



People in Need | Člověk v Tísni

Advocate Together:

*Supporting Democracy, Human Rights, and Citizen
Engagement in Burma*

Report of the Final Evaluation

Olof Nunez & Maurizio Raineri

Yangon, September 2015

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank People in Need for entrusting us with the assignment.

We would like to express our appreciation for the close cooperation throughout the evaluation provided by Tereza Grünvaldová, Monika Kolomazníková, Aye Aye Tha and the whole PIN team in Burma. We would like to specially mention Theingi Khine and Van Hmun Nawl for helping to translate some meetings in Hpa-An and Taunggyi.

Our appreciation goes to all CSOs who took the time to meet, providing information and ideas, and showcasing their achievements. Community and CSO members provided important insights and care was taken to include their views in the report.

Thanks also go to other stakeholders who showed their interest and collaborated with the assignment.

ကျေးဇူးတင်ပါတယ်။

Disclaimer

While being based on a participatory methodology and taking in the views expressed by stakeholders at all levels, the opinions expressed in the report remain the sole responsibility of the evaluators.

List of Contents

- I. Executive Summary
 - II. Introduction
 - III. Methodology
 - IV. Findings
 - Problems and needs (Relevance)*
 - Achievement of purpose (Effectiveness)*
 - Achievement of wider effects (Impact)*
 - Likely continuation of achieved results (Sustainability)*
 - Capacity building and partnerships*
 - V. Overall Assessment
 - VI. Recommendations on Future Programming in Advocacy and Capacity Building
 - VII. Conclusions
- Annexes
- i) Terms of Reference
 - ii) Abbreviations
 - iii) List of informants
 - iv) Evaluation tools

I. Executive Summary

As a part of its support to civil society in Burma, People in Need received financial support from the US State Department's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labour to implement the project "*Advocate Together: Supporting Democracy, Human Rights, and Citizen Engagement in Burma*" from October 2013 to June 2015.

The project aimed "*to contribute to widespread unrestricted exercise of freedom of association as instrument of consolidated democratic transition in Burma*", through "*CSOs/CBOs are capacitated to provide relevant, quality and sizeable advocacy actions in 6 regions of Burma*".

At the end of the project PIN determined to carry out an external evaluation "*to assess achievements, lessons-learned and best practices in PIN's actions focused on advocacy capacity building of civil society ... and to recommend PIN an advocacy strategy and approach for the future programming and cooperation with partner organizations..*"

The evaluation was based on a participatory approach involving main stakeholders at different levels, including PIN management, staff, CSOs, local authorities and resource persons, through mainly key informant interviews and focus group discussions, based on strategic and cluster selection.

The evaluation confirmed that the focus on advocacy is very relevant in Burma's unprecedented reform process, allowing civil society renewed opportunity to engage in the country's development supporting positive change. It was also relevant to focus on the so-called ethnic states and securing the inclusion of women and gender CSOs.

For PIN, this was the first initiative introducing the issue of advocacy and initiating work with Local Authorities in Burma. The main components of the project included capacity building workshops, development of an advocacy toolkit, and small grants to support individual and joint (regional and cross-regional) advocacy initiatives. In general terms, the proposed combination of activities was good, although some key weaknesses were identified, including an excessive number and uneven capacity of CSOs, leading to fewer possibilities for coaching and follow-up, stretching human and financial resources, and difficulties to find an appropriate level in the trainings that would be useful to all participants.

Another focus was to promote cooperation and mutual trust among CSOs. In general the CSOs reported increased cooperation. The evaluators consider the network structures facilitated by the project to be in their inception stage and still need further support to consolidate.

All those involved in the project reported improvements in capacity across the board, and especially for weaker CSOs the project provided good opportunities for capacity building. In response to the capacity of participants PIN adapted the project to include more general aspects of management and basic skills such as proposal writing.

The trainings were accompanied by small grants (individual and joint) to carry out small advocacy projects and put the acquired skills into practise. However, among CSOs overall there is a relatively widespread frustration at the low funding levels and ensuing limited time periods. Yet they allowed small organisations to in some cases access external funding for the first time, which has help to strengthen and activate them.

An effect of the reduced size and time of the initiatives unfortunately did not allow for continued engagement and longer-term follow-up or monitoring of results. Most initiatives took the form of awareness raising or short actions such as workshops, rather than more difficult aspects of lobbying with duty bearers. Rather than having a thematic focus, the project supported the CSOs’ own initiatives, covering covered a plethora of different topics from the child and other right issues to women empowerment and land issues. This latter can be seen as an effort to not impose any agenda, but also did not contribute to a more focused intervention.

According to many CSOs, the partnership with PIN has not always been very easy, with a lack of effective communication leading to some misunderstandings.

An unequivocal result of the evaluation is the appreciation of joint trainings bringing together civil society and Local Authorities, which promoted dialogue and mutual understanding. CSOs mostly reported trying to establish communication with authorities, but still faced difficulties. However, there were also accounts of significant improvements and improved cooperation with Local Authorities in an interesting example a CSO in Mon state described their new role *“as a bridge between local groups and Local Authorities”*.

Given the modest size of the advocacy projects there is yet very little evidence of impact beyond capacity building of partner organisations. Nonetheless, there are some examples of impact at the local level reported by CSOs, including behaviour change among teachers who participated in child rights trainings, decreased corruption in land registration processes in one region, and reportedly even a reduction of cases of violence against women.

Summarised Strengths and Weaknesses of the Project

Key Strengths	Key Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance of advocacy approach in present process of transition • Focus on civil society in (mainly) so-called ethnic states • Inclusion of women and gender CSOs • Useful toolkit • Initial capacity built 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive number CSOs • Wide divergence in CSO capacity, focus and interest • Many small and weak CSOs with basic development needs • Weak focus or possibility for individual follow-up and support • Advocacy projects very limited (funding

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities provided to small CSOs • Networking opportunities • Improving relationship with Local Authorities • Initial examples local impact 	<p>and time)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy projects mostly awareness raising and training rather than lobbying • Problems in effective dialogue PIN-CSOs • M&E: weak qualitative aspect and low feedback into learning
--	---

While unequivocal gains have been made within capacity building, 21 months is a short time for an ambitious project and sustainability of results at present would be expected to be at the lower end of the scale if no further support is provided. The project is rather seen as a first stage of a continued intervention. The evaluators believe that the project has been important in the sense of establishing initial capacity, building relationships and providing lessons learned feeding into a continued, increasingly focused, intervention.

It is important to note that PIN itself has identified many of the issues raised in the report, and have started to address some weaknesses, and are planning differently for the future. In fact the interviews with PIN management staff showed a common understanding of key issues and ways ahead.

Based on the finding of the evaluation, the consultants have put forward a set of recommendations, based on the dual importance of, on the one hand deepening the work with advocacy, and on the other hand continue supporting the wider emergent civil society:

The continued work with advocacy should focus on a reduced number of organisations. The strategy should have a long term focus, stemming from a participative process, and be supported by custom-made tools and appropriate resources. PIN should provide specialised skills, increasingly in the form of process facilitation, coaching, counselling and supporting in strategic and practical aspects of the joint initiative, including monitoring and evaluation. Funding would follow the long term nature of the initiative. This would also require that PIN staff are sufficiently supported to be able to assume their increased role. Government Authorities should be continuously involved through dialogue, and the sustainability of the action and each component must be carefully considered

PINs effort at providing wider civil society support, including smaller CSOs/CBOs from more remote areas, is also important. Benefitting from the experience these organisations may also be given “introduction to advocacy” and lessons learned, best practises from the advocacy work should be shared with them. In general PIN should work on improving dialogue and relation with partners, taking the necessary time to explain procedures and be open to feedback.

II. Introduction

The present document is the report of the external final evaluation of People in Need's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labour (US Department of State)-funded *"Advocate Together: Supporting Democracy, Human Rights, and Citizen Engagement in Burma"* project. The project was implemented from October 2013 to June 2015 (for a period of 21 months).

The project aimed at Overall Objective *"to contribute to widespread unrestricted exercise of freedom of association as instrument of consolidated democratic transition in Burma"*, through its Outcome *"CSOs/CBOs are capacitated to provide relevant, quality and sizeable advocacy actions in 6 regions of Burma"*.

Working with Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), local authorities, local communities and lawyers, the Expected Results were:

1. Enhanced expert knowledge and practical experience of advocacy CBOs
2. Created environment and opportunities for building cooperation and mutual trust
3. Capacitated local authorities familiar with CBOs activities
4. Up-to-date relevant legal and administrative information provided to CBOs and LAs through tool-kit
5. Each platform is provided expert assistance by a specially trained lawyer

The project focussed on six of Burma's states and regions, as shown in the map to the right in grey (light grey: Kachin and Rakhine states, medium grey: Mandalay region and Mon state, dark grey: Shan and Karen states).

As the implementation period of the project ended, PIN determined to carry out an external evaluation with the aim:

"to assess achievements, lessons-learned and best practices in PIN's actions focused on advocacy capacity building of civil society (functioning modules, approaches and ways of cooperation) and to recommend PIN an advocacy strategy and approach for the future programming and cooperation with partner organizations in Myanmar. Furthermore PIN expects the evaluation to give clear and practical recommendations about how to strengthen our capacity building approach in the design and deliver of future advocacy grants, capacity building of local trainers and advocates, networking as well as mentoring activities."

The Terms of Reference defined the key evaluation questions, which are all included in the section of Effectiveness for easy reference. In summary the evaluation should:



1. *“assess the outcome ‘Advocacy CBOs enabled to provide relevant, quality and sizeable advocacy actions’ especially in relation to Expected Result 1 and 2 (including achievements, lessons-learned, best practices);*
2. *assess advocacy approaches and implementation strategy that have been applied by PIN throughout the project implementation (models, project components and approaches);*
3. *provide recommendations on how to strengthen advocacy approach through PIN’s programs and on advocacy capacity building of civil society (sub-grant/strategy design for programming, staff and partner capacity building approach and modules, monitoring and evaluation).”*

The evaluation report follows the outline set out in the ToRs.

III. Methodology

The methodology selected for the evaluation takes the *Logical Framework* of the project as main departure point, with a custom-made process based on standard evaluation practice and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee's *evaluation criteria* (Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability).

An *Evaluation Matrix* linking the specific evaluation questions from the *Terms of Reference* to sources of information and stakeholders, was developed as part of the *Evaluation Plan*. Based on this plan, evaluation tools (e.g. guidelines for semi-structured interviews and FGD guide) were designed.

The evaluation is based on a *participatory approach* by involving main stakeholders at different levels and in different manners.

Main methodologies used included the following:

- Desk review of key project documents, reports, research and advocacy material
- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), using semi-structured interview guides for qualitative information gathering.
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), using semi-structured discussion guides, including a workshop-like exercise, for qualitative and quantitative information with CSOs.

Special attention has been paid to the aspect of gender, ensuring that women informants were included in the process.

The exercise was based on the following *key principles*:

- *Participative* – seeking and basing the evaluation on the views of stakeholders at all levels
- *Constructive* – emphasis on finding improvements and recommendations rather than only seeking weaknesses, while also highlight strengths and opportunities
- *Qualitative* - for the present exercise a qualitative approach has been selected, supported by a few quantitative assessments

Given the amount of CSOs and target areas, a *selection process* was designed, based on geographical clusters corresponding to Burma's States and Regions (but excluding Kachin and Rakhine state where cooperation is finalised). The geographical clusters allowed for a random selection of area, with a 50 percent probability for each area, whereby Shan and Karen states were selected.

Within the selected areas, 2 CSOs with individual grants and 2 additional CSOs were selected at random (given that in Karen State there is only one partner with individual grant, another core partner was randomly selected from Mon State). The result is reflected in the annexed list of informants.

The evaluation team also took the opportunity provided by the regional training events to interview a randomly selected organisation from Mandalay region and Mon state. Other stakeholders interviewed can also be found in the list of informants.

The evaluation was carried out by Olof Nunez (Lead Consultant) and Maurizio Raineri (Co-International Consultant).

Limitations

- Due to the discontinuation with the work in Kachin and Rakhine states no partners from these areas could be interviewed
- Unfortunately the evaluators could not meet with lawyers involved in the project, due to absence and last minute cancellation of meetings
- No response was received from the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor

VI. Findings

Problems and needs (Relevance)

- ❑ Why is 'advocacy' relevant for the work of civil society in Myanmar?

Burma's unprecedented reform process has provided a renewed opportunity for civil society to emerge and to engage in the country's development. Advocacy thus becomes relevant from two perspectives, *firstly* as the country emerges from decades of top-down rule by military-led dictatorship, common people and civil society as a whole has the possibility to influence development. *Secondly* given the country's long-term isolation national and local authorities suffer from wide capacity gaps at a time of rapid and complex change, and civil society can play a constructive role in supporting positive change. However the access to the decision making, even at the local level is not yet ensured and restrictions for the civil society are still evident. The project document reports a clear contextualisation of the situation previous to the project. The evaluators consider that the project has been able to adapt to the changing context.

From the perspective of the Burmese organisations, advocacy provides them with skills that can help them to carry out their work and engage increasingly with (foremost) Local Authorities.

The focus on advocacy is therefore seen as very relevant, especially as many development actors provide more general capacity building and support. In addition, the focus on so-called ethnic states is valuable, as these traditionally have received less support and face a wide range of rights and development issues. It is also relevant to provide CSOs with knowledge in human rights and similar issues, as knowledge levels are still low.

- ❑ To what extent were the designed components/activities relevant for improvement of advocacy actions of the target civil society organisations?

While PIN has been engaged in Burma supporting civil society from the mid- 1990s, establishing a permanent presence in 2012, this is the first initiative introducing the issue of advocacy. The project also brought in (limited) cooperation with Local Authorities for the first time. Seeing the present project as an initial step is an important perspective when evaluating the project, in this sense the project proposal is somewhat misleading as it seems to describe a more advanced approach, which PIN has had to revise.

The main components of the project included capacity building workshops, development of an advocacy toolkit, and grants small grants (USD 6,600), regional seed grants (USD 2000) and cross regional grants (USD2000). In general terms, the proposed combination of activities was good, although some weaknesses can be identified, especially linked to the implementation strategy.

Since advocacy is complex not only in itself, but even more for a civil society emerging from decades of suppression still facing many difficulties, the evaluators consider that additional weight should have been placed on coaching, follow-up and continuous support to the CSOs. However, this was practically impossible given the large number of involved CSOs, which went beyond the planned 36

to around 50. While this in a sense confirms the interest of organisations in learning about advocacy and working with PIN, and also giving PIN the opportunity to get to know many civil society groups, as will be seen it also caused a number of difficulties ultimately impacting on the outcome of the project. To begin with, the excessive amount of CSOs stretched financial and human resources. This was compounded by the inclusion of six geographical areas.

Secondly, while PIN reportedly made a selection process based experiences from previous cooperation with PIN, discussions with PINs main partner organisations/CACs, and dialogue with the CSOs (to assess motivation), there did not seem to be a clear or focused set of selection criteria, as the result was a very diverse group including incipient, well established and medium CSOs with different capacities, focus and interests.

Further, many of the CSOs are very new and small, to a large degree working with communities at what can be said to be a relatively “downstream” (in terms of advocacy). Their needs were thus foremost for basic capacity building in most aspects of management, finance and similar, rather than more “specific” knowledge in advocacy. After carrying out the baseline, the project adapted to the lower level of capacity, with the agreement of the donor (as informed by PIN).

Finally, it should be mentioned that while the term *advocacy* is used throughout the project, in the majority of cases the initiatives should more appropriately be referred to as awareness raising or trainings. While, as described in the toolkit itself, this could be seen as part of *advocacy*, it excludes the more difficult aspects of lobbying with duty bearers. This should be seen from the perspective that on the one hand initial capacities were low and on the other hand that they still face many restrictions and difficulties, including security concerns.

According to one PIN staff member within the framework of the current project she had only heard about three “real” advocacy campaigns. While working with awareness raising can be considered as a natural first step of advocacy work (given the relatively mixed and weak group of CSOs), the evaluators consider that the choice of wording is not ideal to appropriately describe the actual initiatives.

On another note, while the project did not have a specific gender strategy, it is positive that the project included several women’s organisations and organisations working with gender, including LGTB rights. Further there has been a positive gender balance in trainings and women are also well represented among staff.

- ❑ To what extent were the activities relevant for improvement of the operational (legal) environment of civil society in the target areas?

It must be recalled that the project took place at a time of multiple change in Burma. This had the dual effect of, on the one hand increasing the space for civil society, while on the other hand bringing about changes and uncertainties (often in the form of “grey zones”). During the period, in general, many local organisations began to register with the authorities or initiated some form of contact.

The project was aimed at supporting the operational environment of civil society in two distinct ways: directly by collaborating with lawyers and indirectly by strengthening their capacity and providing initial linkages with officials from Local Authorities.

As will be seen throughout the report, the advocacy projects did not focus on laws restricting the work of civil society (although for example LRC in Mandalay has been engaged in this process), but rather on a wide array of other rights and development issues. Thus, the focus on “*advocate for removal of laws restricting free exercise of their activities*” articulated in the Overall Objective was not clearly followed given the changing circumstances.

While the project’s quarterly reports indicate that the trained lawyers provided the CSOs with support on numerous occasions, the evaluators’ interviews with CSOs revealed that their perception in terms of quantity and quality intervention facilitated by the lawyer was weak, and that many already had access to their own legal advice. PIN is still in contact with individual lawyers and continues to cooperate with them for specific issues. The lawyers component is mostly phased out and it is concluded that it was a good decision by the PIN management to do so. Nevertheless it poses questions around the initial selection of lawyers, their interest, as well as the practical dimensions and possibilities for the sustainability.

❑ To what extent were activities relevant for creation of CS cooperation and mutual trust?

The activities proposed to promote cooperation and mutual trust among CSOs are considered to be relevant. In general the CSOs reported increased cooperation, but also reported some limitations (refer to section on effectiveness).

However an aspect which was not sufficiently considered is the fact that almost all organisations already are part of networks, and that participation both has financial costs (especially if you have to participate in meetings at national and regional level) and is also wearing especially for organisations with unremunerated staff. This is of especial relevance when looking at continuity and sustainability. Thus, it may have been useful to consider the possibility of supporting existing fora (e.g. organisations in both Hpa-An and Mandalay are part of local networks; CSOs are also part of national networks, for example Women’s League of Burma). This is especially relevant in considering the large amount of INGOs entering Burma and wishing to work with their own subset of local partners.

With regards to the Community Action Centres (CAC), which in the project document are described as central elements of the work with civil society, these (and the organisations managing them) were reportedly useful for PIN as entry points to the various regions. PIN has described how the centres earlier were important meeting points, providing access to facilities such as internet (while this was still difficult to access otherwise). However the CACs did not become a central point for the CSOs during the rest of the project, and most CSOs were in fact not even aware of their existence. While the CACs predated this project and were not financed from it, they are for example included as a deliverable (“6 CAC in 6 regional areas serving as platform for development of advocacy actions,

coordination and best-practice sharing", in addition to being included in no less than 12 other deliverables).

Achievement of purpose (Effectiveness)

“Before there was no systematic advocacy - just protests” (Informant FGD)

“Before we were hardline, now ‘next level’” (Informant CSO KII)

Effectiveness is determined by assessing the achievement of, or progress towards, the established goals. According to the Terms of Reference the evaluation would focus on “the outcome ‘Advocacy CBOs enabled to provide relevant, quality and sizeable advocacy actions’ especially in relation to Expected Results 1 and 2”.

- ❑ What were external and internal factors that influenced the effectiveness of the advocacy capacity building for civil society organisations?

External (to PIN)
Among the participating CSOs there was a wide <i>diversity in capacity</i> and knowledge, which rendered it difficult to maintain a level at which was useful for all. Thus the trainings could not fit the very different needs of the organisations. As a result, the evaluators received somewhat contradictory accounts ranging from training being too difficult and fast-paced, to too basic and general.
The <i>number of CSOs</i> in fact surpassed the projected 36 to approximately 50 (with some fluctuations). This further reduced the possibilities for follow-up, custom designing to needs and reduced financial resources as measured per CSO.
There was a <i>lack of continuity</i> as a number of CSOs did not consistently send the same participants to trainings. This lack of continuity hindered the development of increasing levels of teaching. This problem relates to the fact that many organisations are small, relying on few persons, mostly on volunteer basis. According to informants some organisations did not take the workshops seriously and some did not even show up. This is also linked to the sense of frustration among many CSOs.
Respondents also reported a <i>difference in technical capacity of trainers/speakers</i> involved, which in some cases affected the result of the capacitation.
Internal (to PIN)
<i>Monitoring and evaluation</i> , meaning qualitative aspects such as identification of partners’ lessons learned, best practises, were not adequately utilised as integral part of capacity building
According to a majority of CSOs, there has been a <i>lack of effective communication</i> with PIN. There is a perception among many that they were not taken seriously as partners and that feedback was not properly taken into account. It should be noted that this finding is not based on the dissatisfaction with per diem levels or

similar, although it can be analysed to be connected with, but not limited to, expectations and motivation (including financial). It must also be noted that PIN had staff who were in constant communication with the CSOs, and that PIN on the whole reported a good relation as evidenced by the continued cooperation with the CSOs. PIN also conducts evaluations after each event and these are later assessed by staff.

- ❑ What were external and internal factors that influenced the effectiveness of the advocacy projects of civil society organisations?

External (to PIN and CSOs)

A dialogue includes two parties, and according to informants *Local Authorities* were not always interested to cooperate. Inversely, the wider transition process provided opportunities. For example the informant from the Local Authorities in Karen state said that they had received orders from the Prime Minister’s Office to cooperate with civil society.

Certain hostility by *traditional leaders* (especially religious) and people in rural areas, who are not keen to learn about e.g. human rights because it is reportedly considered as a destabilising factor for society.

Internal (to PIN and CSOs)

Advocacy projects were overall small, with *little funding over short periods of time*. This led to a lack of continuity and of a more strategic approach. Yet, for many CSOs this represented their first external financial support and was thus much appreciated and useful.

There was *weak focus* in the advocacy, which covered a plethora of themes in distant locations. As clarified by PIN this was purposely done to promote the CSO’s own initiatives, however this clearly also has its downsides (also refer to section on sustainability). In fact, the majority of projects should be categorised as awareness raising rather than advocacy (refer to section on relevance).

Initial capacity of many CSOs was weak. This is of course not unexpected in a project aimed at capacity building, but still restricted the reach and success of the advocacy.

According to a majority of CSOs there has been a *lack of effective communication* with PIN. Particularly funding allocations and requirements for financial reporting were described as “barriers” for fruitful cooperation. (see previous question)
There is also an apparent feeling among CSOs that financial support was too small and implementation periods too short.

- ❑ To what extent were the designed approaches activities (training sessions, networking meetings, activities with local authorities and joint and individual sub-grants) effective for enhancement of CSOs’ advocacy expertise and actions? (ER1)

All those involved in the project reported improvements in capacity across the board, also mentioning specific examples such as the strengthened work on child rights in Mandalay.

The rest of the section will go through the effectiveness of the various activities, starting with the evaluation given by the involved CSOs.

In their workshop the CSOs were divided into five mixed groups with the task of assigning a score from 1 (less useful) to 4 (very useful) to the different project initiatives. The groups also provided explanations and recommendations. In total only four “4s” were assigned, while the score of “1” was given three times. This is remarkable as in similar exercises in Burma normally only “3s” and “4s” are awarded.

Initiative	Average Score (1-4)	Comments	Recommendations
Training workshops	2.6		
Small grants	2.2	Grants were seen as too small. Some did not receive	
Joint advocacy (regional)	2.4	Good for networking, but very low sums	
Joint advocacy (cross-regional)	2.0	Good for networking, but very low sums	
Advocacy toolkit	2.8	Useful tool	Some had not seen or been given the document
Counselling	2.5	Has not been a strong component	
Training with Local Authorities	3.2	Held only one/few times	Recommended to increase
Networking	3.0		

Training sessions:

In general capacity building is very important for the CSOs, especially the smaller ones. As such, PIN’s project has been a good opportunity for many organisations to participate in the trainings. During interviews the organisations’ strong interest and appreciation was highlighted. PIN had an important cooperation with U Aung Myo Min from Equality Myanmar, with broad experience from civil society advocacy work in the country.

However during the interviews complaints also emerged in terms of design and methodology of the trainings. From a methodological point of view the trainings were seen by CSOs as suffering from an overcharged topic agenda within a limited timeframe, and an important time gap between the

different workshops. In terms of the trainers, some were defined as very good, while other lecturers were described as boring and not really prepared or at the appropriate level.

According to PIN, they have increasingly employed more participative training techniques, such as role playing, to improve the effectiveness of the workshops. Yet many participants described a superficial delivery of topics and a low level of retention by the participants considering the complexity of the themes. Also CSOs complained of training agendas with very little consideration of the suggestions provided by the participants.

Given the heterogeneous level of the participants, it became difficult to set a level and focus of trainings that could be useful to all. This has led to varying results in terms of partner CSO interest, commitment and understanding.

Lastly there was a general dissatisfaction concerning logistic aspects including per diem levels, which clearly can affect both commitment and effectiveness, but also influence the perception of participants.

By their side, an important second step which most CSOs had not put in place is a replication or spreading mechanism after the trainings, leaving the acquired knowledge with only one or two individuals. Moreover a number of CSOs did not consistently send the same participants to trainings. This lack of continuity hindered the development of increasing levels of teaching.

Grants:

Grants have also controversial as evidenced by the lowest scores awarded in the joint exercise. It is worth starting by saying that the small funds have allowed small organisations to in some cases access external funding for the first time, which has help to strengthen and activate them.

The grants within the projects were foremost seen as instruments to put the acquired skills into practise through small advocacy projects and to promote cooperation. However, among CSOs overall there is a relatively widespread frustration at the low funding levels and subsequent limited time periods.

While the difference in expectations can be linked to divergent views on the importance or purpose of the funding (also linked to selection criteria, as well as general difficulty to access funds), the reduced size and time of the initiatives also did not allow for continued engagement and medium or long-term follow-up or monitoring of results. Most initiatives took the form of awareness raising or short actions such as workshops, which one might wonder if it was the intended purpose. As mentioned, the focus on awareness raising is linked to the difficulties of lobbying, including restrictions faced by the CSOs and the real danger, in some case, of being arrested or threatened by Authorities.

Thematically the activities covered a plethora of different topics from the child and other right issues to women empowerment and land issues. This is explained by PINs approach to support the CSO's own projects, which can be seen as good from a participative or ownership perspective, but an

Achilles heel from a strategic or long term perspective (including understanding of process of advocacy).

Small grants in the amount of 6-6.5 million Kyat for individual organisations enabled selected organisations to develop their activities, such as advocacy training, awareness, campaigns, and lobbying in few cases. As mentioned many CSOs had higher expectations and found themselves limited by the amounts. In some cases the small grant has been synergetic to other ongoing interventions, allowing the organisation to introduce important aspects of advocacy and news skills into the communities. In the proposed continuation of the advocacy work, individual plans would work towards a joint objective and strategy (see recommendations).

Joint grants, at *regional* and *cross-regional* levels, were a new activity designed to promote trust and cooperation. This is important as mistrust between CSOs is relatively common. As pilots, for the first time CSOs have had opportunity to work together on joint activities. On the whole, CSOs reported that regional grants were more useful (and sustainable) while cross-regional were more difficult to implement as highlighted in the scoring of the joint exercise (see above) were the cross-regional grant received the lowest score. For the continued wider work with civil society these type of grants, especially at regional level, can be useful, while In the proposed continuation of the advocacy work individual plans would be linked and may include common activities rendering joint grants unnecessary (see recommendations).

Networking meetings and activities with local authorities:

Networking meetings are generally seen positively (refer to next question), and especially the joint trainings with local officials were appreciated by partner organisations as well as Local Authorities, and provided important initial contacts.

- ❑ To what extent have the networking meetings and joint sub-grants strengthened the cooperation CSOs and help to exchange experience and knowledge? (ER1&2)

In general the CSOs expressed satisfaction with the facilitation role of PIN in term of enabling a space to get to know each other and for cooperation. CSOs have had opportunities to meet each other and exchange experiences at regional and interregional level. Collaborations have taken place through the joint sub-grants, especially in the form of awareness campaigns, joint trainings, workshops or similar; but there is a lack of common action especially oriented at joint advocacy, acting together with one voice. In general cooperation at regional level can be said to have more potential sustainability than the cross-regional cooperation, as small CSOs lack the financial and other means to continue collaborations over geographical distances.

In general CSOs report improved relationships and increased trust among each other.

A problem voiced by many CSOs is that trainings and workshops, for logistic reasons, have not really allowed the organisations to know each other and to interchange experiences through a proper discussion space. Therefore it is important to provide proper time for the participants to learn from

each other and create synergies as part of the agenda, and carefully matching financial and human resources with an adequate (reduced) amount of partners to be able to provide an effective support. In the view of one informant joint grants fomented competition rather than cooperation (due to the perceived intransparency in terms of how financial resources were allocated, projects approved, as well as low sums involved), however this conclusion is not shared by the evaluators.

- ❑ To what extent have the CSOs been successful in making networks and effective communication with local authorities? (ER2)

“Some local authorities invited to come, started listening to people’s voices” (Informant, FGD)
“Kayin women are encouraged to point out the mistakes of the Government” (Regional Authority)

This is one of the aspects where reported results were mixed. Local Authorities that agreed to meet (naturally) claimed to be interested in discussions with civil society and that they listened carefully to any suggestions. Importantly they also emphasised the importance of including Government Officials in trainings. Nevertheless they admittedly remained sceptical of civil society’s engagement in sensitive issues, such as the peace process.

CSOs mostly reported trying to establish communication with authorities, but being faced with difficulties. From the CSOs there were reports of officials not showing up and also stopping activities by denying permissions. As mentioned previously the inclusion of Government Officials in trainings was overall deemed as very positive by the CSOs.

During the period, in general, many local organisations began to register with the authorities or initiated some form of contact.

There were also accounts of significant improvements and improved cooperation with Local Authorities (refer to Impact section).

Achievement of wider effects (Impact)

- Have the results of the action contributed to the increased enjoyment of civic rights in the target areas?

As previously seen, given the relatively small-scale activities carried out, there is very little evidence of impact beyond the CSOs. It must also be recalled, that as an initial project much focus was set on building the capacity of partner organisations, thus setting the stage for potential future work.

Nonetheless, there are some examples of impact at the local level reported by CSOs:

- A number of teachers who received awareness raising on Child Rights in Mon state, have reportedly adopted new teaching practises, treating children better in the classrooms. In a particular case a teacher who used to beat children ceased this practice
- A CSO working with land issues reported a decrease of corruption due to the sensitisation of the Local Authorities and the improvement, in some cases, of the registration process
- CSOs working with gender issues reported a reduction of cases of violence against women
- In Rakhine state CSOs were involved in the wider advocacy campaign that secured fisher folks' rights to establish community fisheries organisations and associations and protect their livelihoods

Unfortunately there is no systematic monitoring or registration of these or similar success stories within the project, albeit the evaluators have been informed that information material was produced as part of PIN's *Transition Promotion Programme*.

- Have the results of the action contributed to more open environment for constructive advocacy with local authorities?

"...can influence policy-makers, but will take time to change policy" (Informant FGD)

An unequivocal result of the evaluation is the appreciation of joint trainings bringing together civil society and Local Authorities. This promotes dialogue and mutual understanding, as well as creating personal contacts.

While many places remain far from "an open environment", as most consider that Local Authorities are difficult to approach although their attitude is a bit improved, the evaluation produced a number of examples of local collaboration, with for example Authorities attending initiatives, allowing teachers to be part of trainings or even granting meetings to be held in the Minister's office. A result

which is more widespread is that reportedly it is less problematic to ask for permission to hold initiatives (although they are sometimes denied).

An interesting example is that of Ar Man Thit in Mon state, which has become *“as a bridge between local groups and Local Authorities”*. This was attributed to the fact that Ar Man Thit has become more active and visible, while making initial contacts with the authorities. Interestingly, they are based in Mudon and not the state capital, Moulmein - in fact several informants stated that work and contacts with authorities was easier outside the main cities.

❑ Were there any unexpected positive and negative impacts during the action?

The consultants encountered some unexpected results of the action. On the positive side two women leaders from WON in Karen state (as well as other persons from the CSOs) are now competing as candidates in the upcoming parliamentary elections, and according to the informant the project has contributed by building knowledge and confidence. Another success is that the advocacy toolkit has been shared with other NGOs that are considering employing it for their work in the country (confirmed by the evaluators).

No unexpected negative impacts were found.

❑ What is the positive and negative impact on the final beneficiaries in the target areas?

At present it is not possible to measure concretely any positive or negative impacts on the final beneficiaries, as the CSOs, at this stage, do not have developed an M&E systems to capture this type of data. Moreover the project could improve in terms of capitalisation of the experiences and both internal and external dissemination of information. However, as mentioned above, there is anecdotal qualitative evidence of positive impact in some isolated cases.

Likely continuation of achieved results (Sustainability)

- ❑ To what extent are the established networks of CSOs and local partnerships sustainable?

During interviews it emerged that most of the CSO already were members in other networks. In this respect the project should have paid more attention to existing linkages in order to not overload the organisations, while instead supporting in some way civil society's own networks.

The evaluators consider the networking facilitated by the project as "germinal", if we consider the definition of network as "*an association of independent individuals or institutions with a shared purpose or goal, whose members contribute resources and participation in two-way exchanges or communications*"¹. The current situation among the project's CSOs could be summarised as interaction initiated with the facilitation of the project, with different level of involvement and without as yet any longer-term strategies or agendas. These first interactions have been an important step in building trust among the CSOs, but it is believed that the CSOs should be supported in the future to consolidate the capacity to communicate with and share amongst each other and to facilitate learning and collaborations.

- ❑ What factors have influenced the sustainability of the advocacy project's components?

In replying to the question posed one must recall the short nature of the project at hand, given this and factors previously pointed out (such as weak focus, large number and heterogeneous level of CSOs and modest funding levels) the project should be seen as an initial stage of a process, rather than a finished product. Sustainability of results at present would be expected to be at the lower end of the scale, although a certain base has been built up (through the combination of trainings and projects supported by grants). As mentioned previously the cooperation between partners, big and small, at regional level could support a certain degree of sustainability.

At the end of the project PIN opened another call for proposals for CSOs under different funding. According to PIN the results were positive as these were increasingly geared towards advocacy campaigns thus confirming that target CSOs have been able to understand the difference.

- ❑ What are the recommendations to advocacy approach of PIN's programs and capacity building methods (sub-grants/training and mentoring, staff and partner capacity building, monitoring and evaluation)?

Refer to section on recommendations.

Capacity building and partnerships

¹ Plucknett, 1990, in Taschereau, S., Bolger, J. (2006). "Networks and Capacity: A Theme Paper Prepared for the Study "Capacity, Change and Performance." European Centre for Development Policy Management. (ECDPM) – Maastricht/Brussels

Refer to the previous subsections under *Findings* (Relevance, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability) wherein capacity building and partnerships have been included as a key aspect. As noted capacity building has been a main result of the project.

V. Overall Assessment

The project under review represented PINs initial effort to bring in the highly relevant issues of advocacy to its partners in civil society. Given the project's brevity and the large and diverse group of CSOs, it should be seen as a first step towards building up the capacity to influence policy-making. The project had some strong points, but also suffered from some weakness (both summarised in the table below).

Nevertheless it generated a body of lessons-learned that can inform PIN's future work, on which the recommendations set out in the next section are built upon.

It is important to note that PIN itself has identified many of the issues raised in the report, and have started to address some weaknesses, and are planning differently for the future. In fact the interviews with PIN management staff showed a common understanding of key issues and ways ahead.

Summarised Strengths and Weaknesses of the Project

Key Strengths	Key Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance of advocacy approach in present process of transition • Focus on civil society in (mainly) so-called ethnic states • Inclusion of women and gender CSOs • Useful toolkit • Initial capacity built • Opportunities provided to small CSOs • Networking opportunities • Improving relationship with Local Authorities • Initial examples local impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive number CSOs • Wide divergence in CSO capacity, focus and interest • Many small and weak CSOs with basic development needs • Weak focus or possibility for individual follow-up and support • Advocacy projects very limited (funding and time) • Advocacy projects mostly awareness raising and training rather than lobbying • Problems in communication/dialogue PIN-CSOs • M&E: weak qualitative aspect and low feedback into learning

VI. Recommendations on Future Programming in Advocacy and Capacity Building

"Quality before quantity" (Informant KII)

Burma's current reform process is slowly opening up for a wider participation of civil society in decision-making processes. The evaluators believe that the project "Advocate Together" has played an important role in establishing initial capacity, building relationships and providing lessons learned for CSOs to play a larger role and make their voice heard.

The following recommendations are based on the findings of the evaluation, aiming forwards based on the premise that PIN would continue building upon the project's focus on advocacy on one side, while *separately* continuing to support a wider group of CSOs.

Advocacy work:

- Focusing on a reduced number of consolidated organisations PIN should reinitiate its work with advocacy, with the aim of providing specialised skills and developing common long-term initiatives, with the appropriate support. The exact number would be dependent on the selection process as well as availability of resources, both financial and in terms of human resource
- Carry out organisational assessments of potential partners, especially the smaller ones, and design specific capacity building plans
- The partnerships would build upon common interests and shared understanding and focus on advocacy, stemming from a participative process involving PIN, resource persons and the CSOs in the definition of advocacy goals and strategies. A participative formulation of a Theory of Change, involving the selected partners, could be a useful approach for formulating an effective strategy for the medium to long term. *"...Theories of change are illustrations of how change is expected to play out over time and the role that organisations will play in producing that change. They show how strategies will connect to interim outcomes that then set the stage for long-range goals..."*² For this a selection of appropriate flexible tools is key, especially for advocacy, where theories and strategies need to adapt over time to the variability of the political context, as in the case of Burma. The exercise would also serve to consolidate the partnership, engaging the CSOs from the beginning.
- Selection criteria for the renewed work should include: sufficient capacity, interest and commitment, expectations (realism), but not necessarily size of the CSO
- Capacity building should focus on advocacy both theoretically, and increasingly taking the form of process facilitation, coaching, counselling and supporting in strategic and practical aspects of the joint initiative, with more time per partner.

² Harris, E. 2005. "An introduction to theory of change". The Evaluation Exchange, 11(2)

- Monitoring and evaluation should be part of the capacity building, and focus on capturing lessons learned, achievements and challenges
- Effective information sharing mechanisms, both internal and external, should be set up and closely linked with the M&E system in order to capture evidence and disseminate the information. Communications is at the core of effective advocacy, in this respect a communication plans should be developed (e.g. using “Spitfire Smart Chart” as a simple planning tool). The plan should foresee the utilisation of instruments that could facilitate the internal information flow among the partners (this could range from simple newsletters to annual general meeting and e-mail, depending on availability of resources) aiming to consolidate the common vision and building knowledge through a continuous exchange of experiences. Internet-based tools such as a web page (e.g. a good example is the food security working group’s webpage. Despite some limitations, the web <http://www.myanmarfswg.org> has been evaluated as a useful tool for the network), and/or facebook or blog could serve to reach a wider audience and share information and results. Depending on resources and the level of ambitiousness an Information Officer may be required to support these activities.
- PIN staff should be sufficiently supported to be able to assume their increased role, especially with regards to coaching and process management. This could for example include an initial intensive training on specific topics, followed by a closer relationship (mentoring) with Equality Myanmar
- Funding would follow the long term nature of the initiative. Continuity should be seen as the key word, rather than necessarily the size of funds.
- Strategies for continuous involvement and dialogue with Government Authorities should be designed, based on the positive initial experiences from the current project and the specific elements of the joint strategy (see recommendation above)
- Sustainability of the action and each component must be carefully considered

Wider civil society support:

- The evaluators appreciate and encourage PINs effort at supporting smaller CSOs/CBOs from more remote areas, that up till now had no access to external support
- Develop a specific Training of Trainers (ToT) programme to facilitate the dissemination of knowledge (according to PIN this is being done)
- The wider group of CSO partners (especially those already involved) may be given “introduction to advocacy” and lessons learned, best practises from the advocacy work should be shared with them

General:

- PIN should work on improving dialogue and accountability with partners, taking the necessary time to explain procedures and ensuring follow up and counselling. This should depart from the issues identified by partners, and requires necessary resources for example for finance staff to visit organisations and provide necessary coaching. There is no “quick fix”, but it is proposed to include a discussion session in upcoming meetings (possibly mediated by an external resource person) where PIN should present its efforts and partners may feel free to voice their concerns. On another note, if any CSO’s motivation and expectations are unrealistic, there should be a dialogue about this and they may not be included in future collaborations.

- Reporting should be more focused on higher level results, lessons learned and challenges

- Trainings should be tailored on the capacity of participants, should include an evaluation of the knowledge acquired as well as be flexible and open to feedback

VII. Conclusions

The project has been very relevant to the context in Burma. The project includes locally driven initiatives, with roots in civil society and including Burma's ethnic states. The project has also adapted to the new realities of the country, considering civil society as one of the main actors in the social change process, and responding to organisational needs of CSOs. An important aspect of this has been the efforts in promoting networking and cooperation between organisations.

On the whole the intervention has progressed towards its objectives, although there have been some notable shortcomings along the way as depicted throughout the report.

The project has contributed to impact in terms of building the capacities of the partner CSOs and to some extent that of the Local authorities, which in some cases demonstrate a more collaborative attitude.

PIN has played an important role building the capacity of partner organisations and bringing partners together in the framework of the project. However a weakness has been the project construction, the lack of effective communication (as perceived by partners), the very heterogeneous and large group of CSOs, as well as a short implementation period that limited considerably the implementation of any advocacy.

Advocacy campaigns, or even single components of an advocacy campaign, take longer than the duration of the small grants. Advocacy is a long processes wherein define goals need to be defined in short, medium and long terms and effective strategies have to be designed. A short term perspective conversely can create frustration and disillusion among the involved actors.

Although much has been done in terms of capacity building of the CSOs, there are still needs to fill. To address this PIN should design trainings based on organisational assessments and enhance its follow up and counselling capacities. Special emphasis should be on organisational sustainability, allowing the CSOs long term viability in order to pursue their objectives.

The current situation in Burma presents many opportunities for an organisation that has the capacity and experience to lead initiatives and to successfully set a shared agenda. But there is a certain urgency in finding and selecting the right path in a rapidly changing political landscape.

A participative construction of an agreed Theory of Change based on PIN's and its partners' experiences could be the starting point in the definition of future medium and long term objectives and strategies, with the added value of strengthening the relationships among partners, building a common consensus to define and promote advocacy for social change.

The evaluators nevertheless conclude that the project has built solid basis for future potential, building trust, commitment and interest, yet many of the gaps need to be addressed, requiring important attention and effort.

Annexes

- i) Terms of Reference
- ii) Abbreviations
- iii) List of Informants



Terms of Reference

Final evaluation of project “Advocate together”

Contract period July - August 2015

1. Introduction

People in Need (PIN) is a non-governmental and non-partial organization established in 1992 (www.peopleinneed.cz/en). It provides relief aid and development assistance, while working to defend human rights and supporting democratic processes in countries across the globe.

In 2012 PIN opened a permanent office in Burma due to changing political environment in the country. The permanent presence in the country enables PIN to provide direct mentoring and capacity building to local partners and implement projects on strengthening civil society organizations. Since 2012 PIN's office has increased the number of staff members to 15 and opened a sub-office in Mandalay. Currently PIN is implementing projects on civil society empowerment and human rights, community dialogue and child protection.

2. Background

The project ‘Advocate Together’ was designed to address the issues of protection of freedom of association and to support civil society organizations in their efforts to effectively advocate for removal of laws restricting free exercise of their activities. The project was submitted to the call for proposal of the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labour's (U.S. Department of State) that was opened for actions on empowerment of broad-based civil society which presses for legal and institutional reforms needed nationally and regionally.

At the beginning of the project implementation the enjoyment of freedom of association was at very risk because of restrictive legislation regulating public actions such as demonstrations, protests, and formation of civil society organizations. The legal acts such as Peaceful Demonstration and Gathering Law, Law Relating to the Forming of Organizations or Unlawful Association Law were still in place to regulate the environment in which civil society operated. Since that time certain conditions for operation of civil society have changed especially thanks to the adoption of the Registration Law. In this regard a group of civil society activists achieved to advocate for more transparent conditions of registration process and scrutiny rules. The implementation of this law will be finalized by the approval of the accompanying provisions (bylaws) regulating the registration process.

In this political context PIN's project was designed to strengthen civil society organizations from ethnic regions and to support them in their advocacy efforts for removal of laws restricting exercise of their activities through capacity building program, financial funding and mentoring. The activities of civil society groups were coordinated at the newly established regional networks from regional and ethnic areas. Over the project duration the target groups had a chance to obtain individual or joint funding for advocacy campaigns targeting specific issues in their constituencies. One of the main goals was to create advocacy networks in six multi-ethnic areas and support the key actors in their advocacy efforts.

PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Duration: 1/10/2013-30/6/2015

Overall Objective	The projects' overall objective is to contribute to widespread unrestricted exercise of freedom of association as instrument of consolidated democratic transition in Burma.
Outcome	CSOs/CBOs are capacitated to provide relevant, quality and sizeable advocacy

	actions in 6 regions of Burma.
Expected Results	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhanced expert knowledge and practical experience of advocacy CBOs 2. Created environment and opportunities for building cooperation and mutual trust 3. Capacitated local authorities familiar with CBOs activities 4. Up-to-date relevant legal and administrative information provided to CBOs and LAs through tool-kit 5. Each platform is provided expert assistance by a specially trained lawyer
Beneficiaries	Civil society organizations, local authorities, local community members and leaders, as well as lawyers.
Geographic Areas	6 regional areas: Rakhine State, Mon State, Mandalay Region, Shan State, Kachin State and Kayin State (note: the main focus was put on 4 areas: Shan, Mon and Kayin States, Mandalay)

3. Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

The Evaluation Objectives

The key aim of this final evaluation is to assess achievements, lessons-learned and best practices in PIN's actions focused on advocacy capacity building of civil society (functioning modules, approaches and ways of cooperation) and to recommend PIN an advocacy strategy and approach for the future programming and cooperation with partner organizations in Myanmar. Furthermore PIN expects the evaluation to give clear and practical recommendations about how to strengthen our capacity building approach in the design and deliver of future advocacy grants, capacity building of local trainers and advocates, networking as well as mentoring activities.

The Evaluation will:

1. assess the outcome 'Advocacy CBOs enabled to provide relevant, quality and sizeable advocacy actions' especially in relation to Expected Result 1 and 2 (including achievements, lessons-learned, best practices);
2. assess advocacy approaches and implementation strategy that have been applied by PIN throughout the project implementation (models, project components and approaches);
3. provide recommendations on how to strengthen advocacy approach through PIN's programs and on advocacy capacity building of civil society (sub-grant/strategy design for programming, staff and partner capacity building approach and modules, monitoring and evaluation).

Key evaluation questions

Relevance

- ✓ Why is 'advocacy' relevant for the work of civil society in Myanmar?
- ✓ To what extent were the designed components/activities relevant for improvement of advocacy actions of the target civil society organizations?
- ✓ To what extent were the activities relevant for improvement of the operational (legal) environment of civil society in the target areas?
- ✓ To what extent were activities relevant for creation of CS cooperation and mutual trust?

Effectiveness

- ✓ What were external and internal factors that influenced the effectiveness of the advocacy capacity building for civil society organizations?
- ✓ What were external and internal factors that influenced the effectiveness of the advocacy projects of civil society organizations?
- ✓ To what extent were the designed approaches activities (training sessions, networking meetings, activities with local authorities and joint and individual sub-grants) effective for enhancement of CSOs' advocacy expertise and actions? (ER1)
- ✓ To what extent have the networking meetings and joint sub-grants strengthened the cooperation CSOs and help to exchange experience and knowledge? (ER1&2)

- ✓ To what extent have the CSOs been successful in making networks and effective communication with local authorities? (ER2)

Sustainability

- ✓ To what extent are the established networks of CSOs and local partnerships sustainable?
- ✓ What factors have influenced the sustainability of the advocacy project's components?
- ✓ What are the recommendations to advocacy approach of PIN's programs and capacity building methods (sub-grants/training and mentoring, staff and partner capacity building, monitoring and evaluation)?

Impact

- ✓ Have the results of the action contributed to the increased enjoyment of civic rights in the target areas?
- ✓ Have the results of the action contributed to more open environment for constructive advocacy with local authorities?
- ✓ Were there any unexpected positive and negative impacts during the action?
- ✓ What is the positive and negative impact on the final beneficiaries in the target areas?

4. Methodology

The consultant will use a balanced mix of techniques and means of verification to answer the above mentioned questions. The consultant can make use of all the project materials, documents and donor's reports. Besides, the consultant should discuss these questions with PIN and local partners. Moreover the consultant will hold interviews with the key persons involved in the project implementation and stakeholders that have had influence on the implementation and decision-making regarding PIN's advocacy actions. Other methods can be proposed by the consultant if found relevant and effective to provide necessary inputs.

5. Evaluation Timeframe and Deliverables

Timeframe

Phase	Task	Timeline
Phase 1 - Selection process	Evaluation proposal - drafting a methodology and a work-plan	July 2015
	Selection process of an evaluator	27th - 10th August 2015
	Contracting	21st - 24th August 2015
Phase 2 - Evaluation period	Finalization of evaluation methodology, workplan, plan of field trips and evaluation documents (questionnaires, sample selection, etc.)	From the date of conclusion of the contract until 28th August 2015
	Inception meetings with staff members, stakeholders	From 29th August 2015
	Field work	30th - 10th August 2015
Phase 3 - Final report	Submitting the draft evaluation report	15th September 2015
	Submitting the final evaluation report	22nd September 2015

Deliverables

The final evaluation report (not more than 9,000 words) will be max. 20 pages in the format provided by PIN. The report will be accompanied by a 3-page executive summary and annexes (e.g. ToR, questionnaires, sample selection, areas of inquiry, and minutes from workshops/discussions).

Evaluation Report

- Executive Summary
- Introduction
- Methodology
- Findings (answered evaluation questions)
 - Problems and needs (Relevance)
 - Achievement of purpose (Effectiveness)
 - Achievement of wider effects (Impact)
 - Likely continuation of achieved results (Sustainability)
 - Capacity building and partnerships
- Overall assessment
- Recommendations on PIN's future programming regarding advocacy and capacity building
- Conclusions
- Annexes

6. Requirements and Competencies of Evaluator

The evaluator as far as possible should fulfil the following criteria:

- Experience of conducting final evaluations (on advocacy projects and strategy);
- Strong track record in qualitative research methods;
- Understanding and knowledge of Civil Society in Myanmar and Advocacy;
- Knowledge of local context in Myanmar;
- Excellent writing skills in English;
- Ability to meet deadlines and work in a flexible environment.

7. Application process

The candidates should send their evaluation proposals (2-4 pages) by 27th July 2015 to the email address: tereza.grunvaldova@peopleinneed.cz. The proposal should be accompanied by the CVs and a sample of previous evaluation work.

The evaluation proposals should include an outline of:

- evaluation approach and methodology (based on the evaluation background and objectives);
- draft work-plan (including meetings with target groups, stakeholders, team members);
- budget with day rates and estimate travel and other costs for the duration of the evaluation.

People in Need in Myanmar, www.peopleinneed.cz ,
 Local address: 135B Taw Win Yeik Thar Street, Shwe Gone Dine Road, Bahan Township, Yangon,
 Myanmar
 Office number: 01558700

Abbreviations

CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CBO	Community-Based Organisation
US	United States (of America)
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PIN	People in Need
ToR	Terms of Reference
LA	Local Authority
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
KII	Key Informant Interview
LGTB	Lesbian, Gay, Transsexual and Bisexual
CAC	Community Action Centres
ER	Expected Result
INGO	International NGO
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
ToT	Training of Trainers

List of Informants

In chronological order:

- *Anonymous* high-level official, Regional Authorities Karen State
- Daw Aye Mi San & Daw May, Karen Affairs Committee
- Daw May & U Saw Naing Win, Karen Development Network-Next Step
- Ko Thein Saw, Ar Man Thit
- Naw Cristina, Women's Organisation Network, Hpa-An
- Ko Myint Aung, 88 Generation Hpa-An
- Naw Cynthia Win, Karen Women Empowerment Group & CAC
- Community Group, Lyar Tha Wot, Karen state
- Aung Myo Min, Trainer (Equality Myanmar)
- 25 organisations from 4 areas, FGD & exercise
- Khin Maung Shwe, Shwe Kamboza group
- Dr. Pyoe Sone Hein, Civil Authorise Negotiate Organisation
- Zin Nwe and four members, Pa'O Women's Union
- Mynt Win Htun, Metta Ratana
- Ni Ni Lwin, Southern Shan Local Development Organisation
- Cho Mya Oo, Cherry Image
- Khun Tun Kyi, Kaung Rwai Social Action Network
- Aye Aye Tha, Programme Manager, PIN
- Van Hmun Nawl, Field Coordinator, PIN
- Theingi Khine, Field Coordinator, PIN
- Tereza Grünvaldová, Country Director, PIN
- Monika Kolomazníková, Programme Coordinator - Civil Society, PIN

Evaluation Tools (from signed and agreed evaluation plan)

Base Semi-structured Interview Guide

NOTE: Before interview counter-check list of organisations and grants received.

- Introduction and brief description of organisation and its work (collect materials?)
- Introduction of individuals and role/involvement in project (what other persons would be good to speak to?)

- Describe the involvement of the organisation in the project? What support did it receive, in what did it participate?
- How has the project been beneficial to your organisation?
- What aspects have been most beneficial? Why? (Ask about relevant grants/subgrants)
- Which aspects were least beneficial/weakest?
- What are the main improvements of your organisation? In terms of advocacy? (especially related to: freedom of assembly, freedom of association)
- What are the continued needs of your organisation? (Was the capacity building spread to sufficient number of staff/members?)
- Is focus on advocacy appropriate?
- Did you have sufficient access to PIN staff, support, advice? How can the cooperation with PIN improve?

- Was the project beneficial in bringing together your organisation with other partners? Do you continue to work together? (same networks/constellations or different?) (trust)
- Other actors with whom cooperation has been initiated/deepened (journalists, parties, INGOs,...)
- Have the CAC been useful for you?

- Was the information on legal/operational aspects beneficial/sufficient? Is your organisation registered? Is it harassed/free to operate?
- Has your relation with LAs improved? (trust?) Do you have a continued dialogue with them? (Which?) (How about State level? Union level?)
- Are there any other impacts of the project? (Any negative impact?)
- (How has the work of your organisation adapted to the changes in the country?)

- Please describe any advocacy campaign you were involved in. (joint, sole, theme, target group, time period etc). Successful? Weaknesses and strengths. Main difficulties (how tackled/solved). Internal external factors.
- Describe main success. Any changes taken place? Impact in target group/policy etc? (negative impact?)

- What are your organisations future plans (related to project/advocacy). (How has the

project contributed, influenced future plans?)

- What are your key recommendations for PIN future work?

FGD guidelines

1. How important is networking for your organization in advocacy mobilization campaign? Did it improve with the project support?
2. To what extent has the project contributed to enhancing relevant advocacy initiatives?
3. How much are communities and other CBOs (not part of the project) aware about the CACs and its functions?
4. To what extent did you or the communities benefit from the counseling provided by the lawyers?
5. How important is information exchange to and from your organization /network about advocacy issues? Did it improve with the project support?
6. How important is your network/consortium/organization's role in influencing policies at local , regional and national level? Do you have any example?
7. What constraints did your network/consortium/organization encounter in advocating for the communities, and which (if any) improvement did you notice after the Project?
8. What kind of support would your network/consortium/organization find useful to become more effective in mobilizing and advocating?
9. Is your network/consortium/organization connected to other actors at national level? Which kind of activities or interchange do you carry out together?
10. What greater or different role could you envision for your network/consortium/organization in advocating for people?

In addition to the main FGD session, a simple exercise complemented the information produced by generating a constructive reflection process.

Initiative	General score	Explanation	Recommendation
Training for CBOs			
Sub- Grant			

Joint advocacy actions (regional)			
Joint advocacy actions (cross-regional)			
Toolkits			
Counseling			
Training for L.A.			
Networking			