

Final Evaluation Irish Aid Funded Programme 2012-2016 For Christian Aid Ireland

Final Report

January 2016

Renee Kantelberg
Antonella Mancini

With
Maria Fernandez Carcedo
Floresca Karanasou
Andrew Lavalì
Helena Zefanias Lowe

Executive Summary.....	i
1. Introduction	1
1.1 The Evaluation Methodology	3
2. Main Findings	4
2.1 Relevance.....	5
2.2 Effectiveness and Impact	5
Achievements against Objectives and Outcomes.....	6
2.3 The Added Value and Contribution of Christian Aid Ireland	12
2.4 Effectiveness of approaches, structures and systems	18
3.4.1 Programme strategy and theory of change.....	18
3.4.2 Partnerships.....	19
3.4.3 Effectiveness of advocacy and influencing approaches	20
3.4.4 Management, structures and systems	22
3.3.5 Monitoring and evaluation.....	24
4. Finance and Value for Money	26
5. Sustainability	30
6. Conclusions and lessons.....	31
7. Recommendations	33

Acronyms

ALLAT	Action for Large Scale Land Acquisition Transparency	NMA	National Mining Authority
ACC	Associação Construindo Comunidades	NMJD	Network Movement for Justice and Development
BAN	Budget Advocacy Network	IOPT	Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territory
CGG	Campaign for Good Governance	OPT	The Occupied Palestinian Territory
CHIVS	Community Health Voluntary Committees	OSIWA	Open Society Initiative for West Africa
CPSP	Country Programme Strategic Plan	PA	Palestinian Authority
CRC	Constitutional Review Committee	PDU	Programme Development Unit
CSO	Civil Society Organisation	PICOT	Partners in Conflict Transformation
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	PLO	Palestine Liberation Organisation
Dóchas	Irish Association of Non-Governmental Development Organisations	PRF	Programme Results Framework
DHMT	District Health Management Teams	RACAP	Rural Agency for Community Action Programme
EITI	Extractives Industry Transparency Initiative	RADA	Rehabilitation and Development Agency
GBAC	Gender Budget Action Committee	RBM	Results Based Management
GBV	Gender Based Violence	RF	Results Framework
GDP	Gross Domestic Product	RFA	Rights for All programme
GoSL	Government of Sierra Leone	ROI	Republic of Ireland
HAP	Humanitarian Accountability Partnership	SEND	Social Enterprise Foundation Sierra Leone
HR	Human Resources	SEJA	Social and Economic Justice Ambassadors
HRC	Human Rights Council (United Nations)	SFCG	Search for Common Ground
IAPF	Irish Aid Programme Fund	SOCFIN	SOCFIN Group (palm oil and rubber plantations)
IOPT	Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territory	ToC	Theory of Change
IBIS	Education for Development	TVBP	Tackling Violence Building Peace
ICC	International Criminal Court	UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
ICCO	Inter-church Organisation for Development Cooperation (Holland)	UPR	Universal Periodic Review
MAPS II	Multi-Annual Programme Scheme funded by Irish Aid 2006-2011	VDC	Village Development Committee
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation	WDC	Ward Development Committee
MALOA	Malen Land Owners Association	WV	World Vision
MAPS	Multi Annual Programme Scheme	ZIAPF	Zimbabwe Irish Aid Programme Fund
MCSL	Methodist Church Sierra Leone	ZPP	Zimbabwe Peace Project
MDG	Millennium Development Goal		
MSG	Multi Stakeholder Group on Extractives		
MTR	Mid-Term Review		
NACE	National Advocacy Coalition on Extractives		
NAMATI	Innovations in Legal Empowerment		
NCPC	National Council of Paramount Chiefs		
NGO	Non-governmental organisation		

References to Christian Aid in the document

Christian Aid Global (CA Global) – Christian Aid is a global organisation, with a number of related sister organisations, of which Christian Aid Ireland is one.

Christian Aid Ireland (CAI) – Organisation made up of two distinct bodies, one based in Northern Ireland and one in the Republic of Ireland, functioning together as one under a combined Board, and contributing to the work of Christian Aid Global.

Christian Aid Angola, Sierra Leone, Zimbabwe, IOPT, Colombia and Central America - (CA Angola. Etc.) –Sub offices of CA Global, based in the programme country (in most cases), responsible for programme implementation, and funded with funds mobilised by CA Global or Christian Aid Ireland or any other Christian Aid sister organisation

Executive Summary

This report sets out the key findings of the final evaluation of the €12 million Christian Aid Ireland Irish Aid Funded Programme which ran from 2012-2015. The programme aimed at strengthening citizens' capacity and opportunities to engage with governments and other duty bearers/power holders in seven countries affected by high inequality, human rights violations and conflict: Angola, Sierra Leone, Zimbabwe, Israel and the occupied Palestinian Territories, Colombia, Guatemala and El Salvador. The overall programme goal was to bring about pro poor government responses and increased stability and security for poor and marginalised people in the seven countries. A component of the programme also focused on development education, public campaigning and advocacy in Ireland.

The specific objectives are:

1. To strengthen citizens' capacity and opportunities to transform public policy-making
2. To ensure that the space for civil society is maintained or widened, resulting in more active engagement and thereby facilitating dialogue towards inclusive settlements; and
3. To contribute to building an environment of security and stability for poor and marginalised people, through conflict transformation and by holding the state to account on human rights abuses, enabling more citizens to claim their rights successfully and without fear.
4. To strengthen the capacity of Christian Aid Ireland to deliver the programme outcomes through better quality programme support, a stronger contribution to the development sector in Ireland, and by increasing the public support in Ireland for the work of partners

Approximately 51 partners have received funding through the programme with many more partners in country benefiting indirectly from capacity building initiatives, campaigning and advocacy work. The majority of funds have been dispersed to well-established coalitions, networks and non-governmental organisations, which work both at the national and or sub-regional/local level and through partnerships with local community based organisations.

A team of six local and international consultants carried out the evaluation. The methodology built on the key questions set out in the terms of reference and build on the findings and learning from the mid term review of the programme carried out during 2014. It involved a literature review, telephone and field work/country visits to Colombia, Sierra Leone, Zimbabwe, El Salvador, Guatemala and Ireland. The findings have been discussed and refined at various stages of the process.

Findings

The evaluation is overall very positive by the achievements of the programme and how it has developed over the period. At all levels the programme objectives were seen as highly relevant by the vast majority of external informants and the programme approach has supported Christian Aid's partners to respond and adapt to changes and shifts in the external context.

Across all the countries there are many examples of where the programme has contributed to improved governance and where constructive dialogue between citizens and the state has led to improved delivery of services, including access to housing, water, education and health and where the actions of civil society actors and citizens at different levels have contributed to the prevention of land grabs and human rights violations.

Advocacy and campaign work at different levels has also contributed to either improvements to or introduction of policies, laws and decrees, which potentially have major implications in the longer term for the rights and opportunities for poor and excluded citizens. Christian Aid Ireland's policy and advocacy work in Ireland and the EU has also played a significant part in amplifying the advocacy work of partners and putting human rights violations into the spotlight with the public, government and international institutions, contributing in a number of cases in responses that have prevented situations getting worse.

Objectives and Outcomes

Outcome 1: Civil society successfully influences government policies and practice on inequality issues, especially on access to services, land rights and tax justice

Overall the evaluation finds that good progress has been made in all countries in increasing opportunities and building the skills and confidence of citizen groups and partners to engage effectively in governance processes at different levels. Consultant country reports highlight many examples of citizens and their representatives being more able to hold power holders to account and where improved dialogue and engagement between citizens/civil society groups and duty bearers has led to improvements in access and quality of basic services. There is strong evidence of shifts in the way citizens understand their role and relationship with the state and numerous citizen led groups and forums have been established, or strengthened which are likely to continue to have a positive influence in the future.

Outcome 2: Civic space for engagement with power holders is maintained or widened, and effective dialogue between citizens and the state can take place. The evaluation finds strong evidence across all the countries of partners, communities and their organisations finding opportunities to engage in constructive dialogue with the state and other duty bearers using legal arguments, administrative actions, visibility strategies and social mobilisation. Although context plays a significant role in whether dialogue and engagement space is open or closed and to whom, nevertheless the programme emphasis on continual power and context analysis is supporting a number of partners, in contexts where the opportunity for civil society to engage has been constricted, to revisit their strategies and approaches and reconsider different pathways for promoting effective citizen/state dialogue in response to shifts in the context. Thus ensuring that civic space for engagement with power holders even under the most difficult circumstances.

Outcome 3: Better protection against human rights abuses and violence against poor and marginalised citizens, and reduced likelihood of violent conflict. The programme has complemented and expanded the partners' work in enabling thousands of citizens to have access to information about their rights and in many cases has provided a unique safety net to cope with the results of bad governance and abuse of power by the authorities which continue to violate human rights without regard to protections under country constitutions. Many of Christian Aid's Ireland partners and stakeholders, who are activists or human rights defenders, face harassment and in some cases risk their lives in order to secure justice for human rights abuses. The programme contributes to these human rights processes in different ways, such as documenting facts in the legal cases and seeking recognition from the state and society of human rights violations of the victims (IOPT, Colombia); the regular accompaniment of IAPF partners and support from Christian Aid in country and internationally also provides marginalised communities and victims, as well as human rights activists with protection and visibility.

Outcome 4: Christian Aid Ireland has added significant value to the programmes it supports, and has increased awareness and recognition of the programmes amongst the Irish public and the Irish development sector. The evaluation finds that Irish Aid funding has significantly contributed to supporting Christian Aid Ireland to strengthen its own capacity and professionalism to deliver the objectives of the overall programme. Internally the Christian Aid Ireland has developed strong grant management systems, governance and working practices over the period. Christian Aid Ireland has built a strong reputation for its advocacy work in the Republic of Ireland, and has been instrumental in getting tax justice onto the political and development agenda amongst policy makers. Christian Aid Ireland has also played an important role in amplifying the voices of its partners' advocacy and campaign work amongst the general public and decision makers in Ireland on a range of issues, particularly with regards to human rights abuses and injustices. The learning and experience from the programme has made a significant contribution to the development and academic sector in Ireland and to Christian Aid's overall thinking and understanding of peace building, governance, working in conflict and post conflict contexts. Christian Aid Ireland has been particularly effective in raising awareness of development issues in schools in Northern Ireland building on its long established links with schools developed over many years although deeper engagement with youth and the education sector in Southern Ireland has been more challenging. Evidence of the impact of the programme on Christian Aid's global strategy is the recent decision for Christian Ireland to take the strategic lead on Tackling Violence and Building Peace, a key objective in the current global strategy.

Contribution and Added Value of Christian Aid Ireland

- There is strong evidence that Christian Aid Ireland has made a valuable contribution to Christian Aid country programmes and staff through training in power analysis, gender analysis, theory of change and through introducing staff and partners into current thinking and debates on a range of issues, including protection, gender based violence, transitional justice, political smart programming and peace building.
- Christian Aid Ireland field visits, shared learning and peer exchanges has generated useful learning, both for programmes and the broader development sector in Ireland and contributed to supporting Christian Aid staff in particular to engage with the complexity of change and ensure that Christian Aid country management and finance systems and ways of working support programme partners to adapt to changing circumstances.
- Support in monitoring and evaluation has been provided to all countries either through programme visits or distance mentoring and there is evidence that support in this area has improved programme performance, reporting and learning.
- The re-appointment of a gender advisor has meant that Christian Aid Ireland has been able to increase its support to Christian Aid country programmes. Gender audits have been carried out in Angola, Sierra Leone and Colombia. These audits have supported programmes to look at how gender analysis can be better integrated into the design of programmes, to review organisational gender policies, governance and ways of working, and how gender relations and power play out in both public and private domains.
- Christian Aid Ireland has been very effective in its engagement with the development sector, academics and civil society organisations in Ireland, particularly those that are working on similar issues or who share a similar ethos and approach to work on governance and human rights.

Programme Strategy and Design

The design of the programme built on the expertise and experience of existing country programme and partner governance and human rights priorities. The evaluation finds that partners are appreciative of the

flexibility that has been built into the design and approach of the programme, which has supported them to respond to the needs of communities and to changes in the context.

Partnerships

The effectiveness and quality of the programme derives from the strength, commitment, experience and quality of the partners that Christian Aid country programmes have chosen to support and work alongside. Most partners are highly respected and have long track records, good relationships and access to decision makers. Partners do not necessarily distinguish between Christian Aid staff at country level and Christian Aid Ireland. Christian Aid Ireland's relationship with Christian Aid country programmes and the partners engaged with is positive and there is mutual respect on both sides. The overall sense is that Christian Aid Ireland provides strong support with minimal interference.

Equity and Gender

Across the programme there is evidence that a number of partners are beginning to explore a range of approaches for supporting different groups' involvement in decision-making processes to ensure their voices get heard. However issues of gender and inclusion are not always explicitly captured in planning, reporting and learning processes. Although gender is a key priority for Christian Aid Global and some IAPF partners, the picture across the programme is mixed. While there are certainly indications that many of the programmes have actively supported the participation of women in decision making processes and positions in the political sphere, the approaches to gender equality in some partners are still closer to "women in development" than to "gender in development" and the quality of women's participation, and which women are participating is not coming through strongly in reports or in the evaluation nor is it clear the extent to which partner approaches are challenging social norms and systems.

Governance, Management, Structures and Systems

Christian Aid Ireland's Board has good strategic oversight of the programme and the Board annual planning session has been designed to improve their understanding of the IAPF programme. The Finance team and Programme Development Unit work closely with colleagues in London and in country in the development of Christian Aid's programme cycle management systems and finance systems to ensure Christian Aid systems meet reporting standards and accountability requirements. Overall, the evaluation has been impressed with the commitment and quality of programme staff at all levels and the good relationships that have been built with partners and different stakeholders which has facilitated the effectiveness of the work.

Partnership management arrangements at country level are generally working well. The IAPF programme funds a number of dedicated field staff to manage the programme and support the work of the partners. This has generally worked well, although it has been more challenging when staff have left mid way through the programme cycle.

The management between Christian Aid Ireland and country programmes and Christian Aid Ireland and Christian Aid Global headquarters in London is generally good and reports and accountability requirements met on time. However the management set up is complicated. Christian Aid Ireland has no direct management or line responsibility over the Christian Aid countries that manage the IAPF programmes and as a result lines of accountability and decisions about follow up or priorities are not always clear. This at times results in duplication of work, or lack of follow up on recommendations made by Christian Aid Ireland staff.

Monitoring, evaluation and learning processes. The introduction by Irish Aid to results based management approach to the programme has required on-going investment in aligning Christian Aid country and partner systems to meet Irish Aid requirements. The emphasis on results and outcomes has supported a number of partners to think more critically about the outcomes of their actions and to think of how many people benefit. A key challenge has however been the application and use of results framework. Whilst Christian Aid Ireland and programme partners have welcomed the opportunity to re-examine their approaches to monitoring and evaluation and ensure their systems are robust and able to demonstrate impact and strengthen accountability the introduction of results based management has posed many difficulties, not least the time it takes to report on the indicators at different levels.

The partners have valued the peer learning opportunities and piloting of different methodologies in support of participatory planning and monitoring. Whilst some partners have integrated elements of these approaches into on-going programme design others struggle to fully understand or balance more alternative approaches with the demands of donor reporting requirements.

Christian Aid Ireland and Irish Aid

Feedback on Christian Aid Ireland's grant arrangement with Irish Aid is generally positive. Christian Aid Ireland score high results in feedback on the quality of their reports and their engagement with the Irish public to increase awareness and understanding of development and global human rights issues (80%) and reports approved with few substantive concerns.

Although Irish Aid are generally satisfied with results Christian Aid Ireland report, they have raised concerns at the lack of an overall programme strategy and the quality of Christian Aid Ireland's results framework,

which in their view is not helping them to understand how shorter term results are contributing to the outcomes at the higher level or to understand trends over time. Irish Aid has also found it difficult to discern Christian Aid Ireland's added value to the programme as distinct to Christian Aid Global. This poses challenges for the team in Ireland, as partners do not necessarily differentiate between Christian Aid and Christian Aid Ireland and the ethos of the organisation is one of collaboration and working in partnership rather than branding elements of its work and support.

Constant staff changes in the Irish Aid's civil society department has also made it more challenging to build relationships with programme advisors over time to communicate Christian Aid Ireland's overall approach and added value.

Recommendations

Programme Design and Approach

1. For Christian Aid Ireland to consider developing a programme strategy, that should include the IAPF work. This will include but not limited to:
 - Developing a Theory of Change and a narrative that unpacks the theory of change, including elements of the Christian Aid Ireland's approach, roles and partners.
 - A set clear criteria to help guide programme focus, depth, and reach that considers contexts of countries selected and staff capacity in countries.
 - Looking at the role of private sector and other drivers.
2. Develop and invest in an internal communication strategy as part of the programme strategy and design of a new Irish Aid programme, which sets out clearly the structures, responsibilities and processes for the different elements of the programme.
3. Christian Aid Ireland working with staff at country level should undertake a more systematic mapping of existing capacity of staff and partners to help guide where to invest capacity support in specific areas. Topics identified through this evaluation as possible areas to strengthen include gender and inclusion and how to improve targeting of specific groups of vulnerable and excluded citizens, this would include assessing how inclusive existing programmes are and also taking into consideration possible unforeseen risks for those individuals previously excluded from decision making processes during strategy and planning processes. As part of this Christian Aid Ireland should identify the different ways that Christian Aid's Global office currently support staff and partners to ensure that work is not duplicated and that support builds on specific strengths that Christian Aid Ireland is able to contribute in certain areas, for example gender, theory of change, advocacy, power analysis, monitoring and evaluation.
4. More attention should be paid to looking for potential linkages and lessons to build on between governance programmes and projects and other Christian Aid country programme strategies for example livelihoods, food security, climate change etc.

IAPF Management

5. To review the current Memorandum of Understanding with Christian Aid Global to ensure that Christian Aid Ireland and Christian Aid Global and Country programmes can work in a coherent and complementary fashion that makes best use of the particular strengths that different parts of the organisation and that clear lines of accountability are in place.
6. Explore possible joint management arrangements for staff responsible in delivering the IAPF programme at country level between Christian Aid Ireland and Christian Aid's International Programme Department.

Monitoring and Evaluation and Learning

7. For Christian Aid Ireland to consider developing a Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning System that would support its reflective learning approach and analysis on how change happens in governance work as well as support Irish Aid requirements of results. This would include but not limited to:
 - A realistic and simplified standard results framework for Christian Aid Ireland to track top-level results, with minimum number of indicators per objective.
 - One reporting system for country programmes through which top-level results can be identified for reporting results to Irish Aid.
 - Include partner feedback on the effectiveness of the support provided by Christian Aid programme staff and Christian Aid Ireland.
 - Ensure that on-going monitoring and learning systems and approaches also capture lessons about what approaches work in different contexts and what difference this has made as well as drawing out lessons regarding partnerships.
8. Christian Aid Ireland should consolidate and build on the wealth of documented work and experiences that the programme has generated, including examples of approaches that have been particularly effective in terms of

shifting power, attitudes and behaviours as well as policy and practice change, along with lessons learnt to share more widely within Christian Aid and Christian Aid Ireland internally. Many of the examples and stories of change highlighted through this review would also support Christian Aid Ireland staff involved in development education and supporter outreach to communicate the value of investing in partner work on governance and peace building.

9. To consider other models of learning including action research, regional learning exchanges and in country partnerships and collaborations with academics and governance experts.

Partnerships

10. Review the model of partnership support to ensure that partners are not overly dependent on Christian Aid Ireland funding and that exit and/or sustainability strategies are jointly developed with partners to avoid over dependence on Christian Aid funding support.
11. We recommend that Christian Aid Global develop a partnership strategy building on the recent reviews and learning carried out on Christian Aid's approach to working in partnerships, alliances and coalitions. This would include the range of support that Christian Aid provides to its partners including its accompaniment and capacity building approaches.

Gender

12. Christian Aid Ireland should consider making gender central to the IAPF programme by including gender as a commitment and specific objective in its programme, and incorporate it within both the monitoring and evaluation results framework and the Theory of Change.
13. Christian Aid Global, country programmes and Christian Aid Ireland should make gender commitment, understanding and skills within the role profile of senior management at all levels and not just within a specific gender focal person role.

Finance and Value for Money

14. The current finance and monitoring and evaluation systems are not set up to adequately examine value for money and financial efficiency. Although Christian Aid Country Programmes are expected to report to Christian Aid Global on value for money in their annual reports. The current budget lines and coding make it challenging to assess or track organisational investment in specific core programmes/strategic goals. Christian Aid finance and monitoring and evaluation teams should consider reviewing current coding and measures and incentives to ensure that it is possible to track the relative value for money of specific organisational priorities and strategies,

Irish Aid

15. For Irish Aid to review and reconsider their approach to monitoring governance and human rights work and to focus on outcomes rather than annual targets achieved.
16. Governance programmes demand skilled personnel and input. Budgetary restrictions and cost structures should be reconsidered and assessed on a case-by-case basis to ensure that restrictions do not compromise the quality of the work.

Christian Aid Global

17. Private sector actors will continue to play a part in the governance landscape whether through extractives, procurement, economic growth or sectors such as agriculture and land. Partners in accountability and transparency work are questioning how to engage with the private sector, moving beyond the classical 'supply and demand' side equation of accountability. Christian Aid Global in London should consider assessing the approach and work with private sector in their governance portfolio. This is possibly an area that requires some research/mapping of Christian Aid's existing experience with working with and/or private sector lobbying and campaigning to draw on lessons of existing approaches and strategies to inform decisions about tactics and strategies for engagement.

1. Introduction

This report sets out the key findings of the final evaluation of Christian Aid's governance and human rights programme funded by Irish Aid. The total funding for the programme is around €12 million¹. The programme built on a previous Christian Aid Ireland (CAI) programme funded by Irish Aid, MAPSII, which had a strong component on governance². The current programme was launched in 2012 and is due to complete in December 2015, with a bridging year having been agreed to extend the programme to December 2016.

The IAPF programme³

The goal of the programme is to *bring about pro-poor responses and increased stability and security for poor and marginalised people in seven countries affected by high inequality, human rights violations and conflict*. It seeks to shift power and accountability relations between civil society organisations, national governments, global governance institutions and private sector actors that affect the lives of people living in Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Sierra Leone, Zimbabwe, Angola and Israel and the occupied Palestinian territory (IOPT). It also seeks to redress power imbalances in favour of marginalised groups, including women, indigenous people, and people living in poverty by facilitating their participation in decision-making processes that affect their lives. The programme pursues its aims through partnerships in each of the countries above.

Christian Aid's Global Department is responsible for managing the programme with staff either based in country (Sierra Leone, Zimbabwe, Colombia, Central America⁴) or in Christian Aid's Global headquarters in London (IOPT, Angola). CAI's Programme Development Unit (PDU) have strategic oversight of the programme and work closely with CAI's finance team and the Global Department in CA to review plans, budgets and manage risks. CAI staff also provides technical advice to country staff and support partners to influence international duty bearers and inspire support from civil society organisations in Ireland, schools and citizens in Northern Ireland and the Republic⁵.

The specific IAPF programme objectives are:

1. To strengthen citizens' capacity and opportunities to transform public policy-making
2. To ensure that the space for civil society is maintained or widened, resulting in more active engagement and thereby facilitating dialogue towards inclusive settlements; and
3. To contribute to building an environment of security and stability for poor and marginalised people, through conflict transformation and by holding the state to account on human rights abuses, enabling more citizens to claim their rights successfully and without fear
4. To strengthen the capacity of CAI to deliver the programme outcomes through better quality programme support, a stronger contribution to the development sector in Ireland and by increasing the public support for the work of partners.

The programme builds on existing Christian Aid country programme and partner priorities. This is very much in keeping with Christian Aid's ethos and partnership approach, whereby partners take the lead in project design based on a shared analysis of the context and the needs and priorities of different target groups. . Approximately 51 partners receive funding through CAI's Irish Aid funded programme, with many more partners in country benefiting indirectly from capacity building initiatives, campaigning and advocacy work. The majority of grants have been mainly dispersed to well established coalitions, networks and non-governmental organisations, who work both at the national and or sub-regional/local level and through partnerships with local community based organisations⁶. Grants have also been disbursed to local capacity building/resource organisations in Sierra Leone and Angola who provide capacity support in communication (Sierra Leone, Angola) and monitoring, evaluation, gender and finance (Angola). The table below summarises the range of partners and focus areas per country.

Table 1: Summary focus area and work supported in each country⁷

¹ The original agreement was for an annual grant of €3million. This was reduced slightly from 2014 onwards to €2.93 million due to government austerity budget cuts, which required Irish Aid to make a small reduction to grants dispersed across the whole their grant portfolio.

² Through a process of consultation two previous MAPSII countries were dropped (Afghanistan and Rwanda) and three new countries added, Guatemala and El Salvador (Central America) and Zimbabwe. The remaining countries were those previously supported by MAPS II who had existing governance work and a range of partners that would allow opportunities for cross learning about governance and human rights approaches in conflict and post conflict contexts.

³ See also section 3.4 Effectiveness

⁴ The Irish Aid grant funds the following country based posts: 3.2 in Sierra Leone, 1.6 in Zimbabwe, 1 in Central America and 2 in Colombia. Irish Aid funds also support 2 staff posts for the Angola programme and 1.5 posts for the IOPT programme - these are based in London

⁵ Christian Aid Ireland's strategy on governance, peace building and human rights 2013-2016

⁶ In Colombia funding also goes to international partner AB Colombia a network working closely with partners in Colombia and in Ireland and the UK.

⁷ Source: Basic data tables compiled per country as part of the evaluation that lists all implementing partners, focus areas and budget. These tables are in each Country Evaluation Report.

Country	No partners supported by IAPF grant	Summary focus areas	Target
Sierra Leone	4 network/coalition partners based in Freetown and 6 partners <u>Geographic coverage:</u> 8 out of 14 districts, with some partners/networks working nationwide	Budget monitoring/transparency, natural resource governance, conflict transformation, chieftaincy reform, improving access to health services for women and children, enhancing citizen engagement in constitutional review process, land justice, tax justice	<u>National</u> Institutions, government (Mofinance, MofJustice, Constitutional Review Committee, MSG on Extractives <u>District/local:</u> Local councils, devolved agencies, traditional authorities, community monitoring groups (land, health, extractives)
Zimbabwe	6 network/coalition partners 2 partners have nationwide coverage, 4 partners work in specific districts) <u>Geographic Coverage:</u> 10 provinces out of 59 districts	Gender budgeting, mining and extractives transparency and accountability, tax justice, human rights defending, peace building, poverty research, psychosocial support and legal support to victims of violence	<u>National:</u> Govt officials including the Ministry of Mines, Ministry of Finance and legislators, local, national, church leaders, <u>District/local:</u> Local govt, councils women community representatives and community groups, women farmers and vendors, mining company representatives
Angola	7 Partners 4 Resource partners (M&E, Communications, Finance, capacity building) <u>Geographic coverage:</u> Luanda city and Benguela, Huila and Luanda provinces.	Peace and justice, human rights/housing rights, gender rights, influencing and building capacity of media, citizen journalism strengthening and coordination of church leadership to promote justice and conflict resolution, life development with young girls (HIV, gender, empowerment)	<u>National:</u> Victims of housing demolitions young girls, street children, Church councils, HR defenders, stage govt officials, CSO activists, <u>District/local:</u> Community leaders, agro pastoralist populations, church leaders, women, girls, smallholders and cooperative associations, students,
IOPT	13 partners <u>Geographic coverage:</u> 6 based in Israel, 5 based in OPT, 1 based in Lebanon, 1 international) in the overall Rights for All programme in IOPT, of which IAPF forms a part	Human rights protection, youth education and outreach, women's rights, housing, health and employment rights, refugee rights, rights of Palestinian political prisoners, truth commissions, youth led advocacy, leadership development, vocational/IGA for children, women and Palestinian refugees, access to mobile clinics	General public in Israel and OPT, Israeli govt, Palestinian authority, women & youth, Israeli courts, <u>International bodies</u> e.g. EU, UN, ICC, UPR, professionals in legal system, Palestinian prisoners, Bedouins, Gazan youth, Lebanese govt.
Central America	8 national partner organisations, 5 in Guatemala 3 in El Salvador <u>Geographic coverage:</u> <u>Guatemala</u> National + 13 municipalities out of 338 <u>El Salvador</u> National + 9 out of 262	<u>Guatemala:</u> Influencing National/Municipal Social and Economic Policies, Budget Monitoring, Women's Rights, Youth and Advocacy, Tax Justice, Rights of the Victims of Armed Conflict, Electoral Reform <u>El Salvador:</u> Influencing National/Municipal Social and Economic Policies, Budget Monitoring, Women's Rights, Youth and Advocacy, Tax Justice, Defence of the rights of LGBTI people, land, Electoral Reform	<u>National/regional</u> Parliament, Government, Chambers of Commerce, CSO Activists, women & youth, Armed Conflict Victims Movement, LGTBI movement, Women's Movement, Landless Movement <u>District/local</u> local municipalities, indigenous peasant women, youth groups <u>International:</u> Tax Justice Network for Central America and Dominican Republic, UPR.
Colombia	8 partners (1 intl, 1 intl/national, 1 national/regional, 1 national/local, 1 national, 2 national, regional, local, 1 regional) <u>Geographic coverage:</u> National + Departments of Choco, Magdalena Medio, Catatumbo and Cundinamarca.	Protection of human rights defenders, land, tackling GBV, women's empowerment and political participation, legislative reform, psychosocial support, strengthening grass roots organisations, tax justice, food and water security, women's participation and empowerment	<u>National/regional:</u> Women's' networks, Tax Justice network, Judiciary and legislators, media. Military, private sector, <u>District/local:</u> Local municipalities, mayors, CBOs, Peasant & producer Associations, women's groups, water committees, victims groups <u>International</u> Intl media, Irish/UK and EU US, parliamentarians, UPR, UN, multi-national companies

Although contexts differ, some commonality within the programme remains a defining characteristic: in each location groups of citizens have been denied fundamental civil, political, economic and social rights as a result of deeply ingrained and institutionalised power inequalities. Interventions share common objectives to address these rights violations and produce change in development and democratic outcomes through engaging citizens in efforts to influence national level policies related to inequality and creating space for dialogue to improve local level service delivery and protection of rights particularly of marginalised people.⁸

⁸ Christian Aid Ireland, Mid Term Review 2014

There are also common approaches including: direct action of poor and marginalised communities, capacity building to enhance service delivery and protection; generating evidence, research/or using information and policy analysis to enhance national level policies, transparency and accountability; human rights monitoring; campaign, advocacy and lobbying at local, national and international levels, often using international legal frameworks to challenge discriminatory or regressive national government policy.⁹

1.1 The Evaluation Methodology

A team of six consultants carried out the evaluation over a period of six months (May-October). The team was made up of local and international consultants with the team leader based in the UK. The task of the team was to broadly:

1. Provide CAI – and Irish Aid – with a true/validated picture of what the programme has achieved in programme countries and Ireland, compared to where the programme started out.
2. Provide an independent opinion of the quality of the programme as a whole taking into account programme management at country level and in Ireland.
3. Assess the capacity and effectiveness of the programmes monitoring and evaluation system and how the programme used M&E findings to learn and adapt.
4. Assess the organisational capacity of Christian Aid to support and deliver the IAPF programme both in Ireland and Country Programmes.
5. Provide recommendations for future programming, in particular for planning the programme Grant Phase II application to Irish Aid.

The methodology built on the questions set out in the terms of reference and developed further through discussions with CAI programme staff in Ireland and staff at country level¹⁰. The methodology draws on the OECD DAC criteria to flesh out specific questions and to provide an overarching analytical framework for pulling together the findings across the whole programme and for drawing together broad themes regarding relevance, contribution to objectives - outcomes, effectiveness and efficiency.

The evaluation was designed to build on the findings of the mid term review which was completed in November 2014 and which focused on changes to power relations¹¹. Methods of data collection included a review of literature and core documentation¹²; three in-depth country field visits in Colombia, Angola and Sierra Leone each of which involved approximately two week field work and focus group discussions/interviews with a broad range of stakeholders¹³; a more 'light' touch review process in Guatemala, El Salvador, Zimbabwe, and Ireland which also involved interviews and workshops with staff and a review and reflection process with key stakeholders but over a limited number of days¹⁴.

The findings were discussed at various stages of the process with the CAI staff and partners, during the country field visits and at the end of fieldwork period.

A key feature of the approach has been the close involvement of CAI's Programme Development Unit (PDU) in the process. Each member of staff at some stage accompanied one of the country evaluators during field work to 'bring their experience and knowledge of the overall programme and CA Global strategies and policies' and to provide basic background data and information derived from CAI's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and results data. PDU staff each did preparation work before the field work producing summary tables of achievements, financial details and partner details. They were also involved in supporting the analysis of findings at country level and global level and fed back comments on the draft evaluation reports. A member of staff from the IOPT and the Central America programmes also joined the review team in Colombia to share experiences from their respective programme and to also learn more about CA's human rights work in Colombia.¹⁵

⁹ *ibid*

¹⁰ See Annex 2

¹¹ IAPF Mid Term Review, 2014, Cathy Shutt

¹² See Annex 4

¹³ See Appendix 3 for full list of those involved

¹⁴ IOPT and Zimbabwe had both conducted more in depth field-work during the mid term review and in Central America, both countries had recently conducted impact assessments. The Ireland MTR had only involved a small number of external stakeholders, so the Ireland Country review therefore focussed on getting external stakeholder perspectives on CAI's work and added value in the Ireland context. Interviews (mainly via skype) were conducted with 31 external stakeholders and findings shared with staff in Dublin and Belfast with staff.

¹⁵ The evaluation team leader, Renee Kantelberg (UK), conducted the 'light touch evaluation' in Zimbabwe with support from CAI accompanier Alix Tiernan. Maria Fernandez Cacedo (Spanish, based in Moldova) conducted the Central America and Colombia evaluation with support from Cristina Martinez and CAI accompanier Sarah Boyle in Central America and IOPT Project officer Hanan Elmasu in Colombia. Andrew Laval (Based in Freetown) conducted the Sierra Leone evaluation with support from CAI accompanier Roisin Gallagher. Helena Zefanias Lowe conducted the Angola evaluation with support from CAI accompanier Karol Balfe and Antonella Mancini conducted the Ireland evaluation with support from Alix Tiernan, and also input into the overall evaluation design and report writing.

In order to build a body of evidence for the overall synthesis report, an analysis and writing workshop was held in Ireland with five consultants with input via email from the Angola consultant. The analysis and findings from the 'writeshop' were then shared and discussed with CAI programme staff and two members of CA Global based in London both of whom are involved in conducting an impact assessment of CA's overall governance work. Top line findings were also shared and discussed during a strategy development day with CAI's senior management team and two CAI trustees.

There were a number of methodological challenges:

1. There was a wealth and range of documentation to draw on, much of which includes findings about significant results and achievements, but overall there was very little documented analysis that correlated qualitative data with quantitative data, including financial data to draw conclusions about trends. Whilst some data gaps were filled during field visits using templates developed to help gather basic data, it was not possible to compile full data against the indicators set out in the programme results framework at different levels as many of the indicators had either changed or been dropped over the period, or were not aligned to timeframes or a clear logic, a defining feature of results based M&E. This made it more challenging to draw much comparison between quantitative baseline data and targets set for the end of the programme. Whilst the review methodology has certainly been able to identify results and change across all countries and at different levels, in our view the results framework was not helpful in guiding this assessment.
2. Financial limitation on the evaluation budget led to the decision by CAI to not include a finance expert on the team to lead on the financial analysis made it more challenging to pull together overall data and analysis to inform discussions on value for money and efficiency. Financial templates were provided to consultants, and data gathered with the support of PDU and CAI finance staff and discussions in country about value for money did take place. However, there was limited time to devote to this element of the review to ensure that data collated could be cross checked and validated at country and overall programme level.
3. Due to Irish Aid restrictions and coding it was not possible for the PDU in Ireland to set aside or ring fence an overall budget for the final evaluation and funds for the final evaluation had to be found from different budget lines across the IAPF country programme budget lines. This made it more challenging in the initial design phase as not all countries had set a realistic budget for the final evaluation yet at the same time terms of reference for the individual country IAPF reviews were ambitious and expecting a lot from consultants.

The report structure follows the guidelines set out in final evaluation methodology guidelines and draws on the OECD DAC criteria to guide overall analysis and conclusions. The report is both a meta-analysis of the country evaluations and an assessment of the overall programme as an entity. The report focuses on the key findings and significant results, and assesses whether and how the programme design, strategies, partnerships and management arrangements have supported and/or hindered results and whether results identified are likely to be sustainable. The report also has a section on the added value of CAI to the work of CA country programmes and partners, and to the governance and peace building work and overall objectives of Christian Aid's overall strategic goals (See Section 3.3). The more detailed country analysis and examples can be found in the country evaluation reports and basic data appendices which detail more specific results against country programme results matrices.

This report has not attempted to attribute results to specific partners and/or the IAPF fund. Many of CA partners receive funding from other sources, and the majority of examples of outcomes highlighted are the results of the efforts of partners, citizens and a range of actors over many years and decades in many cases. Change in complex, volatile contexts is usually incremental and gains made can also be overturned or set back. The report has tried to highlight where change has happened or been observed, both policy and practice change, behavioural change and shifts in power and gender relations and what difference this has made, if any. Through the process of evidence gathering and discussions with a range of key informants and citizens, we have been able to draw together broader conclusions and lessons on the role and contribution of CA partners and Christian Aid that will hopefully be of value to the organisation, its partners, Irish Aid and others working on similar issues.

2. Main Findings

This section focuses on four key areas:

- Relevance of programme
- Achievements against IAPF objectives and outcomes
- Progress and contribution towards IAPF Goal
- Effectiveness of approaches, structures and systems.

2.1 Relevance

The IAPF programme has responded to each country context and the governance problems with a clear need for improving governance processes, human rights and delivery of public services for poor and marginalised people. The programme is aligned to the CA Global Strategy¹⁶ and Irish Aid strategic priorities around governance, human rights and accountability. And at all levels the vast majority of informants commented on how the programme has supported what are some of the main national governance priorities and issues of all the countries involved.

IAPF partners have played an important role in deepening democratic processes and promoting accountability, and influencing some changes in services delivery. IAPF through its partners has offered alternative perspectives on civil society – government engagement, and opened space for citizens to articulate their needs, priorities and demands. The capacity of IAPF partners to achieve such results is notable in countries where there is limited genuine space for civil society – government dialogue and civil society inputs on national development and good governance. Partners have been challenging and highlighting rising inequality and the low level of inclusion of civil society in the political settlement where the gains in economic growth are unlikely to be equitable or sustained in the long term without improvements in accountability, inclusiveness, responsiveness and transparency.

Those interviewed (external and internal) for this evaluation felt that IAPF has been working in the most relevant and effective governance spaces for the engagement and benefit of partners, communities and citizens. The IAPF approach was noted as strategic in choosing relevant entry points: i) local level government spaces, such as citizen – government committees and platforms, ii) working with women's and marginalised groups, iii) national level policy spaces, iv) budget forums and v) working with partner linkages to international campaigns and networks. The IAPF is supporting CSOs to push issues relevant to them and citizens, to open space for citizens to articulate their needs, priorities and demands. In this way, citizens are contributors to their communities and work with marginalised and hard to reach people as a necessary part of enhanced governance.

The programme is relevant in that it has supported civil society in its capacity to engage with communities and state.. IAPF partners in all countries are known for their policy research and analysis that contribute to addressing multi-stakeholder forums, policy debate and recommendations into policy changes. Partners are working in the political sphere on hard and complex technical issues (e.g. mining, human rights, land, tax justice) while gaining leverage in addressing basic rights (health, education). For example, in Sierra Leone citizens and government value the work of ALLAT, BAN and NACE and regard them as a respected policy voice. ZELA in Zimbabwe, has made recommendations into the Mining Act, NACE in Sierra Leone has chaired a forum which was instrumental in putting measures in place for Sierra Leone to be an Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (EITI) complaint country. IAPF partners attended an international workshop on conflict transformation, transitional justice and gender in Ireland, which supported partner strategies in rebuilding communities and addressing human rights abuses particular to their context and projects. In Angola SOS Habitat are the 'go to' organisation for data and research for media covering the issue of land policy and forced evictions. In regards to conflict transformation and human rights, IAPF has provided tools¹⁷ to partners which has given partners the ability to reflect on their context and look at theories of change for conflict transformation, across all IAPF countries.

2.2 Effectiveness and Impact

Main Findings Summary

There has been significant evidence of change and progress across the programme and towards the programme goal to *bring about pro-poor government responses and increased stability and security for poor and marginalised people in seven countries affected by high inequality, human rights violations and conflict.*

The IAPF programme has achieved a considerable amount in its four years of operation to date. The programme is supporting a range of citizen-government engagement approaches and enhancing civic engagement with government to influence policy implementation and services in favour of the poor and marginalised. This is happening within all IAPF country programmes across all objectives. The consultants found evidence of tangible changes happening including an increase in citizen empowerment, rights being realised by marginalised and often excluded groups, and positive changes in relationships between duty bearers and citizens resulting in both collaboration and responsiveness from government to deliver services. And finally with CSOs themselves there are improvements organisationally and in skills to influence and advocate.

¹⁶ Partnership for Change <http://www.christianaid.org.uk/images/partnership-for-change-summary.pdf>

¹⁷ Partners attended an international workshop on conflict transformation, transitional justice and gender in Ireland, which supported partner strategies in rebuilding communities and address human rights abuses particular to their context and projects and a workshop on protection of human rights defenders in Colombia.

Achievements against Objectives and Outcomes

Objective 1: To strengthen citizens' capacity and opportunities to transform public policy-making, budgeting and practice to be more in their interest, particularly on issues of inequality such as land rights, access to basic services, and tax justice. **Outcome 1:** Civil society successfully influences government policies and practice on inequality issues, especially on access to services, land rights and tax justice

The Evaluation finds that the objective and outcome have been met and very good progress has been made against all five results areas. The IAPF programme has been instrumental in bringing together CSOs and citizens, communities into partnerships that are increasingly capable of engaging in effective policy, advocacy and monitoring. The groups are mostly achieving the objectives they have set for themselves, and have in several cases succeeded in influencing policy, services, securing land and supporting the process of dialogue with government for more accountability on behalf of poor and marginalised citizens.

Result Area – Objective 1 Outcome 1
1. Effective process for accountability and claiming rights
2. Securing land tenure / rights for poor and marginalised
3. Better services for communities
4. Making policies, plans and budgets more pro-poor and gender sensitive
5. More accountable fiscal policies and practice

The IAPF programme's support has been critical to the effectiveness of the advocacy efforts of its partners, and has included various combinations of the following: (1) bringing citizens, communities, duty bearers and various local groups together, (2) advising and supporting the organisational development of IAPF partners (3) providing training on organisational and advocacy skills, (4) on-going mentoring, (5) selective financial support for specific activities, and (6) facilitating dialogue spaces between the government and CSOs and / or citizens. As the IAPF partners continue and engage in more sophisticated results areas 4 and 5 (fiscal / budget policy advocacy) it is clear that there is an increasing need to continue supporting partners with technical support on policy, research and policy budget know-how, through CAI or other avenues.

Effective process for accountability and claiming rights Securing land tenure / rights for poor and marginalised Better services for communities

For example: In IOPT the partners have achieved delays in Israeli plans to displace Palestinian Bedouins allowing for the interests of the Bedouin communities to be heard and taken into account. Social and health services to the Palestinian minority particularly women and Bedouins have improved, with a medical clinic for Bedouins now opened and 3 elementary schools remained open for 2000 Bedouin children due to partner advocacy efforts. For IOPT partners, their hard work has meant government accountability in providing better imprisonment conditions, reduced sentences, and releases for political prisoners. 8000 Palestine married to Israeli citizens will access health and social services. Israel committed 15 million shekels to improve social services to East Jerusalem Palestinians.¹⁸ In Central America, also, municipal budgets are shifting from infrastructure priorities to food security, health & education priorities in Guatemala and El Salvador due to partner lobbying efforts.¹⁹

In relation to land related rights and tenure Central America partner work demonstrates reverting the process of forced displacement in the areas and communities that are being accompanied (politically, legally, organisationally) and supported in their basic needs such as production of food, water, education, psychosocial care).²⁰ Partners supported populations in Colombia in returning to the communities benefiting from protection orders and also less people abandoning communities under threat.²¹

In IOPT, the threat over the homes of 350-500 people was lifted in 2014 when an Israeli district court upheld the cancellation of 51 demolition orders in the Arab unrecognised village of As-Sira in the Negev after the state had appealed against the cancellation. Angolan partners secured better security of tenure and housing rights: 3,000 people from 5 communities were rehoused or received compensation, 160,000 people in 5 provinces stalled or prevented evictions and verbal commitments were granted on access to land for agro-pastoralists in Southern Huila.²² As well, there has been a change in approach away from violent forced evictions in Angola and partners explained there is an increase in compensation rates which was not there before.

Communities in Sierra Leone, Central America, Zimbabwe working on extractive issues have confidence in their capacities, more hope, less fear, and, above all, an increase in collaboration and collective action to

¹⁸ IOPT Evaluation Report 2015

¹⁹ Central America Evaluation Report 2015

²⁰ Central America Evaluation Report 2015

²¹ Colombia Evaluation Summary Report 2015

²² Angola Evaluation Report 2015

influence local government policy on extractive practice and compensation (and with some success, as in Sierra Leone). This last aspect is very important because one of the common strategies used against the communities in land and mining (by the companies, landlords and the state) has been creating divisions in the communities and even playing the card of inter-ethnic and race conflicts (Chocó and Costa Norte with the Afro-indigenous-mestizo conflicts).²³

In Sierra Leone, the most clearly identifiable contribution to basic rights has been in relation to the growing influence of thematic networks (BAN, ALLAT and NACE) and the Village Development Committees (VDCs) on government responsiveness in the improvements of health services, where citizens are now able to access services unlike before, as well as noting a reduction in infant and maternal mortality.²⁴ There is evidence of increased collaboration among communities to influence local government on gender, youth, land, and displacement across all seven countries and evidence in both Colombia and Angola of an increase in the resilience of displaced communities.²⁵ In IOPT partner Adalah legal work and advocacy on basic rights and delivery of education, resulted in 2012 the first high school opened in the recently recognised Bedouin village of Abu Tulul serving 120 pupils in its first year of operation. Due to the absence of a local high school, drop-out rates were extremely high.

Making policies, plans and budgets more pro-poor and gender sensitive More accountable fiscal policies and practice

Result areas four and five, have noted successes but this area proves to be more challenging as partners are limited to the extent to which policies and plans are revised to be pro-poor and / or gender sensitive. Their advocacy efforts are seeing a more inclusive process of engagement and citizen empowerment to dialogue on fiscal policy and gender sensitivity, but the outcome of this influence is still to be seen.

Notable examples on gender sensitive budgeting include, in Guatemala two budget-monitoring reports were presented by 4 women organisations to their respective municipal authorities highlighting the lack of investment in women's development. As a result a 7% rise in investments for women's health and education is now in the national budget and a commitment from the authorities to continue to address the situation in the coming financial year.²⁶

Gender Budgeting Guatemala: The Citizens Transparency Commission, supported by Congcoop since 2012, presented 3 local budget monitoring reports denouncing the lack of transparency in local investments, with one local project stopped as a result. Scale up and replication efforts with Congcoop included 2 neighbouring municipalities in its work on budget monitoring. As result of reports prepared by similar transparency commissions supported by Congcoop and presented to the public, the health budget was increased 6.6 times, benefitting 3600 people. As a result of pressure from Codefem denouncing the low public investment on women's development, there was a 7% rise in investments for women's health and education in the National budget (in which year?). Congcoop presented 4 national budget monitoring reports which, together with social mobilisation and dialogue with authorities, contributed to an increase of 21% in Health, 13% in Agriculture and 18% for women's development programmes. At the national level there have been critical monitoring exercises to the budgets of the Ministries of Health, Rural Development and the allocations for the implementation of the National Policy for the Promotion and Development of Women in Guatemala and Plan of Equal Opportunities 2008 -2023. This last aspect highlights the use of the "gender classifier", thanks to the inclusion of this tool in the reform of the National Budget Law (CODEFEM supported by ICEFI) and contributed to raising the profile on the requirements for greater transparency in public budgets. (Central America Evaluation Report, 2015)

In Sierra Leone, the results are limited from dialogue and engagement in the area of fiscal policy and tax management and pro-poor / gender sensitive budgeting. The Government of Sierra Leone has taken on recommendations from IAPF partners (as is the case in Zimbabwe) and there is improved transparency (e.g. budget boards) but community members are not aware of how monies are being spent and generally private sector and government remain resistant to significant changes in responsiveness. In Sierra Leone the quality of teachers and nurses meant the removal of some staff and others hired in order to improve the quality of service to communities in Bo, Kono and Bonthe districts.²⁷ However, outcomes in budget plans and gender sensitive budgeting implementation in Sierra Leone has not seen much movement. Budget plans are developed and requests passed onto central level for implementation approval but results remain poor on the ground at district level. Sierra Leone partners have influenced policy change in a key area around budgets and taxation issues by closing duty waivers. Imports coming in from mining companies are now taxed. As well, there is an increase in extractive revenues as a result of partners playing a strategic role in the EITI compliance process.²⁸

²³ Colombia Evaluation Report 2015

²⁴ IAPF Sierra Leone Evaluation Report 2015

²⁵ Angola Evaluation Report 2015; Colombia Evaluation Summary Report 2015

²⁶ Central America Evaluation Report 2015

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Sierra Leone Evaluation Report 2015

Through the IAPF partners, governments and duty bearers have been subject to citizen action, advocacy, and dialogue at various levels (local to national) to bring about a more responsive state. Overall, the contexts in which the countries operate to shift policy and practice remains challenging. The evaluation participants across the findings highlight that it is no longer about raising the need for more transparency and accountability in public service and public representatives, something that all social, political and business actors accept, but how. Examples from Colombia highlight the challenge, that in spite of all the efforts and pressure from partners to bring emblematic cases to courts and to use legal strategies to defend communities, that have brought important victories, the government is not fulfilling its legal obligations (e.g. the government is not enforcing sentences of the Constitutional Court in favour of communities when economic interests are at a stake; the investigations of violations of the rights of human rights defenders are not progressing; the level of protection provided by the Government to community/union/organisation leaders benefiting from protection orders have been revised just recently and a lot of them are now left without effective means of protection).²⁹

Objective 2: To ensure that the space for civil society is maintained or widened, and thereby facilitate dialogue towards inclusive settlements. **Outcome 2:** Civic space for engagement with power holders is maintained or widened, and effective dialogue between citizens and the state can take place.

The evaluation finds that the objective and outcome have been strongly met, with results being achieved in all four results areas. There is strong evidence across IAPF countries on the increased capacities of the partners, communities and their organisations to claim for their rights, using legal arguments, administrative actions, visibility strategies and social mobilisation with the state. In connection with this there is also a very important shift in the way citizens understand their role and relationship with the state. This has improved dialogue between actors and increased active citizenship. There is evidence of community actors challenging power holders in all IAPF countries. There is strong evidence that the work of partners at national and local level in promoting opportunities for constructive dialogue between citizens and duty bearers has contributed to citizens increased confidence and empowerment and led to citizens playing a more effective role in governance at the local level. These are important steps on the way to achieving longer term more tangible results. Field work interviews in the IAPF countries noted, that generally partner stakeholders felt more confident to claim their rights and that they can contribute meaningfully to dialogue sessions. Building on this, partners and community stakeholders now have a respected voice in the quality of advice and research and legitimacy when representing the needs and priorities of their constituents.

Result Area – Objective 2 Outcome 2
1. Improved citizen – state dialogue
2. Unequal power structures and relations challenged
3. Participation of women and youth in decision making
4. Making elite bargains more inclusive and accountable.

Some notable examples³⁰ across all four areas at both local and national level are; citizen oversight **at the local level**, for example in Central America extended to 9 municipalities of Morazán, where they have formalised and / or consolidated Committees Local / Municipal Development (CODEMs) in 9 municipalities and Social Monitoring Committees as part of the monitoring system within local governments.³¹ Structures such as Village Development Committees (VDCs) on healthcare services and social services (Sierra Leone), community leadership structures and residents committees on social auditing (Angola); Gender Budget Action Committees (GBAC) for gender responsive budgeting (Zimbabwe); Municipal Councils on budget and planning processes (Guatemala, El Salvador), Municipal Community Development Committees (Guatemala, El Salvador) and Resident Associations (Angola, Zimbabwe) are engaging with local authorities on land eviction and service provision. These platforms have started to influence policy and practice, and there are many examples where marginalised citizens challenge government, service providers and influence unequal power structures through dialogue on issues with government that matter at local district levels..

At national level, for example, Sierra Leone partners are sitting on constitutional review committees and extractive committees. Here IAPF partners are now seeing central government referencing their reports, for example, in the President’s speech in the opening of Parliament.³² In Zimbabwe, the Government is taking on board mining and extractive policy recommendations from partners.³³ In Guatemala and El Salvador, citizens engage on Parliamentary Committees, and various sector Committees raising issues of tax and electoral reforms. And in OPT partners are influencing legislative processes on human rights.³⁴

²⁹ Colombia Evaluation Report 2015

³⁰ In this objective area, results are not so neatly divided between the 4 results areas, as all four are intertwined in the process of dialogue, participation and changes in accountability.

³¹ Central America Evaluation Report 2015

³² Sierra Leone Evaluation Report 2015

³³ Zimbabwe Evaluation Report 2015

³⁴ IOPT Evaluation Report

Making elite bargains more inclusive and accountable.

There are examples of progress in this area made in extremely challenging environments and circumstances. For example, IOPT partners, succeeded in generating international pressure on Israel from the EU and the US, and also criticism from the Israeli Attorney General, over 3 draft bills targeting foreign-funded NGOs (late 2011 – 2013).³⁵ The bills were abandoned. Influencing authorities on various policies, including gender issues, has made relationships stronger particularly at local level. In Colombia, the court ruled in favour of indigenous peoples cases.³⁶ In Central America, partners managed to build alliances with social movements in the municipalities (youth, peasants, women organisations) with other State agencies (Departmental Offices of the Office of Human Rights), and established a presence in other areas of decision-making such as the Community Development Councils (COCODES / Guatemala) "these processes strengthen municipal involvement," while recognising that "the issue of social audit is not widely accepted by municipalities in Guatemala."³⁷

Participation of women and youth in decision-making

There has been a very impressive push by some partners of the programme to ensure that the voices of youth, marginalised and women are taken into account during dialogue sessions. For example, in Colombia after a year long negotiation the Government and the FARC announced in September 2015 that they have finally reached an agreement on Justice and Victims. In spite of very low initial expectations, the contributions made by the victims and civil society networks to facilitate the negotiation, while guaranteeing that the claims of the victims were included, is a very positive change that IAPF can take credit for.³⁸ IOPT partners trained youth and evidence shows that youth feel empowered for civic engagement and political participation. Without this training and programme youth would not have this kind of exposure in IOPT. Youth lobbied for equal pay for young women and men, which 3 companies adjusted salaries to be equal; youth lobbied successfully to increase the mandatory health provision in the West Bank from age 3 to age 6. Zimbabwe partners have made a contribution to building the capacity of marginalised citizens to approach government by supporting them to mobilise around community issues and communicate their issues of concern to government authorities.³⁹

In regards to civic space and a strategy for women's participation in dialogue, IAPF partners could have achieved more if they had developed a strategy that addressed specifically women's needs or were more pro-active in ensuring that a gender approach focused on women beneficiaries.

Access to space and protection

Accessing space for civil society to engage and accessing information through traditional channels over the course of the programme became more limited in Sierra Leone and Angola, (with Zimbabwe not far behind). There has been a tendency to reduce spaces for citizens' participation in the discussion of issues related to national interest. In Angola both public and private media are controlled by the regime making it a significant challenge for partners to advocate on issues⁴⁰. To counteract this diminishing space human rights organisations in particular have made a strategic move to use social media (Facebook, YouTube, webpages, online radios, blogs, Twitter, chain and mass SMS) to provide alternative information and space for denouncing human rights abuse and debating on issues which are of national (and international) relevance. This strategy of social media and international networking is proving increasingly effective for IAPF partners, namely in terms of influencing national and international public opinion but to a lesser extent decision making on the ground. In El Salvador ISD (Iniciativa Social para la Democracia) manages to open spaces for dialogue and participation in decision-making at the municipal level in 9 municipalities and at the regional level with Inter Citizens Association for Local Development (ACIPDL) and the Association of Municipalities northern Morazan and the different institutions with territorial decentralisation. Also at the national level the opportunity for dialogue between civil society, represented in the Movement for Active Citizenship and the Government, particularly the Department of Citizen Participation and the Technical Secretariat of the Presidency, has been strengthened.⁴¹

Effective dialogue between state and citizens social activism entails a heavy personal toll on human rights defenders and social activists, subject to constant threats and criminalisation. The programme has embedded mechanisms in country to tackle these issues (reviewing risks and mitigating as best as possible against security risks) by providing accompaniment and protection to some organisations as well as carrying out protection workshop and peer learning in Colombia. But the needs remain huge. And important to note,

³⁵ IOPT Evaluation Report 2015

³⁶ Colombia Evaluation Summary Report, 2015

³⁷ Central America Evaluation Report, 2015

³⁸ Colombia Evaluation Summary Report, 2015

³⁹ Zimbabwe Evaluation Summary Report, 2015

⁴⁰ The new legislation on the functioning of civil society organisations in Angola, the Presidential Decree number 74/15 of 23rd of March, is supposed to be a legal tool to limit the work of independent civil society organizations working in the pursuit of equal redistribution of the country's wealth between women and men, and between regions, transparency, corruption and governance, even if they are against the constitution. The successful implementation of this law will result in the closure of already narrow space of action of independent organisations.

⁴¹ Ibid.

women activists and human rights defenders face different types of threats and risks. Protocols of protection do not always take into account the gender factor or circumstances.

Changes in power relations

There have been some notable changes in power relations such as citizens feel empowered and more confident to engage with duty bearers, both government and traditional authorities within communities. For example, Palestinian youth feel more empowered to undertake initiatives benefitting their communities, e.g. a young Palestinian woman decided to advocate and get three companies to pay men and women equally.⁴² There is now a young male mayor of Kono who was a long time beneficiary of CA and partner support (MAPS) in Sierra Leone. Related to this, several male youth who have been trained are now running for candidates for municipal elections, in Huehuetanango, Guatemala and Choco, Colombia. There is greater women’s representation in Sierra Leone on local tradition governance structures, where they are now able to question budgets and tax collected by chiefdom authorities in IAPF communities. Overall there are more qualified and proactive women in decision-making processes in Zimbabwe, Sierra Leone, Angola, Central America and Colombia.

Objective 3: To contribute to building an environment of security and stability for poor and marginalised people through conflict transformation and by holding the state to account on human rights abuses.
Outcome 3: Better protection against human rights abuses and violence against poor and marginalised citizens, and reduced likelihood of violent conflict

The evaluation finds that the objective and outcome have been strongly met, with partner’s contribution to building an environment of security and stability for poor and marginalised people. Results have been achieved across the five results areas. There have been several results due to the work of IAPF partners across the four result areas. Overall, the IAPF has complemented and expanded the partners’ programmes, enabling thousands of citizens to have access to alternative information about their rights and in many cases has provided a unique safety net to cope with the results of bad governance and abuse of power by the authorities, who continue to violate human rights without regard to protections afforded by country constitutions. Partners and their stakeholders, who are activists or human rights defenders, including lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people in one programme, face harassment and in some cases risk their lives in order to secure justice for human rights abuses. The programme contributes to these human rights processes in different ways, such as documenting the facts in the legal cases and seeking for a recognition from the state and society about the human rights violations of the victims (IOPT, Colombia); the regular accompaniment by IAPF partners provided to the marginalised communities and victims by partners in these countries is very important to them because they feel they have not been abandoned, that they are supported and accompanied by a strong partnership with CA and local partners gives a sense of security, strength and hope.

Result Area – Objective 3 Outcome 3
1. Human rights abuses highlighted and defended
2. Greater sense of peace, safety and stability
3. Human rights defenders protected
4. International intervention for human rights issues in country

Human rights abuses highlighted and protected International intervention for human rights issues in country

There is good quality documentation of human rights abuses and bringing attention to the public, policy makers, international bodies, judiciary and police in all IAPF countries. In Colombia partners have documented the facts in legal cases and continue to seek for recognition from the state and society about human rights violations.⁴³ In IOPT, a significant outcome achieved is the area of Palestine’s accession to the International Criminal Court (ICC) in 2015 and the subsequent opening of a preliminary investigation into war crime allegations.⁴⁴ Another outcome was the advocacy of CA partners led to the recommendations in the report of the UN Commission of Inquiry on Gaza in 2015, that have called for the referring of matters to the ICC, and that EU members of the UN Human Rights Council supported the adoption of these recommendations.⁴⁵ Promising cases were noted by the evaluation team where there is evidence of government responses in changing their allocation of resources based on partner advocacy, creating a sense of stability and safety. For example, in IOPT, Bedouin people for the time being have been able to hang onto their homes due to partner advocacy and international campaigning to raise the issue of their displacement.⁴⁶ There is less work in Sierra Leone under this objective, but Action for Large scale Land Acquisition Transparency’s (ALLAT) published two widely published press releases on human rights abuses by the police and authorities on MALOA people, and Sierra Leone media ran a story on human rights

⁴² IOPT Evaluation Report 2015
⁴³ Colombia Evaluation Summary Report 2015
⁴⁴ IOPT Evaluation Report 2015
⁴⁵ Ibid
⁴⁶ IOPT Evaluation Report 2015

abuses in Malen.⁴⁷In Angola, illegal demolitions have stopped in some areas as a result of partner work, ACC reported a halting of land grabs and demolitions in 2013. ZPP work in Zimbabwe, recorded and published Human Rights abuses.

In the communities where IAPF partners carried out human rights advocacy, there are examples of better conditions and responsiveness from authorities. For example, as stated above, a result of IOPT partner work hundreds of Palestinians detained or imprisoned by Israel have benefitted from better imprisonment conditions, reduced sentences or have been released.⁴⁸ As well, in IOPT, the international profile of the issue of the Palestinian minority in Israel has been raised and to a large degree this is due to the work of CA and its partners. EU officials interviewed for the mid-term review in 2014 acknowledged that NGOs “*had been very successful*” in putting “*the issue of human rights of Arab citizens firmly on the agenda of bilateral relations of the EU with Israel.*”⁴⁹ As well, IOPT partners succeeded in freezing the adoption of a draft of personal status law, which would disadvantage Palestinian women. The issue of Palestinian refugee rights is seeing “a tremendous change” in Israel due to Zochrot’s public education on this issue⁵⁰ for example, no civilians were tried by Palestinian military courts in the West Bank in 2015, and this can be attributed to pressure brought on by Palestinian human rights organisations including CA partners Al-Haq and Addameer. IOPT partners succeeded in ending abuse of minors in the Israeli Etzion Detention Centre after documenting this abuse in a report and using a variety of official and diplomatic channels to exercise pressure. The prison official at the centre of the abuse has been removed. Conditions in PA prisons have improved, according to CA partner Al-Haq, who have been allowed by the PA to monitor prisons and, recently also, interrogation centres, with surprise visits.⁵¹

Greater sense of peace, safety and stability

A great achievement in IAPF has been the ability to bring about changes in stability of fragile and insecure environments for poor and marginalised citizens. For example, in Colombia partners were able to prevent deaths as well as stopping things from getting worse and further retaliation against human rights defenders.⁵² In Zimbabwe, partners support community security and stability through community monitors which track and report any incidences of human rights abuses.⁵³ In Angola, there has been a reduction in politically-driven conflicts in 18 communities in rural Mavinga.⁵⁴ As well, in Angola, partners held a national conference on peace, reconciliation and democracy with political leaders. Created three provincial inter-church peace building groups, which resulted in better relations between different groups. Evidence highlights that civic education on peace and conflict reduction is supporting a stable and peaceful environment in Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe.⁵⁵ The Ebola crisis in Sierra Leone saw minimal violence in IAPF communities due to partners working with local authorities to prevent violence from the Ebola situation.⁵⁶ Human rights training supported local community activists to persuade local authorities to put the policy of forced resettlement on hold in Angola.⁵⁷ Colombia partners have contributed to the peace agreement – by facilitating the victims to be part of the process of negotiation and manage the expectations so all parties come to a more balanced agreement on transitional justice.⁵⁸

There is still a great distance to go under this Objective and Outcome area as the contextual challenges are many and significant. In Central America, there is strong evidence of the benefits of the truth and reconciliation process and a sense of dignity in the lives of victims of violence, who have found the strength and peace they need in their present and future. However, the emotional status and living conditions of women left with dependents (often grandsons and granddaughters) with little to provide to them in urban areas where they are forced to move to, and the burden of stigma they carry when they have lost their children is difficult to improve.⁵⁹ In El Salvador, the number of people deprived of housing is increasingly serious. Hundreds of families have no legal security of tenure for what they have been and are being threatened by increasingly lavish evictions due to the construction of mega works from private and public initiatives, such as hydroelectric dams, roads, tourism projects, mines among others. As for the defence of the rights of LGBT people, the group expressed the need to have laws to protect their rights and the elimination of discriminatory laws. Most have poor access to basic rights such as education, work and housing, in addition to the rejection of their social and family ties. This then creates a greater aspect of vulnerability, such as exposure to sexual trafficking and kidnappings by maras (gangs) and security forces.

⁴⁷ Sierra Leone Evaluation Report 2015

⁴⁸ IOPT Evaluation Report 2015

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ IOPT Evaluation Report 2015

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Colombia Evaluation Summary Report 2015

⁵³ Zimbabwe Evaluation Report 2015

⁵⁴ Angola Evaluation Report 2015

⁵⁵ Civic education in IOPT programme is on human rights and democracy not peace and conflict reduction.

⁵⁶ Sierra Leone Evaluation Report 2015

⁵⁷ Angola Evaluation Report 2015

⁵⁸ Colombia Evaluation Summary report 2015

⁵⁹ Central America Evaluation Report 2015

2.3 The Added Value and Contribution of Christian Aid Ireland

Objective 4: To strengthen the capacity of CAI to deliver the programme outcomes through better quality programme support, a stronger contribution to the development sector in Ireland, and by increasing the public support in Ireland for the work of partners. **Outcome 4:** CAI as an organisation has added significant value to the programmes it supports, and has increased awareness and recognition of the programmes amongst the Irish public and the Irish development sector.

The programme results framework includes a specific objective around programme delivery through Christian Aid Ireland. The key strategies that contribute to this objective and expected results include management and technical support to programmes, research and learning initiatives, public policy and advocacy and development education and outreach.

Result Areas – Objective 4 Outcome 4
1. CAI has contributed to the adoption of good practice across the country programmes
2. CAI influences government debate, policy and legislation
3. Increased supporters and general public taking action on issues raised by CAI
4. Deeper and smarter relationships with supporters, other organisations, alliances and campaigns resulting in more effective public responses to development issues raised by programme work overseas
5. Increased awareness raised of development issues, and deeper engagement with youth and the education sector in Ireland, North and South.
6. Increased coverage and quality of development and human rights issues in main Irish newspapers, TV programmes or other public fora.
7. CAI increases its capacity to better deliver on the strategy

Overall, Christian Aid has been very effective and made good progress in result areas 1, 2, 4 and 7. CAI has built a strong reputation for its advocacy work in Ireland and its growing reputation as a credible and legitimate civil society actor has contributed to opening opportunities for partner advocacy in Ireland and Europe and strengthened the confidence in what the organisation does. Irish Aid funding has also helped build the professionalism of CAI to improve its grant management and performance systems. The learning and experience from the programme has made a significant contribution to the development and academic sector in Ireland and to Christian Aid Global overall thinking and understanding of peace building, governance, working in conflict and post conflict contexts. Evidence of the impact of CAI on the broader organisation are the recent negotiations between Ireland and London headquarters for CAI to take the strategic lead on its strategic objective of Tackling Violence and Building Peace. CAI has been reasonably effective in result area 3 particularly through its leadership role during the IF campaign in Northern Ireland during 2013⁶⁰. It has been reasonably effective in 5 & 6 but progress has been hampered due to capacity gaps in the communication and media team and the challenge of overcoming CAI's name and identity in Republic of Ireland (RoI) amongst the general public and schools. Below are the key areas of achievements under this objective.

The added value of CAI and the adoption of good practice in the programmes it supports

There is strong evidence that CAI has made a valuable contribution to CA programmes and staff through training in power analysis, gender analysis, theory of change and through introducing staff and partners into current thinking and debates on a range of issues, including protection, gender equality, gender based violence, transitional justice, political smart programming and peace building. The PDU team are small and so much of their effort has been to support CA staff who work closely with partners on the ground in the delivery of the programme. During technical visits to programmes, PDU staff have also had opportunities to engage with partners, and field visits usually include a mix of technical support to CA staff and training for both partners and staff.

⁶⁰ See IAPF Mid Term Review Ireland report page.14

Table 3. Summary of CAI support and contribution to programme quality

MEL Capacity	Gender & advocacy	Research & Learning	Performance Management & Finance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MEL capacity support provided to 7+1 countries (2012: SL, Colombia; 2013: Zimbabwe, Angola; 2014: CenAm, Col, (+DRC for HPP); 2015: SL, Zimbabwe) - Baseline data collated in 7 countries - Mid term review completed in 2014 with all 7 countries - Governance, power and human rights support provided to 7+1 countries (Sierra Leone 2013, Zimbabwe 2013, Angola 2014, IOPT 2014, Colombia 2014, Central America 2015, Angola 2015) <p>Evidence of MEL support improving programme performance, reporting and learning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quality of information in reports has improved from 2012 to 2015 (e.g. Zimbabwe, Colombia, IOPT) - 3 Annual reports submitted to Irish Aid on time, and approved, with few substantive concerns - Score of 2015 report by IA improved by 7% on proposal written in 2011 - Introduction of participatory indicators in SL, CenAm, Zimbabwe, Angola and IOPT, though with varying adoption. - Adaptation and improvement of results framework reflect learning by country teams on how to describe results (also reflected in IA comments on 2014 report) 	<p><u>Gender and Power support:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 gender audits completed (Angola, CAI, Sierra Leone⁶¹, Colombia) - 4 country support visits to review gender work and approaches and build partner capacity (Zimbabwe, Angola, IOPT) - Training for all IAPF staff on integrating gender into REFs - Power analysis is used as a tool for programme design, especially through development of the Country Programme Strategy Papers and their review - MTR using a power analysis lens to review programme and sharpen ToC and power analysis <p><u>Advocacy support:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highlighting human rights concerns in Colombia with politicians in Ireland by focusing on Ireland ratifying an EU Free Trade Agreement and launching ABColombia reports in Ireland - Representing partners human rights issues to the Irish Government in El Salvador, Colombia and Angola through the Universal Periodic Review process in the Human Rights Council - Organised advocacy and programming planning work on Angola with EU human rights and faith based organisations - Advocacy on IOPT including politicians visit to the region, settlements guidelines and Elders visit - Partner participation in the climate justice conference organised by Mary Robinson - DRC advocacy and awareness raising through the GBV consortium - Profiling of partner concerns in relation to civil society space, business and human rights and foreign policy submissions. - Tax advocacy from Central America to Irish government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 research projects initiated - 2013 Land Grab conference and research in collaboration with University of Limerick, and 5 CA countries - 2013. Health Governance (Sierra Leone + University of Limerick - Health governance has driven better coordination of health governance partners in Sierra Leone, and evaluation shows learning from research has been taken on board by partners and influenced implementation 3 peer learning events in Ireland + academic collaborations conducted on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2013: Land grabbing peer learning event with partners from 4 countries - Governance workshop in June/July 2014 in Dublin with ODI and Trocaire and partners/ programme staff from three countries - 2014 Protection peer learning in Colombia (led to 4 countries revising or developing their protection strategies) - 2014 Violence & peace building (10 countries IAPF + other CA countries) – Transitional Justice: Collaboration with Transitional Justice Institute, Uof Ulster as part of peer learning event on peace building with 10 CA countries, opened up new research opportunities and country programmes refining strategies and approaches . - Global meetings held in 2012, 2013 and 2014. First two only CA staff, third meeting included partner staff and was focused on TVBP. Feedback (on evaluation forms and through email) positive. Main challenges faced continue to be the varying perspectives of country programmes on project cycle advocacy plus varying capacity of Programme staff to engage on all the programme quality issues CAI promote 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finance & budget training and support conducted with countries: Sierra Leone, Angola & Central America finance officers - 1 2 1 meetings between CMs and Head of Finance in 2013. - On going support on donor compliance and finance systems - All 4 PDU team acted as peer reviewers for the IAPF countries in CA organizational performance process, providing assessment and guidance. PDU team also input into improving and streamlining the process itself. - 2012-2-14 CA PCM system overhauled and put onto Sharepoint – CAI led on collecting PCM information from across the org, and creating the visual interfaces. <p>Support has resulted in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved results frameworks and annual reports (subject to set-backs due to staff changes) - PCM system up and running in CA – used by all country teams in org - Evidence of improved budgeting practice: Reduction of 70% in annual over spend across the countries from 2012 – 2014. - Budget process more smooth in 2014, with reports returned earlier and in better format than in previous years.

Building & Advancing a Shared Knowledge Base on What Works and What Doesn't

CAI field visits, shared learning and peer exchanges has generated useful learning, both for programmes and the broader development sector in Ireland and contributed to supporting CA country level staff in particular to engage with the complexity of change and ensure that CA systems and ways of working support programme partners to adapt to changing circumstances. Partners particularly value the opportunities to

⁶¹ Gender Audit was carried out by Gender and Social Inclusion Advisor, CA UK

meet with other partners and other international development actors in Ireland to learn from and share their experiences. Peer learning across the programme and research are key elements of the programme design and have exposed a number of partners to cutting edge thinking and learning on a range of areas relevant to their work. For example, the conference hosted by CAI and the Transitional Justice Institute (TJI) at the University of Belfast exposed a number of partners to approaches to tackling violence and transitional justice. The conference also resulted in new research opportunities, funding avenues and refining of strategies and approaches. TJI has also offered scholarships to one of CA's partners to attend their summer school and they have also linked up with one of IOPT partners, Zochrot, for a follow up leadership and learning event in late 2015.

Support in M&E has been provided to all countries either through programme visits or distance mentoring and there is evidence that support in this area has improved programme performance, reporting and learning. The MTR, with its bottom up approach and focus on learning about if and how the IA funded programme is contributing to long-term shifts in power relations, helped a number of countries to consolidate the knowledge and skills gained through engagement with CAI through training on theory of change, power and gender analysis and programmes revisited and adapted their strategies as a result⁶². Six countries⁶³ were introduced to a range of participatory M&E methodologies by CAI's M&E to help strengthen citizen engagement in M&E and planning processes and to get a better understanding of the process of change, particularly shifts in power and perceptions of security and safety. Feedback on the introduction of participatory indicators in Sierra Leone, Central America, Zimbabwe, Angola and IOPT has been generally positive and there are examples where partners have incorporated these into their existing M&E systems (IOPT). However there is still a major disconnect between the participatory indicator work developed in support of results reporting and partner M&E systems. To date partners have not necessarily found the results based management process is supporting them to monitor or track trends or support learning about how change happens and contributions to the change process.

With the re-appointment of a gender advisor in the PDU, CAI has been able to step up its work on gender across the programme. Gender audits have been carried out in Angola, Sierra Leone, Colombia and Zimbabwe. These audits have supported programmes to look at how gender analysis can be better integrated into the design of programmes and to review whether organisational gender policies, governance and ways of working, and how gender relations and power play out in both public and private domains. The recommendation on gender during the MTR also contributed to a number of CA countries reviewing their current approaches (Colombia, IOPT). For example, a key finding of the IOPT MTR was that CA's governance programme in IOPT, Rights for All, had not invested in gender work. As a result of the review and recommendations made, the IOPT team and partners are now working with CAI's gender advisor to undertake a more in-depth review of gender, building on experience to date from partner work, to explore different options and approaches for the next strategy.

Contribution to Partner Visibility and Influencing Opportunities at International Level

The key approach of CA to achieve change through this programme is to carry out international advocacy, something that many of CA's partners recognise as its most important contribution other than funding.⁶⁴ With the appointment of a Governance Advisor role in Christian Aid Ireland there have been greater opportunities to make the links between advocacy issues that emerge from the CA countries and facilitate dialogue with government decision makers in Ireland including Irish Parliamentarians, the Department of Foreign Affairs NGO Standing Committee on Human Rights, the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs and Irish representatives on the UN Human Rights Council, a number of whom have taken partner concerns forward into European and UN level processes. Feedback from partners who have engaged with CAI's on policy and advocacy work is positive. A number of informants spoke of their appreciation of the team in Ireland for support in this area. IOPT, Colombia, Angola, Central America and Sierra Leone have particularly benefited from CAI's support in ensuring that human rights issues and partner concerns reach the relevant decision makers in Ireland and the EU level. In Colombia, for example, international actors have influenced the national government on issues of protection. By raising awareness at this level, CA has prevented attacks against the lives of human rights defenders.⁶⁵

A cross party parliamentarian visit arranged by CAI to IOPT in 2013 resulted in priority issues being raised in national and regional media and a number of the parliamentarians subsequently have spoken out in response to human rights abuses for example the massacre and incursion in Gaza and in favour of an EU ban on the import of produce from illegal settlements.⁶⁶ Between 2012 and 2014, the EU has introduced a number of measures focused on the issue of illegal settlements in OPT.⁶⁷ While this fell short of introducing a ban on settlement produce, a contentious issue, this represented a significant success for Irish NGOs lobbying on the issue, including CAI.

⁶² From MTR

⁶³ Sierra Leone, Central America, Zimbabwe, Angola and IOPT.

⁶⁴ IOPT final evaluation report.

⁶⁵ Christian Aid's Engagement Model on Southern Advocacy, Catherine Bouley, 2015

⁶⁶ Source: Annual report and MTR

⁶⁷ Unfortunately the EU has not yet issued guidelines on labelling settlement imports. It has provided advice to its citizens about risks of economic involvement in the settlements.

In 2014, Christian Aid Ireland addressed the Oireachtas Foreign Affairs Committee on the worsening humanitarian situation in Angola and the impact of tax incentives grants to multinationals on the Sierra Leonean government's efforts to generate resources. And a visit from El Salvadorian partner FESPAD, facilitated by CAI, meant that the organisation was able to brief relevant staff within the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade and the Human Rights Unit, to inform Ireland's position on the Human Rights Council and in advance of their government appearing at the Council as part of the Universal Periodic Review process.

Building a Credible Profile Amongst Decision Makers

The context for engaging with decision makers in Ireland is in some respects unique. There is an open door policy generally and more opportunities to engage with decision makers in policy dialogue compared to other political contexts. Recent research from Dochas suggests that although the policy space is conducive for INGOs to engage in policy and advocacy work, this is not given priority in most agencies, with only 5 dedicated policy posts in the whole development NGO sector. A number of informants commended CAI for investing in this area relative to its size and for setting a high bar for how to engage constructively and effectively in policy making processes in Ireland. This reputation opens up doors for CAI to highlight partner concerns and issues and facilitate dialogue opportunities with international actors. A number of decision makers interviewed for the review remarked on the quality of CAI's analysis and research and the contribution CAI make in policy dialogue forums in Ireland. As one government informant in Ireland noted: *"they (CAI) are focused and serious, when they say something I listen, other bigger better resourced organisations also have things to say but I wouldn't necessarily listen to the detail."*⁶⁸

However a key challenge for the team in Ireland is in meeting the demands and expectations of both partners and CA global advocacy priorities. There is only one staff member dedicated to policy and advocacy work based in Dublin, though part of the governance advisor's role also involves policy and advocacy. At times the team is stretched to follow up on issues and/or make linkages. Much of this comes down also to the advocacy capacity of staff in country who ideally should be identifying linkages and opportunities for linking local/national partner issues at the international level. There is much greater policy capacity in the London office, but staff are not necessarily familiar with the Irish political context, and in any case the effectiveness of this work requires a nuanced understanding of the political context and building trust and relations with decision makers over the longer term.

Colombia EU Free Trade Agreement

In 2014, CAI supported partner advocacy in Colombia on the Trade Agreement between Government of Colombia and EU. CAI played a key role in helping to facilitate a cross party committee aimed at influencing the Irish Government's position on Free Trade negotiations at the EU level. The committee included TDs, and other civil society actors working to raise awareness and campaign on human rights abuses in Colombia.⁶⁹ Stakeholder feedback confirms that CAI's political analysis and communication on the issue was critical in helping to increase awareness of Irish TDs of the impact of the trade agreement particularly in terms of human rights and the impact on farmers. Although in the end the Irish government voted in support of the agreement a political contribution was noted at the EU level, which means there is on record a statement that human rights concerns were raised, and which potentially provides a means to highlight and hold to account those states that breach standards with regards to the protection of human rights.

http://opac.oireachtas.ie/AWData/Library3/Political_Contribution_Com2011569_134923.pdf

<http://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/trade-agreement-with-colombia-and-peru-tests-our-commitment-to-human-rights-1.2081648>

http://www.abcolombia.org.uk/downloads/3BE_Submission_to_the_Committee_for_Jobs_Enterprise_and_Innovation_May_2014.pdf

CAI's Added Value and Contribution to the Development Sector in Ireland

CAI has been very effective in its engagement with the development sector and civil society organisations in Ireland, particularly those that are working on similar issues or who share a similar ethos and approach to work on governance and human rights. Feedback from external stakeholders on Christian Aid's added value was very positive. CAI was described as an 'active civil society player', 'proactive', 'progressive', 'innovative', 'willing to profile difficult topics' and 'focused on the root causes of poverty'. Christian Aid was also described as 'punching above its weight' and achieving a great deal with relatively few staff. The added value has been in contributing to development debates and discourse and helping to complement the work of organisations that are advocating on the same issues.

CAI staff play an active role in a number of civil society organisations and networks, through participation and engagement in working groups and meetings. Participation in these forums are valued by CAI's peers. CAI is seen as bringing interesting insights and constructive perspectives to development debates and topics. Some feedback suggested that they would value more of CAI's presence in some forums, for example participating in current discussions and debates regarding development education and curriculum

⁶⁸ Ireland Field Notes September 2015

⁶⁹ Christian Aid Ireland, Grupo Raices, the Irish Congress of Trade Unions Global Solidarity Committee, Justice for Colombia Ireland, The Latin American Solidarity Centre and Trócaire

development but informants are also aware of constraints on staff time and that more proactive engagement is not always possible.

CAI also contributes to the development sector through their role on various boards. The Campaign and Development Education manager is on the Board of the Centre for Global Education and CAI's CEO is the Chair of the International Gender Based Violence Consortium and was a member of the Dochas's board. Taking on a governance role demonstrates CAI's commitment to supporting and strengthening the civil society sector in Ireland and through this role they are able to bring insights as well as draw on learning from a broad range of organisations working on similar issues. For example, facilitating partner participation in the meetings of the GBV consortium is supporting the sectors' understanding of unequal gender relations as being as much a cause of poverty and marginalisation in Ireland as it is overseas.⁷⁰ Such relationships are also contributing to CAI's growing ability to communicate nuanced accounts of the links between gender, gender based violence and power to supporters and policy makers. A joint briefing to parliamentarians about GBV in the Congo by Christian Aid, Oxfam and Trocaire resulted in the Congo conflict being raised during parliamentary deliberations.⁷¹

With the appointment of the governance advisor, CAI has made a number of strategic links with academic institutions and other development agencies in Ireland to provide opportunities for peer learning for Christian Aid staff and partners and the broader development sector as well as influence academic debates and practice. Feedback from academics that CAI have engaged with spoke about the quality of CAI's political analysis and 'their thinking about the problems and how to tackle these in different contexts' and the quality of their partners and how the engagement has complemented and added value to their work' and other development actors who have engaged in conferences and events organised by CAI in collaboration with others also appreciate CAI's active role in introducing new ideas on a range of topics to influence the development discourse.

CAI's engagement and influence in policy forums and political processes, and through Dochas brings CAI into contact with the majority of the bigger Irish INGOs including Concern and Goal, but participation of these INGOs in the discussions and conferences organised by CAI in collaboration with Trocaire and academic institutions is limited. A decision to focus on organisations that are working on similar issues and countries as CAI is a sensible strategy given staff numbers and existing priorities, but CAI may want to consider developing an engagement strategy in future to ensure that strategic partnerships established are nurtured and areas of synergy and possible joint work on advocacy, campaigns and development education explored.

Shifting the discourse and position of Irish government on tax policy

Funding from Irish Aid and other sources has enabled Christian Aid Ireland to make an increasingly important contribution to domestic and international debates, as well as CA's global campaign and advocacy objectives, particularly in the area of Tax Justice. External informants (decision makers, civil society actors) in Ireland spoke highly about the quality of CAI's advocacy and policy work and political intelligence and research. Christian Aid's work on tax justice in particular is seen as highly relevant. Christian Aid Ireland has made a major contribution to shifting the discourse on tax from a domestic issue to tax as a development issue and the human rights impact of tax policy and a number of informants spoke of Christian Aid as being at the forefront in Ireland for tackling this issue and how effective the organisation has been in making the links between austerity in Ireland and issues of poverty and injustice more globally:

Their tax campaign and work on social justice is breaking the mould. They had a tax conference earlier this year which is one of the best I've ever attended in terms looking at the issues and in bringing new actors including the private sector and Dept of Finance- to bring them into conversation is unique. (Civil Society Peer)

They are the ones that have the most focus on Tax Justice and this is an area I'm interested in and I'm very supportive of their work in this area (Govt Informant).

Through lobbying work, building relations with government officials, in particular the Ministry of Finance and savvy media and quality research Christian Aid Ireland has significantly influenced the Irish Government to consider coherence between aid and other finance related policy. A commitment to policy coherence is evident in the "Spillover analysis" of Irish Aid tax policy to determine if there are any negative consequences for developing countries. The spillover analysis is something that CAI lobbied the government to carry out and The Department has publically acknowledged the role Christian Aid Ireland played in influencing their decision to conduct the analysis. CA internationally is now considering using this approach with other countries in support of its tax justice campaign work.

Public Awareness and Supporter Engagement with the Programmes

CAI's has been very effective in getting coverage in high profile media, print and broadcast/tv for a range of issues including climate change, tax justice, Colombia/Angola human rights abuses, gender based violence etc. This is due in part to the relationships built with key media actors by the governance, policy and advocacy advisors and CEO and hiring in additional communications support for specific occasions. For

⁷⁰ IAPF MTR 2014

⁷¹ ibid

example, in 2014, CAI managed to attract a great deal of media (press, TV and radio) attention during a partner workshop at the Transitional Justice Institute in Northern Ireland, through hiring in an external communications support. This additional capacity ensured that a number of CA partners had the opportunity to speak about their issues and concerns to a broader public. CAI's Head of Advocacy and Policy and the governance advisor have also contributed to profiling partner issues and advocacy concerns through writing articles and pieces for a range of media including the Irish Times and other more mainstream media. Tackling Violence and Building Peace was also the theme Christian Aid week in Ireland in 2014 and resources produced reflected the experience of CA's partners working in conflict regions including Colombia.

CAI's campaign work in Northern Ireland during the IF campaign was also very effective in raising the issue of tax and its links to hunger and the campaign was judged to have been successful in influencing political and media understandings of the links between hunger and tax justice as well as achieving related policy outcomes and there are indications from feedback that tax as an issue has certainly gained more prominence in the media in Ireland due to CAI work in this area. One respondent who works in schools and does voluntary outreach work through the church spoke about how she has been trying to raise awareness about tax issues with the people she engages with:

They are not producing so many teaching resources but really rock solid campaigning materials that can be used in Dev Ed to great effect... when I talk about Tax Justice issues - it sends people away thinking oh my god what money am I living off - my pension, how is the money in my bank account money being used, and in that way they are beginning to think about their own role which is where I think Dev Ed needs to be so then we can look at poverty and see that there are multiple causes and that throwing aid money at the problem is not the only solution. [Teacher Rol]

CAI's CEO and gender advisor have also contributed to raising the profile of CA's work on gender based violence and women's rights amongst CAI supporters and broader public through its media work and engagement with Church leaders. The gender training and awareness raising with Church Leaders has begun as a part of a longer term strategy and commitment of Christian Aid Ireland to addressing gender based violence and building awareness of the issue in Ireland and amongst its supporters. There is great potential to scale up this work in Ireland and make gender a key strategic objective in the next programme proposal.

The inclusion of development education in the Irish Aid fund was new to this round of grant funding. Overall trends show that funding for Development Education has dropped significantly in the last 5 years and although the amount allocated to Development Education represents 1% of total expenditure it has nevertheless supported CAI to add extra capacity to its existing development education work with the appointment of a part time advisor in the Dublin office.

CAI has a good reputation and history of development education work in Northern Ireland amongst teachers and education institutions but had until recently done relatively very little in the Republic of Ireland, mainly due to two differing contexts with regards to education curricula. With the recruitment of a part time post based in Dublin some in-roads have been made in the Republic of Ireland to engage with schools and education institutions and produce materials that are more relevant to the curriculum in Ireland. Data from CAI on school outreach and contacts show that approximately 1000 schools now receive information on CAI work and resources, although the main face to face contact with schools still tends to be those that have supported and worked with CAI longer term.

Feedback on CAI education materials from education informants was generally positive, particularly materials for secondary schools which have supported teachers to introduce complex topics including climate change and fair trade. The trading game, in particular, was mentioned by a number of teachers as helping to raise awareness about the root causes of poverty and injustice. Generally the secondary school materials seem to be most relevant and a number of education establishments mentioned the quality of CA resources and one education informant said she uses CA's research to develop teaching materials for university students: *The research is very solid ... I use them all the time not so much for my work with primary school teachers but with my extra curricular work in universities. I think that is where CAI has excelled.* (Education respondent Rol).

In the Republic of Ireland teachers felt there was more potential to use CAI materials for transition year students where schools are less constrained by curriculum requirements and have more time to engage on broader topics. One curricula specialist questioned the inclusion of a fundraising element in more recent materials produced for primary schools, but also noted that most Irish INGOs use development education to fundraise and that the added value of CAI materials in general was that the focus was on addressing the root causes of poverty, not for fundraising purposes. Interestingly most of the teachers interviewed wanted to also fundraise as they believed this 'act of giving' often involved parent engagement. When questioned about other actions that could be taken, most teachers felt that they didn't have time or the capacity to be more engaged in campaign type work and that the primary purpose of development education was to raise awareness primarily and that hopefully children and students may be inspired to take action and raise issues amongst their peers and at home.

More recently the development education advisor in the Republic of Ireland has focused on setting up a local lobbyist group from supporters and through outreach activities. There are currently 20 active local lobbyists in Northern Ireland who take up issues with their local MPs. The use of local lobbyists in the UK plays a vital role in the success of popular campaigns and certainly during the IF campaign they played an active role in Ireland. However it's not clear how effective this approach is in the Ireland context as there is very little contact or monitoring of this work and it wasn't possible to meet with local lobbyists as part of this review to get feedback on their work.

In the Republic of Ireland the organisation is relatively unknown beyond a more informed audience of peers and political decision makers. Feedback from some education stakeholders in the Republic of Ireland suggest that there are opportunities for CAI to broaden out its development education programme to engage more with education institutions to influence curriculum development, or to partner with organisations who work on similar issues to develop development education materials based on partner/CA experience.

Other informants also recommended that CAI engage more with other groups such as union members and political party members through their public education programmes as many of the issues that CAI are focusing on resonate with these audiences. CAI staff also engage with universities giving talks on CA's work. A challenge however is time resource and funding for this type of development education approach. Donor funding for development education has been cut across the board and Irish Aid's definition of development education is narrowly focused on school education not necessarily public engagement.

CAI's other main contact with the general public is through their outreach work with the Church constituencies. This is mainly in the Northern Ireland context, where CAI receives both funding from a number of church bodies and has built good relations through active engagement with church supporters through talks and in engaging supporters in campaign activities. A number of church leaders have visited CA countries, including Guatemala and IOPT, and have carried messages back to their constituencies. However engaging Church leaders in more challenging and critical stories about the structural causes of poverty and getting church fundraisers to consider funding less tangible projects including governance and peace building work has been more challenging.

2.4 Effectiveness of approaches, structures and systems

3.4.1 Programme strategy and theory of change

The design of the programme built on the expertise and experience of existing country programme and partner governance and human rights priorities. Implicit in the programme design and approach is that governance and human rights type of work takes time, and that change is not predictable and likely to be incremental; where gains are built on previous successes and a longer-term engagement. The evaluation finds that this is the healthiest way to go about planning and working in complex and volatile contexts. It has allowed for flexibility and supported CA's very competent and experienced partners to carry out important work. Aligning the IAPF to country programme governance objectives has also increased the potential of achieving objectives and impacts.

The intention in the choice of countries was to provide opportunities for cross learning on specific themes across the IAPF countries and to a certain extent this has been an effective strategy and enabled CAI to codify elements of its approach to peace-building, governance and human rights. As a result CAI is now in a better position to develop a more coherent programme identity and framework for its work in the future. However it seems there has been less linking across countries or within regions.⁷² A peer to peer exchange did take place between CA staff in Zimbabwe and Sierra Leone, which was valued and through peer accompaniment during the evaluation, however the reviewer in Central America and Colombia noted that opportunities for Colombia to learn from the valuable experience of partners working in post conflict environments in Guatemala and El Salvador were not explored earlier on in the programme cycle.

The programme theory of change developed during the proposal phase of the programme is still valid, but didn't evolve over the course of the programme and not all countries developed a country level theory of change even though training and support in this area was provided to a number of countries through M&E training and power analysis⁷³. The value of a theory of change is its use as a tool for on-going learning and questioning of assumptions, approaches and exploring how change happens. And certainly there is evidence in IOPT and Colombia that ToC is used by staff in this way. Less clear are whether partners who have been trained by CAI in theory of change are using this approach more systematically as part of their on-going learning and strategising or see any value in the tool, compared to other methods. Also absent in the framework is the role of CA and its partners.

⁷² Colombia also hosted a global event on protection attended by staff from 4 countries (IOPT, Angola, Zimbabwe and Colombia) and facilitated by CAI

⁷³ IOPT and Colombia were in a much stronger position in this respect as they already had developed country level theories of change, and revisit these periodically as part of on-going programme practice. See also table 3.

The consultants identified gaps in the current ToC including gender and women's rights, the role of different civil society actors including trade unions, judiciary, and academics although they have played a role in the work in a number of countries. Neither has it theorised the role of other actors, drivers of change such as the private sector, local and large scale or parliamentarians or civil servants. ,

There are many examples of use of media across the programme and specifically the power of media in supporting engagement with both citizens and influencing government and other power holders in Central America and in Angola. However, the role of the media and differentiating between different types of media and the role they play in each country is not sufficiently unpacked or theorised in the programme's power analysis or theory of change. There are also potential missed opportunities to learn lessons across the programme about how programmes have used different communication mechanisms, such as participatory video as a potential tool for advocacy and community mobilisation.

It would have been helpful at the start of the programme to have developed a short narrative document unpacking the programme theory of change in more depth, setting out not only broad assumptions about how change happens but CA's broad approach to governance, peace-building working in conflict, building on learning from the previous MAPSII programme and other governance programmes supported by CA. Although some elements of this are in the current draft CAI's Strategy on governance, peace-building and human rights the document 2013-16 it didn't necessarily get buy in from country programmes as it came one year into the programme cycle when work and plans were already established.

3.4.2 Partnerships

The effectiveness and quality of the programme derives from the strength, commitment, experience and quality of the partners that CA has chosen to support and work alongside. Most partners are highly respected and have long track records, good relationships and access to decision makers. CA's relationship with its partners is positive and there is mutual respect on both sides. The overall sense is that CA provides strong support with minimal interference. Partners are also appreciative of the flexibility that has been built into the design and approach of the programme, which has supported them to respond to the needs of communities and to changes in the context. There is also appreciation for CA's role as a 'critical friend'. How this role plays out varies across the programme and can include elements of political accompaniment, capacity building and mentoring. CA are also learning a great deal from their partners, many of whom have more experience on the issues that CA has chosen to focus on.

Although CA has chosen to work and partner with highly experienced organisations the review did identify some capacity gaps that could be strengthened. For example a great amount of investment has gone into strengthening partner and CA staff understanding of power and power relations. Power analysis and the misuse of power within and among countries and within and among groups and individuals is central to CA's understanding of poverty and how it chooses to address and tackle the root causes of poverty.⁷⁴ The IAPF MTR noted that 'country programmes and partners are increasingly using explicit or implicit power analysis for positioning themselves, identifying allies and foes as well as spaces for change in formal and informal power structures'. Whilst we found evidence of this across the programme, the picture is not consistent. Whilst CA are very respectful of building the programme around its partners' priorities the review noted that some partners are not addressing broader questions about change and how to influence systematic change, or understanding other drivers of change and the implications for strategy.⁷⁵ This in some instances is hampering the effectiveness and potential of coalition and collaborative work that CA is supporting.⁷⁶

Similarly not all CA staff necessarily have the skills or time to be able to support partners to address these broader questions and to critically examine existing strategies and approaches more systematically when situations shift or change. For example in Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe the reviewers noted a number of examples where partners would have benefited from CA playing a more strategic role in facilitating/brokering partner linkages at different levels and strengthening partner political economy analysis to ensure that partners are able to adapt and develop strategies to the changing context.

Likewise on gender, although a key priority for CA and some IAPF partners the picture across the programme is mixed. There are certainly indications that many of the programmes have actively supported the participation of women in decision making processes and positions in the political sphere, the approaches to gender equality in some partners are still closer to "women in development" than to "gender and development" and the quality of women's participation, and which women are participating is not coming through strongly in reports. Gender analysis seems to be stronger when considering more traditional issues such as health, education and basic services but less evident in partner (and CA) research and advocacy on tax justice, mining and extractives or indeed exploring the role of both men and women during conflict unpacked sufficiently. CA programmes are supporting a number of women's rights partners, but learning from these organisations and the work that they do is not necessarily influencing other IAPF partners.

⁷⁴ CAI's strategy on governance, peace building and human rights 2013-2016

⁷⁵ This was noted in Sierra Leone, Zimbabwe.

⁷⁶ *ibid*

The scope of the evaluation did not allow a more in-depth look at the governance and representativeness of the partner organisations, networks and coalitions supported. There are however indications that a number of partners are reviewing their internal gender policies and work practices. For example the 2014 annual report noted that following gender self-assessments by partners in Central America, some reflected on internal policies to promote equal salaries for women and men performing the same responsibilities; commitments to promote gender power relations were included in new partnership agreements in Sierra Leone; the Colombian tax justice network (coordinated by partner Cedetrabajo) strengthened itself internally with more equal representation of men and women. Whilst the gender audits, and the appointment of gender focal persons in CA countries⁷⁷ are supporting CA to look at these issues more systematically, the links between gender strategies and CA partnership policies approaches is a work in progress. Appointing gender focal people in country programmes is a good first step but to be effective it requires a commitment from all staff and particularly leadership. CA needs to examine its own internal practices and systems, including HR policies and performance systems to ensure that issues of gender and inclusion are also considered in recruitment, promotion and the performance criteria of management at all levels.

Other capacity gaps noted, include M&E (Sierra Leone, Angola, Central America), organisational governance, human resource systems and fundraising (Angola). Systematic value for money analysis as a tool to support strategic discussions on effectiveness and efficiency is another key gap of both partners and some CA staff. Consultants also questioned whether some of CA's partners are more dependent on CA/IAPF funding and support than others and whether more needs to be done to assess partner capacity needs and develop some basic standards/progress markers to support CA staff to measure progress in this area more systematically.

Given challenges highlighted, the consultants also questioned whether in some countries programme is spread too thinly given staff numbers, capacity and resources available. For example in Sierra Leone, the programme works in eight districts, similarly partners in El Salvador although supporting fewer partners the location of partner projects are spread across the country. In both cases this made on-going monitoring of the work of partners and playing a more strategic role in supporting learning and linkages more challenging. CAI could have perhaps paid a more proactive role in the proposal phase to support countries to consider the pros and cons of difference modes of implementation, building on lessons from the MAPS II evaluation and other governance programmes and taking into consideration resources available and the capacity of staff and partners.

3.4.3 Effectiveness of advocacy and influencing approaches

Advocacy is the main mechanism that partners and CA have used to engage with and influence power holders at different levels and there are many examples highlighted in the previous sections and in country reports where effective advocacy, using a range of approaches, has made a significant difference in terms of influencing and changing legislation, shifting agendas, behaviours and power relations. In many instances partners will be using a range of different strategies and approaches to transform conditions that have given rise to discrimination and oppression.

Working in Coalitions and at Different Levels

Most partners are engaged in different civil society platforms, consortiums, networks and alliances in the country and internationally. Working in coalitions and networks is particularly relevant in more repressive contexts, where civil society can be targeted and building a critical mass of support can provide protection and help manage risks.

The review came across many interesting examples where collaboration, peer to peer support and political accompaniment of citizen groups and more nascent civil society organisations at local level with more established coalition actors and alliances at national level around common goals and ideals are supporting citizens to access expertise and gain confidence and skills to engage at different levels in political and decision making spaces than they would if working on their own. For example:

- In Sierra Leone partners NMJD and PICOT have community facilitators living in the community providing mentoring to local leaders (men and women) and community groups on monitoring healthcare services, women's rights issues, and organisational development of community groups. This has enabled women to play a more active role as support and engagement can be tailored around women's needs and availability. Elements of the work link to regional and national level.
- Partners Comisión Intereclesial Justicia y Paz (CIJyP) with the support of PBI in Colombia working on land dispossession and advocating for humanitarian zones, have introduced peer to peer learning processes which has involved groups who have successfully become organised to claim their rights to share their experiences with victims of the conflict and provide advice on how to get organised. Once organised they then work in coalition with national level partners to push for their right to a safe haven, which provides at least protection and potential for some stability and access to basic services whilst continuing to advocate for justice and improvements in their conditions.

⁷⁷ Not in IOPT

- In Guatemala, rural indigenous women engaged in social audits of municipal budgets are exchanging experiences with farmers groups in other Departments of the Country. The programme partner's is associated to a federation of cooperatives with presence in 11 Departments in the Country. While the Programme has been supporting social audit and budget monitoring in only one Department the potential of impact is increasing as the communities take the initiative to share their initiatives with peer farmers associations.

Whilst these, and many similar examples, point to important incremental steps in building the confidence and leadership of local activists and groups, there is still a need to have a better understanding of group dynamics to ensure that accountability dialogue approaches at local level aren't inadvertently excluding some individuals. Whilst it is not expected that all women and men wish to play an active role or take up leadership positions it is important that different perspectives and needs are taken into account when designing these processes and that other factors that limit and/or support participation are considered including class, marital status, age, disability etc. It's not always clear from CA partner reports how inclusive the programmes are and whether or not there are unforeseen negative impacts for those individuals previously excluded from decision making processes. Equally important are the skills and understanding that local level facilitators bring when engaging with local communities.

Political Accompaniment and Peer Support

Political accompaniment is another effective strategy in supporting the work at different levels, particularly in Colombia and Central America, where this practice is common in human rights defence work and where CA and CA partners have used this approach strategically. Local level partners in these countries value the solidarity links established with more established partner organisations and networks at national and international level, as it gives them added legitimacy to challenge government and other power holders and protection when lives are threatened, through the bridging and observer and reporting role that CA and national and international partners are able to play in documenting and highlighting abuses. For example in Colombia, political accompaniment at both local and international level has contributed to ensuring legal and physical protection and community resilience of forcefully displaced populations during the process of negotiating with the government for the return of their land, through mobilising the media and decision makers nationally and internationally. This type of support also helps boost partners' profile and impact.

A Multi Pronged Approach

The consultants in Sierra Leone, Zimbabwe, Central America and Colombia noted that approaches to advocacy at the local level are likely to be more sustainable when capacity building in political processes, dialogue and budget literacy is combined with promoting livelihoods and income generation activities and addressing the supply of basic service delivery. However, not all CA programmes are making the linkages.⁷⁸ In Zimbabwe the consultant noted the limited linkage between CA's governance programme and livelihood programmes, and considered this a missed opportunity to develop a collective agenda in support of rights and livelihoods.

The role of Evidence and Research

Evidence and good quality analysis and research is another notable feature of the programme and there are many examples where evidence has been used strategically and effectively to influence and lobby decision makers at different levels. At national and international level CA and its partners are noted for understanding what is going on the ground and for producing sound policy arguments, advice and positions based on reliable and credible research and evidence. Partners and local organisations are also active in data collection and monitoring of government plans at local level and there are many examples of data collected and analysed being used to press government to explain expenditure and to increase government expenditure. The review did not look in depth at the different models of research and evidence gathering. The consultant in Sierra Leone did note however that until recently, most partner research was conducted with international consultants and that perhaps more should be done to partner with local academics, universities, researchers and/or regional think tanks in future to help build local research capacity. A review of the range of research and evidence based work undertaken by partners and lessons learned about the pros and cons with respect to influencing change is possibly an area that the CAI may want to consider looking into more systematically in future.

Use of Litigation

The use of litigation aimed at empowering victims of human rights abuses and contributing to justice and the rule of law and protecting existing standards while advancing the progressive legislation has been an important strategy for partners working in IOPT and Colombia, particularly when combined as part of a broader mobilisation process. Creating new legal precedents even if not successful puts issues into the spotlight, draws in other allies and supporters and when successful can potentially make a positive difference to 1000s of citizens. In Colombia, for example, a significant achievement was getting the Constitutional Court to uphold the right of forcefully displaced communities to land in cases where it has been claimed by national or multi-national companies. Although this has not yet led to full land restitution, the legal precedent has been set and stands to influence future rulings of a similar nature, and communities have gained hope that cases against big companies can actually be won. In El Salvador, the partner

⁷⁸ ibid

FESPAD, successfully brought the Legislative Assembly to issue a Decree allowing 1000 poor families of Finca Breña, Municipality of San Martín, to legalize the property of the land they have been living in for years. For example, the IOPT evaluation also cites many examples where litigation has been a successful approach in supporting the rights of Palestinian citizens in Israel (though not in OPT). For example thousands of Bedouin Palestinians, threatened with eviction, managed to hang on to their homes and land due to CA partners ACRI and Adalah making significant contributions towards freezing an Israel government plan which would have displaced between 40,000-70,000 Arab Bedouin in the Negav.

Constructive Engagement with Government and Power Holders

In a number of countries (Sierra Leone, Central America, Zimbabwe) partners are aware of the need to get the balance right between the demand side (e.g. raising awareness on people's rights, mobilising groups to demand better access to services) and the supply side (e.g. national government ability to pass legislation, local government capacity to deliver). Those partners working with and supporting community groups in budget monitoring and local level governance processes understand the risk of raising expectations on the demand side which cannot be met on the supply side due to insufficient financial resources, mismanagement of public funds and/or lack of commitment. And in general all programmes recognise a need for constructive engagement with government and other political leaders and power holders.

Partners in Guatemala, El Salvador and Sierra Leone have used high quality research and analysis to bolster civil society participation in and influence over budget processes and transparency initiatives. In both instances they were able to use technical knowledge to engage the government constructively and help it meet donor expectations. In Guatemala this has influenced agriculture sector budgets and in Sierra Leone, where the engagement began around extractive industries, the government has agreed in some cases to review mining compensation packages.

The consultants also noted that CA partners have been very effective in carefully managing agendas especially when working with government and/or the private sector and other power holders. Forming tactical alliances and engaging with government and other power holders in constructive dialogue requires a level of sophistication to ensure that positions are not compromised or co-opted.

3.4.4 Management, structures and systems

The evaluation has been impressed with the commitment and quality of programme staff at all levels and the good relationships that have been built with partners and different stakeholders, which has facilitated the work. Management between CAI and country programmes and Christian Aid Ireland and London are good and overall reports and accountability requirements met on time.

CAI and Irish Aid

Feedback on CAI's grant arrangement with Irish Aid is generally positive. CAI score highly in feedback on the quality of their reports on programme results and their engagement with the Irish Public to increase awareness and understanding of development and global human rights issues (80%) and reports were approved with few substantive concerns. Although Irish Aid are generally satisfied with results CAI report, they have raised concerns at the lack of an overall programme strategy and the quality of CAI's results framework, which in their view is not helping them to understand how shorter term results are contributing to the outcomes at the higher level or to understand trends over time.⁷⁹ Irish Aid has also found it difficult to discern Christian Aid Ireland's added value to the programme as distinct to Christian Aid international. This poses challenges for the team in Ireland, as partners do not necessarily differentiate between Christian Aid and Christian Aid Ireland and the ethos of the organisation is one of collaboration and working in partnership rather than branding elements of its work and support.

Constant staff changes in Irish Aid's civil society unit has also made it more challenging to build a relationship with programme advisors over time to communicate CAI's overall approach and added value. The CAI team in Ireland have made a number of revisions to the results framework and reporting over the course of the programme. They are also in much better position to develop a more coherent programme strategy and work on this was progressing during the latter part of this evaluation, building on the learning from the programme over the past four years and the findings of this review.

Christian Aid Ireland Governance, Systems and Management

Christian Aid Ireland's Board has good strategic oversight of the programme and the Board annual planning session has been designed to improve their understanding of the IAPF programme. Feedback from CAI's Board Chair suggests that the Board are now much more involved in strategic discussions regarding programme. Updates from IAPF countries are a standing agenda item of board meetings and programme are shared, strategic issues discussed and risks routinely reviewed by the Board and Audit Committee. The Chair of CAI's board and one other board member also sit on CA's global board, and there are two members of Christian Aid's Global board on the Ireland board. This is helping to build synergy between the CAI and London and support discussions regarding the future of CA's structure and governance.

⁷⁹ Irish Aid feedback on 2014 report and interview with civil society unit Sept 18

CA staff based in London and country programmes have talked about the professionalism and commitment of the staff in Ireland. Partners and staff have particularly appreciated support from the finance team to align finance and management information systems to meet Irish Aid's accountability requirements. Over the period of the grant the finance team has either supported or conducted finance training in Sierra Leone, Angola and with Central America finance officers, and provide on-going distance support on donor compliance and finance systems. There is evidence that there is much better understanding and use of performance management and improved budgeting practices in all six field programme offices as a result.⁸⁰

There is a great deal of interaction between CA Global and CAI. The Finance team work closely with the performance and finance colleagues in London in the development of Christian Aid's programme cycle management systems and finance systems. Members of the PDU sit on various CA international working groups and during 2015 CAI's CEO spent part of the week in London to support CA London to develop its communication strategy. Whilst overall good relations have been established, there is recognition that more work is required to establish clearer lines of accountability and joint working practices and programme coherence.

The role of PDU

The Irish Aid fund has supported CAI to increase its capacity in the PDU team in Ireland and there are now four women and one man who work in the team, four full time⁸¹ and one part time (4 days a week) working mainly from home.⁸² Systems are in place to manage and coordinate the work and regular telephone reviews and discussions with country teams ensure the team has good oversight of the programme implementation and progress and that opportunities to further strengthen the quality of the programme identified. On-going discussions between country staff, PDU and Finance staff and during annual reporting and planning and technical field visits are also reported to be constructive and are said to inform planning decisions in the international department and country regarding partner plans and identify potential risks and issues.

Between 2012-2015 the team made 19 support visits to countries. Although the target for support visits in the results framework was 36, technical support to country programmes is based on country demand which has tended to focus on areas where CAI can add value for example conducting power analysis, gender audits and in supporting results based management approaches and participatory MEL and in meeting Irish Aid accountability requirements. Field visits usually combine training with some grant management oversight (see Table 2 section 4.3).

Generally speaking support provided by the team has been well received but the team are not always clear what other support CA technical staff in London provide to IAPF countries, which makes it challenging at times to coordinate their work to ensure efforts are not duplicated. Feedback from staff in some countries talked about the challenge of meeting requests from staff in London and Ireland, who often ask for the same information. There is lack of clarity on how recommendations or advice given by the team in Ireland are taken on board by country management. As one advisor noted, *"if they don't like what we say they will often ignore us"*.

The management arrangements for the programme within Christian Aid are complex. Christian Aid Ireland is an independent entity with its own Board and also part of the Christian Aid Family. While CAI is ultimately accountable to Irish Aid for the IAPF programme, the International Department with staff based in London, regions and at country level has overall responsibility for programme management and delivery. Whilst the MOU between CAI and CA London clarifies the relationship between the two organisations, and dotted line accountability arrangements between field staff funded by the IAPF and the International Department are in place, the effectiveness of this way of working is reliant on building good relations and in establishing trust and mutual accountability. At times these arrangements can seem more ad hoc limiting the potential benefits that the CAI has to offer country programmes and partners and limiting efficiency.

Country Level Management

Partnership management arrangements at country level are generally working well. The IAPF funds a number of dedicated field staff (see diagram) to manage the programme and support the work of the partners. This has generally worked well, although it has been more challenging when staff have left mid way through the programme cycle, which has been the case in Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe, as it takes time for new staff to get up to speed with the reporting and accountability requirements. In Sierra Leone it was particularly challenging when the Ebola crisis hit in 2014 as most programme managers were understandably focused on managing the crisis. This resulted in less monitoring visits and contact with partner work, particularly in the regions, which in the view of the country consultant did have an impact on programme effectiveness as opportunities were missed to resolve issues and support more collaborative work.

⁸⁰ See CAI Ireland performance against outcome indicators and targets.

⁸¹ Programme Manager, Governance Advisor, Gender Advisor

⁸² MEL advisor

Most partners are well established and have systems in place to manage grants and donor requirements and are already familiar with CA reporting and financial systems. Although aligning partner and country systems to meet Irish Aid's requirements has been more challenging, most countries and partners have been able to meet reporting deadlines.

Christian Aid and its partners have measures to mitigate risk and the IAPF programme has supported a number of programmes to broaden their analysis of risk to ensure risks associated with governance and human rights work, including staff and partner security and protection are taken into consideration, particularly in countries where partner staff have faced death threats for speaking out. The workshop on protection facilitated by CAI with IOPT, Zimbabwe, Angola and Colombia to enhance the programmes work on protection resulted in OPT, Zimbabwe and Angola reviewing and amending their protection policies as a result and introducing new tools to assess risk and to enhance data protection and individual security.

CA Programme Grant application sets out commitments to ensure that all country programmes have received HAP training and have agreements with CA include these principles. The 2014 annual report makes reference to progress in HAP in the country level reviews. HAP training was provided for staff and partners in Central America and the establishment of complaints mechanism was reported for several countries.

3.3.5 Monitoring and evaluation

Christian Aid Ireland's monitoring and evaluation system and country level systems are aligned to Christian Aid's overall performance framework and management information system PROMISE. The purpose of the Christian Aid system is to support different parts of the organisation to review performance and achievements, generate evidence to inform management decisions, assess value for money and account to CA's stakeholders⁸³ at different levels. Partners also have their own M&E systems. Across the programme there is evidence that CA and its partners are drawing lessons from routine monitoring and review processes to inform decisions and inform on-going plans, although there are some gaps across all the programmes noted in the following areas:

- Monitoring the capacities of partner and CBOs (organisational systems and governance, skills)
- Systematic monitoring of gender differentiated impacts and participation of women, men, youth etc.
- Value for Money assessment

Power and context analysis are key features of CAI's approach to programme design and M&E. Although there is evidence that many partners already have some formal or informal processes to reassess the political context of their work to ensure that risks are managed and opportunities identified, the IAPF programme has supported a number of partners to be more systematic in their approach to context and power analysis. The mid term review, with its focus on power relations, was a useful exercise for a number of programmes in terms of supporting staff and in some cases partners to take stock of the work and engage in a more reflective and critical discussions on strategy, power and change. It helped to consolidate the training that staff and partners had received in gender and power analysis, theory of change and political economy analysis. There is evidence, at least in IOPT, Colombia and Central America that a number of recommendations and insights generated from the review have been taken on board and implemented by CA staff and partners. However, not all countries produced a management response after the mid term review making it more challenging to monitor follow up actions and assess whether and how the review process was effective in supporting adaptive programming and learning.

CAI's M&E advisor's support to partners to pilot participatory M&E methodologies for working in conflict and engaging with citizen stakeholders, such as the use of participatory indicators in some cases outcome mapping, has supported some partners to be more systematic in thinking through who and how different citizens, men, women, youth engage in the programme although there is still distance to go in this respect. Overall these approaches are not being adequately applied into existing M&E systems. Feedback from partners in Central America highlight the challenges that many partners still have in using data from participatory M&E processes to inform programme planning and strategic decisions.

In addition to existing M&E systems and learning processes, considerable time and investment has gone into aligning CA country and partner systems to meet the results based management approach, required by Irish Aid. Irish Aid requirements included results based frameworks with annual and end-of-programme targets, against which progress was to be assessed and reported, a greater emphasis on baselines and outcomes against objectives distinguished at three levels of change: micro (immediate and direct benefits to targeted groups), meso level (structures and institutions within a locality bringing systemic change on service delivery) and macro level changes (strengthening institutional arrangements – policies, legislation, institutions, programming at regional and/or national/international level in ways that sustain improvements).

⁸³ Christian Aid Ireland's M&E Plan 2013 v2

Much of the M&E capacity work at country level and with partners involved in the initial phase workshops with partners to explain Irish Aid's requirements and to identify relevant indicators, targets and develop baselines against country level objectives aligned to the programmes overall results framework and theory of change.

The emphasis on results and outcomes has supported a number of partners to think more critically about the outcomes of their actions and some partners have incorporated indicators into their organisation M&E systems (partner feedback in IOPT). CA staff in Ireland and London have also found data generated through the introduction of RBM has contributed to more rigour in reporting progress and outcomes and in some countries it has been a useful management information tool to respond to performance and capacity issues highlighted through this process. The reviewers also noted the high quality of the annual reports put together by the PDU for Irish Aid, which are rich in analysis of the context, lessons learned and which highlight key results and challenges across the whole programme.

A key challenge has however been the application and use of the results framework. Whilst CA and programme partners have welcomed the opportunity to re-examine their approaches to M&E and ensure their systems are able to demonstrate impact and strengthen accountability, the use of results based management for a governance and human rights focused programme has posed many difficulties. There is a big disconnect between the system introduced and country programme and partner M&E systems and other learning approaches introduced by CAI. Although country level results frameworks were developed in close collaboration with partners, and 'reflects partners' own commitments to results in their project plans and proposals'⁸⁴ our findings suggest that the partners see the framework as very much something that is a requirement of Christian Aid and Irish Aid and that performance will be judged on the basis of achieving annual targets and progress against indicators. This has led to an over proliferation of targets and indicators as partners have concerns that if their work is not reflected in the results matrix funding may decrease or cease if they are not seen to be achieving tangible results on an annual basis. This goes counter to CA's partnership ethos and is at odds with the longer term transformational change that partners are working towards.

The conception of the results frameworks was always to capture only outcome level information, but the implementation at country level in reality led to partners reporting on output information as they found it challenging to report at the outcome level without providing output level information to show progress towards outcomes. Likewise the emphasis on annual targets lend themselves to reporting on activities and what partners will produce and not necessarily supporting partners to capture the process of change or understand how change happens or the programme's contribution to change. The annual targets have been particularly problematic *'counting the number of legal interventions, meetings or publications is the least meaningful way of monitoring change in this context where change is not linear, it is slow and often out of the partner's control'* and most partners would not assess their performance against the annual targets.⁸⁵

The consultant for Colombia and Central America also noted that there appear to be a mismatch in the results frameworks she reviewed between indicators and objectives and that the basic premise of a logic framework, i.e. to chart a journey and set of assumptions of how outputs are expected to lead to both short, medium and longer term change and outcomes, gets lost in all the detail, which makes it difficult to use the frameworks as an evaluation tool to monitor and assess progress or draw out overall trends at the outcome level.

The unintended consequence of this is that almost all partners report a steady increase in their reporting workload, and the demands for reporting have been largely placed on partners, many of whom have to also report to other funders as well as contribute to CA's annual reporting. A number of partners feel these demands are disproportionate to the amounts of funds they receive. A number of partners in IOPT have had to increase their staff capacity, including taking on M&E staff in order to meet these additional demands.

CAI could have supported countries to produce something more streamlined and manageable building on existing CA and partner M&E systems and processes. For example the IOPT evaluator noted that CA's annual country programme reports include adequate quantitative coverage data and analysis, which is much more focused on learning and asking critical questions about whether or not programmes are making a difference, and it encourages reflection about the broader context and implications for strategy.

CAI's team in Ireland have also conducted a number of studies and collaborations with sector specialists and the NGO community on relevant approaches to monitoring and evaluating governance and human rights work. These are helping to inform both CAI's thinking on M&E for the programme as well as the discourse amongst like-minded INGOs based in Ireland, but have yet to gain traction in Irish Aid. The programme will however need to demonstrate the effectiveness of alternative models of M&E if they are to convince Irish Aid and donors to consider and support alternative models for evaluating its support to governance and human rights programmes through INGOs.

⁸⁴ Interview with CAI M&E advisor

⁸⁵ IOPT Evaluation 2015

4. Finance and Value for Money

Finance systems and management

The consultants did not carry out a detailed analysis of the financial data (See Methodology Section) nevertheless the evaluation was able to pull together some overall top line findings with regards to programme expenditure in Ireland and country programmes based on the data provided and discussions with country finance staff and programme managers.

Christian Aid Ireland has done a good job and invested a great deal of management time and support in ensuring country and partner financial systems and reporting are aligned to meet Irish Aid's accountability requirements. All IAPF countries have received support from the Finance team in Ireland and a range of other support including finance training of country finance staff in Ireland, distance support on preparing monthly accounts and financial reports and coaching on the adoption of new financial software, and for countries managed at a distance extended support in country by CA programme officers to partners to provide capacity support and accompaniment, and set up early warning systems to pick up issues in a timely and efficient manner.⁸⁶

Relationships between CAI's financial team in Ireland and between CA International and finance staff in country are working well and global systems, standards and policies are in place (SUN, PROMISE) which contribute to financial efficiency and accountability, although CA are still experiencing problems with its grant management system and budget coding which make it more challenging to assess the organisation's overall investment in its core strategic objectives.⁸⁷

From discussions with finance staff in Ireland and at country level it would appear that systems set up to manage and monitor the programme finances have worked reasonably well. This is evidenced by:

- Christian Aid Ireland's ability to report to Irish Aid on a timely basis, using the templates and cost centres required by Irish Aid.
- Active management of annual under- and overspends through a process of negotiation with country programmes.
- Monthly and quarterly review of expenditure to highlight any budget variances and identify any issues
- Budgets for the full four years were stated in 2012 and for each year thereafter programmes restate the budgets for the coming year. There is however 20% flexibility to move funds between programme objectives on a year basis, which supports adaptive work. CAI have also provided additional resources in response to emergencies and contextual changes (e.g. Ebola/Sierra Leone 2014-15, Gaza/IOPT 2012, 2014).
- Internal audits carried out of relevance to IAPF countries in the last 3 years include: Angola (x 2), Colombia, the Middle East, Central America region, Sierra Leone.
- Some countries, (including Ireland) have carried over certain unspent funds when there has been a valid reason for them not being spent in the year (systematic audit for partners receiving grants of over €50k).
- Financial training and capacity support to IAPF countries to address financial capacity gaps and issues
- Annual funding decisions and disbursements based on review of effectiveness and strategic focus of programmes and partners during annual plan and budget processes at country, international and Ireland level (involving PDU in consultation with finance staff and CA staff). This has contributed to ensuring efficiency and flexibility and management of risk.
- Time at Global Managers meeting held in Ireland to discuss pertinent finance issues with CAI finance staff face to face.

A number of challenges with regard to financial management were highlighted during the evaluation:

- The financial reporting templates provided by Irish Aid have required considerably more detail compared to other donors and Christian Aid's own financial reporting requirements. This has meant that across the whole programme CAI and partners have had to set up separate reporting systems. A particular challenge has been the coding of indirect⁸⁸ and direct⁸⁹ costs. Each country has estimated on a percentage basis what should be charged to direct and indirect for both grants to partners and salaries and other team costs. These percentages have ranged from 5% to 40% across the countries involved. It has been particularly difficult for finance staff who

⁸⁶ From Angola review

⁸⁷ From discussions at the feedback workshop with CA and CAI PDU staff.

⁸⁸ Indirect programme costs defined by Irish Aid's Programme Cycle Management Guidelines as "costs that cannot be easily attributed to the implementation of the programme at country level. Further, where funds are sub-granted by NGOs to other partners, then the administration costs of those partners (sub-grantees) would be considered an indirect cost to the programme. Those costs that are directly attributable to the implementation of the programme at field level and will normally be labour costs, materials and expenses such as transport and other logistics costs.

⁸⁹ Direct programme costs defined by Irish Aid's Programme Cycle Management Guidelines as "those costs that are directly attributable to the implementation of the programme at field level and will normally be labour costs, materials and expenses such as transport and other logistics costs"

do not speak English to get to grips with the definitions. The additional time spent in aligning existing systems to meet these requirements has meant that in some countries, with smaller teams (Colombia, Angola) staff with finance expertise have had to be recruited and the finance team based in Belfast has had to spend more time supporting them.

- The budget allocation and expenditure for the programme is broken down by objectives as per the programme results framework, which makes sense if assessing expenditure trends and how costs are apportioned per objective. This does however require a high level of data collection and coding to assess how expenditure is apportioned, including salary and support costs, which CAI has been able to do within CA's global systems, but this has entailed a great deal of additional work to get there. Many of the grants are split across each of the objectives, so in reality only estimates can be made. And we found no evidence that CAI staff or partners use the data generated to inform discussions about value for money or analysis on the investment of time/money of different strategies and approaches vis a vis progress and outcomes. Discussions on value for money and the strategic use of funds tend to happen during budget discussion stage.
- Irish Aid's financial year (Jan-Dec) and budget disbursement process is out of synch with Christian Aid Ireland's and partner budget year (Apr-Mar) and funds from Irish Aid are regularly only disbursed in May, resulting in partners only starting to receive funds in June. CAI only has 6-13 weeks of unrestricted funds or reserves and it would not be feasible for them to be able to underwrite a programme of work until funds come through, nor good practice to build up huge reserves to pre-finance such work. The delay in disbursement has had a significant impact on project implementation and consistent employment of partner staff, and thus has resulted in loss of momentum for some areas of work. Delays in disbursement, including some problems with the PROMISE system, have had an impact on implementation for some partners. For example, in Sierra Leone two partners spoke of the challenges they face between the period January-June/July when they don't receive funds. This has resulted in a number of advocacy activities stopping or getting delayed. Interruptions to programme work due to delayed funds was also noted in Zimbabwe.
- Delays in disbursement has created huge peaks of work for some staff and partners between June and around November, when annual reports have to be prepared to meet Irish Aid's annual reporting timeframe. It is hard to report on results when funds have only been received in June. It also creates uncertainty for staff that are funded through the IAPF grant.
- Not all partners interviewed are necessarily clear about funding decisions. For example in Sierra Leone some partners complained that budget changes between the planning and implementation stages were not always reasonable or appropriately justified by Christian Aid, although part of the reason that Sierra Leone received a reduction in funds during 2015, was due to the largest under-spend in 2014 as a result of the Ebola crisis, and delays in implementation due to staff changes.

Financial Analysis

The total funding for the programme from Irish Aid 2012-15 is just over 12 million Euros. Table 4 below shows how total programme funding has been allocated across the seven countries.

Funding levels were maintained during the first three years, but saw some reduction in the fourth year. This was due to the cuts in government expenditure as a result of the economic downturn, which also affected Irish Aid's programme and meant an overall reduction in funding to INGOs. The reduction in funding to Christian Aid Ireland, compared to what was originally agreed at the start of the programme (€3.056 million per annum) has required some adjustments to plans but we found little evidence to suggest that this significantly affected the performance of the programme.

Table 4. Irish Aid funding allocation per country

€	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total	% of total
IOPT	599889	600840	601219	583000	2384948	20
S Leone	516305	523000	516153	511162	2066620	17
Colombia	478838	481000	480149	468851	1908838	16
Angola	399973	422486	478192	392208	1692859	14
Zimbabwe	381973	387000	388788	380000	1537761	13
Ireland	383143	392,385	385,761	382511	1543800	13
El Salvador/ Guatemala	225325	225000	225000	220000	895325	7
	2985446	3031711	3075262	2937732	12030151	

Source: CAI Finance Team

Funding allocation builds on previous work funded under MAPS II. Allocation is reviewed on an annual basis but funding has remained fairly stable and consistent across the seven countries. The IOPT programme is

the largest recipient of the Irish Aid fund and year on year accounts for approximately 39% of CA's total expenditure on Christian Aid's Rights for All governance work in IOPT, which also includes work under CA's other two Middle East Programmes. However, Irish Aid funds a far larger proportion of this programme's grants to its partners – 73.38% of the total Rights for All programme in the financial year 2014-15.⁹⁰

It should be noted that funding to IOPT partners is in the form of core grants, unlike other CA partners who have to submit yearly project grant proposals. IOPT value core funding as this gives them a greater degree of flexibility compared to much larger funds they receive from other donors. CA staff believe that if the Irish Aid funding ceased, part of the programme would continue because IOPT is a corporate priority area for CA but part of the programme's added value (including core funding) would be reduced.

Table 5. Irish Aid expenditure as a % total of Accountable Governance expenditure by country 2012-2015

€	2012		2013		2014		2015	
	Country total	Irish Aid %						
Angola	519,366	77%	759,097	56%	829,515	58%	692,718	57%
Central America	505,521	45%	463,385	49%	503,434	45%	445,285	49%
Colombia	911,450	53%	805,746	60%	810,839	59%	897,906	52%
IOPT	1,867,987	32%	1,247,219	48%	1,530,742	39%	1,404,619	42%
Sierra Leone	1,158,124	45%	1,756,295	30%	1,338,021	39%	1,272,714	40%
Zimbabwe	543,387	70%	542,109	71%	521,241	75%	512,453	74%

Source: Annual reports Finance Annexes 2012-2014

The table above gives an indication of Irish Aid expenditure as a % of total expenditure of CA's overall governance programme per country. It is noticeable that Zimbabwe is much more dependent on Irish Aid funding as a % of its total governance programme compared to other countries who over the period appear to have diversified funding sources over the period, although most would still be vulnerable should funding reduce or CAI decide to focus on fewer countries.

National level support costs by country and objective

Table 6. Total costs by country and objective 2012-2015

€'000s	Angola	Central America	Colombia	IOPT	Sierra Leone	Zimbabwe	Total
Programme Costs							
Objective 1	441,329 D 182,862 In	261,209 D 105,473 In	666,000 D 5,000 In	172,850 D 32,050 In	624,543 d 246,662 in	416,410 d 107,814 in	
Objective 2	328,202 D 99,911 In	162,955 D 58,338 In	0	815,000 D 162,100 in	389,460 d 53,328 in	356,315 d 74,208 in	
Objective 3	155,314 D 32,683 In	80,582 D 35,150 In	648,000 D 5,000 In	593,050 d 150,950 in	48,265 d 15,980 in	211,775 d 75,727 in	
Objective 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total support costs	327,819 D 124,530 In	163,717 D 27,577 In	414,420 D 171,731 In	428,949 d 30,025 in	417,578 d 274,499 in	197,997 d 99,542 in	
Total	1,692,649	895,001	1,910,151	2,384,974	2,070,315	1,539,788	
Support costs as % of total costs	27%	21%	31%	19%	33%	19%	

The above table shows a breakdown of country level support costs (CA cost, staff & support) as a % of total programme costs per programme objective in each country. These seem fairly reasonable given the scope and relational nature of the programme. Support costs are lot higher in Sierra Leone and Colombia and Angola. It should be noted that Irish Aid funds a number of staff positions based in country and in London to help manage and coordinate the programme which may partly account for these variances (See breakdown below). However a more detailed analysis of these variances was not undertaken.

⁹⁰ According to CA's Rights for All programme's Country Plan for 2015-16, Irish Aid funds €472,000 of programme grants to partners out of a total of € 644, 038 paid in grants

Country	CA Staff (2015)	
	Total	Funded by IAPF
	Based in country	
Sierra Leone	23.2	3.5
Zimbabwe	14	1.6
Central America	12	1
Colombia	4	2
	Based in London	
Angola	4	2
IOPT	3	1.5

Christian Aid Ireland costs

The Irish Aid fund accounts for approximate 39% of Christian Aid Ireland's total income and Irish Aid is CAI's largest donor for its programme work. Approximately 13% (€ 1.53 million) of the total Irish Aid fund has been spent in Ireland over the period, which again seems fairly reasonable given the scope of the programme and work in Ireland. The Irish Aid fund has contributed to building the profile and professionalism of the CAI overall and the PDU team and its capacity to deliver a comprehensive and solid governance programme and as a result the organisation is in a much better position now to seek funding from other donors for its work, compared to where it was at the beginning of the programme.

Table 7 below shows a broad breakdown of costs broken down by CAI activity codes.

Table 7. Breakdown Costs by CAI Activities

IRELAND	2012		2013		2014		2015		2012-2015	
Salary & OTCs	Direct	Indirect	Direct	Indirect	Direct	Indirect	Direct	Indirect	Direct	Indirect
PIAPF001 Development Education	25,868	4,877	24,450	6,113	22,383	9,594	22,384	9,593	95,085	30,176
PIAPF002 Organisational Development	50,877	12,798	65,882	17,791	49,818	21,355	49,818	21,355	216,394	73,299
PIAPF003 Monitoring and Evaluation	80,004	19,595	67,641	17,036	48,500	16,175	55,173	23,646	251,318	76,453
PIAPF004 Research	4,715	1,179	8,222	2,029	26,770	11,475	19,600	8,400	59,306	23,082
PIAPF005 Head Office Costs	149,143	34,235	147,902	35,475	125,968	53,981	120,881	51,810	543,894	175,501
	310,606	72,684	314,096	78,444	273,439	112,580	267,856	114,804	1,165,998	378,512
							Projected	Projected	TOTAL: 1,544,510	

Aside from head office overhead costs, the biggest proportion of expenditure is dedicated to monitoring and evaluation and organisational development. Monitoring and evaluation costs include the costs for the M&E advisor and related costs including training, workshops, the mid term review and final evaluation and staff travel to programmes. Organisational development includes the costs of holding annual global meetings, finance capacity building, and the costs of the Head of Programme Development and Governance advisor. Head office costs also includes a proportion of the CEO's and Head of Finance costs, a proportion of the costs of the policy and advocacy work in Ireland, including networking and civil society membership costs, overseas travel for country staff and partners, training in Ireland, and security training.

Funding for development education was included in the current round of Irish Aid funding for the programme. This enabled CAI to employ a part time post to begin to develop links with education establishments in the Irish Republic and pilot a new school pack more suited to the school curriculum requirements in ROI as well as build on existing development education and outreach work in Northern Ireland. However to make a significant impact on the Development Education sector in ROI would require more investment in terms of funds and capacity. Likewise further investment would be required to develop a range of education materials tailored to the Ireland context and more aligned to the programme work supported by CAI. CAI should possibly review their development education strategy and consider partnering possibly with other more established development education specialists or INGO such as Trocaire who share similar programme objectives to co-produce and develop materials that draw on CAI country case studies and experiences.

Value for money

CA's approach to assessing value for money (VfM) is weighted towards effectiveness and equity rather than economy or efficiency⁹¹ and it also recognises that such an assessment "*ultimately, (...) is a question of judgement*".⁹² Although not a comprehensive value for money assessment was carried out the evaluation offers some overall reflections below.

⁹¹ Christian Aid, How Christian Aid Assesses Value for Money in its Programmes, July 2012.

⁹² Christian Aid, Value for Money: A How-To Guide for Country Programmes, October 2014.

Overall the effectiveness of the programmes is due to the quality of the relationships built at all levels and in choosing to work with effective and experienced partners to enhance results. The added value of CA partners in the changes and results highlighted are the resources they bring to the partnership in terms of their networks, professionalism, expertise and high standing and reputation they have amongst decision makers and civil society actors at local, national and international level and their work with local community based organisations, which is supporting community ownership of their own development processes.

Choosing to build the programme on existing governance programmes under the MAPS II programme has also supported CA programmes to consolidate and sustain gains from the previous programme and build a body of knowledge and experience across the portfolio on what works in different contexts. Whether or not the investments made in developing specific learning outputs from the process has translated to changes in practice across CA's other governance work remains to be seen, there is value in bringing people and partners together, but the programme has not explored other learning approaches that could possibly build capacity and learning at partner and CA level, for example through action research and/or working with local governance/gender experts, who are familiar with the political context, to help facilitate and/or codify learning about different approaches and the process of change.

In terms of efficiency, grants have been dispersed according to both the capacity of the partners to deliver and careful consideration of the actual costs needed to achieve the expected outcomes, technically allowing CA to end relationships that are not delivering value on an annual basis and/or making adjustments to reallocate funds to scale up some partner work. However in some cases CA has not considered an exit strategy for some of its longer term partners or provided appropriate support to ensure the sustainability of work carried out.⁹³

Partners have appreciated the support in M&E and getting them to think more clearly about results and the outcomes of their work, and in helping to improve their contextual and political analysis but they have found that investment in terms of time and money in producing data to populate the results matrices and reporting for Irish Aid is generating data and information that they are not necessarily using for learning purposes or adaptive programming. It is questionable therefore whether this represents good value for money.

In terms of scale many of the policy changes brought about or services provided by the programme affect the lives of thousands of citizens in need of social care, access to services and rights. CA and partners are working with and supporting large numbers of the poorest in socio-economic terms, but also others who are "rights-poor" but not necessarily the most marginalised in socio-economic terms.⁹⁴ Although the programme has put an emphasis on gender and using gender analysis to help strengthen an overall analysis of both gender and exclusion, it is not clear how or whether CA or partners are looking systematically beyond generalised categories of specific groups to consider issues of intersectionality and the differential impacts of the programme and to consider issues of equity and inclusion on a routine basis. This is due to the fact that there was not a strong gender focus initially in the programme design and therefore limited in the results framework.

5.Sustainability

A number of the impacts achieved are likely to be sustainable. For example where legislation or policies have been changed or introduced to be more attuned to the needs of marginalised constituents this is likely to have a long term impact but will require civil society organisations to continue to monitor implementation to ensure that promises made are implemented in practice. Although in theory policy changes could be reduced or reversed, especially those dependent on governments budget priorities, the fact that the IAPF programme has encouraged a long term approach ensures that many of the gains made can be monitored and duty bearers held to account in delivering on promises over the longer term. Changes in legislation and High Court rulings are non-reversible, providing civil society with a mandate to advocate on the implementation of passed laws into practice.

Other impacts such as shifts in attitudes between duty bearers and citizens, increased citizen empowerment, re-energising local governance structures, increased responsiveness or accountability of duty bearers are likely to be more fragile and the extent to which they are sustained will depend on many factors. One influence will be the extent to which partners are able to continue their work and build on achievements. This is more likely as the programme has supported the partners' own agenda and priorities.

As noted also by consultants, citizen groups involved in local governance activities and dialogue with the state and duty bearers are in a stronger position to continue when activities are combined with livelihood and/or economic oriented activities.

⁹³ Consultant findings Sierra Leone and Angola.

⁹⁴ IOPT evaluation report 2015

Overall, the evaluation finds that sustainability exists at three levels:

Partners. IAPF partners have been able to build relevant knowledge and skills in organisational development, advocacy and policy influencing. Partners have through the course of the four years been supported to further deepen and strengthen local level contacts and networks which has supported alliance building around mutual interests and issues. The selection of strong partners has meant that most partners of IAPF will continue to manage most of their work independently of IAPF support or not, but would value both technical and financial support going forward to build and deepen the work they are currently carrying out as a result of the initial support received.

Citizens. For marginalised groups, youth and women skills have been built and there are strong signs of empowerment, increased resilience and confidence that should enable many to carry on with civic engagement and challenge power relations in the future⁹⁵.

Re-energising local governance structures. Local structures have been developed and have improved both in function and performance. There is more meaningful inclusion of citizen participation and this has supported an engagement process that is built around local priorities and identified issues. Most importantly, there is an increased collaboration between civil society and government which has seen relationships built around issues which are important to citizens and duty bearers. Many of the forums, structures and spaces for dialogue that partners have shaped will exist independently of IAPF and are likely to continue to a degree without CA support. These spaces of interaction have also brought about a change in attitudes and behaviours between citizens, civil society and duty bearers improving relations and building trust.

6. Conclusions and lessons

Programme approach and theory of change

The design of the programme built on the expertise and experience of existing country programme and partner governance and human rights priorities, and has privileged context and a localised approach with local actors to tackle significant problems over an overarching global strategy. In many respects there has been an emergent strategy over the period, which has been adapting and changing in small ways, incrementally as circumstances change and as an understanding of power and gender has deepened. Built into the programme design is a strong recognition that this type of work takes time, and that change is not predictable and likely to be incremental; where gains are built on previous successes and the importance of a longer-term engagement. The evaluation assesses that for CA countries this is the healthiest way to go about planning and working in complex and volatile contexts. It has allowed for flexibility and supported CA's very competent and experienced partners to carry out important work. Aligning the IAPF to country programme governance objectives has also increased the potential of achieving objectives and impacts.

The programme theory of change developed during the proposal phase of the programme is still valid, but it didn't evolve over the course of the programme and not all countries developed a country level theory of change even though training and support in this area was provided to a number of countries through M&E training and power analysis.⁹⁶ The theory of change did not theorise other potentially important drivers of change or the role of civil society actors including trade unions, academics, judiciary and the media. Other gaps also noted were gender, and the role of CA partners and CA.

Although not explicit in the programme theory of change, capacity building of both CA and partners is a key approach used in the programme to building a strong, accountable and effective civil society. CA's experience of working in partnerships suggest that partners can only play an effective role if they have the capacity to develop effective and adaptive strategies to engage those in power, are responsive to changes in the context and are able to facilitate the participation, power and influence of marginalised groups in political processes and have the ability to collaborate with others. CA's experience also suggests that staff can only play an effective role in supporting partners if they too have the skills and understanding of key concepts, are able to facilitate reflective practice and devote quality time to supporting partnership collaboration and linkages and put into practice CA's partnership principles. This is implicit in the programme but staff interpret their role in different ways and are under pressure to meet reporting and accountability requirements and are not necessarily equipped or have the time to play a more strategic role.

There is a need to be realistic about what can be achieved in a four year time frame. Much of the work of this programme is policy-oriented and it seeks to challenge structures and power dynamics rather than symptoms. When considering effectiveness, therefore, we need to bear in mind that the way from a call for change by an NGO to a new policy being adopted, implemented and then benefiting people is long and

⁹⁵ The example of the young Mayor in Kono district in Sierra Leone, is a testament to how investment in youth leadership and empowerment. See Sierra Leone case studies.

⁹⁶ IOPT and Colombia were in a much stronger position in this respect as they already had developed country level theories of change, and revisit these periodically as part of on-going programme practice.

there are often setbacks along the way. Most of the impact and achievements described are the result of efforts which span a timeframe much longer than the three and a half years covered by this evaluation.⁹⁷

Partnerships

CAI's partnership approach and the partners it has chosen to support and work alongside are critical to the success and effectiveness of the programme. CAI are supporting some of the best known partners in their field at country level and adding value to the partner work through a range of ways including accompaniment, resources, capacity building and linking partner work and advocacy to decision makers and general public at international level.

However capacity gaps were noted in a number of countries. Although CAI technical staff and CA field staff provide support to partners to address some of these gaps, a more comprehensive institutional assessment of partners at the start of the programme would have possibly supported the programme to invest support in this area more strategically and provide a benchmark/baseline to assess trends and the effectiveness of support provided by both CAI and other parts of the organisation in different contexts, and to discuss the pros and cons of different approaches.

Experiential Learning

There is a great deal of value in having the space and opportunity to hear about the experiences from other contexts and to be exposed to new ways of thinking and doing things. Experiential learning through peer to peer exchanges, including exposure visits to countries by parliamentarians, CA supporters and partner and staff engagement with academics, has received positive feedback from those involved and leading to some changes in policies and approaches as result. However, the extent to which learning and toolkits developed have influenced CA broader work or at country level is more difficult to gauge and possibly too early to judge. Knowledge in any case is not usually transferable through a toolkit or report. To work in new ways takes time, and on-going support, mentoring and accompaniment and taking risks to try things out. It also requires leadership supportive of working in new ways.

There are many examples where CAI staff play this role effectively and use learning and experiences gained to continuously build and strengthen the work of its partners. Similarly CAI partners play a similar role in their support to local level community groups and civil society organisations, but again to work at this level requires an understanding of power dynamics, gender and good facilitation skills and the ability to ask good questions. These softer skills are often overlooked in discussions about strategy, tools and theoretical concepts. In future CAI may want to also consider other learning and research approaches which incorporate elements of capacity building, accompaniment and mentoring such as action research, or collaboration with country level academics and/or governance experts.

Christian Aid Ireland Contribution and Added Value

The programme has added value to CA's organisational understanding of governance and working on governance and human rights in conflict and post conflict contexts. The team in Dublin have also contributed to CA's organisational learning and approaches to M&E, gender and power analysis. Currently discussions are underway for CAI to take a lead on Tackling Violence and Building Peace. Lessons learned from the IAPF programme are more likely to gain traction across the organisation as additional resource will support the CAI to more systematically share the learning from the programme across many more programmes.

The Irish Aid programme has supported CAI to strengthen its own capacity to deliver the programme and many of the outcomes highlighted would not have happened without the support of a highly effective team based in Dublin and Belfast. Irish Aid funds have helped to build the professionalism of CAI and improve its grant management systems and performance reporting and strengthen the Board. The CEO's championing and leadership on gender, and in particular gender based violence, has been a key success factor in helping to make gender a more central pillar of the work in Ireland. Over this period the reputation of the organisation has grown and it has built a solid reputation as a legitimate and credible civil society actor, especially in the political sphere. This has opened doors to decision makers and more importantly provided opportunities to advance partner advocacy priorities and issues, and strengthened the confidence in what the organisation does.

The added value of CAI lies in four key areas: primarily in the access to government officials and to the CA public constituency in the UK and Ireland that CAI provides to its partners. Secondly, in the learning opportunities it has offered to its partners through the conferences and workshops on land grabs (2013) and governance transitional justice (2014). And thirdly the programme technical support CAI provides on advocacy, governance, monitoring and evaluation and gender and fourthly through the international networks to which CAI and CA belongs, such as APRODEV, Crisis Action and ACT Alliance, it is able to bring its partners' evidence and analysis to European quarters of power.

CA Global has invested more attention on value for money analysis and all country programmes and departments are expected to report on value for money in their annual reports. However the evaluation

⁹⁷ IOPT evaluation 2015

found very little formal link between finance management, analysis and value for money discussions for this particular programme.

Monitoring and evaluation

The programme has introduced many valuable learning processes and a degree of rigour and professionalism in terms of performance management and managing for results and a great deal of time, effort and resources has been expended on adapting M&E and financial systems to meet Irish Aid's results based management requirements. As a result a number of partners and CA programme staff relatively new to concepts of theory of change, results based management, got bogged down in the detail of producing results matrices, leaving very little time to invest in other learning and critical reflection processes that support a better understanding of how change happens and are more aligned to underlying ethos of the programme. Whilst implicitly partners constantly question their approaches and strategies to respond to changes in the context, joint analysis at the start of the programme and on an on-going basis could have possibly supported discussions about gender, different models of collaboration, and the effectiveness or not of different strategies and approaches.

It is possible that the team could have come up with a smaller set of common proxy indicators at the programme level, tailored to realistic timeframes, and relevant data about performance and progress generated to support reporting and communication requirements generated from existing CA and partner M&E systems, field trip reports and other more creative learning processes, such as partner review and reflection processes and case studies/stories of change.⁹⁸

Gender

Although a key priority for CA and some IAPF partners, the picture on gender across the programme is mixed. The IAPF programme did not make the focus on a gender approach explicit (e.g. ToC, Programme Strategy, staff focal roles and M&E) and this resulted in sporadic gender work in countries as well as in results. As well, there is a lot of focus on citizen-government dialogue and engagement but a lack of knowing within the space of dialogue whose voices count, and who is actually participating in regards to gender and marginalised. CAI has been able to step up its work on gender across the programme, and through working closely with and supporting gender focal people in country programmes. However gender focal points often lack the power to make decisions. The responsibility for gender also requires strong leadership support and commitment.

7. Recommendations

Programme Design and Approach

1. For Christian Aid Ireland to consider developing a programme strategy, that should include the IAPF work. This will include but not limited to:
 - Developing a Theory of Change and a narrative that unpacks the theory of change diagram, including elements of the Christian Aid Ireland's approach, roles and partners.
 - A set clear criteria to help guide programme focus, depth, and reach that considers contexts of countries selected and staff capacity in countries.
 - Looking at the role of private sector and other drivers.
2. Develop and invest in an internal communication strategy as part of the programme strategy and design of a new Irish Aid programme, which sets out clearly the structures, responsibilities and processes for the different elements of the programme.
3. Christian Aid Ireland working with staff at country level should undertake a more systematic mapping of existing capacity of staff and partners to help guide where to invest capacity support in specific areas. Topics identified through this evaluation as possible areas to strengthen include gender and inclusion and how to improve targeting of specific groups of vulnerable and excluded citizens, this would include assessing how inclusive existing programmes are and also taking into consideration possible unforeseen risks for those individuals previously excluded from decision making processes during strategy and planning processes. As part of this Christian Aid Ireland should identify the different ways that Christian Aid's Global office currently support staff and partners to ensure that work is not duplicated and that support builds on specific strengths that Christian Aid Ireland is able to contribute in certain areas, example gender, theory of change, advocacy, power analysis, monitoring and evaluation.
4. More attention should be paid to looking for potential linkages and lessons to build on between governance programmes and projects and other Christian Aid country programme strategies for example livelihoods, food security, climate change etc.

⁹⁸ CAI was required to undertake an approach using annual targets, which is not used within CA systems in general, and which made it difficult for many partners and staff to rise beyond the output focus to a broader focus on outcomes and change.

IAPF Management

5. To review the current Memorandum of Understanding with Christian Aid Global to ensure that Christian Aid Ireland and Christian Aid Global and Country programmes can work in a coherent and complementary fashion that makes best use of the particular strengths that different parts of the organisation and that clear lines of accountability are in place.
6. Explore possible joint management arrangements for staff responsible in delivering the IAPF programme at country level between Christian Aid Ireland and Christian Aid's International Programme Department.

Monitoring and Evaluation and Learning

7. For Christian Aid Ireland to consider developing a Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning System that would support its reflective learning approach and analysis on how change happens in governance work as well as support Irish Aid requirements of results. This would include but not limited to:
 - A realistic and simplified standard results framework for Christian Aid Ireland to track top-level results, with minimum number of indicators per objective.
 - One reporting system for country programmes through which top-level results can be identified for reporting results to Irish Aid.
 - Include partner feedback on the effectiveness of the support provided by Christian Aid programme staff and Christian Aid Ireland.
 - Ensure that on-going monitoring and learning systems and approaches also capture lessons about what approaches work in different contexts and what difference this has made as well as drawing out lessons regarding partnerships.
8. Christian Aid Ireland should consolidate and build on the wealth of documented work and experiences that the programme has generated, including examples of approaches that have been particularly effective in terms of shifting power, attitudes and behaviours as well as policy and practice change, along with lessons learnt to share more widely within Christian Aid and Christian Aid Ireland internally. Many of the examples and stories of change highlighted through this review would also support Christian Aid Ireland staff involved in development education and supporter outreach to communicate the value of investing in partner work on governance and peace building.
9. To consider other models of learning including action research, regional learning exchanges and in country partnerships and collaborations with academics and governance experts.

Partnerships

10. Review the model of partnership support to ensure that partners are not overly dependent on Christian Aid Ireland funding and that exit and/or sustainability strategies are jointly developed with partners to avoid over dependence on Christian Aid funding support.
11. We recommend that Christian Aid Global develop a partnership strategy building on the recent reviews and learning carried out on Christian Aid's approach to working in partnerships, alliances and coalitions. This would include the range of support that Christian Aid provides to its partners including its accompaniment and capacity building approaches.

Gender

12. Christian Aid Ireland should consider making gender central to the IAPF programme by including gender as a commitment and specific objective in its Programme, and incorporate it within both the monitoring and evaluation results framework and the Theory of Change.
13. Christian Aid Global, country programmes and Christian Aid Ireland should make gender commitment, understanding and skills within the role profile of senior management at all levels and not just within a specific gender focal person role.

Finance and Value for Money

14. The current finance and monitoring and evaluation systems are not set up to adequately examine value for money and financial efficiency. Although Christian Aid Country Programmes are expected to report to Christian Aid Global on value for money in their annual reports. The current budget lines and coding make it challenging to assess or track organisational investment. The current budget lines and coding make it challenging to assess or track organisational investment in specific core programmes/strategic goals. Christian Aid finance and monitoring and evaluation teams should consider reviewing current coding and measures and incentives to ensure that it is possible to track the relative value for money of specific organisational priorities and strategies.

Irish Aid

15. For Irish Aid to review and reconsider their approach to monitoring governance and human rights work and to focus on outcomes rather than annual targets achieved.

16. Governance programmes demand skilled personnel and input. Budgetary restrictions and cost structures should be reconsidered and assessed on a case-by-case basis to ensure that restrictions do not compromise the quality of the work.

Christian Aid Global

17. Private sector actors will continue to play a part in the governance landscape whether through extractives, procurement, economic growth or sectors such as agriculture and land. Partners in accountability and transparency work are questioning how to engage with the private sector, moving beyond the classical 'supply and demand' side equation of accountability. Christian Aid Global in London should consider assessing the approach and work with private sector in their governance portfolio. This is possibly an area that requires some research/mapping of Christian Aid's existing experience with working with and/or private sector lobbying and campaigning to draw on lessons of existing approaches and strategies to inform decisions about tactics and strategies for engagement.