Officer Inclusion and Innovation</td>
<td>ICCO Myanmar</td>
<td>July 23</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Khin Win Myint</td>
<td>Country Programme Officer</td>
<td>ICCO Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Khin Zaw Win</td>
<td>Project Manager, P4 project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Wai Wai Hlaing</td>
<td>Country Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu Ya Soe</td>
<td>Country Finance Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Zin Mar Theint</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Manager</td>
<td>TLMM</td>
<td>July 27</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Riley</td>
<td>DI Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Sithu Htun</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>NAG</td>
<td>July 30</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Htun Htun Naing</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>RMO</td>
<td>July 30</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Naing Win</td>
<td>Supervisor (focal Person)</td>
<td>RMO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Hnin Lai Kyi</td>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Thura Aung</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>August 4</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Seng Pin</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>CESD</td>
<td>August 4</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Thiri Wah Wah</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Thomas Kyaw Naing</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>KMSS</td>
<td>August 7</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interviews with external stakeholders

#### Case 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U David</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Gyobingauk township, Bago region</td>
<td>August 13</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Htun Htun Naing</td>
<td>Farmer Association</td>
<td>Gyobingauk township, Bago region</td>
<td>August 7</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naing Banyar Eain</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>August 15 Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Hla San</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
<td>Amyotha Hluttaw (Lower House)</td>
<td>August 5 Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Ye Htut</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>MAN</td>
<td>August 6 Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Thein Naing Win</td>
<td>Township Officer</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Min Bu Township, Magway region</td>
<td>August 6 Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Soe Lwin Aye</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Regional Farmer Development Association</td>
<td>August 8 Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Lin Myat</td>
<td>Regional Director</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Magway region</td>
<td>August 8 Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Myint Aung</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Myint Myat Taw Win Company</td>
<td>August 11 Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Tin Moe Khaing</td>
<td>Ex. Coordinator</td>
<td>FSWG</td>
<td>August 8 Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Han Nyunt</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Regional Farmer Development Association, Magway region</td>
<td>August 9 Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Myo Thura</td>
<td>Deputy Director General</td>
<td>Ministry of Commerce</td>
<td>August 16 Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Yan Lin</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Agriculture, Livestock and Rural Development Committee, Pyithu Hluttaw (Upper house)</td>
<td>August 18 Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Kyaw Kyaw</td>
<td>Regional Director (retired)</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Yangon region</td>
<td>August 19 Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U San Thein</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>August 20 Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Restitution workshop, September 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bram Peters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Programme Officer Inclusion and Innovation</td>
<td>ICCO Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Khin Win Myint</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country Programme Officer</td>
<td>ICCO Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Khin Zaw Win</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Manager, P4 project</td>
<td>ICCO Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Wai Wai Hlaing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country Coordinator</td>
<td>ICCO Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Seng Pin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Coordinator</td>
<td>CESD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Thiri Wah Wah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>CESD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Gregory Phyo Wai Hpoo</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEAL officer</td>
<td>KMSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Thura Aung</td>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>RDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Htun Htun Naing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>RMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Naing Win</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor (focal Person)</td>
<td>RMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daw Zin Mar Theint</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation Manager</td>
<td>TLMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Riley</td>
<td></td>
<td>DI Advisor</td>
<td>TLMM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2. Workshops’ agendas

**Kick-off Workshop, July 28**

2:30-2:35 Opening
2:35-2:40 Brief intro participants
2:40-2:45 Session 1. Introduction of the evaluation and workshop
2:45-2:55 Icebreaker
2:55-3:15 Session 2. CEA’s added value
3:15-3:50 Session 3. Effectiveness
3:50-4:00 BREAK
4:00-4:25 Session 4. Efficiency/collaboration
4:25-4:55 Session 5. Sustainability
4:55-5:00 Final remarks
5:00-5:05 Evaluation

**Restitution Workshop, September 1**

2:30-2:35 Opening
2:35-2:45 Evaluation process and state of affairs
2:45-3:25 High-level preliminary findings I. Presentation and discussion.
3:25-4:05 High-level preliminary findings II. Presentation and discussion.
4:05-4:15 BREAK
4:15-4:55 Discussing improvements
4:55-5:00 Final remarks
Annex 3. Theories of Changes
Updated by March 2019

PW 3

Impact

Outcomes

Behavioural Changes

Capacity Changes

Outputs

Intervention Strategies

Problematique

Empowered women, youth and PMW are active participants in the agricultural sector.

Inclusive strategies of CSOs and other LAA representatives are developed.

Technical knowledge of CSOs and other LAA representatives on core topics** are developed.

L&A strategies of CSOs and other LAA representatives on core topics** are developed.

Capacity building by CFA partners training and workshops on how to do L&A

Building up knowledge by CFA partners through research activities and evidence-based input on core topics**

Smallholder (pulses) farmers, including women, youth and PMW, are suffering from chronic poverty, because of weak practices and enforcement of policies, regulations, practices and support from government, companies and associations to enable inclusive market systems.

*Core topics: Good Agricultural Practices | Access to good quality seeds | Access to markets | Climate Smart Agriculture | Inclusive business practices (overlap with PW3)

PW 4

Impact

Outcomes

Behavioural Changes

Capacity Changes

Outputs

Intervention Strategies

Problematique

Empowered women, youth and PMW are active participants in the agricultural sector.

Inclusive strategies of CSOs and other LAA representatives are developed.

Technical knowledge of CSOs and other LAA representatives on core topics** are developed.

L&A strategies of CSOs and other LAA representatives on core topics** are developed.

Capacity building by CFA partners training and workshops on how to do L&A

Building up knowledge by CFA partners through research activities and evidence-based input on core topics**

Government, companies and associations implement responsible (agr) business standards in their National Action Plan and business models.

*Core topics: Inclusive agribusiness practices (overlap with PW3) | LUNG Framework | Disability Inclusion | Child protection | Decent Working Place in agricultural value chains
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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Advance Afrika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>Arid land Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Civic Engagement Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>Community Based Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoU TEDDO</td>
<td>Church of Uganda Teso Dioceses Planning and Development Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC</td>
<td>Disability Inclusions Score Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNMC</td>
<td>District NGO Monitoring Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKN</td>
<td>Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAPAD</td>
<td>Facilitation for Peace and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>Faith Based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>German Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>Global Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>Iteso Cultural Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development (agency of the United Nations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementing Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIA</td>
<td>Kerk In Aktie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;A</td>
<td>Lobby &amp; Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LfW</td>
<td>Light for the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRA</td>
<td>Lord’s Resistance Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAIF</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>Multi-Stakeholder Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAADS</td>
<td>National Agricultural Advisory Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORAD</td>
<td>Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWC</td>
<td>Operation Wealth Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAG Soroti</td>
<td>Pentecostal Assemblies of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELUM</td>
<td>Participatory Ecological Land Use Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMEL</td>
<td>Programme Monitoring Evaluation Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMU</td>
<td>Programme Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoC</td>
<td>Pathway of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POMA</td>
<td>Public Order Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPRR</td>
<td>Principles Practices, Rights and Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>People With Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACCO</td>
<td>Savings And Credit Cooperative Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAO-U</td>
<td>Share An Opportunity - Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>Standard Operating Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToT</td>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFFE</td>
<td>Uganda National Farmers’ Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGOF</td>
<td>Uganda National NGO Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

Objectives of the end evaluation of the CEA Programme

Objective of the evaluation is to assess to what extent and how CEA members and their Southern partner organisations have progressed in reaching sustainable results as formulated in the Theories of Change of the specific country pathways during the period 2016-2020. In particular, the evaluation seeks to assess the effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and efficiency of the programme, related to changes the programme has contributed to in relation to: (a) capacities for lobbying and advocacy of Southern partner organisations, and (b) agendas, policies and practices of government and market actors.

The evaluation consists of four phases: (1) an inception stage, (2) a desk study phase, (c) a phase of primary data collection, involving three country case studies and an analysis of the L&A interventions conducted at the Netherlands and EU level and finally (4) a phase of consolidated analysis, reporting, debriefing and communication. This report presents the findings of the country study in Uganda.

Methodology

Figure 1. CEA Uganda Evaluation process

Preparations: Relevant documentation and Stories of Change related to CEA programme Uganda were consulted, which also allowed the identification of cases for a more focused contribution analysis. Documents consulted are listed in annex 1.

The process for the field study, its preparations and a first selection of cases were discussed in a virtual meeting with the ICCO country team on 28 July.

Virtual start-up workshop: a 2.5 hours virtual workshop took place on August 5, introducing the evaluation, creating partners’ ownership for the evaluation, and conducting a first joint overall
assessment of the CEA country programme. 14 participants from 8 organisations attended and ICCO Uganda staff.

**Bilateral meetings with CEA partners:** Implementing partners were involved in the data-collection in various ways. All implementing partners took part in the kick-off workshop and in the restitution workshop. Bilateral interviews with implementing partners were held during the reflection and learning workshop on 10-12 August, in Lira district, one of the CEA intervention regions. This was a good opportunity to meet representatives of the CEA implementing partners in person. One partner was interviewed in the week after, back in Kampala. The bilateral meetings aimed at understanding IP’s involvement in the programme, L&A results and the contribution to capacity development. A list of people consulted can be found in annex 2.

While partners participated in the workshop, the national consultant made use of partners’ contacts in Lira to visit some of the beneficiaries of the programme.

**Contribution analysis for selected cases:**
Three specific cases were selected to be subject of a contribution analysis. A contribution analysis consists of a systematic approach including a reconstruction of the ToC, process tracing (time line), evidence collection, development of performance stories and exploring rival causal explanations (through interviews with external stakeholders or documents). Following selection criteria were used to select the cases: (i) involvement of variety of implementing partners; (ii) importance of case for the entire country programme; (iii) relevant commodities or services represented, (iv) tangible results realised and (v) variation of results achieved at various levels, like local, district and national level. When relevant including linkages to international L&A. The following cases were selected in consultation with the ICCO RO:

1. Extensions services delivery
2. Provision of seeds and seedlings
3. Land grabbing

Contribution analysis was conducted with input from involved partners and by interviewing external stakeholders related to each case. Performance stories on these case are presented in chapter 4 on Effectiveness.

**Interviews with external stakeholders:** Remote interviews with external stakeholders were conducted to complement the reconstruction of the L&A trajectory of the selected cases and collect perspectives on the contribution of CEA and its partners. A list of interviewees is available in annex 1.

**Restitution workshop:** a 2 hours virtual workshop took place on September 21, aimed at presenting preliminary findings and jointly reflect, discuss and validate results. Representatives of all six IPs and ICCO RO took part.

**Final report:** the final report of this country study presents the findings of the evaluation in relation to the evaluation framework defined in the Inception Phase, including recommendations for ICCO, other members of the CEA alliance and partners in Uganda, to increase relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of future related interventions.
Limitations

- The most prominent limitation was the restriction to travel, between the Netherlands and Uganda, and also within Uganda because of the Covid-19 pandemic. It was not possible to make site-visits and interact with as many people as possible especially the final beneficiaries to get a first-hand impression of the outcomes of the CEA programme. This could have affected the depth of evidence for the cases which required collaboration of information from different experiences. Meetings and interviews were held remotely via telephone and zoom. The national consultant took advantage to join the annual reflection and learning workshop in August 2020 to interview all the IPs following the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) of the Ministry of Health. IPs appreciated the opportunity of meeting with the national consultant and providing as much information as possible. It was not possible for the international consultant to join the interviews via WhatsApp calls due to practical challenges of network failures, interferences (noise) in the background and distance from the telephone set couldn’t allow good voice capture.
- Normally the holiday season is pretty much concentrated in end July-August, but because of the travel restrictions several short leaves were taken, up to in September. This made it difficult to get hold of people.
- Opportunities for informal conversations with IPs and other stakeholders were missed out due to limitations on interaction. Usually such informal interactions generate a lot of useful information as there is time to reflect and clarify information, or generate more questions based on how situations unveil.
- Normally a team of consultants and the host organisation work together intensively for 2 weeks. In this field study the work was spread over a period of 7-8 weeks, due to personal circumstances (bereavements), the time it took making contacts for remote interviews and also because activities had to be mingled with other work and priorities.
- Connectivity was certainly a problem. Interviewees in the CEA intervention areas in Northern Uganda are not used to Skype or Zoom conversations and had to be contacted by phone. In many cases, they could not be accessible on phone due to network failure. Calls had to be repeated at different times.

Taking into account the limitations described, the evaluators are of the opinion that the evaluation provides a good picture of the results of the CEA programme in Uganda. Triangulation was done through the combination of written resources (programme documents, programme outputs) with interviews targeting both internal and external stakeholders. CEA partners and stakeholders interviewed were requested to complete the information provided during interviews and workshops, and via mail and written answers to remaining questions that were emerging after the interviews and workshops.
2. Brief description of CEA programme Uganda

Country context

Uganda has made important progress towards meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), especially with respect to increasing income, decreasing poverty, promoting gender equality and women empowerment, reducing child mortality, ensuring environmental sustainability and developing a global partnership for development. Two decades of strong economic growth have led to a significant reduction of poverty. Nevertheless, research shows that income levels for 67% of Uganda’s population remain below US$ 2.40 a day. Inequality is also high by international standards. Agriculture is the predominant sector of Uganda and smallholders account for 96% of the farmers. They underperform significantly as a result of poor market integration, limited access to credit, uncertain land tenure and low levels of (agri) technology. Weather has become unpredictable, and farmers suffer from this. Farmers are not organised and act individually in the value chain, especially in areas where farmer groups are not well developed.

In Uganda CEA members and partners work along PoCs 1, 2 and 3, focusing on small holder farmers. In the following section the context of each PoC is described as well as the key challenges as identified in the inception workshop June 2016 (see Inception workshop report CEA Uganda 2016).

Context Pathways of Change

With regard to civic space:

CSOs and communities have limited capacity to effectively engage with duty bearers for improved service delivery due to restrictive laws and policies (Public Order Management Act 2013 and the NGO Act 2016). Work of many CSOs has been curtailed by the enactment of repressive laws by parliament. Citizens are not conversant with the laws and CSOs are not financially independent and as such the government intervenes regulating their functionality.

Key challenges are: (1) Weak institutional CSO capacity, (2) Inadequate strategic direction, (3) NGO Act regulatory framework not yet in place, (4) NGO Act and POM Act are not understood by local partners and (5) NGOs are not self-sustaining.

With regard to food systems:

Food and nutrition security remains a fundamental challenge for human welfare and economic growth in Uganda. Marginalised small scale farmers especially women and youth and disabled persons in Lango, Teso and Karamoja are food insecure resulting into malnutrition, due to limited access to land and quality seeds and lack of knowledge about good nutrition. Improving women’s access over land, quality seeds and extension services will potentially contribute to greater investments in the land and increased productivity and welfare of households. Farmers have persistently used poor farming practices coupled with the use of traditional seeds and rudimentary inputs for planting, which has resulted into low and poor yields that have in turn affected the nutritional value of their produce. Many years of cropping on the same land have made most soils to lose fertility, organic materials and ability to retain moisture. There are many CSO’s supporting farmers but they are not well coordinated. Private enterprises sell poor quality seeds to farmers
and government officials don’t intervene. Households count many heads, though have very little land to use producing barely enough food.

CEA implementing partners aim strengthening the entire agricultural value chain specifically looking at access to land and quality seeds to enhance food security for small scale farmer’s households.

Key challenges are: (1) Poor quality seeds, (2) Inadequate skills and knowledge about nutrition, (3) Youth and women have limited access to land and (4) Limited knowledge about good farming practices.

*With regard to smallholder empowerment and market access:*

Marginalised small scale farmers in cassava, millet and maize have limited knowledge and skills to access markets. CEA implementing partners aim to remove barriers entering into the market and making markets work for the poor, marginalised small scale producers. Small scale farmers produce poor quality commodities. Some areas are affected by soil exhaustion; most of these lands were previously occupied and over cultivated. Although NAADS is present in the region, their staff concentrate on only selected (cash) crop enterprises (currently mainly fruit tree seedlings), leaving the rest of the crops unattended to. NGOs have attempted to bridge this gap but have worked with only crops of their choice and often focus on post-harvest handling and marketing aspects, leaving out production. Transportation is a strategic issue in better connecting farmers to markets; because of the poor condition of roads and the high costs of transportation, farmers remain largely isolated from markets and middle men buy farmers’ produce at a low price. Inadequate collaboration among farmers and high transaction costs are associated with contract farming. For those not engaged in formal contracts, price fluctuation is the main challenge deterring full participation of actors in the value chain.

Key challenges are: (1) Lack of access to market-oriented information, (2) Limited market driven services and skills and (3) Presence of uncontrolled middlemen.

*Pathways of Change*

Since 2007, ICCO Cooperation and its partners Kerk in Actie and Prisma have worked on food and nutrition security, and on conflict transformation and democratisation in northern and eastern Uganda, resulting in achievements in access to adequate food and empowering communities. An important lesson learned from these programs was that to sustain these achievements and ‘graduate’ farmers from being reliant on subsistence farming to launching successful (small and medium-scale) agribusinesses, it is essential to address the issue of access to land and other productive assets for women and youth, coupled with agribusiness and skills development for both groups. Another important lesson was that policy influencing and lobby for policy implementation in regard to land rights and access to quality seeds should also be part of the new (CEA) programme. These insights resulted in the choice for CEA Uganda to work in the following three Pathways of Change:
**PoC1:** Creating political space for civil society via community development of CSOs, lobby for civic space, and dialogue with government.

**Change envisaged:** Vibrant civil society in which women, youth and marginalised people find space to maneuver and ably engage duty bearers for the benefit of their communities.

**PoC2:** Realising inclusive and sustainable food systems through access to land, services, inputs and markets; special focus on women and youth.

**Change envisaged:** Marginalised small scale farmers, especially women and youth in Lango, Teso and Karamoja region are food and nutrition secure, based on development and implementation of inclusive action plans and budgets towards resilient and sustainable food systems and consumption patterns implemented.

**PoC3:** Small producer empowerment and access to markets, especially for 3 commodities: cassava, millet and maize; with focus on women, youth and PWD.

**Change envisaged:** Women, youth and PWD in Teso, Lango and Karamoja region have improved livelihoods as a result of accessing viable local markets for food and input supplies.

**Presentation of implementing partners and their role in the CEA Programme**

In CEA Uganda almost all CEA members from the Netherlands are represented, except for CNV (Netherlands labour union). Each CEA member is linked to at least one implementing partner organisation, except for Wilde Ganzen, who was responsible for capacity building in L&A and worked across the Uganda CEA team. Most CEA members and IPs have long standing relations of collaboration and funding support in various projects and activities.

The CEA Uganda partnership comprised 7 implementing partners; one partner, PAG-Soroti linked to CEA member Tear and Light for the World, was dropped in 2019. Furthermore CEA members Edukans and Light for the World were present in-country with regional advisors who were hosted by ICCO’s country office in Kampala. As from 2020 Edukans has a country office in Kampala.

Most of the CEA partners in Uganda are Faith Based Organisations (FBOs), well embedded at grass root level, predominantly in the North-East region of Uganda. During the inception phase in 2016 partners designed their collaboration, dividing tasks and roles within specific PoCs, according to expertise and geographical focus. Following the working modus from previous projects, with a logframe “mindset”, a fragmented set-up was decided upon with each partner having a distinct particle. In the course of the implementation process, when more horizontal collaboration emerged, partners teamed up in activities and became more effective in joining forces.

**Overview of linkages and PoC involvement of the CEA partners Uganda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>Linked to CEA member(s)</th>
<th>Engaged in PoC(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAPAD</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoU-TEDDO</td>
<td>Ker in Aktie, ICCO</td>
<td>2, 3(from 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>Red n Kind (Prisma)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PoC1 was led by UNNGOF and the strategy was based on the 2016 survey UNNGOF conducted, on the level of knowledge on the POM Act 2013 and NGO Act 2016 among NGOs. The IPs that were responsible for implementing PoC2 are FAPAD, CoU-TEDDO, and ADP in Lango, Teso and Karamoja regions respectively. PoC3 was implemented by AA in Lango region, SAO in Karamoja region and Pentecostal Assembly of God (PAG) in Teso region, whose activities were taken over in 2019 by CoU-TEDDO.

On behalf of Edukans and Light for the World disability inclusion and agri-skills advisors were added to the Uganda team, supporting partners specifically in PoC1 and 3.

In the following section CEA partners in Uganda are presented, first by their identity, vision and purpose, followed by their engagement in the CEA programme.

**Facilitation for Peace and Development (FAPAD)**

FAPAD is a non-governmental Human Rights organisation established in 2004 in Apac district to respond to the human rights violation targeting women and children. FAPAD launched its operations at the peak of the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) war in northern Uganda to support communities that were grossly affected by the impact of the LRA war (Parts of Acholi and Lango regions) especially women and children in regard to property rights. The goal of the organisation is to mobilise local voices and investing in local solutions to check impunity in human rights violation and improve livelihoods of the people. It has since expanded to cover the nine districts of Lango. In January 2008, the organisation expanded its scope of interventions to cover the following areas:

- Gender justice focusing on access to land by women, youth and People with Disabilities (PWDs) and providing free legal services to such categories of people
- Governance especially in public institutions such as the police district local governments and military
- Livelihoods and Natural Resource protection (since 2019)

In the new strategic plan (2019-2023) it is stated that FAPAD aspires “to be on the leading edge of shaping a resilient world by working with people and communities to harness personal and collective resources within their environment to address adversities and move forward in support of their wellbeing”. Its targets include: all groups of people including children, women, youth and PWDs. The strategic plan spells out the following objectives:

1. Improve sustainable utilisation of natural resources for food and income security;
2. Hold government accountable using different mechanisms within its framework
3. Income security for unemployed youth
4. Promote gender justice
5. Strengthen institutional capacity of FAPAD

Experiences gained from the CEA programme have informed and shaped the new strategic direction of FAPAD.

FAPAD is linked to CEA member ICCO and working in PoC2 and PoC3.

In 2017 FAPAD started mobilising smallholder farmers throughout the five sub-counties of Lira district into farmer platforms of 30 farmers each. The focus was skills enhancement and provision of relevant information for farmers to be able to engage with duty bearers. Specifically, the capacities were:

- Capacity for farmers to identify counterfeit agricultural inputs particularly seed – there was widespread concern about adulterated seed on the market and farmers were unable to deal with the input dealers in the private sector;
- Engaging with the duty bearers through dialogues at parish, sub-county, district and regional levels to address critical concerns of the farmers;
- Capacity to participate in developing joint action plans with the duty bearers including allocation of public resources at the sub-county and district levels.

The roles of FAPAD included:

- Mobilisation of farmers to express their needs to the duty bearers
- Provide evidence to support by-law formulation
- Dissemination of existing ordinance on counterfeit inputs and post-harvest handling. The ordinance already existed but there was limited awareness of its existence and was not being implemented. Instruments for its implementation did not exist.
- Convening and facilitating dialogues at parish, sub-county, district and regional levels to lobby for more support towards provision of agricultural extension services. In all dialogues, FAPAD ensured representation of women, youth and PWDs.
- Facilitation of the development of by-laws to aid implementation of the district ordinance.
- Dissemination of the seed policy for wider awareness.

Church of Uganda Teso Dioceses Planning and Development Office (CoU-TEDDO)

CoU-TEDDO is the planning and development arm of the Church of Uganda Development dioceses of Teso region (CoU-TEDDO comprises of two dioceses of Soroti and Kumi). Its scope of operation covers the ten districts of Teso region. The organisation has a history that dates as far back as 1968 when it was started as Church of Uganda Soroti Diocese Development Office (COU-SDDO). In 2002 it was renamed as CoU-TEDDO.

The organisation operates its development functions using five-year strategic plans. The latest strategic plan 2020-2025 has five thematic areas:

(i) Governance and Social Accountability
(ii) Resilient Livelihoods
(iii) Gender and Social Justice
(iv) Water Sanitation and Hygiene
In the previous strategic plan, gender was a crosscutting component which in the current one has been elevated to a thematic area. The elevation of gender and social justice to a fully-fledged thematic focus was in part influenced by the experiences of the CEA program.

In the CEA programme, CoU-TEDDO is linked to CEA members Kerk in Aktie and ICCO, focussing on PoC2 and also supported on PoC3 after one the implementing partners, PAG Soroti was dropped from the partnership (2019). Interventions include:

- Contributing to L&A to the passing of national seed policy and subsequent dissemination and sensitisation of stakeholders about the policy at the district level.
- L&A with district local government to recruit and facilitate agricultural extension workers at the sub-county to reach out to the rural communities
- Sensitisation of smallholder farmers to detect counterfeit seed, and clean vegetative planting materials. Based on this sensitisation, farmers started raising their concerns about the quality of seed and planting materials supplied by the Government program, Operation Wealth Creation (OWC).
- Organised dialogues for farmers to engage with several stakeholders to discuss their concerns regarding access to quality seed and other issues affecting their farming and livelihoods in general. The dialogues were organised at parish, sub-county and district levels in Kumi district. These dialogues led to a series of interventions, especially related to provision of quality seeds, which is elaborated further in Chapter 4 of this report.
- Convening dialogues at the parish, sub-county, district and regional levels for farmers to articulate their issues and concern to technical people, politicians, and cultural leaders. The representatives of the farmers who generated the concerns of smallholder farmers included the women, youth and PWDs. The role of CoU-TEDDO was to document issues emerging from the discussions and facilitate the discussions. The decisions made from the dialogues were followed up with the respective leaders to implementation. Every year, a district level dialogue was convened for Serere and Ngora where CEA was implemented, and joint regional dialogues for Teso, Lango and Karamoja were also held.
- Dissemination of the guidelines for access to land by different categories of people developed by the Iteso Cultural Union (ICU). These guidelines existed but most people were not aware of them. CoU-TEDDO multiplied and disseminated the guidelines in both English, Ateso and Brail (for persons with visual impairment). As a result of the wide dissemination, clan leaders intervened in several cases of land conflict especially the dispossession of land for widows, youth and PWDs.

**Share An Opportunity (SAO)**

SAO-Uganda is a Christian founded non-government organisation (NGO) established in 1991 but registered in 2002 as a NGO. Initially, the organisation focused on improving the welfare of children but this has since broadened beyond children. The vision is “A holistically developed child within the community” and SAO’s mission is: “To Empower Communities to provide holistic child development”. The organisation operates country-wide. The holistic approach to child development includes emphasis on child survival (for the under 3 years), child development, child protection, child participation in policy and development initiatives, and child health and nutrition.
SAO is linked to CEA member Red n Kind (Prisma) and operating in PoC3, in three sub-counties of Abim: Lotuke, Awach and Morulem. Interventions include:

- Conducting dialogues focused on market access starting from parish level, up to sub counties, district and regional levels. Entry was through existing farmer groups to identify challenges for smallholder farmer access to markets. Issues generated through groups were synthesised, consolidated and filtered for what could be addressed at parish, sub-county and district levels.
- Based on the market related concerns, value chain actors (maize, cassava and millet) were identified (input dealers, microfinance providers, extension workers, etc) and dialogues were organised where smallholder farmers raised their issues and discussed.
- Similar dialogues were convened at sub-counties, district and regional levels also involving political actors such as the councilors, community development officers, district commercial officers, entomologists and the production department staff. At regional level, members of parliament representing the project operation areas and officials from MAAIF attended. SAO, together with other CEA partners has also been involved in meetings at national level.

**Arid Land Development Program (ADP)**

ADP is a Community Based Christian Organisation started in 2004 and acquired the status of NGO in April 2008. Currently it is operating in Karamoja region supporting women groups to access credit and building their capacity in leadership and records management.

ADP’s vision is: Empowered people with decent standards of living. And its mission reads: To improve household income and welfare, food security, health, good governance and quality of education to reduce suffering of men, women, youths and children.

To empower people to stimulate their own sustainable transformation through a holistic development approach, the current ADP programs includes:

- Food and Nutrition Security funded by USAID.
- Agribusiness (honey value chain, white sorghum growing, piggery etc) funded by NORAD and Woord & Daad.
- Community managed micro-finance targeting women groups funded by IFAD through the Ministry of Finance PMU
- Technical vocational education and training (skills empowerment for alternative livelihoods) funded by Enabel and VSO/Dynamic
- Health and HIV/Aids prevention
- Disaster risks reduction

ADP was linked to ICCO in 2013 through the Food and Nutrition Security Program. In the CEA programme ADP is partnering with Woord & Daad. ADP’s interventions are in PoC2 and PoC3:

- Promoting regulation of the seed business in Abim district. The by-laws to support this regulation are under formulation in three sub-counties.
- Convening and facilitating dialogues to lobby for increased access to agricultural extension services, and reactivation of the district land board.
- Dissemination of the land policy and the entitlements for women and youth.
- Organise and build the capacity of farmer groups to access credit through SACCOs and micro-finance institutions. The groups are mixed and comprise of men, women, youth and PWDs.

Advance Afrika (AA)

AA is a non-governmental organisation that has been in operation since 2012. AA aims at contributing to a safe and free society that upholds the dignity of every person. The organisation seeks innovative approaches for creating sustainable sources of livelihood to foster resilience among vulnerable people and social justice in the region. Its focus is on:

- Economic empowerment of vulnerable persons through creating employment opportunities and business development services
- Livelihoods through promoting agriculture and access to markets
- Rehabilitation, reformation and reintegration of prison inmates
- Prevention of violence against women, youth and children
- Widening the space for youth participation in politics and governance

AA is linked to CEA member Edukans, and implemented PoC3 working across all three intervention regions i.e. Lango, Karamoja and Teso. Interventions include:

- Capacity building of extension workers; Life Skills for Lobby and technical skills. Including the development of training modules, e.g. on Advocacy on agri-skills and agri-extension services (2018)
- Skills development for farmers in crop agronomy, post-harvest handling and value addition.
- Providing market information to enhance market access by smallholder farmers
- Advocacy through the media¹ and publication of case studies, e.g. Promoting skills development and market access for cassava, maize and millet in Karamoja, Lango and Teso sub-regions (2017); Assessment of inclusivity, accessibility and capacity of rural advisory services for smallholder farmers in Abim, Lira and Soroti districts (2018)

AA organised expert group meetings to provide opportunities for farmers to interact with experts from MAAIF, district officials and Uganda National Farmers’ Federation (UNFFE) to discuss national level agricultural programs. In such meetings, the farmers were sensitised about the national level agricultural programs (e.g. mechanisation through provision of tractors to organised farmer groups/associations) and explained the procedures and requirements to benefit from such programs. The farmers were informed and linked to the nearest beneficiary groups for them to try and access services when needed. UNFFE provided leaflets with technical information on some commodities.

Uganda National NGO Forum (UNNGOF)

Uganda National NGO Forum (UNNGOF) established in 1997 as a membership organisation for District-based NGOs, National NGOs, District Networks, Faith-Based Organisations and National Networks and International NGOs. The organisation's vision is: ‘A coherent, respected and well informed NGO sector in Uganda actively contributing to citizens’ well-being and safe guarding their rights.’ And the mission reads: ‘To provide a sharing and reflection platform for NGOs to influence governance and development processes in Uganda and enhance their operating environment.’ UNNGOF aims to create solutions in two intervention areas – Civil society strengthening and Influencing development policies and practices. This is achieved through three complementary program components:

- Civil Society Strengthening - to develop the capacity of Uganda’s civil society so that the CSO sector can deliver its core mandate and influence development policies.
- Civic Space and Governance Monitoring - to influence internal and external operating environment issues of CSOs and to ensure a positive environment for NGO operations and citizen engagement in governance processes.
- Policy Advocacy and Engagement - to effectively coordinate collective policy engagements by NGOs on policy of interest to NGOs and relevant to Uganda’s development.

In CEA UNNGOF implemented PoC1, through a project entitled – “Growing Opportunities for Constructive Civic Engagement for CSOs (GO-4-CCE) in Lango, Teso and Karamoja Regions”.

In 2016, UNNGOF conducted a baseline survey on the level of knowledge of the two laws, the NGO Act of 2016 and the POMA of 2013. The findings indicated that there was need to create awareness of the two laws as a way of engaging government to provide conducive environment for operations of CSOs. In 2017, UNNGOF organised dialogues targeting local governments, police and political leaders to create awareness about the two laws and their implications. This round of awareness creation was one of the first activities of CEA to create a supportive environment to partners implementing PoC2 and PoC3. The awareness was conducted in partnership with the NGO Bureau covering the three intervention regions. The exercise also served to introduce CEA partners to the districts though some of them were already operating in those areas but probably not focusing specifically on L&A. More dialogues were conducted in 2018 to disseminate the details of the laws, their implications, the regulations, and penalties in case of violation of the laws and catalysing the establishment of the DNMCs. In 2019 and 2020, focus has been on monitoring the performance of the DNMCs.

UNNGOF also conducted clinics to coach NGOs to comply with the two laws and to ensure that they use the platform created by DNMCs to create a harmonious working relationship with the district authorities, political and cultural leaders. Finally UNNGOF has been participating in capacity building of the CEA implementing partners and hosted the capacity building interventions by Edukans, the Life skills for Lobby training, and Change the Game Academy, supported by Wilde Ganzen, including trainings on Local Fundraising and Mobilising Support.

Pentecostal Assemblies of God (PAG-Soroti)
PAG is a religious (church) organisation which also has a development arm concerned with projects such as child development, emergency relief, advocacy program, food security program in Karamoja and water and sanitation. The Pentecostal Assemblies of God church started in 1963 in the Northern regions and focused for a long time on evangelism activities. When relative peace returned in the area after the civil war, people started returning to their homes but the living conditions were very difficult. In 1994, PAG-Soroti started humanitarian support to people resettling after the war. Between 1994 – 2000, the focus was on giving hand-outs (relief) mainly food and money supplied by TEAR fund based in United Kingdom but also with networks in the Netherlands. With time, it was realised that giving hand-outs was not sustainable and people needed to be empowered to be self-reliant. Thereafter, PAG-Soroti ventured into livelihood support and in addition to relief food, also provided planting materials to help people produce their own food.

PAG-Soroti initiated about 908 community projects including mobilising communities to construct primary and secondary schools, farming and provision of water to communities. With these experiences, TEAR – Netherlands facilitated linkages between PAG-Soroti and ICCO. PAG-Soroti started collaborating with ICCO on a livelihood project in 2011 before the CEA program. With the CEA program, PAG-Soroti scaled down the scope of its implementation and worked with communities in Soroti and Serere districts. Through engagement in CEA program PAG-Soroti contributed to:

- Mobilising farmer groups and communities to engage with the duty bearers in order to advocate for improved service delivery for better livelihood; in each community, PAG has trained disciples who train the advocacy committees to facilitate engagement between farmers and duty bearers.
- Increased knowledge, skills and change of attitudes of communities to lead their own development through value addition to their produce (maize and cassava) and to negotiate better prices with traders, lobbying with sub-county level government securing equipment (e.g. a mill) for value addition, or grading a road connecting communities to the market.
- Capacity of communities to mobilise local resources to support marketing of their produce. Several groups raised funds and hired stores where they could bulk their produce for collective marketing;
- Mobilising farmers to form and work together in groups. PAG-Soroti works with about 46 communities and in each of these, 5-10 groups have legalised their status by registering with the sub-county and district authorities.
- Facilitation of extension workers to deliver among other things, market information (prices) to farmers as part of the extension services. Through advocacy, extension workers were linked to farmers to understand their challenges, one of them being marketing.
- Establishment of by-laws at sub-county to support farmers access better markets and prices, e.g. to register all produce traders and unregistered produce buyers would not be allowed to operate in the sub-county.
- Through dialogues at district and national levels, influenced the development of the Produce Marketing Act.

In CEA PAG-Soroti was engaged in PoC3 concerned with mobilising smallholder farmers to access better markets and was linked to TEAR and to Light for the World in the Netherlands, both Prisma members.
In 2018 and part of 2019, after investigation and an audit, the CEA funding to PAG-Soroti was suspended allegedly over concerns of governance and accountability largely at the Headquarters in Kampala. The CEA program in PAG-Soroti was interrupted prematurely and before planning for sustainability. At the program implementation level in Soroti, interviewees reported that there has not been an official communication to-date about the fate of the partnership in the CEA program.

In the CEA Uganda partner collaboration, two CEA members Edukans and Light for the World, both Prisma members, were present in-country with an advisor. On their behalf disability and agri-skills advisors were added to the CEA team Uganda, supporting partners especially in PoC1 and 3.

**Edukans**

Edukans is one of the consortium members based in the Netherlands and working closely with Advance Africa in PoC3 to develop agro-skills for smallholder farmers to engage in L&A – building the capacity of smallholder farmers to engage with duty bearers. Edukans provides technical backstopping to Advance Africa, and later in the programme introduced the Life Skills for Lobby training.

The agri-skills focused on are emergent from two capacity needs assessments conducted during implementation of the CEA program. The first needs assessment conducted at the beginning of the program was to identify the skills gaps for smallholder farmers and how these skills affected them. A second needs assessment was done one year later to validate the identified needs and further differentiate specific needs for women, youth and PWDs for purposes of inclusivity. With regard to PoC3, the priority skills were: agronomy, post-harvest handling, value addition and market information. Training targeted farmer groups (also comprising of women, youth and PWDs).

Together with AA agri-skills platforms were organised for capacity building and also as a mechanisms for the smallholder farmers to interact with the duty bearers on matters related to markets and market access. Emerging from the engagements, the extension workers in 2020 expressed the need to build their capacity in L&A and ToTs were planned.

**Light for the World (LftW)**

Light for the World is one of the members of the consortium from the Netherlands to support the CEA program on inclusion of PWDs. The disability inclusion advisor joined the CEA program 1.5 years after the start of the program and is hosted by ICCO RO in Kampala.

The contributions of LftW were not specific in certain PoCs and include the following:

- Enabling the CEA implementing partners better understand and appreciate disability inclusion based on a score card with six domains which include issues to do with governance, management, human resource management, financial resources and external relations. The score card is a self-administered tool that helped to identify the gaps that informed the disability inclusion plan.

- Training on different forms of disability. Most people are familiar with the common forms of disability such as lameness, blindness and being deaf; but are not conscious about the hidden forms of disability such as mental disability. The Disability Inclusion Score Card (DISC) helps
learners to assess themselves and even to start learning the appropriate language to use while addressing PWDs.
- Coaching and mentoring of partners on how to address issues of disability e.g. how to make meetings inclusive (what to do before, during and after the meeting); auditing buildings to assess their access to PWDs.
- Training on disability programming to come up with strategies for inclusion of PWDs in all organisational activities and programs

3. Relevance

Relevance of country ToC

The formulation of the CEA programme in Uganda is based on previous interventions in the country by the CEA members and their partners. The Baseline report 2016 reads: “Since 2007, ICCO Cooperation and its partners Kerk in Aktie and Prisma have worked on Food and Nutrition Security and Conflict Transformation and Democratisation in northern and eastern Uganda, resulting in achievements in access to adequate food and empowering communities. An important lesson learned from both programs is that to sustain these achievements and ‘graduate’ farmers from being reliant on subsistence farming to launching successful (small and medium-scale) agribusinesses, it is essential to address the issue of access to land and other productive assets for women and youth, coupled with agribusiness and skills development for both groups. Another important lesson is that policy influencing and lobby for policy implementation in regard to land rights and access to quality seeds should also be part of this new program”.

Four (UNNGOF, CoU-TEDDO, FAPAD and SAO) out of the seven CEA IPs in Uganda were collaborating in previous interventions and it was found essential that they should continue into the new CEA partnership. The others (PAG-Soroti, AA, and ADP) joined the CEA partnership largely on the basis of their connection with some of the CEA members in the Netherlands. There was no transparent selection of partners, and some were weak in terms of L&A. And there was no free selection of partners, only ICCO could choose in-country partners.

The first years of CEA in Uganda had to be used orienting partners into L&A and to the CEA programme approach and intended outcomes. In the first years partners operated in silos of PoCs, and Uganda and Netherlands paired partners until end 2017 when a first joint working plan was made to harmonise and foster more collaborations.

The ToC for the CEA programme in Uganda was validated by partners in the inception workshop in 2016. The challenges identified through previous interventions are addressed in the three Pathways of Change (PoC). Engagement of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) is key in achieving the intentions of PoC2 and PoC3. Therefore, PoC1 was essential to create space for the CSOs/NGOs to engage in that regard. Space for civic engagement in Uganda was constrained by mainly two policies, the NGO Act 2016, and the Public Order Management Act (POM Act, 2013) due to different interpretations of the two laws by the enforcement agencies. Implementation of PoC1 by UNNGOF was code named “Growing Opportunities for Constructive Civic Engagement for CSOs (GO-4-CCE) in Lango, Teso, and Karamoja Regions”. The overall objective was to formulate a constructive engagement
strategy that supports the expansion of civic engagement space for civil society in the selected regions and the country at large. Specifically, PoC1 aimed at:

- increasing awareness among the CSOs and duty bearers on the NGO Act 2016 and its regulations, and the POM Act 2013;
- create avenues for continued dialogue between CSOs and duty bearers at the sub-county and district level;
- equip CSOs with tips on how to operate within a restrictive environment;
- strengthen CSOs partnerships/collaborations at sub-county and district leadership for sustainability of CSO interventions;
- identify and share best practices and tips for CSO-Government relations.

Northern, Eastern Uganda and Karamoja region had been affected by civil war and unrest for over two decades, since 1986, and food and nutritional security and inclusive access to markets were among the essential interventions for restoration of livelihoods and human dignity. Women, youth and PWDs were the most vulnerable categories given that they were disadvantaged with respect to access and control of land – the major livelihood resource. Therefore PoC2 & PoC3 address the needs of smallholder farmers and with emphasis on inclusion of women, youth and PWDs. The two PoCs are closely related and fused during implementation to effectively address the entire value chain. For relevance to the regions, focus was on three specific value chains of maize, millet and cassava. These commodities are the most important for both food security and income of the smallholder farmers in the target regions.

Relevant strategies and interventions

Enhancing capacity for citizen led and evidence-based L&A was the overall strategy for implementation of the CEA programme to ensure sustainable development. AA conducted several studies supporting interventions in PoC 2 and PoC3, e.g. on agri-skills, and on market access. UNNGOF conducted a baseline survey on the level of knowledge of the NGO Act of 2016 and the POMA of 2013. The findings indicated that there was need to create awareness of the two laws as a way of engaging government to provide conducive environment for operations of CSOs. And FAPAD was responsible for baseline surveys in Lango and Teso region.

Under the CEA umbrella two levels of capacity building were developed, capacity of the CEA IPs and capacity of the final target groups. At the start of the programme capacity assumptions were formulated for each PoC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PoC</th>
<th>Capacity Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PoC1</td>
<td>CSO’s are able to use their capacity to formulate dialogue agenda’s about the NGO Act and the Public order Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoC2</td>
<td>Small holder farmers are able to use their capacity to formulate dialogue agenda’s to address duty bearers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of duty bearers and private companies create space for further dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PoC3  Small-scale farmers are willing to formulate dialogue agenda’s with duty bearers and private companies

These assumptions are rather broad, and in the interviews with the IPs, there was no mention of systematic annual capacity building plans aligned to the assumptions of the PoCs, nor was there a clear strategy directed at those participating in a particular pathway.

Edukans conducted two capacity needs assessments. The first needs assessment conducted at the beginning of the program was to identify skills gaps for smallholder farmers and how these skills affected them. This capacity needs assessment was rather general and did not differentiate if there were specific peculiar needs for women, youth and PWDs. A second needs assessment was done one year later to validate the identified needs and further differentiate specific needs for women, youth and PWDs for purposes of inclusivity. With regard to PoC3, the priority skills were: agronomy, post-harvest handling, value addition and market information. Training targeted farmer groups (also comprising of women, youth and PWDs).

It was explained that the agri-skills training conducted was to address the priority needs that emerged from these capacity needs assessment. The assumption was that capacity development through the ToTs would translate into capacity of the smallholder farmers including the women, youth and PWDs to lobby and advocate for delivery of relevant services. Ideally the focus was on how the smallholder farmers engage with the duty bearers and influence policies and practices through L&A. The test for the PoC assumptions is whether at the end of the programme, smallholder farmers can lobby and advocate, however this is a general result of all CEA activities and not only attributed to the capacity building by certain IPs.

Other than the mention that capacities for PoC3 emerged from the needs assessments, no further explanation could be found of how the capacity assessments informed the capacity development strategy and plans.

Not all partners were at the same level with experiences and capacities for L&A. Interviewees pointed out that even some CEA members were not quite familiar with L&A and yet they guided their counterpart partners in Uganda in the activities. This created challenges for ICCO RO’s coordination especially at the beginning of the programme. To bring all partners to the same level, the initial activities of implementation focused on capacity building of the IPs and to build a common understanding on the implementation and intended outcomes of the CEA programme.

In 2016 local trainers (including staff of the ICCO regional office and IPs) have been trained on the content and methodology of the Change the Game Academy (by Wilde Ganzen). This training covered both ‘Mobilising Support for L&A’ as well as ‘Local Fundraising’, which was carried out in 2017 and 2018. After the trainings, partners were supported to come up with a clear work plan for dialogues with small scale farmers about the lobby issues at stake and identifying policy frameworks supporting the lobby agenda. In 2017 IPs were trained in stakeholder mapping and engagement in L&A. Partners were also trained in the use of the lobby logbook, tracking the different lobby activities and identifying outcome stories. In 2018 follow up meetings for Change the Game were organised, which helped partners to strengthen linkages, come up with a common lobby agenda, agree on joint activities and organise peer support. In 2019 the Life Skills for Lobby training was
delivered to the CEA IPs by Edukans as a ToT with support from UNNGOF as the organiser. The IPs then cascaded the intervention to the target beneficiaries, smallholders in Abim, Lira and Soroti districts.

In 2019, the IPs were trained by LftW to understand the different forms of disability and mainstreaming disability inclusion in development interventions using the Disability Inclusion Score Card (DISC) followed by mentoring and coaching on the same. In addition, the annual reflection meetings that involve all IPs were partly used to share knowledge and skills and to harmonise approaches and draw lessons learnt.

These capacities were then applied in organising dialogues at the various levels, parish, sub-county, district and regional. IPs, e.g. SAO and FAPAD, had national engagements in L&A activities by invitation from other CSOs. And later in the programme CEA partners also convened national engagements, e.g. on dissemination of national policies.

The dialogues organised and facilitated by IPs were attended by representatives of relevant stakeholders including the technical persons at the sub-county and district level, political decision makers at sub-county and district levels, the private sector and other extension service providers. The regional level dialogues were also attended by members of parliament from the CEA districts, representatives of relevant ministries and the national farmers’ federation. In these dialogue meetings, the smallholder farmers clearly articulated their needs and interests and their views were taken seriously by duty bearers. The voices of smallholders invoked responses to facilitate extension workers to reach out to farmers; putting up regulatory mechanisms at district level (including developing by-laws in for instance Lira district) to control and minimise the distribution and sale of fake/counterfeit seed and other inputs; influence the cultural land management systems to guarantee rights of women (mainly widows) girls and orphans to land; and organising farmers to bulk and access better markets for their produce. According to IPs building the capacity for smallholder farmers in L&A proved to be an effective and sustainable way to influencing inclusive service delivery from the duty bearers as opposed to advocacy by CSOs/NGOs.

In 2017, UNNGOF organised dialogues targeting local governments, police and political leaders to create awareness about the two laws and their implications (NGO Act of 2016 and the POMA of 2013). This round of awareness creation was one of the first activities of CEA to create a supportive environment to partners implementing PoC2 and PoC3. Once both local governments and CEA Partners are aware of the provisions in the law, UNNGOF assumed, they will have more collaborations for more transformative advocacy.

The awareness was conducted in partnership with the NGO Bureau covering the three intervention regions. The exercise also served to introduce CEA partners to the districts though some of them were already operating in those areas but not focusing specifically on L&A. More dialogues were conducted in 2018 to disseminate the details of the laws and their implications and the regulations, penalties in case of violation of the laws and catalysing the establishment of District NGO Monitoring Committees (DNMCs). In 2019 and 2020, focus has been on monitoring the performance of the DNMCs.

The dialogues organised by UNNGOF for PoC1 created an opportunity for technocrats at the district level, the CSOs and enforcement agencies for POMA and NGO Act to develop a common
understanding of the policies and come up with agreed arrangements for implementation of development interventions including L&A without confrontations. Roles and responsibilities of the actors were clarified and DNMCs, chaired by the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) were established to guarantee space for IPs to implement their activities unhindered. Compliance clinics for the CSOs conducted by UNNGOF provided the tips for CSOs to better utilise and manage the space available to implement their activities including strengthening capacity for L&A. These clinics also boosted IPs’ appreciation of their key obligations as regards to the NGO regulatory framework.

UNNGOF also conducted clinics to coach NGOs to comply with the two laws and to ensure that they use the platform created by DNMCs to create a harmonious working relationship with the district authorities, political and cultural leaders.

Relying on FBOs was also strategic in the Uganda context of limited space for CSOs; the advantages of working via FBOs included:

- The FBOs already had established networks in the communities and reach the most vulnerable in the community including women, youth and PWDs
- The FBOs have credibility in the communities where they operate. The people believe in them and perceive them to be neutral
- Because of the limited space under the POM Act there is little room for CBOs and NGOs to mobilise communities. FBOs had more space to act compared to other CSOs/NGOs and are known to governments as politically neutral and non-activists organisations, working at community level. Therefore FBOs are allowed a little more room to manoeuvre at district level, e.g. having meetings, organise trainings, finding room for dialogue and lobby with government and other stakeholders on concrete issues affecting the position of smallholders.

For PoC2 & PoC3, the IPs targeted existing groups, those that were already working with the partner organisations in the area. This study could not confirm that these groups were also connected to other existing private initiatives that are not necessarily church related. For example, every district has a District Farmers’ Association which are members of the National Farmers Federation (UNFFE), however, there was no mention of engagement with the district farmers’ associations and it is not clear whether the targeted farmer groups were registered members of the District Farmers’ Association, nor if there is a close collaboration. This is information that would have been verified by obtaining the authentic members of the District Farmers’ Association and checking if the targeted groups were members. Evaluators did not have the opportunity to do so.

Programme responding to needs and priorities of CSOs involved

All the IPs were involved in some community development work related to food security prior to CEA programme though they used different approaches. PoCs were used for action planning and each IP was responsible for implementing a particular PoC. The use of PoCs and a citizen led L&A approach was a learning experience for all IPs. There was no systematic baseline research done specifically for CEA to benchmark the different PoCs as basis for assessing outcomes, hence, the expected outcomes are formulated in general terms. It was explained that the issues for L&A were informed by three commodity value-chain analyses (cassava, maize and millet) and community
dialogues. The start of CEA Uganda was more of a continuation of activities of the previous MFSII programme, so some of the needs were basically carried over from previous programme (aimed at service delivery). The dialogues helped to galvanise the community needs and planned activities by the IPs. Harmonisation of approaches for implementation took some time as the IPs developed common understanding and capacity for L&A.

The relevance of the PoCs to the respective organisations and their expected outcomes are described below.

**Outcome PoC1**

PoC1 was led by UNNGOF and the strategy was based on the 2016 survey, UNNGOF conducted, on the level of knowledge on POM Act 2013 and NGO Act 2016 among NGOs. Through PoC1, UNNGOF focussed on creating common understanding and interpretations of the two laws amongst the responsible stakeholders. The dialogues and resultant spaces created through agreements on the roles and responsibilities of the different actors including government enforcement agencies should enable:

- Local governments at district and sub-county levels to work in partnership with the CSO/NGOs to improve service delivery. Barriers created by the POM Act and the NGO Act are minimised due to clarity of roles and responsibilities of the actors. IPs recognised that L&A can be an instrument for improving service delivery.
- CSOs to ensure that they comply (through compliance clinics) with POM Act and NGO Act and utilise the restricted space to mobilise communities to lobby and advocate for better services with minimal conflicts with government.
- CSOs to ensure that marginalised people within their communities particularly women, youth and PWDs are not excluded from development interventions resulting from constraints imposed by POM Act and the NGO Act at sub-county, district and national levels.

These outcomes are within the broad mandates and goals of UNNGOF to strengthen the capacity of CSOs/NGOs to influence development policies and practices.

**Outcome PoC2**

The IPs that were responsible for implementation of PoC2 are FAPAD, CoU-TEDDO, and ADP in Lango, Teso and Karamoja regions respectively. All these IPs have food security and empowerment of communities with elements of L&A as part of their core mandates. Two of them (FAPAD, CoU-TEDDO) had worked together on food security initiatives in the MFSII. The background and operational focus of these IPs are aligned with PoC2 aspirations of realising the right to adequate

---

food and nutrition by small holder farmers and specifically the women, youth and PWDs. The expected outcomes of implementation of PoC2 include:

- Smallholder farmers including women, youth and PWDs raise their voices and engage with duty bearers to influence development policies, practices and plans (including budgets) towards inclusive and resilient food system
- Position and access to productive resources (land, quality seed, markets, credit), extension services and knowledge of target groups is improved
- Local government at the sub-county and IPs ensure that the implementation of food security programs include the needs of women, youth and PWDs

Outcome PoC3

PoC3 was implemented by AA in Lango region, by SAO in Karamoja region and by PAG-Soroti in Teso region. After PAG-Soroti left the partnership in 2019, their responsibilities and activities were taken over by CoU-TEDDO since they were working on the same value chains in the same region. In PoC3, AA was responsible for skills development for smallholder farmers and extension service providers. These IPs focussed on empowerment of smallholders with production skills and access to services but little was done on actual facilitation of smallholder farmers to access better markets. Although PoC2 and PoC3 were conceptually distinct, implementation was rather fused and outcomes similar. This is understandably due to inter-connectedness of the two PoCs in the value chains. The expected outcomes of PoC3 were:

- Duty bearers at local, sub-county and district level respond to implement pro-poor, inclusive value chain work plans and policies for small holder farmers.
- Smallholder farmers acquire skills and knowledge to organise themselves to access viable local markets for their products.
- Smallholder farmers have better access to extension services and quality inputs

The main focus of the programme in Uganda was on PoC1 and PoC2, which is reflected in the budget, where almost 75% was spent in these PoCs. More information about the budget can be found in chapter 5 of this report.

Gender and inclusiveness

Culturally in Uganda, women carry the primary responsibility for provision of food in a household. The quantity and quality of food consumed especially in the rural communities is determined by women who largely depend on peasant farming. Income for women is more likely to be used for general welfare of family than that of men. Moreover, at the start of CEA, it was identified that in sub-regions of Lango, Teso and Karamoja, women especially those from polygamous marriages and widows had limited access to and control of land – which is the most important livelihood resource. Therefore, targeting women would result in greater impact for PoC2 & PoC3. Whereas the broader target of CEA in Uganda was smallholder farmers, there was specific attention to women, youth and PWDs, assuming that the most effective and efficient way to serve smallholder farmers is through groups in which also female farmers were represented. The first intervention in PoC2 and PoC3 was to reconfigure the composition of the groups for inclusiveness of women, youth and
PWDs. Inclusion of PWDs is more complex than women and youth as the PWDs are not easily visible in a community even though they exist.

**Conclusions**

Based on the discussions above, the following conclusions can be made:

**ToC**

The formulation of the CEA programme in Uganda was based on previous interventions in the country by the CEA members and their partners. In 2016 in a workshop with ICCO and partners the general ToC for the CEA programme was discussed and refined for Uganda, and ToCs and assumptions formulated for each PoC. On this basis partners FAPAD, AA and UNNGOF hired consultants for specific baseline surveys. The research findings as well as challenges identified through previous interventions are addressed in the three PoCs. Engagement of CSOs is key in achieving the intentions of PoC2 and PoC3. Therefore, PoC1 was seen as essential to create space for the CSOs/NGOs to engage in that respect.

PoCs were used for action planning and each IP was responsible for implementing a particular PoC. There was no systematic overall baseline research done specifically for CEA to benchmark the different PoCs as basis for assessing outcomes, hence, the expected outcomes are formulated in general terms. IPs explained that the issues for L&A were informed by three commodity value-chain analyses (cassava, maize and millet) and community dialogues. The start of CEA Uganda was more of a continuation of activities of the previous MFSII programme, so some of the needs were basically carried over from previous programmes (aimed at service delivery).

**PoCs**

PoC1 was essential to create space for civic engagement in Uganda, which was constrained by mainly two policies, the NGO Act 2016, and the Public Order Management Act (POM Act, 2013). Specifically, PoC1 aimed at increasing awareness among the CSOs and duty bearers, to create avenues for continued dialogue between CSOs and duty bearers at the sub-county and district level, equip CSOs on how to operate within a restrictive environment and strengthen CSOs partnerships/collaborations at sub-county and district leadership for sustainability of CSO interventions.

PoC2 & PoC3 address the needs of smallholder farmers, with emphasis on inclusion of women, youth and PWDs. The two pathways are closely related and fused during implementation to effectively address the entire value chain. For relevance to the regions, focus was on three specific value chains of maize, millet and cassava.

The main focus of the programme in Uganda was on PoC1 and PoC2, which is reflected in the expenditures, with almost 75% of the total budget spent in these PoCs.
**Uganda Partner Alliance**

Four (UNNGOF, CoU-TEDDO, FAPAD and SAO) out of the seven CEA IPs in Uganda already collaborated together, and with ICCO in previous interventions (MFSII). Partners found it essential that they should continue into the new CEA partnership. The others (PAG-Soroti, AA, and ADP) joined the CEA partnership largely on the basis of their connection with some of the CEA members in the Netherlands. All IPs were involved in some community development work related to food security though they used different approaches. Interventions continue to take place in Northern and Eastern Uganda and Karamoja region which had been affected by civil war and unrest for over two decades, and where food and nutritional security and inclusive access to markets were among the essential interventions for restoration of livelihoods and human dignity.

**Citizen led L&A**

In developing the CEA programme citizen led L&A was appreciated as the most effective and sustainable means of influencing service delivery and inclusive development policies and practices, however, IPs as well as CEA members in the Netherlands did not have adequate capacity for this approach to L&A. The CEA programme was therefore a valuable joint learning experience and capacity building initiative in citizen led L&A for IPs, local governments and communities.

**Capacity development**

Enhancing capacity for citizen led and evidence-based L&A was the overall strategy for implementation of the CEA programme to ensure sustainable development. Two levels of capacity building were developed: 1) capacity of the CEA IPs, and 2) capacity of the final target groups. In the inception phase capacity assumptions were formulated for each PoC, however there was no mention of systematic annual capacity building plans aligned to these assumptions.

Other than the mention that capacities for PoC3 emerged from the needs assessments, no further explanation could be found of how capacity assessments informed the capacity development strategy and plans.

Not all partners were at the same level with experiences and capacities for L&A. To bring all partners to the same level, the initial activities of implementation focused on capacity building of the IPs, which were trained on the content and methodology of the Change the Game Academy by CEA member Wilde Ganzen, and to build a common understanding among the IPs on the implementation and intended outcomes of the CEA programme.

After the trainings in 2017 and 2018, partners were supported to come up with a clear work plan for dialogues with small scale farmers about the lobby issues at stake and identifying policy frameworks that support the lobby agenda. In 2017 local partners were trained in stakeholder mapping and engagement in L&A, and they were introduced to the use of the lobby logbook. In 2018 follow up meetings were organised, which helped partners to strengthen linkages, come up with a common lobby agenda, agree on joint activities and organise peer support.

In 2019 the Life Skills for Lobby training was delivered to the CEA IPs by Edukans as a ToT with support from UNNGOF as the organiser. The IPs then cascaded the intervention to the target...
beneficiaries, smallholders, starting in Abim, Lira and Soroti districts. And in 2020 also to extension workers and government officials in the region.

**FBOs**

Relying on FBOs was also strategic in the Uganda context of limited space for CSOs. FBOs already had established networks in the communities and have credibility; people perceive them to be neutral. FBOs had more space to act compared to other CSOs/NGOs and are known to governments as politically neutral and non-activists organisations, working at community level. Therefore FBOs are allowed a little more room to manoeuvre at district level.

For PoC2 & PoC3, the IPs targeted existing groups that were already working with the involved IPs. This study could not confirm that these groups were also connected to other existing private initiatives, like e.g. a District Farmers’ Association.

**Gender and inclusiveness**

At the start of CEA, it was identified that in sub-regions of Lango, Teso and Karamoja, women especially those from polygamous marriages and widows had limited access to and control of land. Therefore, targeting women would result in greater impact for PoC2 & PoC3. Whereas the broader target of CEA in Uganda was smallholder farmers, there was specific attention to women, youth and PWDs, assuming that the most effective and efficient way to serve smallholder farmers is through these groups.

In 2019 IPs were trained to understand the different forms of disability and mainstreaming disability inclusion in development interventions. IPs were encouraged and supported in making a d.i. plan for their organisation.

**4. Effectiveness**

**Changes at the level of implementing partners**

In this evaluation several changes at the level of IPs are reported, which are associated with the capacities developed by the CEA programme. These include:

**Enhanced capacity for L&A**

At the start of the programme, the IPs had varied experiences in L&A. A few had some experience in L&A from their previous engagements under the MFSII programme, while others had not engaged much with L&A before. Even those who had some experience, the L&A was mainly done by the organisation on behalf of the citizens which in many cases brought them into confrontation with government on accusations of advancing their own agenda and spurring discontent in communities. The CEA programme introduced a new approach of empowering citizens and specifically the smallholder farmers to be at the forefront of L&A tasking the duty bearers to improve service delivery. Specifically, the implementing partners reported competences gained in L&A such as:
i. Mobilising community support and empowering the communities to articulate their needs and interests to duty bearers;

ii. Identification of allies and opponents in L&A and how to engage with each of the categories;

iii. Life skills (soft skills) to foster relationships through communication, managing emotions, negotiations, conflict management, self-esteem, etc.;

iv. Integration of gender in L&A to address the unique needs of women, youth and PWDs.

IPs confirmed these results, however no data were found of a systematic monitoring on these topics of training.

**Consciousness and proactiveness to integrate women, youth and PWDs in development programmes**

Whereas inclusiveness was not necessarily a new term, the consciousness and deliberate intentions to include these categories especially in food security programmes was not apparent to IPs before the CEA programme. The focus of the CEA programme on these often marginalised categories of people revealed a gap in development interventions. Most of the IPs reported institutionalised inclusion of women, youth and PWDs in programming their development interventions and are integrating them in proposals for their future initiatives. It is now realised that targeting these categories is likely to increase their chances of securing support for development interventions. FAPAD, SAO and CoU-TEDDO have for example employed PWD on the basis of affirmative action. CoU-TEDDO has elevated Gender and Social justice from a cross-cutting issue to a thematic focal area in their new strategic plan 2020-2025 motivated by experiences in the CEA programme.

**Increased networking and collaboration**

Implementation of the CEA programme necessitated collaboration among the IPs and with CEA members. The connectedness of the PoCs in the CEA programme therefore strengthened and broadened the network of partners nationally. This was not apparent in the first two years of the programme, when IPs operated rather in silo’s of their PoCs. See also chapter 5 of this report.

Developing collaborations exploited the synergies and complementarity and hence effectiveness in L&A. A more collaborative relationship (than ever before) has been established between the IPs and the district local governments where the CEA programme was implemented and relevant Ministries such as Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF). In turn, this has increased the trust and credibility of the IPs by government agencies. The programme also enabled the IPs to make connections with capacity development institutions such as the Actor Alliance Academy.

**Local fundraising influenced by Change the Game training**

The IPs rely almost entirely on external funding to support their development interventions. The Change the Game training and exposure challenged IPs to rethink and pursue local fundraising including initiation of income generating projects for sustainability of their development efforts. For example FAPAD started a seed multiplication project for income generation and have also
applied the skills gained to fundraise in 2020 for support to the district COVID-19 management task force.

**Local capacity at UNNGOF for Training in L&A**

Through collaboration with CEA member Wilde Ganzen, UNNGOF has trained a pool of resident resource persons (ToTs) to scale out the capacity building for L&A particularly in Mobilising Support and Local Fundraising, and in collaboration with Edukans the Life Skills for Lobby training. UNNGOF is exploring the establishment of an academy for tailor-made short courses on L&A. It is proposed that the training would be offered on a cost-recovery basis or subsidised.

**Changes at the level of CBOs (other than IP)**

Except for UNNGOF, IPs largely engaged directly with farmer groups at the community level, although in a few cases some CBOs participated in the training of extension workers (as reported by Advance Africa). UNNGOF involved a wide range of CBOs in sensitisation on POM Act 2013 and the NGO Act 2016. The change at this level is the awareness of the CBOs about POM Act 2013 and NGO Act 2016. This awareness and the coaching in the compliance clinics made the CBOs develop better working relationship with the government (district local government) as they manoeuvred within the limited space to execute their roles and responsibilities while complying with the laws.

**Changes at the level of government actors**

**Lobby up to district and sub-county levels**

The L&A through dialogues that cascaded from the parish up to the national level had major impact at the local government levels, namely the district and sub-county levels. These changes included:

**Improved working relationship and collaboration between NGOs and government**

The dialogues and sensitisation about the NGO Act 2016 and POM Act 2013 led by UNNGOF clarified the roles and responsibilities of the different agencies of government and NGOs. Government officials, NGO leaders (263) and 230 CSOs participated in awareness meetings both at local and national level. This awareness in 2018 influenced the establishment of the District NGO Monitoring Committees (DNMCs) chaired by the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) as provided for in the NGO Act 2016. DNMC is a mechanism for ensuring harmony and partnerships between district local government and NGOs in development interventions. To foster this harmony, UNNGOF in 2019 conducted three compliance clinics for NGOs in the three sub-regions to coach the NGOs to comply with the NGO Act 2016 and how to resolve any misunderstanding that might arise during the L&A activities.

**Enhanced targeting and delivery of extension services to smallholder farmers**

The L&A dialogues at the sub-county and district levels created a connection between the extension workers (some of whom had just been recruited) with the farmer groups to deliver extension services. For some farmer groups, the first contact between the sub-county extension workers and farmer groups was made during the L&A dialogues. With these contacts, farmers could call the extension workers and seek for information and support whenever needed. See the following
Performance story about the role of CEA in the dissemination of the National Agricultural Extension Policy of 2015 to local level.

Performance story: enhancing access to agricultural extension

The National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) ceased to provide essential agricultural extension services in 2014 by a presidential pronouncement following unsatisfactory performance to serve the smallholder farmers. MAAIF was henceforth instructed to reform the extension services. To start with, MAAIF in consultation with CSOs undertook to develop a new agricultural extension policy to guide the design of an inclusive extension system that particularly addresses the needs of the smallholder farmers who are also the majority. In a record one year, the National Agricultural Extension Policy (NAEP) was passed in 2015. The new policy reinstated agricultural extension delivery in the mainstream of MAAIF and through the District Local Governments (DLGs) with stronger collaboration with the Non-state Actors. However, due to national budgetary constraints, NAEP was operationalised in phases. Between 2015/16 - 2016/17 financial years, over three thousand new staff (of the targeted five thousand) were recruited and in 2018/19 funds were provided to facilitate extension workers with vehicles for district production departments and motorcycles for frontline extension workers based at sub-counties.

This implied that the public extension was basically non-functional or had minimal activities between 2014 and 2017. Indeed, the CEA consultations and dialogues at the community level in 2018/19 highlighted the lack of access to agricultural extension as one of the critical constraints of smallholder farmers. In the dialogues facilitated by CEA program and attended by the technical service providers, the administrators, political leaders and other stakeholders, smallholder farmers including women, youth and PWDs tasked the duty bearers to provide extension services to boost production and productivity of smallholder farmers, so that they could meet their food and nutritional needs among others. The articulations by the smallholder farmers signified ushered in a new form of accountability system where the duty bearers were directly answerable to smallholder farmers as rights holders. The voices of the smallholder farmers transcended through dialogues to all administrative levels from parish, to sub-county to district and regional levels. At each level, the voices triggered an appropriate response from the duty bearers to prioritise delivery of extension services to the smallholder farmers and to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders involved.

The fact that most of the extension workers had just been recruited, farmers got to know the extension workers in charge of their sub-counties in the dialogue meetings. These interactions enabled direct contact and communication between the extension workers and the smallholder farmers. At the same time, the duty bearers were obliged to facilitate the sub-county extension workers to deliver services to the farmers.

Further this also created a relationship between sub-county extension workers and CEA partners to jointly address the extension needs of the farmers. This resulted in improved access to public agricultural extension service after several years of absence of such service. To promote collective responsibility, representatives of smallholder farmers were co-opted on the district and sub-county planning and budgeting committees to ensure that extension services delivery is prioritised and allocated a reasonable share of the budget at both the sub-county and district levels. This level of participation was induced by the strong voices from smallholder farmers during the dialogic engagement with duty bearers.
In some districts like Ngora, increase in operational budget for extension at sub-county and district levels is achieved, and further the district purchased two motor-cycles with funds from outside extension grants to facilitate district staff to supervise extension delivery. In Barr sub-county in Lira district, farmers presented alternative budget that prioritised extension service delivery. To ensure quality of extension services delivered, FAPAD supported reorientation of thirteen newly recruited extension workers in critical areas such as: approaches for extension delivery, group dynamics, agronomy of selected crops including citrus fruits, and seed quality & seed borne diseases.

In conclusion, a convergence of revitalisation of agricultural extension service delivery by MAAIF and advocacy led by smallholder farmers championed by the CEA program enhanced access to quality agricultural extension services in the target districts. Through CEA interventions capacity of community representatives was enhanced to claim their access to extension services as implied by the national policy. The unique contribution from CEA was that both communities as well as extension workers were supported with skills training and the facilitation of dialogues. There is however not sufficient evidence to the claim that CEA program influenced the recruitment of extension staff and release of national level budget for agricultural extension.

**Participation of smallholder farmers in district and sub-county planning and budget processes**

Through dialogue meetings, smallholder farmers demanded to be involved in planning and resource allocation at the district and sub-counties. In Lira for example, representatives of smallholder farmers have been invited to scrutinise sub-county annual plans and budgets by sub-county production and natural resources committee. Farmers co-opted on the district and sub-county planning and budgeting committees, and are reported to have influenced budget allocation for delivery of extension services. In Barr sub-county, Lira District, farmers made specific budget recommendations (Financial Year 2019-2020) aiming to increase support for agricultural extension service delivery.

**Regulation and quality control of seed and other agricultural inputs**

Regulation of agricultural inputs supply system was one of the key items on the L&A agenda following the wide-spread prevalence of counterfeit or fake inputs. In 2019 CEA contributed to dissemination of National Seed Policy (of 2018) spelling out the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders in the seed value chain. Farmers were sensitised and enabled to detect counterfeit seed, and demand for information for traceability from the suppliers. In operational terms the CEA IPs contributed to dissemination of the seed policy in the Teso, Lango and Karamoja regions mainly through dialogue meetings, local FM radio programs, and multiplication and distribution of the popular version of the policy. This popular version had already been developed by MAAIF but the IPs sponsored the multiplication and distribution in the region.

Farmer engagement with duty bearers at the district level stimulated the implementation of the National Seed Policy. See also the following Performance Story:

**Performance story quality seeds provision**

Access to quality seeds is the first step of ensuring sustainable access to food and income by the smallholder farmers. In Uganda, the production and distribution of seed is mainly a domain of the private sector which has not been properly regulated and monitored. The passing of the National Seed Policy in October 2018 is a landmark towards regulating the seed industry to among other things ensure quality.
Based on the dialogues organised and facilitated by CEA partners for farmers to engage with different stakeholders, access to quality seed by smallholder farmers emerged as one of the critical challenges that had to be addressed. The major concern was the prohibition of counterfeit seed in the seed business. The passing of the seed policy was a timely intervention as the dialogues cascaded from the community to the sub-county to the district and regional level. The focus of action was therefore placed on operationalisation of the policy to regulate the seed industry to ensure access to quality seed by the smallholder farmers. A stakeholder analysis in the seed value chain was conducted and responsibilities of the different actors including farmers were identified and agreed.

The fact that the challenge was proactively raised by the grassroots farmers at all levels of dialogue, action was taken in all districts where the CEA programme operated. The production departments of the districts took action to inspect the private seed suppliers to ensure compliance with the established standards and to certify the authentic seed suppliers. The sub-county level extension workers, with information from the farmers worked alongside the district staff to close down businesses that were involved in supplying counterfeit seed or did not meet the minimum standards including the sale of seeds in open markets. The authentic seed suppliers were encouraged to open up outlets in the rural areas or work directly with farmer groups to supply them with quality seed.

The districts responded by putting up quality assurance committees at the district, sub-county and even at parish levels to certify sources and monitor the quality of inputs available on the market including inputs supplied through the government programme of Operation Wealth Creation (OWC). Punitive actions and surveillance greatly reduced counterfeit seeds and inputs on the market. In Lira district, in 2019 by-laws on Control of Handling, Selling and Use of Fake Agro-Inputs were developed with support of IP FAPAD to provide a legal framework at the sub-county level for implementation of the related district ordinance which had earlier been developed but lacked instruments for implementation. This intervention is being extended to the neighbouring district of Amolatar. FAPAD supported the dissemination of both the district ordinance and the by-laws to create awareness and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the different actors in the seed value chain. In Barr sub-county, a committee with a farmer representative was set up and charged with the responsibility of monitoring and reporting fake/counterfeit seed to the District Agricultural Officer (DAO) who would then trigger action.

A group of farmers in Teso region, Serere district, with support of CEA partner CoU-TEDDO undertook an initiative to select and preserve indigenous seed that are known to be ecologically adapted and have the desired attributes of resistance to pests and diseases. The group developed a Community Managed Seed security (CMS) that has so far selected and is multiplying indigenous varieties of cassava (Elogulogu), groundnuts (Erudurutu and Ongwara), millet, sorghum, maize, pigeon peas and yams. Small quantities of the seed is given to selected farmers to multiply and return the same quantity of seed they got to be given to other farmers. CoU-TEDDO has supported the group to acquire quality indigenous seed; mobilised farmer groups and ensured inclusion of women, youth and PWDs; and trained farmers in good practices for seed production such as agronomy, seed selection, seed hygiene, post-harvest handling and storage, group dynamics, record management and farmer group development principles. The group has established a community seed bank to preserve indigenous seed with preferred traits.

For penetration to the communities, five-member committees were set up at the parish level comprising of 2 Community Peace Promoters (CPP), one area councillor, one LCIII representative and one LCI representative. This system has greatly reduced sale of counterfeit seed by the private traders as some of the culprits (e.g. in Onywako parish) were arrested and prosecuted/cautioned. Dealers in counterfeit seed closed their businesses in five out of the seven parishes of Barr sub-county. The sub-county set standards for operating a seed business including the trader having a valid license.
Similarly, markets for produce (especially grain) is being structured and regulated with gazetted market places to reduce on the number of middle-men in the value chain to guarantee reasonable income to smallholder farmers.

Generally, from these interventions, IPs reported that: (1) Farmers are more conscious to check the labels and demand for information on the source of seed from the traders, (2) Following the closure of dealers in counterfeit seed, a few certified ones are left. In some cases, farmers organise to make collective purchase of seeds from certified suppliers and (3) Extension workers at the sub-county continue to sensitise farmers to create awareness on counterfeit seed.

The main interventions through the CEA program included not only sensitising and creating awareness about the national seed policy among the stakeholders to appreciate their prescribed roles and responsibilities. CEA partners capacitated farmers to claim implementation of the national policy, and catalysing district local governments to take action towards realising the intentions of the policy, to ensure that smallholder farmers have access to quality seed.

CEA unique contribution lies in the acceleration of the implementation of the national policy at local level all districts where the programme is active. Various streams of activities under all three PoCs come together, resulting in expected outcomes of PoCs such as farmers capacitated to discuss with duty bearers about seed regulations, and claim control and enforcement, training of farmers and extension workers, and the development of an indigenous seed supply system, to provide stock which is adapted to local circumstances and can be purchased at an affordable price. Significant improvements were made not just regarding awareness and knowledge of farmers, but more generally in ‘multi-stakeholder collaboration’ for agricultural and rural development, improving the business environment, cleaning up the seed delivery system at the local and regional level.

Changes at the interface level (local-national)

CEA did not undertake comprehensive interventions at national level, however, the regional dialogues were also attended by representatives of relevant line ministries and other national level actors like the National Farmers’ Federation (UNFFE). Some contributions of the CEA programme at national level include:

*Dissemination of the National Seed Policy and mobilising and supporting the district local governments* to set up and implement regulatory systems for the seed sector. The CEA consortia in Uganda engaged with MAAIF (2019) to come up with a plan for dissemination of the national seed policy to local level in the three regions of intervention.

*Providing input for review of the Market Act.* Through dialogues at regional and national level, issues for amendment of the Market Act were presented on the principles of the Market Act to increase the bargaining power of smallholder farmers to get better prices and improving the quality of produce mainly through post-harvest handling and storage. In 2018 the Ministry of Trade Industry and Cooperatives proposed an Agriculture Produce Regulatory Bill providing a platform through which farmers and produce dealers will be able to negotiate with regards to the quality and price of the produce. Further L&A is ongoing to take the bill to parliament soon. If this bill is passed there will be market standards and competitive market prices for the produce.

*Better understanding of Government Agricultural Programs by smallholder farmers.* In the regional dialogues smallholder farmers tasked the representatives from MAAIF and other line ministries to
explain some of the government interventions in agriculture and how the smallholder farmers could benefit. One such intervention is the tractor hire programme of government to support agricultural mechanisation, and access to agricultural credit. The farmers were guided on how to access the services and referred to the nearest contact points for any further guidance and support.


*Changes at the level of value chains and private sector actors*

The private sector, mainly the agro-input dealers and produce buyers were involved in the dialogues. Their views were taken into account in the regulation of agro-inputs at the district level. The outcome of this engagement was improved business environment and increased business volume for the certified input suppliers. The regulatory mechanism put in place at the district level led to closure of companies and agents involved in counterfeit inputs thereby creating more opportunities for the certified input providers to expand their coverage and sales volume. In many cases especially in the remote rural places, farmer groups were directly linked to the certified input dealers while in other cases, the certified companies identified trusted agents (traders/farmers) to facilitate access to quality inputs including seed. The farmers are also involved in monitoring and reporting of suspicious agro-input dealers.

CoU-TEDDO is supporting farmer groups in Ngora district to progress from producing quality farmer saved seed to Quality Declared Seed (QDS) to increase farmer access to quality seed. There is mutual understanding between MAAIF and the CEA partners to popularise and promote the QDS approach to widen opportunities for farmer access to quality seeds. In Abim district, there has been efforts to link the micro-finance support center in Moroto to the farmers’ network comprising of about 500 smallholder farmers. In preparation for provision of credit, the micro-finance support center in 2018 trained farmers in how to establish SACCO for the farmers’ network, management of SACCO, entrepreneurship, savings and record keeping. This will enable farmers in the district to access start-up capital for bulking produce and investing in farm enterprises.

In Abim farmer groups have confederated into a network partly to enable bulking, collective marketing, and value addition post-harvest handling and storage practices.

*Changes at the level of other target groups*

The other target groups in this case are smallholder farmers/groups, particularly, the women, youth and PWDs. IPs reported the following changes at the level of targeted beneficiaries:

**Capacity of smallholder farmers to engage with duty bearers to L&A for service delivery**

Through the mobilisation and organisation of the smallholder farmers with inclusion of women, youth and PWDs, the farmers are capable of analysing their development needs, prioritise issues
for their L&A agenda and objectively engage the duty bearers at various levels to influence solutions to their specific needs, as evidenced by their meaningful participation in community dialogues. This citizen led approach is more sustainable in L&A as the farmers are likely to invoke a quicker response from the duty bearers than CSOs.

Security of women, youth and PWDs on land

The regions where the CEA programme was implemented have a customary land tenure system where land is controlled by the clans. This system inherently disadvantages women (widows) and girls in favour of men/boys. It was common practice that widowed women were dispossessed of their land (by clan members and neighbours), thereby depriving them of their livelihoods. The IPs have supported and strengthened the customary land management system (through land committees) to guarantee the right to land by women, youth and PWDs in tandem with the land law in Uganda. This has led to amicable and systematically documented resolution of numerous land related disputes involving women, youth and PWDs. Proper documentation of cases resolved minimises re-occurrence of the disputes in the future. See the following Performance Story.

Performance story: Land Grabbing

Land grabbing is an increasingly common phenomenon depriving vulnerable masses of their livelihood. Land grabbing manifests in many different forms. The CEA program was implemented in regions that were affected by civil war and conflicts between 1986 to 2005. These regions also have a customary land tenure where land is controlled and distributed by clan leaders to the families. There are committees that are mandated to mediate and settle land related disputes under a traditional justice system. During the period of conflict, villages were evacuated and people were concentrated in camps where government could provide them security. When peace was restored in 2005/6, families started to resettlement to their original land but in doing so, different forms of land conflicts manifested with elements of land grabbing. Some of the land related conflicts are founded in the cultural values and practices of inheritance where women/girls are not entitled to a share of family land. The common land related conflicts included land boundary disputes, outright land grabbing from the disadvantaged poor families by the rich and politically well-connected families, and dispossessing widows of their land by the male clan members and neighbours.

Two options existed for resolving land related conflicts; one is using the courts of law and the other is using the customary land committees as part of the traditional justice system. The former was perceived to favour the powerful and well-resourced families/persons who could afford to hire lawyers and manoeuvre the precarious legal procedures while the customary system mediated by clan leaders, elders and socially accepted land negotiators was preferred by the weak and poor resourced families/persons. Culturally, there was perception that within a family, customary land is inherited or shared by the sons, so inherently women and girls were not entitled to family land. This cultural perception created challenges for especially the widows who after losing their spouses would be disposed of land by either the clan members or even neighbours.

The CEA program interventions sought to strengthen the customary land dispute resolution mechanism and to guarantee the right of women, girls and orphans on land. This was through aligning the customary land management system with the land law to ensure non-discrimination and to avoid contradiction between the customary and legal systems; and to systematically document the processes of dispute resolution for future reference.

In Lira district, IP FAPAD, with expertise and track record in restoring rights of women and children (see chapter 2.3. with description of the organisation and its goal) encouraged the clan leaders to co-opt the
Community Peace Promoters (CPP) who were trained to broker peace and reconciliation while people were in the camps on the customary land committees. They brought on board the negotiation skills and the rights perspectives into the customary land dispute resolution mechanism. In 2017, the organisation trained the customary land committees in Lango region on the land law and how to respect the rights of women, youth and PWDs in mediation of land related conflicts. In 2016, CoU-TEDDO supported the Iteso Cultural Union (ICU) to disseminate (including translation from Ateso to English, and Braille) its guidelines on Principles, Practices, Rights and Responsibilities (PPRR) on customary land, which also guaranteed right to land by widows, girls, orphans, the elderly and displaced people. ICU was established in 1994 and comprises the two main ethnic groups in Teso region, namely the Iteso and Kumam. The ICU committees on land also co-opt land mediators trained by CoU-TEDDO and GIZ in 2018 to offer technical advice and harmonising the cultural land system and the land law. Both FAPAD and CoU-TEDDO have supported the cultural systems to systematically document the cases of land disputes that they handle for future reference. After resolution of the disputes, land boundaries were marked by trees called Eligoi and Ejumula in Teso and Obara Omaro in Lango to provide permanent landmarks. Similar interventions are reported by ADP in the Karamoja region.

In Lango region over one thousand land related cases are reported to have to-date been amicably resolved and documented by the customary land committees (FAPAD reported it gets a copy of the files for each case resolved). About 600 of these reported cases were solved under the CEA programme. In Teso region no exact number could be provided but Teso Cultural Union stated that many cases had been resolved.

This system has worked well for the poor families who cannot afford or may not necessarily get justice through the formal judicial system to reposes and get security on land. The widows and girls whose marriages fail were the major beneficiaries. It is also reported that the cultural justice system on land has greatly reduced cases of violence related to land conflicts, which were resulting from desperate actions of vulnerable members of community losing hope for justice through the formal judicial system. Several cases that had been in the judicial system for many years are cited to have been formally recalled and handled by the customary system. Only a few mainly wealthy families still prefer to go to formal courts of law for land related disputes.

In conclusion, the CEA programme improved and accelerated successfully the modus operandi of the cultural land management system in Teso, Lango and Karamoja regions, strengthened the capacity of the cultural land committees and increased credibility and trust in the cultural land management system to among other things prevent land grabbing and guarantee the rights of vulnerable members of the community especially widows, girls, and orphans. FAPAD and CoU-TEDDO took the lead in boosting this support, which already started at a small scale in the area with support of GIZ. Under CEA both IPs could expand in terms of training of committees, documentation of cases and the translation of guidelines in local languages. Through their contacts in the regions of intervention at grass root level, communities gained more trust in resolving land issues in this way and many cases were successfully concluded.

**Reduced discrimination of women, youth and PWDs due to increased awareness creation and change of attitudes**

*Within the CEA programme*

The sensitisation and targeting women, youth and PWDs in the CEA program created awareness about the rights and how they have been systematically discriminated and excluded from development initiatives. Targeted existing farmer groups were reconfigured to be inclusive of women, youth and PWDs. IPs report enhanced emancipation and involvement of women, youth and PWDs in L&A. Specific barriers to women, youth and PWDs to access markets and work were identified and included in the L&A agenda. Integration of the unique needs of women, youth and
PWDs in the L&A agenda consequently increased their access to services including extension, agro-inputs and output markets.

IPs reported improvement of women’s access and control over land, access to quality seeds and extension services, which is presumed to have contributed to greater investments in the land and increased productivity and welfare of households.

To minimise exclusion and discrimination of PWD, Lira District earmarked a vote to facilitate mobilisation and sensitisation of PWDs to benefit from general government programs. Lira district also provided resources for sensitisation of communities on the plight of PWDs. Further, all target districts are reported to have made provisions for easy access of PWDs to the district buildings including toilets.

Within CEA partner organisation

The CEA IPs have institutionalised targeting of women, youth and PWDs in their organisations and in new proposed projects which is likely to encourage continuation of access to essential services for food and nutritional security.

In 2018 four IPs trained their staff members on disability inclusion with support from Light for the World, resulting in an action plan and a disability inclusion audit in their organisations. With the sensitisation, training and technical support from the disability advisor, some of the IPs have since developed internal policies for inclusion of PWDs in their programs and activities.

In 2019, all CEA implementing partners, except UNNGOF, and alliance members ICCO and Edukans were trained on disability inclusion in L&A which increased awareness that has enhanced the need for disability inclusion at all levels in the CEA Programme. As a demonstration of appreciation of the principle of non-discrimination, some of the CEA IPs (FAPAD, SAO, CoU-TEDDO) deliberately provided employment opportunities for PWDs, the one employed by FAPAD is a front desk officer. SAO Uganda in partnership with LftW provided a 3 months placement for a volunteer who has a disability. This volunteer helped in the development of a working paper to highlight key issues that should be taken into account when working with PWDs in the work place. The paper was shared in the CEA community.

Inclusion of women, youth and PWDs is articulated in proposals for future projects of IPs. CoU-TEDDO has for example elevated gender and social justice from a cross-cutting issue to a thematic focal area in their new strategic plan 2020-2025.

Conclusions

In view of the specific changes at various levels of intervention discussed above, the following conclusions can be made:

At the level of Implementing Partners
The capacity for L&A developed among the IPs translated into empowerment of smallholder farmers including women, youth and PWDs to engage with duty bearers to lobby and advocate for improved service delivery to enhance the food and nutrition security of vulnerable people.

The developing collaborations exploited synergies and complementarity and hence effectiveness in L&A. A more collaborative relationship (than ever before) has been established between the IPs and the district local governments where the CEA programme was implemented and relevant ministries such as MAAIF. In turn, this has increased the trust and credibility of the IPs by government agencies. Collaboration under the CEA programme also enabled IPs to make connections with capacity development institutions such as Actor Alliance Academy.

The IPs rely almost entirely on external funding to support their development intervention. The training on Local Fundraising challenged IPs to rethink and pursue local fundraising including initiation of income generating projects for sustainability of their development efforts.

Change of attitudes resulted in increased appreciation of inclusion of women, youth and PWDs in development interventions by the IPs; affirmative action was taken by IPs FAPAD, SAO and CoU-TEDDO.

At the level of CBOs (other than IPs)

The dialogues created a safe space (within the restrictive POM Act 2013 and NGO Act 2016) for CSOs/NGOs to partner with local government mobilising communities through which smallholder farmers engaged with duty bearers to influence service delivery and pro-poor policies.

Except for UNNGOF, IPs largely engaged directly with farmer groups at the community level, although in a few cases some CBOs participated in training of extension workers (as reported by Advance Africa, in their collaboration with Edukans).

At the level of government actors

District and sub-county level

The CEA programme in Uganda can be associated with changes at various levels of intervention but most significantly with the influence on local government to improve delivery of extension services and regulatory systems to ensure access to quality inputs including seed by smallholder farmers and in particular, the women, youth and PWDs. Through dialogue meetings, smallholder farmers demanded to be involved in planning and resource allocation at the district and sub-counties.

Deliberate inclusion targeting of women, youth and PWDs influenced change of attitudes among duty bearers, IPs and communities towards conscious planning and institutionalisation of gender to reduce vulnerability and improve their access to productive resources of land, extension services and access to markets at district and sub-county local government and communities.

Local-national level
CEA partners did not undertake comprehensive interventions at national level, however, the regional dialogues were also attended by representatives of relevant line ministries and other national level actors like the National Farmers’ Federation (UNFFE).

Contributions of the CEA programme from national to local level include dissemination of the National Seed Policy and mobilising and supporting the district local governments to set up and implement regulatory systems for the seed sector.

Through CEA interventions capacity of community representatives was enhanced to claim their access to extension services as implied by the National Agricultural Extension policy. The unique contribution from CEA was that both communities as well as extension workers were supported with skills training and the facilitation of dialogues.

In dialogues at regional and national level, issues for amendment of the Market Act were presented, increase the bargaining power of smallholder farmers to get better prices and improving the quality of produce mainly through post-harvest handling and storage.

With technical input CEA partner Light for the World influenced the amendment of persons with Disabilities Act of 2006 to conform to the principles of United Nations Convention on the Rights of PWDs.

At the level of value chains and private sector actors

The private sector, mainly agro-input dealers and produce buyers were involved in the community dialogues. Also their views were taken into account in the regulation of agro-inputs at district level.

There is now mutual understanding between MAAIF and the CEA partners to popularise and promote the Quality Declared Seed approach to widen opportunities for farmer access to quality seeds.

IPs put efforts in creating better micro-finance support, by collaboration in at least one district (Abim) with a local micro-finance support center, which in preparation for provision of credit, trained farmers in how to establish SACCO for the farmers’ network, management of SACCO, entrepreneurship, savings and record keeping.

Inclusion of specific target groups

Through mobilisation and organisation smallholder farmers are capable of analysing their development needs, prioritise issues for their L&A agenda and objectively engage duty bearers at various levels to influence solutions to their specific needs, as evidenced by their meaningful participation in community dialogues.

The IPs have supported and strengthened the customary land management system (through land committees) to guarantee the right to land by women, youth and PWDs in tandem with the land law in Uganda. This has led to amicable and systematically documented resolution of numerous land related disputes involving women, youth and PWDs (in Lango region at least 1,000 cases of
which 600 under the CEA programme). Proper documentation of cases resolved minimises reoccurrence of the disputes in future.

The sensitisation and targeting of women, youth and PWDs in the CEA interventions created awareness about their rights and how they have been systematically discriminated and excluded from development initiatives.

IPs reported improvement of women’s access and control over land, access to quality seeds and extension services, which is presumed to have contributed to greater investments in the land and increased productivity and welfare of households.

5. Efficiency

Organisational efficiency

Governance and programme management

IPs are unanimous that ICCO-RO had a strong position in guiding partners and showed good leadership in managing the CEA programme in Uganda. Timely technical advice was provided, and through courtesy calls and field visits management stayed in close contact with what was happening on the ground. The CEA programme was complex to manage, both in relations and budget repartition between partners, but also the silo operation in the first years didn’t help a smooth implementation and coordination of all actors and the roll out of the programme was difficult. The choice of partners was a continuation of the MFSII programme, in the same regions of intervention. IPs could build on contacts and experiences. However there was no competitive selection of IPs related to the L&A focus of the new programme. Some IPs had experience in L&A, others did not and had to be equipped to play their role in the programme, which took time.

ICCO-RO had regular contacts with ICCO-GO. ICCO-GO paid field visits related to PMEL, for instance in the reflection & learning workshop, and in guidance of reporting and the use of monitoring tools. And ICCO country and regional coordinators participated in the annual face-2-face conferences in the Netherlands. In 2018 monthly Skype calls were initiated with ICCO-GO, ICCO regional and representatives of the CEA members, and were very useful for a quick exchange of information and solving implementation problems. According to the CEA team in Uganda these contacts helped connections between The Netherlands and the Uganda partners, and increased responsiveness of members to situations and questions from IPs.

HRH Dutch Embassy didn’t have a specific staff member for the Strategic Partnership programmes in Kampala. Insights from quarterly review meetings were shared with Embassy staff. And in general info from the CEA programme was welcomed, but the role of the Embassy was a passive one.

On 11-12 March 2020, the CEA programme facilitated a field trip for the MoFA Food Security Policy Officer (FSPO) to meet with key stakeholders from two IPs, i.e. FAPAD and CoU-TEDDO in Lira and
Soroti districts aimed at facilitating experience sharing by partners and their target audiences on CEA implementation, and an analysis of the overall impact of the CEA program on its key stakeholders and identification of scalable interventions.

**Influence on efficiency**

The CEA programme in Uganda had a difficult and slow start. Partnerships between CEA members and partners in Uganda was a continuation of the MFSII programme, which framed expectations of both IPs in Uganda as well as CEA members. In the first years of the programme partners operated in silo’s per PoC. In the early years annual contracts and plans were not adequately redirected to the ToC.

Next to the CEA programme some Dutch partners financed their partners in Uganda on other activities. This finance enabled partners continuation of their ongoing projects aimed at service delivery to communities. The good relations with communities and parishes, as well as contacts with relevant persons at government level offered the CEA programme a solid basis in the regions of intervention.

**Programmatic efficiency**

For CEA partners it was a big step to go from a programmatic approach as in the MFSII programme to a Theory of Change approach, which was introduced for the CEA programme implementation. At the start of CEA Uganda only one partner CoU-TEDDO was familiar with the ToC approach.

A country ToC represents how change is expected to happen successfully, responding to a situation with complexity and uncertainty. With the choice for a ToC approach in CEA the idea was to contextualise PoCs and specific contents and strategies for interventions, increasing sustainability of change. PoCs are supposed to be closely integrated in region specific ToCs and program plans. In CEA Uganda PoCs were formulated on the basis of previous experiences and perceived needs from the communities. Gradually IPs became more familiar with the new approach and its concepts, they appreciated the flexibility in programme implementation and felt more at easy to discuss and implement changes in plans to achieve the desired change, rather than operating in a rigid and linear framework. Budget allocation for an entire year also helped the flexibility to address emerging issues and adapt action plans without deviating from the main goal.

**Measures to improve efficiency during programme implementation**

Several actions were undertaken to increase the knowledge and skills of partners in working with the new approach.

PMEL officers of ICCO-GO participated in the course of 2017 in a working group on Strategic Partnerships under the umbrella of development network organisation Partos in the Netherlands, discussing the introduction of the ToC approach in the Partnership programmes and the use for CSOs. Ideas and experiences sharing inspired and supported the guidance from GO to the ROs and COs in the CEA programme.
In the learning workshop of 2017-2018 with CEA Uganda partners the ToCs for the pathways of change were reviewed and more focus and coherence in particular PoC 2 and 3 are reported.

ICCO-RO introduced peer feedback in quarterly meetings where partners commented and gave suggestions to colleagues creating a more conducive environment for learning from each other’s experiences and become more flexible in moving along changes in the context, tracking emerging changes and grasping opportunities. These meetings were also used for harmonisation of strategies by implementing partners and for planning purpose. Partners would agree on the indicators of the different interventions. A framework for generating evidence was used and the lower level indicators were measured by the implementing partners. This made the M&E participatory, bringing about learnings and was appreciated by partners.

Synergies between partners were progressing in the course of the project cycle. As one of the IPs stated: In 2016, the level of collaboration could have been rated about 10% but currently it could be rated about 70%. This progression in collaboration developed as the implementing partners appreciated the synergies and complementarities during implementation. However this collaboration was within a certain PoC.

Once there was clarity about roles, responsibilities and budget division, partners report a good collaboration. In for instance PoC1 FAPAD and UNNGOF worked closely and successfully together in Lango region. In Karamoja region ADP worked closely with SAO on PoC3. AA relied on groups mobilised by other partners for capacity building. And also SAO relied on existing groups, some mobilised by ADP. CoU-TEDDO and FAPAD collaborated successfully in boosting the cultural land management system in all three regions. And when PAG-Soroti left the Uganda alliance, CoU-TEDDO could smoothly take over activities, as they were collaborating the same area.

Within the CEA alliance some IPs took the lead like CoU-TEDDO, SAO and FAPAD and others were more following, while UNNGOF was involved in capacity development for all IPs and their constituencies.

CEA members Edukans and Light for the World were present in-country and report a good collaboration with IPs. Their position was different, but their technical advice and support was smoothly integrated in ongoing activities and appreciated.

Partners took more and more initiatives to build a knowledge basis together, for instance in the most recent reflection and learning workshop in August 2020 partners had a specific session on laws related to agriculture, presented by a local consultant who was hired by SAO. The purpose was to bring partners up to speed on the legal architecture that applies to the agricultural sector in Uganda so as to empower the partners with the knowledge that support the program’s lobby agenda. The partners planned actions for the national level lobby engagements.

Topics for capacity building of farmers emerged out of the two needs assessments conducted. The first one in 2016 focused on opportunities and challenges for market access by smallholder farmers; and the second one in 2019 focused on skills gaps for extension workers. The needs assessments however, did not differentiate the unique units of different categories e.g. women, youth and PWDs. Therefore the training was generic for all.
Inefficiencies

The use of a ToC approach was in the first half of the programme period difficult. Partners were not used to this way of working and continued in the ‘old’ way they were used to from the MFSII, with a fixed activity programme per partner and without an overall idea of the change to be accomplished, nor the connections between interventions and underlying assumptions. Results were counted in numbers of meetings held, participants trained etc. In combination with the operation in silo’s, both vertical the Netherlands - Uganda and in PoCs, which didn’t help the sharing and learning from each other, nor adapting to insights and changing circumstances. Gradually this improved, with more contacts between staff from partner organisations and the guidance from the ICCO-GO in an “on the job” capacity building.

Checking assumptions and monitoring results could have led to adaptation of country ToC and PoCs, but assumptions were not reviewed in a systematic way. This can be explained by taking into account the unfamiliarity of partners with this new approach.

The CEA programme design was not based on a systematic baseline research study. In 2016 in a workshop with partners the country ToC, derived from the overall Programme ToC, was validated. For the country plan the course of the MFSII programme was continued, which didn’t provide a specific basis for L&A work, creating inefficient input of means. For instance the intention was to advocate for a national seed policy, when partners learnt that such a policy already passed and existed. Plans were adapted and focused on dissemination of the policy to make farmers and other stakeholders, including duty bearers aware of the policy guidelines.

Quarterly exchange meetings as well as the introduction of M&E tools like lobby logbooks and Stories of Change were seen more as reporting tools than for learning purposes. In combination with the compartmentalisation between partners and PoCs the learning potential of partners remained underused in the first years of the programme implementation.

A feeling of togetherness, creating synergy in operating as one country alliance didn’t really emerge in the first half of the programme implementation. Besides the afore mentioned compartmentalisation, partners had their own specific tasks and corresponding budgets. The allocation to the IPs for the five years was decided upon in the Netherlands. Yearly budgets were decided upon by the ICCO CEA coordinator and the CEA member. Every IP submitted their own yearly work plan that was basically informed by the overall CEA Plan for Uganda. The yearly allocation depended much on the ability of the implementing partner in terms of the plan shared with ICCO.

The CEA programme focuses on L&A of CSOs and to capacitate organisations to express their needs and get into dialogue with duty bearers. This new “mental model” had to be integrated by partners in their ongoing activities related to service delivery improving livelihoods of their constituencies. This appeared a difficult process. Continuation of service delivery activities frustrated the L&A approach in the CEA programme. An example is from the Lango region where the CEA partner responsible for implementing PoC3 did not do enough to mobilise farmers’ access to markets. Over the years when lobby issues became more clear, as well as the way of operating and first results on district level were achieved, synergy emerged from the new approach in a solid foundation in the communities.
Especially collaboration between partners in Poc2 and Poc3 was important as these PoCs are linked in aim and target audience. However compartmentalisation in PoCs, with different partners per PoC operating in the same region, resulted in some cases in duplication of efforts, for instance in convening regional dialogues, while it could have been more efficient to have one dialogue meeting at regional level. In the second half of programme implementation more alignment was created.

Efficient use of the budget

Every partner did yearly audits. IPs submitted audit reports, financial and narrative reports upon which ICCO was able to transfer funds to their accounts. When partners fulfilled the requirements of adequate reporting, including the auditing, funds were released on time for an entire year. For some partners this was new; they were not used to funds released for the entire year at once. This provided freedom for planning execution of activities, and also taking advantage of opportunities that might emerge with minimal constraints.

In a two cases tripartite agreements were designed for releasing funds, reflecting the implementing partner, ICCO and the CEA member from the Netherlands that is affiliated to the IP. Funds channelled via the CEA member was the case for ICCO – SAO – Red een Kind, and for ICCO – PAG Soroti – Tear. All other IPs had bilateral agreements with ICCO. One of the reasons given was to have a track record documented for future proposals.

Procedures and requirements for release of funds were clear to IPs. Any left-over balance from one contract was carried over to next year’s contract, and used in the subsequent year.

To assess efficient use of the budget in this evaluation essential information is missing, like detailed planned budgets. An indicative budget of 1,775.000 euro for Uganda is mentioned in the programme document (2015) and at that time country programmes were not yet elaborated. A more detailed budget is available from 2017 where a total sum of 2,507.700 euro is foreseen for CEA Uganda. The difference with the 2015 budget can be explained by the fact that some of the CEA members have their focus of activities especially on Africa, like Prisma, Kerk in Aktie, Edukans and Wilde Ganzen. The choice to allocate more budget for these CEA members in Africa was made during the inception phase of the programme. The expected total budget spent by the end of the programme in December 2020 is expected at 2,572.030 euro.

In the following tables 1 and 2 the expenditures per PoC and per implementing CEA member are presented.

Table 1 Overview of the CEA programme budget in euro’s per CEA member, per Pathway of Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PoC1: Political space for CSOs</th>
<th>Realized 2016-2019</th>
<th>Remaining budget 2019</th>
<th>Adjusted budget 2020</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICCO RO</td>
<td>266.897</td>
<td>21.173</td>
<td>42.262</td>
<td>330.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red een Kind</td>
<td>193.678</td>
<td>-24.011</td>
<td>-24.667</td>
<td>145.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tear</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90.000</td>
<td>60.000</td>
<td>150.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woord&amp;Daad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30.000</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>50.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light for the World</td>
<td>70.705</td>
<td>4.642</td>
<td>20.653</td>
<td>96.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edukans</td>
<td>29.831</td>
<td>4.142</td>
<td>26.026</td>
<td>59.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerk in Aktie</td>
<td>63.947</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>30.053</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilde Ganzen</td>
<td>60.000</td>
<td>3.700</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>68.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total PoC1</strong></td>
<td><strong>685.058</strong></td>
<td><strong>135.646</strong></td>
<td><strong>179.327</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,000.031</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PoC2: Right to Adequate Food**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICCO RO</td>
<td>347.182</td>
<td>37.010</td>
<td>146.476</td>
<td>530.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red een Kind</td>
<td>66.611</td>
<td>23.747</td>
<td>59.642</td>
<td>150.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tear</td>
<td>61.219</td>
<td>70.281</td>
<td>88.500</td>
<td>220.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woord&amp;Daad</td>
<td>30.000</td>
<td>-30.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total PoC2</strong></td>
<td><strong>505.012</strong></td>
<td><strong>101.038</strong></td>
<td><strong>294.618</strong></td>
<td><strong>900.668</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In an audit commissioned by the Dutch CEA member Tear a financial misuse was found in 2019 at partner PAG Soroti. In 2020 no money was transferred to this IP and these funds were reallocated to CoU-TEDDO, Advance Africa, ADP and part of the money was sent to CEA Ethiopia.*

**PoC3: Small Producer Empowerment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICCO RO</td>
<td>128.305</td>
<td>65.779</td>
<td>96.249</td>
<td>290.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woord&amp;Daad</td>
<td>78.947</td>
<td>7.053</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>96.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tear</td>
<td>135.005</td>
<td>-65.000</td>
<td>-70.005</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total PoC3</strong></td>
<td><strong>480.668</strong></td>
<td><strong>-19.370</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.014</strong></td>
<td><strong>511.332</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PoC4: Sustainable Private Sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edukans</td>
<td>25.621</td>
<td>3.628</td>
<td>30.750</td>
<td>59.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerk in Aktie</td>
<td>63.682</td>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>21.318</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total PoC4</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.303</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.628</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.068</strong></td>
<td><strong>159.999</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Distribution per Pathway of Change (in €)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway of Change</th>
<th>Realized 2016-2019</th>
<th>Remaining budget 2019</th>
<th>Adjusted budget 2020</th>
<th>Total 2019</th>
<th>% of total budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PoC1 Political space for CSOs</td>
<td>685.058</td>
<td>135.646</td>
<td>179.327</td>
<td>1,000.031</td>
<td>39 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoC2 Right to Adequate Food</td>
<td>505.012</td>
<td>101.038</td>
<td>294.618</td>
<td>900.668</td>
<td>35 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoC3 Small Producer Empowerment</td>
<td>480.688</td>
<td>-19.370</td>
<td>50.014</td>
<td>511.332</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoC4 Sustainable Private Sector</td>
<td>89.303</td>
<td>18.628</td>
<td>52.068</td>
<td>159.999</td>
<td>6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,760.061</strong></td>
<td><strong>235.942</strong></td>
<td><strong>576.027</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,572.030</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trend in expenditures per PoC shows 2016 indeed as a starting-up year, in 2017 and 2018 activities came up to speed, in 2019 there is considerable increase in expenditures, and in 2020 the remaining budget is spent without knowing if there would be a CEA2 programme.
In some cases the programme has been flexible in reallocating resources. For instance in 2018 for facilitating engagement with policy actors during the World Food Day celebrations in Nabilatuk.

In 2020 resources were reallocated to support the control of Covid-19 pandemic in the communities.

In the country plan of 2016 there were no activities in Uganda foreseen in PoC4, however from 2017 onwards increasing expenditures are made in this PoC, by implementing partners Edukans and Kerk in Aktie.

Expenditures in PoC2 show some fluctuations. Remarkable is the substantial sum budgeted for the final programme year 2020.

In PoC3 after a slow start expenditures were done especially in 2018 and 2019, with a risk of overspending in 2020.

As the programme progressed some adjustments were made between IPs and countries, but not between PoCs.

Table 3 Expenditures over the years of implementation, per Pathway of Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PoC1</td>
<td>45.951</td>
<td>128.673</td>
<td>220.669</td>
<td>289.767</td>
<td>135.646</td>
<td>179.327</td>
<td>1,000.033</td>
<td>560.000</td>
<td>1,092.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoC2</td>
<td>46.076</td>
<td>222.101</td>
<td>85.716</td>
<td>151.199</td>
<td>101.038</td>
<td>294.618</td>
<td>900.668</td>
<td>600.000</td>
<td>825.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoC3</td>
<td>69.445</td>
<td>46.874</td>
<td>166.011</td>
<td>198.358</td>
<td>-19.370</td>
<td>50.014</td>
<td>511.332</td>
<td>455.000</td>
<td>430.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoC4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.446</td>
<td>23.485</td>
<td>38.372</td>
<td>18.628</td>
<td>52.068</td>
<td>159.999</td>
<td>160.000</td>
<td>160.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161.472</td>
<td>425.094</td>
<td>495.881</td>
<td>677.615</td>
<td>235.942</td>
<td>576.027</td>
<td>2,572.032</td>
<td>1,775.000</td>
<td>2,507.700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Convening and Convincing Programme Document October 2015
**Source: Convening and Convincing ICCO consortium Annual Plan 2017

In the repartition of the budget over IPs and ICCO RO, see table 4, it can be noticed that ICCO RO spent a considerable portion of the budget (45%). As information from financial forecasts are missing it is not possible to assess the efficiency. Budgets for implementing partners UNNGOF, FAPAD and partly CoU-TEDDO were channelled via ICCO RO. And RO took charge of the reflection and learning workshops, consultancies, video project and other miscellaneous running costs.

In addition ICCO RO reports a fixed annual sum of 50.333 euro for overhead in the years 2017-2020.

Amongst the CEA members Prisma spent the biggest share of the budget, 35%. Prisma member Red een Kind, working via partner Share An Opportunity, didn’t have any expenditures before 2018; in 2020 overspending is expected. Budgets in PoC1 for Prisma members Woord&Daad and TEAR are foreseen in 2020 while no expenditures were made by these organisations in the first four years in this specific pathway of change.

Table 4 Distribution per implementing partner and ICCO RO
## Monitoring and evaluation

A Theory of Change approach can be a useful tool for reflecting on the implementation of interventions and is related to learning, critical thinking about assumptions and transformational development, supporting system change. As mentioned under Programme Efficiency the uptake of a ToC approach took time in CEA Uganda. Subsequently M&E in the first years showed partners were used to tools and processes from a programmatic approach with logframes, objectives and indicators; reporting was the main purpose. Only later in the implementation period, with support of ICCO-GO the reflection and learning took more shape. Partners started to appreciate the new perspective on evaluating change and moving away from numbers, identifying the real changes resulting from their work. Partners called this a valuable learning curve for their staff and they intend to continue this way of working in future operations. One partner mentioned that Dutch partners learnt a lot from counter partners in the Uganda as much as the reverse is true.

For M&E in CEA Uganda the following tools are mentioned:

1. Lobby logbook, a tool to maintain and monitor the progress of lobbying to the various stakeholders of the program. These logbooks were used at a later stage, because L&A activities were developed at a slow pace and furthermore the concept of lobby logbooks was unknown to partners and difficult to understand. This tool could have been more informative, in building relationships, monitoring contacts and following up, and building arguments for lobby trajectories.

2. Stories of Change, about actions and successful changes, were used for communication purposes more than for evaluation purpose. In the learning workshop reports 12 Stories of Change are mentioned, every CEA partner had to produce at least one. These SoC were more seen as a reporting tool than for learning purposes in the L&A process.

3. Report of activities (workshops, discussions, etc.) by partners in program implementation.

4. Indicator matrix, shared with partners and used for implementation. Partners reported their confusion about the use and meaning of the numbers: are we counting the number of meetings, or the change coming from these meetings? In general indicators were developed together with the PO, however could have been more contextualised informing the implementation of CEA Uganda

5. Quarterly meetings with partners, guided by ICCO-CR and RC.

6. Bi-annual 2-day meetings for monitoring and action planning, in combination with #7

7. Annual reflection and learning event; various M&E tools were used to assess progress, like the spider diagram, rich pictures and stakeholder mapping, which made the reflection on the programme more practical.

8. Light of the World shared disability M&E tools used for tracking of disability targeting and inclusion.
9. WhatsApp group was created for the CEA team, to inform each other, and partners were showing what they were doing (pictures, messages). This was much appreciated by partner staff and created an informal peer learning platform.

10. Informal contacts with ICCO-CO (CC/RC was very approachable and available any time for advice and support, partners reported)

11. Contacts between partners, within the same district, and/or working within the same PoC activities, for the purpose of sharing ideas and experiences

12. Stakeholder analysis (1st time was in the inception workshop 2016, reviewed in the reflection and learning workshops in the following years) on national level, elaborated by partners for local and district level. A power analysis was part of the stakeholder mapping.

13. Collaboration with Alliance members; monthly Skype updates with ICCO-CO through which consortium members from the Netherlands are able to share their thoughts in the implementation of the program. Through these Skype conversations CEA Uganda has been able to obtain quick feedback from the Global Office Specialists.

ICCO-RO conducted quarterly program reviews, shared key insights with partners and the Embassy of the Netherlands in Uganda. ICCO-RC has had frequent field visits for spot checks and courtesy calls which helped in keeping track of what was going on in the regions of interventions. In these visits, updates and possible opportunities the CEA Program can benefit from are shared. During quarterly reflection meetings, the implementing partners share their lobby logbook and peer-feedback is provided. Partners made a deliberate effort to enhance L&A capacities, each quarter reported and discussed specifics on L&A, like trends, key issues, made suggestions to each other, and acquired skills together.

Annual Reflection & Learning workshops were a kind of hybrid: systematic reflection on what to consolidate, what to improve and what to initiate. While monitoring activities and outputs, the learning took place, with the help of tools like the spider diagram.

ICCO-RO participates in dialogue meetings organised by the IPs. After the dialogue meetings feedback sessions took place which have proved to be very useful enhancing learning.

In Uganda compared to other CEA countries quite a number of partners (7 + in-country advisors of 2 CEA members) were operating under CEA. And the consortium had to get used to working in a new approach (ToC). M&E was different from what IPs were used to in for instance the MFSII programme. The RC signalled they could have been helped by a person who could be of support in getting the new M&E activities up and running, and could coach the IPs in this. Some of the larger organisations have their own M&E person, like CUO-TEDDO. ICCO-GO offered support in the PMEL activities and gave methodological support. Several field visits to Uganda were made, by CEA members, like in joining IPs in the annual reflection and learning workshops.

Conclusions

The CEA Uganda experienced a slow and difficult start, due to operation in silo’s, when PoCs were not contextualised and there was no integration of pathways. IPs were not used to working with a ToC approach. In the second half of the implementation of CEA this improved, when sharing experiences and insights in reflection and learning workshops, and horizontal collaboration became
more prominent. In the first half of implementation years the learning potential of the IP consortium was underused. Gradually partners learned together and improved their collaboration.

L&A was new to some partners. They had to make a mind shift, together with their constituencies from service delivery to L&A. While at the same time the organisations continued in service delivery with other sources of funding. It took time to bring these two together, finding out how synergy could be created.

The discussions around ToC and PoCs were not based on a solid baseline research study, related to the focus on L&A. Nor were partners selected in competition for their track record in L&A. This is the downside of the continuation with the MFSII set of partners. However the positive side is that these partners had their structures and contacts in place, which were available for other CEA partners and who could rely on these existing structures. And a lot of data was available with partners, about the situation in the three regions of intervention.

Roles and responsibilities between IPs were clear. Some partners were leading the partnership in Uganda, while others remained more passive, following, or relying on the Dutch partner for guidance.

Budgets were released timely, after partners fulfilled the requirements; budgets were released for the entire year.

Efficiency of spending cannot be assessed properly because essential info is missing.

As there was no solid baseline study research conducted, related to the focus of the programme on L&A to inform the design and related M&E system, the expected outcomes are formulated in rather general terms, as well as indicators, defined to monitor the L&A trajectory.

M&E improved over the years, and when partners got more familiar with the ToC approach, M&E resulted in learning and adapting of strategies, discussing changes and assumptions underlying these changes and factors influencing. IPs are determined to continue working in this way for future projects and interventions.

6. Sustainability

Changes in the CEA programme Uganda spring mainly from dialogues. How will these continue after the CEA programme ends? And how will changes accomplished during programme implementation be sustained? In this chapter different aspects of sustainability will be presented.

*Sustainability of L&A capacity development*

One of the pillars of the CEA programme is capacity building on L&A. During the restitution workshop, as part of this evaluation, IPs discussed which plans are foreseen making L&A expertise sustain after 2020.

Partners and stakeholders were capacitated in L&A, and staff will pass on acquired skills to colleagues and networks; some IPs have integrated L&A training in their strategic plans.
UNNGFO will continue providing the Local Fundraising and Mobilising Support trainings. Edukans is supporting AA in the roll out of the Life Skills for Lobby training. Both AA and UNNGFO are planning to use a ToT approach and train people who will then bring these trainings to partners in other districts.

AA was trained by Edukans to capacitate extension workers and government officials who will bring L&A training to CBOs and FOs. AA is working on the creation of a platform for Extension Officers, for district and sub-county leadership to better dialogue on extension service delivery challenges. One of the challenges expressed by extension workers is that some supervisors might look at as they are showing interest in standing for elective positions, while working on L&A.

Rolling out the training by ToT was expected to start in the course of 2020 but was delayed by the interruption of the covid-19 pandemic. In addition UNNGOF which hosted all CEA capacity building in L&A was yet to put in place a framework and plan for long-term capacity building in L&A using the ToTs as resource persons.

IPs like FAPAD and AA made use of existing groups, which structures were already in place before the start of the CEA programme. These structures will remain, the skills gained during the CEA programme will be useful to the communities and refresher meetings will be planned by these IPs.

As these farmers networks will remain, IPs will continue working with leaders interfacing with duty bearers at sub-county and district level. Farmers know which office to approach, and vice versa institutions know how farmers are organised and whom to contact. Constituencies are very well aware what the benefits are of working together with local duty bearers. Any newcomer in the area should know the issues, and will meet with community leaders.

Capacity building involved local government staff, and IPs will continue organising dialogues after the programme ends. Sustainability is more guaranteed as this aligns to their core business. Most IPs are FBOs receiving also other funding, like from donations and are not only dependant on project funding.

In all districts IPs have structures in place and people have been capacitated. For example extension officers, interact with farmers and farmers’ groups, and will do so, even without CEA. Another example comes from disability networks, whose representatives are now being invited to platforms and existing fora at sub-county level, e.g. in Covid-19 task forces.

**Sustainability of L&A outcomes**

At the very end of the programme it is difficult to already assess if outcomes will last. However some conditions seem to be in place, creating an enabling situation for changes to be consolidated.

IPs claim that the CEA programme presented opportunities and potentials for their organisation and partners to continue jointly, in fundraising and working together; pending conversations are going on between partners for the time after CEA, on how to enhance sustainability and scale up changes.
Some CEA lobby issues have been included in sub-county development plans. These plans are embedded in regular policy processes and protocols. Representatives of CSOs are involved in the budget meetings.

Good working relationships are established with political leaders, anticipating on upcoming elections next year. Some IPs support local leaders with evidence and arguments from achievements on CEA lobby issues. Discussion is ongoing how to include farmers’ issues in manifestos of election for candidates. There are plans for formulating Farmers’ Manifestos, with the priorities of communities in relation to agriculture, health and education. Such Farmers’ Manifestos can be a basis for signing a social contract and facilitate dialogues between farmers and candidates.

For Lira district the plan is, and FAPAD is leading, to organise a 3-day training for local government, for creating commitment in elections time. Aim is mobilising new governments for 9 districts to formulate ordinances.

Each of the IPs is working with key stakeholders in the production sector, holding quarterly meetings; they work with the district agricultural officer and the district production officer to mobilise, capacitate, lobby and influence. IPs are engaging with multi-stakeholder platforms, for example at district level, bringing together farmers, political leaders at different levels, the district and sub-county administrators and extension workers, private input dealers, produce buyers. This is ongoing business and will continue after the CEA programme ends.

The work on PoC1, creating space for civil society is within UNNGOF’s mandate, they will continue as an ongoing activity. Also the SDGs platform is hosted by UNNGOF where issues from Poc2 and PoC3 are addressed.

**Sustainability of the CEA consortium**

**Within CEA partners**

Skills related to for instance fundraising, disability inclusion are embedded in organisational policies and strategic plans of at least three of the IPs: FAPAD, CoU-TEDDO and SAO.

Some organisations like FAPAD, SAO and CoU-TEDDO have included L&A in plans for future projects and will use their expertise from the CEA programme in future interventions and in scaling-up of changes achieved under CEA.

Documentaries were produced as reference for future programming, and shared with ICCO and other partners.

Synergies between programmes within the organisation were created and will continue, for example SAO has a strong competency in child wellbeing, and through CEA the organisation grew in L&A; now they work on child labour issues. Through the CEA programme the organisation started working with smallholders and integrated issues of child labour and child nutrition in their community work.
**Within the IP Alliance**

CEA Uganda has been linked to existing development programmes in the country; some of these contacts resulted for example in participation in activities towards politicians at national level. This network will continue, and some IPs are in the process of submitting new proposals. Likely any initiative of IPs for joint follow-up proposals will contribute to sustain the changes achieved under CEA.

A number of IPs have sustainability plans, continuing their collaboration in capacity building for local government staff and farmers. They will also work on scaling up of activities, for example IPs had a meeting on this aspect in 2019, where regional leaders came together from the 3 intervention regions. Topic for discussion were ordinances, e.g. on counterfeit seeds, based on the practices they learned in CEA.

The CtGA ToTs gave UNNGOF an opportunity to deepen their capacity and knowledge of more transformative approaches while advocating for change. Additionally the Life Skills for L&A brought in a new dimension of transformative advocacy in a more collaborative way. UNNGOF stated that the two learning opportunities boasted their capacity as an institution to pass on knowledge to their diverse membership and also coordinate the same programmes on behalf of Edukans and CtGA. As UNNGOF’s sees topics in the three PoCs within their mandate, the organisation intends to convene platforms for sharing and reflecting; the organisation states that they will take care that CEA partners will not be left out and are seeking collaboration with IPs to be able financing these activities.

CEA consortium partners are working on a MoU with the Ministry of Agriculture, presenting the consortium as a structure for disseminating national policies to local level in the northern area of the country. The cases of the National Agricultural Extension Policy (2015) and the National Seed Policy (2018) have proved CEA partners are successful in their dissemination strategies.

All IPs are member of the Participatory Ecological Land Use Management (PELUM) or work with this platform; an idea being discussed amongst IPs is to bring Farmers’ Manifestos to this platform for scaling up purpose.

For strengthening local-national-international L&A, partners are convinced it will be key to continue research, have facts and figures to base cases and for input in a L&A agenda. And also to establish strategic collaboration in the right places. A start was made during the CEA implementation.

Each IP has interacted with stakeholders at various levels, like AA with stakeholders related to markets, and FAPAD with stakeholders related to production. IPs are exploring how to combine and re-enforce the role of a CEA consortium 2.0.

**Exit strategy**

In the programme design no exit strategy is foreseen. In the final year of the programme IPs expected a CEA2 where they could continue activities, consolidate achievements and scale up.
Some IPs will plan an exit meeting in the 4th quarter of 2020 with their contacts in each district to reflect on what was accomplished and looking forward into future engagements.

Conclusions

There is no exit strategy in place for the entire programme. Partners counted on a second phase and expected to continue their activities for another number of years.

Each IP has ideas about the phase when the CEA programme ends. Some have already made plans and provisions, others are still discussing and exploring possibilities. Some decided their collaboration and submitted joint proposals for new projects.

Capacity building will only sustain when a follow-up is offered. This is foreseen by the leading partners in CEA, who are planning to scale up. UNNGOF can play a role with their ToTs which are now well developed and tested. And partners like AA who operate at district level, can do the same. Edukans signalled the need to establish a mechanism for better monitoring of the lobby activities of the extension officers, as well as other tools for AA capturing data and documentation.

During programme implementation IPs made use of existing structures. These will continue, after the programme ends, capacitated and better aware of policies and regulations. They know how to approach their duty bearers, who in return experienced successfully what emerged from systematic dialogues with CBOs representatives. The Farmers’ Manifestos are an interesting approach to connect candidates for elections to important issues like agriculture, health and education.

On national level with the signing of a MoU with the Ministry of Agriculture, the CEA consortium partners can establish their position as an effective structure for disseminating national policies to local level in the northern area of the country. IPs showed what they are capable of in filling the gap in the transmission of national policies to local and regional level.

The majority of IPs knew each other from the MFSII programme and continued their collaboration in CEA. Partners became better acquainted with each other strengths and which powerful connections can be forged. These bonds will continue in the shape of new projects and joint action for instance at district level.

7. Final conclusions

Slow and fragmented start

The CEA programme was formulated based on experiences in the MFSII programme and partners in this previous programme implicitly became partners in CEA programme. The other partners were selected largely based on their relationship with CEA members in the Netherlands. Whereas the CEA programme had a new orientation to focus on citizen led L&A and an approach based on Theories of Change, the partners initially perceived it as a continuation of MFSII, rather than on the basis of a participatory design of a ToC and PoCs, focussing on L&A.

Most of the CEA partners in Uganda are Faith Based Organisations (FBOs), well embedded at grass root level, and working predominantly in the North-East region of Uganda. During the inception
phase in 2016 partners designed their collaboration, dividing tasks and roles within specific PoCs, according to expertise and geographical focus. Following the working modus from previous projects, with a logframe “mindset”, a fragmented set-up was decided upon with each partner having a distinct particle. In the course of the implementation process, when more horizontal collaboration emerged as partners became more familiar with the ToC approach, and had a better idea on how to operate in a L&A approach partners teamed up in activities and became more effective in joining forces.

The CEA Uganda experienced a slow start, due to operation in compartments, because of siloing in PoCs. As the IPs were not used to working with a ToC approach, and most of the organisation were unknown to a L&A focus, PoCs were only contextualised in general terms. Activities were implemented within a specific PoC and there was no integration of pathways. In the second half of the programme implementation this improved, when sharing experiences and insights in reflection and learning workshops, and linkages between especially PoC2 and 3 became more prominent. In the first half of the implementation years the learning potential of the IP consortium was underused. Gradually partners learned together and improved their collaboration.

Finding synergy

L&A was a relatively new approach to IPs including the Dutch partners, which explains why capacity building in L&A was front-loaded to align all partners in the same direction of project implementation. They had to make a mind shift, together with their constituencies from service delivery to lobby and advocacy, while at the same time the organisations continued in service delivery with other sources of funding. It took time to bring these two together, finding out how synergy could be created.

The advantage however, was that most of the Uganda partners were FBOs and had established structures and systems for working with the communities. Furthermore the FBOs were trusted by the communities and government, hence were allowed space to operate despite the restrictions of the PoM Act 2013 and the NGO Act 2016. Engagement with the communities was easier and faster. These existing structures will continue, after the programme ends, capacitated and better aware of policies and regulations. Community reps know how to approach their duty bearers, who in return experienced successfully what emerged from systematic dialogues with CBOs.

Relevant and effective on local level

Building capacity for L&A with smallholder farmers to engage with the duty bearers was a very effective strategy to influence change towards improved service delivery to the smallholder farmers and in particular to women, youth and PWDs. The citizen led L&A invoked quick responses from district and sub-county levels to improve extension service delivery, regulate the private sector to assure quality of seed and other agricultural inputs, and to influence and strengthen the cultural land management system to be more sensitive to the needs of women/girls, orphans and to guarantee their rights on land and settle land disputes.

Significant improvements were made not only in terms of awareness raising and increasing knowledge of farmers, but more generally in ‘multi-stakeholder collaboration’ for agricultural and rural development, improving the business environment, e.g. in cleaning up the seed delivery
system at the local and regional level, better access to financial services etc. The private sector, mainly the agro-input dealers and produce buyers were involved in the dialogues. Their views were taken into account in the regulation of agro-inputs at district level. The outcome of this engagement was an improved business environment for both producers and suppliers.

L&A in PW 2 and 3 produced results in terms of better relations between CSOs and duty bearers, as well as socialising government policies and programmes, which makes a good basis for influence on local/regional government policies/practices. Through by-laws developed with support of the CEA programme a broader legal framework, access to quality seed and other inputs by smallholder farmers were guaranteed. The power of voices of smallholder farmers during the L&A activities created the necessity for representation of smallholder farmers at the district and sub-county planning and budgeting committees where their participation can continue to influence plans and policies to support smallholder farmers to ensure food and nutrition security. Whereas capacity for L&A has been enhanced in the IPs, strategies and mechanisms for scaling up such capacity is yet to be actualized. More effort is required to institutionalise the capacity building for L&A within UNNGOF, who can then re-enforce their role in capacitating members in transformative approaches while advocating for change.

Deliberate focussing on women, youth and PWDs was very appropriate in moving towards sustainable food and nutritional security. Mainstreaming the rights of women, youth and PWDs in the customary land system needs to be formalised and capacities of the cultural land committees strengthened and oriented towards rights-based decisions. The CEA programme further influenced change of attitudes amongst duty bearers including IPs towards conscious planning and institutionalisation of gender to reduce vulnerability of women, youth and PWDs. Inclusion of gender targeted interventions in the proposals for future development interventions by the IPs is a pointer in the right direction that needs to be encouraged. Inclusion of PWDs is more complex than women and youth as the PWDs are not easily visible in a community even though they exist. This challenge was effectively met in the CEA programme, to the extent that more awareness was created, both with duty bearers, community and clan leaders, as well as with the rights holders who learned about their rights and ways to claim these.

**Investment for the future**

The CEA programme was a valuable joint learning experience and capacity building for citizen led L&A that has high potential to influence policies and practices for inclusive development. However the time for learning and consolidating achievement has been rather too short to guarantee sustainability. Moreover, an exit strategy was not anticipated at the design stage and there are no concrete plans and structures to ensure scaling up or even continuity. However IPs are determined to continue the CEA L&A approach, as some have incorporated in their strategies and plans for the coming years. Furthermore IPs have already started initiatives to scale up interventions from the CEA programme in all 9 districts in the Northern region of Uganda.

The individual institutional initiatives to integrate elements in their development programmes though commendable can also fragment the package for citizen led L&A to the extent that wider-scale impacts may be elusive. Substantial investments are required to maintain and/or expand partnership, deepen the learning and consolidate achievements with solid principles and practices for scaling up. The basis for this is a strong one.
The developing collaborations between IPs exploited synergies and complementarity and hence effectiveness in L&A. A more collaborative relationship (than ever before) has been established between the IPs and the district local governments where the CEA programme was implemented and relevant ministries such as MAAIF. In turn, this has increased the trust and credibility of the IPs by government agencies. This basis is used by the IPs to position their consortium as partner to the government for the dissemination of national policies. The MoU to be signed with MAAIF is a good example of this development.
8. Annexes

Annex 1: documents consulted

Annual plans CEA Uganda 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020

Annual reports CEA Uganda 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019

Report Learning workshops CEA Uganda 2017-18, 2019

Notes Skype calls ICCO RO with ICCO GO and CEA members

Report inception workshop ICCO and partners, 6-10 June 2016

Baseline report CEA Programme Uganda 2016

Uganda Program Document and Baseline Report, September 2016, ICCO

Baseline survey Lango 2016

Baseline survey Teso 2016

Baseline survey NGO and POM Acts  2016

Baseline report PW3 on value chains cassava, maize and millet 2016

Stories of Change CEA Uganda

Indicator sheets CEA Uganda 2017, 2018, 2019

Convening and Convincing Program Document ICCO 2016-2020

Inception report CEA end evaluation

Desk study report end evaluation CEA Uganda (internal document)
Annex 2: People consulted

Bilateral interviews implementing partners CEA Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name interviewee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAPAD</td>
<td>Juliet Ebil - Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grace Patricia Dikan - Social Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>Rev. Nelson Owili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Afrika</td>
<td>Daniel Ntende – Project Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daphne Egwar – Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAO Uganda</td>
<td>Carolyn Masaba – National Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sakira Emmanuel – Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Kerunga – Program Area Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoU-TEDDO</td>
<td>Moses Egayu – Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abraham Otuya – Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda National NGO Forum (UNNGOF)</td>
<td>Robert Ninyesiga – Programme Officer Civil Society Strengthening Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAG-Soroti</td>
<td>Patrick Onaga - Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edukans</td>
<td>Stephen Kaheru – Skills Advisor for Uganda, Kenya and Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light for the World</td>
<td>Ambrose Murangira – Disability Inclusion Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Allot</td>
<td>Barr Sub-county, Lira District</td>
<td>Community Peace Promoter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Ario</td>
<td>Lira district Local Government</td>
<td>Senior Agricultural Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Echodu</td>
<td>Labor sub-county, Serere district</td>
<td>Trainer, community seed system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Adude</td>
<td>Ngora District Local Government</td>
<td>District Agricultural Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Ageet</td>
<td>Serere District Local Government</td>
<td>District Agricultural Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Akol Alloch</td>
<td>Iteso Cultural Union</td>
<td>Minister in Charge of Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Amwona</td>
<td>Abim District Local Government</td>
<td>District Agricultural Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
END EVALUATION CIVIC ENGAGEMENT ALLIANCE

REPORT EVALUATION EU/NL LOBBY AND ADVOCACY

Team of consultants:
Jet Proost
Geert Phlix

2 DECEMBER 2020
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are grateful to the invaluable support from ICCO Global Office, who promptly responded to our requests for information, provided names and contact details of people we needed to talk to and organised meetings with the NL lobby team for purposes of this evaluation. We like to thank the CEA members for providing us with information, documents and sharing their lobby logbooks with us. And lobbyists in organisations and platforms CEA collaborated with are highly appreciated for their cooperation with the evaluation team to freely share information and experiences about the CEA programme and identified the contacts that provided more details about the cases.
**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Action by Churches Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRI</td>
<td>Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APF</td>
<td>AgriProFocus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of South-East Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR</td>
<td>Business and Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL</td>
<td>Centraal Bureau voor de Levensmiddelen (Interest group supermarkets and food service companies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Civic Engagement Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>(World) Committee on Food and Nutrition Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNV</td>
<td>Christian national labour union (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPA-COGECA</td>
<td>European Farmers-European Agri Cooperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Company Social Responsibilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DevCo</td>
<td>Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Directorate General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSO-MO</td>
<td>Social Development Department-Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKN</td>
<td>Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETUC</td>
<td>European Trade Union Confederation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>Faith Based Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMS</td>
<td>Foundation Max van der Stoel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNLI</td>
<td>Federatie Nederlandse Levensmiddelen Industrie (Umbrella organisation for branches and companies in the food industry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNS</td>
<td>Food and Nutrition Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT&amp;DC</td>
<td>Foreign Trade &amp; Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>Good Agricultural Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAPKI</td>
<td>Gabungan Pengusaha Kelapa Sawit Indonesia (The Association of Indonesian Palm Oil Entrepreneurs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAR</td>
<td>Golden Agri Resources group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARD</td>
<td>Heads Rural Development EU member states’ Ministries of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>International Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSR</td>
<td>International corporate social responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDH</td>
<td>IDH Sustainable Trade Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGCN</td>
<td>Indonesia Global Compact Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGG</td>
<td>Directie Inclusieve Groene Groei (Directorat Inclusive Green Growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMVO</td>
<td>Internationaal Maatschappelijk Verantwoord Ondernemen (International Social, Economical and Environmental Responsible Entrepreneurship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementing Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPSO</td>
<td>Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRBC</td>
<td>International Responsible Business Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITUC</td>
<td>International Trade Union Confederation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KiA</td>
<td>Kerk in Actie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>Royal Tropical Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;A</td>
<td>Lobby &amp; Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHFP</td>
<td>Months of Adequate Household Food Provisioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDD-W</td>
<td>Minimum Dietary diversity for women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoFA</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVO</td>
<td>Maatschappelijk Verantwoord Ondernemen (Social, Economical and Environmental Responsible Entrepreneurship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWGN</td>
<td>Netherlands Working Group on Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKPA</td>
<td>Pusat Kajian dan Perlindungan Anak (Center for Child Study and Protection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Power Point Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Pathway of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PwC</td>
<td>PricewaterhouseCoopers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBC</td>
<td>Responsible Business Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSPO</td>
<td>Round table on Sustainable Palm Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiFAV</td>
<td>Sustainability Initiative of Fruit and Vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small and Medium Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoC</td>
<td>Story of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUN</td>
<td>Scaling Up Nutrition Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGP</td>
<td>United Nations Guiding Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPD</td>
<td>Union Product Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBDO</td>
<td>Association of Investors for Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU</td>
<td>Vrije Universiteit, Free University, Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC</td>
<td>World Council of Churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUR/CDI</td>
<td>Wageningen University &amp; Research/ Centre for Development Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

1.1. Objectives and methodology of the evaluation NL/EU case

The objective of the evaluation of the CEA programme is to assess to what extent and how CEA and their Southern partner organisations have progressed in reaching sustainable results as formulated in the Theories of Change of the specific country pathways during the period 2016-2020. In particular, the evaluation seeks to assess the effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and efficiency of the programme, related to changes the programme has contributed to in relation to: (a) capacities for lobbying and advocacy of Southern partner organisations, and (b) agendas, policies and practices of government and market actors.

The evaluation consists of four phases: (1) an inception stage, (2) a desk study phase, (c) a phase of primary data collection, involving three country case studies and an analysis of the L&A interventions conducted at the Netherlands and EU level, (4) a phase of consolidated analysis, reporting, debriefing and communication. This report presents the findings of the evaluation of the L&A at the Netherlands and EU level.

Methodology applied:

- **Desk research**: relevant documentation related to the CEA programme in the Netherlands and at EU level has been consulted (Documents are listed in annex 3). As a first step, based on project documents and Stories of Change, the different types of L&A interventions were listed and an overview was made of the networks and lobby platforms CEA members were involved in. This overview was complemented by the ICCO PM and lobbyists from CEA members. Secondly, an overview was made of the main topics and documented outcomes of the L&A trajectories. The desk study also allowed to identify specific cases for a more focused contribution analysis. Criteria for case selection were: (i) case concerns evidence-based lobby, (ii) mix of cases at level of the Netherlands, as well as EU and international, (iii) several CEA members involved, (iv) the case focuses on a specific issue, (v) preferably cases cover the 4 PWs. The case selection was presented and validated by the CEA lobby-team. Following three cases were subject for a more in-depth analysis:
  1) Role of FBO in development (linked to PW1, involving Prisma, Kerk in Actie and ICCO, lobby Netherlands government, collaboration with Partos Civic Space Platform)
  2) Food and Nutrition Security, smallholder inclusion and agro-ecology (PW2 and PW 3, involving ICCO, Woord en Daad, Edukans, lobby Netherlands government and EU, collaboration with AgriProFocus, Concord and ACT EU)
  3) Round Table on Sustainable Palm Oil (PW4, involving CNV International and the CEA alliance in Indonesia, link between national and international level L&A)

- **Virtual workshops**: for the first two cases, a virtual workshop was organised with the CEA members involved to reconstruct the timeline of the L&A process and discuss contributing factors to the realised outcomes. For the third case evidence was collected during the field

---

1. CEA L&A in NL/EU was focused on: Faith Based Organisations and Development; Food and Nutrition Security, small holder inclusion and agro-ecology (both NL and EU); responsible business and respect of UNGP.
2. Not all CEA members were involved in L&A in the Netherlands and the EU. Especially ICCO, Woord en Daad and Kerk in Actie were active in these L&A interventions.
3. CEA member Wilde Ganzen focused on capacity development and was not involved in CEA L&A, with the exception of a specific collaboration in the public awareness campaign “Shift the Power” (2019).
study for Indonesia. (reconstructed timelines added in annex 1, outline of workshop added in annex 4)

- **Semi-structured interviews with several CEA members**, like ICCO, Woord en Daad and CNV International, to complement the data obtained during desk-study and virtual workshops.

- **Semi-structured interviews with lobby targets and L&A allies**: for each of the selected cases external stakeholders were identified and interviewed via remote conversations. A list of all people interviewed is added in annex 2)

- **Electronic survey**: a short electronic survey was sent to 14 representatives of L&A networks and platforms, to assess the added value and quality of the contributions of CEA members to the respective network/platform. Only two respondents have completed the questionnaire. Because of the low response rate, the results of the e-survey have not been used in the evaluation. Information was obtained through interviews with some of these networks, like Partos civic space platform, Partos lobby group, IDH Sustainable trade initiative (during Indonesia data-collection), RSPO and ACT EU. The low response rate can be explained by the fact that there was limited ownership or interest for this survey among members of platforms and networks.

- **Sense-making workshop**: a 2 hours virtual workshop took place on October 27 with the CEA lobby group in the Netherlands, aimed at presenting preliminary findings of the assessment of the evaluation, and jointly reflect, discuss and validate them. All CEA members except CNV International participated.

- **NL/EU Country report**: this report presents the findings of the evaluation in relation to the evaluation framework defined in the inception phase, and presents recommendations to increase the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of future related interventions.

**1.2. Brief description of CEA L&A conducted at The Netherlands and EU level**

**Theory of Change**

L&A activities of CEA NL/EU aimed a.o. to support actions undertaken in the CEA countries, via influencing and cooperation with Dutch Government, Dutch Embassies, EU Organisations and UN related bodies and networks. The purpose of this L&A was to make NL/EU agenda supportive for the L&A agenda of partners and allies in the specific CEA countries. The L&A activities in NL/EU and at global level concentrated primarily on influencing public policies on the enabling environment of CSOs, and paid attention to different priority fields where CSOs operate such as, food and nutrition security, land governance issues, labour rights (with special emphasis on women rights and child rights), CSO (legal) regulatory frameworks.

In the inception phase in 2016, a country plan was developed, aiming at connections in L&A interventions at different levels. No overall ToC for the CEA NL/EU L&A was formulated, however for each of the four CEA PWs a separate ToC was formulated, with a set of underlying assumptions about lobby targets as well as about the strategic partnership. Following outcomes were identified for the different PWs:
**PW1: Political space for civil society organisations**
The desired change was an improved operational space for Civil Society Organizations (CSO specifically including labour unions and faith-based organisations - FBOs) in countries worldwide, but especially in the CEA countries. And to highlight the importance of these issues in NL/EU; to identify possibilities in the NL/EU to support towards a positive development of / to denounce a negative development on these topics in the CEA countries.

**PW2: Right to Adequate Food**
The CEA alliance aimed at enabling the realisation of the Right to Adequate Food for All, based on promotion of Sustainable Food Systems and Sustainable Consumption. Food systems form the basis for Food Security, which is defined by availability of nutritious food from national to local level, accessibility (affordability) of nutritious food for households and individuals and utilization at individual level. Overall stability is key and in order to be sustainable, food systems should also be inclusive, climate-smart, efficient, nutrition- and health-driven, and business-friendly.

**PW3: Small scale producer empowerment and inclusive markets**
The CEA alliance aimed to contribute to trade policies and international governance of value chains and food systems that enable the inclusion of small-scale farmers, and especially women and youth, that protect and promote the right of workers, and that contribute to sustainable and improved incomes and livelihoods.

**PW4: Towards an inclusive private sector**
The desired change was that the Dutch Government, the European Commission and companies increasingly adhere to their responsibility to Protect and Respect and Commitment to support human rights (especially the rights of male and female smallholders - including the right of women and men to land and natural resources and to food-, male and female workers, and children’s rights).

In 2018, in discussions with the NL CEA members and L&A team, on the basis of the actual implementation and evolution of the ToCs, it was decided during the annual learning workshop to integrate pathway 2 and 3 for NL and EU, and to develop a new set of indicators, partly new and partly adjusted.

**Main strategies for NL/EU L&A**
In 2016, at the start of the CEA programme, CEA members discussed their lobby strategy design for The Netherlands and the EU. A joint lobby team was formed, with all CEA members participating. L&A strategies, positions, policy letters, results and progress were discussed in the meetings of the lobby team. Some Alliance members provided specific thematic expertise, while others were active in concrete lobby activities, both in The Netherlands as well as in Brussels. L&A interventions were supported by evidence from CEA programme implementation and research conducted in CEA countries. Following the main L&A strategies for NL/EU L&A are described.

*Lobby for space for CSOs*: involvement in the Partos Civic Space platform and the network of strategic partners working on civic space, as well as international networks (ACT Alliance, ACT EU, CONCORD, and World Council of Churches), evidence collection from the CEA countries, contributing specific evidence and knowledge on the role of FBOs and labour unions, case studies on the role of FBOs with regard to civic space and using the outcomes for L&A, to promote space for diversity of CSOs in civil society.

*NL and EU level lobby for improved position and food security of smallholder farmers in developing countries*: lobbying for and contributing to improved tools to measure impact on food and nutrition security and women empowerment at target group level, pilots in several countries, using data for
L&A, round table with IGG and DSO-MO on impact measurement, empowerment and inclusion. Cooperation with NWGN, KIT and WUR/CDI, lobbying for continuing attention for FNS on the NL and EU agenda (with AgriProFocus, NWGN, foodFIRST, ACT EU and CONCORD), ACT and CONCORD fostered an inclusive dialogue space, bringing together the EU and CSOs to discuss inter alia the agenda of the Committee on World Food Security, promoting various conferences and events.

**Lobby for inclusive and global value chains:** Continuing attention for smallholders and workers and gender awareness. Lobby at NL (APF, IDH) and EU level (CONCORD).

**Lobby for responsible business and respect of UNGP in the Netherlands:** Lobby for trade missions that pay attention to the CSR risks in the concerning sectors/countries; negotiations CSR covenant food sector and implementation (and monitoring); contribute to dialogue about the involvement of the private sector in development and lobby for responsible business; organizing HUMAN round tables. Influence the process of developing an Union Product Database (UPD). At EU level: promotion of the CONCORD ‘10-point roadmap on private sector in development’, organising discussions and round tables.

**In the Netherlands:** strengthening partnership with MoFA. Through support of the Building Change, CEA has been active on the field of Policy Coherence for Development in the Dutch government’s policy. Through the Adopt an SDG-campaign attention was given to Responsible Business Conduct and sustainable Global Value Chains. Recommendations were formulated for NL policies on FNS; representatives of political parties were informed on FNS policies and the positive/negative effects of the current policy implementation on FNS. The CEA alliance also has been lobbying for increased focus and more prominent place for youth employment and skills training and education in Dutch development policy.

**Networks:** As the CEA coalition was not yet known, one of the dominant strategies in L&A was the participation of CEA members in well known platforms, networks and working groups that engage with lobby targets and on lobby subjects, aligned to the ToC of the CEA alliance. CEA members contributed by sharing evidence from practice in CEA countries and research results, by providing input to policy papers, lobby letters, and positions taken, by supporting the co-organisation of events and/or providing input (conferences, workshop, expert meetings, etc.), contributing to newsletters or articles that are disseminated via the network/platform and by conducting joint lobby activities like meetings with lobby targets, personal contacts. In this way the visibility of the CEA member’s organisation was combined with CEA’s expertise and human resources (e.g. to conduct research). CEA members participated in the following networks/platforms/working groups: ACT EU- Policy Advisory group and Food Security Working Group and the Civic Space Working group, ACT International – Advisory group on development Policies and Practices, AgriProFocus policy working group, Building Change, Concord Europe, Food and Knowledge Business Platform, Food Covenant, Global Campaign on Education, HUMAN, IDH-Sustainable Trade Initiative, MVO Platform, Netherlands Working group on International Nutrition (NWGN), Partos Civic Space Platform and Partos lobby group, the VU Kennisplatform Religie & Ontwikkeling and WO=MEN. Time and human resources investment varied among these platforms. In some occasions, CEA took a leading role, in other platforms CEA was one of the members participating in the debates. The largest financial contribution was spent on the membership of the ACT alliance.

**Link between national and international L&A:** Connections between national and international L&A were sought too, but rather limited and only visible somehow in seven countries (Bangladesh, Central America, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Myanmar and Uganda). Connections between the national and regional L&A were mainly visible in Bolivia and Guatemala. No formal L&A plan was existing to guide
the collaboration between the national CEA team (ICCO and IPs) and the CEA lobbyist team at global level, which was also observed during the MTR. Collaboration and information exchange took place on an ad-hoc base.

- Kenya, Ethiopia and Indonesia have been involved with case studies in the research on the role of FBO (published in 2019)
- IPs visiting the Netherlands have been put in contact with MEP or became keynote speaker in a conference (e.g. Edukans partners participating in the “Youth Employment as a Root cause for Migration?” conference in The Hague April 2019)
- IPs from Uganda and Bangladesh joined the October 2019 CFS (Committee on world Food Security) conference in Rome, where the Uganda CEA case on seed provision was presented and discussions organised with Western seed companies)
- Myanmar programme commissioned a research on the role of ASEAN in promoting UNGP in agricultural value chains (published in September 2018) and conducted research on the impact of EU policies in Myanmar
- The establishment of a national chapter of the IDH-Sustainable Spice Initiative in Indonesia, and the input provided by CEA members and IP in the public consultation on the revision of the RSPO standard (2018)
- Central America, representatives from AMPB, working on forest and indigenous people, participated in a tour in Europe on climate change during the COP meeting in 2018, with support of the NL lobby team.
- Lastly, in several countries, CEA facilitated access of IP to national chapters of international networks (e.g. in Asia RSPO Indonesia, SUN alliance in Bangladesh).

1.3. Limitations

Materials: Evaluators found a substantial amount of information and documents concerning the L&A activities and results of work from the CEA lobby team and colleagues in the CEA members’ organisations. However, information was not always available in a well-structured fashion. Many topics emerged from documents, like reports, papers, letters, which could not all be assessed within the limited scope of this study.

As the lobby team made a deliberate choice for an indirect involvement in L&A, via networks and platforms, and address lobby targets in name of their own organisation and not as CEA, it was only via contacts with lobbyists and lobby targets evaluators were able to assess CEA’s contribution and added value in specific L&A trajectories.

Resource persons: A full contribution analysis was hampered by lack of sufficient resources that could be interviewed. Key people who definitely interacted with CEA members in certain activities, refused their cooperation, saying that they didn’t know CEA and/or thought evaluators had approached the wrong person. Refreshing their memory revealed that they thought to be in contact with ICCO, Prisma or Woord & Daad, but not CEA. Other key people had a transfer to another function, left for another organisation and in some case moved abroad. For some an activity was too long ago and they didn’t feel comfortable talking with the evaluators.

Taking into account the limitations described, the evaluators are of the opinion that the evaluation provides a good picture of the results of the CEA programme in the Netherlands and at EU level. Triangulation was done through the combination of written resources (programme documents, programme outputs) with interviews targeting both internal and external stakeholders. CEA members and stakeholders interviewed were requested to complete the information provided during interviews and virtual workshops, and via mail and written answers to remaining questions that were emerging after the interviews and workshops.
2. Contribution analysis selected cases

This chapter presents the results of the contribution analysis applied on the selected cases. Reconstructed timelines are added in annex 1. In this chapter, the performance stories are presented.

2.1. Role of FBO in development

Introduction - ToC

The trend of shrinking space for CSOs is unabated, and values related to inclusion and the right of otherness are undermined (CEA, Annual plan 2020). The CEA aimed at contributing to the debate on civic space to develop a new narrative, particularly focusing on FBOs, CBOs and labour unions. The L&A in the Netherlands and at international levels sought to improve government attention towards the shrinking operational space for CSOs and civic action, and to enhance support for specific and concrete policy measures to increase the space for CSOs and civic action. Envisaged changes as formulated in PW1 relate to:

(i) Increased awareness of lobby targets and knowledge of practical recommendations to adjust policy regulations and practices towards an enabling environment for CSOs, including FBOs and trade unions, supported by improved frameworks, regulations, budget allocations, services, etc.

(ii) Increased commitment and action taken by lobby targets

(iii) Lobby targets promoting civic space and space for CSOs related to the SDG Agenda, Aid effectiveness agenda; supporting promotion of civic space and space for CSOs in southern countries; and promoting and supporting civic space and space for CSOs related to land governance and labour issues.

The L&A strategy was based on the assumptions that (i) there is a genuine interest within the Dutch government, Dutch parliament, embassies, EU and multinational institutions to enhance the space for CSOs, (ii) that these actors have concrete mechanisms or the interest/capacity to develop such mechanisms to have impact on national / EU / multinational policy agendas with regard to civic space, (iii) the SDG’s and agenda 2030 function as a working context to enhance space for CSOs.

The case selected for the evaluation of the NL/international L&A (PW1) relates to the L&A work implemented to enhance visibility and recognition of the role of FBO in development and to improve the role and position of FBO for civic action.

Performance Story

During CEA programme preparation (2015-2016), the role of FBOs was included in the discussions of the alliance members when debating the shrinking space for civil society. The CEA alliance agreed that lobby was needed to highlight the added value of FBOs in development and specifically also in L&A processes, and in the framework of agenda 2030, and to gain recognition for their specific features that make FBO relevant actors in creating and offering space for civic action. (CEA baseline report, 2016). However, during programme development (2016-2017), the role of FBO in country programmes was not outspoken, resulting in several countries having no or very few FBO among the implementing partners (exception for Eastern Africa programmes). The role of FBO gained more explicit attention within the CEA alliance from 2017 onwards, a.o. because of the acknowledgment by MoFA of the specific asset of the CEA alliance being a faith-based alliance. The CEA members agreed that the role of the FBO needed to be made more visible, showing the specific role and position of FBOs in creating/maintaining civic space.

The L&A strategies consisted of a mix of formal and informal lobby targeting MEP, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and the Minister of Development Cooperation and Foreign Trade, and advocacy meetings with MEP, MoFA and NGOs to create awareness on the role of FBO. L&A was supported by research. CEA collaborated with the Partos Civic Space Platform and the ACT EU to disseminate the
messages. The L&A on the role of FBO for CEA was led by Prisma, with support from ICCO and Kerk in Actie. The subject was included in the regular meetings between faith-based organisations, like Kerk in Actie, ICCO, Prisma and Cordaid, and the so-called C7 group, created by Christian political parties.

The role of religion in development has been on the agenda of the MoFA since 2007, but rather under the radar and not much expertise on the role of religion was available at MoFA, according to interviewees. Since the rise of IS in Iraq and Syria in 2014, interviewees confirmed that attention for the role of religion enhanced within foreign diplomacy. Both the parliament as the diplomacy have been putting pressure on the MoFA to strengthen its expertise to this regard. With the arrival of the new government in 2017, in which also Christian-based political parties participate, a momentum arose to accelerate the debate on the role of religion in foreign policy. Within the Ministry, the strategic advisory department started to conduct an internal research on the knowledge and attitudes of staff of MoFA. Research results were presented at the board of MoFA in December 2017, demonstrating the limited knowledge of the role of religion and the negative attitude towards promoting religion and FBO in development. Several interviewees confirmed that, both within the parliament as within the MoFA, scepticism existed on the role of religion in development.

The start of the CEA L&A coincided with the start of the new government, which created a window of opportunity to have actual influence on the new policies that were being developed. In 2017, the CEA alliance responded to the new policy of the new Minister of Development Cooperation and Foreign Trade (D66), via an article in the newspaper Trouw, accusing the Minister of the fact that FBOs were not explicitly included in the new policy. The Minister openly responded by stating she did not agree with the accusation. But the topic was brought under the attention of the public debate.

Along the initiatives taken by the MoFA, the CEA alliance started to lobby the MEP so to put pressure on the newly installed government to recognise the role of religion and FBO in development. In 2018, CEA members supported MEP in developing motions on the promotion of freedom of religion, on the attention for religion in foreign policy, on the need to install a special envoy for Freedom of religion and on the need to intensify the Human Rights Fund and keep freedom of religion among its priorities. CEA members collaborated especially with the same four MEP from CU and CDA that follow-up the parliamentary debates on this matter. Motions were adopted by a majority of MEP (one exceptions – see timeline in annex).

Three important milestones demonstrate the growing willingness within the MoFA to promote freedom of religion. In October 2018, the Minister of Foreign Affairs (VVD) confirmed in a letter to the parliament that freedom of religion would remain one of the priorities of the Human Rights Fund, with an increased budget assigned to this priority, and in December 2018, the Minister of Foreign Affairs described, in a letter to the parliament, its commitment to enhance the expertise within the MoFA with regard to religion and foreign policy, in particular: (i) to establish an internal working group at MoFA to prepare policy advice in the relation between religion and foreign policy, (ii) to include the EKNs in this debate, (iii) to include religious literacy in trainings for staff, (iv) to enhance participation in international networks with regard to religion. Also, the process to appoint a special envoy for freedom of religion and conviction had started, as requested by a motion of Van Helvert, Voordewind and Van der Staaij (November 5 and November 15; 2018). In September 2019, the special envoy was appointed.

L&A was continued so to increase awareness and knowledge of staff of MoFA and MEP (mainly CU and CDA members), and to also have influence on the subsidy frameworks that were being developed by the Minister of Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation. To strengthen the L&A process, CEA launched a research on the role of religion and FBOs, based on case studies in three countries,
Indonesia, Ethiopia and Kenya (2018), which was finalised and internally validated by beginning of 2019. The research provided evidence on the specific and constructive role of FBOs, as an actor of the civil society, in contributing to development and creating civic space for action. In 2019, the research results were shared with MEP, MoFA and other development NGOs in several occasions, when possible in presence of partners from CEA programme countries (see timeline). The CEA alliance and ACT EU also contributed financially to the establishment of a ‘Leerstoel Religion and Development’ at the VU (2019). In 2020, after the outbreak of the Covid-19 virus, CEA conducted research on the role of FBO in managing the pandemic-crisis. Results were presented during a seminar in June 2020, organised by CEA, Hivos, Cordaid and Free Press and attended by the Special Envoy for ‘Freedom of religion and conviction’. On October 30, the CEA alliance organised a round table for MEP on the oppression of human rights since the COVID-19 pandemic, and the need to protect freedom of religion and conviction.

The continuous L&A conducted by CEA and the continuous pressure from MEP contributed to a changing discourse at the MoFA and among development NGOs, resulting in some concrete actions. In November 2019, Freedom of religion was selected as one of the 7 thematic priorities in the new subsidy framework ‘Power of Voice’. In January 2020, religion and the role of FBO was subject of the Dutch ambassadors conference. In March 2020, the Special Envoy for Freedom of religion and Conviction launched a broad consultation on the role of religion. And in June 2020, ACT EU included the role of FBOs in its lobby on the new European Africa policy. In September 2020, Freedom of religion is explicitly included in the 2021 budget of MoFA.

**Contribution analysis**

The CEA L&A on the role of FBO has contributed to increased awareness and knowledge among MEP, some staff members of MoFA and other NGOs, to MEP promoting civic space for FBOs, and a changing discourse at policy level within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This has resulted inclusion of freedom of religion in policies and subsidy frameworks; and in a process of enhancing the religious literacy within MoFA. This process has just started. The fact that the MoFA working group on the matter has not been very active yet, demonstrates that L&A still is needed. CEA also envisaged more structural changes, for example with regard to the revision of partnership criteria and funding instruments and the development of faith-sensitive context analysis framework (see research report If you need us, Allow us, 2019). This has not been realised yet.

It can be substantiated that the CEA alliance has played an important role in putting pressure on the MoFA to promote Freedom of Religion, mainly through their collaboration with MEP. The CEA expertise and quality of information provided by CEA members is confirmed by interviewees. Prisma appears to profile itself clearly on the subject and is the main information source of MEP on this subject. CEA’s participation in the public debate on the matter and the knowledge and examples of the role of FBO shared with MEP have supported the MEP to take their motions to the parliament and get these adopted. Furthermore, the CEA alliance is contributing to increasing knowledge and changing attitude from civil servants and staff of other NGOs towards a more positive attitude regarding the role of religion and FBO in development. This process is ongoing and also supported by other Christian-based organisations such as Cordaid and Mensen Met een Missie.

The CEA alliance has contributed partially to the obtained results. There are also several other factors that have contributed to the increased attention given to religion in foreign policy, such as the evolutions in the context (national and internationally) that have put the role of religion on the agenda of foreign policy, the dynamics within the MoFA (initiatives of individual staff members) and other
research conducted on the subject. The evaluators conclude that the contribution of CEA has been necessary but not sufficient to bring about the envisaged change, but sufficient to accelerate the debates and keep the topic under the attention. CEA’s future role will be that of a watch dog, to monitor implementation of the engagements of the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The CEA alliance will need to keep on building knowledge and willingness among staff of MoFA, so to create a positive attitude towards the role of FBO in development, in alliance with the Special Envoy for Freedom of Religion.

2.2. Food and Nutrition Security, Smallholders inclusion and Agro-ecology – Netherlands/EU

Introduction
CEA experts from Woord & Daad, Edukans and ICCO, were involved in advocacy initiatives to promote more sustainable and inclusive agro-food systems in the global south. And sometimes also CNV was involved, when IMVO issues were discussed as part of the food system. Central in the initiatives were smallholder farmers, and within this group particular attention was paid to the position of women and youth.

In the inception phase This performance story is about activities and achievements under PoC 2 and 3. In annual reflection meetings ToCs were reviewed and adapted. In 2018 the lobby team decided to integrate PoC2 and 3, since these were so much interrelated. L&A interventions in both pathways were considered complementary to each other and sometimes overlapping. Strengthening the position of smallholder farmers (food security, access to agricultural supplies and services, access to markets) became the overall result expectation for these combined pathways.

L&A network
Relations with the NL Parliament were well developed; all CEA members had relevant contacts, across all political parties.

On EU level ICCO was already an active member of the ACT Alliance, and Woord & Daad held a membership of CONCORD and of EU Cord, network of christian organisations in Brussels. These were the two main EU L&A channels for CEA, building on existing contacts and relationships, and relevant for the purpose of PoC2 and 3. ACT Alliance EU 4 is a network of European church-based humanitarian and development agencies whose purpose is to influence EU policy and practice, in order to provide sustainable benefits to and improvements in the lives of people affected by poverty and injustice around the world. As part of a wider EU Food Policy Coalition ACT Alliance EU supports the call for a fundamental transition to sustainable and resilient food systems and adopt clear and ambitious targets. CONCORD is the European NGO confederation for relief and development, aiming at European policies promoting sustainable economic, social and human development, addressing causes of poverty, based on human rights, gender equality, justice and democracy, respecting diversity and the limits of the planetary capacity. Apart from CEA members, the most active organisations which contributed to CONCORD and Act Alliance EU advocacy were: Action Aid Europe, Oxfam EU, World Vision EU Office, Brot für die Welt, Christian Aid, Welthungerhilfe and Terra Nuova. They bring in valuable knowledge complementing CEA expertise, like: agro-ecological approaches, local seed systems and the potential effect of Common Agricultural Policies and Trade on food security in the "Global South".

4 ACT Alliance Europe is part of ACT Alliance (Action by Churches Together), a global coalition of more than 130 relief and development agencies. Integration strengthens the combined ability to influence global processes, adding EU advocacy and policy expertise to ACT Alliance’s advocacy work in the global South and with the United Nations, and vice-versa. Source: https://actalliance.eu/about-us/
The involvement of CEA has for strategic reasons not been direct; CEA members joined forces with a select number of long known allies, both at Dutch and European level, who were key players in the action. In NL these include Partos (cooperation of NL development organizations), AgriProFocus and the Netherlands Working Group on International Nutrition at Dutch level, where advocacy was implemented in a mixed way: directly as CEA and more indirectly through contributing to a broader initiative of a network or temporary coalition. NGOs participating in CONCORD and ACT EU dispose of a wide range of contacts and inroads to decision makers, most notably the European Commission (DG DevCo), the European Parliament (DEVE Committee members) and the Rome-based food agencies (FAO, WFP, IFAD, especially the CFS - World Committee on Food Security). Through active participation of CEA members resp. Woord & Daad in CONCORD and ICCO in Act Alliance EU lobbyists had regular (in)formal meetings with the Commission’s DevCo unit responsible for food security, as well as with key MEPs from the DEVE Committee working on agriculture and food security.

The L&A strategy was evidence-based. Under PoC2 and 3 this approach was materialised in independent research combined with evidence and information from the field, strengthening lobby, sometimes opening doors, sometimes making lobby possible in a difficult political context where ‘objective’ research outcomes are less sensitive compared to more political lobby messages, sometimes creating opportunities to link lobby at national and international level. In both the Netherlands as at EU level, team members participated in meetings, consultations and conferences, sharing CEA experiences with data collection and the use of new technologies, such as geodata, for lobby. Furthermore, informal contacts with key decision makers were used, and/or open letters, publications and events for experts.

As part of the CEA L&A strategy the ambition was to use examples from the country programs. As CEA was contributing to the SDGs, the lobby team as from 2018 decided to aim for stronger connections with local SDG initiatives and national SDG Action Plans, to monitor SDG progress, using this information to hold governments accountable. In West-Africa a pilot started to collect evidence at grass root levels for a few SDGs (a.o. on SDG 2, food and nutrition security).

Moving along with political changes was an essential part of the L&A strategy. The context for Development Cooperation in the Netherlands was changing, as a result of the elections 2017 and the formation of a new government. With new MPs, relationships had to be established and also the composition of relevant committees changed, like the committee on Foreign Trade & Development Cooperation, where policies and budgets are being discussed and new policy initiatives prepared. CEA lobbyists had to analyse the new government’s coalition agreement on themes of FNS, global value chains, ‘Aid & Trade’, SDGs, ICSR covenants, and space for civil society. With this basis, CEA had to consider adaptations of lobby messages and –objectives, and as a result for instance lobbied successfully to include education again as one of the development issues, important for PoC 2 and 3. In international and Dutch politics growing attention emerged for sustainable and climate resilient food systems to address hunger and food security. The government of the Netherlands formulated in 2019 her ambition to shift towards a circular, food-sensitive agriculture, domestically as well as well in foreign trade. At EU level, there were no major changes in European Commission or European Parliament till the elections in 2019. In 2020 also on EU level a similar policy shift is being acknowledged towards more resilient food systems.

Priority themes
CEA’s L&A activities were centred in two domains:

1) Sustainable Food Systems, the challenges of reaching SDG2 in the light of climate change and, related to this, the potential of agro-ecological approaches
2) Smallholder inclusion, in policies and programmes for development cooperation.
These two domains were elaborated along the following thematic lines, leading to several milestones with specific CEA contribution:

(1) CEA brings long term experience in working with smallholder farmers and the relation between poverty reduction and food security. Therefore, CEA took a lead role in the debate on the characteristics and potential of smallholder farmers. With CEA funds in 2019 CEA member Edukans conducted a study in several CEA countries on the position of smallholders, which results were used in the NL and EU lobby. Results were also used in advocacy for reinforcement of agri-skills development in NL policy and development programmes, especially in Africa.

Milestones
2018: CEA advocated a differentiated approach with small and medium enterprises (SMEs) as driving forces within local agro-food value chains. Experiences with tailored financial services for SMEs have been captured in the report Critical Capital for African Agri-food SMEs, which was broadly shared during and after the 2018 foodFIRST conference in the Netherlands.
2019: The Dutch government issued a Food Security Policy letter, “Op weg naar een wereld zonder honger in 2030: de Nederlandse inzet”, referring to the need for a transformation of the current food system towards contextualised and inclusive approaches. CEA’s lobby statements in close coordination with other civil society organisations were brought forward and integrated.

(2) Political awareness and a swift implementation of the SDGs (in particular to SDG 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 16, and 17) was an important line in L&A interventions, through the Adopt a SDG campaign aimed at MPs, under the Building Change Programme. L&A for SDGs was also implemented with ACT Alliance, where SDGs are high on the agenda. Building Change is a collaboration of Partos, Max van der Stoel Foundation and CEA member Woord & Daad. The Max van der Stoel Foundation (FMS) is an independent foreign foundation affiliated with the PvdA, committed to democratisation in the EU’s neighboring countries, fairer Dutch and EU policy towards developing countries, and stimulating public debate on these themes in the Netherlands. Building Change is a coalition of some forty CSOs monitoring these politicians and providing valuable information and advice where possible. These organisations are in contact with the so-called “adoptive parents” through social media, events, personal conversations and letters. The aim is to provide MPs with concrete tools for contributing to their SDGs.

Milestones
SDGs general:
More than 25 MPs participated in the successful "Adopt an SDG" campaign. MPs, from eight political parties have committed themselves to their SDGs. An SDG test was introduced and accepted by Parliament: the Integral Assessment Framework (IAK), an instrument intended to test new policy, legislation and regulations for quality and associated factors, has been expanded to include the SDGs. With extra attention to the effects on developing countries and gender.

SDG2:
2016: Lobbyists pick-up the lack of effective metrics to measure inclusion of poor and/or food insecure households and to what extent interventions resulted in an improvement of the food and nutrition situation at household and individual level, which was revealed as part of a review of the Dutch food security policy (2012-2016).

---

5 https://drive.google.com/file/d/1X-vZ_49kKtOpq4EwMJ_2OE7HH91lACOP/view?pli=1
2017: CEA subject matter specialists strategically collaborated with like-minded actors from the Policy Working Group of AgriProFocus and the Netherlands Working Group on International Nutrition. Presentation of experiences with measuring progress on nutrition improvement, to government officials in an expert meeting of the Food & Knowledge Business Platform, and at the SDG conference; proposal for improved and more specific food and nutrition security indicators in L&A letters to the Minister as well as to MPs (continued in 2019). Input in working sessions with government officials, combining CEA’s hands-on experience with proposed indicators, with evidence-based information from Wageningen Centre for Development and Innovation (WCDI) and the Royal Tropical Institute.

2018: Presentation of experiences with measuring progress on nutrition improvement, to government officials in an expert meeting of the Food & Knowledge Business Platform, and at the SDG conference; proposal for improved and more specific food and nutrition security indicators in L&A letters to the Minister as well as to MPs (continued in 2019). Input in working sessions with government officials, combining CEA’s hands-on experience with proposed indicators, with evidence-based information from Wageningen Centre for Development and Innovation (WCDI) and the Royal Tropical Institute.

2019: Officials from the Inclusive Green Growth department of the Dutch MoFa improved and further specified the Results and Indicator Framework for FNS, including the by CEA proposed indicators such as: minimum dietary diversity for women (MDD-W) and months of adequate household food provisioning (MAHFP). This framework forms the basis for an annual overview of the aggregated results of all initiatives supported by the Government towards the realisation of SDG2 and its progress, and is presented to Parliament as well as to the public at large.

In cooperation with ACT EU and CONCORD (CEA lobbyists in Brussels, Oxfam Europe and Action Aid) active L&A for the inclusion of agro-ecology and inclusive sustainable food systems in EU policies and policy coherence, resulted in 2020 in the integration of systematic attention for smallholders in mechanisms for monitoring the FNS framework and reporting at the level of the European Commission.

(3) Following up on #2 in the NL L&A focused on global value chains, trade policies, trade agreements and climate policy, coherent with the SDGs. In debates around FNS policies CEA asked specifically attention for a target group lens, differentiating interventions for smallholder farmers focusing on those involved in (international) value chains and those focusing primarily on production for own consumption and local markets, and circular economy (agro-ecology approaches), showing inconsistencies between FNS targets, value chains and trade policies.

At EU level specific attention was put on developments in agriculture and in the private sector. CONCORD lobbied successfully for amendments in the European Parliament (DEVE) and the reformulation of the GAP, with special attention for the position of smallholders and agro-ecology. CEA contributed directly to this lobby through one of its lobbyists who represents CONCORD, and indirectly through ICCO’s support to Act Alliance EU, one of CONCORD’s members with expertise in this area.

Milestones

2017: The second EU consensus on Development expressed a commitment to support the agro-ecological approach and smallholder farming. This is a direct result of CONCORD/Act Alliance EU advocacy. Following a number of interventions from CONCORD and its members, the European Commission seemingly became more open to support the agro-ecological approach, as an interesting approach that they wanted to explore by giving concrete support via EU Delegations in EU partner countries. The Commission started to make an inventory of agro-ecological projects that are already supported via EU Delegations, and has requested CONCORD and its members to provide them with a good evidence base of what works and what does not work. This resulted in 2017 in the “CONCORD Policy Brief: Agro-ecology to Strengthen Resilience”.

2018: Reference to agro-ecology, also resulting from the CONCORD/Act Alliance EU advocacy, was made in the European Commission’s third progress report on the implementation of its food security policy. This progress report is based on data provided by Commission services and Ministries of Foreign Affairs of the EU Member States. Most concrete public data were provided by the UK and The
Netherlands. The progress report was endorsed by the Foreign Affairs Council in its Conclusion of 26 November 2018.

(4) Under the three PoCs 2, 3 and 4 CEA lobbied for **criteria of sustainable agriculture production** in global value chains and climate smart agriculture, and in trade and investments policies. The 2019 IMVO covenant on food was considered as an important contribution to improvement of the livelihoods of smallholders and local communities.

**Milestones**

2017: Manifesto on Food in Transition, to MPs, followed by personal contacts with these MPs and with other interventions, see below.

2018: Detailed letter to members of the parliamentary committee, on Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation, as input for their debate on the 2019 budget, resulting in a specific request from Parliament to the MoFA and the Ministry of Agriculture for an updated policy brief on the Dutch contribution to global food security.

2019: CSO advocates monitored the translation of the new Food Security Policy letter towards targeted and effective policies and programs, combined with additional letters to MPS, bringing up also the need of policy coherence contributing to the transition towards more inclusive and sustainable circular food systems.

**Dilemma's**

Although the strategy appeared to be effective, some “struggles” or dilemmas were encountered, which affected the success in L&A. One of these “struggles” was to find **an effective entry point in ongoing lobby for CEA priority themes** of smallholder inclusion and agro-ecology. In the early years of CEA, EU trade and policy issues related to smallholders/workers either showed no relevant progress (e.g. EPAs) nor linkage with national CEA action plans on PoC3. Lobbyists noted that “there is not always much ‘demand’ for dialogue”. Especially the agro-ecology focus required specific attention. A CONCORD paper about a.o. agro-ecology presented at the European Commission DG DevCo en HARD members (heads rural development of member states’ MoFA’s) was welcomed with little enthusiasm and commented that climate smart agriculture was already on their agenda and what was the added value of agro-ecology? These responses resulted in a change of strategy, with emphasis on contacts with national HARD reps, creating a more personal dialogue, showing the concept is a solid and scalable base for investments in climate smart agriculture. However key persons stayed reluctant, like the Dutch HARD rep and the Head of FNS at DG DevCo. Their objections were not so much with the goals of the agro-ecological approach, but rather from fear of ending up in an ideological debate about agro-ecology versus other agricultural models. In addition, other challenges, equally important, such as ‘rural economic transformation’ in the light of urbanisation in Africa, merits attention as well, as they said.

In 2018 an expert meeting was organised to engage EU MPs into the agro-ecology approach and the potential of its implementation, showing cases from a.o. CEA partners. This was crucial to open up the minds of DG DevCo officials to the agro-ecological approach. In the months following, the dialogue with DG DevCo continued through lobby meetings with small groups of CONCORD experts.

One of the pillars under the NL/EU lobby was to **connect national level lobby issues** emerging in CEA countries, **with issues at international level**. This ambition appeared to be difficult to implement due to various reasons. CEA’s EU advocacy was presented during global face-to-face conferences with partners. Via regular Skype calls with partners in different regions, lobbyists obtained input for the CEA advocacy in Europe. Opportunities came up, but were not successfully elaborated in a L&A trajectory. For instance, in November 2016, ICCO on behalf of CEA supported ACT EU to launch the Right to Food and Nutrition Watch 2016, on **Keeping Seeds in People’s Hands** during a meeting at the European
Parliament. This resulted in the first public debate within the European Parliament on the international dimension of seed policies and regulations as well as the implicit role of the EU. Both politicians, government officials as well as the private sector engaged in a promising dialogue. The Netherlands plays an important role in the international seed production and trade. At the same time CONCORD was able to work together for the first time with the European farmers organisation COPA-COECA, bringing together partners from very different sectors and represent very diverging interests. Together with other partners these organisations were able to come up with a strong call for a transition towards sustainable food systems based on a broad and large constituency. In several CEA countries, e.g. Uganda CEA partners documented successful experiences in local seed provision and implementation of national seed policies in the region. All assets were there for a successful international L&A. Unfortunately, within the CEA group not enough resources could be made available to follow-up, to the frustration of lobbyists and CEA partners. Lobby contacts interviewed during this evaluation appreciate CEA lobbyists for their excellent “radar” for important issues emerging in CEA countries, linking to current developments in NL and EU and opportunities for L&A. However, the internal dynamics within the CEA Alliance, releasing limited resources for L&A, as well as the lack of “feel for L&A”, slowed down or even prohibited promising potential initiatives.

The strategic choice for an indirect involvement, working via a select number of networks had as a consequence that CEA’s specific contribution to the L&A results cannot be shown directly, but needs to be seen within the scope of activities of these networks. From Woord & Daad, one of the most prominent lobby organisations in CEA, it is a recurring question on what title CEA members request discussions with MPs: from Building Change, PerspActive or CEA? Due to the relative unfamiliarity of CEA and its broad lobbying agenda, the choice often fell on other connections.

Contacts in networks and lobby targets confirmed in this evaluation the valuable contribution from CEA members, as described in the milestones, however acknowledged that they were not aware of a CEA.

Connected to the issue of visibility is the lack of an exit L&A strategy. Halfway 2020, when it was clear that no CEA2 funding was to be expected, the CEA lobby team formulated an action plan on how to sustain/continue L&A efforts from CEA after 2020. The common denominator is that each CEA member will explore how they can integrate L&A results from the CEA programme into ongoing activities after 2020, including documentation of experiences and results, and publication of guides and toolkits. There is no consolidated plan.

2.3. Sustainable Palm Oil

Introduction

The envisaged ultimate change for PW 4 as formulated in the NL/EU plan reads as “The Dutch Government, the European Commission and companies increasingly adhere to their responsibility to protect and respect and commitment to support human rights (especially the rights of male and female smallholders - including the right of women and men to land and natural resources and to food-, male and female workers, and children’s rights).” The L&A interventions as implemented for PW 4 in NL related to (i) the participation of CEA members in in the MVO platform, Concord and ACT Alliance, ETUC and ITUC fora to promote adherence of the Dutch government and EU to UNGPs on Business and Human Rights, and (ii) the development of toolkits and guidelines to support private companies to deal with human rights in their workplaces through direct engagement with companies but also through participation of CEA members in multi-stakeholder platforms such as IDH, the HUMAN coalition and the ICSR covenants (mainly food and bank covenants). Key in this PW is the promotion of UNGP Business and Human Rights and Children and Business rights.
One of the cases for in-depth assessments, namely L&A on sustainable palm oil, was selected, by the evaluators and confirmed by the CEA lobby team, because the case illustrates the different components of the interventions strategies as implemented under PW 4 and more in particular because of its linkages between national and international L&A.

The Indonesia evaluation report presents an assessment of the CEA interventions in the palm oil industry. This report analyses the L&A that have taken place in the Netherlands and at international level, which was mainly conducted by CNV International. The evaluators observed that a clear and elaborated CEA intervention strategy was lacking with regard to the L&A on sustainable palm oil, and that alignment between L&A conducted in the Netherlands and in Indonesia was rather weak. At international level, L&A on palm oil targeted the Round Table on Sustainable Palm Oil, some private sector actors and the international trade missions. No timeline has been reconstructed as L&A on these topics at international level was limited and fragmented.

**L&A on the RSPO standard**
The start of the CEA programme coincided with the periodic revision of the international RSPO Standard and Principles (a process that had started in 2017 and was finalised in 2019). The CEA alliance in Indonesia has provided input in the public consultation on the revision of the RSPO standard and Principles, that has taken place between August 2018 and October 2018. All main CEA members and partners in Indonesia have contributed to this process, under coordination of PKPA: ICCO Indonesia, CNV Indonesia, PKPA Foundation, NGO Council, Penabulu Foundation and Hukatan. The preparation of the CEA position was done in a joint effort, in which each of the CEA partners contributed according to its specific expertise. On July 20 and 21, 2018 the CEA alliance Indonesia has organised an internal positioning workshop to prepare the CEA input for the online public consultation, which was further finetuned during a workshop on key words on July 24-25, 2018. Early August 2018, input of the CEA alliance was uploaded. Input was provided on 7 principles, with focus on smallholder inclusion, workers’ rights and conditions, and attention for the rights of children.

The CEA alliance claims to have contributed to enhanced attention to the UNGP Business and Human Rights in the RSPO standard. This could not be confirmed. There is also no monitoring report available from CEA on the extent the expected outcomes have been achieved. According to RSPO, the UNGP is one of the frameworks that guide the development of the RSPO standards and all NGOs that have provided input in the public consultations have referred to this framework. During these public consultations, input is provided by many organisations (a.o. also other Dutch NGOs such as Oxfam Novib (focus on gender) and Both Ends), which makes it difficult to claim any contribution as time in this evaluation did not allow for an extensive analysis of the input provided and their relative influence. Challenges RSPO is facing are the slow and lengthy complaint mechanisms in case of violation of the RSPO standard and principles. It is foreseen to include an obligation for a due diligence policy in the next RSPO standard. The RSPO working group on human rights is preparing this discussion (Hukatan recently joined this working group). RSPO also encourages membership of trade unions to RSPO. RSPO would like to welcome CVN as member and has planned to vote for Hukatan membership to the board of governors (November 2020).

The evaluators are of the opinion that this L&A process currently above all has contributed to enhancing knowledge of CEA partners on RSPO and to alliance building between CEA partners. This is important as at national level, follow-up is given to this RSPO standard through the national interpretation of the international RSPO standard. Hukatan is member of the RSPO-Indonesia working group assigned with that task. Discussions are ongoing as the national RSPO standard needs to align to the national regulations and policies that are less ambitious. In 2011, an Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (IPSO) was developed, being less ambitious but which resulted in the withdrawal of Gapki from
However, many Gapki members still are part of RSPO. The international market, but also national value chain actors like banks, put pressure on palm oil companies to adhere to the more ambitious RSPO standard. Hukatan is also member of two other RSPO working groups (human rights and shared responsibility), and CEA members and partners (CNV, ICCO, PKPA, NGO Council) also participate in the RSPO-NGO forum. Contribution of Hukatan to the RSPO debates is assessed by interviewees as rather limited at the moment, as time is needed to become familiar with the debates and the functioning of RSPO, and to enhance English proficiency.

There has not been a concerted and coordinated intervention by CNV International or the CEA alliance at international level in providing input in this public consultation process. It was noted that CNV Indonesia, CNV International in the Netherlands and CNV Latin America all have provided inputs in the public consultation separately. In Indonesia, this was seconded to the CNV representative in Indonesia. CNV International is not a member of RSPO and as such has not taken part in the preparation of the revision of the former and future RSPO standards and principles. Though CNV International is committed to become a member of RSPO in the near future. Its partner in Indonesia, Hukatan, has become member of RSPO Indonesia since September 2019, due to mediation of the CNV representative who had been working for RSPO Indonesia beforehand, and will become a member of the international RSPO board of governors by November 2020, as presence of a trade union is very much welcomed by all stakeholders in RSPO.

RSPO is not aware of research that has been conducted on the palm oil industry in Indonesia by CEA members, nor on the work with regard to child labour or women ‘rights. Based on the interviews, it is learned that the attention to child rights in RSPO still is limited. Collaboration was looked for with UNICEF to that end recently. UNICEF is currently preparing input for the next revision of the RSPO standard 2023, a process that will start in 2021. UNICEF prepared a paper on Child Rights in Palm Oil Plantations in Indonesia, but no reference was made to CEA, ICCO or PKPA (although PKPA collaborates closely with UNICEF Indonesia).

**L&A targeting private sector actors**

CEA Indonesia also has been lobbying several large-scale companies in the palm oil industry, like GAR-Sinarmas and Wilmar (see Indonesia report). Both companies are member of RSPO, and Wilmar-Head Quarter is also member of IGCN. Both companies aim at enhancing sustainability of the palm oil sector (and employ a large number of sustainability officers at the company). The CEA programme has contributed to enhanced social dialogues between the palm oil companies and the trade unions. These L&A interventions only have taken place in Indonesia and were not supported by interventions in the Netherlands or at international level. Relations have also been established with GAPKI, the employers’ association in palm oil sector, representing 30% of the palm oil companies. With support from GAPKI, a documentary was produced by CNV International and Hukatan, financed by the CEA programme, on the added value of social dialogue in palm oil plantations that was shown at the RSPO conference in Paris in 2019.

Apart from the documentary shown at the international RSPO conference, no specific actions have been taken by CEA members at international or regional level to lobby private sector companies in the palm oil industry.

In 2020, CEA alliance was able to participate in a side event organised during the Foreign trade mission from the Netherlands to Indonesia. The ICCO Regional manager could have informal meetings with several companies in the palm oil industry. Due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, not much

---

6 Gapki considering RSPO having less added value as the IPSO standard is the only mandatory standard.
follow-up could be given yet. No linkages were established yet between companies met during this meeting and CEA members.

3. Assessment of the L&A conducted in NL/EU

3.1. Relevance

ToC approach
To guide the L&A in the Netherlands and at EU level, four ToCs were developed, one per PW, with a merge of the PWs 2 and 3 during programme implementation. The ToCs were based on a good context and stakeholder analysis, and choices have been made with regard to lobby topics that are relevant for the country programmes and the evolutions with regard to the specific topics at international and Netherlands level.

Alignment between L&A conducted in the Netherlands and L&A conducted at country level was hampered by the lack of an integrated ToC that could make joint efforts and strategies more explicit. Furthermore, the ToCs have not actually guided the actual L&A processes, but rather set the global ambitions. For example, not much distinction was made with regard to envisaged changes within the groups of lobby targets. It was not made visible how different groups of lobby targets (parliament, ministries, staff of ministry, private sector and civils society) interrelate.

The ToCs for the NL/EU level have provided a general framework for the L&A interventions that were already being implemented by the different CEA members, and as such are fragmented and diverse in themes, foci and approaches. The number and variety of foci has been often point of discussion during the meetings of the lobby team. There was a felt need that PWs needed to be further developed and integrated (make linkages between PWs and between international and country level L&A clearer) and to bring more focus in topics and strategies. Attempts were made but with little success. During programme implementation an agreement was made to focus CEA L&A activities on following topics: (1) Sustainable Food Systems, the challenges of reaching SDG2 in the light of climate change and, related to this, the potential of agro-ecological approaches, and (2) Smallholder inclusion in policies and programmes for development cooperation. This however, was not articulated in an adapted ToC.

Relevant strategies
Mainly insider L&A strategies have been applied, providing advice and recommendations to political decision makers, through the participation in consultations organised by MoFA and the provision of input in parliamentary questions and motions. A structural consultation is existing between CEA members and the CDA (C7 group), where faith-based organisations meet with CDA leaders at a regular base to inform and exchange on the Dutch development cooperation policy.

Also, a lot of advocacy has been done (outsider L&A strategy) as to create awareness and inform a larger group of decision makers, NGOs and staff of MoFA on the CEA policy topics, such as expert meetings and conferences. Advocacy was most often evidence-based. Occasionally, CEA members also approached the media, e.g. to publicly discuss the new policy of the Minister of Development Cooperation and Foreign Trade and to participate in the public debate on domestic resource mobilisation. Lobby targets interviewed confirmed that articles in newspapers were important to support members of parliament in making their case in the parliamentary debate (e.g. discussions on role of religion in development, and importance of SDGs).
CEA members had more access to Christian-based political parties compared to other political parties, which was beneficial in the current policy period as these parties were part of the coalition that was installed in 2017. CEA members had more contacts within the affiliated political parties and MoFA, and much less with staff of ministerial cabinets and with private sector actors.

A lot of L&A was done through participating in lobby networks and platforms, in which CEA members often were engaged before the CEA programme. CEA programme enabled continuation of the participation of CEA members in these networks (time and financial investments). Time investments varied between these platforms. It is not clear to what extent a good analysis was done of the added value of participation in networks (national and international) in contributing to the envisaged changes of the ToCs and the required (and available) time investments. It seems that these reflections have rather taken place at individual level, or at organisational level, but that clear guidelines and agreements to that end were missing at programme level.

It was noticed that not much L&A capacity development strategies have taken place to strengthen L&A capacity of CEA members, although not all CEA members equally could rely on existing L&A expertise. At the start of the programme, some capacity assessments have taken place, but these were not followed-up by CD trajectories. Only in 2020 a successful E-learning trajectory had started on Food Systems (with more than 50 participants). Other possible topics addressed were how the EU works, how a motion in Parliament becomes legislation etc.

**Responding to needs of implementing partners and country programme**

Although the L&A in the NL/EU was grounded in the experiences of the programme implementation in the 12 CEA countries, contribution of IPs and CEA members to the L&A at NL/EU was limited to the provision of information, evidence and testimonies. L&A in NL/EU was usually not aligned nor supportive to the L&A done at the level of the CEA countries. CEA country teams have not participated in the design and implementation of the NL/EU trajectories.
### 3.2. Effectiveness

Following table summarises the main documented achievements of the L&A trajectories conducted by the CEA Dutch lobby team.

**Table 1: Overview of achievements in the different thematic domains of the NL/EU L&A, L&A strategies applied and CEA members involved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>L&amp;A strategies</th>
<th>CEA members involved*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role of FBO (see case)</td>
<td>Effective recognition by policy makers of the constructive role of FBO in development and promotion of religious literacy for civil servants Appointment of special Envoy on religion and convictions Secular Dutch NGOs having a more open attitude towards FBOs</td>
<td>Letters to MEP, evidence-based lobby, advocacy (public debate, expert meeting on religion, learning meetings, meetings with diplomats, news article) Involvement in Partos Civic Space platform, ACT Alliance and ACT EU, VU Kennisplatform Religie &amp; Ontwikkeling</td>
<td>ICCO, Kerk in Actie, Prisma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for CSOs</td>
<td>Input provided into the new subsidy framework for strengthening CSO in the South</td>
<td>Involvement in Partos Civic Space platform, meeting with MEP</td>
<td>ICCO Wilde Ganzen (Prisma, till 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic resource mobilisation</td>
<td>Local fundraising included in the new policy framework of the Minister for development cooperation and foreign trade</td>
<td>Scoping study on the link between domestic resource mobilisation and civic space Article in Vice Versa Conferences, meetings, debates and media</td>
<td>Wilde Ganzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and employment</td>
<td>Renewed focus on education in new policy ‘Investing in Prospects’</td>
<td>Input in policy consultation process for MoFA youth policy, Involvement in Partos’ conference on youth</td>
<td>Edukans ICCO CNV Internationaal Woord &amp; Daad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs and policy coherence</td>
<td>MEP including CEA messages in the parliamentary debates</td>
<td>Participation in SDG platform and Building Change Seminars on various SDGs</td>
<td>ICCO CNV Internationaal Woord &amp; Daad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Food systems and Smallholder inclusion (see case)</td>
<td>New Dutch Food security Policy refers to the need for transformation of the current food system towards contextualised and inclusive approaches</td>
<td>Evidence based L&amp;A targeting MoFA-IGG, participation in consultative dialogue with ministries, lobby MEP, Involvement in AgriProfocus and ACT EU</td>
<td>ICCO Woord &amp; Daad Edukans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Food and Nutrition Indicators (see case)</td>
<td>Improved food and nutrition indicators included in the Framework for Food and Nutrition Security</td>
<td>Expert meetings and working sessions at MoFA – IGG, lobby MEP and Ministries, advocacy (presentation at SDG conference</td>
<td>ICCO Woord &amp; Daad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agro-ecology, food and nutrition security (see case)</td>
<td>Adoption of amendments to the DEVE Committee report for the reform of the European Common Agricultural Policy Recommendations of Concord reflected in the paper ‘Towards a sustainable Europe by 2030’ of EC Vice-President</td>
<td>Various international conferences Participation in Concord, and via ACT Alliance. Concord lobbying the European Council, DG DevCo European MEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive value chain</td>
<td>Tools to assess supply chains on gender issues, inclusion and good business conduct integrated in IDH’s gender policy, gender business case developed in the Ethiopian floriculture sector Responsible business roadmap part of the IDH’s toolbox for SME</td>
<td>Participation in IDH and IDH-SSI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of UNGP Business and Human Rights</td>
<td>Senate approved the Wet Zorgplicht Kinderarbeid IRBC Food covenant signed in 2018 New policy on trade missions with specification of criteria when and how to exclude companies from foreign trade missions (but lack of implementation) New RBC guidelines for embassies with regard to trade missions</td>
<td>Lobby MEP on the due diligence law7 (general and specific on child labour) and on trade missions (incl. RBC guidelines), lobby RVO and MoFA (trade missions) Stakeholder meetings on implementation of Responsible Business Conduct in foreign trade missions Participation in MVO Platform, in IRDB Food Covenant and in HUMAN coalition8 Participation in foreign trade missions9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancing sustainable Palm Oil Business and HR (see case)</td>
<td>BHR included in the revised RSPO Principles and Criteria (2018) and in the RSPO independent smallholder standard (2019)</td>
<td>Participation in RSPO Participation in UN Forum on BHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International trade agreements</td>
<td>Positions of Concord reflected in EU SDG Multi-stakeholder platform</td>
<td>Participation in Concord Policy paper ‘10-point roadmap on private sector for development’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These CEA members were leading; activities were discussed and coordinated in bi-weekly meetings of the lobby team in the Netherlands

7 Two motions in parliament on CSR guidelines for EKN, and on excluding companies not complying with OECD guidelines from trade missions (no policy change yet, 2018)

8 HUMAN coalition consists in VBDO, PwC, ICCO and CNV Internationaal. The HUMAN coalition organised multi-stakeholder roundtables to enhance knowledge on doing due diligence in the supply chains

9 Trade missions to Colombia (2018)
The table demonstrates the variety of lobby topics of the NL/EU lobby. The CEA programme provided the means and opportunities to complement existing L&A programmes that were being implemented by the CEA members, and enabled CEA members to take up an active engagement in the various L&A networks/platforms. It was a deliberate choice to implement L&A interventions besides direct lobby, through networks and L&A platforms, in order to achieve more impact and to put CEA priority topics and positions on the agenda of these networks and platforms. The documents and interviews confirm that CEA members have been successful to that end. The role of FBOs gained importance in the Partos Civic Space platform. CEA members were successful in raising attention in the various CSO lobby networks for topics such as (i) domestic resource mobilisation, (ii) inclusion of smallholder farmers in the debates on the SDG and policy coherence, on food and nutrition indicators and on agro-ecology, (iii) gender sensitivity of supply chains. In several cases, the added value of the CEA members in these networks consisted in the specific expertise shared with the network, evidence from practice and research. CEA members were valued for their content expertise, that was based on research and substantiated cases from the 12 CEA countries, and the use of scientific data. Another important feature of the CEA alliance for these networks, was the access of CEA members to Christian-based political parties and MEP, as such bringing the L&A messages of the networks/platforms under the attention of the Netherlands government coalition partners.

Another strategy consisted in the participation of CEA members in (i) public consultations, such as the Dutch policy consultations on youth and employment, on inclusive food systems, on the new CSO subsidy framework; (ii) the international public consultation on sustainable palm oil and (iii) the participation in institutionalised MSP such as the ICSR covenants and IDH, the sustainable trade initiative. CEA topics were shared and, in several occasions, CEA positions have been included in new policies or regulatory frameworks. As these are the results of an often-wider consultation process, it is difficult to assess the relative contribution and added value of CEA members to the documented results.

In some cases, CEA members successfully provided relevant technical input for policy makers and private sector actors such as the input provided for the improvement of food and nutrition indicators and the toolkit on the integration of gender in supply chains.

L&A targeting the European level was mainly conducted via CONCORD and ACT Europe. CEA member Woord & Daad took a leading role in guiding the CONCORD working group at EU level (on SDG and policy coherence). CEA positions were reflected in the L&A work done by these European networks, that at their turn have contributed to revised policies at European level with regard to the European Common Agricultural Policy, and the European SDG policy.

To which extent the CEA NL/EU L&A has been supportive for the L&A agenda of CEA partners in the CEA countries is not clear. On the one hand, policy changes at global and NL level will have an indirect effect on the CEA countries when effective policy implementation with regard to adapted subsidy schemes for CSOs, the SDG commitments, increased support for FBOs, attention for youth and employment, inclusive food systems, etc. will take place. This requires structural monitoring of the level of policy implementation. On the other hand, the CEA NL/EU L&A has not directly supported the L&A agenda of partners and allies in the specific CEA countries. There was not much alignment between the NL/EU and CEA country level L&A plans, and CEA partners were not much involved in developing the NL/EU L&A agenda.
Contribution of IPs in the CEA countries was limited to the provision of information, evidence and testimonies, as such supporting informed-based L&A at NL/EU level. Although this is a strong feature of the L&A strategies, Mayne et al.\(^\text{10}\) argue that policy making is rarely evidence-based. The authors argue that for effective influencing strategies the supply of evidence is an important however insufficient part. Other elements that are important for effective policy influencing relate to the knowledge of lobbyists on how the process of policy-making works (and knowing at what moment most influence can be exerted), on how to design L&A messages adapted to the specific audiences in order to maximise influence (develop appropriate communication strategies), and apply a combination of influencing strategies that are adapted to changing contexts. Reflections to that end were not systematically organised at the CEA lobby team. Capacity development support provided to the CEA members to strengthen L&A competencies was rather limited and received some attention only towards the end of the CEA programme.

3.3. Efficiency

Organisational efficiency

As the CEA programme was complementing existing L&A interventions of CEA alliance members, steered by their own internal organisational processes, the CEA alliance was confronted with the challenge to find an appropriate structure and way of working to align all these interventions. A CEA programme and lobby team were created - that met bi-weekly - in which all CEA lobbyists participated and which was led by the CEA programme manager. During the first 1, 5 year, it was decided for efficiency reasons, to split the lobby team and the CEA programme team, because of the fact that the agenda was dominated by programme issues and less by L&A. Within the lobby team, the focus moved more towards discussing the L&A agenda and strategies, but in separate entities, linked to the specific L&A thematic trajectories (and PWs). Gradually more strategic integration in the discussions emerged.

Several factors challenged the coordination of the NL/EU L&A: (i) there was no coherent vision on the NL/EU L&A, resulting in a fragmented and silo-ed implementation of the L&A trajectories; (ii) rather different topics were subject of the lobby trajectories, involving thematic specialists from the different CEA members that were less interested or experienced in the other thematic topics and experiencing waste of time when debating specific thematic matters in the lobby-group; (iii) the CEA programme managers was not the line manager of the CEA lobbyists, as such having a limited mandate to steer and align the L&A processes; (iv) most of the L&A was embedded in CEA members’ ongoing L&A trajectories, that were not fully known by the CEA alliance, and which made it difficult to find windows of opportunities to align with the CEA programme and partners. (v) It was confirmed by CEA members interviewed that decisions on L&A messages and strategies were taken in consensus, but this seems to be varying for the different L&A trajectories. During interviews it became clear that there was not always much shared knowledge and comprehension of the L&A trajectories conducted by each of the CEA members.

It can be questioned whether the lobby group has been the most appropriate structure to coordinate and manage the NL/EU L&A. It certainly served the exchange of information within the CEA network and it was beneficial to avoid duplication and identify opportunities for joint action (e.g. jointly approaching MEP). However, the lobby group did not succeed in bringing more focus to the programme, nor it was taken as a platform for L&A capacity development support.

Programmatic efficiency

The CEA programme, by design, envisaged a high level of programme efficiency, because of the fact that the CEA programme was complementary to ongoing L&A interventions of CEA members, and the choice taken to leverage L&A activities of networks and platforms. Evidence from CEA countries was used in these ongoing lobby processes, and further accelerated and enhanced existing L&A. The voice from the “South”, as some respondents put it, could be amplified in various networks and fora. These real-life cases were highly valued by policy officers of L&A networks (NL and at EU level), who could build stronger, evidence-based arguments, and by MEP that gained a better understanding of the issues at stake. Moving along with existing networks and fora, meant that L&A interventions at the level of the Netherlands and EU are characterised by different approaches.

There were also several factors that negatively influenced programmatic efficiency such as (i) the fragmented and silo-ed approach, (ii) the lack of alignment between NL/EU level lobby and the L&A at CEA country level, (iii) the lack of focus, dividing financial and human resources over multiple L&A processes and networks. No guidelines existed on whether or not, when and how to participate in L&A networks. In some networks, CEA members took a pro-active role (e.g. Partos lobby group, Concord SDG working group – Building Change), in other networks contribution was more limited because of lack of sufficient time investment of CEA lobbyists (e.g. IDH, RSPO). (iv) Multiple staff changes hampered the policy influencing process, which requires consistency in network building. (V) Inefficient use of time and effort was signalled by CEA members interviewed, in the cases of requests from MoFA for input in individual cases. And from the side of government officials, lack of a coherent and integrated message was signalled.

Not all CEA members could rely on experienced lobbyists within their organisations. The level of knowledge and experience with L&A processes differed between the CEA members, though a comprehensive capacity development strategy has not been developed, making use of the existing L&A capacity and further developing L&A capacity at alliance level. A coherent L&A vision was lacking, which hampered the evolution towards a more coherent, integrated and/or focused NL/EU L&A programme. L&A strategies could be further improved. Lobby targets interviewed indicated that it was not always clear why they had been approached by CEA members or what the added value was of the evidence provided by CEA members, and/or suggested that other strategies and information could have yield more effect. Seasoned lobbyists interviewed advised to design a careful strategy and choose a point of entry like values, beliefs, framing, facts and substantiate the choice.

Learning took place during bi-annual meetings and learning days of the lobby team, but this was not supported by an elaborated learning trajectory, for example linked to the identified assumptions in the ToC.

The purpose of the CEA alliance for L&A was not made explicit for the CEA members (e.g. L&A alliance information exchange, capacity development support). It was a deliberate choice to not put the CEA alliance ‘in the market’ as a brand, which is an appropriate choice as it requires years to become known as a lobby alliance. The evaluators have not found guidelines on how and when CEA members had to refer to the CEA alliance. In some communication materials, reference was made to the CEA alliance, in others not. CEA lobbyist operated most often in the name of their organisation and not as CEA. However, a value driven alliance, such as the CEA alliance, that can rely on a broad support base (including constituencies of CEA partners) could be an added value in L&A processes. The latter has not been explicitly explored during programme implementation.
Budget
For the CEA L&A in The Netherlands and EU a total budget of around 8,5 million euro was available for the period 2016-2020. On average half of that budget was used for programme management costs (including M&E), and half of that budget for NL/EU L&A. Annual expenses for NL/EU L&A were related to:

- Research, workshops, events, publications, etc.: € 70.000 per year
- Network memberships and contributions: € 300.000 per year (ACT membership is a large part of this)
- Staff costs for ICCO (participating in the lobby team): € 120.000 per year (4 persons, part-time)
- Staff costs Alliance Members (participating in the lobby team) Prisma/Woord en Daad/Kerk in Actie/Edukans/Wilde Ganzen/CNV Internationaal: € 120.000 per year (8 persons, all part-time)

It is observed that the CEA programme relied on 12 part-time staff members for conducting L&A, which is a considerable group, though CEA members and some networks refer to lack of sufficient time for some L&A activities. The evaluation has not analysed in detail budget and time investments for CEA L&A at NL/EU level, but lack of focus might explain the experienced time pressure by L&A staff.

In the following table the annual budgets are presented, as per total and per Pathway of Change.

Table 2: Overview of budget L&A NL-EU, in euro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.476.198</td>
<td>6.365.902</td>
<td>1.778.688</td>
<td>1.298.889</td>
<td>1.549.027</td>
<td>1.739.298</td>
<td>2.110.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.401.178</td>
<td>1.046.169</td>
<td>294.704</td>
<td>227.932</td>
<td>204.797</td>
<td>318.735</td>
<td>355.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.752.979</td>
<td>1.362.080</td>
<td>409.844</td>
<td>190.375</td>
<td>319.592</td>
<td>442.269</td>
<td>390.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.971.923</td>
<td>1.363.118</td>
<td>394.578</td>
<td>275.985</td>
<td>302.710</td>
<td>389.845</td>
<td>608.805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*real expenditures, according to financial reports submitted and approved, and checked by ICCO’s financial auditors; including global programme management and learning budget for ICCO and other CEA members.

The evaluators observe that a large budget of the CEA programme is spent on the NL/EU level. For example, the case countries have been granted respectively 2,235.475 EUR for Indonesia, 1,213.007 EUR for Myanmar and 2,664.031 EUR for Uganda.

In all PWs, the annual budget is more or less equally divided over the different years, which can be explained by the fact that the CEA L&A was complementing existing L&A interventions. For PW3 2017 was an exceptional year when less budget was spent compared to the other years of implementation. This can be explained by the fact that for this PW a clear focus was not yet found in relation to L&A in NL/EU. With the integration of PW2 and 3 a clear overall focus could be presented, especially for L&A in The Netherlands. For PW 1 and PW 4 relatively large sums are made available for 2020, the final year of the programme.

Table 3: Repartition of budget over the different PWs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PW1</td>
<td>39,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>16,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW3</td>
<td>20,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW4</td>
<td>23,3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PW1, creating civic space, consumed the largest share, namely 40% of the total budget. Budget for PW2 was the smallest with 17%, and the budgets for PW3 and PW4 (sustainable private sector) account each for around 20% of the total budget. Activities for L&A in PW2 and PW3 (food systems) were integrated in the course of 2018, although the budgets remained separate.

Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
The M&E system for the CEA programme was centrally managed and similar for all CEA countries, including the NL/EU L&A. The ToC, as developed for the different PWs and including indicators and assumptions, has not steered the actual L&A processes. Each CEA member applied the organisation specific M&E system to monitor their L&A interventions. For example lobbyists kept record of all their L&A activities which was stored at their own organisation, and they filled out a separate lobby logbook for CEA. M&E for CEA was experienced as fulfilling reporting and accountability requirements. No specific M&E approach was applied on the different thematic L&A trajectories, for example by formulating specific outcome levels and monitoring thereof. Monitoring was done at the output level. Stories of Change were written for publicity purpose rather than for MEL, as reported by interviewees.

Later in the implementation period, reflection and learning took more shape. Though interviewees reported that the learning took mostly place in their own organisation.

3.4. Sustainability

Institutional sustainability

Policy level: CEA programme has contributed to several policy changes that have been adopted by parliament, to regulatory frameworks that are being implemented and toolkits that are being used (e.g. like food indicators framework, new subsidy framework for CSOs, local fundraising included in new policy framework, agri-skills development in new policy, policy on trade missions, RSPO standard). In many cases, the L&A focus will have to shift from lobbying for policy change to policy implementation, which might require different expertise and/or contacts with different type of lobby targets. Furthermore, CEA members have contributed to enhanced awareness and knowledge of certain topics, such as the role of FBO in development, the UNGP Business and Human Rights, enhanced attention for inclusion of small-scale farmers and transition to sustainable food systems including an agro-ecology approach. Continuing L&A still is needed.

Programme level: The CEA L&A topics are embedded in the mission and strategies of most CEA members and as such will be included in new programmes and projects. Although no explicit CD trajectories in L&A have been implemented, CEA members have further strengthened their L&A expertise during implementation (e.g. building networks of contacts with lobby targets, confirming participation in L&A networks) and by learning-by-doing. Their expertise is widely recognised among all stakeholders interviewed. The challenge will be to retain L&A staff as L&A is highly dependent on personal networks and to develop a strong data- and relation management system in case knowledge and networks have to be transferred to new staff.

Sustainability strategies are lacking. No clear follow-up strategies have been developed for the L&A at NL/EU level. As several achievements with regard to putting topics on the policy agenda and with regard to policy change have been realised during programme implementation, focus should shift in these cases to monitoring policy implementation. No clear strategy to that end was developed. This is
probably due to the ad-hoc approach of the L&A work, and the lack of human resources to invest in trajectories which go beyond a certain achievement.

There is also no clear statement on how to advance with the CEA alliance, how to consolidate the benefits from working in this alliance, and on how to bring more focus to the EU/NL agenda and enhance linkages with country programmes.

Financial sustainability

Policy level: Some policy changes effectively appear to be resource-based. Clear example is the attention for ‘Freedom of religion’ in the 2021 government budget and the priority for ‘Freedom of religion and conviction’ in the Human Rights Fund. Other topics are linked to priority interest of the MoFA, such as the ICSR and the follow-up given to the ICSR covenants (funding of pilot projects). For other policy changes achieved, financial support is less clear or less relevant, or the level of available resources will become clear during policy implementation (which requires follow-up).

Programme level: Financing the continuation of L&A interventions will depend on the capacity of each of the CEA members to mobilise funding that will also be assigned to L&A. When funding decreases, less funding will become available for L&A. It is not clear at this moment what choices will be made for the future by CEA members. It can be assumed that CEA members with a long track-record in L&A, and a strong lobby network will continue investing in L&A. The fact that CEA has mostly complemented ongoing L&A secured to a certain extent the level of institutional and financial sustainability. It is currently be explored by CEA members how to integrate existing L&A trajectories in new programmes and projects. With regard to L&A of CEA members with less experience in L&A continuation is not clear.
4. Conclusions and recommendations

4.1. Conclusions

Relevance
The CEA programme has effectively complemented ongoing L&A interventions of CEA members, aligned to their respective programme foci. By consequence, several thematic topics were included in the CEA agenda. ICCO took the lead in the L&A on food security, Prisma on the role of FBO, Wilde Ganzen on domestic resource mobilisation, Edukans on youth and employment, CNV International on UNGP and international trade agreements. Woord & Daad, having an EU lobbyist took the lead in the European lobby on food security and private sector development. All alliance members share the common interest to defend the rights of smallholder farmers. The choice to complement existing L&A trajectories has positively contributed to the level of effectiveness and institutional sustainability, and to a certain extent also the level of efficiency, by bringing contacts, networks and efforts of CEA members together, and creating extra space for L&A with CEA programme funding.

Relevant L&A strategies have been developed, based on good knowledge of the political challenges and the available thematic expertise in the alliance. CEA programme enabled continuation of formal and informal L&A, like meetings (both formal as well as informal) with MEPs and staff of MoFA, participation in public consultations, expert meetings and conferences and contributing to public debates via media. The CEA lobbyists operated mainly through participation in networks and platforms (#16 counted). CEA members were valued by lobby targets and allies in networks for their content expertise, that was based on research and substantiated cases from the 12 CEA countries, and the use of scientific data. An important feature of the CEA alliance was the access of CEA members to Christian-based political parties and MEP, as such bringing the L&A messages of the networks/platforms under the attention of the Netherlands government coalition partners, which was a valuable asset for the L&A networks and platforms CEA was engaged in.

CEA members took not much advantage of the CEA programme to reflect further on the applied L&A strategies, and strengthen further their joint L&A expertise, for example with regard to enhancing knowledge of lobbyists on how the process of policy-making works (and knowing at what moment most influence can be exerted), on how to design L&A messages adapted to the specific audiences in order to maximise influence (develop appropriate communication strategies), and to reflect on the combination of influencing strategies adapted to changing contexts. L&A expertise was varying among the CEA members, but no explicit capacity development strategy has been developed to that end.

The lack of a clear and integrated ToC, of a clear vision and shared L&A strategy at alliance level and the lack of strategic choices and focus contributed to a fragmented and silo-ed implementation of the programme, having a negative influence on the level of programmatic efficiency.

Although the L&A in the NL/EU was grounded in the experiences of the programme in the 12 CEA countries, contribution of IPs to the L&A at NL/EU was limited to the provision of information, evidence and testimonies. The CEA NL/EU L&A has not directly supported the L&A agenda of partners and allies in the specific CEA countries. There was not much alignment between the NL/EU and CEA country level L&A plans, and CEA partners were not much involved in developing the NL/EU L&A agenda.
**Effectiveness**

In the 4 PWs several milestones were accomplished. For PW 1 (*political space for CSOs*), CEA effectively has contributed to putting the role of FBO in development on the policy agenda and in accelerating the debates to that end in the MoFA. This has already resulted in an increase in budget for FBO and for promoting freedom of religion and conviction in the new CSO-subsidy frameworks and the Human Rights Fund. The importance of southern ownership, the role of trade unions, and the importance of strengthening local fundraising capacity have equally been included in the new CSO subsidy framework.

For PW 2 and PW 3 (*the right to adequate food and smallholder empowerment and inclusive value chains*) important policy changes were obtained such as: the integration of the Indicator Framework for measuring progress in policies for food and nutrition security in policy development procedures by the Dutch MoFA; the new Dutch Food Security Policy referring to the need for contextualised and inclusive approaches with regard to the transformation of current food systems; the SDG check included in policy formulation procedures. In these cases, MEP gained knowledge on these topics and played also a crucial role in bringing these topics to parliamentary debates. At European level, attention for smallholders became integrated in the mechanism for monitoring progress in the FNS framework of the European Commission; and the report for the reform of the European Common Agricultural Policy included a reference to agro-ecology in developing countries, including biodiversity and position of women in food production.

For PW 4 (*sustainable private sector*), CEA members contributed to keeping the UNGP on Business and Human Rights under the attention of the ICSR covenants, international trade missions and in MSP involving private sector actors.

No elaborated L&A trajectories had been developed for each of these topics, that specified the concrete envisaged changes at short and/or long term, the minimum expected change and the desired change, enabling monitoring thereof.

**Efficiency**

Several factors challenged the coordination of the NL/EU L&A: (i) there was no coherent vision on the NL/EU L&A, resulting in a fragmented and silo-ed implementation of the L&A trajectories; (ii) rather different topics were subject of the lobby trajectories, involving thematic specialists from the different CEA members that were less interested or experienced in the other thematic topics and experiencing waste of time when debating specific thematic matters in the lobby-group; (iii) the CEA programme managers was not the line manager of the CEA lobbyists, as such having a limited mandate to steer and align the L&A processes; (iv) most of the L&A was embedded in CEA members’ ongoing L&A trajectories, that were not fully known by the CEA alliance, and which made it difficult to find windows of opportunities to align with the CEA programme and partners. (v) Decisions on L&A messages and strategies were taken in consensus, but this seems to be varying for the different L&A trajectories.

It can be questioned whether the lobby group has been the most appropriate structure to coordinate and manage the NL/EU L&A.

The CEA programme, per design, envisaged a high level of programme efficiency, because of the fact that the CEA programme was complementary to ongoing L&A interventions of CEA members, and the choice taken to leverage L&A activities of networks and platforms.
There were also several factors that negatively influenced programmatic efficiency such as (i) the fragmented and silo-ed approach, (ii) the lack of alignment between NL/EU level lobby and the L&A at CEA country level, (iii) the lack of focus, dividing financial and human resources over multiple L&A processes and networks. No guidelines existed on whether or not, when and how to participate in L&A networks. In some networks, CEA members took a pro-active role (e.g. Partos lobby group, CONCORD SDG working group – Building Change), in other networks contribution was more limited because of lack of sufficient time investment of CEA lobbyists (e.g. IDH, RSPO). (iv) Multiple staff changes hampered the policy influencing process, which requires consistency in network building. In combination with the unfamiliarity with the lobby logbooks and relation management mapping, valuable expertise and contacts were lost when lobbyists left the organisation. (V) Inefficient use of time and effort was signalled by CEA members interviewed, in the cases of requests from MoFA for input in individual cases

**Sustainability**

Especially in PW1 and in combined PW2 and 3 milestones were achieved, in terms of policy influence and policy changes, contributions to debates and strategic consultations, agenda setting and public awareness. Institutional sustainability is guaranteed. Policy implementation is to be seen. However, no clear follow-up strategies have been developed for the L&A at NL/EU level to monitor policy implementation, explained by the ad-hoc approach of the L&A work, and the lack of human resources to invest in trajectories which go beyond a certain achievement.

4.2. Recommendations

**More focus:** There was no deliberate strategic decision made between a top-up programme for L&A interventions of CEA members and a specific L&A focus for the CEA alliance. Implementation became a hybrid and was therefore not used to its full potential. To improve effectiveness and efficiency of L&A efforts it is recommended to bring more focus to the L&A programme.

**Improve ToC approach:** The ToC approach can be used to bring more focus, look for a more integrated programme, synergy between PWs and connection between national and international L&A. This will require less thematic topics. ToC needs to give insight in the vision of the alliance on how policy change processes take place. More causal assumptions need to be identified that can also be subject of an explicit learning agenda.

**Capacity development for L&A:** An explicit and comprehensive capacity development support strategy for enhancing L&A capacity of CEA members can be developed, including the identification of domains of change, CD trajectories per organization and at alliance level, reflection on different strategies, such as peer learning, training, coaching and learning-by-doing. A capacity development programme should be accompanied by a monitoring system to keep track of the development in L&A capacities and possible changing needs.

**Strategies targeting private sector:** The results of the CEA L&A programme in The Netherlands and EU are rather limited in PW4. A strategy for targeting the private sector, with clear ambitions and tactics needs to be further elaborated. The comparative advantages of the trade union and the CSOs can be made more explicit. An international value chain lens, linked to specific supply chains, can contribute to bringing more focus to the interventions. Top-down and bottom-up strategies can mutually enforce. A strategy on how to evolve from changing practices of frontrunners towards changes in the entire industry (on a specific commodity) needs to be developed. The use of business
cases in convincing private sector actors (in different levels of the value chain) can be explored. Assumptions with regard to the uptake of toolkits on gender, child rights, human rights by private sector actors need to be monitored.

**Sustainability strategies:** As the L&A interventions took off as continuation of existing trajectories, and second phase was expected, no exit strategy was included in the design of the NL EU programme. Some interesting results have been achieved, and contacts established which may fade out without a strategy for retaining the CEA lobby power. Follow-up strategies need to be developed, in particular on how to monitor policy implementation of the realized results. As foreseen in the CEA annual plan 2020, it will be needed to consolidate partnerships established, reflect on what can be transferred to CEA members’ individual programmes and/or implementing partners and to document results and experiences for further reference.

**M&E and learning:** It will be relevant to continue building M&E capacity for L&A, exploring the use of progress markers, and improving and further elaborate the use of lobby logbooks and Stories of Change.

**Reflect on the programme management structure:** a more agile and relevant programme management structure needs to be established, making a distinction between overall programme management involving CEA members, and management of the L&A strategies involving CEA lobbyists. The decision to separate the two was taken in the second year of implementation, however the lobby team continued working in a rather fragmented way.
## 5. Annexes

### 5.1. Timelines for selected cases

*Reconstructed timeline L&A on the role of FBO*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Contributing factors (not exhaustive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>- CEA’s explicit statement that FBOs and trade unions are part of the civil society and need to be included in L&amp;A on shrinking civic space</td>
<td>- Internal discussions during CEA programme design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>- CEA recognises the importance of the specific role of FBO and the need to make this role more visible</td>
<td>- Internal CEA discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- MoFA acknowledges CEA as a faith-based alliance and considers this as a specific asset of CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Regular meetings with C7 group on visibility of FBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 meetings with two MEP of CDA and leadership of CDA on the role of FBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Minister Kaag (Development Cooperation and Foreign Trade, D66) responds to an open letter from CEA in the newspaper (Trouw) and brings the topic to the public debate. Later on, the role of FBO is included in her policy discourse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>- 3 motions of MEP:</td>
<td>- New Dutch government with participation of CU and CDA, showing more openness to religion as an asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Voordewind on promotion of freedom of religion (May 15, adopted)</td>
<td>- Role of religion in development included agreement of the new government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Voordewind and Kuik on attention for religion in foreign policy (July 8, rejected)</td>
<td>- CEA publishing an open letter in Trouw to point to the fact that FBO are not explicitly included in the new policy of Minister Kaag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Van Helvert, Voordewind, Van der Staaij asking for a special envoy for ‘freedom of religion’ at MoFA. (November 5 and 15, adopted)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Regular meetings with C7 group on role of FBO and with individual MEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Input provided by CEA for the development of the motions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Oct.’18: Minister Blok (Foreign Affairs, VVD) presents an letter on Human Rights in Foreign Policy to the Parliament (2e Kamer), referring to the confirmation of freedom of religion as one of the priorities of the Human Rights Fund and increase in budget for this priority</td>
<td>- Motion Voordewind on the importance of intensifying Human Rights Fund and the attention given for freedom of religion (November 15, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dec. ’18: Minister Blok (Foreign Affairs, VVD) presents an internal letter on religion and Foreign Policy in Parliament (2e Kamer) in the framework of the budget 2019 debate</td>
<td>- “Future of World Religion”, research conducted by PEW Research centre in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Internal research by MoFA Strategic Advisor on religious literacy at MoFA and EKN (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Discussions at board MoFA December 2017 on religious literacy at MoFa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Discussions in parliament (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CEA states explicitly that FBO have a specific and constructive role in civil society</td>
<td>- Research conducted in three CEA countries, resulting in the report ‘If you need us, Allow us’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>September ’2019: Jos Douma is appointed ambassador for ‘Freedom of religion and conviction’</td>
<td>See in the above: motions in parliament, internal research at MoFa, letter of Minister Blok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced knowledge and openness on the role of FBO among staff of MoFA and MEP (among them also those who had voted against the motion of Van Helvert (D66, Groen Links)</td>
<td>Expert meeting organised in collaboration with MoFA, VU, Mensen met een Missie, Cordaid, Pax and CEA/Prisma (June 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- See in the above: motions in parliament, internal research at MoFa, letter of Minister Blok</td>
<td>- CEA organised several meetings between CEA (and non-CEA) partners and MEP of CDA on issues related to human rights and religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regular meetings with C7 group on role of FBO</td>
<td>- Meetings between CEA and Special Envoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting for MEP of “eerste kamer”, organised by VU on ‘religion and safety’. (nov. ‘19) A KiA partner from Myanmar participated in that meeting and could meet Jos Douma afterwards to inform on human rights violations</td>
<td>- Letter from CSOs to the Minister of Development Cooperation, including attention to the role of FBO in the new subsidy framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CEA organised a meeting with foreign ambassadors in the Netherlands sharing the research results (no concrete results yet)</td>
<td>- A KiA partner from Myanmar participated in that meeting and could meet Jos Douma afterwards to inform on human rights violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Nov. ’19: ‘Freedom and religion’ is one of the 7 thematic priorities in the new subsidy framework ‘Power of Voice’</td>
<td>Increased attention in parliament for religion, pressure by MEP of CDA and CU and changed discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Establishment of the ‘leerstoel Religion and Development’ at VU</td>
<td>Meetings between CEA and Special Envoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Positive response of participants at the European Development days on the role of FBO</td>
<td>- Letter from CSOs to the Minister of Development Cooperation, including attention to the role of FBO in the new subsidy framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Chair is supported by VU, CEA and ACT EU</td>
<td>- CEA delivering input during European Development Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>- Jan ’20: Religion and the role of FBO is subject of the Dutch ambassadors conference</td>
<td>Special Envoy at MoFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- March ’20: Launch of a broad consultation on the role of religion by Jos Bouma</td>
<td>Implementation of policy engagements of Minister of Foreign Affairs (creation of an internal working group at MoFa, collaboration with EKN on this topic, investment in religious literacy at MoFa, participation in international networks on religion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- April ’20: internal working group at MoFA including thematic and regional directors, on the role of religion appears not to be active. Special Envoy recognising this needs to be re-activated</td>
<td>- June ’20: ACT EU includes the role of FBO in its lobby on the new European Africa policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- June ’20: ACT EU includes the role of FBO in its lobby on the new European Africa policy</td>
<td>- CEA contribution to the policy brief of ACT EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enhanced knowledge and openness on the role of FBO among staff of MoFA and MEP</td>
<td>See in the above +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Seminar June ’20 on the impact of Corona in the South, co-organised by Hivos, Cordaid, Free Press and CEA. CEA presenting the results of the new research on the importance of the contribution of FBO in managing the Corona crisis</td>
<td>- Masterclasses for MEP, organised by C7 group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **Sept ’20:** Importance of freedom of religion explicitly included in the 2021 budget of MoFA
- **Changing discourse within MoFA**

| - To be determined | - October 2020: Round Table for MEP on the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on the oppression of human rights, in collaboration with Cordaid, Pax and Free Press unlimited. CEA giving input on the importance of protecting freedom of religion. |

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Contributing factors (not exhaustive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Start</strong></td>
<td>CEA members exploring their lobby activities, contacts, networks, and demarcating issues for CEA L&amp;A; development of country plan and cooperation in NL lobby team, aiming at connections in L&amp;A interventions at different levels. NL/international ToC for L&amp;A includes the 4 PWs of Change, with an elaborated ToC per PW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW2</strong></td>
<td>In the Food Security Policy Working group of the AgriProFocus network CEA contribution to L&amp;A strategy to keep FNS and natural resource management high on the agenda of future policies and government officials, given the upcoming March 2017 national elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW2</strong></td>
<td>Informal meetings with government officials on measuring results in FNS, and sharing (hands-on) CEA experiences from the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW2</strong></td>
<td>CEA support to ACT EU launch of the campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW2</strong></td>
<td>Input for lunch meeting at the EU Parliament, hosted by three MPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW2</strong></td>
<td>Through CONCORD, participation in analysis of implementation and monitoring of the EU Food Security Policy Framework, with presentation to relevant Commission staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW2</strong></td>
<td>Input to discussion and dissemination of information from the Open Data Foundation on Open Data and SDG monitoring. Together with other INGOs (such as OXFAM International and Development Initiatives) launch of initiative to collaborate on the development of impactful ICT solutions and data analysis for marginalised farmers and their communities (a.o. e-farming and data driven lobby and advocacy) and the supporting lobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW3</strong></td>
<td>Co-assessing proposals for funding on gender sensitivity and impact for smallholders. Development of a field monitoring guide, about data gathering and assessment of inclusive business and scalability, for IDH’s grant funded projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW3</strong></td>
<td>Presence in two IDH steering committees (Fruit &amp; Vegetables, SIFAV and Processed) contributing to on-going agenda of Covenants (CEA initiating topics such as gender, decent wages, scaling of inclusive models for small-scale farming); also contribution in monitoring of program development against agreed targets and international standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW3</strong></td>
<td>Active engagement in capacity development of IDH program managers on design and monitoring of gender and inclusive programs/projects. Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW3</td>
<td>Awareness raising about possible withdrawal (Q4) of market access preferences from six African countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 PW2</td>
<td>Manifesto on Food in Transition for MPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Influencing the 2nd EU’s Consensus on Development: expression of commitment to support the agro-ecological approach and smallholder farming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SoC: Influencing the EU Consensus on Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PW2</th>
<th>Lobby Letter to MPs of VVD, D66, SP, PvdA, GroenLinks en PvdD, about budget for Ministry of Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation</th>
<th>In this letter the 6 messages from the Manifesto about Food transition were integrated. Related to the Manifesto follow-up conversations took place with reps from CDA, CU en SGP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>MoFA invites FNS expert of CEA-ICCO for follow-up meeting</td>
<td>Regular informative discussions at MoFA (IGG, DSH) about FNS indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW3</td>
<td><strong>strategy paper on smallholder access to market</strong></td>
<td>Taking into account the findings of the IOB evaluation (MoFA/IC) report ‘Food for Thought’, CEA partner EDUKANS led the elaboration of this strategy paper, which was based on extensive literature review, and generated further input for policy recommendations at Dutch as well as European level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW3</td>
<td>L&amp;A on support of youth employability in developing countries, as part of the Foreign Trade &amp; Development Cooperation policy of the new Dutch government</td>
<td>After the 2017 national elections L&amp;A at MoFA to influence the Coalition Agreement of the new Dutch government, and debate in Parliament on budget for international cooperation (IC). Building relationships with newly elected spokespersons for IC and contributing to information and knowledge sharing on the main themes of the CEA ToCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW3</td>
<td>Improvement of IDH’s (gender) policy</td>
<td>As part of CEA’s CSO membership of IDH influence on IDH’s gender policy by introducing 2 practical tools and an info graphic, enabling European businesses (traders, retailers) to assess their supply chains on gender, inclusion and good business conduct. These tools have been fully integrated into IDH’s gender policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2018 | **Awareness raising among policy makers for continuous attention for food and nutrition security as follow-up on the Manifesto on Food in Transition (2017)** | **Masterclass on FNS with MPs**  
CEA’s participation and contribution to the Netherlands Working Group on Nutrition (NWGN), with expert meeting on ‘Nutrition Sensitive Agriculture and Improved Metrics’. Presentations were based on participatory household level research by CEA in Ethiopia. Next step was the mapping of four communities in Mali to promote so-called ‘zero-hunger’ zones  
CEA experts actively participated in consultations and follow-up meetings bringing forward issues like: FNS improvement and the commitment to leave no one behind; promotion of careful selection and monitoring of resource poor farmer households combined with tailored interventions, taking into account gender, generations, access to natural resources, services and markets |
<p>| PW2 | <strong>Input for Expert meeting of Food &amp; Knowledge Business Platform (May)</strong>                                           | Presentation of experiences with measuring progress on FNS; promoting validated M&amp;E mechanisms and tools to measure impact on household food security and individual nutrition security as well as women empowerment |
| PW2 | <strong>SDG-conference (Aug)</strong>                                                                                          | Presentation of experiences with measuring progress on FNS to government officials; promoting validated M&amp;E mechanisms and tools to measure |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PW2</th>
<th>Building Change: Adopt SDG campaign; SDG conference (August) leading to increased attention in parliament for SDGs; MPs adopting different SDGs, in particular: #2 zero hunger and food and nutrition security; #6 clean water and sanitation; #8 inclusive, sustainable economic growth and decent employment; #12 sustainable consumption and production patterns.</th>
<th>Impact on household food security and individual nutrition security as well as women empowerment. CEA members approaching MPs, providing information, and input for debates and discussions in Parliament and in committees; MPs adopt different SDGs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Recommendations from the report of the EU SDG Multi-Stakeholder Platform, co-authored by CONCORD and addressed to the Commission Vice-President Timmermans, were to some extent reflected in Timmermans’ paper ‘Towards a sustainable Europe by 2030’.</td>
<td>CEA contributed via its EU lobbyists in Concord and ACT Europe in particular to input on SDG2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Detailed letters to parliamentary committee on Foreign Trade &amp; Development Cooperation; input for debate on budget 2019 FT&amp;DC</td>
<td>Promotion of the recommendations from the ‘Manifesto on Food in Transition’ (with AgriProFocus) among government officials, providing evidence-based recommendations for FNS/agriculture policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Expert meeting agro-ecology in the European Parliament, at the invitation of EU MP Maria Heubuch; several EU MPs participating, as well as reps from IPES and FAO (March)</td>
<td>Presentation by CONCORD of a position paper with contribution from an Ethiopian agro-ecology expert (contacts via CEA partners). Purpose of the meeting was to get support from political as well as officials’ level for the agro-ecology concept, aligned with the text in the EU Consensus on Development. Result is support from DG DevCo for a series of pilots and Concord and partners are invited to submit proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2/3</td>
<td>European Commission’s third progress report on the implementation of the Food Security Policy Framework (Oct): reference to agro-ecology. The progress report was endorsed by the Foreign Affairs Council in its Conclusions of 26 November 2018. In mechanism for monitoring of FNS framework at the level of the European Commission attention for smallholders is integrated; resulted in reporting systematic attention for smallholders.</td>
<td>Successful advocacy at EU level for more focus in the food security policy on smallholder farmers and agro-ecology, resulting in a text formulation in 3rd progress report on the implementation of the Food Security Policy Framework. The European Commission acknowledged that the most concrete public data for this were provided by the UK and the Netherlands, and the Netherlands specifically reported on the number of hectares of farmland that were improved with more eco-efficient practices (27% of the total no. of hectares with improved exploitation). CEA contributed directly to this lobby through one of its lobbyists who represented CONCORD, and indirectly through ICCO’s support to Act Alliance EU. Within CONCORD, a small group of lobbyists and food security experts (the so-called Sustainable Consumption and Production work stream of Hub 1) co-organised an expert meeting in the European Parliament on 20 March 2018, which was crucial to open up the minds of DG DevCo officials to the agro-ecological approach. In the months following the expert meeting, the dialogue with DG DevCo continued through lobby meetings with small groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW3</td>
<td>Publication of report Critical Capital for African Agri-Food SMEs and broadly shared during and after the 2018 foodFIRST conference</td>
<td>In this report CEA’s work with small and medium enterprises (SMEs) as driving forces within local agro-food value chains was captured, as well as experiences with tailored financial services for SMEs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Food Security Policy letter “Op weg naar een wereld zonder honger in 2030: de Nederlandse inzet” (June) issued by the Dutch Government (Towards a world with zero hunger in 2030)</td>
<td>Elements from CEA’s lobby statements in close coordination with other CSOs via networks like AgriProFocus. were adopted in the policy letter, including a call to differentiate interventions for smallholder farmers focusing on those involved in (international) value chains and those focusing primarily on production for own consumption and local markets. Including an additional issue: need for more coherence among aid and trade policies to contribute to the transition towards more inclusive and sustainable circular food systems, both in the Netherlands and internationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Participation at stakeholder meeting on FNS policy dialogue, organised by Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Fisheries (January)</td>
<td>Input to discussion on policy coherence issues related to The Netherlands’ position as one of the world’s largest food exporters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Results and Indicator Framework for Food and Nutrition Security further improved in collaboration with officials of the Green Growth department of MoFA</td>
<td>Contribution in working session with government officials, combining CEA hands-on experience with proposed indicators, with evidence-based information from Wageningen Centre for Development and Innovation (WCDI) and the Royal Tropical Institute. Resulted in actual improvement and further specification of the result and indicator framework, specifically including the by CEA proposed indicators such as: minimum dietary diversity for women (MDD-W) and months of adequate household food provisioning (MAHFP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>World Committee on Food and Nutrition Security (CFS), conference in Rome with participation of reps from CEA partners in Uganda and Bangladesh</td>
<td>Preparation with reps from Uganda and Bangladesh of case studies to be presented and anticipating L&amp;A opportunities in meetings and side events. Participation in the conference and side-events. CONCORD members engaging in follow-up of the June Rome Declaration of EU and AU on ‘food &amp; farming’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>“Food” Breakfast organised for MPs as starter for debate in Parliament</td>
<td>Had to be cancelled, however lobby letter on FNS was integrated in debate on budget 2020 on Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Raising public awareness on the importance of attention and support in IC for Food Systems in developing countries</td>
<td>Joint contribution from CEA and AgriProFocus in national newspapers about food systems, signed by directors of ICCO and Hivos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Workshop in LandAc conference 2019, with reps from CEA partners Bolivia</td>
<td>Preparation and participation in the conference; putting together evidence material with CEA partners in Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>World Food Day</td>
<td>CEA participating at launch of Netherlands Food Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Food &amp; Business Knowledge platform meeting at AgriProFocus (dec)</td>
<td>CEA input used for a.o. for the Powerscan, created by Wageningen University &amp; Research, during meeting “community of practice on food systems”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW3</td>
<td>Report CEA-Edukans Making knowledge, training and extension work for smallholders on access to markets</td>
<td>Pizza ProFocus organised by AgriProFocus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW3</td>
<td>Conference Youth Unemployment as a Root Cause for Migration?</td>
<td>Based on the research results contacts by CEA lobbyists with MPs for supporting a target group policy in relation to smallholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2/3</td>
<td>Focus on Agro-ecology at EU level via Concord and ACT EU and how this could contribute to Climate Resilience</td>
<td>Collecting and synthesising research results into different models of agriculture: large-scale agribusiness approaches, agro-ecological practices, and the impact on decent labour, livelihoods and local economic development. Outcomes were used to support ACT EU advocacy on the impact of the revised EU Common Agricultural Policy on developing countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2/3</td>
<td>Publication of CONCORD lobby document 'How will you work for sustainable development? A litmus test for EU leaders'. With recommendations on 'food &amp; farming': reduction of negative impact of EU GLB, sustainable value chains, promotion of agro-ecology and recommendations CFS as basis for EU input on FNS</td>
<td>Presentation by CEA lobbyist at the Agenda 2030 Working Party in Boekarest (April); document circulated and used at several lobby opportunities as basis for the lobby message about agriculture/agro-ecology and FNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW3/4</td>
<td>Joint meeting with CEA members (WD, ICCO en CNV Internationaal) about IMVO covenant Food</td>
<td>Strategy development within CEA for a joint approach: 1. Addressing branche organisations on related topics in meetings and events 2. Improvement of a monitoring tool (consulting smallholders, producers and workers at the start of the value chain) 3. Clarify requests from FNLI and CBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Smallholder inclusion and inclusive food systems, incl. follow-up of 2019 research project</td>
<td>The Edukans study on smallholders (2019) was used to promote ‘smallholder sensitive’ implementation of Dutch food security and agriculture policies. NL level: Draw attention to and influence decision-making of the MoFa and MPs for the position of smallholder farmers and inclusive food systems. EU level, through ACT Alliance Europe/Food Policy Coalition: Participation in public letter with recommendations by African and European CSOs regarding the implementation of the Ministerial Declaration and Action Agenda adopted on 21 June 2019 (Declaration developed in the 3rd AU-EU Agriculture Ministerial Conference of 21 June 2019, in Rome). Submission of paper to the public consultation on EU Green Deal: Farm to Fork Strategy-Sustainable Food (March). Contribution to Recommendations for a people-centered and transformative EU-Africa strategy (May). Contribution to public paper with CSO recommendations concerning global transition in Food Systems: “Raising the ambition on global aspects of the EU farm to fork strategy”(Sept). Contribution to Open Letter to the President of the European Commission, the Presidency of the Council of the European Union, and the Conference of Presidents of the European Parliament calling for full alignment of the reformed Common Agricultural Policy with the European Green Deal (Sept).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>In mechanism for monitoring of FNS framework at the level of the European Commission attention for smallholders is integrated; result in reporting systematic attention for smallholders</td>
<td>In cooperation with ACT EU and CONCORD (CEA lobbyists in Brussels, Oxfam Europe and Action Aid) contributing actively to the inclusion of agro-ecology and inclusive sustainable food systems in EU policies and policy coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Input from AgriProFocus on FNS in committees preparing elections papers for political parties (national elections March 2021)</td>
<td>CEA contribution via AgriProFocus, for group staff of political parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Rep AgriProFocus participating in panel at the final session of the World Food Day (October)</td>
<td>CEA delivering input, through the APF working group on Food Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Adopt SDG campaign continued</td>
<td>Various activities towards MPs, following-up of Building Change initiative (Partos, FMS, Woord &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW2</td>
<td>Awareness raising with MPs and government officials; public awareness raising about consequences of budget cuts in IC in times of Covid-19</td>
<td>Lobby letters from AgriProFocus to parliamentary commission on Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation in relation to Advies Internationale Vraagstukken Covid-19 and the anticipated budget cuts of Ministry of Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation; CEA input in particular related to FNS and agriculture. Joint contribution from CEA members and 18 other (I)NGOs, with Plan International Nederland leading, in national newspapers about the devastating consequences of the Covid-19 pandemic for developing countries and the effect if the 2021 Dutch budget for development cooperation will be decreased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW3</td>
<td>Youth Employability</td>
<td>Dialogue with MoFA and other stakeholders in the Netherlands about effective interventions to promote youth employability in development cooperation; follow-up of conference in 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to the covid-19 pandemic some activities couldn’t be implemented the way they were planned or had to be organised in an adapted time schedule.*
5.2. List of people consulted

**CEA Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacob van der Duijn Schouten</td>
<td>Woord &amp; Daad</td>
<td>14 April, 28 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Krooneman</td>
<td>Woord &amp; Daad</td>
<td>14 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sietse Blom</td>
<td>Edukans</td>
<td>28 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigitte Cerfontaine</td>
<td>Edukans</td>
<td>28 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Voordewind</td>
<td>Prisma</td>
<td>28 September and 16 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonda de Haan</td>
<td>Kerk in Actie</td>
<td>28 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piet Posthuma</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>28 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabelle Lijers</td>
<td>CNV International</td>
<td>13 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evert-Jan Brouwer</td>
<td>Formerly Woord &amp; Daad</td>
<td>16 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marieke de Vries den Hollander</td>
<td>CNV International - RSPO</td>
<td>22 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicky de Morree</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>30 September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Van den Bergh</td>
<td>Cordaid, policy adviser</td>
<td>13 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Marie Van Heemskerk</td>
<td>Partos</td>
<td>15 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine Brassen</td>
<td>Oxfam, member of RSPO board</td>
<td>20 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Rinzema</td>
<td>Min. Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>22 October (via email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos Bouma</td>
<td>Special Envoy Religion at MoFA</td>
<td>26 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annelou</td>
<td>Policy officer at DMM – Human Rights Fund at MoFA</td>
<td>26 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne van der Schee</td>
<td>Formerly Prisma</td>
<td>27 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonne Poissonnier</td>
<td>CONCORD Brussels</td>
<td>29 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bente Meidertsmeyer</td>
<td>AgriProFocus/NL Food Partnership</td>
<td>29 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri Krooneman</td>
<td>SGP 2e Kamer</td>
<td>30 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Voordewind</td>
<td>CU 2e Kamer MP</td>
<td>30 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koos de Bruijn</td>
<td>Partos</td>
<td>4 November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3. List of documents consulted

Programme documents:
- CEA Annual Plan Netherlands/International 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020
- CEA annual reports NL/International of 2017, 2018 and 2019
- CEA baseline report NL/Internationaal. 2016
- Narrative reports alliance member Prisma 2018 and 2019
- Narrative report alliance member Kerk in Actie 2019
- MVO Platform. Rapportage lobby MVO and handelsmissie 2018
- Reports of annual learning workshops NL of 2017 and 2019
- Reports F2F meetings of 2019
- CEA Dutch and EU level advocacy for Sustainable Food Systems and Smallholder Inclusion, review by Marijke de Graaf (ICCO) 2019
- Lobby logbooks Woord & Daad, ICCO and Prisma

Research reports:
- CEA (2019) If you need us, Allow us!
- Making knowledge, training and extension work for smallholder access to markets. An exploratory study on CEA’s lobby and advocacy strategy for smallholder access to markets in Africa, March 2019, financed and commissioned by CEA/Edukans.
  - Policy brief Getting serious about inclusive development Using a livelihoods-based farmer typology in support of rural transition.

Websites:
- www.rspo.org
- www.idhsustainabletrade.com
- https://ad-partnership.org/commodities/palm-oil
- https://actalliance.org
- https://actallianceeu.org
- https://concordeurope.org
- https://agriprofocus.com
- https://the-nwgn.org/

A selection of recent lobby letters and papers, related to FNS and smallholders:
- https://concordeurope.org/blog/2019/04/12/how-will-you-work-for-sustainable-development-concords-litmus-test-for-eu-leaders/
- Joint letter to Members of the European Parliament’s Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (AGRI). July 2019
- EU-AU Cooperation on Agriculture and Food Systems: Suggestions by African and European civil society organisations regarding the implementation of the Ministerial Declaration and Action Agenda adopted on 21 June 2019. December 2019
- EU-AU Cooperation on Agriculture and Food Systems Recommendations by African and European civil society organizations regarding the implementation of the Ministerial Declaration and Action Agenda adopted on 21 June 2019. February 2020
- ACT Alliance Advocacy to the EU Submission to public consultation on EU Green Deal: Farm to Fork Strategy – Sustainable Food. March 2020
• ACT Alliance Europe: Recommendations for a people-centred and transformative EU-Africa strategy. May 2020
• Online Public Consultation on a new Regulation establishing the European Union’s Generalised Scheme of Preferences (GSP). July 2020
• RAISING THE AMBITION ON GLOBAL ASPECTS OF THE EU FARM TO FORK STRATEGY, Civil society recommendations. September 2020

Debates at parliament (2e kamer)
• Motie uit 2018 van Voordewind over het bevorderen van godsdienstvrijheid: https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/moties/detail?id=2018Z08793&did=2018D28571
• Motie uit 2018 van Van Helvert over een gezant voor vrijheid van godsdienst en levensovertuiging: https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/moties/detail?id=2018Z20090&did=2018D52660
• Brief van minister Blok over intensivering mensenrechtenfonds: https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/brieven_regering/detail?id=2018Z19499&did=2018D51445
• Motie uit 2020 van Voordewind en Van Helvert over de positie van christenen en andere religieuze minderheden: https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/moties/detail?id=2020Z12100&did=2020D5641
• Opiniestuk Voordewind: ‘religie is onmisbaar bij ontwikkelingssamenwerking’ https://www.rd.nl/opinie/religie-is-onmisbaar-bij-ontwikkelingssamenwerking-1.1491762
• Brief van de regering door minister de Blok: Hoofdpunten van een interne notitie over het onderwerp ‘religie en buitenlands beleid’ https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/brieven_regering/detail?id=2018Z24697&did=2018D61607
5.4. Guidelines for timeline workshop

Purpose of the workshop: to gain insight in the lobby-trajectory, identify important milestones, identify lobby targets that can be interviewed and conduct an internal assessment of the lobby process and results.

Two timeline workshops were organised: one with CEA members involved in the lobby on the role of FBO in development cooperation and one on Food and Nutrition Security, involving Dutch and European level L&A. Workshops took place on August 28 and 30.

- Participants workshop FBO: Gonda de Haan (ICCO), Manuel Voordewind (Prisma) and Piet Posthuma (KiA)
- Participants workshop FNS: Jacob van der Duijn Schouten (Woord&Daad), Sietse Blom (Edukans), Brigitte Cerfontaine (Edukans) and Dicky de Morrée (ICCO)

Outline of the workshop:
- Brief introduction of the objectives and evaluation process (5 min.)
- Icebreaker (5 minutes)
- Brainstorming on milestones (15 minutes)
- Discussion reconstructed timeline: milestones and contributing factors (1 hr)
- Reflection on lessons learned (25 minutes)
- Identification of lobby targets that can be interviewed and documents that need to be consulted (10 minutes)

Guidelines for facilitation

Session 1: introduction
- Brief introduction of objectives and evaluation process, state of affairs in general of the evaluation and approach for the evaluation of the EU/NL case. Based on PPP

Session 2: Icebreaker
- Five years into CEA, what image (or animal?) best represent how you feel about the lobby work done in the Netherlands and at EU level? Think about the process, its results, your organisation, other stakeholders, partnerships, etc. (5 min.). Participants tell what image/animal was chosen but do not explain yet why.

Session 3: Brainstorming on milestones
- We use a jamboard and invite all participants to identify important milestones and add them on the jamboard. On the jamboard a timeline is drafted that starts before the CEA programme. Every-body can add milestones, by using the post-its.

< 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020

- This is an individual exercise: identify milestones in the lobby process. Milestones refer to important achievements with regard to agenda setting, influence on policy discourse, action taken by lobby targets, policy change, policy implementation. Milestones do not refer to your input. Milestones are achievement that are important in realizing the ultimate goal envisaged by your lobby and are not necessarily the result of your intervention. A milestone can be the result of your input, but also the result of other’s input or contextual evolutions.
- If necessary you also can identify milestones that have taken place before the start of CEA but that have an influence on the lobby process and achieving the envisaged change.

**Session 4: Discussion on the reconstructed timeline**
- This is a plenary session: the facilitator invites people to explain the different milestones, starting from the past and evolving towards 2020
- Guiding questions:
  - What is the milestone about?
  - What has contributed to realising this milestone?
- At the end: (i) ask if important milestones are missing and (ii) what external factors have accelerated or hampered the lobby process and the realisation of the envisaged change, which have not been discussed yet.

**Session 5: Reflection on lessons learned**
- Refer to the image/animal chosen at the start of the workshop. Explain why you have chosen that image/animal
- What is for you an important lesson learned?
- What would you do differently in the future?
- Probe further if not discussed yet:
  - How can the link between local-national and global L&A be strengthened?
  - Specific question on the M&E system: was the M&E system helpful in monitoring the L&A processes (logbooks, SoC, indicators)?
  - How do you assess the collaboration within the CEA alliance in this lobby trajectory

**5.5. Interview guideline lobby targets**
Introduce briefly the evaluation and the lobby case assessing
- Can you explain where and/or when you have met the CEA member (name them to make it more concrete)?
- What kind of information have you received from the CEA member?
- How do you assess the and quality of information provided by the CEA member?
  - Relevant for your work
  - Useful, concrete
  - Feasible recommendations
  - Quality of the analysis
  - ... To what extent do you agree with the input/analysis/positions provided by the CEA member and with what do you not agree?
- How or when have you used the information provided by CEA member (formulation of policy, motion, input in discussions internally, etc..)?
- What other factors or actors have also supported you with regard to putting topics on the policy agenda, policy development, position taking, etc.? 
- What follow-up is done by yourself with regard to the policy topics?
- What is the importance of the CEA member in this field of action (probe for legitimacy of the CEA member involved, the relative importance compared to other CSOs)?
- What do you think is strong in the L&E approach of the CEA partner and what could be improved?
- Validate other findings that emerged from the timeline exercise (where relevant)
5.6. **Stories of Change** (titles are from CEA website):

**European Union:**
- European Union support to agro-ecology: moving from policy to practice
- Influencing the EU Consensus on Development
- Improved FNS indicators

**The Netherlands:**
- Faith based organizations indispensable in sustainable development
- Dutch Ministry acknowledges importance of domestic resource mobilization
- Multi-stakeholder HUMAN round tables
- Alliance and VBDO lobby for more responsible business