TURN
ON
THE

POWER OF DIALOGUE
قوة الحوار
POUVOIR DU DIALOGUE

Power of Dialogue

Baseline cover report

Power of Dialogue Consortium

2021-2025

Submission date: November 1, 2021

Contents

1. Introduction

This document presents the cover report of the baseline studies for the Power of Dialogue (PoD) Programme. The PoD programme is a Strategic Partnership between the PoD Consortium and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) for the period 2021-2025. The PoD consortium consists of Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy (NIMD), Akina Mama wa Afrika (AMwA), Centre for Mediteranean and International Studies (CEMI) and Goree Institute (GORIN).

The PoD programme is funded through the Power of Voices (PoV) grant instrument and falls within the policy framework for Strengthening Civil Society (SCS). The PoD programme aims at making **political and civic actors collaborate, influence and participate in legitimate, transparent and accountable political processes**, to ultimately create **peaceful democratic space, and inclusive, responsive and representative political decision-making at all levels**.

This cover report contains an overview of the objectives and scope (section 2) and approach of the baseline studies (section 3), as well as a reflection on the implications of the baseline studies for the country Theories of Change (ToC) (section 4). Lastly, it presents two overview tables of the PoD indicators and their contribution to the baseline and target values of the Strengthening Civil Society (SCS) basket indicators and Security and Rule of Law (SRL) indicators (section 5).

2. Objectives and Scope

The main objective of the baseline exercise was to describe and measure the baseline situation for each intermediate outcome and outcome of the four programmatic pathways of the PoD programme per country/region. Another objective was to set targets for each intermediate outcome (annual) and outcome indicator (end-of programme). Since the PoD indicators do not always correspond to the same outcome/intermediate outcome level of the SCS indicators, country teams were asked to either provide targets per annum for 2021-2025 for the PoD intermediate indicators or a breakdown of the end-of-programme targets into annual targets. So annual targets and cumulative targets are available for all indicators.

The target setting 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.

The baselines were conducted in the period July-September 2021, covering the first six months of the PoD programme. NIMD conducted baseline studies in eleven countries (Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger, Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda, Mozambique, Colombia, Guatemala, Jordan and Myanmar). AwMA conducted baselines in Horn of Africa (Uganda, Ethiopia and Kenya), CEMI in Tunisia,

GORIN in the Sahel regional (Senegal, Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger). All country baseline reports can be found in Annex I. With this side note that the baseline in Mozambique was delayed and will be submitted as soon as it is finalized. Moreover, the PoD consortium did not conduct baseline studies in Iraq and Sudan, as they are 'pilot countries'. A baseline study for Iraq will be conducted in the first quarter of 2022, when it becomes a full-fledged programme. Sudan will be incorporated in the regional baseline study of AMwA.

3. Approach

The Grant Agreement with the MFA set the parameters for the baseline exercise. The PoD 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 PoD Secretariat facilitated two training modules, consisting of four and five sessions each, on the PoD monitoring system and Outcome Harvesting as monitoring approach. The first module touched upon the link between the PoD framework and 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.

The trainings prepared country teams for the baseline exercise. Moreover, there has been continuous remote 1-on-1 support to country teams to conduct the baseline exercise. In addition, an Indicator Reference Sheet (IRS – see Annex III) was developed to support country teams in the operationalization and further contextualization of the indicators.

The PoD Secretariat developed the initial set of indicators (see IRS) to cover all intermediate outcomes and outcomes of the four pathways of the PoD ToC and are aligned with the SCS framework and Security, Rule of Law framework of DSH. 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 PoD 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 PoD 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 PoD 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 SCS indicators are at output level directly measuring results of activities.

The baseline studies used mixed methods to collect data, including data review, focus groups discussions (FGDs) and structured interviews. In many cases country teams limited their primary data collection to reviewing their Political Economy Analysis (PEA) and other documents to best describe the baseline situation.

Aside from a focus on PoD 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 (or 2025) or copied change steps from the Actor-based 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, and identified enabling and disabling factors and actors by the PEA and context analysis. The usefulness and accuracy of targets might proof limited in light of the complex and often fluid operational environments of the PoD programme, which require an adaptive approach to programming.

4. Implications of baseline study for ToC and programmatic choices

PoV 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, however, when the implications of the PEA for the ToC, Actor-based Pathways of Change (ABPoC) and programmatic choices were reviewed. 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 you can find in annex of the respective baseline studies.

5. Overview baseline and target values SCS and SRL frameworks

The tables below provide an overview of how contextualized indicators contribute to SCS basket indicators and the SRL basket indicators. Full indicator frameworks, including indicators that do not link directly to the SCS and SRL frameworks can be found in Annex II. Since the PoD indicators do not always correspond to the same outcome/intermediate outcome level of the SCS indicators, country teams were asked to either provide targets per annum for 2021-2025 for the PoD intermediate indicators or a breakdown of the end-of-programme targets into annual targets. So annual targets and cumulative targets are available for all indicators.

It is important to note that these do not represent the full intended scope of results of the PoD programme, as country teams have picked and choose indicators as they saw it fit and some activities and outcomes are monitored by indicators that we could not align with the SCS basket indicators or Outcome Harvesting. Also to avoid double counting indicators that are used to monitor collaborative efforts of PoD partners, especially in Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia, are presented only once.

Table 1: Overview baseline and target values SCS framework

		Kenya	Mozambique	Uganda	Ethiopia	Colombia	Guatemala	Jordan	Myanmar	Tunisia	Gorin Sahel	Horn of Africa Kenya	Horn of Africa Ethiopia	Horn of Africa Uganda	Sahel Mali	Sahel Burkina	Sahel Niger	Baseline	Target 2021	Target 2022	Target 2023	Target 2024	Target 2025	Target 21-25
SCS 1 # of laws, policies and norms, implemented																		1	50	56	55	55	55	83
SCS 014 # of by-laws implemented for sustainable and inclusive development																		1	50	56	55	55	55	83
	B	1			0										0	0		1						

# of political/civic actors taken measures enhancing representation of women and youth	T21	3	47			0	0	50			
	T22	3	47			2	4		56		
	T23	2	47			2	4			55	
	T24	2	47			2	4				55
	T25	2	47			2	4				55
	T21-25	12	47			8	16				83

SCS 2 # of laws, policies and norms/attitudes, blocked, adopted, improved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCS024 # of bylaws, blocked, adopted, improved for sustainable and inclusive development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

# international L&A resolutions on democratic space adopted	B	0
	T21	0
	T22	0
	T23	0
	T24	0
	T25	0
	T21-25	0

SCS 3 # of times that CSOs succeed in creating space space for CSO demands and positions through agenda setting, influencing the debate and/or creating space to engage	47	89	187	231	243	168	813
SCS031 # of times that CSOs succeed in creating (at national, international, and/or regional level)	42	81	141	169	189	149	624

# of inclusive policy-making processes (at regional level)	B	0	0
	T21		0
	T22	10	10
	T23	15	15
	T24	20	20
	T25	25	25
	T21-25	25	25

# of inclusive policy-making processes (at national level)	B	4		0	2			0					**6**						
	T21	7		0	2			0						**9**					
	T22	5		2	1			8							**16**				
	T23	6		2	1			7								**16**			
	T24	4		2	1			4									**11**		
	T25	5		3	1			2										**11**	
	T21-25	27		9	6			21											**63**
# of created/opened spaces for women/youth (at regional level)	B						0				0		**0**						
	T21										0			**0**					
	T22						10				2				**12**				
	T23						20				0					**20**			
	T24						30				2						**32**		
	T25						40				0							**40**	
	T21-25						40				4								**44**
# of created/opened spaces for women/youth (at national level)	B		1			2			0	0	0	0	**3**						
	T21		2			2			0	0	1	0		**5**					
	T22		8			1			10	1	1	2			**23**				
	T23		13			0			15	1	2	2				**33**			
	T24		18			0			10	1	2	4					**35**		
	T25		0			0			0	1	0	0						**1**	
	T21-25		41			3			35	4	6	8							**97**
# of multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings (at international)	B	3			0								**3**						
	T21	4			4									**8**					
	T22	1			4										**5**				
	T23	1			4											**5**			
	T24	1			4												**5**		
	T25	1			4													**5**	

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	B	T21	T22	T23	T24	T25	T21-25
	T21-25	8			20												28
# of multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings (regional level)	B							0			0						
	T21							3				3					
	T22							5					5				
	T23							10						10			
	T24							15							15		
	T25							20								20	
	T21-25							53									53
# of multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings (at national level)	B	8		0	5	0	0		0	0	13						
	T21	10		1	8	8	0		0	6		33					
	T22	5		1	5	8	0		9	12			40				
	T23	5		1	5	8	2		9	12				42			
	T24	5		1	5	8	3		9	12					43		
	T25	5		1	5	8	3		9	0						31	
	T21-25	30		5	28	40	8		36	42							189
# of interparty dialogue meetings (at national level)	B	2	6		7		2				17						
	T21	3	6		10		4					23					
	T22	4	13		5		8						30				
	T23	2	13		5		8							28			
	T24	2	13		5		8								28		
	T25	2	1		5		8									16	
	T21-25	13	46		30		36										125
SCS032 # of times that CSOs succeed in creating space for CSOfor CSO demands and positions through agenda setting, influencing the debate and/or creating space to engage at sub-national level											5	8	46	62	54	19	189
# of inclusive policy-making processes (at	B	2		1				0			3						
	T21	2		1				0				3					
	T22	2		3				3					8				

subnational level)	T23	2			3				3								8			
	T24	2			0				3									5		
	T25	2			0				0										2	
	T21-25	10			7				9											26
# of created/opened spaces for women/youth (at subnational level)	B		2							0		2								
	T21		2							0			2							
	T22		10							5				15						
	T23		10							10					20					
	T24		10							15						25				
	T25		1							0							1			
	T21-25		33							30										63
# of multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings (at sub-national level)	B				0	0	0				0									
	T21				0	3	0						3							
	T22				15	8	0							23						
	T23				24	8	2								34					
	T24				10	8	5									23				
	T25				0	8	7										15			
	T21-25				49	35	14													98
# of interparty dialogue meetings (at subnational level)	B						0				0									
	T21						0						0							
	T22						0							0						
	T23						0								0					
	T24						1									1				
	T25						1										1			
	T21-25						2													2

SCS 4 # of advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs , for, by or with their membership/constituency	52	43	66	75	85	67	305
SCS041# of advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs at national (or international/regional) level	52	41	62	71	81	63	287

Indicator	Period																					
# of proposals aimed at strengthening democratic space (jointly) formulated and used for L&A (at regional level)	B										0					**0**						
	T21										0						**0**					
	T22										1							**1**				
	T23										2								**2**			
	T24										1									**1**		
	T25										2										**2**	
	T21-25										6											**6**
# of proposals aimed at strengthening democratic space (jointly) formulated and used for L&A (at national level)	B	9			0	1	0	0			0		0	0	0	**10**						
	T21	11			0	1	4	0			0		0	0	0		**16**					
	T22	6			0	1	8	0			10		1	1	4			**31**				
	T23	6			0	1	8	1			10		1	1	5				**33**			
	T24	6			1	1	8	1			10		1	1	7					**36**		
	T25	6			0	0	8	0			5		1	1	7						**28**	
	T21-25	35			1	4	36	2			35		4	4	23							**144**
# of international L&A campaigns	B	3														**3**						
	T21	5														**5**						
	T22	2														**2**						
	T23	2														**2**						
	T24	2														**2**						
	T25	2														**2**						
	T21-25	13														**13**						
# of regional L&A campaigns	B		1								0					**1**						
	T21		1								0						**1**					
	T22		3								2							**5**				
	T23		3								1								**4**			
	T24		3								2									**5**		
	T25		0								1										**1**	

Indicator	Period	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7
	T21-25			10								6								16
# of L&A activities for making the political system more inclusive (in relation to women / youth / minority groups) at regional level	B							0						0						
	T21							1							1					
	T22							5								5				
	T23							10									10			
	T24							15										15		
	T25							20											20	
	T21-25							20												20
# of L&A activities for making the political system more inclusive (in relation to women / youth / minority groups) at national level	B	12		0		0		0			0	0	0	12						
	T21	14		2		0		7			0	0	0		23					
	T22	6		7		0		4			1	1	1			20				
	T23	5		8		1		4			1	1	2				22			
	T24	5		10		1		4			1	1	2					24		
	T25	5		0		1		4			1	1	0						12	
	T21-25	35		27		3		23			4	4	5							101
SCS042 # of advocacy initiatives carried out by CSOs at sub-national level														0	2	4	4	4	4	18
# of L&A activities for making the political system more inclusive (in relation to women / youth / minority groups) at subnational level	B							0						0						
	T21							2							2					
	T22							4								4				
	T23							4									4			
	T24							4										4		
	T25							4											4	
	T21-25							18												18
SCS 5 # of CSOs with increased L&A capacities														26	81	93	111	133	149	257
SCS051 # of women led CSOs with increased L&A capacities														0	25	33	43	53	60	74
	B			0				0						0						

# of CSOs with increased organizational capacities (women led)	T21	5		20	25			
	T22	3		30		33		
	T23	3		40			43	
	T24	3		50				53
	T25	0		60				60
	T21-25	14		60				74

SCS052 # of youth led CSOs with increased L&A capacities			8	30	53	62	74	83	132
# of CSOs with increased organizational capacities (youth led)	B	8	0	0	8				
	T21	9	20	1		30			
	T22	10	40	3			53		
	T23	10	50	2				62	
	T24	11	60	3					74
	T25	11	70	2					83
	T21-25	51	70	11					132

SCS053 # of other led CSOs with increased L&A capacities			18	26	7	6	6	6	51
# of CSOs with increased organizational capacities (other led)	B	18	0	18					
	T21	26	0		26				
	T22	4	3			7			
	T23	3	3				6		
	T24	3	3					6	
	T25	3	3						6
	T21-25	39	12						51

SCS 6 # of CSOs included in PoV programmes		20	92	119	152	167	170	500
SCS061 # of CSOs included (women led)		**2**	**17**	**25**	**30**	**40**	**48**	**85**
# of CSOs included in the PoD	B	0	2	0	0	2			

												B	T21	T22	T23	T24	T25	T21-25
programme (women led)	T21	5		2	0			10					17					
	T22	2		6	2			15						25				
	T23	2		6	2			20							30			
	T24	2		6	2			30								40		
	T25	0		6	2			40									48	
	T21-25	11		26	8			40										85
SCS062 # of CSOs included (youth led)													**18**	**36**	**49**	**75**	**79**	**89**	**203**
# of CSOs included in the PoD programme (youth led)	B				0		18	0	0		18							
	T21				3		18	15	0			36						
	T22				5		19	20	5				49					
	T23				5		20	40	10					75				
	T24				5		21	50	3						79			
	T25				5		22	60	2							89		
	T21-25				23		100	60	20									203
SCS063 # of CSOs included (other led)													**0**	**39**	**45**	**47**	**48**	**33**	**212**
# of CSOs included in the PoD programme (other)	B		0	0		0				0	0	0						
	T21		2	30		0				7	0		39					
	T22		2	30		2				7	4			45				
	T23		4	30		2				7	4				47			
	T24		4	30		3				7	4					48		
	T25		0	30		3				0	0						33	
	T21-25		12	150		10				28	12							212

Table 2: Overview baseline and target values SRL framework

| | | | | | | | | | | | Gorin | Horn of Afrika | | Sahel | | | | | | | | | | |
		Kenya	Mozambique	Uganda	Ethiopia	Colombia	Guatemala	Jordan	Myanmar	Tunisia	Sahel	Kenya	Ethiopia	Uganda	Mali	Burkina	Niger	Baseline	Target 2021	Target 2022	Target 2023	Target 2024	Target 2025	Target 21-25
3. Peace processes & political governance - States, regional and local authoritis and societies at large are able to effectively prevent and resolve conflict in a non-violent and inclusive manner																								
b) Number of dialogue processes organised for (local/national/regional) conflict management																		33	70	103	119	115	88	495
# of multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings (at international)	B	3						0										3						
	T21	4						4											8					
	T22	1						4												5				
	T23	1						4													5			
	T24	1						4														5		
	T25	1						4															5	
	T21-25	8						20																28
# of multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings (regional level)	B							0										0						
	T21							3											3					
	T22							5												5				
	T23							10													10			
	T24							15														15		
	T25							20															20	
	T21-25							53																53

Indicator	Period																
# of multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings (at national level)	B	8		0	5	0	0		0	0	**13**						
	T21	10		1	8	8	0		0	6		**33**					
	T22	5		1	5	8	0		9	12			**40**				
	T23	5		1	5	8	2		9	12				**42**			
	T24	5		1	5	8	3		9	12					**43**		
	T25	5		1	5	8	3		9	0						**31**	
	T21-25	30		5	28	40	8		36	42							**189**
# of interparty dialogue meetings (at national level)	B	2	6		7			2			**17**						
	T21	3	6		10			4				**23**					
	T22	4	13		5			8					**30**				
	T23	2	13		5			8						**28**			
	T24	2	13		5			8							**28**		
	T25	2	1		5			8								**16**	
	T21-25	13	46		30			36									**125**
# of multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings (at sub-national level)	B				0	0	0				**0**						
	T21				0	3	0					**3**					
	T22				15	8	0						**23**				
	T23				24	8	2							**34**			
	T24				10	8	5								**23**		
	T25				0	8	7									**15**	
	T21-25				49	35	14										**98**
# of interparty dialogue meetings (at subnational level)	B						0				**0**						
	T21						0					**0**					
	T22						0						**0**				
	T23						0							**0**			
	T24						1								**1**		

Indicator	Period														Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Total
	T25							1													**1**
	T21-25							2													**2**
c) number of people (f/m) trained in conflict resolution skills															**92**	**117**	**167**	**192**	**192**	**137**	**805**
# of represetatives of civic/political actors trained in dialogue/mediation	B		0	0				0	92						**92**						
	T21		0	25				0	92							**117**					
	T22		30	25				20	92								**167**				
	T23		30	50				20	92									**192**			
	T24		30	50				20	92										**192**		
	T25		0	25				20	92											**137**	
	T21-25		90	175				80	460												**805**
e) number of people (f/m) that have been trained in political governance activities															**1129**	**2153**	**1632**	**1939**	**2099**	**1422**	**8195**
# of women/youth leaders trained	B		165	0	434	0	0		156	0	0	0	0	0	**755**						
	T21		165	20	900	30	100		159	150	0	120	70	30		**1744**					
	T22		200	35	300	50	80		162	150	25	50	70	46			**1168**				
	T23		250	35	300	50	80		162	300	25	90	70	76				**1438**			
	T24		300	35	300	50	80		159	450	25	50	70	76					**1595**		
	T25		25	35	0	50	80		159	600	0	0	0	46						**995**	
	T21-25		940	160	1800	230	420		801	600	75	310	280	274							**5890**
# of representatives (m/f) of political actors have participated in democratic values oriented training	B	75	0	0				0	299						**374**						
	T21	100	0	0				0	309							**409**					
	T22	50	50	35				30	299								**464**				

	Code												B	T21	T22	T23	T24	T25	Total
activities (e.g. democracy schools)	T23	50	70	35			30	316								501			
	T24	50	90	35			30	299									504		
	T25	25	0	55			20	327										427	
	T21-25	275	210	160			110	1550											2305
g) number of studies on drivers of conflict or political governance perception surveys conducted with NL support													**12**	**18**	**18**	**20**	**17**	**9**	**78**
# of studies for evidence based L&A disseminated	B	6		0	0	2			0	1		3	**12**						
											0		**0**						
	T21	8		0	0	3			3	1		3		**18**					
											0			**0**					
	T22	9		1	1	1			2	1		0			**15**				
											3				**3**				
	T23	6		1	1	1			4	1		3				**17**			
											3					**3**			
	T24	4		1	1	1			6	1		0					**14**		
											3						**3**		
	T25	4		1						1								**6**	
											3							**3**	
	T21-25	31		4	3	6			8	5		9							**66**
											12								**12**

18

Annex I: Country Baseline Reports PoD

Annex II: Updated Indicator Frameworks PoD

Annex III: Indicator Reference Sheet PoD