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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S C</td>
<td>Capacity development model which focuses on 5 core capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>Aliansi Sumut Bersatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal map</td>
<td>Map with cause-effect relationships. See also ‘detailed causal map’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal mechanisms</td>
<td>The combination of parts that ultimately explains an outcome. Each part of the mechanism is an individually insufficient but necessary factor in a whole mechanism, which together produce the outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen University and Research centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA</td>
<td>Co-Financing Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>Co-Financing Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed causal map</td>
<td>Also ‘model of change’. The representation of all possible explanations – causal pathways for a change/ outcome. These pathways are that of the intervention, rival pathways and pathways that combine parts of the intervention pathway with that of others. This also depicts the reciprocity of various events influencing each other and impacting the overall change. In the 5C evaluation identified key organisational capacity changes and underlying reasons for change (causal mechanisms) are traced through process tracing (for attribution question).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General causal map</td>
<td>Causal map with key organisational capacity changes and underlying reasons for change (causal mechanisms), based on SPO perception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFS</td>
<td>Dutch co-financing system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoFA</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>Organisational Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>Priority Result Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process tracing</td>
<td>Theory-based approach to trace causal mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO</td>
<td>Southern Partner Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI</td>
<td>Semi-structured Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wageningen UR</td>
<td>Wageningen University &amp; Research centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction & summary

1.1 Purpose and outline of the report

The Netherlands has a long tradition of public support for civil bi-lateral development cooperation, going back to the 1960s. The Co-Financing System (Medefinancieringsstelsel, or ‘MFS’) is its most recent expression. MFS II is the 2011-2015 grant framework for Co-Financing Agencies (CFAs), which is directed at achieving a sustainable reduction in poverty. A total of 20 consortia of Dutch CFAs have been awarded €1.9 billion in MFS II grants by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA).

The overall aim of MFS II is to help strengthen civil society in the South as a building block for structural poverty reduction. CFAs receiving MFS II funding work through strategic partnerships with Southern Partner Organisations.

The MFS II framework stipulates that each consortium is required to carry out independent external evaluations to be able to make valid, evaluative statements about the effective use of the available funding. On behalf of Dutch consortia receiving MFS II funding, NWO-WOTRO has issued three calls for proposals. Call deals with joint MFS II evaluations of development interventions at country level. Evaluations must comprise a baseline assessment in 2012 and a follow-up assessment in 2014 and should be arranged according to three categories of priority result areas as defined by MoFA:

Achievement of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) & themes;
Capacity development of Southern partner organisations (SPO) (5 c study);
Efforts to strengthen civil society.

This report focuses on the assessment of capacity development of Southern partner organisations. This evaluation of the organisational capacity development of the SPOs is organised around four key evaluation questions:

1. What are the changes in partner organisations’ capacity during the 2012-2014 period?
2. To what degree are the changes identified in partner capacity attributable to development interventions undertaken by the MFS II consortia (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?
3. Were the efforts of the MFS II consortia efficient?
4. What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?

The purpose of this report is to provide endline information on one of the SPOs involved in the evaluation: ASB in Indonesia. The baseline report is described in a separate document.

Chapter 2 describes general information about the Southern Partner Organisation (SPO). Here you can find general information about the SPO, the context in which the SPO operates, contracting details and background to the SPO. In chapter 3 a brief overview of the methodological approach is described. You can find a more detailed description of the methodological approach in appendix 1. Chapter 4 describes the results of the 5c endline study. It provides an overview of capacity development interventions of the SPO that have been supported by MFS II. It also describes what changes in organisational capacity have taken place since the baseline and why (evaluation question is 1 and 4). This is described as a summary of the indicators per capability as well as a general causal map that provides an overview of the key organisational capacity changes since the baseline, as experienced by the SPO. The complete overview of descriptions per indicator, and how these have changed since the baseline is described in appendix 3. The complete visual and narrative for the key organisational capacity changes that have taken place since the baseline according to the SPO staff present at the endline workshop is presented in appendix 4.

For those SPOs involved in process tracing a summary description of the causal maps for the identified organisational capacity changes in the two selected capabilities (capability to act and commit; capability to adapt and self-renew) is provided (evaluation questions 2 and 4). These causal maps
describe the identified key organisational capacity changes that are possibly related to MFS II interventions in these two capabilities, and how these changes have come about. More detailed information can be found in appendix 5.

Chapter 5 presents a discussion on the findings and methodology and a conclusion on the different evaluation questions.

The overall methodology for the endline study of capacity of southern partner organisations is coordinated between the 8 countries: Bangladesh (Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath; INTRAC); DRC (Disaster Studies, Wageningen UR); Ethiopia (CDI, Wageningen UR); India (CDI, Wageningen UR: Indonesia (CDI, Wageningen UR); Liberia (CDI, Wageningen UR); Pakistan (IDS; MetaMeta); (Uganda (ETC). Specific methodological variations to the approach carried out per country where CDI is involved are also described in this document.

This report is sent to the Co-Financing Agency (CFA) and the Southern Partner Organisation (SPO) for correcting factual errors and for final validation of the report.

1.2 Brief summary of analysis and findings

Since the baseline, two years ago, ASB has seen most changes in the capability to act and commit. Better task delegation, clearer job descriptions and strategic planning have helped ASB’s leadership in organizing staff and program activities better. The capability to adapt and self renew also slightly improved through the improved application of M&E and the establishment of a diversity communication forum, through which ASB can easier keep track of developments amongst its beneficiary communities. The capability to deliver on development objectives has improved through more systematic working. Day to day activities have been more aligned to the organization’s strategy and each other. In the capability to relate ASB improved in its networking capacity. More stakeholders are engaged in the development of policies and strategies, which is a very slight improvement compared to the baseline. New partnerships with academia have strengthened external relations and opened up new opportunities. Finally, ASB has very slightly improved in its capability to achieve coherence. Operational guidelines of ASB have slightly improved with the introduction of standard operating procedures for all divisions.

The evaluators considered it important to also note down the SPO’s story in terms of changes in the organisation since the baseline, and this would also provide more information about reasons for change, which were difficult to get for the individual indicators. Also for some issues there may not have been relevant indicators available in the list of core indicators provided by the evaluation team. During the endline workshop some key organisational capacity changes were brought up by ASB’s staff: the provision of health insurance (BPJS) linked to investments; increased job security, through more permanent staff contracts; improved staff capacity to implement programs.

Within two of these organisational capacity changes, changes overlap with the key organisational capacity changes that were selected for process tracing because they were linked to MFS II funded capacity development interventions, namely the capacity to manage the organization. More details can be found in the relevant section below.

The overall organizational capacity change to be more recognized as an organization focussed on pluralism issues, with its underlying 3 organisational capacity changes mentioned above, can only be partially attributed to MFS II supported capacity development interventions. In particular the MFS II (HIVOS) funded strategic planning workshop has played an important role in terms of the change in leadership style and having a strategic planning document. Furthermore, HIVOS (MFS II) supported the revision of the financial standard operating procedures (SPOs), which ultimately supported getting more funds for program implementation, more staff, better staff welfare and job security. However, non-MFS II funded interventions such as the TIFA foundation (in this case trainings supported and funded partially by external funders) in the field of finance and communication also played an important role in these changes. It can be said that the MFS II capacity development interventions contributed more to the strategic organizational changes, whilst other interventions provided more change at an operational level.
Two organizational capacity changes were more closely investigated with process tracing: the improved capacity to manage the organization, and the improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues. The improved capacity to manage the organization can be attributed to a large extent to the planned MFS II (HIVOS) capacity development intervention of the strategic planning workshop. The intervention was the main underlying reason for the change in leadership style and the development of a strategic plan. Both of these proved very important to bring about changes in the organization for enhanced capacity to manage the organization. The improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues can only be partially attributed to MFS II interventions. Particularly competencies to communicate results about diversity issues have improved as a result of the English course, although other non-MFS II interventions (externally funded through TIFA) have impacted this as well. Despite HIVOS’ detailed plans to address the issue, ASB has developed a great deal of initiatives on their own to address this issue and improve this particular capacity.
2 General Information about the SPO – Aliansi Sumut Bersatu

2.1 General information about the Southern Partner Organisation (SPO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td>People Unlimited 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Dutch NGO</td>
<td>HIVOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project (if applicable)</td>
<td>Civil and Religious Societies' Participation in Promoting Peace and Diversity in North Sumatra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern partner organisation</td>
<td>Aliansi Sumut Bersatu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project/partner is part of the following evaluation component(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement of MDGs and themes</th>
<th>Capacity development of Southern partner organisations</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efforts to strengthen civil society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 The socio-economic, cultural and political context in which the partner operates

The socio-economic, cultural and political context in which the partner operates

Initially focused on social pluralism regarding sexual and gender equality issues Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (ASB) has broadened its scope of action since 2010, including freedom of religion. An example of this is ASB's present project: "Civil and Religious Societies' Participation in Promoting Peace and Diversity in North Sumatra". This program, which in the framework of MFSII is co-financed by HIVOS, aims at bringing about religious pluralism in North Sumatra. But what does pluralism mean and why does Indonesia need religious pluralism?

Religious pluralism means more than the coexistence or mere tolerance for diverse religious beliefs. Rather, pluralism means an "energetic engagement with diversity" as well as "the active seeking of understanding across lines of difference". As such, pluralism means that different religious groups do not merely accept and tolerate each other's existence but understand, acknowledge and respect the validity of others' religious beliefs as they do with their own. In the context of Indonesia, which consists mostly of Muslim citizens, this very idea poses a considerable challenge for groups like ASB who intend to create a more pluralistic social landscape. This challenge is formed mainly due to monotheistic believers like Muslims and Christians who tend to have their own doctrines as the only possible truth. Furthermore, there are a myriad of different interpretations of Islam and Christianity among Indonesians as well as other religious currents, what does not make pluralism any easier to be reached. Besides facing the challenge of bringing monotheistic citizens to an understanding and comprehensive approach towards different beliefs, in its recent project ASB also needs to cope strategically with the Western political connotation that "pluralism" receives among certain groups in Indonesia.

1 Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (2011), ASB Proposal Form to HIVOS
As pointed out by Robert Hefner (2001:4-6), Indonesia is one of the countries in Southeast Asia where, since its independence after World War II, deep-rooted religious and ethnic divisions have been strikingly damaging for the society. Attacks in churches by Muslims as well as Bible-inspired local regulations in Papua (and the tensions these events brought up) are but a few examples of this religious impasse and how it damages the Indonesian society. In the past year 39 cases of interreligious tensions were registered and it has been concluded that (in comparison with last year) violence due to religious differences has doubled. Nevertheless, the Indonesian government has played down the case. Moreover, religious segregation amounts to "lack of common social will", what reflects civil society weakness and undermines democracy.

The results of the media monitoring in 2012, ASB found some news of freedom violation of religion and belief that mass media highlighted a lot the issues that are:

1. Rejection of religious activity that is Congress Confucianism in Emerald Garden on June 22 to 26, 2012. These discriminatory actions are repeatedly reported by several Mainstream Newspapers.
2. Issues and destruction of Houses of Worship and threats
3. Throughout the year 2012, the United North Sumatra Alliance also advocated sealing of 17 houses of worship in Singkil and 14 houses of worship in Banda Aceh.

These data indicate a violation of religious freedom tends to spread and massive. This is a problem that is equally harmful damage the harmony of society within the framework of the Unitary Republic of Indonesia.

2.3 Contracting details

When did cooperation with this partner start: 1st July 2009.

What is the MFS II contracting period: 5th of January 2013 until 4th of December 2015

Did cooperation with this partner end: Not applicable

If yes, when did it finish: Not applicable

What is the reason for ending the cooperation with this partner: Not applicable

Is there expected cooperation with this partner after 31st of December 2015: Yes.

2.4 Background to the Southern Partner Organisation

History

North Sumatera is an area that is often used as the symbols of diversity in Indonesia. As the largest province on the island of Sumatra based on statistical data; the inhabitants of north sumatera are 12,985.075 individuals. From the religious aspect of north inhabitant of Sumatra consisting of Islam (65,45 %), Protestant (26,62 %), Catholic (4,78 %), Buddhist (2,82 %), official Hindu ( %), and an adherent of other faiths 0,14 %.

---

8 Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (2011), Proposal Form to HIVOS
9 Concept Paper Program ASB 2013-2015
10 Ibid.
There are 27,841 houses of worship in North Sumatera, consisting of 15,752 mosques, 9,777 protestant churches, 1,855 Catholic churches, 194 puras, 128 Viharas, and 135 Klentengs. Based on inhabitant percentage of ethnic are Melayu (5.86 %), Karo (5.09 %), Batak (25.62 %), Mandailing (11.27 %), Nias 6.36 %, Simalungun (1.04 %), and Pakpak (0.73 %). And also ethnic immigrants is Java (33.4 %), Minang (2.66 %), Chinese (2.71 %), Aceh (0.97 %), and the combine of other ethnic 3.29 %.11

Those data very often become material used by the government of Indonesia, especially in North Sumatra to describe diversity in North Sumatra so that North Sumatra often declared as a barometer of tolerance in Indonesia. But in reality people in North Sumatra often faced with the reality of intolerance.12

The United Alliance of Northern Sumatra (Aliansi Sumut Bersatu-ASB) was initiated in 2006, intentionally at the occasion of the International Women’s Day. The creation of the ASB took place in the context of a “come together” of various NGO’s, artists, students, activists and others against an “ultra-conservative-district-level” bill against pornography and indecent behaviour, the so-called RUU APP. This bill was intended by the PKS (Partai Keadilan Sejahtera or Justice and Prosperity Party) as a way of gaining political popularity among Muslims (90% of Indonesian population) through creating this bill based on PKS’ conservative understanding of the Islamic principles. The dialogue between the organizations that stood up against what this bill represented and could bring forth resulted in the declaration of the Aliansi Sumut Bersatu. Through peaceful actions, discussions, hearings with the House of Parliament and the collection of signatures ASB was created to stand against RUU APP and all activities, laws, norms and behaviour that generate social exclusion. Aliansi Sumut Bersatu was officially established in 200814.

Vision
Aliansi Sumut Bersatu’s vision is “the achievement of recognition, protection, fulfilment of and respect toward diversity”.15

Mission
Aliansi Sumut Bersatu’s mission are16:
1. Implement the diversity education
2. Conduct efforts in the protection of intolerance victims of violence
3. Conduct advocacy for realizing policies that respect diversity and favor of the marginalized groups and minorities
4. Conduct studies and research to the diversity issues
5. Build and encourage civil society organizations to be involved in the recognition, protection, fulfillment and respect for diversity.

Strategies
Aliansi Sumut Bersatu’s strategies are: to offer education in feminism, sexuality and pluralism to the community. In the context explained above, “community” encompasses the cross-religion student activists and other social groups. Furthermore, ASB engages in monitoring the practices of religious intolerance in North Sumatra, advocating on policy and advocacy for groups which became the victim of intolerance and doing research on the practices of pluralism in North Sumatra17.
3 Methodological approach and reflection

3.1 Overall methodological approach and reflection

This chapter describes the methodological design and challenges for the assessment of capacity development of Southern Partner Organisations (SPOs), also called the ‘SC study’. This SC study is organised around four key evaluation questions:

1. What are the changes in partner organisations’ capacity during the 2012-2014 period?
2. To what degree are the changes identified in partner capacity attributable to development interventions undertaken by the MFS II consortia (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?
3. Were the efforts of the MFS II consortia efficient?
4. What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?

It has been agreed that the question (3) around efficiency cannot be addressed for this SC study. The methodological approach for the other three questions is described below. At the end, a methodological reflection is provided.

Note: this methodological approach is applied to 4 countries that the Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen University and Research centre is involved in terms of the SC study (Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Liberia). The overall approach has been agreed with all the 8 countries selected for this MFS II evaluation. The SC country teams have been trained and coached on this methodological approach during the evaluation process. Details specific to the SPO are described in chapter 5.1 of the SPO report. A detailed overview of the approach is described in appendix 1.

The first (changes in organisational capacity) and the fourth evaluation question are addressed together through:

- **Changes in the SC indicators since the baseline**: standard indicators have been agreed upon for each of the five capabilities of the five capabilities framework (see appendix 2) and changes between the baseline and the endline situation have been described. For data collection a mix of data collection methods has been used, including self-assessments by SPO staff; interviews with SPO staff and externals; document review; observation. For data analysis, the Nvivo software program for qualitative data analysis has been used. Final descriptions per indicator and per capability with corresponding scores have been provided.

- **Key organisational capacity changes – ‘general causal map’**: during the endline workshop a brainstorm has been facilitated to generate the key organisational capacity changes as perceived by the SPO since the baseline, with related underlying causes. For this purpose, a visual as well as a narrative causal map have been described.

In terms of the attribution question (2 and 4), **process tracing** is used. This is a theory-based approach that has been applied to a selected number of SPOs since it is a very intensive and costly methodology, although it provides rich information and can generate a lot of learning within the organisations. This approach was presented and agreed-upon during the synthesis workshop on 17-18 June 2013 by the 5C teams for the eight countries of the MFS II evaluation. A more detailed description of the approach was presented during the synthesis workshop in February 2014. The synthesis team, NWO-WOTRO, the country project leaders and the MFS II organisations present at the workshop have accepted this approach. It was agreed that this approach can only be used for a selected number of SPOs since it is a very intensive and costly methodology. Key organisational capacity changes/ outcomes of the SPO were identified, based on their relationship to the two selected capabilities, the capability to act and commit the capability to adapt and self-renew, and an expected relationship with CFA supported capacity development interventions (MFS II funding). It was agreed to
focus on these two capabilities, since these are the most targeted capabilities by the CFAs, as established during the baseline process.

Please find below an explanation of how the above-mentioned evaluation questions have been addressed in the 5C evaluation.

At the end of this appendix a brief methodological reflection is provided.

### 3.2 Assessing changes in organisational capacity and reasons for change - evaluation question 1 and 4

This section describes the data collection and analysis methodology for answering the first evaluation question: **What are the changes in partner organisations’ capacity during the 2012-2014 period?** And the fourth evaluation question: **“What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?”**

In order to explain the changes in organisational capacity development between baseline and endline (evaluation question 1) the CDI and in-country evaluation teams needed to review the indicators and how they have changed between baseline and endline and what reasons have been provided for this. This is explained below. It has been difficult to find detailed explanations for changes in each of the separate 5c indicators, but the ‘general causal map’ has provided some ideas about some of the key underlying factors actors and interventions that influence the key organisational capacity changes, as perceived by the SPO staff.

The evaluators considered it important to also note down a consolidated SPO story and this would also provide more information about what the SPO considered to be important in terms of organisational capacity changes since the baseline and how they perceived these key changes to have come about. Whilst this information has not been validated with sources other than SPO staff, it was considered important to understand how the SPOs has perceived changes in the organisation since the baseline.

For those SPOs that are selected for process tracing (evaluation question 2), more in-depth information is provided for the identified key organisational capacity changes and how MFS II supported capacity development interventions as well as other actors, factors and interventions have influenced these changes. This is integrated in the next session on the evaluation question on attribution, as described below and in the appendix 1.

How information was collected and analysed for addressing evaluation question 1 and 4, in terms of description of changes in indicators per capability as well as in terms of the general causal map, based on key organisational capacity changes as perceived by the SPO staff, is further described below.

During the baseline in 2012 information has been collected on each of the 33 agreed upon indicators for organisational capacity. For each of the five capabilities of the 5C framework indicators have been developed as can be seen in Appendix 2. During this 5C baseline, a summary description has been provided for each of these indicators, based on document review and the information provided by staff, the Co-financing Agency (CFA) and other external stakeholders. Also a summary description has been provided for each capability. The results of these can be read in the baseline reports.

The description of indicators for the baseline in 2012 served as the basis for comparison during the endline in 2014. In practice this meant that largely the same categories of respondents (preferably the same respondents as during the baseline) were requested to review the descriptions per indicator and indicate whether and how the endline situation (2014) is different from the described situation in 2012\(^\text{18}\).

\[^{18}\text{The same categories were used as during the baseline (except beneficiaries, other funders): staff categories including management, programme staff, project staff, monitoring and evaluation staff, field staff, administration staff; stakeholder categories including co-financing agency (CFA), consultants, partners.}\]
Per indicator they could indicate whether there was an improvement or deterioration or no change and also describe these changes. Furthermore, per indicator the interviewee could indicate what interventions, actors and other factors explain this change compared to the baseline situation. See below the specific questions that are asked for each of the indicators. Per category of interviewees there is a different list of indicators to be looked at. For example, staff members were presented with a list of all the indicators, whilst external people, for example partners, are presented with a select number of indicators, relevant to the stakeholder.

The information on the indicators was collected in different ways:

1. **Endline workshop at the SPO - self-assessment and ‘general causal map’**: similar to data collection during the baseline, different categories of staff (as much as possible the same people as during the baseline) were brought together in a workshop and requested to respond, in their staff category, to the list of questions for each of the indicators (self-assessment sheet). Prior to carrying out the self-assessments, a brainstorming sessions was facilitated to develop a ‘general causal map’, based on the key organisational capacity changes since the baseline as perceived by SPO staff. Whilst this general causal map is not validated with additional information, it provides a sequential narrative, based on organisational capacity changes as perceived by SPO staff;

2. **Interviews with staff members**: additional to the endline workshop, interviews were held with SPO staff, either to provide more in-depth information on the information provided on the self-assessment formats during the workshop, or as a separate interview for staff members that were not present during the endline workshop;

3. **Interviews with externals**: different formats were developed for different types of external respondents, especially the co-financing agency (CFA), but also partner agencies, and organisational development consultants where possible. These externals were interviewed, either face-to-face or by phone/Skype. The interview sheets were sent to the respondents and if they wanted, these could be filled in digitally and followed up on during the interview;

4. **Document review**: similar to the baseline in 2012, relevant documents were reviewed so as to get information on each indicator. Documents to be reviewed included progress reports, evaluation reports, training reports, etc. (see below) since the baseline in 2012, so as to identify changes in each of the indicators;

5. **Observation**: similar to what was done in 2012, also in 2014 the evaluation team had a list with observable indicators which were to be used for observation during the visit to the SPO.

Below the key steps to assess changes in indicators are described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key steps to assess changes in indicators are described</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide the description of indicators in the relevant formats – CDI team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review the descriptions per indicator – in-country team &amp; CDI team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Send the formats adapted to the SPO to CFA and SPO – in-country team (formats for SPO) and CDI team (formats for CFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collect, upload &amp; code the documents from CFA and SPO in NVivo – CDI team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organise the field visit to the SPO – in-country team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interview the CFA – CDI team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Run the endline workshop with the SPO – in-country team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Interview SPO staff – in-country team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fill-in observation sheets – in-country team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Interview externals – in-country team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Upload and auto-code all the formats collected by in-country team and CDI team in NVivo – CDI team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Provide to the overview of information per 5c indicator to in-country team – CDI team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Analyse data and develop a draft description of the findings per indicator and for the general questions – in-country team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Analyse data and develop a final description of the findings per indicator and per capability and for the general questions – CDI team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Analyse the information in the general causal map –in-country team and CDI-team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the CDI team include the Dutch 5c country coordinator as well as the overall 5c coordinator for the four countries (Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Liberia). The 5c country report is based on the separate SPO reports.

Please see appendix 1 for a description of the detailed process and steps.
3.3 Attributing changes in organisational capacity - evaluation question 2 and 4

This section describes the data collection and analysis methodology for answering the second evaluation question: **To what degree are the changes identified in partner capacity attributable to (capacity) development interventions undertaken by the MFS II consortia (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?** and the fourth evaluation question: **“What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?”**

In terms of the attribution question (2), ‘process tracing’ is used. This is a theory-based approach that has been applied to a selected number of SPOs since it is a very intensive and costly methodology, although it provides rich information and can generate a lot of learning within the organisations. Key organisational capacity changes/ outcomes of the SPO were identified, based on their relationship to the two selected capabilities, the capability to act and commit the capability to adapt and self-renew, and an expected relationship with CFA supported capacity development interventions (MFS II funding).

It was agreed to focus on these two capabilities, since these are the most targeted capabilities by the CFAs, as established during the baseline process.

Below, the selection of SPOs for process tracing as well as the different steps involved for process tracing in the selected SPOs, are further explained.

3.3.1 Selection of SPOs for 5C process tracing

Process tracing is a very intensive methodology that is very time and resource consuming (for development and analysis of one final detailed causal map, it takes about 1-2 weeks in total, for different members of the evaluation team). It has been agreed upon during the synthesis workshop on 17-18 June 2013 that only a selected number of SPOs will take part in this process tracing for the purpose of understanding the attribution question. The selection of SPOs is based on the following criteria:

- MFS II support to the SPO has not ended before 2014 (since this would leave us with too small a time difference between intervention and outcome);
- Focus is on the 1-2 capabilities that are targeted most by CFAs in a particular country;
- Both the SPO and the CFA are targeting the same capability, and preferably aim for similar outcomes;
- Maximum one SPO per CFA per country will be included in the process tracing.

The intention was to focus on about 30-50% of the SPOs involved. Please see the tables below for a selection of SPOs per country. Per country, a first table shows the extent to which a CFA targets the five capabilities, which is used to select the capabilities to focus on. A second table presents which SPO is selected, and takes into consideration the selection criteria as mentioned above.

For the detailed results of this selection, in the four countries that CDI is involved in, please see appendix 1. The following SPOs were selected for process tracing:

- Ethiopia: AMREF, ECFA, FSCE, HUNDEE (4/9)
- India: BVHA, COUNT, FFID, SMILE, VTRC (5/10)
- Indonesia: ASB, ECPAT, PPPMA, YPI, YRBI (5/12)
- Liberia: BSC, RHRAP (2/5).

3.3.2 Key steps in process tracing for the 5C study

In the box below you will find the key steps developed for the 5C process tracing methodology. These steps will be further explained here. Only key staff of the SPO is involved in this process: management; programme/ project staff; and monitoring and evaluation staff, and other staff that could provide information relevant to the identified outcome area/key organisational capacity change. Those SPOs selected for process tracing had a separate endline workshop, in addition to the ‘general endline workshop. This workshop was carried out after the initial endline workshop and the interviews during the field visit to the SPO. Where possible, the general and process tracing endline workshop
have been held consecutively, but where possible these workshops were held at different points in time, due to the complex design of the process. Below the detailed steps for the purpose of process tracing are further explained. More information can be found in Appendix 1.

### Key steps in process tracing for the 5C study

1. Identify the planned MFS II supported capacity development interventions within the selected capabilities (capability to act and commit and capability to adapt and self-renew) – CDI team
2. Identify the implemented MFS II supported capacity development interventions within the selected capabilities (capability to act and commit and capability to adapt and self-renew) – CDI team
3. Identify initial changes/ outcome areas in these two capabilities – CDI team & in-country team
4. Construct the detailed, initial causal map (theoretical model of change) – CDI team & in-country team
5. Identify types of evidence needed to verify or discard different causal relationships in the model of change – in-country teams, with support from CDI team
6. Collect data to verify or discard causal mechanisms and construct workshop based, detailed causal map (model of change) – in-country team
7. Assess the quality of data and analyse data and develop final detailed causal map (model of change) – in-country team with CDI team
8. Analyse and conclude on findings – CDI team, in collaboration with in-country team

### 3.3.3 Methodological reflection

Below a few methodological reflections are made by the 5C evaluation team. These can also be found in appendix 1.

**Use of the 5 core capabilities framework and qualitative approach:** This has proven to be a very useful framework to assess organisational capacity. The five core capabilities provide a comprehensive picture of the capacity of an organisation. The capabilities are interlinked, which was also reflected in the description of standard indicators, that have been developed for the purpose of this 5C evaluation and agreed upon for the eight countries. Using this framework with a mainly qualitative approach has provided rich information for the SPOs and CFAs, and many have indicated this was a useful learning exercise.

**Using standard indicators and scores:** Using standard indicators is useful for comparison purposes. However, the information provided per indicator is very specific to the SPO and therefore makes comparison difficult. Whilst the description of indicators has been useful for the SPO and CFA, it is questionable to what extent indicators can be compared across SPOs since they need to be seen in context, for them to make meaning. In relation to this, one can say that scores that are provided for the indicators, are only relative and cannot show the richness of information as provided in the indicator description. Furthermore, it must be noted that organisations are continuously changing and scores are just a snapshot in time. There cannot be perfect score for this. In hindsight, having rubrics would have been more useful than scores.

**General causal map:** whilst this general causal map, which is based on key organisational capacity changes and related causes, as perceived by the SPO staff present at the endline workshop, has not been validated with other sources of information except SPO feedback, the 5C evaluation team considers this information important, since it provides the SPO story about how and which changes in the organisation since the baseline, are perceived as being important, and how these changes have come about. This will provide information additional to the information that has been validated when analysing and describing the indicators as well as the information provided through process tracing (selected SPOs). This has proven to be a learning experience for many SPOs.

**Using process tracing for dealing with the attribution question:** This theory-based and mainly qualitative approach has been chosen to deal with the attribution question, on how the organisational capacity changes in the organisations have come about and what the relationship is with MFS II supported capacity development interventions and other factors. This has proven to be a very useful process, that provided a lot of very rich information. Many SPOs and CFAs have already indicated that they appreciated the richness of information which provided a story about how identified
organisational capacity changes have come about. Whilst this process was intensive for SPOs during the process tracing workshops, many appreciated this to be a learning process that provided useful information on how the organisation can further develop itself. For the evaluation team, this has also been an intensive and time-consuming process, but since it provided rich information in a learning process, the effort was worth it, if SPOs and CFAs find this process and findings useful.

A few remarks need to be made:

- Outcome explaining process tracing is used for this purpose, but has been adapted to the situation since the issues being looked at were very complex in nature.

- Difficulty of verifying each and every single change and causal relationship:
  - Intensity of the process and problems with recall: often the process tracing workshop was done straight after the general endline workshop that has been done for all the SPOs. In some cases, the process tracing endline workshop has been done at a different point in time, which was better for staff involved in this process, since process tracing asks people to think back about changes and how these changes have come about. The word difficulties with recalling some of these changes and how they have come about. See also the next paragraph.
  - Difficulty of assessing changes in knowledge and behaviour: training questionnaire is have been developed, based on Kirkpatrick’s model and were specifically tailored to identify not only the interest but also the change in knowledge and skills, behaviour as well as organisational changes as a result of a particular training. The retention ability of individuals, irrespective of their position in the organisation, is often unstable. The 5C evaluation team experienced that it was difficult for people to recall specific trainings, and what they learned from those trainings. Often a change in knowledge, skills and behaviour is a result brought about by a combination of different factors, rather than being traceable to one particular event. The detailed causal maps that have been established, also clearly pointed this. There are many factors at play that make people change their behaviour, and this is not just dependent on training but also internal/personal (motivational) factors as well as factors within the organisation, that stimulate or hinder a person to change behaviour. Understanding how behaviour change works is important when trying to really understand the extent to which behaviour has changed as a result of different factors, actors and interventions. Organisations change because people change and therefore understanding when and how these individuals change behaviour is crucial. Also attrition and change in key organisational positions can contribute considerably to the outcome.

Utilisation of the evaluation

The 5C evaluation team considers it important to also discuss issues around utility of this evaluation. We want to mention just a few.

**Design:** mainly externally driven and with a focus on accountability and standard indicators and approaches within a limited time frame, and limited budget: this MFS II evaluation is originally based on a design that has been decided by IOB (the independent evaluation office of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and to some extent MFS II organisations. The evaluators have had no influence on the overall design and sampling for the 5C study. In terms of learning, one may question whether the most useful cases have been selected in this sampling process. The focus was very much on a rigorous evaluation carried out by an independent evaluation team. Indicators had to be streamlined across countries. The 5C team was requested to collaborate with the other 5C country teams (Bangladesh, Congo, Pakistan, Uganda) to streamline the methodological approach across the eight sampled countries. Whilst this may have its purpose in terms of synthesising results, the 5C evaluation team has also experienced the difficulty of tailoring the approach to the specific SPOs. The overall evaluation has been mainly accountability driven and was less focused on enhancing learning for improvement. Furthermore, the timeframe has been very small to compare baseline information (2012) with endline information (2014). Changes in organisational capacity may take a long, particularly if they are related to behaviour change. Furthermore, there has been limited budget to carry out the 5C evaluation. For all the four countries (Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Liberia) that the Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen University and Research centre has been involved in, the budget has been overspent.
However, the 5C evaluation team has designed an endline process whereby engagement of staff, e.g. in a workshop process was considered important, not only due to the need to collect data, but also to generate learning in the organisation. Furthermore, having general causal maps and detailed causal maps generated by process tracing have provided rich information that many SPOs and CFAs have already appreciated as useful in terms of the findings as well as a learning process.

Another issue that must be mentioned is that additional requests have been added to the country teams during the process of implementation: developing a country based synthesis; questions on design, implementation, and reaching objectives of MFS II funded capacity development interventions, whilst these questions were not in line with the core evaluation questions for the 5C evaluation.

**Complexity and inadequate coordination and communication:** many actors, both in the Netherlands, as well as in the eight selected countries, have been involved in this evaluation and their roles and responsibilities, were often unclear. For example, 19 MFS II consortia, the internal reference group, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Partos, the Joint Evaluation Trust, NWO-Wotro, the evaluators (Netherlands and in-country), 2 external advisory committees, and the steering committee. Not to mention the SPO’s and their related partners and consultants. CDI was involved in 4 countries with a total number of 38 SPOs and related CFAs. This complexity influenced communication and coordination, as well as the extent to which learning could take place. Furthermore, there was a distance between the evaluators and the CFAs, since the approach had to be synchronised across countries, and had to adhere to strict guidelines, which were mainly externally formulated and could not be negotiated or discussed for the purpose of tailoring and learning. Feedback on the final results and report had to be provided mainly in written form. In order to enhance utilisation, a final workshop at the SPO to discuss the findings and think through the use with more people than probably the one who reads the report, would have more impact on organisational learning and development. Furthermore, feedback with the CFAs has also not been institutionalised in the evaluation process in the form of learning events. And as mentioned above, the complexity of the evaluation with many actors involved did not enhance learning and thus utilization.

**5C Endline process, and in particular thoroughness of process tracing often appreciated as learning process:** The SPO perspective has also brought to light a new experience and technique of self-assessment and self-corrective measures for managers. Most SPOs whether part of process tracing or not, deeply appreciated the thoroughness of the methodology and its ability to capture details with robust connectivity. This is a matter of satisfaction and learning for both evaluators and SPOs. Having a process whereby SPO staff were very much engaged in the process of self-assessment and reflection has proven for many to be a learning experience for many, and therefore have enhanced utility of the 5C evaluation.
4 Results

4.1 MFS II supported capacity development interventions

Below an overview of the different MFS II supported capacity development interventions of ASB that have taken place since 2011 are described. The information is based on the information provided by HIVOS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the MFS II supported capacity development intervention</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Timing and duration</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning workshop to develop work plans 2012/2013-2015</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Reviewed and revised the SOP of work division and on finance</td>
<td>October 2011</td>
<td>700 Euro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English course</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Intensive coaching and training on English skills to focus on both writing proposals and project reports to encourage skills that would affect both the capability to act and commit as well as the capability to adapt and self-renew</td>
<td>2013-2015 (ongoing)</td>
<td>700 Euro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 5C endline_support to capacity development sheet_CFA perspective_Indonesia_ASB

4.2 Changes in capacity development and reasons for change - evaluation question 1 and 4

Below you can find a description of the changes in each of the five core capabilities. This information is based on the analysis of the information per each of the indicators. This detailed information for each of the indicators describes the current situation, and how and why it has changed since the baseline. See also annex 3.
4.2.1 Changes in the five core capabilities

**Capability to act and commit**

Overall, the capability to act and commit considerably improved since the leader of ASB has changed his leadership style from a one-man show to a leader who delegates work well. This change occurred after the strategic planning workshop (sponsored by HIVOS) returned a lot of feedback to the organization’s leadership. Ever since, delegation of tasks has increased, job descriptions have become clearer, more feedback on staff performance has been given and the overall gap between leadership and staff has decreased. With improved strategic guidance and better articulated strategies also the daily activities are now more in line with the strategies.

More opportunities now exist for the staff to take their own responsibilities and staff experiences more independently in their work, particularly amongst senior staff, and this has improved staff to be motivated in their work. Staff turnover has not changed, even though some staff left, the other staff joined in the organization, other people with appropriate skills for the job have been hired. The skill gap between senior staff and leadership has diminished, which has allowed the director to lead with general strategic directions and technical guidelines as opposed to hands-on control.

After ASB has acquired new donor funds (TIFA) in 2013, new and more staff training opportunities become available. Particularly on the field of media monitoring, advocacy, investigative journalistic and writing skills and general analytical thinking and data analysis with further training is required. Similar training has been conducted in 2011, however some new staffs hired in 2013, has not been participated in these type of training yet.

Score: From 3.0 to 3.8 (improvement)
ASB has continued to apply the same M&E approach for the last two years. More frequent meetings in the form of staff meetings and the annual evaluation & planning meetings have enabled ASB to capture more input and optimize M&E. ASB continuously compares the work plans with the results and output of activities. Furthermore staff indicated that stakeholder opinions are now included more frequently in M&E activities. Through regular meetings and annuals reviews a systematic evaluation method is in place which allows for all staff members to provide their input on current projects and general organizational developments. Although the system is in place M&E is still performed by individual staff members, and not a dedicated M&E function. The director continuously plays an important role in this. In terms of the internal culture of critical reflection and sharing of ideas, the atmosphere in ASB is considered to be more open and communication is stimulated. Beneficiaries are able to approach the organization more easily and in general ASB has become more responsive to stakeholders. Overall this capability has improved slightly, mainly due to the greater frequency in meeting and greater role of staff input. Being involved in networks and having students do research at ASB helps them to keep track of what is happening in the environment.

Score: From 3.1 to 3.6 (slight improvement)
The capability to deliver on development objectives has slightly improved mainly due to the fact that ASB has more clear operational plans and gives opportunity to the staff to align their activities to their organization’s strategic level. Even though ASB has acquired more donor funds, they are more creative in terms of using their resources cost effectively. This care is displayed for instance in how staff is now more carefully selected for attending external or internal events, and also through coordinating events with universities to reduce operational costs for venues. The saved costs are in turn utilized to fund programs which are not directly supported by donors. There is no formal system in place to assess beneficiary needs, but through the established FKK (Diversity and Communication Forum), beneficiary and stakeholder needs could be checked and balanced. Although there is no formal system to compare inputs with outputs but they have regular meetings to help them assessing the work progress as a part of work efficiency assessment.

Score: From 3.3 to 3.9 (slight improvement)

**Capability to relate**

The capability to relate has slightly improved mainly due to having an extended network on local, national and even in the international level. ASB has also established new partnerships with universities which resulted in the establishment of a support system for the handling of legal cases. Collaboration with universities and being involved in the FKK network has also improved relationships with beneficiaries. In relation to the improved supporting system for handling cases, ASB’s bargaining position in the networks has increased, which has led to opportunities for new collaborations and funding. Internally, relationships have improved due to having a director who often invites the staff to have dinner and watching movies after hours.

Score: From 3.6 to 4.1 (slight improvement)
Capability to achieve coherence

Even though there is no formal discussion about vision and mission, ASB still operate based on the same vision and mission. However, with the help of HIVOS, the strategic planning process has taken place, which is also helped develop implementation plans in line with the strategies. Generally, program, strategies and activities are in line with the vision and mission of the organization. Project activities are still complimentary as in the baseline such as program from HIVOS for case handling while program from TIFA for counseling training. Counseling training completed the case handling activities as when handling some cases, it is needed skill to be a good listener or a good counselor.

Score : From 3.5 to 3.6 (very minor improvement)

4.2.2 General changes in the organisational capacity of the SPO

The evaluation team carried out an endline assessment at Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (ASB) from 16 July 2014 to 18 July 2014. During this workshop, the team made a recap of key features of the organisation in the baseline in September 2012 (such as vision, mission, strategies, clients, partnerships). This was the basis for discussing changes that had happened to the organisation since the baseline. The three main changes that happened in the organisation since the baseline, as identified by the staff during the endline workshop were:

1. Being more recognized as an organization working on pluralism issues [1].
2. The provision of health insurance (BPJS) linked to investments [2].
3. Increased job security, with through more permanent staff contracts [3]
4. The first is the most important change in the organization. Each of these changes and how these have come about is explained more in detail below. Numbers in the narrative correspond to numbers in the visual.
5. Both these latter changes were achieved through better staff welfare [8]
Being more recognized as an organization focusing on pluralism issues [1].
According to ASB staff present at the end line workshop, the main change that has taken place in the organization since the baseline in 2012 is being more recognized as an organization working on pluralism issues [1]. ASB has become the benchmark for both private and public organizations working in the field of pluralism in North Sumatra. In general it can be concluded that the strategic planning session organized by HIVOS in October 2013 has played an important underlying factor in realizing the abovementioned key change in the organization.

The greater recognition of ASB in terms of pluralism issues was the result of:
1. Improved staff capacity to implement programs [4]
2. Increased trust from stakeholders [5]

Each of these factors is explained below:

First of all improved staff capacity to implement programs came about from five developments, each of which are listed here. First, staff became more confident in implementing program activities [6]. Second, better staff welfare resulted in a more productive and motivated workforce [8]. Third, three new staff members were added to the organization in the fields of advocacy, monitoring and finance that did not yet exist before the baseline in 2012 [9]. Fourth, better office infrastructure allowed staff to work more efficiently [10]. Staff used to work with limited office support facilities, but with the addition of voice recorders, laptops, projectors and a stable internet connection, communication was greatly enhanced. Finally, fifth, an overall increase in program activities increased the speed at which staff learned about program implementation [11]. Each of these areas is further explained below.

Greater confidence amongst staff in implementing their program activities [6] came largely about from a greater number of opportunities for staff to participate in training and capacity building activities [7]. These opportunities were created by the board, who soon came to recognize the (importance of) staff capacity [13] because staff operated with greater autonomy on the one hand [17] whilst communicating results in more frequent internal meetings to discuss issues on the other [18].

Staff was enabled with greater autonomy through more opportunities to manage programs independently [21]. This was the direct result of more and more work being delegated from management to senior and junior staff [24], one of the key decisions that came about in the change in leadership style that occurred [33].

The increase in meeting frequently [18] came about from an overall increase in awareness amongst staff for the need of operational performance [29]. This was carefully communicated by the new leadership in place [33]. The change in leadership style was an important change as a result of the strategic planning session funded by HIVOS in 2013 [38].

The other four factors that affected improved staff capacity (better welfare) [8], new staff additions [9], better office infrastructure [10], and more program activities [11]) all resulted from the addition of funds enabled by acquiring the TIFA foundation as a new sponsor [14]. This was enabled shifting the policy of single funders to achieve greater diversity of funding sources [19]. ASB was able to shift towards this new paradigm—from single funders to the greater variety of funding sources—through increased confidence of donors and stakeholders [22], which in turn occurred as a result of three factors:

1. An increased capacity and confidence amongst staff to develop proposals and present these to donors [25] therefore getting in touch with more potential funding candidates;
2. More transparent financial statements and accountable reporting through the website [26];
3. Improved quality of service delivery [27].

The first of these factors resulted from increased awareness amongst the staff regarding operational performance [29]. Simply put, with greater awareness the overall sense for the need to proactively engage with stakeholders came about amongst staff. In addition to this, a clearer programmatic guidance to propose for funding [30] significantly increased both capacity and confidence of staff to propose to donors. The guidance resulted from a strategic planning paper [34] written as a result from the HIVOS funded strategic planning workshop in 2013 [38].
The second factor, greater transparency in financial statements and accounting resulted from an overall improvement in operational financial management [31]. This improvement can be attributed to the BITRA financial management training which was performed in 2011 on the one hand [39], and the review and revision of standard operating procedures on finance sponsored by HIVOS in 2013 on the other [40].

The third factor, improved quality of service delivery resulted from the lower cost to handle case work and an increase in overall efficiency in doing so [32]. The greater support from stakeholders and partner organizations [39] through increased cooperation with religious and faith based leaders [36] was the main reason for this. Overall, this support came about through the increased awareness in partner networks about ASB’s ambition to introduce pluralism issues to the public [37], which in turn was identified in the strategic planning workshop in 2013 [38].

Prior to 2012, the network of the organization was limited only to certain religious leaders among which were Protestant and Parmalim (local religion) religious leaders. From 2012 onwards, ASB expanded their network to universities (Universitas Sumatera Utara, Universitas Negeri Medan), journalists, local NGOs, and religious leaders from other religions such as Matakin (local religion), Hinduism, Bahai, Konghucu, and Advent Protestant. ASB also started working with religious-based organizations such as Majelis Kelenteng Konghucu Indonesia (MKKI), Majelis Budhayana Indonesia (MBI) and Persatuan Hindu Darma Indonesia.

All of the above has explained how ASB’s improved staff capacity to implement programs has come about [4]. But there is a second factor which has influenced the key change of ASB being recognized as an organization focusing on pluralism issues: the increased trust from stakeholders in ASB [5]. This came about from a wide public acknowledgement of ASB, and what they are doing [12]. On the one hand this occurred through an improved acceptance of ASB by its stakeholders through ASB’s improved quality of service delivery [27]. On the other hand, the public itself became more and more aware of ASB and their objectives through the various seminars, workshops and other events organized by the organization [16]. ASB staff members got more and more public interest to attend such events through the increased documentation and publication of their work [20]. This practice was enabled by cooperating with various academics and journalists on publications [23], but largely founded on the increased capacity of the staff members to communicate results [28]. The latter greatly benefited from a writing course sponsored by KIPAS in 2012 [41], and a workshop on investigative journalistic writing sponsored by YAKOMA PGI in 2011 [42].

Since 2013, ASB has maintained an agreement with the local university by providing a scholarship program to college students to write their thesis on pluralism issues. In addition to that, academic publishing and public publishing with the help of university experts has increased. The ties to the academic and media networks have significantly increased the organization’s visibility to become the leading organization for pluralism issues.

4.3 Attributing changes in organisational capacity development - evaluation question 2 and 4

Note: for each country about 50% of the SPOs has been chosen to be involved in process tracing, which is the main approach chosen to address evaluation question 2. For more information please also see chapter 3 on methodological approach. For each of these SPOs the focus has been on the capability to act and commit and the capability to adapt and self-renew, since these were the most commonly addressed capabilities when planning MFS II supported capacity development interventions for the SPO.

For each of the MFS II supported capacity development interventions -under these two capabilities- an outcome area has been identified, describing a particular change in terms of organisational capacity of the SPO. Process tracing has been carried out for each outcome area. The following outcome areas have been identified under the capability to act and commit and the capability to adapt and self-renew. Also the MFS II capacity development interventions that could possibly be linked to these outcome areas are described in the table below.
Table 2  
Information on selected capabilities, outcome areas and MFS II supported capacity development interventions since the baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Outcome area</th>
<th>MFS II supported capacity development intervention(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capability to act and commit</td>
<td>Improved capacity to manage the organization</td>
<td>Strategic planning workshop to develop work plans 2012/2013-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability to adapt and self-renew</td>
<td>Improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues</td>
<td>English course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next sections will describe the results of process tracing for each of the outcome areas, and will describe to what extent these outcome areas have taken place as a result of MFS II supported capacity development interventions and/or other related factors and actors.

All key organisational capacity changes that were identified during the general map exercise happen to coincide with the outcome areas selected for process tracing. Each of these three areas is described more in detail below, and a full description of these changes and how they have come about is provided in Appendix 5. In the descriptions the numbers refer to the visual which includes all organisational capacity changes and can be found below.

4.3.1 Improved capacity to manage the organization

In the capability to act and commit the following outcome area has been identified, based on document review and discussions with SPO and CFA: ‘improved capacity to manage the organization’.

In the capability to adapt and self-renew the following outcome area has been identified, based on document review and discussions with SPO and CFA: ‘improved staff capacity to communicate results on diversity issues’

- Below you will find a description of the ‘improved capacity to manage the organization’ and how this has come about. According to staff present at the (process tracing) endline Process Tracing Minutes Meeting the improved capacity to manage the organization is mainly due to: Improved senior staff capacity [2] (Annex L, M, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting) Better planning, organized and documented work [3] (Annex, D, E, L, M) Both of these factors are further described explained below. The numbers in the visual correspond with the numbers in the narrative.

**Improved senior staff capacity [1]**

First of all, the improved ability to manage the organization came about from an improvement in senior staff’s capacity. This was validated by both internal and external stakeholders [1] (Annex D, E, L, M, and Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). The greater capacity of senior staff resulted from greater opportunity for senior staff to manage the program [4] (Annex A, D, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). This in turn came about from an ability to work more independently without having to wait for leadership instructions [5] (Annex A, D, L, M, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). The statement was echoed by senior program staff during the end line Process Tracing Minutes Meeting. The Director said that currently they have more opportunity to work independently including making decisions. Further, more staff has been better recognized by the partners of the organization, not only by the Director.
Staff members indicated during the end line Process Tracing Minutes Meeting (Annex D, E, M, L, P, and Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting) that the greater independence in their work resulted from two occurrences: sharing knowledge by leadership with senior staff, and by senior staff with junior staff [7] on the one hand, and clearer job descriptions on the other. The two paragraphs below describe each occurrence.

First of, a of knowledge took place by leadership with staff members [7] (Annex A, L, M, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). This was enabled by the willingness of the organization to expand and improve their organization [20] (Annex A, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting) and more frequent meetings at the organizational level [17] (Annex A, D, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). In the baseline, the regular meetings between staff and the Director were conducted monthly, while in the end line, they stated that they have had bi-weekly meetings in addition to monthly meetings.
Both these factors resulted from a change in leadership style [22] (Annex D, E, L, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). Some staff said that previously the Director tended to be “one man show” and did not really provide great autonomy to staff. However, based on the Director’s opinion, the narrowed autonomy he provided to staff was by intention. The Director wanted to do stepwise delegation due to the great competency gap among leader, senior and junior staff. The leadership style was significantly changed as a result of the strategic planning supported by HIVOS in 2011 [24] One of the agenda points in the strategic planning Process Tracing Minutes Meeting was to reflect and evaluate the leadership style of the current Director as proposed by the Board of the organization. The Board has advised to the Director to give greater autonomy to the staff (Annex A, B, L, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting).

The second development that enabled senior staff to do their work with more independence was the development of clearer job descriptions for the staff in general [6] (Annex A, D, E, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). Previously in ASB, there was a lot of overlap among staff responsibilities [6] (Annex E, M, L, P, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). One staff member could work on more than one task. The need for a clearer description of work responsibilities for staff members therefore came about for three different reasons. Firstly, staff realized that a better job and task division was required and they realized this during their regular staff meetings [8]. Secondly, there was a new Department for advocacy [10] (Annex A, D, E, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). Thirdly, three new staff members were recruited utilizing the newly acquired TIFA budget [11] (Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting).

These last two factors were derived from the new funding obtained from TIFA in 2013. The success to obtain funding from TIFA came about from the result of strategic planning that was used as a tool to propose new funding [13] (Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting, last revision of proposal to TIFA for period of Jan-Dec 2014.doc).

**Better planning, organized and documented work [3]**

The improved capacity to manage the organization was not only due to improved senior staff capacity, but also to better planning, organized and documented work [3] (Annex, D, E, L, M). Staff stated that this occurred primarily based on the now regular (monthly) development of monthly work plans [12] (Annex L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting), but was also due to having half yearly and annual ‘evaluations’ [25] (Annex L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting), which specifically supported the documentation of the work being implemented. This monthly meetings, and improved evaluation came about from the having more systematic and well developed annual work plans [14] (Annex E, D, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting, program schedule 2013-2014 to HIVOS.doc), which in turn were enabled by a much greater focus on strategic directions and key issues in diversity, pluralism and minorities in North Sumatra [16] (Annex A, B, E, D, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). This more specific focus was formulated in a program, as explained in the strategic proposal 2013-2015. This was based on the logical framework that was developed for HIVOS in 2011 [23](Final log frame revisi.doc), as result of the Strategic Planning Process Tracing Minutes Meeting in 2011, which was focused on developing a work plans until 2015 [24] (Annex A, B, L, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting).

4.3.2 Improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues

- ASB is an institution that was founded in 2006 and was officially established in 2009 as association. Initially focused on social pluralism regarding sexual and gender equality issues Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (ASB) has broadened its scope of action19 since 2010. An example of this is ASB’s present project: “Civil and Religious Societies’ Participation in Promoting Peace and Diversity in North Sumatra”. This program, which in the framework of MFSII is co-financed by HIVOS, aims at bringing about religious pluralism in North Sumatra. The end line focused on the following key organizational capacity change or key outcome in the capability to adapt and self-renew: improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues [4] (Annex A, D, E, L, M). This came out of document

---

19 Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (2011), ASB Proposal Form to HIVOS
review as well as discussion with staff present at the end line workshop (Annex A, B). Improved capacity to communicate is expected to and already affects communication of results, through the following means:

- Dissemination through a road show to five ASB area namely Siantar, Aceh Singkil, Binjai, Langkat, and Medan. These areas were targeted to disseminate the result of ASB regular reporting on pluralism and diversity and discussed what possible action can be done to response the report. These five areas have issued a policy of intolerance and discriminatory [1] (Process Tracing Minutes Meeting.)
- Procurement media campaigns such as: brochures, stickers, calendars and pocket books[2] (Annex D, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting, program schedule 2013-2015 sent to HIVOS.
- Book Distribution Results of Monitoring Results Report [4]. They did the monitoring of diversity issues and collected the monitoring results in the form of books. As part of ASB’s advocacy strategy, ASB disseminated diversity information by distributing the monitoring result books. (Process Tracing Minutes Meeting)

Staff’s capacity to communicate results in diversity issues has improved because of the following four reasons:

Each of these factors and their underlying logic is explained below.
Wider network of stakeholders and partners [5]

Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (ASB) has an extensive network including various communities, media, and religious groups. In 2012, ASB expanded their network to academia with various religions such as Konghucu, Islam, Hindu, Budha, Bahai, Ahmadiyah, Parmalin and Advent. Previously, these stakeholders have not been part of ASB. In other words, ASB has wider network of stakeholders and partners [5] (Annex A, D, E, M, R, )

This improved network was realized through increased cooperation with academia [9] (Annex L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting) on the one hand, and case collaboration with partners on the other [10] (Annex D, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting).

Increasing the network with academia was also part of ASB’s strategy to improve the institutions’ efficiency. To strengthen commitment to pluralism, ASB has expanded networking to local, national and international partner organizations.

- At the local level these organizations included: Fitria, Human Rights Study Center, Medan University, and Sumatra Utara University (Annex E, M, P, and Process Tracing Minutes Meeting).
- At the national level these included: Setara Institute, Wahid Institute, ILRC (Indonesian Legal Resource Center), SEJUK, Asean Moslem Action Network (AMAN), PGI (Persekutuan Gereja Indonesia – Indonesian Church Community), and YAKOMA (Annex A, D, E, M, P).
- At the international level these included: Amnesty International and CSW (Christian Solidarity Worldwide) (Annex E, M, L, and Process Tracing Minutes Meeting).

Agreements were made in order to establish relationships with universities [14] (Annex D, L, M, R). The relationship was in the form of providing venues to conduct workshops and or seminars related to pluralism issues. One of the program staff said that another reason of the intensified relationships with academia was the provision of scholarships by the organization for university students whose thesis was about pluralism issues [13] (Annex L, M, L, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting) which was used as a strategy to disseminate pluralism issues at the university level.

With respect to handling cases, ASB was supported by some networking and partners. Case collaboration has been affected to the escalation of ASB network and partners – i.e, ASB has stronger collaborative work with the National Commission on Violence Against Women (Komnas Perempuan) in Jakarta when they handle the cases [10] (Annex D, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting).

Case collaboration, scholarship initiative, and agreement with university have been influenced by a greater emphasis networking and publicity [16] (Annex B, D). ASB has a strong commitment regarding pluralism issues.

Improved competencies to communicate issues about diversity [6]

The fact that staff have improved their competencies to convey diversity issues [6] (Annex A, L, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting), is the second factor that influenced the improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues [4] (Annex A, D, E, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting). This improvement can be attributed to three factors. The first factor was an English course funded by MFS II [17] (Annex A, B C) after the partner organization realized that communication needed to be improved. The second factor affecting the improved communication competency was the writing course conducted by KIPAS in 2012. KIPAS has been ASB’s partner since 2009. KIPAS has the same concern as ASB – advocacy strategy through journalism [18] (Annex B, D). The third and last contributing factor was a journalism investigative and writing training which was held by YAKOMA PGI in 2011 [19] (Annex B).

Documentation practices respecting diversity in North Sumatra [7]

The third factor relating to the improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues was improved documentation practices regarding diversity in North Sumatra [7] (Annex A, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting, program schedule 2013-2015 sent to HIVOS). Similarly to the improved competencies to communicate issues about diversity [6] (Annex A, L, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting) as described in the previous section, this was the result of the writing course [18] (Annex B, D) and the investigative journalistic writing training [19] (Annex B, Interview questionnaire staff). ASB
creates annual reports on media monitoring and documenting cases of intolerance in Aceh and North Sumatra (doc: meeting minutes). The data is used as a reference for media and community and society to reveal the diversity of pluralism in Indonesia.

**Documenting policies and discrimination [8]**
The final factor contributing to the improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues includes the documenting of policies [8] (Annex B, D). This in turn was affected by two factors. On the one hand documentation of media monitoring results [11] (Annex E, L, W, program schedule 2013-2015 sent to HIVOS) on the other hand social media monitoring of policies and discrimination against minority religious group [12] (Annex L, M, P, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting, program schedule 2013-2015 sent to HIVOS). ASB has staff that is responsible for monitoring intolerance cases through media and social media (Process Tracing Minutes Meeting). Starting from 2011, the ASB published a book as a result of the monitoring of the media and social media monitoring, and HIVOS supported this publication (Annex E, L, W, program schedule 2013-2015 sent to HIVOS).

Both the documentation of media monitoring results as well as actively monitoring social media for policies came forward from a workshop to analyze media monitoring results funded by HIVOS in 2013 [15] (Annex A, B). This workshop on analyzing media monitoring results came about from the first similar workshop which was conducted in 2011. This 2011 workshop also funded by HIVOS [20] (Annex A, B).
5 Discussion and conclusion

5.1 Methodological issues

General: Applied to all or most SPOs
With regard to the methodology, Indonesia has made some data collection adjustment based on the context. The first adjustment was related to the type of instrument used. To assess the organizational capacity, the study has provided self-assessment, observation and interview sheets. These all were used during the baseline with all SPOs. During the end line the team used self-assessment, interview and observation sheets. However the evaluator applied interview sheets as self-assessment—where participants were asked to fill these sheets by themselves. For the participants who did not attend the workshop, the interviews were done separately using the interview sheet and the results from the interview were included in the subgroup interview sheet that was already filled by the staff member. Were combined into the relevant sub categories in the interview sheet. Interview sheets were also applied for interviews with the CFAs, partners and consultants.

The baseline study showed that having two similar instruments (self assessments, and interview sheets) did not have any effect in relation to obtaining adequate and quality data.

Another adjustment to the methodology was the language. The team has translated all instruments into Bahasa Indonesia to be able better understood by the SPO’s. This also applied to the initial findings (translated back into Indonesia) for three SPOs that are YRBI, ASB and PT.PPMA.

To have some clarification post visit to all SPOs, the evaluator used email and phone interviews.

Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (ASB)
The interview sheet was sent prior to the workshop and filled by most of the respondents. The participants involved in this end line process were 1 management, 2 coordinator programs, 1 finance and administration, 4 field staffs, 1 partner and 1 consultant. The organization was selected for process tracing and had the chance to be visited twice by the evaluators. In relation to process tracing, six staffs filled the training questionnaire related to MFS II funded training events since the baseline in 2012. For the process-tracing workshop, the evaluator has provided initial draft causal maps for the evaluator as guidance. These initial draft causal maps were developed, based on document review. The first map on the capability to act and commit was not shown during the workshop and the participants developed the map based on their own understanding led by the evaluator (bottom up process). Due to limited time and workshop participants being tired, the initial draft causal map for the capability to adapt and self-renew was used as the basis for discussions with the workshop participants. After the had seen the map, the evaluator asked for their verification, clarification and allowed them to modify the map where necessary. It is not clear whether the initial causal map that was developed directed the workshop participants into a particular thinking. But all the issues have been checked and verified.

5.2 Changes in organisational capacity development

This section aims to provide an answer to the first and fourth evaluation questions:

1. What are the changes in partner organisations’ capacity during the 2012-2014 period?
2. What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?
Whilst changes took place in all of the five core capabilities, the improvements were only minor. Below the changes in each of the capabilities are further explained, by referring to the specific indicators that changed.

Over the last two years most improvements took place in the indicators under the capability to act and commit. A slight improvement occurred in the responsiveness of leadership. The current leadership is considered to have improved in task delegation in the absence of leadership, greater clarity in staff’s job descriptions, staff regeneration, and feedback to staff performance as a post-monitoring mechanism. An improvement occurred in terms of strategic guidance in the organization as well. The Director is now focusing on more strategic tasks to the level of responding to organizational issues instead of internal staff conflicts. He is able to provide strategic direction to the staff whilst allowing them to solve implementation problems on their own. An improvement also occurred in the organisational structure. This occurred particularly due to the increased clarity in tasks and responsibilities for staff members. A slight improvement happened in the articulation of strategies. ASB has increasingly utilized strategic planning in their approach to communicate and frame their work activities and plans. Daily operations improved slightly due to staff members placing their work plans on the writing board for everyone to see and refer to on a day to day basis. Staff skills have improved due to the delegation of work tasks and sharing of information to subordinates. This has empowered subordinate staff throughout the organization. Training opportunities have improved due to the availability of new funding sources from for example TIFA. In addition the ASB director now plays an important role in deciding who will participate in which training, giving a fairer chance to all staff members. Incentives have slightly improved. Even though nothing changed in terms of remuneration, the increased freedom to manage work independently and the addition of flexible working hours, added to overall staff motivation and stimulated creativity on the job. Funding resources improved as well. With assistance from HIVOS, ASB’s strategic plan has become a reference to seek new funding opportunities. This mechanism has allowed ASB to act more strategically on proposals, initiatives and directions instead of the former responsive attitude.

In the capability to adapt and self-renew ASB also slightly improved on various indicators. In terms of M&E application a slight improvement occurred as more frequent meetings in the form of staff meetings and the annual evaluation & planning meetings have enabled ASB to capture more input and optimize M&E. M&E competencies also slightly improved as the role of M&E person is now fulfilled by another person next to the director. Critical reflection within ASB improved slightly as the director encourages staff to attend informal meetings in order to discuss their concerns. A slight improvement was also found relating to the freedom of ideas, staff stated that their director has readjusted his expectations to the staff’s work to be more in line with the challenges faced in the field. The system for tracking the environment has been slightly improved as ASB established the FKK (a Diversity Communication Forum) as part of their networking support. Within this forum they encourage members of their network to assist them by extending their case monitoring in the field. Finally there was a slight improvement in the stakeholder responsiveness: since the baseline, ASB has actively expanded their network of partner organizations and beneficiaries. Feedback from the network and beneficiaries are taken into account during program planning and the development of strategic plans.
In terms of the capability to deliver on development objectives, an improvement has taken place with the development of ASB’s strategic plan, which has positively affected the operational plans that were already in place. Day to day and operational activities now align better with the organizational strategy. Similarly a slight improvement took place on cost-effective resource use as ASB has become creative through their concern in spending funds. ASB also adjusted their operational strategy and organizational decisions to reflect this. Delivering planned outputs has slightly improved for the organization. ASB delivers planned outputs in a timely manner, even with its limited resources through the involvement of volunteers and their network. The mechanism for beneficiary needs has slightly improved too, as the strategy to establish the FKK (Diversity and Communication Forum) has been proven to be a successful mechanism to meet beneficiary needs. Monitoring efficiency has slightly improved as ASB always evaluates the progress of each project biweekly and monthly and utilizes the feedback to evaluate work efficiency. In terms of balancing efficiency requirements with the quality of work, a slight improvement occurred as all work plans are aligned to each other and used to examine the quality of achievements versus implementation time.

In the capability to relate ABS improved in its networking capacity. More stakeholders are engaged in the development of policies and strategies, which is a very slight improvement compared to the baseline. Engagement in networks has improved, as new partnerships but also academia are approached. Target groups have been engaged more through the Diversity Communication Forum. Finally, relations within the organisation have slightly improved as relationships are considered more open and equal, since the director has delegated more tasks and roles and responsibilities are more clear.

Finally, SDS has very slightly improved in its capability to achieve coherence. Operational guidelines of ASB have slightly improved with the introduction of standard operating procedures for all divisions.

**General organisational capacity changes related to MFS II Interventions**

The evaluators considered it important to also note down the SPO’s story in terms of changes in the organisation since the baseline, and this would also provide more information about reasons for change, which were difficult to get for the individual indicators. Also for some issues there may not have been relevant indicators available in the list of core indicators provide by the evaluation team. Please note that this information is based only on the information provided by ASB staff during the endline workshop, but no validation of this information has been done like with the process tracing causal maps. For details in relation to attribution, we refer to the next section (5.3).

During the endline workshop some key organisational capacity changes were brought up by ASB staff, these have been captured in the general causal map in 4.2.2: the provision of health insurance (BPJS) linked to investments; increased job security, through more permanent staff contracts; improved staff capacity to implement programs. All of these are expected to contribute to ASB being more recognised as an organisation to focus on pluralism issues. ASB staff experienced these as the most important capacity changes in the organisation since the baseline.

First, both the provision of Health insurance (BPJS) linked to investments, and the increased job security through permanent contracts, can be attributed to better staff welfare through an addition of funds from the TIFA funding. TIFA funds could be acquired through a more diverse funding focus after donors and stakeholders gained confidence in the organisation to invest. This confidence could be attributed to the increased capacity to propose to donors, more transparent and accountable statements and improved quality of service delivery. Greater capacity to propose for funding can be attributed to clearer programmatic guidance, based on a strategic planning paper being created after the MFS II funded strategic planning workshop in 2013. Clearer programmatic guidance also occurred through increased awareness on operational performance as instructed by the leader through his new leadership style. This shift in style also occurred after the strategic planning workshop was concluded.

Increased financial statement transparency and accountability on the other hand, was enabled by better operational financial management. This can be attributed to the BITRA Indonesia financial management training in 2011 (non-MFS II) but also to the review and revision of standard operating procedures (SPOs) on finance in 2013, which was MFS II funded.
The improved quality of service was the result from lower cost in handling cases and increased efficiency. This can be attributed to greater support in handling cases through increased cooperation with religious and faith based leaders. This was enabled by increased awareness on the topic of pluralism issues amongst the public, which was one of the recommendations and key actions defined in the HIVOS sponsored strategic planning workshop in 2013.

Improved staff capacity to implement programs occurred through the addition of new staff members, an increase in program activities and staff being more confident in implementing those activities. New staff, improved office infrastructure and more activities could all be attributed to the addition of TIFA funds. The acquisition of those funds follows the same line of changes as described above, and are tied to the MFS II funded strategic planning workshop in 2013, as well as the review and revision of SOP’s in 2013, although also to the BITRA Indonesia financial management training in 2011.

The increase in confidence to implement program activities occurred through more opportunities to participate in trainings and capacity building activities, after the board started to recognize the value of staff capacity. This in turn was enabled by greater staff autonomy and more frequent internal meetings, in which staff got the chance to prove said capacity to their leadership. More autonomy can be attributed to an increase in opportunities to manage the program after more delegation from the top down into the organization took place. This was the direct result of the change in leadership style, which occurred per recommendation in the MFS II funded strategic planning workshop in 2013. The increase in meeting frequency also can be attributed to this leadership style as that increased awareness of staff on operational performance, which was carefully communicated to all staff.

Finally, the greater recognition of ASB as an organization focussing on pluralism issues also came about through increased trust from stakeholders. This was in part enabled by the increase in program activities as described earlier, but on the other hand through the organization being more widely acknowledged. The latter change occurred in part through more communication initiatives which were partially related to two other non-MFS II developments: a writing course by KIPAS in 2012, and an investigative journalistic writing course by YAKOMA PGI in 2011.

In conclusion, the overarching organizational capacity change area of ASB being more recognized as an organization focussed on pluralism issues can be only partially attributed to MFS II supported capacity development interventions. The MFS II funded strategic planning workshop and financial SOP review and revision contributed to a large extent to organizational changes related to staff capacity and welfare. However, non-MFS II funded interventions in the field of finance and communication also played an important role in these changes. It can be said that the MFS II interventions contributed more to the strategic organizational changes, whilst other interventions provided more change at an operational level. This was not the purpose of this particular exercise. It must be noted that the information provided has not been validated through other sources of information, and therefore the conclusions must be understood in that respect. More detailed information can be found in the next section where selected organisational capacity changes have been thoroughly investigated through process tracing.

5.3 Attributing changes in organisational capacity development to MFS II

This section aims to provide an answer to the second and fourth evaluation questions:

2. To what degree are the changes identified in partner capacity attributable to development interventions undertaken by the MFS II consortia (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?
4. What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?

To address the question of attribution it was agreed that for all the countries in the 5C study, the focus would be on the capability to act and commit and the capability to adapt and self-renew, with a focus on MFS II supported organisational capacity development interventions that were possibly related to these capabilities. ‘Process tracing’ was used to get more detailed information about the changes in these capabilities that were possibly related to the specific MFS II capacity development interventions. The organisational capacity changes that were focused on were:
• Improved capacity to manage the organization
• Improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues

The first organisational capacity change falls under the capability to act and commit (in relation to the part on improved staff’s capacity) and the capability to adapt and self-renew (in relation to the part on planning and M&E). The second organisational capacity change falls under the capability to adapt and self-renew. The organisational capacity change areas that were chosen are based on document review as well as discussions with the SPO and CFA. Each of these organisational capacity changes is further discussed below.

The following issues are discussed for the MFS II funded activities that are related to the above-mentioned organisational capacity changes:

a. Design: the extent to which the MFS II supported capacity development intervention was well-designed. (Key criteria: relevance to the SPO; SMART objectives)
b. Implementation: the extent to which the MFS II supported capacity development was implemented as designed (key criteria: design, according to plans during the baseline);
c. Reaching objectives: the extent to which the MFS II capacity development intervention reached all its objectives (key criteria: immediate and long-term objectives, as formulated during the baseline);
d. The extent to which the observed results are attributable to the identified MFS II supported capacity development intervention (reference made to detailed causal map, based on ‘process tracing’).

Please note that whilst (d) addresses the evaluation question related to attribution (evaluation question 2), the other three issues (a, b and c) have been added by the synthesis team as additional reporting requirements. This was done when fieldwork for the endline process had already started and is also not the focus on this 5c evaluation. With the minimum information available the evaluation team tried to address these first 3 questions.

Improved capacity to manage the organization
The following MFS II capacity development intervention supported by HIVOS is linked to the key organisational capacity, change “improved capacity to manage the organization”:

1. Strategic planning workshop to develop work plans 2012/2013-2015

Strategic planning workshop to develop work plans 2012/2013-2015 – October 2011

Design
This capacity development intervention was not explicitly planned during the baseline, and took place in October 2011. HIVOS assisted in the formulation of work plans, since ASB struggled in finding the right focus of work. Both HIVOS and ASB have confirmed the CFA intervention in both the self-assessments and interviews.

The immediate objective of the workshop was to create focused work areas and related work plans for 2013 to 2015. In addition, more strategic organizational questions were discussed, such as the “fit” of leadership style of the acting director.

The capacity development intervention was initiated by the management of ASB after good experiences in self-reflection during the MFS II baseline evaluation and the need for more focussed work plans and activities. The exercise therefore proved very relevant to the organisation as it was meant to outline activities and directions for the coming years that up until that point did not yet exist. Nonetheless it quickly became apparent that input and assistance from HIVOS was required to sharpen the organization’s objectives, vision and mission.
Due to the spontaneity of the intervention, expected effects were not formulated in a SMART way (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound).

**Implementation**
Based on the information that is available to the evaluation team, the implementation of the capacity development intervention occurred as designed during a one day workshop. In this workshop, the vision, mission and strategy were for established for the period of 2013, with the agreement of revising these items once every three years. The only major difference was the involvement of HIVOS in the process. Originally the workshop was intended to be an ASB exclusive activity. The HIVOS coordinator who participated in the workshop stated that all of the staff members attended and participated in the workshop.

**Reaching objectives**
Not having objectives that were defined as SMART objectives makes it difficult to assess whether they have been successfully accomplished. The immediate objective to create focused work areas was met through the production of clear work plans for 2013 to 2015 as well as the foundations laid for a logframe exercise from HIVOS. With respect to long term objectives, the workshop resulted in a change in leadership style of the director which led him to allow greater autonomy of his staff members. Finally the workshop set a precedent for a continuing series of strategic planning sessions from 2013, in which operational and strategic plans are reassessed periodically.

**Attribution of observed results to MFS II capacity development interventions**
Overall, the improved capacity to manage the organization was due to improved senior staff’s capacity as well as better planning and organized, documented work. Both these capacity changes can be attributed to the MFS II intervention of the strategic planning workshop as an underlying reason for changes in terms of managing the organisation.

The improved senior staff’s capacity was due to the opportunity and ability of staff to manage the programs they were involved in, which can be attributed to the fact that senior staff has become more independent in their jobs. Other than before the baseline, senior staff did not require to await instructions from the director before carrying on with their work. This development was enabled by the director sharing more knowledge with senior staff, and senior staff doing the same with their juniors. Having more information ready at hand enabled all staff members make better decisions independently. On the other hand clearer job descriptions amongst the staff in general made it clearer for staff members to carry out their work without having to first get permissions or answers from their superiors. Clearer job descriptions were developed due to an increase in staff awareness to have a better division of labour and task division, the development of a new advocacy department which allowed more effective splitting of work, as well as the recruiting of three new staff members under the newly acquired TIFA budget.

The new process of superiors sharing knowledge with the subordinates, as well as the increased staff awareness for better job and task division can be attributed to more frequent regular meetings that were organized at the organisational level. In addition to monthly staff meetings, bi-weekly meetings were added between staff members and ASB’s director, which allowed for more frequent discussions of issues and solutions. Both the greater frequency of meetings as well as the sharing of information and knowledge to superiors resulted from a greater willingness of the organization to expand and improve itself. This could be attributed directly to the change in leadership style, which became less strict and more open to initiative and autonomy of the staff members. The change in leadership style in turn was the direct result of the strategic planning workshop in October 2011, in which after much discussion, the Board of ASB advised the director to alter his leadership style.

The newly acquired TIFA budget obtained in 2013 was the result of strategic planning used as a tool to propose for new funding. In practice, this meant that in the proposal, submitted in 2013 to TIFA, ASB’s vision, mission and specific goals were presented with the 2011 strategic plan as foundation. Similarly specific activities and outputs related to these goals were presented, resulting in a well-rounded proposal for the period of January to December 2014. Writing this proposal was possible due
to the greater capacity and confidence of staff to develop and submit proposals for new funding sources. This capacity growth can be attributed to the development of the strategic proposal 2013-2015 developed as a concept paper early 2013. The development of this concept paper was made possible due to the groundwork laid out in the development of the logical framework (LogFrame) for HIVOS in 2011. This logframe development was one of the actions defined for the work plans during the strategic planning workshop in 2011.

Finally, the improved capacity to manage the organization also came about from better planning and more organized and documented work. This could be attributed to the development of frequent (monthly) work plans as well as half-yearly evaluations. Both of these procedures were enabled by the more systematic annual work plan developed in 2013 as a result of a greater focus on key issues in diversity, pluralism and minorities in North Sumatra in an effort to develop more focussed strategic directions. The development of these directions can be attributed to the developed program based on the strategic planning which came about from the logframe exercise for HIVOS.

In conclusion the above series of developments displays how the improved capacity to manage the organization can be attributed to a large extent to the planned MFS II capacity development intervention, as the main underlying reason for a change in leadership style and the strategic plan, which both proved very important to bring about changes in the organisation for enhanced capacity to map to manage the organisation.

**Improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues**

The following MFS II capacity development interventions supported by HIVOS are linked to the key organisational capacity change “Improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues” (please also see section 4.3):

1. **English course**

   **English course (2013-ongoing)**

   **Design**

   These capacity development interventions were planned for during the baseline and were, according to HIVOS, one of the most important aspects for ASB to develop. HIVOS intended for intensive coaching and training on English skills to focus on both writing proposals and project reports to encourage skills that would affect both the capability to act and commit as well as the capability to adapt and self-renew. According to the CFA, for a small and young organization like ASB with a limited number of staff members these trainings were expected to have a big impact on the organization and highly relevant. ASB itself benefits from the English course as it allows them to contact new potential fundraisers and connections.

   It was not specified in what form the course would be given, or whether it would occur as a single training.

   More specifically, HIVOS expected immediate effects of the training to allow ASB to be able to develop project proposals and revise their year-round procedures. Additionally they expected that as a result of a more structured way of working through writing – ASB would adhere stricter to the strategic plan, and not work as impulsively as they did prior to the baseline evaluation in 2012.

   In the long term, HIVOS expected that ASB would actually get support from other Donors than HIVOS as well as a result of successfully developing proposals. This should lead to more stability in the implementation of ASB’s programs and activities.

   This intervention was planned for during the baseline workshop and specified in the Theory of Change and thereby relevant to the organisation.

   The expected effects were not formulated in a SMART way (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound). Then again, the evaluation team did not ask the CFA for SMART objectives specifically during the baseline, but rather asked about the expected or observed immediate and long term effects of the interventions.
**Implementation**
The English course was implemented in 2013 as an ongoing activity until 2015 for all staff members of ASB to attend. Other than only focussing on writing skills, teaching the English language was also included on this intervention. In the implementation ASB was also assisted by other initiatives on behalf of ASB themselves. KIPAS, a partner organization helped in organizing a separate writing workshop. No further details are known to the evaluation team regarding the specific design or setup of the intervention.

**Reaching objectives**
Since the objectives haven’t been formulated as SMART objectives, it is difficult to assess to what extent these objectives have been reached. Additionally, the course is still ongoing and therefore only partially implemented which makes evaluation of long term objectives difficult. However, as can be seen in section 4.3.1, the capacity and confidence to write reports have increased which is in line with the immediate expected effect as formulated by HIVOS in the baseline evaluation. Similarly, ASB was able to secure additional funding from TIFA through the development of its own proposal based on strategic planning. This aligns to the long-term expected effect that HIVOS formulated earlier. Whether or not this will lead to a more sustainable and independent ASB is however as of yet inconclusive.

**Attribution of observed results to MFS II capacity development interventions**
ASB has improved its’ capacity to communicate results on diversity issues over the last years. This development can be attributed to four distinct factors, namely: a wider network of stakeholders and partners; improved competencies to communicate issues about diversity; better documentation practices respecting diversity issues; and overall better documentation on policies and discrimination.

Out of these four factors only one attributes to an MFS II capacity development intervention. Each factor will be described in detail below.

First, the wide network of stakeholders and partners was due to increased cooperation with academia, as well as case collaboration with partners. The cooperation with academia resulted from the ASB scholarship initiative on the one hand and the establishment of university agreements on the other. Both of these could be attributed to a greater emphasis on networking and publicity by ASB.

Secondly, improved competencies to communicate issues about diversity could be attributed directly to the English course provided to all the staff members by HIVOS from 2013 to 2015. KIPAS, ASB’s partner organization aided in a writing course as well provided in 2012. The competence to communicate can therefore be attributed in part to MFS II sponsored interventions.

Thirdly, documentation practices respecting diversity in North Sumatra were realized in 2013. These practices can be attributed to the writing course provided by KIPAS in 2012, as well as an investigative journalistic and writing course conducted by YAKOMA in 2011 on ASB’s own initiative.

Finally the documenting of policies and discrimination was due document media monitoring results conducted in 2013 as well as a social media monitoring initiative of policy discriminating against minority religious groups in the same year. Both these were enabled by a series of workshops organized by ASB between 2013 and 2014 to analyse media monitoring results as a result of an in-house media analysis training organized by ASB themselves in 2011.

In conclusion, the improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues can only be partially attributed to MFS II interventions. Particularly competencies to communicate results about diversity issues have improved as a result of the English course, although other non-MFS II interventions have impacted this as well. Despite HIVOS detailed plans to address the issue, ASB has developed a great deal of initiatives on their own to address this issue and improve this particular capacity.
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List of Respondents

### People Present at the Workshops

**Date:** 16-18 July 2014  
**Organisation:** Aliansi Sumut Bersatu 9ASB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROLE IN THE ORGANISATION</th>
<th>DURATION OF SERVICE</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veryanto Sitohang</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>0812.6593.680</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tohang_very@yahoo.com">Tohang_very@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redina</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>0811.6080.45</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Verius_redina@hotmail.com">Verius_redina@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Wira P</td>
<td>Monitoring and advocacy</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>0813.9692.8252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dessy Hutajulu</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0853.6004.3451</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dessyhutajulu@yahoo.co.id">dessyhutajulu@yahoo.co.id</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Samosir</td>
<td>Advocacy staff</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0812.6045.8584</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jhonsaut@yahoo.co.id">Jhonsaut@yahoo.co.id</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldevia Endora T</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0812.6936.9417</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tariganeldevia@yahoo.co.id">Tariganeldevia@yahoo.co.id</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Finance / administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROLE IN THE ORGANISATION</th>
<th>DURATION OF SERVICE</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heri Syahputra</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td>0852.7571.0523</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Herisaputra913@yahoo.com">Herisaputra913@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Field staff**

### List of People Interviewed

**Date:** 16-18 July 2014  
**Organisation:** Aliansi Sumut Bersatu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROLE IN THE ORGANISATION</th>
<th>DURATION OF SERVICE</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veryanto Sitohang</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>0812.6593.680</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tohang_very@yahoo.com">Tohang_very@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redina</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>0811.6080.45</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Verius_redina@hotmail.com">Verius_redina@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Wira P</td>
<td>Monitoring and advocacy</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>0813.9692.8252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dessy Hutajulu</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0853.6004.3451</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dessyhutajulu@yahoo.co.id">dessyhutajulu@yahoo.co.id</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Samosir</td>
<td>Advocacy staff</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0812.6045.8584</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jhonsaut@yahoo.co.id">Jhonsaut@yahoo.co.id</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldevia Endora T</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0812.6936.9417</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tariganeldevia@yahoo.co.id">Tariganeldevia@yahoo.co.id</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Finance / administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROLE IN THE ORGANISATION</th>
<th>DURATION OF SERVICE</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heri Syahputra</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td>0852.7571.0523</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Herisaputra913@yahoo.com">Herisaputra913@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Field staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROLE IN THE ORGANISATION</th>
<th>DURATION OF SERVICE</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>Advocacy and publication (website)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0823-7009-1056</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Others**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROLE IN THE ORGANISATION</th>
<th>DURATION OF SERVICE</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anto</td>
<td>Executive Director Kipas Institution</td>
<td>5 year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarma</td>
<td>Independent Consultant for monitoring book publication and strategic planning</td>
<td>8 year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

This appendix describes the methodological design and challenges for the assessment of capacity development of Southern Partner Organisations (SPOs), also called the ‘5C study’. This 5C study is organised around four key evaluation questions:

1. What are the changes in partner organisations’ capacity during the 2012-2014 period?
2. To what degree are the changes identified in partner capacity attributable to development interventions undertaken by the MFS II consortia (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?
3. Were the efforts of the MFS II consortia efficient?
4. What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?

It has been agreed that the question (3) around efficiency cannot be addressed for this 5C study. The methodological approach for the other three questions is described below. At the end, a methodological reflection is provided.

In terms of the attribution question (2), ‘process tracing’ is used. This is a theory-based approach that has been applied to a selected number of SPOs since it is a very intensive and costly methodology, although it provides rich information and can generate a lot of learning within the organisations. This approach was presented and agreed-upon during the synthesis workshop on 17-18 June 2013 by the 5C teams for the eight countries of the MFS II evaluation. A more detailed description of the approach was presented during the synthesis workshop in February 2014. The synthesis team, NWO-WOTRO, the country project leaders and the MFS II organisations present at the workshop have accepted this approach. It was agreed that this approach can only be used for a selected number of SPOs since it is a very intensive and costly methodology. Key organisational capacity changes/outcomes of the SPO were identified, based on their relationship to the two selected capabilities, the capability to act and commit the capability to adapt and self-renew, and an expected relationship with CFA supported capacity development interventions (MFS II funding). It was agreed to focus on these two capabilities, since these are the most targeted capabilities by the CFAs, as established during the baseline process.

Please find below an explanation of how the above-mentioned evaluation questions have been addressed in the 5C evaluation.

Note: the methodological approach is applied to 4 countries that the Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen University and Research centre is involved in in terms of the 5C study (Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Liberia). The overall approach has been agreed with all the 8 countries selected for this MFS II evaluation. The 5C country teams have been trained and coached on this methodological approach during the evaluation process. Details specific to the SPO are described in chapter 5.1 of the SPO report. At the end of this appendix a brief methodological reflection is provided.

Changes in partner organisation’s capacity – evaluation question 1

This section describes the data collection and analysis methodology for answering the first evaluation question: What are the changes in partner organisations’ capacity during the 2012-2014 period?

This question was mainly addressed by reviewing changes in 5C indicators, but additionally a ‘general causal map’ based on the SPO perspective on key organisational capacity changes since the baseline has been developed. Each of these is further explained below. The development of the general causal map is integrated in the steps for the endline workshop, as mentioned below.
During the baseline in 2012 information has been collected on each of the 33 agreed upon indicators for organisational capacity. For each of the five capabilities of the 5C framework indicators have been developed as can be seen in Appendix 2. During this 5C baseline, a summary description has been provided for each of these indicators, based on document review and the information provided by staff, the Co-financing Agency (CFA) and other external stakeholders. Also a summary description has been provided for each capability. The results of these can be read in the baseline reports.

The description of indicators for the baseline in 2012 served as the basis for comparison during the endline in 2014. In practice this meant that largely the same categories of respondents (preferably the same respondents as during the baseline) were requested to review the descriptions per indicator and indicate whether and how the endline situation (2014) is different from the described situation in 2012.20 Per indicator they could indicate whether there was an improvement or deterioration or no change and also describe these changes. Furthermore, per indicator the interviewee could indicate what interventions, actors and other factors explain this change compared to the baseline situation.

See below the specific questions that are asked for each of the indicators. Per category of interviewees there is a different list of indicators to be looked at. For example, staff members were presented with a list of all the indicators, whilst external people, for example partners, are presented with a select number of indicators, relevant to the stakeholder.

The information on the indicators was collected in different ways:

1. **Endline workshop at the SPO - self-assessment and ‘general causal map’**: similar to data collection during the baseline, different categories of staff (as much as possible the same people as during the baseline) were brought together in a workshop and requested to respond, in their staff category, to the list of questions for each of the indicators (self-assessment sheet). Prior to carrying out the self-assessments, a brainstorming sessions was facilitated to develop a ‘general causal map’, based on the key organisational capacity changes since the baseline as perceived by SPO staff. Whilst this general causal map is not validated with additional information, it provides a sequential narrative, based on organisational capacity changes as perceived by SPO staff;

2. **Interviews with staff members**: additional to the endline workshop, interviews were held with SPO staff, either to provide more in-depth information on the information provided on the self-assessment formats during the workshop, or as a separate interview for staff members that were not present during the endline workshop;

3. **Interviews with externals**: different formats were developed for different types of external respondents, especially the co-financing agency (CFA), but also partner agencies, and organisational development consultants where possible. These externals were interviewed, either face-to-face or by phone/Skype. The interview sheets were sent to the respondents and if they wanted, these could be filled in digitally and followed up on during the interview;

4. **Document review**: similar to the baseline in 2012, relevant documents were reviewed so as to get information on each indicator. Documents to be reviewed included progress reports, evaluation reports, training reports, etc. (see below) since the baseline in 2012, so as to identify changes in each of the indicators;

5. **Observation**: similar to what was done in 2012, also in 2014 the evaluation team had a list with observable indicators which were to be used for observation during the visit to the SPO.

---

20 The same categories were used as during the baseline (except beneficiaries, other funders): staff categories including management, programme staff, project staff, monitoring and evaluation staff, field staff, administration staff; stakeholder categories including co-financing agency (CFA), consultants, partners.
Below the key steps to assess changes in indicators are described.

Key steps to assess changes in indicators are described

1. Provide the description of indicators in the relevant formats – CDI team
2. Review the descriptions per indicator – in-country team & CDI team
3. Send the formats adapted to the SPO to CFA and SPO – in-country team (formats for SPO) and CDI team (formats for CFA)
4. Collect, upload & code the documents from CFA and SPO in NVivo – CDI team
5. Organise the field visit to the SPO – in-country team
6. Interview the CFA – CDI team
7. Run the endline workshop with the SPO – in-country team
8. Interview SPO staff – in-country team
9. Fill-in observation sheets – in-country team
10. Interview externals – in-country team
11. Upload and auto-code all the formats collected by in-country team and CDI team in NVivo – CDI team
12. Provide to the overview of information per 5c indicator to in-country team – CDI team
13. Analyse data and develop a draft description of the findings per indicator and for the general questions – in-country team
14. Analyse data and develop a final description of the findings per indicator and per capability and for the general questions – CDI team
15. Analyse the information in the general causal map –in-country team and CDI-team

Note: the CDI team include the Dutch 5c country coordinator as well as the overall 5c coordinator for the four countries (Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Liberia). The 5c country report is based on the separate SPO reports.

Below each of these steps is further explained.

Step 1. Provide the description of indicators in the relevant formats – CDI team

• These formats were to be used when collecting data from SPO staff, CFA, partners, and consultants. For each of these respondents different formats have been developed, based on the list of 5C indicators, similar to the procedure that was used during the baseline assessment. The CDI team needed to add the 2012 baseline description of each indicator. The idea was that each respondent would be requested to review each description per indicator, and indicate whether the current situation is different from the baseline situation, how this situation has changed, and what the reasons for the changes in indicators are. At the end of each format, a more general question is added that addresses how the organisation has changed its capacity since the baseline, and what possible reasons for change exist. Please see below the questions asked for each indicator as well as the more general questions at the end of the list of indicators.

General questions about key changes in the capacity of the SPO

What do you consider to be the key changes in terms of how the organisation/ SPO has developed its capacity since the baseline (2012)?

What do you consider to be the main explanatory reasons (interventions, actors or factors) for these changes?

List of questions to be asked for each of the 5C indicators (The entry point is the the description of each indicator as in the 2012 baseline report):

1. How has the situation of this indicator changed compared to the situation during the baseline in 2012?
   Please tick one of the following scores:
   o -2 = Considerable deterioration
   o -1 = A slight deterioration
   o 0 = No change occurred, the situation is the same as in 2012
   o +1 = Slight improvement
   o +2 = Considerable improvement
2. Please describe what exactly has changed since the baseline in 2012
3. **What interventions, actors and other factors explain this change compared to the baseline situation in 2012? Please tick and describe what interventions, actors or factors influenced this indicator, and how. You can tick and describe more than one choice.**

- Intervention, actor or factor at the level of or by **SPO**: ........
- Intervention, actor or factor at the level of or by the **Dutch CFA (MFS II funding)**: ..... 
- Intervention, actor or factor at the level of or by the **other funders**: ...... .
- Other interventions, actors or factors: ...... .
- Don’t know.

**Step 2. Review the descriptions per indicator – in-country team & CDI team**

Before the in-country team and the CDI team started collecting data in the field, it was important that they reviewed the description for each indicator as described in the baseline reports, and also added to the endline formats for review by respondents. These descriptions are based on document review, observation, interviews with SPO staff, CFA staff and external respondents during the baseline. It was important to explain this to respondents before they filled in the formats.

**Step 3. Send the formats adapted to the SPO to CFA and SPO – in-country team (formats for SPO) and CDI team (formats for CFA)**

The CDI team was responsible for collecting data from the CFA:

- 5C Endline assessment Dutch co-financing organisation;
- 5C Endline support to capacity sheet – CFA perspective.

The in-country team was responsible for collecting data from the SPO and from external respondents (except CFA). The following formats were sent before the fieldwork started:

- 5C Endline support to capacity sheet – SPO perspective.
- 5C Endline interview guides for externals: partners; OD consultants.

**Step 4. Collect, upload & code the documents from CFA and SPO in NVivo – CDI team**

The CDI team, in collaboration with the in-country team, collected the following documents from SPOs and CFAs:

- Project documents: project proposal, budget, contract (Note that for some SPOs there is a contract for the full MFS II period 2011-2015; for others there is a yearly or 2-yearly contract. All new contracts since the baseline in 2012 will need to be collected);
- Technical and financial progress reports since the baseline in 2012;
- Mid-term evaluation reports;
- End of project-evaluation reports (by the SPO itself or by external evaluators);
- Contract intake forms (assessments of the SPO by the CFA) or organisational assessment scans made by the CFA that cover the 2011-2014 period;
- Consultant reports on specific inputs provided to the SPO in terms of organisational capacity development;
- Training reports (for the SPO; for alliance partners, including the SPO);
- Organisational scans/ assessments, carried out by the CFA or by the Alliance Assessments;
- Monitoring protocol reports, especially for the 5C study carried out by the MFS II Alliances;
- Annual progress reports of the CFA and of the Alliance in relation to capacity development of the SPOs in the particular country;
- Specific reports that are related to capacity development of SPOs in a particular country.

The following documents (since the baseline in 2012) were requested from SPO:

- Annual progress reports;
- Annual financial reports and audit reports;
- Organisational structure vision and mission since the baseline in 2012;
- Strategic plans;
• Business plans;
• Project/ programme planning documents;
• Annual work plan and budgets;
• Operational manuals;
• Organisational and policy documents: finance, human resource development, etc.;
• Monitoring and evaluation strategy and implementation plans;
• Evaluation reports;
• Staff training reports;
• Organisational capacity reports from development consultants.

The CDI team will code these documents in NVivo (qualitative data analysis software program) against the 5C indicators.

Step 5. Prepare and organise the field visit to the SPO – in-country team

Meanwhile the in-country team prepared and organised the logistics for the field visit to the SPO:

• **General endline workshop** consisted about one day for the self-assessments (about ½ to ¾ of the day) and brainstorm (about 1 to 2 hours) on key organisational capacity changes since the baseline and underlying interventions, factors and actors (‘general causal map’), see also explanation below. This was done with the five categories of key staff: managers; project/ programme staff; monitoring and evaluation staff; admin & HRM staff; field staff. Note: for SPOs involved in process tracing an additional 1 to 1½ day workshop (managers; program/project staff; monitoring and evaluation staff) was necessary. See also step 7;
• **Interviews with SPO staff** (roughly one day);
• **Interviews with external respondents** such as partners and organisational development consultants depending on their proximity to the SPO. These interviews could be scheduled after the endline workshop and interviews with SPO staff.

**General causal map**

During the 5C endline process, a ‘general causal map’ has been developed, based on key organisational capacity changes and underlying causes for these changes, as perceived by the SPO. The general causal map describes cause-effect relationships, and is described both as a visual as well as a narrative.

As much as possible the same people that were involved in the baseline were also involved in the endline workshop and interviews.

Step 6. Interview the CFA – CDI team

The CDI team was responsible for sending the sheets/ formats to the CFA and for doing a follow-up interview on the basis of the information provided so as to clarify or deepen the information provided. This relates to:

• 5C Endline assessment Dutch co-financing organisation;
• 5C Endline support to capacity sheet - CFA perspective.

Step 7. Run the endline workshop with the SPO – in-country team

This included running the endline workshop, including facilitation of the development of the general causal map, self-assessments, interviews and observations. Particularly for those SPOs that were selected for process tracing all the relevant information needed to be analysed prior to the field visit, so as to develop an initial causal map. Please see Step 6 and also the next section on process tracing (evaluation question two).

An endline workshop with the SPO was intended to:
• Explain the purpose of the fieldwork;
• Carry out in the self-assessments by SPO staff subgroups (unless these have already been filled prior to the field visits) - this may take some 3 hours.
• Facilitate a brainstorm on key organisational capacity changes since the baseline in 2012 and underlying interventions, factors and actors.

Purpose of the fieldwork: to collect data that help to provide information on what changes took place in terms of organisational capacity development of the SPO as well as reasons for these changes. The baseline that was carried out in 2012 was to be used as a point of reference.

Brainstorm on key organisational capacity changes and influencing factors: a brainstorm was facilitated on key organisational capacity changes since the baseline in 2012. In order to kick start the discussion, staff were reminded of the key findings related to the historical time line carried out in the baseline (vision, mission, strategies, funding, staff). This was then used to generate a discussion on key changes that happened in the organisation since the baseline (on cards). Then cards were selected that were related to organisational capacity changes, and organised. Then a ‘general causal map’ was developed, based on these key organisational capacity changes and underlying reasons for change as experienced by the SPO staff. This was documented as a visual and narrative. This general causal map was to get the story of the SPO on what they perceived as key organisational capacity changes in the organisation since the baseline, in addition to the specific details provided per indicator.

Self-assessments: respondents worked in the respective staff function groups: management; programme/ project staff; monitoring and evaluation staff; admin and HRM staff; field staff. Staff were assisted where necessary so that they could really understand what it was they were being asked to do as well as what the descriptions under each indicator meant.

Note: for those SPOs selected for process tracing an additional endline workshop was held to facilitate the development of detailed causal maps for each of the identified organisational change/ outcome areas that fall under the capability to act and commit, and under the capability to adapt and self-renew, and that are likely related to capacity development interventions by the CFA. See also the next section on process tracing (evaluation question two). It was up to the in-country team whether this workshop was held straight after the initial endline workshop or after the workshop and the follow-up interviews. It could also be held as a separate workshop at another time.

Step 8. Interview SPO staff – in-country team

After the endline workshop (developing the general causal map and carrying out self-assessments in subgroups), interviews were held with SPO staff (subgroups) to follow up on the information that was provided in the self-assessment sheets, and to interview staff that had not yet provided any information.

Step 9. Fill-in observation sheets – in-country team

During the visit at the SPO, the in-country team had to fill in two sheets based on their observation:
• 5C Endline observation sheet;
• 5C Endline observable indicators.

Step 10. Interview externals – in-country team & CDI team

The in-country team also needed to interview the partners of the SPO as well as organisational capacity development consultants that have provided support to the SPO. The CDI team interviewed the CFA.

Step 11. Upload and auto-code all the formats collected by in-country team and CDI team – CDI team

The CDI team was responsible for uploading and auto-coding (in Nvivo) of the documents that were collected by the in-country team and by the CDI team.
Step 12. Provide the overview of information per 5C indicator to in-country team – CDI team

After the analysis in NVivo, the CDI team provided a copy of all the information generated per indicator to the in-country team for initial analysis.

Step 13. Analyse the data and develop a draft description of the findings per indicator and for the general questions – in-country team

The in-country team provided a draft description of the findings per indicator, based on the information generated per indicator. The information generated under the general questions were linked to the general causal map or detailed process tracing related causal map.

Step 14. Analyse the data and finalize the description of the findings per indicator, per capability and general – CDI team

The CDI team was responsible for checking the analysis by the in-country team with the Nvivo generated data and to make suggestions for improvement and ask questions for clarification to which the in-country team responded. The CDI team then finalised the analysis and provided final descriptions and scores per indicator and also summarize these per capability and calculated the summary capability scores based on the average of all indicators by capability.

Step 15. Analyse the information in the general causal map – in-country team & CDI team

The general causal map based on key organisational capacity changes as perceived by the SPO staff present at the workshop, was further detailed by in-country team and CDI team, and based on the notes made during the workshop and where necessary additional follow up with the SPO. The visual and narrative was finalized after feedback by the SPO. During analysis of the general causal map relationships with MFS II support for capacity development and other factors and actors were identified. All the information has been reviewed by the SPO and CFA.

Attributing changes in partner organisation’s capacity – evaluation question 2

This section describes the data collection and analysis methodology for answering the second evaluation question: To what degree are the changes identified in partner capacity attributable to (capacity) development interventions undertaken by the MFS II consortia (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?

In terms of the attribution question (2), ‘process tracing’ is used. This is a theory-based approach that has been applied to a selected number of SPOs since it is a very intensive and costly methodology, although it provides rich information and can generate a lot of learning within the organisations. Key organisational capacity changes/ outcomes of the SPO were identified, based on their relationship to the two selected capabilities, the capability to act and commit the capability to adapt and self-renew, and an expected relationship with CFA supported capacity development interventions (MFS II funding). It was agreed to focus on these two capabilities, since these are the most targeted capabilities by the CFAs, as established during the baseline process. The box below provides some background information on process tracing.
Background information on process tracing

The essence of process tracing research is that scholars want to go beyond merely identifying correlations between independent variables (Xs) and outcomes (Ys). Process tracing in social science is commonly defined by its addition to trace causal mechanisms (Bennett, 2008a, 2008b; Checkle, 2008; George & Bennett, 2005). A causal mechanism can be defined as "a complex system which produces an outcome by the interaction of a number of parts" (Glennan, 1996, p. 52). Process tracing involves "attempts to identify the intervening causal process – the causal chain and causal mechanism – between an independent variable (or variables) and the outcome of the dependent variable" (George & Bennett, 2005, pp. 206-207).

Process tracing can be differentiated into three variants within social science: theory testing, theory building, and explaining outcome process tracing (Beach & Pedersen, 2013).

- Theory testing process tracing uses a theory from the existing literature and then tests whether evidence shows that each part of hypothesised causal mechanism is present in a given case, enabling within case inferences about whether the mechanism functioned as expected in the case and whether the mechanism as a whole was present. No claims can be made however, about whether the mechanism was the only cause of the outcome.
- Theory building process tracing seeks to build generalizable theoretical explanations from empirical evidence, inferring that a more general causal mechanism exists from the fact of a particular case.
- Finally, explaining outcome process tracing attempts to craft a minimally sufficient explanation of a puzzling outcome in a specific historical case. Here the aim is not to build or test more general theories but to craft a (minimally) sufficient explanation of the outcome of the case where the ambitions are more case centric than theory oriented.

Explaining outcome process tracing is the most suitable type of process tracing for analysing the causal mechanisms for selected key organisational capacity changes of the SPOs. This type of process tracing can be thought of as a single outcome study defined as seeking the causes of the specific outcome in a single case (Gerring, 2006; in: Beach & Pedersen, 2013). Here the ambition is to craft a minimally sufficient explanation of a particular outcome, with sufficiency defined as an explanation that accounts for all of the important aspects of an outcome with no redundant parts being present (Mackie, 1965).

Explaining outcome process tracing is an iterative research strategy that aims to trace the complex conglomerate of systematic and case specific causal mechanisms that produced the outcome in question. The explanation cannot be detached from the particular case. Explaining outcome process tracing refers to case studies whose primary ambition is to explain particular historical outcomes, although the findings of the case can also speak to other potential cases of the phenomenon. Explaining outcome process tracing is an iterative research process in which ‘theories’ are tested to see whether they can provide a minimally sufficient explanation of the outcome. Minimal sufficiency is defined as an explanation that accounts for an outcome, with no redundant parts. In most explaining outcome studies, existing theorisation cannot provide a sufficient explanation, resulting in a second stage in which existing theories are re-conceptualised in light of the evidence gathered in the preceding empirical analysis. The conceptualisation phase in explaining outcome process tracing is therefore an iterative research process, with initial mechanisms re-conceptualised and tested until the result is a theorised mechanism that provides a minimally sufficient explanation of the particular outcome.

Below a description is provided of how SPOs are selected for process tracing, and a description is provided on how this process tracing is to be carried out. Note that this description of process tracing provides not only information on the extent to which the changes in organisational development can be attributed to MFS II (evaluation question 2), but also provides information on other contributing factors and actors (evaluation question 4). Furthermore, it must be noted that the evaluation team has developed an adapted form of ‘explaining outcome process tracing’, since the data collection and analysis was an iterative process of research so as to establish the most realistic explanation for a particular outcome/ organisational capacity change. Below selection of SPOs for process tracing as well as the different steps involved for process tracing in the selected SPOs, are further explained.

**Selection of SPOs for 5C process tracing**

Process tracing is a very intensive methodology that is very time and resource consuming (for development and analysis of one final detailed causal map, it takes about 1-2 weeks in total, for different members of the evaluation team). It has been agreed upon during the synthesis workshop on 17-18 June 2013 that only a selected number of SPOs will take part in this process tracing for the
The purpose of understanding the attribution question. The selection of SPOs is based on the following criteria:

- MFS II support to the SPO has not ended before 2014 (since this would leave us with too small a time difference between intervention and outcome);
- Focus is on the 1-2 capabilities that are targeted most by CFAs in a particular country;
- Both the SPO and the CFA are targeting the same capability, and preferably aim for similar outcomes;
- Maximum one SPO per CFA per country will be included in the process tracing.

The intention was to focus on about 30-50% of the SPOs involved. Please see the tables below for a selection of SPOs per country. Per country, a first table shows the extent to which a CFA targets the five capabilities, which is used to select the capabilities to focus on. A second table presents which SPO is selected, and takes into consideration the selection criteria as mentioned above.

**ETHIOPIA**

For Ethiopia the capabilities that are mostly targeted by CFAs are the capability to act and commit and the capability to adapt and self-renew. See also the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability to:</th>
<th>AMREF</th>
<th>CARE</th>
<th>ECFA</th>
<th>FSCE</th>
<th>HOA-REC</th>
<th>HUNDEE</th>
<th>NVEA</th>
<th>OSRA</th>
<th>TTCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act and commit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver on development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt and self-renew</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve coherence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number 1 stands for not targeted, 5 for intensively targeted. These scores are relative scores for the interventions by the CFA to strengthen the capacity of the SPO. The scores are relative to each other, a higher score means that this capability gets more attention by the CFA compared to other capabilities.

Source: country baseline report, Ethiopia.

Below you can see the table describing when the contract with the SPO is to be ended, and whether both SPO and the CFA expect to focus on these two selected capabilities (with MFS II funding). Based on the above-mentioned selection criteria the following SPOs are selected for process tracing: AMREF, ECFA, FSCE, HUNDEE. In fact, six SPOs would be suitable for process tracing. We just selected the first one per CFA following the criteria of not including more than one SPO per CFA for process tracing.
## Table 2

**SPOs selected for process tracing – Ethiopia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPOs</th>
<th>End of contract</th>
<th>Focus on capability to act and commit – by SPO</th>
<th>Focus on capability to act and commit – by CFA</th>
<th>Focus on capability to adapt and self-renew – by SPO</th>
<th>Focus on capability to adapt and self-renew – by CFA</th>
<th>CFA</th>
<th>Selected for process tracing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMREF</td>
<td>Dec 2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>AMREF NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Dec 31, 2015</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – slightly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CARE Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECFA</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Child Helpline International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSCE</td>
<td>Dec 2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Stichting Kinderpostzegels Netherlands (SKN); Note: no info from Defence for Children – ECPAT Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOA-REC</td>
<td>Sustainable Energy project (ICCO Alliance): 2014 Innovative WASH (WASH Alliance): Dec 2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – slightly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNDEE</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ICCO &amp; IICD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVEA</td>
<td>Dec 2015 (both)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Edukans Foundation (under two consortia); Stichting Kinderpostzegels Netherlands (SKN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSRA</td>
<td>C4C Alliance project (farmers marketing): December 2014 ICCO Alliance project (zero grazing: 2014 (2nd phase)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ICCO &amp; IICD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTCA</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Edukans Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIA

For India the capability that is mostly targeted by CFAs is the capability to act and commit. The next one in line is the capability to adapt and self-renew. See also the table below in which a higher score means that the specific capability is more intensively targeted.

Table 3
The extent to which the Dutch NGO explicitly targets the following capabilities – India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability to:</th>
<th>BVHA</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>DRIST</th>
<th>FFID</th>
<th>Jana Vikas</th>
<th>Samarthak Samiti</th>
<th>SMILE</th>
<th>SDS</th>
<th>VTRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act and commit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver on development objectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt and self-renew</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve coherence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number 1 stands for not targeted, 5 for intensively targeted. These scores are relative scores for the interventions by the CFA to strengthen the capacity of the SPO. The scores are relative to each other, a higher score means that this capability gets more attention by the CFA compared to other capabilities.

Source: country baseline report, India.

Below you can see a table describing when the contract with the SPO is to be ended and whether SPO and the CFA both expect to focus on these two selected capabilities (with MFS II funding). Based on the above-mentioned selection criteria the following SPOs are selected for process tracing: BVHA, COUNT, FFID, SMILE and VTRC. Except for SMILE (capability to act and commit only), for the other SPOs the focus for process tracing can be on the capability to act and commit and on the capability to adapt and self-renew.

Table 4
SPOs selected for process tracing – India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPOs</th>
<th>End of contract</th>
<th>Focus on capability to act and commit – by SPO</th>
<th>Focus on capability to act and commit – by CFA</th>
<th>Focus on capability to adapt and self-renew – by SPO</th>
<th>Focus on capability to adapt and self-renew – by CFA</th>
<th>CFA</th>
<th>Selected for process tracing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BVHA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Simavi</td>
<td>Yes; both capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Woord en Daad</td>
<td>Yes; both capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRISTI</td>
<td>31-03-2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hivos</td>
<td>No - closed in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFID</td>
<td>30-09-2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 RGVN, NEDSF and Women’s Rights Forum (WRF) could not be reached timely during the baseline due to security reasons. WRF could not be reached at all. Therefore these SPOs are not included in Table 1.
INDONESIA

For Indonesia the capabilities that are most frequently targeted by CFAs are the capability to act and commit and the capability to adapt and self-renew. See also the table below.

Table 5
The extent to which the Dutch NGO explicitly targets the following capabilities – Indonesia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability to:</th>
<th>ASB</th>
<th>Daya kologi</th>
<th>ECPAT</th>
<th>GSS</th>
<th>Lem baga</th>
<th>Kita</th>
<th>PT. PPMA</th>
<th>Rifka Annisa</th>
<th>WTIP</th>
<th>Yad upa</th>
<th>Yayasan Kelita</th>
<th>YPI</th>
<th>YRBI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act and commit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver on development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt and self-renew</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve coherence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number 1 stands for not targeted, 5 for intensively targeted. These scores are relative scores for the interventions by the CFA to strengthen the capacity of the SPO. The scores are relative to each other, a higher score means that this capability gets more attention by the CFA compared to other capabilities.

Source: country baseline report, Indonesia.
The table below describes when the contract with the SPO is to be ended and whether both SPO and the CFA expect to focus on these two selected capabilities (MFS II funding). Based on the above-mentioned selection criteria the following SPOs are selected for process tracing: ASB, ECPAT, PT.PPMA, YPI, YRBI.

### Table 6

**SPOs selected for process tracing – Indonesia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indonesia – SPOs</th>
<th>End of contract</th>
<th>Focus on capability to act and commit – by SPO</th>
<th>Focus on capability to act and commit – by CFA</th>
<th>Focus on capability to adapt and self-renew – by SPO</th>
<th>Focus on capability to adapt and self-renew – by CFA</th>
<th>CFA</th>
<th>Selected for process tracing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>February 2012; extension Feb 1, 2013 – June 30, 2016</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hivos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayakologi</td>
<td>2013; no extension</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Cordaid</td>
<td>No: contract ended early and not matching enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECPAT</td>
<td>August 2013; Extension Dec 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, a bit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Free Press Unlimited - Mensen met een Missie</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No: contract ended early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>31 December 2012; no extension</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, a bit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Free Press Unlimited - Mensen met een Missie</td>
<td>No: contract ended early</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lembaga Kita</td>
<td>31 December 2012; no extension</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Free Press Unlimited - Mensen met een Missie</td>
<td>No - contract ended early</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT.PPMA</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>Yes, capability to act and commit only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifka Annisa</td>
<td>Dec 31, 2015</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rutgers WPF</td>
<td>No - no match between expectations CFA and SPO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIIP</td>
<td>Dec 2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not MFS II</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not MFS II</td>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td>No - Capacity development interventions are not MFS II financed. Only some overhead is MFS II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia – SPOs</td>
<td>End of contract</td>
<td>Focus on capability to act and commit – by SPO</td>
<td>Focus on capability to act and commit – by CFA</td>
<td>Focus on capability to adapt and self-renew – by SPO</td>
<td>Focus on capability to adapt and self-renew – by CFA</td>
<td>CFA</td>
<td>Selected for process tracing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yayasan Kelola</td>
<td>Dec 30, 2013; extension of contract being processed for two years (2014-2015)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>Hivos</td>
<td>No - no specific capacity development interventions planned by Hivos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPI</td>
<td>Dec 31, 2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRBI</td>
<td>Oct, 30, 2013; YRBI end of contract from 31st Oct 2013 to 31st Dec 2013. Contract extension proposal is being proposed to MFS II, no decision yet.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yadupa</td>
<td>Under negotiation during baseline; new contract 2013 until now</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nothing committed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nothing committed</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>No, since nothing was committed by CFA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIBERIA**

For Liberia the situation is arbitrary which capabilities are targeted most CFA's. Whilst the capability to act and commit is targeted more often than the other capabilities, this is only so for two of the SPOs. The capability to adapt and self-renew and the capability to relate are almost equally targeted for the five SPOs, be it not intensively. Since the capability to act and commit and the capability to adapt and self-renew are the most targeted capabilities in Ethiopia, India and Indonesia, we choose to focus on these two capabilities for Liberia as well. This would help the synthesis team in the further analysis of these capabilities related to process tracing. See also the table below.
Table 7
The extent to which the Dutch NGO explicitly targets the following capabilities – Liberia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability to:</th>
<th>BSC</th>
<th>DEN-L</th>
<th>NAWOCOL</th>
<th>REFOUND</th>
<th>RHRAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act and commit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver on development objectives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt and self-renew</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve coherence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number 1 stands for not targeted, 5 for intensively targeted. These scores are relative scores for the interventions by the CFA to strengthen the capacity of the SPO. The scores are relative to each other, a higher score means that this capability gets more attention by the CFA compared to other capabilities.

Source: country baseline report, Liberia.

Below you can see the table describing when the contract with the SPO is to be ended, and whether both SPO and the CFA expect to focus on these two selected capabilities (with MFS II funding). Also, for two of the five SPOs capability to act and commit is targeted more intensively compared to the other capabilities. Based on the above-mentioned selection criteria the following SPOs are selected for process tracing: BSC and RHRAP.

Table 8
SPOs selected for process tracing – Liberia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberia – SPOs</th>
<th>End of contract</th>
<th>Focus on capability to act and commit – by SPO</th>
<th>Focus on capability to act and commit – by CFA</th>
<th>Focus on capability to adapt and self-renew – by SPO</th>
<th>Focus on capability to adapt and self-renew – by CFA</th>
<th>CFA</th>
<th>Selected for process tracing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>Dec 31, 2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SPARK</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEN-L</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>No – not matching enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAWOCOL</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>No – not matching enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFOUND</td>
<td>At least until 2013 (2015?)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>No – not matching enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHRAP</td>
<td>At least until 2013 (2014?)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key steps in process tracing for the 5C study**

In the box below you will find the key steps developed for the 5C process tracing methodology. These steps will be further explained here. Only key staff of the SPO is involved in this process: management; programme/ project staff; and monitoring and evaluation staff, and other staff that could provide information relevant to the identified outcome area/key organisational capacity change. Those SPOs selected for process tracing had a separate endline workshop, in addition to the ‘general endline workshop. This workshop was carried out after the initial endline workshop and the interviews during the field visit to the SPO. Where possible, the general and process tracing endline workshop have been held consecutively, but where possible these workshops were held at different points in time, due to the complex design of the process. Below the detailed steps for the purpose of process tracing are further explained.
Key steps in process tracing for the 5C study

1. Identify the planned MFS II supported capacity development interventions within the selected capabilities (capability to act and commit and capability to adapt and self-renew) – CDI team
2. Identify the implemented MFS II supported capacity development interventions within the selected capabilities (capability to act and commit and capability to adapt and self-renew) – CDI team
3. Identify initial changes/ outcome areas in these two capabilities – CDI team & in-country team
4. Construct the detailed, initial causal map (theoretical model of change) – CDI team & in-country team
5. Identify types of evidence needed to verify or discard different causal relationships in the model of change – in-country teams, with support from CDI team
6. Collect data to verify or discard causal mechanisms and construct workshop based, detailed causal map (model of change) – in-country team
7. Assess the quality of data and analyse data and develop final detailed causal map (model of change) – in-country team with CDI team
8. Analyse and conclude on findings – CDI team, in collaboration with in-country team

Some definitions of the terminology used for this MFS II 5C evaluation

Based upon the different interpretations and connotations the use of the term causal mechanism we use the following terminology for the remainder of this paper:

- **A detailed causal map** (or **model of change**) = the representation of all possible explanations – causal pathways for a change/ outcome. These pathways are that of the intervention, rival pathways and pathways that combine parts of the intervention pathway with that of others. This also depicts the reciprocity of various events influencing each other and impacting the overall change.
- **A causal mechanism** = is the combination of parts that ultimately explains an outcome. Each part of the mechanism is an individually insufficient but necessary factor in a whole mechanism, which together produce the outcome (Beach and Pedersen, 2013, p. 176).
- **Part or cause** = one actor with its attributes carrying out activities/ producing outputs that lead to change in other parts. The final part or cause is the change/ outcome.
- **Attributes of the actor** = specificities of the actor that increase his chance to introduce change or not such as its position in its institutional environment.

**Step 1. Identify the planned MFS II supported capacity development interventions within the selected capabilities (capability to act and commit and capability to adapt and self-renew)** – CDI team

Chapter 4.1 and 4.2 in the baseline report were reviewed. Capacity development interventions as planned by the CFA for the capability to act and commit and for the capability to adapt and self-renew were described and details inserted in the summary format. This provided an overview of the capacity development activities that were originally planned by the CFA for these two capabilities and assisted in focusing on relevant outcomes that are possibly related to the planned interventions.

**Step 2. Identify the implemented capacity development interventions within the selected capabilities (capability to act and commit and capability to adapt and self-renew)** – CDI team

The input from the CFA was reviewed in terms of what capacity development interventions have taken place in the MFS II period. This information was be found in the ‘Support to capacity development sheet - endline - CFA perspective’ for the SPO, based on details provided by the CFA and further discussed during an interview by the CDI team.

The CFA was asked to describe all the MFS II supported capacity development interventions of the SPO that took place during the period 2011 up to now. The CDI team reviewed this information, not only the interventions but also the observed changes as well as the expected long-term changes, and then linked these interventions to relevant outcomes in one of the capabilities (capability to act and commit; and capability to adapt and self-renew).
Step 3. Identify **initial changes/outcome areas in these two capabilities** – by CDI team & in-country team

The CDI team was responsible for **coding** documents received from SPO and CFA in NVivo on the following:

- **5C Indicators**: this was to identify the changes that took place between baseline and endline. This information was coded in Nvivo.
- Information related to the **capacity development interventions implemented by the CFA** (with MFS II funding) (see also Step 2) to strengthen the capacity of the SPO. For example, the training on financial management of the SPO staff could be related to any information on financial management of the SPO. This information was coded in Nvivo.

In addition, the response by the CFA to the changes in 5C indicators format, was auto-coded.

The in-country team was responsible for timely collection of information from the SPO (before the fieldwork starts). This set of information dealt with:

- MFS II supported capacity development interventions during the MFS II period (2011 until now).
- Overview of all trainings provided in relation to a particular outcome areas/organisational capacity change since the baseline.
- For each of the identified MFS II supported trainings, training questionnaires have been developed to assess these trainings in terms of the participants, interests, knowledge and skills gained, behaviour change and changes in the organisation (based on Kirkpatrick’s model), one format for training participants and one for their managers. These training questionnaires were sent prior to the field visit.
- Changes expected by SPO on a long-term basis (‘Support to capacity development sheet - endline - SPO perspective’).

For the selection of change/outcome areas the following criteria were important:

- The change/outcome area is in one of the two capabilities selected for process tracing: capability to act and commit or the capability to adapt and self-renew. This was the first criteria to select upon.
- There was a likely link between the key organisational capacity change/outcome area and the MFS II supported capacity development interventions. This also was an important criteria. This would need to be demonstrated through one or more of the following situations:
  - In the 2012 **theory of change** on organisational capacity development of the SPO a link was indicated between the outcome area and MFS II support;
  - During the baseline the CFA indicated a link between **the planned MFS II support** to organisational development and the expected short-term or long-term results in one of the selected capabilities;
  - During the endline the **CFA** indicated a link between **the implemented MFS II capacity development interventions**, and observed short-term changes and expected long-term changes in the organisational capacity of the SPO in one of the selected capabilities;
  - During the endline the **SPO** indicated a link between **the implemented MFS II capacity development interventions** and observed short-term changes and expected long-term changes in the organisational capacity of the SPO in one of the selected capabilities.

Reviewing the information obtained as described in Step 1, 2, and 3 provided the basis for selecting key organisational capacity change/outcome areas to focus on for process tracing. These areas were to be formulated as broader outcome areas, such as ‘improved financial management’, ‘improved monitoring and evaluation’ or ‘improved staff competencies’.

Note: the outcome areas were to be formulated as intermediates changes. For example: an improved monitoring and evaluation system, or enhanced knowledge and skills to educate the target group on climate change. Key outcome areas were also verified - based on document review as well as discussions with the SPO during the endline.
Step 4. Construct the detailed, initial causal map (theoretical model of change) – CDI & in-country team

A detailed initial causal map was developed by the CDI team, in collaboration with the in-country team. This was based on document review, including information provided by the CFA and SPO on MFS II supported capacity development interventions and their immediate and long-term objectives as well as observed changes. Also, the training questionnaires were reviewed before developing the initial causal map. This detailed initial causal map was to be provided by the CDI team with a visual and related narrative with related references. This initial causal map served as a reference point for further reflection with the SPO during the process tracing endline workshop, where relationships needed to be verified or new relationships established so that the second (workshop-based), detailed causal map could be developed, after which further verification was needed to come up with the final, concluding detailed causal map.

It’s important to note that organisational change area/ outcome areas could be both positive and negative.

For each of the selected outcomes the team needed to make explicit the theoretical model of change. This meant finding out about the range of different actors, factors, actions, and events etc. that have contributed to a particular outcome in terms of organisational capacity of the SPO.

A model of change of good quality includes:

- The causal pathways that relate the intervention to the realised change/ outcome;
- Rival explanations for the same change/ outcome;
- Assumptions that clarify relations between different components or parts;
- Case specific and/or context specific factors or risks that might influence the causal pathway, such as for instance the socio-cultural-economic context, or a natural disaster;
- Specific attributes of the actors e.g. CFA and other funders.

A model of change (within the 5C study called a ‘detailed causal map’) is a complex system which produces intermediate and long-term outcomes by the interaction of other parts. It consists of parts or causes that often consist of one actor with its attributes that is implementing activities leading to change in other parts (Beach & Pedersen, 2013). A helpful way of constructing the model of change is to think in terms of actors carrying out activities that lead to other actors changing their behaviour. The model of change can be explained as a range of activities carried out by different actors (including the CFA and SPO under evaluation) that will ultimately lead to an outcome. Besides this, there are also ‘structural’ elements, which are to be interpreted as external factors (such as economic conjuncture); and attributes of the actor (does the actor have the legitimacy to ask for change or not, what is its position in the sector) that should be looked at (Beach & Pedersen, 2013). In fact Beach and Pedersen, make a fine point about the subjectivity of the actor in a dynamic context. This means, in qualitative methodologies, capturing the changes in the actor, acted upon area or person/organisation, in a non sequential and non temporal format. Things which were done recently could have corrected behavioural outcomes of an organisation and at the same time there could be processes which incrementally pushed for the same change over a period of time. Beach and Pedersen espouse this methodology because it captures change in a dynamic fashion as against the methodology of logical framework. For the MFS II evaluation it was important to make a distinction between those paths in the model of change that are the result of MFS II and rival pathways.

The construction of the model of change started with the identified key organisational capacity change/ outcome, followed by an inventory of all possible subcomponents that possibly have caused the change/ outcome in the MFS II period (2011-up to now, or since the baseline). The figure below presents an imaginary example of a model of change. The different colours indicate the different types of support to capacity development of the SPO by different actors, thereby indicating different pathways of change, leading to the key changes/ outcomes in terms of capacity development (which in this case indicates the ability to adapt and self-renew).
Figure 1  An imaginary example of a model of change

Step 5. Identify **types of evidence** needed to verify or discard different causal relationships in the model of change – in-country teams with support from CDI team

Once the causal mechanism at theoretical level were defined, empirical evidence was collected so as to verify or discard the different parts of this theoretical model of change, confirm or reject whether subcomponents have taken place, and to find evidence that confirm or reject the causal relations between the subcomponents.

A key question that we needed to ask ourselves was, “What information do we need in order to confirm or reject that one subcomponent leads to another, that X causes Y?”. The evaluation team needed to agree on what information was needed that provides empirical manifestations for each part of the model of change.

There are four distinguishable types of evidence that are relevant in process tracing analysis: **pattern**, **sequence**, **trace**, and **account**. Please see the box below for descriptions of these types of evidence.

The evaluation team needed to agree on the types of evidence that was needed to verify or discard the manifestation of a particular part of the causal mechanism. Each one or a combination of these different types of evidence could be used to confirm or reject the different parts of the model of change. This is what is meant by robustness of evidence gathering. Since causality as a concept can bend in many ways, our methodology, provides a near scientific model for accepting and rejecting a particular type of evidence, ignoring its face value.
Types of evidence to be used in process tracing

- **Pattern evidence** relates to predictions of statistical patterns in the evidence. For example, in testing a mechanism of racial discrimination in a case dealing with employment, statistical patterns of employment would be relevant for testing this part of the mechanism.

- **Sequence evidence** deals with the temporal and spatial chronology of events predicted by a hypothesised causal mechanism. For example, a test of the hypothesis could involve expectations of the timing of events where we might predict that if the hypothesis is valid, we should see that the event B took place after event A took place. However, if we found that event B took place before event A took place, the test would suggest that our confidence in the validity of this part of the mechanism should be reduced (disconfirmation/falsification).

- **Trace evidence** is evidence whose mere existence provides proof that a part of a hypothesised mechanism exists. For example, the existence of the minutes of a meeting, if authentic ones, provide strong proof that the meeting took place.

- **Account evidence** deals with the content of empirical material, such as meeting minutes that detail what was discussed or an oral account of what took place in the meeting.

*Source: Beach and Pedersen, 2013*

Below you can find a table that provides guidelines on what to look for when identifying types of evidence that can confirm or reject causal relationships between different parts/subcomponents of the model of change. It also provides one example of a part of a causal pathway and what type of information to look for.

### Table 9
*Format for identifying types of evidence for different causal relationships in the model of change (example included)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of the model of change</th>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Type of evidence needed</th>
<th>Source of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe relationship between the subcomponents of the model of change</td>
<td>Describe questions you would like to answer in order to find out whether the components in the relationship took place, when they took place, who was involved, and whether they are related</td>
<td>Describe the information that we need in order to answer these questions. Which type of evidence can we use in order to reject or confirm that subcomponent X causes subcomponent Y? Can we find this information by means of: Pattern evidence; Sequence evidence; Trace evidence; Account evidence?</td>
<td>Describe where you can find this information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example:**
Training workshops on M&E provided by MFS II funding and other sources of funding

**Example:**
What type of training workshops on M&E took place?
Who was trained?
When did the training take place?
Who funded the training?
Was the funding of training provided before the training took place?
How much money was available for the training?

**Example:**
Trace evidence: on types of training delivered, who was trained, when the training took place, budget for the training
Sequence evidence on timing of funding and timing of training
Content evidence: what the training was about

**Example:**
Training report
SPO Progress reports
Interviews with the CFA and SPO staff
Financial reports SPO and CFA

Please note that for practical reasons, the 5C evaluation team decided that it was easier to integrate the specific questions in the narrative of the initial causal map. These questions would need to be addressed by the in country team during the process tracing workshop so as to discover, verify or
discard particular causal mechanisms in the detailed, initial causal map. Different types of evidence was asked for in these questions.

**Step 6. Collect data to verify or discard causal mechanisms and develop workshop-based, detailed causal map – in-country team**

Once it was decided by the in-country and CDI evaluation teams what information was to be collected during the interaction with the SPO, data collection took place. The initial causal maps served as a basis for discussions during the endline workshop with a particular focus on process tracing for the identified organisational capacity changes. But it was considered to be very important to understand from the perspective of the SPO how they understood the identified key organisational capacity change/outcome area has come about. A new detailed, workshop-based causal map was developed that included the information provided by SPO staff as well as based on initial document review as described in the initial detailed causal map. This information was further analysed and verified with other relevant information so as to develop a final causal map, which is described in the next step.

**Step 7. Assess the quality of data and analyse data, and develop the final detailed causal map (model of change) – in-country team and CDI team**

Quality assurance of the data collected and the evidence it provides for rejecting or confirming parts of causal explanations are a major concern for many authors specialised in contribution analysis and process-tracing. Stern et al. (2012), Beach and Pedersen (2013), Lemire, Nielsen and Dybdal (2012), Mayne (2012) and Delahais and Toulemonde (2012) all emphasise the need to make attribution/contribution claims that are based on pieces of evidence that are rigorous, traceable, and credible. These pieces of evidence should be as explicit as possible in proving that subcomponent X causes subcomponent Y and ruling out other explanations. Several tools are proposed to check the nature and the quality of data needed. One option is, Delahais and Toulemonde’s Evidence Analysis Database, which we have adapted for our purpose.

Delahais and Toulemonde (2012) propose an Evidence Analysis Database that takes into consideration three criteria:

- Confirming/ rejecting a causal relation (yes/no);
- Type of causal mechanism: intended contribution/ other contribution/ condition leading to intended contribution/ intended condition to other contribution/ feedback loop;
- Strength of evidence: strong/ rather strong/ rather weak/ weak.

We have adapted their criteria to our purpose. The in-country team, in collaboration with the CDI team, used the criteria in assessing whether causal relationships in the causal map, were strong enough. This has been more of an iterative process trying to find additional evidence for the established relationships through additional document review or contacting the CFA and SPO as well as getting their feedback on the final detailed causal map that was established. Whilst the form below has not been used exactly in the manner depicted, it has been used indirectly when trying to validate the information in the detailed causal map. After that, the final detailed causal map is established both as a visual as well as a narrative, with related references for the established causal relations.
Step 8. Analyse and conclude on findings – in-country team and CDI team

The final detailed causal map was described as a visual and narrative and this was then analysed in terms of the evaluation question two and evaluation question four: “To what degree are the changes identified in partner capacity attributable to development interventions undertaken by the MFS II consortia (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?” and “What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?” It was analysed to what extent the identified key organisational capacity change can be attributed to MFS II supported capacity development interventions as well as to other related factors, interventions and actors.

Explaining factors – evaluation question 4

This paragraph describes the data collection and analysis methodology for answering the fourth evaluation question: “What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?”

In order to explain the changes in organisational capacity development between baseline and endline (evaluation question 1) the CDI and in-country evaluation teams needed to review the indicators and how they have changed between baseline and endline and what reasons have been provided for this. This has been explained in the first section of this appendix. It has been difficult to find detailed explanations for changes in each of the separate 5c indicators, but the ‘general causal map’ has provided some ideas about some of the key underlying factors actors and interventions that influence the key organisational capacity changes, as perceived by the SPO staff.

For those SPOs that are selected for process tracing (evaluation question 2), more in-depth information was procured for the identified key organisational capacity changes and how MFS II supported capacity development interventions as well as other actors, factors and interventions have influenced these changes. This is integrated in the process of process tracing as described in the section above.

Methodological reflection

Below a few methodological reflections are made by the 5C evaluation team.

Use of the 5 core capabilities framework and qualitative approach: this has proven to be a very useful framework to assess organisational capacity. The five core capabilities provide a comprehensive picture of the capacity of an organisation. The capabilities are interlinked, which was also reflected in the description of standard indicators, that have been developed for the purpose of this 5C evaluation and agreed upon for the eight countries. Using this framework with a mainly qualitative approach has provided rich information for the SPOs and CFAs, and many have indicated this was a useful learning exercise.

Using standard indicators and scores: using standard indicators is useful for comparison purposes. However, the information provided per indicator is very specific to the SPO and therefore makes
comparison difficult. Whilst the description of indicators has been useful for the SPO and CFA, it is questionable to what extent indicators can be compared across SPOs since they need to be seen in context, for them to make meaning. In relation to this, one can say that scores that are provided for the indicators, are only relative and cannot show the richness of information as provided in the indicator description. Furthermore, it must be noted that organisations are continuously changing and scores are just a snapshot in time. There cannot be perfect score for this. In hindsight, having rubrics would have been more useful than scores.

**General causal map:** whilst this general causal map, which is based on key organisational capacity changes and related causes, as perceived by the SPO staff present at the endline workshop, has not been validated with other sources of information except SPO feedback, the 5C evaluation team considers this information important, since it provides the SPO story about how and which changes in the organisation since the baseline, are perceived as being important, and how these changes have come about. This will provide information additional to the information that has been validated when analysing and describing the indicators as well as the information provided through process tracing (selected SPOs). This has proven to be a learning experience for many SPOs.

**Using process tracing for dealing with the attribution question:** this theory-based and mainly qualitative approach has been chosen to deal with the attribution question, on how the organisational capacity changes in the organisations have come about and what the relationship is with MFS II supported capacity development interventions and other factors. This has proven to be a very useful process, that provided a lot of very rich information. Many SPOs and CFAs have already indicated that they appreciated the richness of information which provided a story about how identified organisational capacity changes have come about. Whilst this process was intensive for SPOs during the process tracing workshops, many appreciated this to be a learning process that provided useful information on how the organisation can further develop itself. For the evaluation team, this has also been an intensive and time-consuming process, but since it provided rich information in a learning process, the effort was worth it, if SPOs and CFAs find this process and findings useful.

A few remarks need to be made:

- Outcome explaining process tracing is used for this purpose, but has been adapted to the situation since the issues being looked at were very complex in nature.
- Difficulty of verifying each and every single change and causal relationship:
  - Intensity of the process and problems with recall: often the process tracing workshop was done straight after the general endline workshop that has been done for all the SPOs. In some cases, the process tracing endline workshop has been done at a different point in time, which was better for staff involved in this process, since process tracing asks people to think back about changes and how these changes have come about. The word difficulties with recalling some of these changes and how they have come about. See also the next paragraph.
  - Difficulty of assessing changes in knowledge and behaviour: training questionnaire is have been developed, based on Kirkpatrick’s model and were specifically tailored to identify not only the interest but also the change in knowledge and skills, behaviour as well as organisational changes as a result of a particular training. The retention ability of individuals, irrespective of their position in the organisation, is often unstable. The 5C evaluation team experienced that it was difficult for people to recall specific trainings, and what they learned from those trainings. Often a change in knowledge, skills and behaviour is a result brought about by a combination of different factors, rather than being traceable to one particular event. The detailed causal maps that have been established, also clearly pointed this. There are many factors at play that make people change their behaviour, and this is not just dependent on training but also internal/personal (motivational) factors as well as factors within the organisation, that stimulate or hinder a person to change behaviour. Understanding how behaviour change works is important when trying to really understand the extent to which behaviour has changed as a result of different factors, actors and interventions. Organisations change because people change and therefore understanding when and how these individuals change behaviour is crucial. Also attrition and change in key organisational positions can contribute considerably to the outcome.
Utilisation of the evaluation

The 5C evaluation team considers it important to also discuss issues around utility of this evaluation. We want to mention just a few.

**Design** – mainly externally driven and with a focus on accountability and standard indicators and approaches within a limited time frame, and limited budget: this MFS II evaluation is originally based on a design that has been decided by IOB (the independent evaluation office of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and to some extent MFS II organisations. The evaluators have had no influence on the overall design and sampling for the 5C study. In terms of learning, one may question whether the most useful cases have been selected in this sampling process. The focus was very much on a rigorous evaluation carried out by an independent evaluation team. Indicators had to be streamlined across countries. The 5C team was requested to collaborate with the other 5C country teams (Bangladesh, Congo, Pakistan, Uganda) to streamline the methodological approach across the eight sampled countries. Whilst this may have its purpose in terms of synthesising results, the 5C evaluation team has also experienced the difficulty of tailoring the approach to the specific SPOs. The overall evaluation has been mainly accountability driven and was less focused on enhancing learning for improvement. Furthermore, the timeframe has been very small to compare baseline information (2012) with endline information (2014). Changes in organisational capacity may take a long, particularly if they are related to behaviour change. Furthermore, there has been limited budget to carry out the 5C evaluation. For all the four countries (Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Liberia) that the Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen University and Research centre has been involved in, the budget has been overspent.

However, the 5C evaluation team has designed an endline process whereby engagement of staff, e.g. in a workshop process was considered important, not only due to the need to collect data, but also to generate learning in the organisation. Furthermore, having general causal maps and detailed causal maps generated by process tracing have provided rich information that many SPOs and CFAs have already appreciated as useful in terms of the findings as well as a learning process.

Another issue that must be mentioned is that additional requests have been added to the country teams during the process of implementation: developing a country based synthesis; questions on design, implementation, and reaching objectives of MFS II funded capacity development interventions, whilst these questions were not in line with the core evaluation questions for the 5C evaluation.

**Complexity and inadequate coordination and communication:** many actors, both in the Netherlands, as well as in the eight selected countries, have been involved in this evaluation and their roles and responsibilities, were often unclear. For example, 19 MFS II consortia, the internal reference group, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Partos, the Joint Evaluation Trust, NWO-Wotro, the evaluators (Netherlands and in-country), 2 external advisory committees, and the steering committee. Not to mention the SPO’s and their related partners and consultants. CDI was involved in 4 countries with a total number of 38 SPOs and related CFAs. This complexity influenced communication and coordination, as well as the extent to which learning could take place. Furthermore, there was a distance between the evaluators and the CFAs, since the approach had to be synchronised across countries, and had to adhere to strict guidelines, which were mainly externally formulated and could not be negotiated or discussed for the purpose of tailoring and learning. Feedback on the final results and report had to be provided mainly in written form. In order to enhance utilisation, a final workshop at the SPO to discuss the findings and think through the use with more people than probably the one who reads the report, would have more impact on organisational learning and development.

Furthermore, feedback with the CFAs has also not been institutionalised in the evaluation process in the form of learning events. And as mentioned above, the complexity of the evaluation with many actors involved did not enhance learning and thus utilization.

**5C Endline process, and in particular thoroughness of process tracing often appreciated as learning process:** The SPO perspective has also brought to light a new experience and technique of self-assessment and self-corrective measures for managers. Most SPOs whether part of process tracing or not, deeply appreciated the thoroughness of the methodology and its ability to capture details with robust connectivity. This is a matter of satisfaction and learning for both evaluators and SPOs. Having a process whereby SPO staff were very much engaged in the process of self-assessment...
and reflection has proven for many to be a learning experience for many, and therefore have enhanced utility of the 5C evaluation.
Appendix 2  Background information on the five core capabilities framework

The 5 capabilities (5C) framework was to be used as a framework for the evaluation of capacity development of Southern Partner Organisations (SPOs) of the MFS II consortia. The 5C framework is based on a five-year research program on ‘Capacity, change and performance’ that was carried out by the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM). The research included an extensive review of the literature and sixteen case studies. The 5C framework has also been applied in an IOB evaluation using 26 case studies in 14 countries, and in the baseline carried out per organisation by the MFS II organisations for the purpose of the monitoring protocol.

The 5C framework is structured to understand and analyse (changes in) the capacity of an organization to deliver (social) value to its constituents. This introduction briefly describes the 5C framework, mainly based on the most recent document on the 5C framework (Keijzer et al., 2011).

The 5C framework sees capacity as an outcome of an open system. An organisation or collaborative association (for instance a network) is seen as a system interacting with wider society. The most critical practical issue is to ensure that relevant stakeholders share a common way of thinking about capacity and its core constituents or capabilities. Decisive for an organisation’s capacity is the context in which the organisation operates. This means that understanding context issues is crucial. The use of the 5C framework requires a multi-stakeholder approach because shared values and results orientation are important to facilitate the capacity development process. The 5C framework therefore needs to accommodate the different visions of stakeholders and conceive different strategies for raising capacity and improving performance in a given situation.

The 5C framework defines capacity as ‘producing social value’ and identifies five core capabilities that together result in that overall capacity. Capacity, capabilities and competences are seen as follows:

- **Capacity** is referred to as the overall ability of an organisation or system to create value for others;
- **Capabilities** are the collective ability of a group or a system to do something either inside or outside the system. The collective ability involved may be technical, logistical, managerial or generative (i.e. the ability to earn legitimacy, to adapt, to create meaning, etc.);
- **Competencies** are the energies, skills and abilities of individuals.

Fundamental to developing capacity are inputs such as human, material and financial resources, technology, and information. To the degree that they are developed and successfully integrated, capabilities contribute to the overall capacity or ability of an organisation or system to create value for others. A single capability is not sufficient to create capacity. All are needed and are strongly interrelated and overlapping. Thus, to achieve its development goals, the 5C framework says that every organisation or system must have five basic capabilities:

- The capability to act and commit;
- The capability to deliver on development objectives;
- The capability to adapt and self-renew;
- The capability to relate (to external stakeholders);
- The capability to achieve coherence.

In order to have a common framework for evaluation, the five capabilities have been reformulated in outcome domains and for each outcome domain performance indicators have been developed. A detailed overview of capabilities with outcome domains and indicators is attached in Appendix 3.

There is some overlap between the five core capabilities but together the five capabilities result in a certain level of capacity. Influencing one capability may have an effect on one or more of the other
capabilities. In each situation, the level of any of the five capabilities will vary. Each capability can become stronger or weaker over time.
Appendix 3   Changes in organisational capacity of the SPO - 5C indicators

Below you will find a description for each of the indicators under each of the capabilities, what the situation is as assessed during the endline, how this has changed since the baseline and what are the reasons for change.

**Description of Endline Indicators_Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (ASB)**

**Capability to Act and to Commit**

1.1 Responsive leadership: ‘Leadership is responsive, inspiring, and sensitive’

*How would you describe your leadership? Leadership within the organisation (operational, strategic). If there is a larger body then you may also want to refer to leadership at a higher level but not located at the local organisation?)*

The leadership practiced in ASB has enhanced along with their organizational development. The ASB leadership is still practicing what they have done since the baseline although some areas have developed. The current leadership is considered to have improved in task delegation in the absence of leadership, greater clarity in staffs job descriptions, staff regeneration, and feedback to staff performance as a post-monitoring mechanism. The Director ensures that the staffs have more opportunities and access to capacity building both internally and externally. Task delegation by the director has been especially appreciated by the board, which can now focus on future programs, strategic planning and mitigating emerging issues. The staff’s independency in performing their work has improved even in the absence of their leader. Nonetheless, the need for standard operating procedures (SOPs), regeneration at staff level and the need for additional board members are frequently mentioned during the interviews. Furthermore, the urge of ensuring that staff participates in capacity building is demanded to the Director.

Score: From 4 to 4.5 (slight improvement)

1.2. Strategic guidance: ‘Leaders provide appropriate strategic guidance (strategic leader and operational leader)’

*This is about the extent to which the leader(s) provide strategic directions*

There has been mission a shift in focus and role of leadership since the baseline. The staff considered these positive changes, and mentioned that leadership has significantly improved. The Director is now focusing on more strategic tasks to the level of responding to organizational issues instead of internal staff conflicts. Instead of responding to staff obstacles in implementing their work, the Director is able to provide strategic direction to the staff whilst allowing them to solve implementation problems on their own. This has allowed for staff to develop their own problem solving capacity and independence. Due to this, the Board has gained more trust in the director and reduced the number of interventions throughout the year. Nevertheless, the board remains involved in the annual review and utilizes it as a place to provide their strategic view and feedback to the program.

Score: From 3 to 4 (improvement)

1.3. Staff turnover: ‘Staff turnover is relatively low’

*This is about staff turnover.*
The staff turnover rate is still as low as during the baseline. There are only four project staff members who completed their project of which three of them are continuing their studies whilst the other one moved to other organisation. The acquisition of an additional funding source from TIFA has allowed for the addition of four new staff members in ASB. The new staff recruitment was also based on specific requirements imposed by TIFA who expected staff with a background in Law. ASB currently has eight staff members of whom six are full time and two are part time employed.

Score: From 4 to 4 (no change)

1.4 Organisational structure: ‘Existence of clear organisational structure reflecting the objectives of the organisation’

This is about leadership within the organisation (operational, strategic). If there is a larger body then you may also want to refer to leadership at a higher level but not located at the local organisation.

ASB has extended their organizational structure. Currently eight staffs has fulfilled the need of human resource. Meanwhile, the clarity in tasks and responsibilities for the individual staff members and divisions has increased, particularly as an effect of increased use of strategic planning for guidance.

Score: From 3 to 4 (improvement)

1.5 Articulated strategies: ‘Strategies are articulated and based on good situation analysis and adequate M&E’

Observable indicator: strategies are well articulated. Situation analysis and monitoring and evaluation are used to inform strategies.

There has only been a slight change in this indicator compared to the baseline situation. ASB has increasingly utilized strategic planning as the approach to communicate and discuss work plans. At the same time, HIVOS still assists ASB in sharpening their strategic directions and plays an important role in using strategic planning as a form of capacity building for ASB.

Score: From 3.5 to 4 (slight improvement)

1.6 Daily operations: ‘Day to day operations are in line with strategic plans’

This is about the extent to which day-to-day operations are aligned with strategic plans.

ASB has continued to use their strategic plan from 2011. With support from HIVOS, ASB has started to develop and use strategic planning and annual work plans to deliver their activities. In practice, staff members have placed the work plan in writing on the writing board so that everybody can see and refer to it on a day to day basis. This has allowed ASB staff to reflect and understand what is happening in the program, assess implementation challenges, and to discuss partnerships and networking issues they may encounter.

Score: From 3 to 3.5 (slight improvement)

1.7 Staff skills: ‘Staff have necessary skills to do their work’

This is about whether staff have the skills necessary to do their work and what skills they might they need.

Overall, senior staff capacity and work performance has increased since the baseline. Their ability to manage and delegate work to junior level staff has had great impact on program implementation. On top of that, an additional funding source from HIVOS has brought further opportunities for capacity building for the staff. Through increased networking and advocacy, staffs have also created external capacity building opportunities for themselves. Director and senior staff have collaborated to facilitate a media analysis in-house training for junior staff in 2011. The media analysis training has led them to distribute result of diversity issue monitoring in a form of book annually.

Nonetheless it was found that additional capacity building is required in particular for the new staff hired in 2013 who had not participated in the training in 2011. The additional training identified in
particular for newly hired staff are media monitoring and advocacy, investigative journalistic and writing skills, general analytical skills and data analysis.

Score: From 2.5 to 3.5 (considerable improvement)

1.8. Training opportunities: ‘Appropriate training opportunities are offered to staff’

This is about whether staff at the SPO are offered appropriate training opportunities.

The new funding sources from HIVOS and TIFA have opened up more training opportunities for ASB in the last two years. HIVOS and TIFA have provided technical training for ASB staffs in order to improve their technical skills in delivering program activities. In addition to that, the ASB director now plays an important role in deciding who will participate in which training. This change has brought about a positive response from the staff who consider and appreciate this change as a fair mechanism. Staff members now consider themselves as having the same opportunities for training and development as their colleagues. Despite this positive development however staff has indicated that there is still room for development. Some staff members indicated they would prefer to see a standardized way of sharing training lessons and experienced amongst colleagues.

Score: From 3 to 4 (improvement)

1.9.1. Incentives: ‘Appropriate incentives are in place to sustain staff motivation’

This is about what makes people want to work here. Incentives could be financial, freedom at work, training opportunities, etc.

According to staff, the most appreciated incentive that ASB offers is its’ family-like working environment. Staff admitted working in ASB feels like being part of a family. They also experienced equality in the working place. Even though nothing changed in terms of remuneration, the increased freedom to manage work independently and the addition of flexible working hours, added to overall staff motivation and stimulated creativity on the job.

Score: From 3 to 3.5 (slight improvement)

1.9.2. Funding sources: ‘Funding from multiple sources covering different time periods’

This is about how diversified the SPOs funding sources are over time, and how the level of funding is changing over time.

ASB has significant improvement to seek and secure their funding. A change in organizational strategy by developing strategic planning has attracted many new donors to fund their activities. For the last two years ASB has received more variety and continuous funding from HIVOS and TIFA (2013-2014), Pelayanan Komunikasi Masyarakat / Community Communication Services (YAKOMA PGI) (2013-2014), Suara Kita/Our Voice (2010-2014), and Persekutuan Gereja-Gereja Indonesia Pusat (PGI Pusat)/Church World Service (CWS) (2013-2014). Funding from CWS was the result of improved organizational networking capacity in ASB which in turn was recommended by PGI.

Score: From 2 to 3.5 (considerable improvement)

1.9.3. Funding procedures: ‘Clear procedures for exploring new funding opportunities’

This is about whether there are clear procedures for getting new funding and staff are aware of these procedures.

With assistance from HIVOS, ASB’s strategic plan has become a reference to seek new funding opportunities. During each call for proposal, the organization’s strategic direction and program focus was discussed at the hand of this document. This assisted ASB in determining whether a proposal or new funding call was in line with their strategic directions, and if it should be accepted or not.
This mechanism has allowed ASB to act more strategically on proposals, initiatives and directions instead of the former responsive attitude. Finally, ASB has also opened themselves up for more information about funding opportunities by increasing their networking and communication activities.

Score: From 2 to 3 (improvement)

Summary of Capability to Act and to Commit

Overall, the capability to act and commit considerably improved since the leader of ASB has changed his leadership style from a one man show to a leader who delegates work well. This change occurred after the strategic planning workshop (sponsored by HIVOS) returned a lot of feedback to the organization’s leadership. Ever since, delegation of tasks has increased, job descriptions have become clearer, more feedback on staff performance has been given and the overall gap between leadership and staff has decreased. With improved strategic guidance and better articulated strategies also the daily activities are now more in line with the strategies.

More opportunities now exist for the staff to take their own responsibilities and staff experiences more independently in their work, particularly amongst senior staff, and this has improved staff to be motivated in their work. Staff turnover has not changed, even though some staff left, the other staff joined in the organization, other people with appropriate skills for the job have been hired. The skill gap between senior staff and leadership has diminished, which has allowed the director to lead with general strategic directions and technical guidelines as opposed to hands-on control.

After ASB has acquired new donor funds (TIFA) in 2013, new and more staff training opportunities become available. Particularly on the field of media monitoring, advocacy, investigative journalistic and writing skills and general analytical thinking and data analysis with further training is required. Similar training has been conducted in 2011, however some new staffs hired in 2013, has not been participated in these type of training yet.

Score: From 3.0 to 3.8 (improvement)

Capability to Adapt and to Self Renew

2.1. M&E application: ‘M&E is effectively applied to assess activities, outputs and outcomes’

This is about what the monitoring and evaluation of the SPO looks at, what type of information they get at and at what level (individual, project, organisational).

ASB is still applying the same M&E approach it used for the last two years. The monthly meetings that were used to do this have now also been used as an activity planning point, which opens up the possibility to directly apply lessons learned. More frequent meetings in the form of staff meetings and the annual evaluation & planning meetings have enabled ASB to capture more input and optimize M&E. ASB continuously compares the work plans with the results and output of activities. Furthermore staff indicated that stakeholder opinions are now included more frequently in M&E activities. ASB has been applied program monitoring through monthly, semester, and annual program report. There appeared to be some improvement in the M&E process in terms of the systematic recording of results in their program. For the accountability at the end of a program, ASB report the financial audit result to a public accountant.

Score: From 3 to 3.5 (slight improvement)

2.2. M&E competencies: ‘Individual competencies for performing M&E functions are in place’

This is about whether the SPO has a trained M&E person; whether other staff have basic understanding of M&E; and whether they know what information to collect, how to process the information, how to make use of the information so as to improve activities etc.

Since the baseline, the responsibility of M&E functions still remains with the director. There is no dedicated person to perform M&E in the organization. Staff indicated that in the last two years at least
two staff members took on this role. One of these included the director, who frequently acts as M&E person due to his M&E experience.

Score : From 2 to 2.5 (slight improvement)

2.3. M&E for future strategies: ‘M&E is effectively applied to assess the effects of delivered products and services (outcomes) for future strategies’

This is about what type of information is used by the SPO to make decisions; whether the information comes from the monitoring and evaluation; and whether M&E info influences strategic planning.

Description of the endline situation:

ASB’s practice to apply M&E for strategic purposes remains the same as during the baseline. Notwithstanding, ASB have no particular M&E staff but ASB has been applied program monitoring through monthly, semester, and annual program report. The evaluation results are used as references for decision making. The annual program evaluation is also used for compiling the strategic planning for the next year. For example, previously monitoring process was done by the staff, but now the media monitoring process involves the beneficiaries. Another example is ASB worked only for case handling but now they also begin to plan the advocacy in the government level.

Score: From 3 to 3 (no change)

2.4. Critical reflection: ‘Management stimulates frequent critical reflection meetings that also deal with learning from mistakes’

This is about whether staff talk formally about what is happening in their programmes; and, if so, how regular these meetings are; and whether staff are comfortable raising issues that are problematic.

Staff has indicated that there is sufficient space to discuss problems or issues. Staffs communicates both informally and formally about what is happening in their programs. Moreover, the director encourages staff to attend informal meetings in order to discuss their concerns. Formally, staffs holds biweekly meetings per project on the one hand, and monthly meetings for all staff on the other.

Score: From 3 to 3.5 (slight improvement)

2.5. Freedom for ideas: ‘Staff feel free to come up with ideas for implementation of objectives’

This is about whether staff feel that ideas they bring for implementation of the programme are welcomed and used.

The ASB director plays an important role in creating a supportive environment for staff to share their ideas. Improving upon the common practices applied since the baseline, staff stated that their director has readjusted his expectations to the staff’s work to be more in line with the challenges faced in the field. Staff also indicated that they felt that their office environment is now more open and accessible to beneficiaries.

Score: From 4 to 4.5 (slight improvement)

2.6. System for tracking environment: ‘The organisation has a system for being in touch with general trends and developments in its operating environment’

This is about whether the SPO knows what is happening in its environment and whether it will affect the organisation.

ASB uses its network to keep track of its environment. They encourage students at universities to be involved in their programs by providing final year student research opportunities to students who want to graduate on issues relevant to ASB’s work. This helps them in staying in touch with state of the art academic developments relating to their work. Furthermore, ASB established the FKK (a Diversity Communication Forum) as part of their networking support. Within this forum they encourage members of their network to assist them by extending their case monitoring in the field.
Score: From 3 to 3.5 (slight improvement)

2.7. Stakeholder responsiveness: ‘The organisation is open and responsive to their stakeholders and the general public’

This is about what mechanisms the SPO has to get input from its stakeholders, and what they do with that input.

Stakeholders and beneficiaries are actively involved in ASB’s strategic planning development. Since the baseline, ASB has actively expanded their network of partner organizations and beneficiaries. Feedback from the network and beneficiaries are taken into account during program planning and the development of strategic plans. The FKK (Diversity Communication Forum) aids in reaching out to beneficiaries.

Score: From 4 to 4.5 (slight improvement)

Summary of Capability to Adapt and To Self Renew

ASB has continued to apply the same M&E approach for the last two years. More frequent meetings in the form of staff meetings and the annual evaluation & planning meetings have enabled ASB to capture more input and optimize M&E. ASB continuously compares the work plans with the results and output of activities. Furthermore staff indicated that stakeholder opinions are now included more frequently in M&E activities. Through regular meetings and annuals reviews a systematic evaluation method is in place which allows for all staff members to provide their input on current projects and general organizational developments. Although the system is in place M&E is still performed by individual staff members, and not a dedicated M&E function. The director continuously plays an important role in this. In terms of the internal culture of critical reflection and sharing of ideas, the atmosphere in ASB is considered to be more open and communication is stimulated. Beneficiaries are able to approach the organization more easily and in general ASB has become more responsive to stakeholders. Overall this capability has improved slightly, mainly due to the greater frequency in meeting and greater role of staff input. Being involved in networks and having students do research at ASB helps them to keep track of what is happening in the environment.

Score: From 3.1 to 3.6 (slight improvement)

Capability to Deliver Development Objective

3.1. Clear operational plans: ‘Organisation has clear operational plans for carrying out projects which all staff fully understand’

This is about whether each project has an operational work plan and budget, and whether staff use it in their day-to-day operations.

The development of ASB’s strategic plan has positively affected the operational plans that were already in place. Day to day and operational activities now align better with the organizational strategy. Staff members now have clear guidelines on how to develop their operational plans to the annual work plan. At staff level, the annual work plan has been printed and placed at the board where they used it as reminder between themselves. Additionally, ASB has tried to develop the simple M&E framework to reflect the result chains.

Score: From 3 to 4 improvement)

3.2. Cost-effective resource use: ‘Operations are based on cost-effective use of its resources’

This is about whether the SPO has the resources to do the work, and whether resources are used cost-effectively.

ASB is still applying their strategy in using their own resources to preserve and avoid unnecessary cost. As noted in the baseline evaluation, ASB has become creative through their concern in spending
funds. ASB also adjusted their operational strategy and organizational decisions to reflect this. In terms of operational strategies, they chose the lowest price and utilized their own property (such as motorbike) in an effort to save on operational costs. ASB will only have to pay the maintenance and gas for the cost incurred for program implementation. ASB also saves costs which are in turn utilized to fund programs which are not directly supported by donors. On the other hand, ASB now carefully selects which staff to be assigned for external or internal events such as seminars or workshops. In addition to that, the cooperation with universities also reduced operational cost due to the use of university locations for venues.

Score: From 3.5 to 4 (slight improvement)

3.3. Delivering planned outputs: ‘Extent to which planned outputs are delivered’

This is about whether the SPO is able to carry out the operational plans.

There is a slight improvement in this indicator. ASB delivers planned outputs in a timely manner, even with its limited resources. They are able to carry out their operational plans by involving volunteers and their network. Besides that, ASB has received increased support, not only from their network, but also from getting additional funds from TIFA which enabled more flexibility in implementing their programs. Previously ASB had to get funds before implementing

Score: From 3.5 to 4 (slight improvement)

3.4. Mechanisms for beneficiary needs: ‘The organisation has mechanisms in place to verify that services meet beneficiary needs’

This is about how the SPO knows that their services are meeting beneficiary needs

The strategy to establish the FKK (Diversity and Communication Forum) has been proven to be a successful mechanism to meet beneficiary needs. It channels the two way communication between ASB, stakeholders, and beneficiaries to check and balance their support to the community. The forum has also proven to be a good response to the baseline assessment, as it significantly changed their approach in how to work with beneficiaries.

Score: From 4 to 4.5 (slight improvement)

3.5. Monitoring efficiency: ‘The organisation monitors its efficiency by linking outputs and related inputs (input-output ratio’s)’

This is about how the SPO knows they are efficient or not in their work.

ASB always evaluate the progress of each project biweekly and monthly. Beside, the input from stakeholders becomes one of the tools to evaluate their work efficiency. There is no particular monitoring to examine the relation between output (result) and input (fund and time)

Score: From 3 to 3.5 (slight improvement)

3.6. Balancing quality-efficiency: ‘The organisation aims at balancing efficiency requirements with the quality of its work’

This is about how the SPO ensures quality work with the resources available

ASB ensures their working quality by examine the achievement of the biweekly work plan and examine their project timeline. Biweekly work plan is derived from monthly work plan while the monthly work plan is derived from the annual work plan. Each project has progress implementation evaluation in biweekly meeting. We can see from the project timeline that there are some works have not conducted yet; such as dissemination through road show for regency and municipality that establishes intolerance and discriminative policies. This work should be done in the first semester of 2014 but has not conducted yet.

Score: From 3 to 3.5 (slight improvement)
Summary of Capability to Deliver Development Objective

The capability to deliver on development objectives has slightly improved mainly due to the fact that ASB has more clear operational plans and gives opportunity to the staff to align their activities to their organization’s strategic level. Even though ASB has acquired more donor funds, they are more creative in terms of using their resources cost effectively. This care is displayed for instance in how staff is now more carefully selected for attending external or internal events, and also through coordinating events with universities to reduce operational costs for venues. The saved costs are in turn utilized to fund programs which are not directly supported by donors. There is no formal system in place to assess beneficiary needs, but through the established FKK (Diversity and Communication Forum), beneficiary and stakeholder needs could be checked and balanced. Although there is no formal system to compare inputs with outputs but they have regular meetings to help them assessing the work progress as a part of work efficiency assessment.

Score: From 3.3 to 3.9 (slight improvement)

Capability to Relate

4.1. Stakeholder engagement in policies and strategies: ‘The organisation maintains relations/collaboration/alliances with its stakeholders for the benefit of the organisation’

This is about whether the SPO engages external groups in developing their policies and strategies, and how.

ASB still uses the same method in engaging the beneficiaries and stakeholders to sharpen their strategies. ASB engages external groups in developing their policies and strategies. For the evaluation & planning meeting and strategic planning meeting, ASB invites more various stakeholders, beneficiaries and partners to participate in discussions about the programs. The stakeholders that ASB is involved with are local partners, national organizations and international NGOs, and also specific target groups. Their input influences next years’ work plan.

Score: From 4 to 4.25 (very slight improvement)

4.2. Engagement in networks: ‘Extent to which the organisation has relationships with existing networks/alliances/partnerships’

This is about what networks/alliances/partnerships the SPO engages with and why; with they are local or international; and what they do together, and how do they do it.

ASB has intensified its networks locally, nationally and internationally with respect to baseline situation two years ago. ASB has expanded their network with stakeholders such as KIPAS, HKTP (Violence Against wWmen) networks, KBB, ILRC (Indonesia Legal Resource Center), Wahid Institute, AMAN, ILRC, Sejuk (Serikat Jurnalis Untuk Perdamaian), YIPC (Young Interfaith Pluralism Community), and media network such as Tribun Medan, Sindo, and Radio Suara Berkah Sidikalang. ASB has also established new partnerships with universities such as USU, UNIMED and IMKRIS. As a result of that, over the last two years ASB has established a support system to promote pluralism and diversity issues among the university students, which has strengthened ASB in their bargaining position within the others network such as university, religious institution, and improve access to the organizations within the network. In addition to that, ASB engagement gained more funding from national networks.

Score: From 4 to 4.75 (improvement)

4.3. Engagement with target groups: ‘The organisation performs frequent visits to their target groups/beneficiaries in their living environment’

This is about how and when the SPO meets with target groups.

The establishment of the FKK (Diversity Communication Forum) has strengthened ASB’s approach in engaging target groups. FKK has assisted to intensify the communication with target groups and
increase their level of trust. In addition to that, ASB has facilitated the relationship between the victims to become closer. 

Score: From 3 to 3.5 (slight improvement)

4.4. Relationships within organisation: ‘Organisational structure and culture facilitates open internal contacts, communication, and decision-making’

*How do staff at the SPO communicate internally? Are people free to talk to whomever they need to talk to? When and at what forum? What are the internal mechanisms for sharing information and building relationships?*

The organizational culture has improved slightly since the baseline. Relationships are considered more open and equal, since director has delegated more tasks and roles and responsibilities are more clear. The staff is free to talk to whomever they want to talk to. Previously, most of the decisions were taken by the director, but currently decisions are made in cooperation with staff members. This occurred for instance in determining the theme for a live talk show on radio.

Score: From 3.5 to 4 (slight improvement)

**Summary Capability to Relate**

The capability to relate has slightly improved mainly due to having an extended networks on local, national and even in the international level. ASB has also established new partnerships with universities which resulted in the establishment of a support system for the handling of legal cases. Collaboration with universities and being involved in the FKK network has also improved relationships with beneficiaries. In relation to the improved supporting system for handling cases, ASB’s bargaining position in the networks has increased, which has led to opportunities for new collaborations and funding. Internally, relationships have improved due to having a director who often invites the staff to have dinner and watching movies after hours.

Score: From 3.6 to 4.1 (slight improvement)

**Capability to Achieve Coherence**

5.1. Revisiting vision, mission: ‘Vision, mission and strategies regularly discussed in the organisation’

*This is about whether there is a vision, mission and strategies; how often staff discuss/revise vision, mission and strategies; and who is involved in this.*

The vision and mission of ASB have not changed since the baseline but with the support of HIVOS, ASB has focus more on the pluralism and religion diversity issues and the strategic planning has improved in the organisation over the last two years.

Score: From 4 to 4 (no change)

5.2. Operational guidelines: ‘Operational guidelines (technical, admin, HRM) are in place and used and supported by the management’

*This is about whether there are operational guidelines, which operational guidelines exist; and how they are used.*

In February 2014, ASB started to discuss the idea of developing standard operating procedures for all divisions. The discussion was held during the general staff meeting which was attended by all of the board and director. The result in this meeting was only a guideline to develop those SOPs, but, it is uncertain if, when and how the idea will be further developed.

Score: From 2 to 2.5 (slight improvement)
5.3. Alignment with vision, mission: ‘Projects, strategies and associated operations are in line with the vision and mission of the organisation’

This is about whether the operations and strategies are line with the vision/mission of the SPO.

ASB still operates based on the same vision and mission. They also implement their activities in accordance with their core mandate which aligns program, strategies and implementation on the field. This process has been strengthened with the support from HIVOS to develop a strategic plan and annual work plan.

Score: From 4 to 4 (no change)

5.4. Mutually supportive efforts: ‘The portfolio of project (activities) provides opportunities for mutually supportive efforts’

This is about whether the efforts in one project complement/support efforts in other projects.

ASB project activities still have the same support to other activities or program implementation and provided opportunity for mutual supportive efforts, for example case handling is supported by the counselling training for staff and beneficiaries (in pluralism victim) therefore the staff can understand the beneficiaries’ feeling and know how to respond them.

Score: From 4 to 4 (no change)

Summary Capability to Achieve Coherence

Even though there is no formal discussion about vision and mission, ASB still operate based on the same vision and mission. However, with the help of HIVOS, the strategic planning process has taken place, which is also helped develop implementation plans in line with the strategies. Generally, program, strategies and activities are in line with the vision and mission of the organization. Project activities are still complimentary as in the baseline such as program from HIVOS for case handling while program from TIFA for counseling training. Counseling training completed the case handling activities as when handling some cases, it is needed skill to be a good listener or a good counselor.

Score: From 3.5 to 3.6 (very minor improvement)
Results - key changes in organisational capacity - general causal map

Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (ASB) General Causal Map
Narrative of Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (ASB) General Causal Map

The evaluation team carried out an endline assessment at Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (ASB) from 16 July 2014 to 18 July 2014. During this workshop, the team made a recap of key features of the organisation in the baseline in September 2012 (such as vision, mission, strategies, clients, partnerships). This was the basis for discussing changes that had happened to the organisation since the baseline. The three main changes that happened in the organisation since the baseline, as identified by the staff during the endline workshop were:

1. Being more recognized as an organization working on pluralism issues [1].
2. The provision of health insurance (BPJS) linked to investments [2].
3. Increased job security, with through more permanent staff contracts [3]

The first is the most important change in the organization. Each of these changes and how these have come about is explained more in detail below. Numbers in the narrative correspond to numbers in the visual.

4. Both these latter changes were achieved through better staff welfare [8]

Being more recognized as an organization focusing on pluralism issues [1].

According to ASB staff present at the end line workshop, the main change that has taken place in the organization since the baseline in 2012 is being more recognized as an organization working on pluralism issues [1]. ASB has become the benchmark for both private and public organizations working in the field of pluralism in North Sumatra. In general it can be concluded that the strategic planning session organized by HIVOS in October 2013 has played an important underlying factor in realizing the abovementioned key change in the organization.

The greater recognition of ASB in terms of pluralism issues was the result of:

1. Improved staff capacity to implement programs [4]
2. Increased trust from stakeholders [5]

Each of these factors is explained below:

First of all improved staff capacity to implement programs came about from five developments, each of which are listed here. First, staff became more confident in implementing program activities [6]. Second, better staff welfare resulted in a more productive and motivated workforce [8]. Third, three new staff members were added to the organization in the fields of advocacy, monitoring and finance that did not yet exist before the baseline in 2012 [9]. Fourth, better office infrastructure allowed staff to work more efficiently [10]. Staff used to work with limited office support facilities, but with the addition of voice recorders, laptops, projectors and a stable internet connection, communication was greatly enhanced. Finally, fifth, an overall increase in program activities increased the speed at which staff learned about program implementation [11]. Each of these areas is further explained below.

Greater confidence amongst staff in implementing their program activities [6] came largely about from a greater number of opportunities for staff to participate in training and capacity building activities [7]. These opportunities were created by the board, who soon came to recognize the (importance of) staff capacity [13] because staff operated with greater autonomy on the one hand [17] whilst communicating results in more frequent internal meetings to discuss issues on the other [18].

Staff was enabled with greater autonomy through more opportunities to manage programs independently [21]. This was the direct result of more and more work being delegated from management to senior and junior staff [24], one of the key decisions that came about in the change in leadership style that occurred [33].

The increase in meeting frequently [18] came about from an overall increase in awareness amongst staff for the need of operational performance [29]. This was carefully communicated by the new leadership in place [33]. The change in leadership style was an important change as a result of the strategic planning session funded by HIVOS in 2013 [38].

The other four factors that affected improved staff capacity (better welfare) [8], new staff additions [9], better office infrastructure [10], and more program activities [11]) all resulted from the addition of funds enabled by acquiring the TIFA foundation as a new sponsor [14]. This was enabled shifting
the policy of single funders to achieve greater diversity of funding sources [19]. ASB was able to shift towards this new paradigm—from single funders to the greater variety of funding sources—through increased confidence of donors and stakeholders [22], which in turn occurred as a result of three factors:

1. An increased capacity and confidence amongst staff to develop proposals and present these to donors [25] therefore getting in touch with more potential funding candidates;
2. More transparent financial statements and accountable reporting through the website [26];
3. Improved quality of service delivery [27].

The first of these factors resulted from increased awareness amongst the staff regarding operational performance [29]. Simply put, with greater awareness the overall sense for the need to proactively engage with stakeholders came about amongst staff. In addition to this, a clearer programmatic guidance to propose for funding [30] significantly increased both capacity and confidence of staff to propose to donors. The guidance resulted from a strategic planning paper [34] written as a result from the HIVOS funded strategic planning workshop in 2013 [38].

The second factor, greater transparency in financial statements and accounting resulted from an overall improvement in operational financial management [31]. This improvement can be attributed to the BITRA financial management training which was performed in 2011 on the one hand [39], and the review and revision of standard operating procedures on finance sponsored by HIVOS in 2013 on the other [40].

The third factor, improved quality of service delivery resulted from the lower cost to handle case work and an increase in overall efficiency in doing so [32]. The greater support from stakeholders and partner organizations [35] through increased cooperation with religious and faith based leaders [36] was the main reason for this. Overall, this support came about through the increased awareness in partner networks about ASB’s ambition to introduce pluralism issues to the public [37], which in turn was identified in the strategic planning workshop in 2013 [38].

Prior to 2012, the network of the organization was limited only to certain religious leaders among which were Protestant and Parmalim (local religion) religious leaders. From 2012 onwards, ASB expanded their network to universities (Universitas Sumatera Utara), journalists, local NGOs, and religious leaders from other religions such as Matakin (local religion), Hinduism, Bahai, Konghucu, and Advent Protestant. ASB also started working with religious-based organizations such as Majelis Kelenteng Konghucu Indonesia (MKKI), Majelis Budhayana Indonesia (MBI) and Persatuan Hindhu Darma Indonesia).

All of the above has explained how ASB’s improved staff capacity to implement programs has come about [4]. But there is a second factor which has influenced the key change of ASB being recognized as an organization focusing on pluralism issues: the increased trust from stakeholders in ASB [5]. This came about from a wide public acknowledgement of ASB, and what they are doing [12]. On the one hand this occurred through an improved acceptance of ASB by its stakeholders through ASB’s improved quality of service delivery [27]. On the other hand, the public itself became more and more aware of ASB and their objectives through the various seminars, workshops and other events organized by the organization [16]. ASB staff members got more and more public interest to attend such events through the increased documentation and publication of their work [20]. This practice was enabled by cooperating with various academics and journalists on publications [23], but largely founded on the increased capacity of the staff members to communicate results [28]. The latter greatly benefited from a writing course sponsored by KIPAS in 2012 [41], and a workshop on investigative journalistic writing sponsored by YAKOMA PGI in 2011 [42].

Since 2013, ASB has maintained an agreement with the local university by providing a scholarship program to college students to write their thesis on pluralism issues. In addition to that, academic publishing and public publishing with the help of university experts has increased. The ties to the academic and media networks have significantly increased the organization’s visibility to become the leading organization for pluralism issues.
Appendix 5  Results - attribution of changes in organisational capacity - detailed causal maps
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Narrative Key Outcome C.1.1 Capacity to manage organisation
Note: for each country about 50% of the SPOs has been chosen to be involved in process tracing, which is the main approach chosen to address evaluation question 2. For more information please also see chapter 3 on methodological approach. For each of these SPOs the focus has been on the capability to act and commit and the capability to adapt and self-renew, since these were the most commonly addressed capabilities when planning MFS II supported capacity development interventions for the SPO.

For each of the MFS II supported capacity development interventions - under these two capabilities - an outcome area has been identified, describing a particular change in terms of organizational capacity of the SPO. Process tracing has been carried out for each outcome area. The following outcome areas have been identified under the capability to act and commit and the capability to adapt and self-renew.

In the capability to act and commit the following outcome area has been identified, based on document review and discussions with SPO and CFA: ‘improved capacity to manage the organization’.

In the capability to adapt and self-renew the following outcome area has been identified, based on document review and discussions with SPO and CFA: ‘improved staff capacity to communicate results on diversity issues’

Below you will find a description of the ‘improved capacity to manage the organization’ and how this has come about. According to staff present at the (process tracing) endline Process Tracing Minutes Meeting the improved capacity to manage the organization is mainly due to: Improved senior staff capacity [2] (Annex L, M, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting) Better planning, organized and documented work [3] (Annex, D, E, L, M)

Both of these factors are further described explained below. The numbers in the visual correspond with the numbers in the narrative.

**Improved senior staff capacity [1]**

First of all the improved ability to manage the organization came about from an improvement in senior staff’s capacity. This was validated by both internal and external stakeholders [1] (Annex D, E, L, M, and Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). The greater capacity of senior staff resulted from greater opportunity for senior staff to manage the program [4] (Annex A, D, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). This in turn came about from an ability to work more independently without having to wait for leadership instructions [5] (Annex A, D, L, M, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). The statement was echoed by senior program staff during the end line Process Tracing Minutes Meeting. The Director said that currently they have more opportunity to work independently including making decisions. Further, more staff has been better recognized by the partners of the organization, not only by the Director.

Staff members indicated during the end line Process Tracing Minutes Meeting (Annex D, E, M, L, P, and Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting) that the greater independence in their work resulted from two occurrences: sharing knowledge by leadership with senior staff, and by senior staff with junior staff [7] on the one hand, and clearer job descriptions on the other. The two paragraphs below describe each occurrence.

First of all, a of knowledge took place by leadership with staff members [7] (Annex A, L, M, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). This was enabled by the willingness of the organization to expand and improve their organization [20] (Annex A, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting) and more frequent meetings at the organizational level [17] (Annex A, D, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). In the baseline, the regular meetings between staff and the Director were conducted monthly, while in the end line, they stated that they have had bi-weekly meetings in addition to monthly meetings.

Both these factors resulted from a change in leadership style [22] (Annex D, E, L, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). Some staff said that previously the Director tended to be “one man show” and did not really provide great autonomy to staff. However, based on the Director’s opinion, the narrowed autonomy he provided to staff was by intention. The Director wanted to do stepwise delegation due to the great competency gap among leader, senior and junior staff. The leadership style was significantly changed as a result of the strategic planning supported by HIVOS in
One of the agenda points in the strategic planning Process Tracing Minutes Meeting was to reflect and evaluate the leadership style of the current Director as proposed by the Board of the organization. The Board has advised to the Director to give greater autonomy to the staff (Annex A, B, L, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting).

The second development that enabled senior staff to do their work with more indepence was the development of clearer job descriptions for the staff in general [6] (Annex A, D, E, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). Previously in ASB, there was a lot of overlap among staff responsibilities [6] (Annex E,M,L,P, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). One staff member could work on more than one task. The need for a clearer description of work responsibilities for staff members therefore came about for three different reasons. Firstly, staff realized that a better job and task division was required and they realized this during their regular staff meetings [8]. Secondly, there was a new Department for advocacy [10] (Annex A, D, E, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). Thirdly, three new staff members were recruited utilizing the newly acquired TIFA budget [11] (Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting).

These last two factors were derived from the new funding obtained from TIFA in 2013. The success to obtain funding from TIFA came about from the result of strategic planning that was used as a tool to propose new funding [13] (Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting, last revision of proposal to TIFA for period of Jan-Dec 2014.doc).

**Better planning, organized and documented work [3]**

The improved capacity to manage the organization was not only due to improved senior staff capacity, but also to better planning, organized and documented work [3] (Annex, D, E, L, M). Staff stated that this occurred primarily based on the now regular (monthly) development of monthly work plans [12] (Annex L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting), but was also due to having half yearly and annual 'evaluations' [25] (Annex L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting), which specifically supported the documentation of the work being implemented. This monthly meetings, and improved evaluation came about from the having more systematic and well developed annual work plans [14] (Annex E, D, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting, program schedule 2013-2014 to HIVOS.doc), which in turn were enabled by a much greater focus on strategic directions and key issues in diversity, pluralism and minorities in North Sumatra [16] (Annex A, B, E, D, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting). This more specific focus was formulated in a program, as explained in the strategic proposal 2013-2015. This was based on the logical framework that was developed for HIVOS in 2011 [23](Final log frame revisi.doc), as result of the Strategic Planning Process Tracing Minutes Meeting in 2011, which was focused on developing a work plans until 2015 [24] (Annex A, B, L, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting minutes meeting).
Narrative of Key Outcome 3: Improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issue

1. Improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues:
   - Dissemination through Roadshow to the county and the city issued a policy of intolerance and discrimination (Workshop minutes meeting).
   - Procurement media campaigns such as brochures, stickers, calendars, pocket book.

2. Wider network of stakeholders and partners:
   - Increased cooperation with academia (Annex L, M, Workshop minutes meeting).
   - Case collaboration with partners (Annex D, L, M, Workshop minutes meeting).

3. Improved competencies to communicate issues about diversity:
   - ASB Scholarship initiative (Annex L, M, Workshop minutes meeting).
   - Established university agreements (Annex D, L, M).


5. Social media monitoring of policies and discrimination against minority religious groups:

6. Documenting and monitoring policies and discrimination against minority religious groups:
   - Documenting policies and discrimination (Annex M, L, P, Workshop minutes meeting).

7. Documenting policies and monitoring results:

8. Workshops to analyses media monitoring results:
   - Workshops to analyses media monitoring results (program schedule 2013-2015 sent to Hivos).

9. Greater emphasis on networking and publicity:
   - Greater emphasis on networking and publicity (Annex A, L, M, P, Workshop minutes meeting).

10. ASB Scholarship initiative:
    - ASB Scholarship initiative (Annex L, M, Workshop minutes meeting).

11. Writing course to KIPAS (2012):

12. Dissemination through Roadshow:
    - Dissemination through Roadshow to the county and the city issued a policy of intolerance and discrimination (Workshop minutes meeting).

13. Documentation Practices Respecting Diversity in North Sumatra:

14. English course:
    - English course (Annex A, B, C).

15. Workshops to analyses media monitoring results:
    - Workshops to analyses media monitoring results (program schedule 2013-2015 sent to Hivos).

16. Investigative journalistic and writing:

17. English course:
    - English course (Annex A, B, C).

18. Book Distribution Results of Monitoring Results Report:


20. Workshops to analyses media monitoring results:
    - Workshops to analyses media monitoring results (program schedule 2013-2015 sent to Hivos).

21. Documenting policies and monitoring results:

22. Social media monitoring of policies and discrimination against minority religious groups:
    - Social media monitoring of policies and discrimination against minority religious groups (Annex L, M, P, Workshop minutes meeting).

23. Reporting:
    - Reporting CDI.

24. Narrative of Key Outcome 3:
    - Narrative of Key Outcome 3: Improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issue.

25. Aliansi Sumut Bersatu:
    - Aliansi Sumut Bersatu.
Aliansi Sumut Bersatu

Narrative of Key Outcome 3: Improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issue

- ASB is an institution that was founded in 2006 and was officially established in 2009 as association. Initially focused on social pluralism regarding sexual and gender equality issues Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (ASB) has broadened its scope of action since 2010. An example of this is ASB's present project: “Civil and Religious Societies' Participation in Promoting Peace and Diversity in North Sumatra”. This program, which in the framework of MFSII is co-financed by HIVOS, aims at bringing about religious pluralism in North Sumatra. The end line focused on the following key organizational capacity change or key outcome in the capability to adapt and self-renew: improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues [4] (Annex A, D, E, L, M). This came out of document review as well as discussion with staff present at the end line workshop (Annex A, B). Improved capacity to communicate is expected to and already affects communication of results, through the following means:
  - Dissemination through a road show to five ASB area namely Siantar, Aceh Singkil, Binjai, Langkat, and Medan. These areas were targeted to disseminate the result of ASB regular reporting on pluralism and diversity and discussed what possible action can be done to response the report. These five areas have issued a policy of intolerance and discriminatory [1] (Process Tracing Minutes Meeting.)
  - Procurement media campaigns such as: brochures, stickers, calendars and pocket books[2] (Annex D, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting, program schedule 2013-2015 sent to HIVOS.
  - Book Distribution Results of Monitoring Results Report [4]. They did the monitoring of diversity issues and collected the monitoring results in the form of books. As part of ASB's advocacy strategy, ASB disseminated diversity information by distributing the monitoring result books. Process Tracing Minutes Meeting)

Staff’s capacity to communicate results in diversity issues has improved because of the following four reasons:

Each of these factors and their underlying logic is explained below.

Wider network of stakeholders and partners [5]
Aliansi Sumut Bersatu (ASB) has an extensive network including various communities, media, and religious groups. In 2012, ASB expanded their network to academia with various religions such as Konghucu, Islam, Hindu, Budha, Bahai, Ahmadiyah, Parmalin and Advent. Previously, these stakeholders have not been part of ASB. In other words, ASB has wider network of stakeholders and partners [5] (Annex A, D, E, M, R, )

This improved network was realized through increased cooperation with academia [9] (Annex L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting) on the one hand, and case collaboration with partners on the other [10] (Annex D, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting).

Increasing the network with academia was also part of ASB’s strategy to improve the institutions’ efficiency. To strengthen commitment to pluralism, ASB has expanded networking to local, national and international partner organizations.

---
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• At the local level these organizations included: Fitria, Human Rights Study Center, Medan University, and Sumatra Utara University (Annex E, M, P, and Process Tracing Minutes Meeting).
• At the national level these included: Setara Institute, Wahid Institute, ILRC (Indonesian Legal Resource Center), SEJUK, Asean Moslem Action Network (AMAN), PGI (Persekutuan Gereja Indonesia – Indonesian Church Community), and YAKOMA (Annex A, D, E, M, P).
• At the international level these included: Amnesty International and CSW (Christian Solidarity Worldwide) (Annex E, M, L, and Process Tracing Minutes Meeting).

Agreements were made in order to establish relationships with universities [14] (Annex D, L, M, R). The relationship was in the form of providing venues to conduct workshops and seminars related to pluralism issues. One of the program staff said that another reason of the intensified relationships with academia was the provision of scholarships by the organization for university students whose thesis was about pluralism issues [13] (Annex L, M, L, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting) which was used as a strategy to disseminate pluralism issues at the university level.

With respect to handling cases, ASB was supported by some networking and partners. Case collaboration has been affected to the escalation of ASB network and partners – i.e, ASB has stronger collaborative work with the National Commission on Violence Against Women (Komnas Perempuan) in Jakarta when they handle the cases [10] (Annex D, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting).

Case collaboration, scholarship initiative, and agreement with university have been influenced by a greater emphasis networking and publicity [16] (Annex B, D). ASB has a strong commitment regarding pluralism issues.

**Improved competencies to communicate issues about diversity [6]**

The fact that staff have improved their competencies to convey diversity issues [6] (Annex A, L, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting), is the second factor that influenced the improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues [4] (Annex A, D, E, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting). This improvement can be attributed to three factors. The first factor was an English course funded by MFS II [17] (Annex A, B, C) after the partner organization realized that communication needed to be improved. The second factor affecting the improved communication competency was the writing course conducted by KIPAS in 2012. KIPAS has been ASB’s partner since 2009. KIPAS has the same concern as ASB – advocacy strategy through journalism [18] (Annex B, D). The third and last contributing factor was a journalism investigative and writing training which was held by YAKOMA PGI in 2011 [19] (Annex B).

**Documentation practices respecting diversity in North Sumatra [7]**

The third factor relating to the improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues was improved documentation practices regarding diversity in North Sumatra [7] (Annex A, L, M, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting, program schedule 2013-2015 sent to HIVOS). Similarly to the improved competencies to communicate issues about diversity [6] (Annex A, L, R, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting) as described in the previous section, this was the result of the writing course [18] (Annex B, D) and the investigative journalistic writing training [19] (Annex B, Interview questionnaire staff). ASB creates annual reports on media monitoring and documenting cases of intolerance in Aceh and North Sumatra (doc: meeting minutes). The data is used as a reference for media and community and society to reveal the diversity of pluralism in Indonesia.

**Documenting policies and discrimination [8]**

The final factor contributing to the improved capacity to communicate results on diversity issues includes the documenting of policies [8] (Annex B, D). This in turn was affected by two factors. On the one hand, documentation of media monitoring results [11] (Annex E, L, W, program schedule 2013-2015 sent to HIVOS) on the other hand social media monitoring of policies and discrimination against minority religious group [12] (Annex L, M, P, Process Tracing Minutes Meeting, program schedule 2013-2015 sent to HIVOS). ASB has staff that is responsible for monitoring intolerance cases through media and social media (Process Tracing Minutes Meeting). Starting from 2011, the ASB published a book as
a result of the monitoring of the media and social media monitoring, and HIVOS supported this publication (Annex E, L,W, program schedule 2013-2015 sent to HIVOS).

Both the documentation of media monitoring results as well as actively monitoring social media for policies came forward from a workshop to analyze media monitoring results funded by HIVOS in 2013[15] (Annex A,B). This workshop on analyzing media monitoring results came about from the first similar workshop which was conducted in 2011. This 2011 workshop also funded by HIVOS [20] (Annex A, B).
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