



Baseline Cover Report

LEAP4Peace Consortium

November 1, 2021

Revised June 25, 2022

Activity number 4000004358





Contents

Introduction	3
Objectives and Scope	3
Approach	3
Implications of baseline study for ToC	5
Programme contribution to WRGE and SCS indicators	6
Background	6
Overview baseline and target values	7
Lessons learned	14



Introduction

This is the cover report for the 2021 baseline measurements under the Strategic Partnership between the LEAP4Peace Consortium and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA). The Consortium consists of the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy (NIMD), the Burundi Leadership Training Program (BLTP), the Gender Equality Network Myanmar (GEN), the NIMD office in Colombia and Myanmar, and the Gender Action for Peace and Security (GAPS)

This cover report contains an overview of the programme objectives, scope and approach of the baseline studies, as well as an overview of the implications of the baseline studies on programmatic choices and Theories of Change (ToC). The last section presents an overview table of the LEAP4Peace indicators' baseline and target values and the contribution to the baseline and target values of the WRGE indicators.

Objectives and Scope

Over the period from July until September 2021, baseline studies were conducted by all consortium partners in all LEAP4Peace countries (Myanmar, Colombia and Burundi). Baseline study covered the first six months of the LEAP4Peace programme implementation.

The objective of the baseline exercise was to describe and measure the baseline situation for each intermediate outcome and outcome of the four pathways of LEAP4Peace Theory of Change (ToC) per each country. Another objective was to set targets for each intermediate outcome and outcome indicator. This entailed both a qualitative target description and a quantitative value. Only descriptions of baseline situation and targets (expected outcomes) were formulated, where Outcome Harvesting (OH) was chosen as the method to monitor results of a certain intermediate outcome or outcome. Lastly, the baseline exercise, as a formative assessment, was another opportunity to collect or review data that could inform programme decisions and changes to the country specific ToCs.

Approach

The Grant Agreement with the MoFA set the parameters for the baseline exercise. The LEAP4Peace consortium opted to have the baseline studies conducted by country teams, as opposed to centrally guided external consultants, to give substance to leading from the South. Other reasons to put country teams in the driving seat were to strengthen M&E capacity within the consortium, enhance programme ownership and cost-effectiveness.

In the run-up to the baseline study exercise, the PMEL team in The Hague facilitated two training modules, consisting of four and five sessions each. The first module explained in details LEAP4Peace monitoring system and baseline requirements, while second module was dedicated to the NIMD Outcome Harvesting monitoring approach. The first module also explained links between the LEAP4Peace framework and WRGE/SCS framework, conducting the baseline study, operationalizing the monitoring system, IATI reporting, using the information management system for reporting, and detailing of the ToC into Actor-based Pathways. The second module was about identifying and formulating outcome statements, and guarding the quality and credibility of the outcomes via internal verification and substantiation, as well as how to use harvested outcomes to get additional insight of the programme for adaptive management. These trainings prepared country teams for the baseline exercise.

In addition to above, there has been continuous remote 1-on-1 support to country teams to conduct the baseline exercise. An indicator reference sheet, as well as other templates have been developed and shared with network to support country teams in the operationalization and further contextualization of the indicators.

The PMEL team in the Hague developed the initial set of indicators (see IRS) to cover all intermediate outcomes and outcomes of the four pathways of the LEAP4Peace ToC and are aligned with the WRGE/SCS framework. It partially used indicators that worked well in previous NIMD programmes. Country teams in turn made their initial selection from this set, when the submission of the LEAP4Peace proposal was due. The indicator selection was further refined in the inception phase, when the ToC and programme were more defined. During the baseline exercise, the indicators were further operationalized.

The monitoring framework, hence the baseline, is set up to measure change that happens as a result of the programme interventions. With this approach, the scope focuses on the contribution of the LEAP4Peace programme and less so to the larger context. For instance, not any (relevant) L&A initiative is described and measured, but only those targeted within the LEAP4Peace programme. Subsequently, many of the baseline values are zero, as in many cases programme activities had not been implemented yet in the first six months and the WRGE/SCS indicators are at output level directly measuring results of activities.

The baseline studies used mixed methods to collect data, including data review, FGDs and interviews/surveys. In many cases country teams limited their primary data collection to desk study to best describe the baseline situation.

Aside from a focus on LEAP4Peace results, the baseline exercise also accommodated the provision of qualitative information. Country teams have been asked to provide a description of the baseline situation as well as a description of the target value. Moreover, many intermediate outcomes and outcomes are monitored through Outcome Harvesting. For the target descriptions of the Outcome Harvesting, country teams formulated outcomes they'd like to harvest in 2021 (until 2025) or have used change described in different steps of their key actors' Pathways of Change which have the same syntaxes (who did what differently when).

Country teams set numerical targets for indicators by taking into account their experiences with implementation of democracy support activities and the outcomes of that, as well as the ambitions in the multi-annual and annual plans. The usefulness and accuracy of targets might be limited in light of the complex and often fluid operational environments of the LEAP4Peace programme (especially in Myanmar), which require an adaptive approach to programming.

The choice for a light-touch, qualitative oriented, and oftentimes in-house conducted baseline, may have biases, but these have been mitigated in the following ways. Only the Colombia team decided against an in-house study, but hired an external consultant to increase objectivity.

Since the baseline measures what happens *as a result* of the programme and often so set at 'zero', the baseline values as such don't have biases. The qualitative descriptions are composed of PEA analysis -which have been conducted with rigor, so as to mitigate biases- but have been often triangulated with other data sources and interviews with stakeholders (see for instance the Burundi and Colombia baseline studies) In the case of Myanmar such triangulation with additional interviews has not been possible in the current operational environment (see Myanmar baseline).

The biases in target setting were mitigated by a reflection on and triangulation between (multi-) annual plans, current PEA analyses and accumulative experience with similar interventions. Nevertheless as the realities are so fluid and uncertain, there may have been optimism biases in the target setting.

Implications of baseline study for ToC

LEAP4Peace consortia were invited to make the baseline exercise a formative assessment, as the baseline study is yet another opportunity to gain insights in the validity of the ToC and the relevance of programmatic choices.

A thorough revision of the ToC and programmatic choices had been done earlier in the inception phase already. As a result, the formativeness of the baseline study remained limited. In some cases, the indicator framework has been updated prior to baseline study, as a more refined choice for indicators could be made. The updated indicator frameworks can be found in the annexes of the respective baseline studies.

All programme teams and partners reported a continued validity of the ToC and programmatic choices. They also sharpened their choice of indicators to monitor the programme. Even though the context in Myanmar changed dramatically since the coup, both partners in Myanmar also reported a continued validity of the ToC and programmatic choices.

Programme contribution to WRGE and SCS indicators

This section explains background and presents LEAP4Peace programme contribution to WRGE and SCS indicators.

Background

Following MoFA instructions and set of webinars related to WRGE/SCS indicators, NIMD have adopted similar advice toward country teams, allowing them full flexibility and autonomy in order to assure local ownership over the programme, which is in line with NIMD southern leadership principles. Hence, PME team in The Hague had instructed country teams to first and foremost use 2 main criteria when choosing indicators:

1. Use **limited number of relevant indicators** from LEAP4Peace result framework, focusing on the first 2 years of programme implementation, but keeping in mind country overall programme objectives. This advice was guided from previous experiences as well as limitations encounter this year. The objective was not to overburden, often-limited programme implementation teams, with extensive M&E frameworks just for the purpose of accountability to the donor. In addition to this, we had to consider our main limitation was related to Covid, as PME The Hague team was not able to provide face-to-face trainings. Earlier, NIMD had regional meetings completely dedicated to M&E issues, which would often include trainings and intense face-to-face support as well as south-to-south knowledge exchange. These programme meetings were necessary for improving understanding across countries about measurements, as well as further alignment of indicators across countries.
2. Use extensively **mix methods**, which would allow **for adaptive programming** approach. For this reason, we are encouraging teams to use all evidence they collect using mix methods approach – indicator measurements and Outcome Harvesting to inform their programmatic choices. The aim is for programme to remain flexible and relevant in often challenging country contexts, by allow country teams to change intervention strategies (and therefore indicators as well) in case of necessary programme adaptation in the future.

PME team in The Hague have aligned as much as possible programme indicators to WRGE and SCS indicator framework (see Annex 1: LEAP4Peace Result Framework below), but as mentioned above, we have left country teams with full flexibility and autonomy regarding the choice of indicators. This means that NIMD in The Hague did not request obligatory or minimum number of indicators for the programme. This resulted in country programme level indicators contributing to various WRGE indicators.

When it comes to target estimates, PME NIMD team advise was to keep estimates realistic, taking into account limited annual country budget, as well as context limitations (Covid, coup d'état etc). This resulted in very modest target estimates in all countries programme (see section Overview baseline and target values for more details).

Overview baseline and target values

Tables below provides an overview of how LEAP4Peace contextualized indicators contribute to WRGE/SCS basket indicators. Tables contain baseline values, annual target and accumulative values the duration of the programme.

Tables below presents *only data* from partners whose interventions, and therefore - some of their indicators, contributes to particular WRGE (4.1, 4.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.2, and SCS 4). In the process of data aggregation, we discovered that some of LEAP4Peace programme indicators contributes directly to SCS6 indicator (please see last table in this chapter). Full indicator frameworks, including indicators that do not link directly to the WRGE/SCS basket indicators can be found in the separate country baseline files.

Indicator Name		Partner/Year	Baseline measurement	Targets					
				2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	
WRGE 4.4. # of times that CSOs succeed in creating space for CSO demands and positions on promote women's meaningful participation and leadership in conflict prevention and peace- and state-building and protecting women's and girls' rights in crisis and (post-)conflict situations, through agenda setting, influencing the debate and/or movement building									
Outcome Indicator	# of inclusive multi-stakeholders policy making processes	Myanmar (MySop+GEN)	0	0	0	0	0	2	End of programme target (2021-2025)
		Programme Total	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Intermediate outcome indicators	# agreements reached as a result of dialogue platform meeting	Myanmar (MySop + GEN)	0	0	0	1	2	2	
		Burundi (BLTP)	0	2	2	2	2	2	
		Colombia (NIMD)	0	0	0	0	0	1	End of programme target (2021-2025)
		Programme Total	0	2	2	3	4	5	16
	# studies for evidence-based L&A disseminated to political actors	Colombia (NIMD)	0	1	1	1	1	1	End of programme target (2021-2025)
		GAPS	0	1	1	1	1	0	
Programme Total		0	2	2	2	2	1	9	

Indicator Name		Partner/Year	Baseline measurement	Targets					
				2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	
WRGE 5.2.1 # of organizations (disaggregated by women-led, youth-led or other) with strengthened capacity to advance women's rights and gender equality									
Intermediate outcome indicators	# women-led CSOs with increased L&A capacities	Myanmar (GEN)	0	0	0	0	3	3	
		GAPS	4	6	2	2	2	0	End of programme target (2021-2025)
		Annual targets	4	6	2	2	5	3	18
	# political actors participating in dialogue platforms (disaggregated by type)	Burundi (BLTP)	0	0	3	2	2	5	
		Colombia (NIMD)	39	47	8	8	8	8	End of programme target (2021-2025)
		Annual targets	39	47	11	10	10	13	91
	# political actors who adopt measures and policies to enhance representation of women in their decision-making processes	Burundi (BLTP)	0	0	3	3	2	2	End of programme target (2021-2025)
		Annual targets	0	0	3	3	2	2	10

Indicator Name		Partner/Year	Baseline measurement	Targets					
				2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	
WRGE 5.2.2. # of individuals with strengthened competencies to advance women's rights and gender equality (disaggregated by type, age and gender)									
Intermediate outcome indicators	# democracy school graduates	NIMD Colombia	0	72	72	72	72	72	End of programme target (2021-2025)
		Annual targets	0	72	72	72	72	72	360
	# women (aspiring) leaders trained	Myanmar (MySop + GEN)	0	0	35	35	25	0	
		Burundi (BLTP)	0	250	75	75	75	100	
		Colombia (NIMD)	134	150	150	150	150	150	End of programme target (2021-2025)
		Annual targets	134	400	260	260	250	250	1420

Indicator Name		Partner/Year	Baseline measurement	Targets					
				2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	
WRGE 5.2.3 # of advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs, for, by or with their membership/constituency									
Intermediate outcome indicators	# of international advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs	Myanmar (GEN)	0	0	0	0	1	1	
		GAPS	0	1	2	2	2	1	End of programme target (2021-2025)
		Annual targets	0	1	2	2	3	2	10
	# of regional advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs	Myanmar (GEN)	0	0	0	1	2	2	End of programme target (2021-2025)
		Annual targets	0	0	0	1	2	2	5
	# of national advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs	NIMD Colombia	0	0	0	0	1	1	End of programme target (2021-2025)
		Annual targets	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

Indicator Name		Partner/Year	Baseline measurement	Targets					
				2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	
SCS6 # of CSOs included in SPs programmes									
Intermediate outcome indicators	# of women-led CSOs included in the programme activities	Myanmar (GEN)	0	0	8	8	8	6	
		Burundi (BLTP)	0	0	2	2	3	3	
		Colombia (NIMD)	0	0	2	3	2	3	End of programme target (2021-2025)
		Annual targets	0	0	12	13	13	12	50
	# of other CSOs included in the programme activities	GAPS	4	8	2	2	2	2	End of programme target (2021-2025)
		Annual targets	4	8	2	2	2	2	16

*Intermediate outcome indicators are measured and reported annually, outcome indicators are reported at baseline, mid-term and end-term.

Lessons learned

After analyzing baseline reports and contribution to WRGE/SCS indicators, NIMD PME team in The Hague draw some lessons learned and recommendations:

1. In order to provide better understanding of programme contribution to WRGE/SCS indicators it appears that there is need to introduce minimum set of required indicators, especially at the output level. However, current Ministry advice about choice of indicators is not in line with this conclusion.
2. Estimating targets was extremely difficult for all PME staff involved in Baseline exercise for various reason. It would be useful if Ministry consider capacity development on this issue across partnerships, or at least more clear and instructive guidance notes.
3. Disaggregating indicators (for example SCS6 or on types of NGO) appear not to add value to reporting, as country teams then focus only on main actors/beneficiaries of the programme, and do not see viable reasons to have 3 instead of 1 indicator. This can lead to under-representation of programme results, which is an issue that deserve attention from the Ministry in the future.



Annex 1: LEAP4Peace Result Framework

Outcomes Indicators	WRGE/SCS Indicator name
Women's satisfaction with participation in political and peacebuilding processes (disaggregated by age/intersectional group)	
Share of women in public office	
Share of women in decision-making positions in peacebuilding processes	
# of laws blocked, proposed, adopted or improved to promote women's voice, agency, leadership, and representative participation in (political) decision-making processes in conflict prevention, peace- and state-building	4.2. # of laws, policies and strategies blocked, adopted or improved to promote women's meaningful participation and leadership in conflict prevention, peace- and state-building and protect women's and girls' rights in crisis and (post-)conflict situations
# of policies blocked, proposed, adopted or improved to promote women's voice, agency, leadership, and representative participation in (political) decision-making processes in conflict prevention, peace- and state-building	4.2. # of laws, policies and strategies blocked, adopted or improved to promote women's meaningful participation and leadership in conflict prevention, peace- and state-building and protect women's and girls' rights in crisis and (post-)conflict situations
# of by-laws blocked, proposed, adopted or improved to promote women's voice, agency, leadership, and representative participation in (political) decision-making processes in conflict prevention, peace- and state-building	4.2. # of laws, policies and strategies blocked, adopted or improved to promote women's meaningful participation and leadership in conflict prevention, peace- and state-building and protect women's and girls' rights in crisis and (post-)conflict situations
# national and international L&A resolutions adopted	4.4. # of times that CSOs succeed in creating space for CSO demands and positions on promote women's meaningful participation and leadership in conflict prevention and peace- and state-building and protecting women's and girls' rights in crisis and (post-)conflict situations, through agenda setting, influencing the debate and/or movement building (link SCS3)
# of inclusive multi-stakeholders policy making processes	4.4. # of times that CSOs succeed in creating space for CSO demands and positions on promote women's meaningful participation and leadership in conflict prevention and peace- and state-building and protecting women's and girls' rights in crisis and (post-)conflict situations, through agenda setting, influencing the debate and/or movement building (link SCS3)
Outcome Harvesting	



Intermediate outcomes /outputs Indicators	WRGE/SCS Indicator name
# agreements reached as a result of dialogue platform meeting	4.4. # of times that CSOs succeed in creating space for CSO demands and positions on promote women’s meaningful participation and leadership in conflict prevention and peace- and state-building and protecting women’s and girls’ rights in crisis and (post-)conflict situations, through agenda setting, influencing the debate and/or movement building (link SCS3)
# democracy school graduates	5.2.2. # of individuals with strengthened competencies to advance women’s rights and gender equality (disaggregated by type, age and gender)
# inclusive policies proposed (as a result of dialogue platforms)	4.2. # of laws, policies and strategies blocked, adopted or improved to promote women’s meaningful participation and leadership in conflict prevention, peace- and state-building and protect women’s and girls’ rights in crisis and (post-)conflict situations
# interparty dialogue meetings	
# multi-stakeholder dialogue/platform meetings	
# of (aspiring) politicians/leaders trained (disaggregated by affiliation, gender, age, ethnicity etc)	5.2.2. # of individuals with strengthened competencies to advance women’s rights and gender equality (disaggregated by type, age and gender)
# of international advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs	5.2.3 # of advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs, for, by or with their membership/constituency
# of advocacy initiatives carried out by political actors	
# of women-led CSOs included in the programme activities	SCS6 # of CSOs included in SPs programmes
# women-led CSOs with increased L&A capacities	5.2.1 # of organizations (disaggregated by women-led, youth-led or other) with strengthened capacity to advance women’s rights and gender equality (link SCS5)
# of targeted male politicians with improved knowledge, attitudes and practises towards women’s voice, agency, leadership and representative participation in decision-making processes	2.3 # of targeted actors (disaggregated by type, age and gender) with improved knowledge, attitudes and practises towards women’s voice, agency, leadership and representative participation in decision-making processes
# Party resolutions for women’s inclusion and equal participation in decision-making	4.2. # of laws, policies and strategies blocked, adopted or improved to promote women’s meaningful participation and leadership in conflict prevention, peace- and state-building and protect women’s and girls’ rights in crisis and (post-)conflict situations
# political actors participating in dialogue platforms (disaggregated by type)	5.2.1 # of organizations (disaggregated by women-led, youth-led or other) with strengthened capacity to advance women’s rights and gender equality (link SCS5)
# political actors trained (disaggregated by type)	
# political actors who adopt measures and policies to enhance representation of women in their decision-making processes	5.2.1 # of organizations (disaggregated by women-led, youth-led or other) with strengthened capacity to advance women’s rights and gender equality (link SCS5)
# political actors who implement internal measures and/or policies to enhance representation of women in their decision-making processes	
# studies for evidence-based L&A disseminated to political actors	4.4. # of times that CSOs succeed in creating space for CSO demands and positions on promote women’s meaningful participation and leadership in conflict prevention and peace- and state-building and protecting women’s and girls’ rights in crisis and (post-)conflict situations, through agenda setting, influencing the debate and/or movement building (link SCS3)

# women (aspiring) leaders trained	5.2.2. # of individuals with strengthened competencies to advance women's rights and gender equality (disaggregated by type, age and gender)
Share of women candidates	
# of regional advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs	5.2.3 # of advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs, for, by or with their membership/constituency
# of national advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs	5.2.3 # of advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs, for, by or with their membership/constituency
# of sub-national advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs	5.2.3 # of advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs, for, by or with their membership/constituency
# youth-led CSOs with increased L&A capacities	5.2.1 # of organizations (disaggregated by women-led, youth-led or other) with strengthened capacity to advance women's rights and gender equality (link SCS5)
# of other CSOs with increased L&A capacities	5.2.1 # of organizations (disaggregated by women-led, youth-led or other) with strengthened capacity to advance women's rights and gender equality (link SCS5)
# of youth-led CSOs included in the programme activities	SCS6 # of CSOs included in SPs programmes
# of other CSOs included in the programme activities	SCS6 # of CSOs included in SPs programmes
Outcome Harvesting	

