



Annual Report 2016

Strategic Partnership Programme NIMD-AWEPA

Conducive Environment for Effective Policy Influencing: the Role of Political Parties and Parliaments

April 2017

**This document is part of the 'Dialogue and Dissent Programme',
implemented by NIMD and AWEPA in partnership with the Dutch
Ministry of Foreign Affairs.**

Table of contents

1) Introduction	3
2) Programme update	3
3) Update on the ToC	5
4) Cross-cutting themes and programme	8
4.1) International Lobby and Advocacy (ILA)	8
4.2) The Learning Agenda.....	8
4.3) Capacity building for partner organizations and country offices.....	9
4.4) Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME)	9
5) Significant changes.....	10
6) Challenges and lessons learned	10
Annex 1 Overview of intermediate indicator measurements.....	12
Annex 2 Human Interest stories.....	17

1) Introduction

This document presents the NIMD-AWEPA Annual Report 2016 for the programme on "Conducive Environment for Effective Policy Influencing: the Role of Political Parties and Parliaments", implemented under the 2016-2020 Strategic Partnership (SP) with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA). The SP Programme between NIMD, AWEPA and the MFA focuses on strengthening the lobby and advocacy role and capacities of political actors, and the creation of an enabling environment for inclusive development, so that lobby and advocacy efforts by civil society fall on fertile ground.

The core of the programme constitutes of interventions that are implemented at a country level,¹ based on a country-specific Theory of Change. During the first six months of 2016, the focus has primarily been on putting in place the necessary systems and processes for the programme to take off. In a number of countries, the set up process took a bit longer due to the establishment of new offices and the selection of new local implementing partners (e.g. in Kenya, Uganda, Mali and Indonesia). Despite the fact that the majority of the interventions started relatively late, a number of highlights can already be reported in relation to progress on the formulated result areas at actor, system and culture levels and the cross-cutting themes of gender equality and inclusiveness. In addition, in 2016 NIMD, AWEPA and the MFA jointly explored the possibilities for a potential programme in Ethiopia with a positive outcome.

In the following sections, an update will be provided on the programme context (§2) and the Theory of Change (§3), including a number of country cases and a summary of the main programme developments in 2016. After that, a number of cross-cutting themes and programmes will be highlighted, including ILA, the Learning Agenda, capacity building for partner organizations and country offices, and Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (§4). In §5, the main changes in programmes and budgets are highlighted and explained. Finally, in §6 the main lessons learned and challenges with regard to the programme are outlined.

2) Programme update

In 2016, the contexts changed in a number of programme countries. In general, a trend of closing democratic space was observed, for example in Mali, where the slow implementation of the 2015 peace agreements led to an increase in social and security tensions, or in Mozambique, where the country's situation was marked by military attacks and the debt crisis. Other examples include Uganda, where elections were held early 2016 amidst a challenging political climate for political leaders and parties on the opposition side, that resulted in protests after the announcement of election results. Or in Ghana where, in the run-up to the December 2016 elections, many electoral reform proposals were not implemented and a number of presidential candidates were excluded by the Electoral Commission (though later reinstated after court cases).

These increasing tensions have had an impact on the role and influence of both political and civic actors in policy making processes, as much attention was drawn towards restoring and maintaining peace and stability. The changes in the programme contexts have not yet significantly affected the programme, but did sometimes influence the content and planning of interventions. For instance, in Mali priority has been given to parliamentary outreaches in the three northern regions of Mali (Tombouctou, Gao and Kidal), where tensions are high and the presence and visibility of national institutions such as Parliament needs to be strengthened. In Kenya, there was a need to fast track the local Kenya Women Parliamentary Association (KEWOPA) Chapters in the Counties. To avoid a situation of inactivity in 2017, when the parliamentarians will be in a campaign mode, it appeared to be prudent to work with the women parliamentarians before parliament would be disbanded.

Positive developments towards the end of the year were noted as well. For example in Mozambique, where the relationship between the political parties and civil society has improved due to a consensual national agenda that consists of re-establishing political and democratic stability. By the end of 2016, an agreement was reached

¹ The programme is implemented in Benin, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Mozambique, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Georgia, Indonesia, Myanmar and Central America (Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador) and explorations were undertaken in Ethiopia.

on the cessation of hostilities between RENAMO and FRELIMO forces for two months, sparking some renewed hope for the restoration of peace in the run-up to the 2018 municipal elections. In Indonesia, stronger political coalitions emerged in parliament resulting in improved cooperation between MPs in terms of law making, budgeting processes and general oversight. This offers a window of opportunity for democratic reforms on key issues. In Guatemala and Honduras, the international organizations that fight against corruption, the UN organization CICIG in Guatemala and MACCIC supported by the OAS in Honduras, create openings for the work of NIMD. Besides their investigation mandate, these organizations contribute to disclosing information on legal and illegal party finances and support stricter regulations and transparency for political parties. This provides a window of opportunity for NIMD who has been supporting reform of political and electoral legislation.

In the context of this annual report, we would like to highlight the programmatic developments in Ethiopia as a new programme, and Mali and Kenya as ongoing programmes. In Annex 2, we have included a number of human interest stories, that further explain programmatic developments and highlights in Uganda, Mozambique, Myanmar, Benin and Kenya.

Ethiopia

2016 has been a politically volatile year for Ethiopia. Public unrest in especially the Oromia and Amhara regions led to the declaration of the State of Emergency in October. Besides a repressive government response, these developments also led to changes in the ruling party coalition and tentative overtures for substantial political reforms were announced. Against this backdrop, NIMD and AWEPA, in close partnership with the Netherlands Embassy in Addis Abeba, decided to start an exploration of a possible programme in Ethiopia under the flexible funding line of the programme. A scoping mission was undertaken in April and concluded that, despite the realities of a *de facto* 'one party dominant state' and significant political turmoil, there appears to be sufficient political will on the side of the ruling party coalition and the main opposition parties to engage in a joint programme which will focus on capacity strengthening for political parties and parliaments. At the end of an initial two-year-startup phase in 2017-2018, an assessment will be made on the actual political space to develop and implement a programme and whether there is indeed continued political will from the key stakeholders to engage with NIMD and AWEPA. The announcements for possible substantial political system reforms reshaped expectations of our Ethiopian partners and consequently prompted NIMD and AWEPA to seek additional funding from the MFA to respond to these dynamics in the coming two years.

To enable NIMD and AWEPA to work in Ethiopia, an agreement with the government is necessary. In the second half of the year, NIMD and AWEPA engaged in detailed consultations with the Federal Parliament, the Oromia regional state Parliament and the National Electoral Board of Ethiopia (NEBE) to develop Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs). The first two agreements were signed in January 2017 with the HPR and Oromia Caffee allowing us to conduct the first activity with parliament. The NEBE MOU is expected to follow soon. Based on our demand-driven approach, NIMD and AWEPA further started initial preparatory consultations to start-up activities with the MOU stakeholders that will take effect in the first half of 2017. AWEPA has been offered an office at the federal parliament and will be equipping it in the first half of 2017, while NIMD is looking into possibilities to partner with a local CSO to implement the political party component of the programme.

Mali

During the first year of its multi-year programme in Mali, NIMD and AWEPA were able to support political reform processes as well as build the capacity of politicians to fulfill their roles. Through capacity support and dialogue the programme contributed to a number of political reform processes and enhanced awareness among Malian citizens of political processes. For instance, the parliamentary outreach initiative organized by AWEPA in 2016 was the first time in recent years that the National Assembly stepped outside its institutional walls and reached out the Malian citizens located in remote regions. While CMDID facilitated the appropriation by political and civil society actors of the Algiers Peace Accord in 8 regions through workshops, and radio and tv debates.

To increase the visibility of parliamentary work and create space for interaction, the National Assembly of Mali and AWEPA kicked off the new “Parlement chez vous” (parliament at your doorstep) initiative in the region of Ségou (Central Mali) in October 2016. MPs from the National Assembly were able to engage with the local communities from all the different districts of the region. See §3 for more information about the achievements in Mali.

Mozambique

The legacy of a protracted war that ended in 1992 and the dominance of the ruling Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO), and the opposition Mozambique National Resistance (RENAMO) in the national assembly continue to haunt the country in 2016. Sources of conflict, amongst others, include the electoral law, calls for decentralisation and concerns over sharp economic decline.

During 2016, the programme in Mozambique addressed the issues arising around the electoral laws and conflict resolution in relation to the national agenda, providing space for political dialogue with civil society. For example, a dialogue platform on the electoral law in Mozambique was facilitated by AWEPA and NIMD for politicians and civil society, as well as roundtable discussions organized by AWEPA for parliamentarians, academics and civil society. In addition, through working with selected community radio and television stations, the parliamentary programme facilitated phone-in discussion programmes that provided an opportunity for citizens to engage directly with MPs and members of provincial and municipal assemblies in debate on thematic issues related to the political and economic concerns. Support for this programme included workshops for journalists at national and provincial levels. See §3 and the story in annex 2 for more information about the achievements in Mozambique.

3) Update on the ToC

The Theory of Change (ToC) explains the changes AWEPA and NIMD wish to contribute to, the strategies and interventions that are put in place to contribute to that change, and the underlying assumptions. During the initial year of implementation, most programme countries dedicated their energy to further operationalizing their country-specific ToCs, contextualizing the indicator frameworks and conducting the baseline measurements. As programme implementation only started in most countries in the second half of 2016, it was too early to detect a need for revision of the ToC, considering the short implementation period until that time. Yet, the Georgia and Uganda programmes have indicated the need to adjust their respective activities in 2017 because of unforeseen developments in the political situation, outlined below.

Georgia:

In Georgia, political developments influenced the cooperation with political parties. Firstly, the ruling coalition - Georgian Dream - fell apart. Secondly, United National Movement (UNM) started to boycott parliamentary sessions after the incident in Kortsakheli (May 22 2016), when supporters of the governing party physically assaulted the opposition leaders. Lastly, after elections, UNM split into groups. Only three parties (GD, UNM, AoP) were able to overcome the five percent threshold, leaving both liberal parties (FDs and Republicans) out of the parliament. Currently, there are only three parties left in parliament. The ruling party has a supermajority and the ability to change the Constitution by itself. This does not seem to be a healthy democratic situation. Therefore, NIMD will focus more on a more pluralistic political arena and the capacity building of opposition parties in 2017.

Uganda:

In Uganda, the 2016 elections incited a number of developments that have implications on the operations of IPOD (the interparty dialogue platform) and the implementation of the programme. First, the composition of parliament changed from six to four political parties, resulting in a reduction of IPOD membership of two parties. Secondly, contestations over the conduct and outcome of the elections continue to exist among the ruling and opposition parties. These conditions have undesirably affected commitment to interparty dialogue and the

enabling environment for policy reform. Activities therefore predominantly focused on rebuilding bridges among political actors who have come to be increasingly sceptical of each other.

On the side of parliamentary component of the programme, changes in the political party composition in Parliament with a 83% turnover of new members, high representation of independents and a majority representation of the ruling party, puts parliament under executive control. With the limited capacity of new members, policy change can delay or be stifled by dominant groups in Parliament. Therefore, there is a need to intensify interventions geared towards enlightening MPs on parliamentary functions.

Progress on the ToC

The measurement of the first intermediate indicators was only conducted in the first quarter of 2017. Preliminary results indicate that interventions are addressing the key challenges identified and that there is no need to alter our overall ToC. In the section below, we have highlighted the main findings from the measurement of each of the levels that NIMD and AWEPA are working on (system, actor, culture). The table in Annex 1 provides a summarized overview of the intermediate indicators that have been most frequently measured across the various country programmes. More country-specific examples can be found under the respective country programmes in IATI.

Progress at system level

At a system level, the programme aims to contribute to creating an enabling environment where political and civic actors can fruitfully interact and play their roles in inclusive policy making. One important outcome that the programme is working towards is the creation of safe spaces for dialogue between relevant political and civic actors. While these spaces operate in a distinctive and unique way in each of the countries, they all facilitated dialogue between political stakeholders (sometimes including civil society actors) who may not have had other forums in which they could engage constructively. In 2016, NIMD supported 6 interparty dialogue platforms (Ghana, Uganda, Kenya, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and El Salvador) in which 47 Political Parties were represented. The topics discussed at the platforms included political and electoral reforms, enhancing equitable party financing, electoral law amendments, achieving equitable political participation and representation and youth policy (system result area). Within the framework of the platforms, there were a total of 21 consensus-based proposals, including policy and legislative proposals. Six of these were submitted to parliament for consideration in five countries (Mali, Ghana, Kenya, Benin and Mozambique). The platforms also facilitated formulation of common stands towards the policy issues codes of conducts.

In Mali, for instance, a joint policy document was prepared by the interparty dialogue platform and tabled at the Parliament by both the ruling coalition and the opposition parties. There has also been an initiative developed by parliament to promote public consultation as part of a policy formulation process. In addition to this, it is worth highlighting Benin, where a delegation of political and civil society stakeholders travelled to Kenya to learn about the constitutional review process and the content of the Kenyan constitution. The outcomes of this exchange visit will feed into a workshop with MPs, political parties and civil society actors in 2017, aiming to provide collective input to the draft bill. More generally, the 2016 measurements show an increase in inclusive policy formulation processes. For example, there have been noticeable efforts by MPs to consult citizens on draft policies in Mali, Benin, Mozambique and Uganda.

Progress at actor level – Outcome:

At an actor level, the programme intends to contribute to making political actors more embedded in society and more responsive to citizens. Important outcomes that the programme aims to achieve relate to increasing the capacity of political actors to oversee and scrutinize legislation and policy, and to increase the capacity of political actors to develop and formulate policy ideas.

In 2016, NIMD and AWEPA contributed to strengthening these capacities by training 1483 political stakeholders from 56 different political parties in the area of electoral law reform (Guatemala, Mozambique, Mali), women

political participation (Uganda, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Guatemala), political party financing (Kenya), environmental security (Honduras) and youth participation (Benin, Ghana). In Ghana, a number of retreats were organized in the run-up to the elections, preparing youth leaders for interaction with political leaders in the policy arena by developing their lobby and advocacy capacities. This included policy analysis training but also how to develop a common voice, identifying policy challenges and opportunities to influence. During both the capacity building retreat and the stakeholder workshops, youth leaders developed and issued collective statements regarding their role in the elections. Statements focus on the needs and interests of the youth as well as their role to maintain peace. Another noteworthy example is Guatemala, where NIMD supported the establishment of the Women Caucus of Congress, which aims to ensure gender mainstreaming in legislation and promote equal rights for men and women.

AWEPA focused particularly on activities to increase the capacity of MPs to formulate legislation. After several workshop on legislative drafting, MPs and their support staff in programme countries are gradually building the confidence to design legislation. For instance, there has been noticeable rise in legislation awareness in Mali, Benin and Uganda. It is worth noting that the turnover of MPs in these countries was very high, with Uganda at the top of the list with 86% MPs being new in parliament at the start of the programme.

Progress at culture level

At a culture level, NIMD and AWEPA intend to contribute to creating a culture of accommodation and consultation between political actors and with civic actors. This facilitates system and actor level change. One important outcome that the programme is working towards, is to ensure that politicians have internalized democratic values, and more gender sensitive and inclusive politics.

In 2016, democratic values and behaviour were promoted through, amongst other interventions, dedicated democracy schools in 6 countries (Myanmar, Georgia, Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala and Benin). In 2016, a total of 421 people were trained, thereby greatly contributing to the development of democratic behavior, values and skills at an individual level, and to the creation of trust, responsiveness and mutual understanding between political and civic actors. In Georgia, the democracy schools provided an open space for constructive engagement between political stakeholders, civil society and local government on political, economic and social issues defining the development course of the country. They also provided an opportunity to jointly analyze challenges that could impede a free and fair pre-election campaign and prevent a peaceful election day itself. To counter the wave of anti-democratic and xenophobic movements and rhetoric in Georgia, a “Democracy Boot Camp” for the 40 alumni of NIMD Democracy Schools was organized, during which all dimensions of national identity were discussed through the lens of both dominant and marginalized groups of society. A contribution to building trust amongst the representatives of different political and ethnic groups was also recorded in Myanmar, where gathering different political stakeholders is an achievement in itself, in the light of the ongoing ethnical fighting.

Furthermore, in addition to the interparty dialogue platforms supported under the system level, NIMD supported 10 multi-stakeholder platforms composed of political actors, civil society representatives, academics, parliamentarians, journalists, community leaders and government officials in 8 countries.

AWEPA geared its interventions particularly towards exposing parliamentarians to democratic and gender-sensitive norms and practices, and the inclusion of minority groups and youth. The intermediate indicator measurements seem to point to the fact that the political leadership is gradually seeing the benefits of formal and informal interactions with civil society. For example, in Benin and Mali, a total of 39 civic actors have been consulted by political actors on various issues of national interest. Also, public hearings were organized by MPs in several partner countries. In Mali, the themes of discussion included the establishment of penal institutions and land reform policies. In Uganda, AWEPA cooperated with relevant committees such as the Committee on Equal Opportunities and Gender, Labour & Social Development, the Committee on Equal opportunities and the Human Rights Committee as well as with organizations representing women, people with disabilities, youth, civil society and local leaders. Results from Kenya on civic participation stand out, with 200 civic actors consulted by

political actors on various policy issues. The pool of civic actors included a wide range of opinion leaders, practitioners, women's groups, youth groups, community based organizations, health care providers, children rights officers, clergy, and law enforcement offices.

4) Cross-cutting themes and programme

Within the SP programme, there are a number of cross-cutting programmes and themes. In this section, these will be highlighted:

- 1) International Lobby and Advocacy
- 2) Learning Agenda
- 3) Capacity building for partner organizations and local offices
- 4) Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME)

4.1) International Lobby and Advocacy (ILA)

In the course of 2016, NIMD and AWEPA developed an International Lobby & Advocacy strategy aimed at lobbying for the integration of political parties and parliaments as essential actors in international development policies. By creating more space for political actors in development at a national, regional and international level, and by creating interlinkages between lobby and advocacy activities at the various levels, the programme seeks to maximize the impact of lobby and advocacy efforts on issues that emanate from national policy agendas.

In 2016, the strategy focussed on the ILA efforts towards the EU, in light of the current review of a number of EU funding instruments (EDF and EIDHR), which provide an opportunity under the SP to encourage greater funding to political parties and parliaments. A number of specific activities were implemented through the European Partnership for Democracy (EPD) as well as with AWEPA's Sections and MPs in Europe (including the European Parliament). AWEPA held information briefing meetings with its Sections in the Dutch Parliament and European Parliament. During meetings held for all Sections, the focus was placed on topics such as: the Partnership Frameworks and Migration 'Trust Funds' with Africa under the European Agenda for Migration; the Post-Cotonou Agreement; and the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs).

To inform staff on the role and function of EU actors and delegations, two information guides were produced by EPD. In addition, two training sessions were organized on working with the EU, with a focus on mobilising key EU actors for political party support. To influence the mid-term review processes for EIDHR, two statements were prepared and shared extensively to promote a more prominent position for democracy support under EIDHR. To influence the EDF review process, an input paper was developed, exploring both the general funding framework of the EDF, as well as a number of country cases, underlining need for the EU to adopt a more political approach to development. Besides these more formal interventions, a lot of 'behind the scenes' lobby and advocacy took place in Brussels, in the form of informal discussions with EU staff members and officials, and multiple talks with the evaluators for the EDF and EIDHR frameworks. These efforts seem to pay off, as one of the key recommendations in the EIDHR mid-term report is to enhance funding to political parties and parliaments. Furthermore, AWEPA and NIMD were represented and visible during the European Development Days in June 2016 whereby the organizations participated in sessions and attended the information stand of EPD members.

4.2) The Learning Agenda

Within the SP Programme, joint learning is a key priority. In the course of 2016, a learning agenda was developed and discussed with the local implementing partners and the MFA. One of the main objectives under the Learning Agenda is to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the programmes and to ensure the innovation of programme intervention strategies. To this end, NIMD and AWEPA are actively facilitating the sharing of experiences and best practices between programmes. In October 2016, a first strategic reflection meeting took place in The Hague, where the country programme staff from all 13 SP countries gathered to discuss programme progress, take stock of results, share experiences and identify common challenges. Challenges mainly related to the political context and dynamics in a number of countries, which sometimes make it difficult to implement

activities according to plan. In addition, partners expressed the need for ongoing support with regard to further operationalising the ToC, as this is a new process for them.

During the strategic reflection days, a discussion paper was presented on one of the core themes of the SP Learning Agenda: the cooperation between political parties and parliaments. The nexus between political parties and parliaments lies at the core of the SP programme. In 2016, background research was conducted to inform the key considerations for the tools and documents to be produced under this learning subject in the years to come. One of the main conclusions was that there are only few NGOs that target both political parties and parliaments using an integrated approach and that it would be worthwhile to further explore the relations between parties and parliaments in practice, and how we can best support them. A start will be made on this, more in-depth exploration in 2017. Also in relation to the learning agenda, impact and human interest stories were produced on Benin and Kenya and shared amongst the AWEPA and NIMD network. Preparations for other country stories started in 2017 (attached to this report in Annex 2).

4.3) Capacity building for partner organizations and country offices

Within the context of the SP Programme, NIMD and AWEPA's main focus is to build the capacity of political stakeholders to influence policy and be receptive to civil society's demands and proposals. In addition, NIMD and AWEPA work on capacity building of local implementing partners and offices. In 2016, as part of the baseline measurement process, capacity assessments of all NIMD and AWEPA partners were conducted to determine the priorities for capacity development interventions. In 2016, NIMD delivered trainings for 13 implementing partners and local offices attended by 34 individuals in total. The main focus of the capacity building efforts for partner organizations and country offices, was around increasing PME capacities, lobby & advocacy towards the EU, interparty dialogue skills, and securing a sustainable funding base. All implementing partners were trained in the PME frameworks their country, in using the indicator reference sheets and in conducting the baseline measurements. In Myanmar and Central America, dialogue facilitation training was organized to strengthen the facilitation skills of local implementing partners. In Mali and Georgia, further investments were made in the operationalization of fundraising strategies to increase the sustainability of the programmes. In 2017, the focus will be on further operationalizing and supporting the lobby and advocacy capacities of the local implementing partners and offices.

4.4) Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME)

In 2016, the main focus of NIMD and AWEPA's PME efforts was to operationalize the country-level ToCs, develop a monitoring framework and roll-out the baseline measurements. In-country coordination meetings were organized between NIMD and AWEPA partners and a tailor-made M&E framework was developed for the programme, including a data collection toolkit and PME manual. Kick-off meetings were organized in all regions to launch the programme and to rollout the baseline measurements for all countries. Through a participative baseline process, the implementing partners and staff selected baseline data for all countries, serving as a basis for future programme planning and monitoring. After this intensive process, the implementation of activities in the countries kicked off particularly in the second half of the year.

This process resulted in practical and programmatically relevant baseline reports and contributed to building the PME capacities of both NIMD and AWEPA, as well as the local implementing partners and staff. As the PME process in general and the ToC in particular has been rather challenging for both NIMD and AWEPA and its partners. A number of challenges encountered within the programmes are worth highlighting:

- While the contextualization of indicators greatly contributed to the relevance and ownership of the PME framework, it posed a challenge in terms of data aggregation and comparative analysis across countries. For 2017 and beyond, a set of cross-cutting programmatic indicators will be developed to facilitate future data analysis and results aggregation.
- Some of the intermediate indicators selected by the country programmes proved difficult to collect, due to security issues and political sensitivities (e.g. in Myanmar). In those countries, an alternative set of intermediate indicators with more feasible data collection possibilities will be selected.

- Building the lobby and advocacy capacities of partner organizations is one of the main objectives of the SP, requiring targeted interventions that trigger behavioral change. This takes time to be realized. The current intermediate indicators related to the capacity of partner organizations insufficiently capture progress in this area. Further reflections are required to determine how best to contribute to, measure and track the lobby and advocacy capacity of local implementing partners.
- For most of the partner organizations, as well as for NIMD and AWEPA Programme Managers, working with a set of (quantitative) indicators to measure progress is new. Hence, the baseline and intermediate indicator measurements are a learning process in themselves, with flaws in the process as well as in the measurements. Consequently, results are not perfect. They do, however, provide a good starting point for capacity building and improving the measurements along the way. Substantial PME support and technical assistance for the in-country PME staff as well as the establishment of a network of M&E focal points to enhance peer learning are foreseen. This network will serve to exchange best practices and improve future reporting.
- In 2016, NIMD and AWEPA used IATI as their main reporting instrument towards the MFA. IATI reporting comes with its own challenges, both in terms of practicalities (staff capacity to enter data, technical challenges, dealing with politically sensitive data) as well as the relevance and added value of IATI reporting. As the (mainly) quantitative data reporting in IATI tells only one part of the story, it is important to complement the IATI data with more qualitative information gathered through human interest stories (see Annex 2 for examples) and alternative data collection methods.

5) Significant changes

In a number of SP country programmes, some changes in the (political) context that influence the programme or operations of the implementing partners can be noted. The most relevant country-specific changes are highlighted under the country programme sections in IATI.

Budget deviations

The annual budget approved by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs for 2016 was €6.631.190. The actual spending is €5.314.501, which means an expenditure of 80%. The difference between the actual spending and the budget is caused by an under expenditure on the country programmes and cross-cutting programmes. Due to the inception phase, the extensive baseline process and the identification of new partners in a number of countries, most programmes experienced delays in programme implementation. This inception phase was very intensive and time-consuming, both for the local organizations as for headquarters of AWEPA and NIMD.

For the country programmes and cross-cutting programmes, explanations are provided for deviations of more than 10% as compared to the original budget. It is expected that delays in programme implementation will be made up for in 2017 in most countries. The deviations for most programmes differ from the expected roll over communicated with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs at the end of 2016. This is due to the fact that a large part of the activities could not be implemented within the planned timeframe.

6) Challenges and lessons learned

During this first year of implementation, there are many things that we have learned along the way. In this section the main challenges and lessons learned are pointed out. For country specific issues, please see IATI.

Challenges

- The main challenges at programme level are related to the political context (e.g. rising tensions amongst political parties, lack of political will) and the environment in which the country programmes take place. These factors sometimes make it difficult to implement activities according to plan. In some countries, involving representatives of both ruling and opposition parties in all activities remains a challenge. For example, in El Salvador, the youth members of the governing party FMNL are not participating in the Democracy Schools, though the party had indicated their interest in the School. NIMD El Salvador keeps

an open communication with FMNL to see how they can encourage involvement of the FMNL youth in the Democracy Schools. In the other NIMD activities, FMLN does participate.

- In the parliamentary programme, the planning of activities remains a challenge because of the planning difficulties faced by parliaments. The parliamentary agenda changes on a regular basis and priorities may differ from the programmatic topics. In Mali, these planning difficulties are being mitigated by the setting up of a programme steering committee that includes members of the parliamentary leadership, chaired by the First Deputy Speaker, ensuring that timing and content of activities remain relevant and feasible with regards to the National Assembly's agenda.

Lessons learned, cooperation and added value of the partnership:

- Cooperation with Embassies is very positive in most countries. In many countries, regular meetings take place and relations with Embassy staff are constructive. The level of cooperation does depend however on staff capacities and interests on the side of the Embassies.
- In a number of countries in which NIMD and AWEPA work together, the sharing of experiences and consultations on implementation of interventions between programme staff of the two organizations is very useful and is taking place on a regular basis. In some countries, there is less contact and coordination between AWEPA and NIMD staff. It is important to further reflect on how the added value of both organizations can be best used at a country level. The same goes for the role and added value of the MFA within the partnership.
- Building a partnership takes time. In 2016, NIMD and AWEPA invested considerable time and energy in setting up effective coordination mechanisms for the programme, streamlining and harmonising planning and reporting cycles and designing workable frameworks for joint projects and activities. This requires a continuous and careful balancing act between the institutional interests of the two organizations in a bid to pursue the common goals. This aspect of the programme should not be underestimated, and requires the continuous reflection and commitment of both organizations.

Inclusiveness:

Gender and inclusiveness are important cross-cutting themes within the SP country programmes. Within the programmes, specific attention is being paid to gender and youth related topics, international gender protocols, and the strengthening of women and youth politicians. Some examples of how inclusiveness is being addressed within the programmes:

- Marginalized groups such as the Tuareg and Songhai people are present in parliamentary outreaches taking place in remote parts of Mali (i.e. Northern Mali).
- Young political party and CSO representatives are involved in the School of Politics training sessions in Benin, as well as in the democracy schools in Myanmar, Georgia and Central America. Politically aspiring youth in general and young women in particular, are being capacitated to influence policy development and decision-making processes to be more inclusive and accommodative.
- KEWOPA county chapters' have been established through cooperation with KEWOPA and efforts are underway and ongoing in Kenya to include women nominations through political parties.
- In the parliamentary programme, AWEPA cooperates with relevant committees such as the Committee on Equal Opportunities, Gender Labour and Social Development, and the Human Rights Committee as well as with organizations representing women, people with disabilities, youth, civil society and local leaders.

Annex 1 Overview of intermediate indicator measurements

Objective	Outcome	Outcome indicator	Intermediate indicator 2017
System level An enabling environment exists at national, regional and international levels for political and civic actors to interact and play their roles in inclusive policy making	1.A level playing field, for all political actors, based on trust, including civic actors wanting to influence politics	# of inclusive law making processes, including # of inclusive law making processes with active CS consultation + # consensual law making processes (KEN, HON, GUA, IND) Trust in the political process by different groups and citizens, including % of Latino and Afro barometer respondents (IND, MMR, BEN, MALI, GHA, UGA, KEN, HON, GUA, SAL) % of political actors that experience an enabling environment in which they are involved in inclusive policy making (BEN, MAL, GHA, UGA, MOZ, IND) Extent to which civic actors experience an enabling environment in which they can influence/are involved in inclusive policy making (GHA, MOZ, MMR)	% of political actors who indicate that they regularly work together with other political actors SAL – 78% # of policies formulated based on consultation with interest groups, local experts, CS GUA – 2; SAL – 1; % of political parties that experience that their contribution to policy processes are more effective HON – 62.5 %; SAL – 75 %; # of thematic policy issues discussed and brought to parliament MAL: 1; KEN: 2; UG: 2; # of initiatives developed by Parliament to improve public consultation MAL: 1; Level of diversity and inclusivity of actors participating in the policy platform MOZ – 3;
	2.Safe (and institutionalized) space for dialogue between all relevant political (and civic) actors	# of structural changes opening up space for greater engagement by political and civic actors, including # of laws, structural changes and new mechanisms for greater engagement by political and civic actors + # of laws and mechanisms ensuring safe engagement between political and civic actors (BEN, MAL, HON, GUA, SAL, GEO)	# of functional interparty dialogue platforms 6: GHA, UGA,KEN,MOZ, ZIM, SAL; # of thematic policy issues discussed and brought to parliament 6: BEN, MAL, MOZ, GHA, KEN;

			<p># MPs of joint committee that have been trained/oriented on NPRC oversight ZIM: 42;</p> <p># of Committees trained/oriented on oversight role ZIM: 2;</p>
	3. Formulation of and approval of jointly formulated policies in parliament securing civil and political rights	# of (inclusive) policies jointly submitted to Parliament by the ruling and opposition parties (taking part in the dialogue platforms) (UGA, KEN)	<p># of policies and proposed amendments jointly formulated for submission to Parliament by the ruling and opposition parties taking part in the dialogue platforms BEN – 0; MAL – 1; UGA – 1; KEN – 6; MOZ – 1;</p> <p># of MPs and parliamentary staff trained on public consultation processes. ZIM: 53;</p>
	4. A more conducive environment for inclusive participation of women (and political processes and policy-making includes the voice of women and minority groups, and gender equality agenda receives wider support in and out of parliament)	<p># of policies proposed by political parties that reflect national minority needs and interests (GEO)</p> <p>% of women and members of marginalized groups in policy making posts</p>	<p>% of women involved in politics that feel they are able to take part in decision-making processes MOZ – 1; MMR – 70.6 %; HON – 100%; GUA – 100 %;</p> <p># women participants in programme activities MMR – 50; SAL - 334;</p> <p># of women trained in Lobby and Advocacy strategy ZIM: 38;</p>
Actor level Political actors are embedded in society and responsive to citizens.	5. Political actors that voice and monitor citizen interests	<p># of published political documents (manifestos, election programmes, position papers, policy proposal) by political actors based on inputs from a defined support base (on improving gender equality and/or on inclusion) (MAL, UGA, KEN, MOZ, IND, MMR, HON, SAL, GEO)</p> <p>Afrobarometer score on "Public perception on how well MPs listen to the needs of their constituency</p>	<p># of political actors who have been trained on the importance of the CS dialogue MAL – 0; IND – 0; MMR-52; SAL – 262;</p>

			<p>% of political actors who have increased their interaction with CS since the training MMR: 22,44 %; SAL- 78 %;</p> <p>Level of increased capacity of staff to “assist MPs” BEN: 1/4; KEN: 1/4; UGA: 2/4</p> <p>Level of increased capacity of MPs to “formulate and scrutinize legislation” BEN : 2/4;</p>
	6. Improved capacity of local partners (based on adapted 5 Core Capabilities of NIMD's scan)	Local implementing partners increased their scores on NIMD's and AWEPA's organizational scans the 5 C model (MAL, GHA, UGA, KEN, MOZ, IND, MMR,HON, GUA, SAL, GEO)	<p>Score on capability to relate and attract; NA;</p> <p># of trainings delivered by NIMD to the partners: 13</p>
	7.Improved capability of political actors to attract and relate	# of active alliances between political actors and/or between political actors and CS stakeholders (MOZ, HON, GUA, SAL)	<p># of events to consult citizens on their concerns UGA- 2; IND – 3;</p>
	8.Distinctive programmatic profiling - internal, public and in parliament - in relation to electorates and support bases of political actors	# and % of political parties that base their political and policy proposals on a distinctive profile (BEN)	<p># of political parties that report progress on developing capacities in policy making, management and intra/party democracy inclusion N/A;</p> <p># of innovative initiatives tested in practice N/A;</p>
	9.Political actors have increased capacity to oversight, scrutiny of government legislation, policy and performance	# of instances oversight instruments were used (questions, interpellations, missions of enquiry, etc.) BEN	<p># of participants in capacity-building activities BEN – 63; KEN- 242; ZIM - 80; SAL - 565; MMR – 145; GUA – 101; GEO - 138; HON - 149</p>

	10. Political actors understand the legislative process and have increased capacity to develop and formulate policy ideas into legislation	# of Private Members' Bills moved and % adopted (MAL, UGAN, KEN)	# of participants in capacity-building activities BEN – 63; KEN- 242; ZIM – 80; SAL – 565; MMR – 145; GUA – 101; GEO – 138; HON - 149 # of amendments proposed by MPs MOZ: 4;
Culture level A culture of accommodation and consultation between political actors and with civic actors exists that also facilitates system and actor level change	12. Interest in consulting, collaborating, harmonizing, being responsive and a sense of trust and mutual understanding among and between political and civic actors	% of political actors who indicate that they collaborate with other political actors at least x times per year (KEN, MMR, BEN, GUA, IND, BEN, MAL)	# of consultation meetings/ # of events organized to consult civil and political actors on democratic practice (BEN, UGA, MALI, KEN, GEO) ZIM – 10; UGA – 1;
		% of political actors who indicate that collaborate with other civic actors at least x times per year (GHA, KEN, MMR, HON, GEO, BEN, MAL)	% of civic actors that indicate that they experience an increased willingness-to-interact from political actors HON - 66,67%; SAL - 75%;
		% of opposition parties that consider members of the governing party as constructive partner in policy development and implementation (MOZ)	Level of increased capacity of MPs/Staff to use parliamentary tools for gender equality UGA: 2/4;
		% of civic actors that consider members of the governing party as constructive partner in policy development and implementation (MOZ)	# of new content brought to the parliamentary radio MAL: 1; # of civic actors consulted on policy issues MAL: 17; BEN: 22; KEN: 200; UGA: 5; # of political actors consulted on policy issues through parliamentary consultation MAL: 38;

			# of civic and parliamentary petitions received through online platforms. KEN: 9;
	13. Political actors are more aware of and have internalized democratic values, rule of law and gender sensitive & inclusive politics.	% of political actors that reference the following topics in their manifesto/public statements, other publications - democratic values and/or rule of law and/or gender sensitive & inclusive politics (UGA, MMR, HON, BEN, GUA)	# of graduates from democracy and political education schools (disaggregate sex, age, social group etc) BEN – 35; MMR – 52 (32 male and 20 female); HON – 30; GUA – 234; SAL – 36(11 women, 24 men, 1 LGBTI); GEO – 34 (13 male and 21 female);

Annex 2 Human Interest stories

In the attached annexes, please find attached human interest stories on:

- Kenya
- Benin
- Myanmar
- Mozambique
- Uganda

