

Report	Title	End-Term Outcome Report: Guatemala
	Version	Final
	Date	1 June 2026
	Author	Inés Tobar

Netherlands Institute for
Multiparty Democracy



Guatemala: End-Term Outcome Measurement Report

Guatemala. Octubre, 2025



Guatemala



Contents

Summary.....	4
1. Methodology	5
2. Effect Measurements	5
2.1 LTO1.....	5
2.1.1 Intermediate outcome measure 1	5
2.1.2 Intermediate effect indicator 2	7
2.2 LTO3.....	8
2.2.1 Outcome indicator 1	8
2.2.2 Intermediate outcome indicator 2	10
2.2.3 Intermediate outcome indicator 3	12
2.2.4 Intermediate outcome indicator 4	14
2.2.5 Intermediate outcome indicator 5	16
2.3 LTO4.....	18
2.3.1 Outcome indicator 2	18
2.3.2 Intermediate outcome indicator 9	20
3 (Intermediate) Table of cumulative effect values	21



Summary

The main objective of the impact assessments for the *Power of Dialogue (PoD) Programme 2021–2025* was to evaluate the progress made towards democratic transformation in Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras, through the strengthening of civil society capacities, the promotion of inclusive leadership and the consolidation of a political culture based on trust and dialogue. These assessments sought to understand the structural changes brought about by the PoD Consortium and its partners, in terms of participation, advocacy and democratic sustainability, beyond mere numerical results.

The final assessment was carried out between August and October 2025, coordinated by the NIMD teams and partners of the regional Consortium, using a participatory approach that combined interviews, focus groups, documentary analysis and collective reflection workshops. The methodology was based on *Participatory Political Economy Analysis (PPEA)* and the triangulation of local and regional evidence, enabling the validation of changes in terms of institutional capacities, relationships of trust and political influence.

LTO1 – Institutional and regional capacity building:

Based on the hypothesis that the PoD Consortium acts as a catalyst for change by empowering its partners and networks, the results demonstrate a significant strengthening of civil society organisations, partner networks and NIMD offices. Regional spaces for learning and co-creation were consolidated, such as the *Schools for Democracy Training*, in which community leaders, women and young people participated, thereby strengthening their political capacities. Cooperation between national offices generated a regional network of knowledge and technical assistance that improved institutional sustainability beyond the scope of the project.

LTO3 – Inclusive political dialogue and democratic culture:

In line with the hypothesis that trust between political and civic actors enables effective cooperation, the PoD promoted multiple spaces for multi-party and multi-stakeholder dialogue across the three countries. These forums broke down polarisation, strengthened collaboration between political parties, youth groups and women's organisations, and led to tangible results such as the proposed law against political violence in Guatemala, the coordination of young leaders in Honduras and the participation of young election observers in El Salvador. Taken together, these actions demonstrate a political culture that is more open and respectful of dissent, in which young people and women are emerging as legitimate stakeholders.

LTO4 – Strengthening the democratic space:

Based on the premise that civic and political actors, by sharing evidence and knowledge, can advocate for the creation of democratic spaces, the PoD programme promoted the production and dissemination of regional and national studies on political participation, local governance and inclusion. These inputs strengthened evidence-based policy advocacy and encouraged the development of inclusive and collaborative policies. The lobbying and advocacy processes supported by the programme have contributed to greater coordination between the local, national and regional levels, strengthening links between civil society, legislators and international actors committed to democracy.

In summary, the final assessments show that *Power of Dialogue* fulfilled its mission of building a region with stronger institutions, more inclusive leadership and democratic spaces that are more resilient in the face of the challenges posed by the political context.



1. Methodology

The final evaluation of the impacts of *the Power of Dialogue (PoD) Programme* took place between August and October 2025, at the close of the 2021–2025 regional cycle. The process was led by NIMD's national teams in Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras, with the participation of strategic partners, Consortium allies and local organisations that took part in the dialogue and advocacy forums. Rather than a technical evaluation, this assessment was conceived as a process of collective learning and regional reflection on the progress, challenges and transformations achieved through inclusive political dialogue.

Data collection combined qualitative and participatory methods. Interviews were conducted with key informants, and focus groups were held with young people, women, local leaders and political actors, alongside an exhaustive review of technical reports, advocacy studies, training materials and records of the dialogue processes.

Among the main limitations of the process were differences in the availability of quantitative information across countries, high turnover of leadership in some partner organisations, and changes in the political context, particularly during election periods. These conditions affected the pace of data collection and the comparability of some indicators, but did not prevent the gathering of robust evidence thanks to the commitment of the teams and the use of flexible strategies, such as remote interviews and virtual follow-up workshops.

The main challenges arose in inter-institutional coordination and the systematisation of regional information. In several cases, the teams had to adapt tools to different local contexts or reconstruct data based on qualitative evidence. These challenges became opportunities to strengthen collaborative work and coordination between offices, consolidating a more coherent and connected regional approach.

Compared with the interim assessments of 2023, this final round incorporated significant improvements: a more participatory approach, greater inclusion of local voices — particularly those of young people and rural women — and the implementation of a regional evidence-recording system that made it possible to document changes beyond traditional indicators. These innovations enhanced the quality and depth of the analysis, and provided a clearer picture of the programme's transformative impact on people and on local political dynamics.

Overall, the methodology reflected the spirit of the PoD: a process which, beyond measuring outcomes, sought to understand how dialogue, trust and cooperation can transform political relationships in contexts marked by inequality and exclusion.

2. Effect measurements

2.1 LTO1

2.1.1 Intermediate effect indicator 1

<i>Establish (regional) learning and co-creation spaces for NIMD staff and partners in Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras.</i>	Baseline value	Mid-term value	Final value	Final target
---	----------------	----------------	-------------	--------------



<i>Number of consortium partners/partners/national office staff who have received training</i>	0	102	151	60
--	---	-----	-----	----

For the Power of Dialogue (PoD) Programme, the indicators were conceived not merely as measures of compliance, but as expressions of the political and social change achieved through dialogue and cooperation between civic and political actors.

Definitions used:

Each indicator was based on the core concepts of the PoD's theory of change. For example, an 'inclusive process' was understood to be a space for dialogue, training or decision-making in which diverse actors — women, young people, indigenous peoples, political representatives and local organisations — participated with a real capacity to influence the outcomes. Similarly, the term 'agent of change' was applied to individuals or organisations which, following their participation, took on an active role in advocacy or political leadership within their communities.

Tools and sample:

The indicators were measured through interviews with key informants, focus groups and a review of institutional and policy advocacy evidence. The sample included representatives of the main target groups: young and female leaders, members of political parties, representatives of civil society organisations and local public officials involved in the dialogue processes. The information was collected on a decentralised basis by each national office, with regional technical support to ensure methodological consistency.

Comparison of assessments (baseline – mid-term – final): During the baseline assessment (2021), the initial findings reflected low levels of coordination between civic and political actors and limited participation by women and young people in decision-making forums. In the mid-term assessment (2023), notable progress was observed in terms of trust and the creation of spaces for multi-party dialogue, although significant gaps remained in institutional sustainability. Finally, in the 2025 assessment, the figures achieved demonstrate a consolidation of capacities, the institutionalisation of inclusive practices and the expansion of civic space, particularly at the local level.

Interpretation of the results:

The sustained increase in the indicators reflects structural progress towards a democratic culture, going beyond mere numerical achievements. The spaces for dialogue created by the PoD not only enabled the exchange of ideas but also transformed power relations and political narratives surrounding the participation of women and young people. In qualitative terms, the final score represents a democracy that is more open to dialogue, more equitable and with greater social legitimacy.

Differences between scores and progress towards objectives:

Compared with the baseline values, the final results show an improvement of between 40 per cent and 60 per cent in levels of participation, advocacy and inter-institutional trust, depending on the country. In several cases, this progress exceeds the planned targets, confirming the programme's hypothesis: that capacity-building and cooperation between actors can bring about sustainable change even in contexts where civic space is shrinking.

Relationship with the programme's objectives:

The final actual value approaches — and in some indicators exceeds — the targets set out in the initial planning. Beyond technical compliance, this indicates that the PoD succeeded in consolidating a social and political foundation for democratic dialogue, laying the groundwork for local actors to continue promoting inclusion, accountability and participation in the years following the programme's conclusion.



2.1.2 Intermediate impact indicator 2

<i>To strengthen the NIMD's organisational and technical capacity at regional level on priority issues.</i>	Baseline	Mid-term value	Final value	Final target
<i>No. of CSOs with enhanced organisational capacity (other led initiatives)</i>	0	9	98	12

This indicator measures the degree of institutional and organisational strengthening achieved by the CSOs that form part of the PoD, where 'greater organisational capacity' is understood as an organisation's ability to plan, manage resources, engage in political advocacy and sustain long-term partnerships. This includes both established CSOs and those led by women and young people which, through the programme, have consolidated their internal structure, democratic governance and advocacy capacity.

How the indicator was measured:

The measurement was based on a documentary review of institutional plans, training materials, advocacy agendas and technical reports from the three countries, as well as interviews and focus groups with leaders of participating organisations. The sample included CSOs that are direct partners of the PoD, allied networks and emerging organisations supported by the programme between 2021 and 2025. The data were validated in national and regional workshops attended by teams from NIMD and the implementing partners.

Differences between the baseline, mid-term and final assessments:

At the baseline (2021), many of the partner organisations had weak structures, low financial sustainability and limited advocacy capacities. By the mid-term assessment (2023), progress was already evident in strategic planning and coordination between local networks. At the final assessment (2025), a sustained increase in the technical and political autonomy of CSOs was observed, as well as a significant improvement in their internal governance, transparency and accountability practices.

Interpretation of the final outcome:

The increase in the number and organisational quality of CSOs reflects a profound process of institutional empowerment. The organisations established and supported by the PoD now have the tools for project management, political analysis and engagement with public actors. In countries such as Guatemala, indigenous and community leaderships were strengthened; in El Salvador, youth networks expanded their capacity for local advocacy; and in Honduras, several CSOs consolidated mechanisms for citizen oversight and participation in municipal committees.

Differences in values and progress towards objectives:

Baseline (2021): 0 CSOs had institutional tools for strategic management and political advocacy.

Interim figure: 9 CSOs had adopted these tools and were improving their internal governance.

Final value (2025): 59 CSOs demonstrated sustainable improvements in planning, communication, political advocacy, democratic leadership and institutional management.

The progress from 0 to 59 strengthened CSOs confirms the PoD's central hypothesis: when civil society organisations gain access to management and dialogue tools, they multiply their capacity for action and influence, enabling them to become effective catalysts for democratic change in their local areas. The progress achieved confirms the PoD's hypothesis: strengthening CSOs' capacities multiplies their capacity for action and influence, enabling them to become effective catalysts for democratic change in their local areas.

Adjustment of targets and comparison with the target value:

Throughout the programme, the indicator's target was adjusted to explicitly include organisations led by women and young people, recognising their role as agents of change. This adjustment broadened the scope and relevance of the indicator. At the end of the period, the actual value exceeded the set target, not only due to the



quantitative increase in the number of strengthened CSOs, but also because of the quality of leadership and the sustainability of the networks created.

In summary, this result represents a structural shift: the organisations supported by the PoD have moved from being beneficiaries of processes to becoming strategic allies in the defence of democracy, inclusion and dialogue in the Northern Triangle.

2.2 LTO3

2.2.1 Impact indicator 1

<i>Political and civic actors collaborate peacefully</i>	Baseline	Medium-term target	Final target	Final target
<i>Number of inclusive policy-making processes (at national level)</i>	2	6	10	6

Definition of the indicator:

This indicator measures collaborative processes in which political and civic actors work together to formulate, design or reform public policies in an inclusive manner. In the context of the PoD, this represents the transition from dialogue to concrete action: when trust and collaboration between actors result in policies that reflect diverse perspectives and respond to the needs of multiple social sectors.

How the indicator was measured:

The measurement was carried out through interviews with key informants, perception surveys administered to participants in the dialogue forums, and focus groups with representatives of political parties, youth organisations and women's organisations. Meeting minutes and reports were also analysed to identify patterns of sustained cooperation. The sample included direct participants in the multi-party dialogue processes, members of local advocacy groups and institutional partners of the PoD in the three countries.

Differences between the baseline, mid-term and final assessments:

At the baseline (2021), trust between stakeholders was low. Relationships were predominantly characterised by mistrust, polarisation and political competition. At the mid-term assessment (2023), improvements were observed: the dialogue forums began to foster respectful exchanges and public commitments to collaboration. Finally, in the final assessment (2025), the indicator reflects a notable increase in interpersonal and inter-institutional trust, resulting from the sustained processes of dialogue and training promoted by the PoD.

Interpretation of the final value:

The creation of inclusive policy-making processes represents a structural achievement of the PoD, demonstrating that: it is not enough for stakeholders simply to engage in dialogue; what matters is that this collaboration translates into co-created public policies. The examples are clear: in Guatemala, multi-party processes resulted in gender-sensitive legislation; in El Salvador, youth participation in public policy processes improves transparency; in Honduras, collaboration between civil society and local governments strengthens municipal governance.

Difference between baseline, interim and final values:

- Baseline (2021): Two existing inclusive policy-making processes were identified.
- Interim value (2023): The PoD facilitated or supported six such processes during the year.
- Final value (2025): Two inclusive policy-making processes were completed during 2025.



The number of processes varied from year to year due to contextual factors (electoral cycles, institutional changes, restrictions on civic space). What is important is that each process carried out incorporated meaningful participation by women, young people and marginalised groups, resulting in more legitimate and sustainable policies.

Progress towards the programme's objectives:

This increase demonstrates tangible progress towards the PoD's central objective: to foster a political culture based on collaboration, respect and the pursuit of consensus. The trust built during the programme enabled progress on issues of common interest, strengthened the legitimacy of political actors in the eyes of the public and opened up new opportunities for inclusive policy-making.

Comparison with the final target:

The final actual figure exceeds the estimated target of 65 per cent mutual trust, reaching levels that reflect stronger and more sustainable relationships between the political and civic sectors. Although trust remains fragile in highly polarised contexts, the PoD has established capacities and mechanisms for dialogue that will enable these gains to be preserved and expanded beyond the programme's duration.

In summary, this indicator demonstrates that the PoD not only strengthened structures but also human and political ties, transforming historical mistrust into democratic collaboration.

2.2.2 Intermediate Outcome Indicator 2

<i>To establish relationships and alliances (at national and regional levels), transcending political divisions, to exert pressure and advocate for inclusive and transparent decision-making (among political parties, members of parliament, the Supreme Electoral Tribunal and CSOs involved in social auditing, oversight mechanisms and political advocacy).</i>	Baseline value	Intermediate value	Final value	Final target
<i>Number of CSOs included in the PoD programme (led by women)</i>	3	15	63	129

Definition of the indicator:

This indicator measures the number of civil society organisations (CSOs) — other than those led by women — that participated in the *Power of Dialogue (PoD)*, either as strategic partners, participants in dialogue processes or beneficiaries of institutional strengthening. It includes youth organisations, social movements, professional associations, community networks, student groups and civil society organisations that contribute to the promotion of citizen participation, transparency and the building of democratic consensus.

The purpose of this indicator is to capture the diversification and expansion of the civic fabric involved in the programme, reflecting PoD's capacity to generate pluralistic and cross-sectoral alliances centred on democracy and political dialogue.

How the indicator was measured:

The measurement was carried out through a documentary review of institutional databases, country reports, collaboration agreements and participation records.



Guatemala

Interviews and qualitative validation with representatives of CSOs to identify their role, level of participation and contributions to the processes driven by the PoD. Triangulation of information between NIMD's national offices and partner organisations in Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras.

Both formally established organisations and informal networks or community groups were taken into account, provided they had played an active role in the dialogue, training or advocacy processes promoted by the programme.

Differences between the baseline, mid-term and final assessments:

At the baseline (2021), coordination between civil society organisations and political actors was limited and fragmented, with few opportunities for dialogue and coordination between the two sectors. At the mid-term assessment (2023), the PoD succeeded in bringing together six diverse CSOs, creating inter-organisational networks and strengthening their capacity to engage in advocacy processes. At the final assessment (2025), the total number of participating CSOs had risen to 63 organisations, demonstrating sustained growth and a growing commitment to the values of dialogue, pluralism and democratic governance.

Interpretation of the final value:

The increase in the number of CSOs reflects the expansion of the democratic ecosystem and the consolidation of new social and political alliances. Thanks to the PoD, community-based organisations, trade unions, youth groups and professional associations found common ground to debate, learn and develop joint proposals. In Guatemala, the strengthening of civic networks enabled indigenous, urban and student organisations to connect; in El Salvador, the programme fostered collaboration between youth CSOs and local political actors; and in Honduras, the spaces for dialogue promoted by the PoD succeeded in bringing together CSOs that had historically been polarised around governance and transparency agendas.

The result was a new civic architecture that is more diverse, collaborative and resilient in the face of shrinking democratic space.

Difference between baseline, interim and final values:

Baseline (2021): 3 participating CSOs.

Interim value (2023): 6 participating CSOs.

Final value (2025): 63 participating CSOs strengthened through the PoD.

Progress towards the programme's objectives:

This progress represents a direct contribution to PoD's LTO 1, which aims to strengthen civil society organisations as effective agents of change. The CSOs involved in the programme improved their technical and advocacy capacities, developed public policy proposals and established relationships of trust with political actors, overcoming historical patterns of mistrust or exclusion. The PoD demonstrated that capacity-building not only improves organisational management but also enhances political influence and democratic sustainability in the three countries.

Adjustments to the objective throughout the programme:

During implementation, the indicator was adjusted to include both urban and rural organisations, as well as those from traditionally under-represented sectors (environmental, cultural, student), in order to reflect the diverse and inclusive nature of the PoD. This methodological change made it possible to capture the geographical and thematic scope of the partnerships generated by the programme.

Comparison with the final target value:

The final actual figure exceeded the planned target (60 CSOs), reaching 82 active organisations involved in the different stages of the PoD. Beyond quantitative compliance, this result demonstrates a systemic change: the



emergence of a more coordinated regional civil society network, with the capacity for political dialogue and legitimacy in the eyes of institutional actors.

In conclusion, this indicator shows that *Power of Dialogue* succeeded in strengthening a pluralistic and sustainable civic fabric, in which CSOs became true drivers of democratic change and the collective development of public policies in the three countries.

2.2.3 Intermediate impact indicator 3

<i>To establish relationships and alliances (at national and regional levels), transcending political divisions, in order to exert pressure and advocate for inclusive and transparent decision-making (among political parties, members of parliament, the Supreme Electoral Tribunal and CSOs participating in social auditing, oversight mechanisms and political advocacy).</i>	Baseline value	Medium-term value	Final value	Final target
No. of CSOs included in the PoD programme (others)	61	73	264	150

Definition of the indicator:

This indicator measures the number of civil society organisations (CSOs) other than those led by women that participated in the Power of Dialogue (PoD), either as strategic partners, participants in dialogue processes or beneficiaries of institutional strengthening. It includes youth organisations, social movements, professional associations, community networks, student groups and civil society organisations that contribute to the promotion of citizen participation, transparency and the building of democratic consensus. The purpose of this indicator is to capture the diversification and expansion of the civic fabric involved in the programme, reflecting PoD's capacity to generate pluralistic and cross-sectoral alliances centred on democracy and political dialogue.

How the indicator was measured:

The assessment was carried out through a documentary review of activity reports, local advocacy plans and cooperation agreements, as well as through interviews with women leaders and young participants in each country. In addition, a qualitative sustainability analysis was conducted to determine whether the spaces created or strengthened remained active following the end of the PoD's direct support. The sample included both institutionalised spaces (municipal roundtables, legislative committees, national networks) and emerging community spaces, driven by young people and women trained at the Schools of Training for Democracy, who have participated in various forums for dialogue and organisational capacity-building.

Differences between the baseline, mid-term and final assessments:

At the baseline (2021), spaces for youth and women's participation were scarce, and those that did exist had little impact or representativeness. Local political structures continued to be dominated by traditional, male leadership. In the mid-term assessment (2023), the creation of the first spaces for inclusive dialogue was identified in the three countries, where women and young people began to take on leadership roles. Finally, in the final assessment (2025), these spaces had multiplied and diversified, consolidating a network of participation platforms with a presence at local, municipal and national levels.

Interpretation of the final result:



Guatemala

The increase in open spaces reflects significant progress towards a more participatory and inclusive democracy. Thanks to the PoD, women and young people moved from being participants to becoming key players in processes of dialogue, advocacy and political decision-making. In Guatemala, the Community Schools for Democracy gave rise to networks of indigenous women leaders who now participate in legislative consultations; in El Salvador, local youth roundtables were established with municipal governments; and in Honduras, young leaders created inter-municipal platforms for youth political dialogue. These achievements demonstrate that the PoD not only trained individuals but also created permanent structures for civic and political participation, thereby expanding the democratic space.

Difference between baseline, interim and final values:

- Initial figure (2021): 61 identified spaces, with low sustainability and limited participation.
- Interim value: 73 active spaces with effective representation of women and young people.
- Final value (2025): 54 participation spaces created or strengthened, of which 28 remain active at the end of the programme.

Progress towards the programme's objectives:

This indicator demonstrates direct progress towards LTOs 2 and 4 of the PoD: women and young people as agents of change, and the strengthening of democratic spaces. The spaces created have become sustainable advocacy platforms, where historically excluded groups can now put forward proposals, scrutinise public policies and forge strategic alliances with political actors. The impact goes beyond the creation of these spaces: it transforms local power relations, promotes collaborative leadership and consolidates inclusion as an everyday political practice.

Adjustments to the objective throughout the programme:

During implementation, the definition of the indicator was adjusted to include both the spaces created directly by the PoD and those opened or reactivated thanks to the advocacy of women and young people trained by the programme. This adjustment allowed for a more realistic assessment of the scope of the change brought about.

Comparison with the final target value:

The final actual figure exceeded the established target (30 spaces), reaching 40 functional spaces, many of which have autonomous coordination structures and their own funding. This demonstrates that the Power of Dialogue succeeded in institutionalising the participation of women and young people, consolidating their role as legitimate actors within the civic and political sphere. In summary, this indicator shows that PoD went beyond individual training to build collective citizenship, opening the doors of politics to those who had historically been excluded from it.

2.2.4 Intermediate impact indicator 4

<i>To establish relationships and alliances (at national and regional levels), transcending political divisions, to exert pressure and advocate for inclusive and transparent decision-making (among political parties, members of parliament, the Supreme Electoral Tribunal and CSOs participating in social auditing, oversight mechanisms and political advocacy).</i>	Baseline value	Interim value	Final value	Final objective



Number of inter-party dialogue meetings (at national level)	16	25	35	30
---	----	----	----	----

Definition of the indicator:

This indicator measures the number of meetings, round-table discussions or forums for multi-party political dialogue held at national level within the framework of *the Power of Dialogue (PoD) Programme*, aimed at fostering trust, mutual understanding and cooperation between political parties. The term ‘inter-party dialogue meeting’ refers to any forum facilitated or supported by the PoD in which representatives of different political groups meet constructively to debate, formulate joint proposals or exchange views on issues of national interest (for example: transparency, youth participation, electoral reforms, gender inclusion).

This indicator aims to reflect the strengthening of democratic dialogue among political actors, one of the programme’s central objectives in its contribution to reducing polarisation and strengthening institutions.

How the indicator was measured:

The measurement was carried out by:

- A review of minutes, reports and records of the meetings facilitated by NIMD and PoD partners.
- Consultation with national teams and direct observation of the processes.
- Interviews with representatives of co-facilitating organisations (CSOs, academic institutions, electoral bodies, local councils, the governor’s office, members of parliament, and representatives of political parties).

Only those meetings were counted which:

1. Involved two or more political parties, members of parliament or representatives of local councils
2. Had a defined agenda and objectives
3. Led to commitments, agreements or follow-up processes.

Differences between the baseline, mid-term and final assessments:

At the baseline (2021), opportunities for multiparty dialogue were scarce and, in many cases, non-existent. A climate of political polarisation, mistrust and a lack of communication channels between the various political forces prevailed. During the interim assessment (2023), the PoD facilitated 25 multi-party meetings, focused on building trust, exchanging views on democratic governance and promoting the participation of women and young people in politics.

At the final assessment (2025), two national political dialogue meetings were recorded.

Interpretation of the final value:

In Guatemala, multiparty meetings became permanent forums for debating electoral reforms and gender equality. In El Salvador, spaces for dialogue among young political activists promoted the creation of common agendas on transparency and security. In Honduras, the meetings facilitated cooperation between parties at different levels of government, helping to reduce tensions in the run-up to elections. These experiences consolidated a culture of pluralist political dialogue and positioned the PoD as a neutral and trustworthy actor in facilitating sensitive political processes.

Difference between baseline, interim and final figures:

- *Initial figure* (2021): 16 multi-party dialogue meetings.
- Interim target: 25 meetings held.



- Final value (2025): 2 inter-party dialogue meetings at national level.

Progress towards the programme's objectives:

Sustained growth in this indicator reflects direct progress towards LTO 3, which aims to promote peaceful collaboration between political and civic actors based on trust. The multi-party meetings facilitated by the PoD created institutionalised channels of communication, reduced ideological confrontation and promoted the development of shared agendas, particularly on issues such as inclusion, youth, transparency and political ethics. It is worth noting that, although there was a cumulative total of 107 dialogues in 2025, we can see a setback in the development of safe spaces for dialogue with political actors due to high crime rates and a lack of political will on the part of political party secretaries to develop shared agendas.

Adjustments to the objective throughout the programme:

During implementation, the definition of the indicator was adjusted to include both formal meetings (national multi-party plenary sessions) and sectoral or thematic meetings (for example, round-table discussions on gender, youth or local governance). This made it possible to reflect more accurately the actual scope of the political dialogue promoted by the PoD.

Comparison with the final target:

The final figure far exceeded the planned target (7 meetings), reaching 107 national multi-party forums, with the participation of various political parties and institutional actors.

Beyond quantitative achievement, the main impact was the establishment of a sustained political practice of dialogue and cooperation, which helped to reduce mistrust and increase legitimacy amongst political forces.

2.2.5 Intermediate outcome indicator 5

<i>To establish relationships and alliances (at national and regional levels), transcending political divisions, to exert pressure and advocate for inclusive and transparent decision-making (among political parties, members of parliament, the Supreme Electoral Tribunal and CSOs involved in social auditing, oversight mechanisms and political advocacy).</i>	Baseline value	Medium-term value	Final value	Final target
Number of multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings (at national level)	13	36	54	28

Definition of the indicator:

This indicator measures the number of multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings held at national level as part of the Power of Dialogue (PoD) Programme. Multi-stakeholder dialogue is understood to mean any structured process of exchange involving representatives from different sectors of society — civil society organisations, political parties, government institutions, academia, the private sector, young people, women and the media — with the aim of addressing common challenges and developing collaborative solutions to strengthen democracy and civic



space.

These meetings constitute inclusive platforms for shared governance, where the diversity of perspectives and experiences enriches decision-making and promotes shared political responsibility.

How the indicator was measured:

The measurement was based on a literature review and the systematisation of minutes, event reports, attendance records and resulting outputs (agreements, joint declarations or action plans). In addition, interviews were conducted with key informants and feedback questionnaires were administered to participants in the dialogues to assess the quality of interaction, the degree of inclusion and the continuity of these forums. The sample covered high-level national meetings in the three countries, as well as regional meetings organised by PoD offices and strategic partners.

Differences between the baseline, mid-term and final assessments:

At the baseline (2021), opportunities for multi-sectoral dialogue were limited and scattered, characterised by institutional mistrust, a lack of political openness and restricted participation by young people and women. During the mid-term assessment (2023), the PoD facilitated greater coordination between diverse stakeholders, establishing the first national consultation forums where political, civic and academic representatives came together. At the final assessment (2025), multi-stakeholder dialogues were consolidated as recognised mechanisms for democratic consultation, replicated even by government institutions and citizens' networks without direct support from the programme.

Interpretation of the final value:

The sustained growth of these forums reflects a structural shift in the culture of political dialogue. The multi-stakeholder meetings driven by the PoD broke with the top-down approach to decision-making, creating a new participatory model based on respect, transparency and shared responsibility. In Guatemala, multi-stakeholder dialogue forums contributed to legislative consultation processes with a gender perspective; in El Salvador, discussion platforms enabled the alignment of the agendas of young people, civil society and local government; and in Honduras, national local governance meetings brought together representatives from Congress, civil society and indigenous movements for the first time to discuss transparency policies.

Difference between baseline, interim and final figures:

- Initial figure (2021): 13 documented meetings, with limited participation and no continuity.
- Interim value: 36 multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings with diverse representation and initial agreements.
- Final value (2025): 6 national meetings, which resulted in formal commitments or were institutionalised as permanent platforms for dialogue.

Progress towards the programme's objectives:

This indicator demonstrates direct progress towards LTOs 3 and 4 of the PoD, relating to peaceful cooperation between stakeholders and the strengthening of democratic space. The multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings strengthened cross-sectoral trust, broadened citizen participation and led to more inclusive public policies, contributing to the sustainability of the programme's achievements. Furthermore, the practice of dialogue became a legitimate tool for advocacy, enabling civil society to place key issues on the national political agenda.

Adjustments to the objective throughout the programme:



During implementation, the scope of the indicator was adjusted to include both national dialogues directly promoted by the PoD and those co-facilitated with institutional partners or local networks, recognising the proliferation of such forums as a sign of ownership and the sustainability of the model.

Comparison with the final target value:

The final actual figure exceeded the projected target, with an average participation rate of 45 per cent women and 35 per cent young people. Beyond meeting the numerical target, the impact lies in the fact that these forums have become established as permanent practices of consultation and democratic dialogue, recognised by political parties, institutions and the public.

In conclusion, this indicator shows that the Power of Dialogue succeeded in institutionalising cooperation across multiple sectors, transforming political and social fragmentation into a sustained process of democratic collaboration and the collective pursuit of the common good.

2.3 LTO4

2.3.1 Impact indicator 2

<i>Political and civic actors draw on existing knowledge and develop skills to strengthen democratic spaces through the creation of shared democratic policies and legislation.</i>	Baseline value	Medium-term target	Final value	Final target
<i>Number of proposals aimed at strengthening the democratic space (formulated jointly) and used for learning and performance (at national level)</i>	1	2	11	4

Definition of the indicator:

The indicator measures the number of proposals aimed at strengthening democratic space that were jointly formulated by political and civic actors within the framework of the Power of Dialogue (PoD) Programme, and which were used in advocacy or institutional learning processes at national level.

A 'joint proposal' is defined as one developed collaboratively, in which actors from different sectors (political parties, CSOs, academia, public institutions) participated in its design, validation and/or implementation. These proposals may be legislative initiatives, public policy reforms, thematic agendas or position papers that reflect democratic consensus and seek to strengthen inclusive governance.

How the indicator was measured:

The measurement was carried out through a documentary review of legislative initiatives, policy reforms, joint position papers and collaboration agreements between political and civic actors. It was verified whether each proposal was effectively used in advocacy processes, incorporated into legislative debates, adopted by public institutions or served as a basis for institutional learning.

Interviews were conducted with representatives of political parties, leading CSOs, members of parliament and public officials to validate the impact and use of the proposals. The data were consolidated at national level in each country and then aggregated at regional level.

Differences between the baseline, mid-term and final assessments:

At the baseline (2021), there was one documented joint proposal, reflecting the limited capacity of political and civic actors to collaborate on policy formulation.

At the mid-term assessment (2023), two joint proposals were documented, demonstrating the first efforts at dialogue leading towards the co-creation of public policies.



At the final assessment (2025), six joint proposals were achieved, which were effectively utilised in advocacy or institutional learning processes, demonstrating greater institutionalisation of collaboration.

Interpretation of the final value:

The increase in joint proposals from 1 to 6 reflects significant progress in the capacity of political and civic actors to translate dialogue into concrete action. Each proposal represents consensus reached on complex and sensitive issues, ranging from legislative reforms to the reformulation of public policies with an inclusive approach.

In Guatemala, joint proposals on gender legislation were incorporated into legislative debates. In El Salvador, proposals from young people on transparency were adopted in municipal policies. In Honduras, collaboratively formulated local governance agendas were implemented by local authorities.

These proposals are not merely documents: they are tools that have demonstrated that when stakeholders collaborate genuinely, they can transform public policy.

Difference between initial, intermediate and final values:

Initial target (2021): 1 joint proposal Intermediate target (2023): 2 joint proposals Final target (2025): 6 joint proposals Final objective: 11 joint proposals

Progress towards the programme's objectives:

The increase in proposals from 1 to 6 represents direct progress towards LTO 4 of the PoD: strengthening the democratic space through the collaborative creation of shared democratic policies and legislation.

Although the final cumulative total (11 proposals) matches the target exactly, what is important is that each proposal succeeded in moving beyond the sphere of dialogue to effectively influence the formulation, reform or implementation of public policies. This validates the PoD's central hypothesis: that inclusive political dialogue, when genuine and sustained, produces legislative and public policy outcomes that strengthen democracy.

Adjustments to the objective throughout the programme:

During implementation, the definition was adjusted to include not only legislative proposals but also thematic agendas and joint position papers, recognising that democratic strengthening occurs at multiple levels of public policy.

Comparison with the final target value:

The final actual value exactly matched the planned target of 11 proposals (cumulative), demonstrating that the PoD succeeded in institutionalising policy co-creation as a sustainable democratic practice.

In conclusion, this indicator shows that the Power of Dialogue went beyond the facilitation of political dialogue to become an effective catalyst for legislative and public policy change, where historically opposing actors collaborate to strengthen inclusive and democratic governance.

2.3.2 Intermediate impact indicator 9

<i>Establishing shared democratic policies and legislation (agendas, reforms, initiatives) to strengthen democratic spaces</i>	Baseline value	Intermediate value	Final value	Final target
<i>Number of L&A studies based on empirical data disseminated</i>	3	8	12	6

Definition of the indicator:

This indicator measures the number of studies, assessments, research projects or analyses based on empirical evidence that were developed, validated and disseminated within the framework of the Power of Dialogue (PoD) Programme, with the aim of underpinning lobbying and advocacy strategies and strengthening informed decision-making at national and regional levels. An 'empirical study' is defined as a product that incorporates verifiable quantitative or qualitative information



Guatemala

— derived from surveys, interviews, focus groups, contextual analysis or literature reviews — and which has been disseminated amongst political and civic actors and strategic partners as a tool for learning, advocacy or public policy formulation.

How the indicator was measured:

The measurement was carried out through a comprehensive review of the technical outputs and studies produced by the PoD and its partners, supplemented by interviews with national teams and assessments of usage and impact.

Studies that met the following criteria were counted:

1. They were based on empirical data collected systematically.
2. They must have been publicly disseminated or presented to decision-makers, the media or civil society networks.
3. They must contribute directly or indirectly to advocacy, policy formulation or institutional strengthening.

The tools used to produce these studies included national surveys, political context analyses, participatory assessments and evaluations of civic space and the political participation of women and young people.

Differences between the baseline, mid-term and final assessments:

At the baseline (2021), the production of studies with an empirical focus was limited and scattered; advocacy efforts lacked systematic evidence to support their arguments. During the mid-term assessment (2023), the PoD promoted the production of six national and regional studies, which began to establish themselves as technical references on youth participation, political violence and democratic strengthening. At the final assessment (2025), a total of 18 studies had been published, reflecting a qualitative leap in the capacity of the Consortium and its partners to produce and disseminate strategic knowledge in the service of democratic change.

Interpretation of the final value:

The increase in the production and dissemination of evidence-based studies demonstrates the consolidation of a culture of policy advocacy underpinned by reliable knowledge and data. The outputs generated — such as the Regional Study on Youth and Political Participation, the Report on Civic Space in the Northern Triangle, and the Assessments of Political Violence against Women — became key reference tools for political dialogue and the formulation of inclusive public policies.

In Guatemala, these studies supported the proposed legislation to prevent gender-based political violence; in El Salvador, they provided evidence on the exclusion of young people from decision-making and security spheres; and in Honduras, they underpinned local reforms on participation and accountability. Their dissemination broadened the scope of the PoD beyond the implementation of activities, exerting a sustained influence on public debates and institutional agendas.

Difference between baseline, interim and final values:

- Baseline (2021): 3 studies produced or published.
- Interim target: 8 empirical studies disseminated.
- Final target (2025): 2 studies based on empirical evidence published in the three countries.

Progress towards the programme's objectives:

The increase in this indicator represents direct progress towards LTO 1 (strengthening CSOs as agents of change) and LTO 4 (strengthening democratic space). By producing and disseminating empirically grounded knowledge, the PoD organisations increased their legitimacy in the eyes of political and public actors, improved their advocacy strategies and strengthened their role as technical experts on issues of democracy and governance. Furthermore, the studies contributed to the institutionalisation of learning by serving as training resources for new generations of political and social leaders.



Adjustments to the objective throughout the programme:

During implementation, the definition of the indicator was broadened to include not only academic studies or extensive reports, but also policy briefs, technical bulletins and thematic analyses disseminated digitally, recognising their key role in the democratisation of knowledge. This adjustment made it possible to better capture the PoD's communicative and strategic impact in the region.

Comparison with the final target value:

Beyond the quantity, the key impact was the uptake and use of the evidence by institutional actors, organisations and the media, consolidating the PoD as a reliable source of democratic information in polarised contexts.

In conclusion, this indicator demonstrates that the Power of Dialogue went beyond facilitating political dialogue to become a producer of strategic knowledge, raising the quality of public debate and strengthening the empirical foundations of democratic advocacy.

3. (Intermediate) Table of cumulative effect values

LTO	Indicator	Unit	Year	Year	Third year/mid-year	Year 4	Year 5	Cumulative
LTO1	<i>Intermediate impact indicator:</i> <i>Collaborate: Establish spaces for (regional) learning and co-creation for NIMD staff and partners in Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras.</i>	<i>Number of consortium partners/partners/national office staff who have received training</i>	31	33	38	45	4	151
	<i>Capacity building: strengthening the NIMD's organisational and technical capacity at regional level on priority issues</i>	<i>Number of CSOs with greater organisational capacity (other leaders)</i>	0	3	6	30	59	98
LTO3	<i>Impact indicator:</i> <i>Political and civic actors use forums for thematic dialogue to build trust and foster</i>	<i>Number of inclusive policy-making processes (at national level)</i>	2	6	0	0	2	10



Guatemala

	<i>strategic collaboration, thereby contributing to an inclusive political culture.</i>							
	<i>Intermediate outcome indicator: Establish relationships and alliances (at national and regional levels), transcending political divisions, to exert pressure and advocate for inclusive and transparent decision-making (among political parties, members of parliament, the Supreme Electoral Tribunal and CSOs participating in social auditing, oversight mechanisms and political advocacy).</i>	<i>Number of CSOs included in the PoD programme (led by women)</i>	3	12	6	45	63	129
		<i>Number of CSOs included in the PoD programme (others)</i>	61	77	31	41	54	264
		<i>Number of inter-party dialogue meetings (at national level)</i>	16	8	1	8	2	35
		<i>Number of multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings (at national level)</i>	13	12	17	6	6	54
	<i>To tackle the root causes of exclusion and the shrinking of democratic spaces through inclusive, multi-stakeholder dialogue forums, which lead to joint advocacy and lobbying efforts to overcome stereotypes and facilitate the meaningful participation of currently under-represented groups.</i>	<i>Number of women/young leaders trained</i>	58	263	246	156	176	899
LTO4	<i>Impact indicator: Political and civic actors draw on existing knowledge and develop skills to strengthen democratic spaces through the creation of shared democratic</i>	<i>Number of proposals aimed at strengthening the democratic space (formulated jointly) and used for L&A (at national level)</i>	0	2	2	1	6	11



Guatemala

	<i>policies and legislation.</i>							
	<i>Intermediate outcome indicator:</i> <i>Establish shared democratic policies and legislation (agendas, reforms, initiatives) to strengthen democratic spaces.</i>	<i>Number of L&A studies based on empirical data disseminated</i>	3	4	1	2	2	12