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This report describes the findings of the end line assessment of the Ethiopian Rural Self-Help Association (ERSHA) that is a partner of ICCO and IICD under the Connect4Change (C4C) Consortium.

The evaluation was commissioned by NWO-WOTRO, the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research in the Netherlands and is part of the programmatic evaluation of the Co-Financing System - MFS II financed by the Dutch Government, whose overall aim is to strengthen civil society in the South as a building block for structural poverty reduction. Apart from assessing impact on MDGs, the evaluation also assesses the contribution of the Dutch Co-Funding Agencies to strengthen the capacities of their Southern Partners, as well as the contribution of these partners towards building a vibrant civil society arena.

This report assesses ERSHA’s contribution towards strengthening Civil Society in Ethiopia and it used the CIVICUS analytical framework. It is a follow-up of a baseline study conducted in 2012. Key questions that are being answered comprise changes in the five CIVICUS dimensions to which ERSHA contributed; the nature of its contribution; the relevance of the contribution made and an identification of factors that explain ERSHA’s role in civil society strengthening.
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1 Introduction

This report presents the civil society end line findings of the Ethiopian Rural Self-Help Association (ERSHA) which is a partner of ICCO and IICD under the Connect4Change (C4C) consortium. It is a follow-up to the baseline assessment that was carried out in 2012. According to the information provided during the baseline study ERSHA is working on MDG 1, Agriculture.

These findings are part of the overall evaluation of the joint MFS II evaluations to account for results of MFS II-funded or -co-funded development interventions implemented by Dutch CFAs and/or their Southern Partner Organisations (SPO) and to contribute to the improvement of future development interventions. The civil society evaluation uses the CIVICUS framework and seeks to answer the following questions:

- What are the changes in civil society in the 2012-2014 period, with particular focus on the relevant MDGs & themes in the selected country?
- To what degree are the changes identified attributable to the development interventions of the Southern partners of the MFS II consortia (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?
- What is the relevance of these changes?
- What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?

The CIVICUS framework that comprises five dimensions (civic engagement, level of organization, practice of values, perception of impact and contexts influencing agency by civil society in general) has been used to orient the evaluation methodology.

Changes in the civil society arena of the SPO

In the 2012 – 2014 period the two most important changes that took place with regards to the level of organisation and the perception of impact dimension of CIVICUS.

ERSHA’s Farmer Market Organisations (FMOs) became more independent since the baseline. Eight of these, having access to electricity, were equipped with ICT tools to conduct digital transactions, which helped some of them to improve their bargaining position when negotiating with traders and gain more trust of their members. In the meanwhile they became a member of the Oromia Cooperatives Association. More women are said to take leadership positions in the FMOs, and female membership increased slightly from 27 % since the baseline to 27-30 %.

The union, endorsed by the government, managed to diversify its financial resource base. In the meanwhile it adhered to the Federation of Oromia Cooperative Unions.

ERSHA itself became a member of the East African Food Security Network of ICCO partners and engaged with their Kenya partners on ICT.

With regards to perception of impact, in particular the relations with the woreda administration are constructive: both the administration, the FMOs, the Union and ERSHA together explore how they can access potential market chains. Apart from this the local administration gave a clearance to the 14 MFOs to create their own union: officially only one union per district is allowed, but when the existing union refused the adhesion of the FMOs, these were allowed to create their own union. Additionally ERSHA has worked to link the union to different stakeholders such as the financial sector and to the Federation of Oromia Cooperative unions. In particular the relations with the Bank helped the union to diversify its financial resource base and to do investments that help the further marketing of agricultural produce.

These findings were obtained through an analysis of documents, a workshop and follow-up interviews with ERSHA, and interviews with external resources persons working in civil society organisations that receive support from ERSHA; other civil society organisations with whom ERSHA is collaborating; public
or private sector agents and; external resource persons capable of overlooking the MDG or theme on which ERSHA is concentrating.

**Contribution analysis**

Based upon an analysis of the projects and programmes financed by the Dutch CFAs a selection was made of SPOs to be included in an in-depth process tracing trajectory and those to be included for a quick contribution assessment. ERSHA was selected for a quick assessment.

The first outcome achieved that the evaluation team looked at was the increased capacities of the FMOs to serve their members: at least 6 of the eight FMOs are said to have improved their performance. The most plausible explanation of this outcome consists of both projects implemented by ERSHA and the other members of the C6NGO consortium; an ICCO funded project to create value chains and create FMO and Unions and; the ICT project implemented with IICD and the Connect4Change Alliance. Both together seem to provide a sufficient and necessary explanation of the outcome. The ICT component helps FMO leaders to track their financial situation, to more easily obtain price information to negotiate better prices and to increase relations of trust between FMO members and the management. However the enabling environment provided by the local government is to be seen as a condition to this success.

A second outcome achieved consists of the wider network in which the FMOs and the Union currently engage. These networks have both a business character (access to finance and to markets) and a civil society character (membership of the Federation of Oromia Cooperative unions and of the Oromia Cooperatives Association). Also in this case both project contributed to the outcome.

**Relevance**

Interviews with staff of ERSHA, with external resource persons, with ICCD as well as contextual information helped to assess the relevance of ERSHA’s interventions in terms of; its Theory of Change (ToC) for Civil Society (SC) as designed during the baseline study; the context in which ERSHA is operating; the CS policies of ICCO and IICD.

With regards to the baseline ToC, the interventions and outcomes achieved are relevant because FMOs have been capacitated in terms of skills and knowledge of ICT, but also in taking ownership of their work and forming a union. In terms of the second condition ERSHA has not increased the networking much. This is largely due to the fact that they are already regularly meeting with the C6NGOs network. The largest change in this respect is the effort to form a partnership with Kenya. The area where ERSHA is lacking behind is the organisational development. The issues which were identified during the baseline have not been resolved.

The changes identified helped to increase farmers’ trust in cooperative structures and to make access to markets easier to some extent and therefore are relevant; however their relevance would increase with the availability of a full-fledged market information system. The fact that one FMO, not on the power grid, managed to mobilise contributions from his members as a means to run a generator for electricity is to be interpreted as an indicator of the relevance of ICT as perceived by farmers.

With regards to IICD’s and C4C’s policies the changes are relevant because they contribute to its social innovation policy, in particular with regards to the creation of trust amongst stakeholders and increased connectivity.

**Explaining factors**

The information related to factors that explain the above findings was collected at the same time as the data were gathered for the previous questions. The evaluation team looked at internal factors within ERSHA, the external context in which it operates and the relations between ERSHA and ICCO/IICD.

Most important internal factors that explain the findings consist of a positive level of motivation of staff, but field staff missing the experiences necessary to engage with the private sector.

The most important external factor that explains the findings is that market information available is not always relevant, because only the Ethiopia Commodity Exchange provides regular information only in relation to export commodities. Access to internet facilities is generally low in Ethiopia, as well as having access to electricity; yet with the expansion of the mobile network access will improve over time.
The following chapter briefly describes the political context, the civil society context and the relevant background with regards to MDG 1 that ERSAH is working on. Chapter three provides background information on ERSAH, the relation of its MFS II interventions with the CIVICUS framework and specific information on the contract with ICCO. An evaluation methodology has been developed for the evaluation of the Civil Society component which can be found in appendix 2; however, deviations from this methodology, the choices made with regards to the selection of the outcomes for contribution analysis, as well as difficulties encountered during data collection are to be found in chapter 4. The answers to each of the evaluation questions are being presented in chapter 5, followed by a discussion on the general project design in relation to CS development; an assessment of what elements of the project design may possibly work in other contexts or be implemented by other organisations in chapter 6. Conclusions are presented in chapter 7.
2 Context

This paragraph briefly describes the context ERSHA is working in.

2.1 Political context

The Ethiopian Government has enacted a five year Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP) to implement over the period of 2011-2015. Two of the major objectives of the plan are to maintain at least an average real GDP growth rate of 11%, meet the Millennium Development goals, and expand and ensure the qualities of education and health services thereby achieving the MDGs in the social sectors (FDRE, 2010). The government acknowledged that NGOs and CSOs have an important role to play in the implementation of this plan: According to the preamble of the new charities and societies proclamation NO. 621/2009 of Ethiopia, civil society’s role is to help and facilitate in the overall development of the country. This is manifested in the government’s approach of participatory development planning procedures. For example, NGOs established a taskforce under the umbrella of the CCRDA to take part in the formulation of the country’s first Poverty Reduction Strategy paper formulation. They were a major stakeholder in the planning process of the five year GTP plan. Despite fears that the NO. 621/2009 proclamation was thought to have negative impacts on Civil Society, the number of newly registered charities and societies have increased considerably. 800 new charities and civil societies were registered between 2010/11 and 2011/12 and as of February 2012, these were implementing over 113.916 projects in different social, economic and governance related sectors. Governance related projects comprise interventions in the area of democracy and good governance, peace and security, human rights, justice, and capacity building. The charities and societies are most engaged in the health sector (19.8%), followed by child affairs (11.9%), education (9.2%), governance (8.3%) and other social issues (7.8%). These figures are more or less similar to the pre-proclamation period, and would imply that new charities or societies have replaced foreign and Ethiopian charities that are not allowed to work on sectors related to governance and human rights. This might indicate that there might have been some flexibility in the interpretation of some of the provisions of the proclamation.

2.2 Civil Society context

This section describes the civil society context in Ethiopia that is not SPO specific. The socioeconomic, socio-political, and sociocultural context can have marked consequences for civil society, perhaps more significantly at the lower levels of social development. The information used is in line with the information used by CIVICUS.

---

2 February 2009, Charities and Societies Proclamation (proc. no.621/2009), Federal Negarit Gazeta, Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
2.2.1 Socio-economic context

Table 1
Ethiopia’s rank on respectively the Human Development Index, World Bank Voice and Accountability Index and Failed State Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking Body</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Ranking Scale (best – worst possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN Human Development Index</td>
<td>173 (2013)</td>
<td>1 - 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank Voice &amp; Accountability Indicators</td>
<td>12 (2012)</td>
<td>100 - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed State Index</td>
<td>19 (2013)</td>
<td>177 - 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: UNDP, World Bank Governance Indicators, and Fund for Peace

The Human Development Index (HDI) is a summary measure for assessing long-term progress in three basic dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, access to knowledge and a decent standard of living. Ethiopia’s HDI value for 2013 is 0.435— which is in the low human development category—positioning the country at 173 out of 187 countries and territories. Between 2000 and 2013, Ethiopia’s HDI value increased from 0.284 to 0.435, an increase of 53.2 percent or an average annual increase of about 3.34 percent.

An alternative non-monetary measure of poverty and well-being is the Basic Capabilities Index (BCI). This index is based on key human capabilities that are indispensable for survival and human dignity. Ethiopia falls with a BCI of 58 in the critical BCI category, which means the country faces major obstacles to achieving well-being for the population. 10% of children born alive do not grow to be five years old, only 6 % of women are attended by skilled health personnel and only 33% of school age children are enrolled in education and attain five years of schooling.

Ethiopia scores relatively low on the Social and Economic Rights Fulfilment Index (SERF Index). In 2012 Ethiopia is only protecting 58.10% of all its social and economic rights feasible given its resources, and the situation has worsened between 2010 and 2012. Especially the right to food and the right to housing remain problematic.

The Transparency International’s Global Corruption Barometer survey shows how 1,000 Ethiopian people assess corruption and bribery in their home country: A low score indicates that a country is perceived as highly corrupt, while a high score indicates that a country is perceived as very clean. Ethiopia has a Corruption Perception Index score of 3.3 out of 10 in 2014, which places the country on position 110 out of 174 countries. Survey participants were furthermore asked to rate their perceptions of corruption within major institutions in their home country on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being most corrupt and 1 being least corrupt. With a range of perceived corruption scores from around 2 (military, education and NGO’s) to over 3 (private sector, public officials, and judiciary), most major institutions are perceived as corrupt.

Ethiopia’s economic freedom score in 2014 is 50.0, making its economy the 151st freest out of 174 countries in the 2014 Index. Its 2014 score is 0.6 point higher than in 2013 due to improvements in five of the 10 economic freedoms, including business freedom, labour freedom, and fiscal freedom. Ethiopia

---

5 A long and healthy life is measured by life expectancy. Access to knowledge is measured by: i) mean years of education among the adult population, which is the average number of years of education received in a life-time by people aged 25 years and older; and ii) expected years of schooling for children of school-entry age, which is the total number of years of schooling a child of school-entry age can expect to receive if prevailing patterns of age-specific enrolment rates stay the same throughout the child’s life. Standard of living is measured by Gross National Income (GNI) per capita expressed in constant 2011 international dollars converted using purchasing power parity (PPP) rates.
8 http://www.transparency.org/country/#ETH
9 http://www.transparency.org/gcb2013/country/?country=ethiopia
is ranked 35th out of 46 countries in the Sub-Saharan Africa region, and its overall score continues to be below the regional average.\textsuperscript{10}

2.2.2 Socio-political context

In February 2009, the Government adopted the NO. 621/2009 Proclamation which is Ethiopia’s first comprehensive law governing the registration and regulation of NGOs. This law violates international standards relating to the freedom of association. Notably, the Proclamation restricts NGOs that receive more than 10% of their financing from foreign sources from engaging in essentially all human rights and advocacy activities.

The UN Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Mr. Maina Kiai, has commented that “The enforcement of these provisions has a devastating impact on individuals’ ability to form and operate associations effectively, and has been the subject of serious alarms expressed by several United Nations treaty bodies.” Mr. Kiai went on to recommend that “the Government revise the 2009 CSO law due to its lack of compliance with international norms and standards related to freedom of association, notably with respect to access to funding”.\textsuperscript{11} The Ethiopian Proclamation may effectively silence civil society in Ethiopia by starving NGOs of resources, and thus essentially extinguish their right to expression.\textsuperscript{12}

In November 2011, the Ethiopian Charities and Societies Agency issued the Guideline on Determining the Administrative and Operational Costs of CSOs, which is applicable to all charities and societies (international and domestic). Retroactive to July 2011, when approved by the Agency without any consultation with organizations or donors, the “70/30” regulation limits administrative costs for all charities and societies to a maximum of 30% of their budgets.\textsuperscript{13}

Freedom of assembly and association are guaranteed by the constitution but limited in practice. Organizers of large public meetings must request permission from the authorities 48 hours in advance. Applications by opposition groups are routinely denied. Peaceful demonstrations were held outside mosques in July 2012, but the security forces responded violently, detaining protestors, including several prominent Muslim leaders. A total of 29 Muslims were eventually charged with offences under the antiterrorism law. They were awaiting trial at year’s end.\textsuperscript{14}

Table 2
Ethiopia’s rank on respectively the World Bank Rule of Law Index, Transparency International Perception of Corruption Index and Freedom House’s Ratings of Freedom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking Body</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Ranking Scale (best – worst possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank Rule of Law Index</td>
<td>31 (2012)</td>
<td>100 – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency International perception of corruption index</td>
<td>111 (2013)</td>
<td>1 – 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom House: Freedom in the World</td>
<td>Status: Not Free</td>
<td>Free/Partly Free/Not Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Rights: 6</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Liberties: 6 (2014)</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: World Bank Governance Indicators, Transparency International and Freedom House

Freedom House evaluates the state of freedom in 195 countries annually. In 2014, Ethiopia scored a 6 on both the political rights and civil liberties ratings, indicating that the country is neither politically free

\textsuperscript{10} http://www.heritage.org/index/pdf/2014/countries/ethiopia.pdf
\textsuperscript{11} See UN Human Rights Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Maina Kiai, April 24, 2013.
\textsuperscript{12} http://www.icnl.org/research/monitor/ethiopia.html
\textsuperscript{13} Idem
\textsuperscript{14} Idem
nor performing on protecting civil rights. Its total aggregate scores from the Freedom House Index decreased with 15 points in the 2008-2012 period.

The media are dominated by state-owned broadcasters and government-oriented newspapers. One of the few independent papers in the capital, Addis Neger, closed in 2009, claiming harassment by the authorities. Privately-owned papers tend to steer clear of political issues and have low circulations. A 2008 media law criminalizes defamation and allows prosecutors to seize material before publication in the name of national security.

Trade union rights are tightly restricted. All unions must be registered, and the government retains the authority to cancel registration. Two-thirds of union members belong to organizations affiliated with the Confederation of Ethiopian Trade Unions, which is under government influence. Independent unions face harassment. There has not been a legal strike since 1993.

Women are relatively well represented in Parliament, having won 152 seats in the lower house in the 2010 elections. Legislation protects women’s rights, but they are routinely violated in practice. Enforcement of the law against rape and domestic abuse is patchy, with cases routinely stalling in the courts. Forced child labour is a significant problem, particularly in the agricultural sector. Same-sex sexual activity is prohibited by law and punishable with imprisonment.

2.2.3 Socio-cultural context

The World Values Survey Wave 2005-2009 asked 1500 Ethiopians the question: “Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?” Out of 1500 respondents, only 21.4% stated that most people can be trusted. 66.2% indicated they needed to be very careful. Additionally, only 36.1% of the respondents mentioned ‘tolerance and respect for other people’ as a quality that needs to be encouraged to learn children at home. 74% of the respondents think that churches are giving adequate answers to people’s spiritual needs.

2.3 Civil Society context issues with regards to the MDG

ERSHA is a member of a consortium of six NGOs which is working on market access strategies for poverty alleviation of small-scale farmers. As part of the consortium, ERSHA has been supporting and strengthening farmers marketing organizations (FMOs) as well as forming and strengthening unions of FMOs. The activity includes linking FMOs and unions with chain actors, introducing of new high value crops, and integrating ICT to the FMOs and unions activity. It aims at increasing agricultural production, increasing household income, and enhancing the capacity of the target community.

ICT can play a crucial role in benefiting the resource-strapped farmers with up to date knowledge and information on agricultural technologies, best practices, markets, price trends, and weather conditions. The experiences of most countries indicate that rapid development of ICT, which facilitates the flow of data and information, has tremendously enhanced the knowledge management practice in agriculture. However, in Ethiopia the use of ICT for the accumulation and dissemination of knowledge and information is still low. The major challenges inhibiting the use of ICT in disseminating agricultural knowledge and information primarily is the availability of relevant information and the low access level of access to ICT infrastructure and services.

16 http://www.freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/FIW%202013%20Booklet.pdf
18 Idem
19 Idem
20 Idem
21 Idem
Thus, the low level of ICT infrastructure in Ethiopia is believed to have hindered the agriculture sector from realizing its potential. It has inhibited the effectiveness of farmers training centres that are available at Kebele (i.e., the lowest administrative unit) level. The centres aim at closely supporting smallholder farmers in creating and delivering agricultural knowledge to increase productivity and production and to enhance efficiency. But, in most places, these training centres are not connected to modern ICT infrastructure and services. As a result, research-extension-farmer linkages are weak and costly as such linkages have to be fostered through physical contact such as training, field demonstration, field day program and visits. The low level of access to ICT infrastructure is also believed to have slowed the sharing and exchange of knowledge and information generated from research centres at national and regional levels. The contribution of access to ICT also includes the benefit of obtaining production and market information that help farmers sell their produce at the right price, moment and places. It also improves competitiveness of the actors involved through adding efficiency and effectiveness. But the fact that access to ICT service is low has limited the performance of farmers and the cooperatives they created.
3 Description of ERSHA and its contribution to civil society/policy changes

3.1 Background of ERSHA

**History**

Ethiopian Rural Self Help Association (ERSHA), is a national, Non-Governmental, not for profit development organization (NGO), registered under the Federal Ministry of Justice in October 1997 and has operational agreement with the Federal Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Commission (DPPC) and project agreements with different concerned Regional Bureaux.

ERSHA started its operations in January 1998 and implements projects in different parts of rural Ethiopia. The organization is involved in the implementation of rural development programs and is governed by a Board of Directors and a General Assembly.

**Vision and mission:**

Vision: To see a poverty free Ethiopia where men and women equally enjoy dignified life

Mission: ERSHA aims to support the rural community with special emphasis on the poor households in their efforts to attain food security by implementing gender sensitive and sustainable development programs, through active participation of stakeholders.

**Main strategic actions:**

ERSHA supports gender equality promotion, HIV/AIDS mitigation, natural resource development and environmental protection and indigenous capacity efforts as cross cutting development themes.

The values of ERSHA include solidarity with the poor and marginalized people, justice and equality, respect for the rights of women and children, integrity and partnership.

3.1 MFS II interventions related to Civil Society

ERSHA is one of the members of the Consortium of six NGOs (C6NGOs) that implement the ‘Integration of ICT in Agricultural Commodity Value Chain’ project with support of ICCO and the Connect for Change Alliance. Other members of C6NGOs are ADAA, CDI, ERSHA, FC, HUNDEE and OSRA.

The C6NGOs are responsible for the implementation of two projects with the support of the ICCO. One project focuses on organizational support for FMOs and their Unions for which ICCO is the responsible Dutch NGO and which is part of the ICCO alliance (see Report MFSII Joint Evaluation C7), while the above mentioned ICT project is being implemented under the responsibility of IICD as a member of the Connect for Change Alliance. This last project consists of the provision of ICT infrastructure for the involved FMOs, their Unions and the NGOs supporting these farmers’ organizations."

ERSHA’s project sites for the two projects are West Shoa, Ambo area - Gosu (100 km from Addis Ababa) and Altufa (106 km from Addis Ababa). It will reach 14 out of 115 Farmers Marketing Organisations,

---
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1400 – 1800 farm households (11% of all households), and 2700 indirect beneficiaries (11 %) of the entire project implemented by C6NGOs. ERSAH’s general operations in Ambo have ended by September 2014 except the ICT activities as reported by the former program manager Mr. Olika Belachew on 25.10.2014.

The main interventions of the ICT project consist of capacitating Farmers Market Organisations (FMOs) and their members and the established unions in the area of ICT. This should improve their access to market information and would ultimately improve their efficiency and professional work.

3.2 Basic information

Table 3: basic information on ERSAH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of SPO</th>
<th>Ethiopian Rural Self Help Association (ERSHA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consortium and CFA</td>
<td>ICCO/IICD Connect4Change (C4C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Integration of information and communication technologies on agriculture value chain commodities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG/theme on which the CS evaluation focuses</td>
<td>1 – Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start date of cooperation between the CFA and the SPO</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other donors if applicable</td>
<td>Not specified by documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracts signed in the MFS II period</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th># months</th>
<th>Total budget</th>
<th>Estimation of % for Civil Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Phase of the project</td>
<td>September 2011 - 2013</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>€525,000 Euro for C6NGOs, of which €81,900 earmarked for ERSAH.</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: project documents
4 Data collection and analytical approach

The data collection aimed at answering the question of change was conducted as planned. All relevant information were collected through discussion and document review from the SPO’s head office in Addis Ababa as well as from various stakeholders in the field located in Guder. The field visit has not required methodological adjustments of any kind.

The two impact outcome orientations chosen for the evaluation were strengthening intermediate organizations (IO) and networking. Three management members including the executive manager have been consulted at the head office level and the filed officer, the Woreda cooperation officer, the union leader and FMO leaders are consulted at the field level.

Both, the management staff and the field staff confirmed that ERSHA is contributing a lot to change the livelihood of the farmers by strengthening the farmer organizations. A continuous training, financial and material supply with the associated follow up is ERSHA’s model of change. Similarly, respondents confirm that ERSHA’s effort in creating a better networking is becoming fruitful.

In this data collection, we observed that the project coordinator is no longer in his position and we face a minor challenge in collecting some hard copy documentations. But, the other project staffs located in the project site were very cooperative and facilitated the data collection activity effective.
5 Results

5.1 Results obtained in relation to project logframe

The planned outputs and outcomes for the project ‘integration of ICT in Agricultural Commodity Value Chain’ are focused on the C6NGOs network. ERSHA’s work is mainly based in Gosu and Altufa, and plans to reach 14 out of 115 Farmer Markets Organisations (FMOs). This leads to a total of 1400-1800 farm households and 2700 indirect beneficiaries reached. Unfortunately it is impossible to check the progress with regards to these numbers as the progress reports do not mention numbers or are inconsistent about them.

Three outputs are being mentioned in the progress reports and proposal. The first output is to ‘establish a management information system at C6NGOs level through the use of ICT and improve networking and collaboration among consortium members and other stakeholders for learning and information sharing’. ERSHA’s contribution to this is to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of 14 FMOs for the promotion of value chain development using ICT. Basically this output can be seen as the foundation for the whole project as most activities are developed to enhance the ICT skills of the C6NGOs members. It was decided that a needs assessment would be done by every member of the consortium, and that staff members would be trained on ICT tools for communication and development, and website development. Progress reports mention that these activities all have been done, but are inconclusive about the number of participants. Also, new ICT tools were bought for the NGOs in order to capacitate them in their work.

The second output, ‘establishing interactive market information system through the use of ICT’, focuses on enhancing competitiveness of FMOs in the decision making process of their member households through accessing relevant and reliable market information. For ERSHA this means that they focus on 14 FMOs and 1075 member households. The main activities for this output are to train FMO leaders on ICT tools, mobile phone use and market information management. Other activities include facilitating training centres and providing FMOs with ICT materials. According to data sheets provided by IICD in 2013 and in 2014, 13718 FMO staff and members (of which 16 percent women) were trained by C6NGOs, however no detailed records were available for ERSHA. Progress reports further mention that the ICT training centre at the Ambo site was established by ERSHA and equipped with materials. Also, 8 of the 14 FMOs were equipped with ICT tools, the six remaining not having access to electricity. A last important step consisted of establishing collaboration between Apposit and C6NGOs in 2013 to discuss data collection for the market information system during the project and in the future. Apposit is a private IT firm which develops software to collect market information. The initial plan was that the Union would collect market information themselves and distribute it to FMOs through this software. However, the software proved to be too expensive for the Union which caused them to doubt the added value of using it. Apposit started collecting market information in Ambo and other places, but neither ERSHA nor the Union were involved in the process and until so far data were not made available.

According to the progress reports made available (those of 2012 and 2013) the following outcomes were reached:

- 5781 (1292 women) small-scale producers and entrepreneurs use ICT to access production and market information;
- More than 1111 farmers (142 women) are receiving wheat market information from Ethiopian Commodity Exchange (ECX) because of skills and experience gained from the project. However, this can only tell the trend of wheat prices rather than national market price information. They also use their computers to write letters to their customers in order to notify them the official grain prices

---
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and the existing stocks. The usage of ICT has simplified the communication systems with their customers. This has saved time, energy and money they spent in communication;

- More than 1265 (231 women) farmers have obtained mobile phone user skill and experiences
- The FMO’s in ERSHA’s target area formed an Union;
- 28% of the FMO’s in ERSHA’s target area graduated after fulfilling all steps and requirements to integrate ICT in the way they are doing business. This is said to have enhanced communication at different levels of the chain using mobile short messages i.e. communication between unions and FMO leaders and between FMO leaders and members. This further improved members’ satisfaction and trade performances;
- FMOs which are exchanging information have increased their turnover rate;
- Most FMOs attracted new members and membership increased by 1142 (7%) with female membership increasing by 580 (11%);

The third and last output is ‘enhanced efficiency and effectiveness of ICT services’. This output focuses on improving household productivity. The planned activities to achieve this are creating awareness on ICT in the community at large, deploying social media for knowledge sharing and discussion, developing audiovisual on improved agricultural technology. The progress reports state that several NGOs (not ERSHA) of the network have collaborated with research centres to develop learning materials whilst ERSHA has created general awareness on ICT usage.

5.2 Changes in civil society in the 2012-2014 period

5.2.1 Civic engagement

Civic engagement describes the formal and informal activities and participation undertaken by individuals to advance shared interests at different levels. Participation within civil society is multi-faceted and encompasses socially-based and politically-based forms of engagement.

ERSHA’s main target group consists of 1400-1800 small-scale households and 2700 indirect beneficiaries. These are divided over 14 Farmer Market Organisations, of which some have formed a union. Unfortunately it does not become clear how many members this union has. The average FMO member is a small scale farmer. Between 27 and 30 per cent of the FMO members are women in 2014, compared to 27 % in 2011. Their participation is promoted in the bylaws of the FMOs. Since the baseline, the number of women taking leadership roles in FMOs has increased, although the total percentage of women has not increased. However, not all FMOs are including more women in their management committees and some are not including marginalised groups as they should be. Women are represented at the consortium level as they are part of the FMO management committee.

The total score for this dimension is +1, and this is mainly due to the increased involvement of women at a leadership level. The total number of women members in FMOs has not increased, although this was already identified as an issue during the baseline. Also, the total number of households and beneficiaries has not increased since the baseline.

Score baseline 2012 on an absolute scale from 0-3: 2
Score end line 2014, relative change on a scale of (-2, +2): 1

5.2.2 Level of organization

This dimension assesses the organisational development, complexity and sophistication of civil society, by looking at the relationships among the actors within the civil society arena.

Like during the baseline, collaboration between ERSHA and the other members of the C6NGOs consortium remained constructive as well as relations with the CCRDA and the Poverty Action Network Ethiopia (PANE). The same applies for ERSHA’s relations with the FMOs and the Union that was formally established in 2012. A new East African Food Security Network with ICCO partners is currently being created and ERSHA engaged with their Kenya partners on ICT.
Since the baseline the FMOs and the union are increasingly taking the responsibility to defend the interests of their members. These structures have become more independent from ERSHA. In the meanwhile ERSHA's financial resource base has deteriorated with two donors ending their partnership.

Score baseline 2012 on an absolute scale from 0-3: 2
Score end line 2014, relative change on a scale of (-2, +2): 1

5.2.3 Practice of Values

Practice of Values refers to the internal practice of values within the civil society arena. Important values that CIVICUS looks at such as transparency, democratic decision making, taking into account diversity that are deemed crucial to gauge not only progressiveness but also the extent to which civil society’s practices are coherent with their ideals.

ERSHA’s executive leader is accountable to the General Assembly and the Board of Directors, which is unchanged since the baseline. During the baseline evaluation it was indicated that these bodies are less frequently informed than the government or donor organisations. Nothing changed in this respect. The FMOs and union leaders indicated that they are being informed by ERSHA about the project and phase out.

The Board of Directors is currently comprises four men and one woman. During the baseline there was no information available about the composition of the Board of Directors. Consequently it is not possible to indicate any change for this indicator. The same applies to the financial auditing, which is still done annually by an external firm. There is no information available on these audits.

Score baseline 2012 on an absolute scale from 0-3: NA
Score end line 2014, relative change on a scale of (-2, +2): 0

5.2.4 Perception of Impact

Perception of Impact assesses the perceived impact of civil society actors on politics and society as a whole as the consequences of collective action. In this, the perception of both civil society actors (internal) as actors outside civil society (outsiders) is taken into account. Specific sub dimensions for this evaluation are the extent to which the SPO has contributed to engage more people in social or political activities, has contributed to strengthening CSOs and their networks, and has influenced public and private sector policies.

Since the baseline FMO members have obtained better access to markets and to market information and became a member of the Oromia Cooperative Association. At the same time the union has diversified its resource base by taking a share in the Oromia Cooperative Bank and built a store and an office. The Union is now better connected to other stakeholders such as the Federation of Oromia Cooperative Unions.

Six of the 8 FMOs that accessed ICT equipment are now able to keep records of transactions made which helps them to set the sales price and with their mobile phones they can reach out to more traders and negotiate better prices. Two of the eight FMOs equipped still have a weak performance.

Relations with the public sector at district level are constructive: together with the district cooperative promotion office, FMOs, the Union and ERSHA address their common concern of market access. Although the regulations in place currently allow the presence of only one union per district, the FMOs obtained the clearance to establish their own union after the one existing union refused their membership.

ERSHA has made attempts to link the FMOs to flour and oil factories, but the organization lacks the necessary capacities at field level to connect the FMO to promising value chains. The organization is currently negotiating with an organization who knows how to supply market information via SMS, but an agreement on the intellectual property rights has not been fulfilled. In the meanwhile the FMOs and the union work with private sector organisations to sell their produce or to buy inputs.

Score baseline 2012 on an absolute scale from 0-3: 1
Score end line 2014, relative change on a scale of (-2, +2): 2
5.2.5 Civil Society Environment

The social, political and economic environment in which civil society operates affects its room for manoeuvre. The civil society context has been described in chapter 3. In this section we describe how ERSHA is coping with that context.

The 2009 Proclamation to Provide for the Registration and Regulation of Charities and Societies (CSP) and the related “70/30” regulation that limits administrative costs for all charities and societies to 30% of their budgets. This has resulted in a delay in the start of the ICT project as new administrative arrangements had to be taken by ICCO.

Also there is a lack of reliable and responsive private sector work in the area of ICT. Market information is not yet fully available and is not always accurate. So far only ECX (Ethiopia Commodity Exchange) provides information on a regular basis, yet this is only from the central trade market in Addis and considers only export commodities.

Score baseline 2012 on an absolute scale from 0-3: 1
Score end line 2014, relative change on a scale of (-2, +2): 0

5.3 To what degree are the changes attributable to the Southern partners?

5.3.1 FMOs have the capacity to serve their members.

According to the interviews, some but not all FMOs improved their services to their members. In the first place this is reflected by the fact that they function according to their bylaws, calling a general assembly two times a year, record transactions which are audited, and using their ICT equipment. FMOs have obtained the trust of their members who in consequence increased their sales volumes through the FMO. In addition, members have started to use improved seed varieties and started to grow cash crops to ensure a better access to markets. On their turn, some of the FMOs are said to have increased their sales volumes considerably, which gives them a better bargaining position on the market. As a member of the union, FMOs have further expanded their services to their members, by means of making available consumer goods.

The integration of the ICT component in the operations of the eight selected FMOs had the following contribution to this outcome: In the first place FMOs started recording their daily transactions in excel, which helped them to easily and effectively track their financial status which also helped in the auditing of each cooperative. In the second place FMO management started to use mobile phones and more easily obtain price information from many traders, also from other towns. This has increased their possibility to compare different traders and to negotiate better prices, implying that their bargaining power has increased. In the third place ICT is said to have helped increase the transparency of the FMO management towards their members and particular with regards to the payment of dividend.

Not all eight FMOs that were equipped with ICT tools improved their performance: two FMOs do not have the educational level, do not show commitment and do not take initiative and have high staff turnover. On the other side another FMO that does not have access to electricity mobilised contributions from its members to use a generator which then helped the FMO to access the ICT tools.

The most plausible explanation for this outcome consists of the technical support provided by ERSHA through both the ICCO alliance Value Chain Program and the ICT program. This is a sufficient and necessary explanation of the outcome. However the enabling environment provided by the local government, meaning Woreda level, is to be seen as a condition to this success.

It has however not been possible to assess exactly what the contribution has been of the ICT introduction and that of the value chain development project. Both interventions need to be seen as a causal package. ICT is mainly being used to improve processes and access to information.
5.3.2 Increased network to access financial services and access to markets

The second outcome achieved consists of the FMOs and the unions having increased their networks which led to improved access to financial services, in particular the Union being linked to the cooperative bank of Oromia in which it took a share and obtained a loan. This loan is said to be used by FMOs to pay their members upon delivery of agricultural produce because the Union transfers a sufficient amount of money to the FMOs as a means to manage their cash flows. Other network outcomes are that more sharing of lessons takes place amongst FMOs of C6NGOs; the Union becoming a member of the Oromia Cooperative federation, and; FMOs being able to sell produce to consumer cooperatives after conflicts had been resolved.

ERSHA’s contribution consisted of facilitating experience sharing, providing technical assistance to the Union to engage with Oromia Cooperative Bank and Oromia cooperatives federation. Those contributions are to be attributed to both projects implemented by ERSHA and the C6NGOs. ERSHA, UNION, Oromia Cooperative bank and Oromia cooperatives federation play an important role. ICT interventions are contributing to this outcome as it helps to improve connectivity. As a result of ICT interventions it becomes possible to access information about stakeholders, but also to share information and documentation. Moreover, the technical assistance provided by ERSHA entailed providing a better membership overview which was a result of ICT interventions. ICT thus helps to connect between organisations, stakeholders, traders etc.

5.4 What is the relevance of these changes?

5.4.1 Relevance of the changes in relation to the Theory of Change of 2012

The ToC of 2012 states that the overall objective of ERSHA is to become an innovative and efficient civil society organisation that serves its clients. There are three conditions to reach this objective: 1) strengthening material and technical capabilities of FMOs and their members, 2) networking and partnership development and 3) strengthening ERSHA’s organisational capacity to meet clients’ and partners’ needs.

The changes achieved as described in paragraph 5.2 show that progress has been made to meet all three conditions.

5.4.2 Relevance of the changes in relation to the context in which ERSHA is operating

The relevance of the changes in relation to the context has two components: that of organising farmers in value chains and supporting these chains with market information systems and ICT for the management of FMOs and Unions.

A differentiation needs to be made between the FMO business oriented cooperative structures and the government supported multi-purpose cooperatives that aim to support consumers and vulnerable households. Past governments have used cooperative structures for their Marxist policies, which in consequence has led to a distrust of farmers in any new cooperative structure. If the FMOs manage to increase the trust of farmers in their services as well as help farmers to sell their produce at a higher price, than the change is very relevant.

ICT services are an important factor in making the agricultural sector efficient. However, in Ethiopia the availability of ICT tools and services is limited. The ICT tools necessary for receiving information are not available everywhere and are difficult to come by. Moreover, the knowledge and skills of farmers in the area of ICT is very limited. ERSHA has worked on improving the knowledge and skills of FMOs in working with ICT tools. This has worked for 6 of the eight FMOs, the two remaining facing difficulties related to amongst others low education levels.

However market information for agricultural commodities is only limited to export crops and the collaboration with Apposit to collect market information for the FMOs and the Unions until so far has not been successful. Although some indications exist that sms-services help farmers and FMOs to collect market information and to improve their bargaining position, the absence of a market information system partially questions the relevance of the ICT project in relation to market access.
The changes identified helped to increase farmers’ trust in cooperative structures and to make access to markets easier to some extent and therefore are relevant; however their relevance would increase with the availability of a full-fledged market information system.

5.4.3 Relevance of the changes in relation to the policies of Connect4Change

IICD’s approach is that of social innovation and their Civil Society policy is that of providing their partners with support and information after having received a request for support. According to IICD ICT has shown to increase the trust between farmers and their FMOs because it helps to increase the transparency of the management of sales which is to be considered as a major contributor to social innovation.

The work of ERSHA has been relevant as the agricultural sector is not very organized when it comes to access to information. In this project IICD trained ERSHA to introduce the ICT in the FMOs and ICCO provided the necessary funding. ERSHA was the leading party to implement it in FMO practices. They have also taken an important role in creating awareness of the importance of this information for the farmers. They have raised awareness to a level where farmers are willing to pay a small price for receiving accurate information which can be used at their farm. They have started to realize that this can improve their livelihood.

5.5 Explaining factors

5.5.1 Internal factors

Despite the fact that ERSHA mentioned in its 2012 ToC that its own organisational performance needed to be addressed, only limited efforts have been taken until so far.

One of the areas that needs further attention – not related to the market information system however – is that staff at field level strengthens its capacities to engage with private sector actors as a means to integrate the FMOs in promising value chains. The staff is highly motivated in this organisation.

5.5.2 External factors

As mentioned above, only market information for export commodities is available in Ethiopia and a market information system to inform the farmers with whom C6NGOs are working and who are delivering on domestic markets is not yet available. Making the ICT tools available is a first step, however the second step of providing the FMOs and farmers with market information did not yet materialise.

The government of Ethiopia is increasingly looking at ICT as an important tool for development. The five year government plan under implementation, called Growth and Transformation Plan, argues that embracing ICT is essential to creating new jobs, new business opportunities, to education and to improving the effectiveness of government administration and service delivery. Nonetheless, it was found out that the Ethiopia’s ICT initiatives have not been taken up by the private sector and therefore reliable statistics are not as easily available as in some other African countries that have been strategically ramping up their local ICT industry (Lixi and Dahan, 2014).24

According to International Telecommunication Union Key Global Telecom Indicators released in 201425, Ethiopia registered improvement in the ICT growth. Nonetheless the performance of Ethiopia remained very low compared to other counties in Africa as well as other developing countries. The following figures show how Ethiopia performed in some of the key indicators:

- Percentage of individuals using internet improved from less than 0.2 in 2004 to about 1.5 percent in 2012,
- Fixed broadband subscription per 100 inhabitants increased to 0.045 in 2012 from 0.005 in 2010,
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• Mobile cellular subscription per 100 inhabitants reached close to 24 from a figure that was well below 5 in 2008. As a result mobile subscription surpassed 23 million.

The International Telecommunication Union classified Ethiopia as one of the least performing in terms of ICT Development Index (IDI), which measures the level of ICT advancement in 166 countries by combining 11 indicators that focus on three areas – ICT access, ICT use and ICT skills. The result showed that Ethiopia stood 162 both in 2012 and 2013. The four countries that performed less than Ethiopia in both years were Eritrea, Chad, Niger, and Central African Republic. Price and affordability of ICT services is one of the challenges that is affecting access to the services in Ethiopia. If we take the cost of an entry-level fixed-broadband subscription as an example the performance was that in 2012 it cost Ethiopia USD 23.70 to access fixed broadband internet (ITU, 2013). The cost was higher than what several countries charged for the same service. In addition, the cost in Ethiopia was one of the most expensive in terms of gross national income per capita which amounted to 71 percent. As a result Ethiopia ranked as 18th most expensive country out of 169 countries in total.

This ICT context explains the difficulties that the C6NGOs have in negotiating the provision of market information with ICT businesses like Apposit.

5.5.3 Relations CFA-SPO

In September 2014 the field office of ERSHA was closed because of funding problems. In consequence the value chain project that helped to create the FMOs and the unions was closed, but the ICT project will continue until the end of 2015. As of that moment IICD only engages with the headquarters of ERSHA and lost contact with the field.

---

6 Discussion

6.1 Design of the intervention

The intervention is designed for the entire C6NGOs consortium which makes the goals and activities applicable to all involved organisations. ERSHA works with a limited number of FMOs but has been successful in implementing the programme. The FMOs and their members report that they feel better capable to perform in their business and use ICT in their work. The introduction of the ICT in the first place helps to keep data, but in the second place helps to negotiate better prices.

An important component that would be worthwhile to explore consists of a more systems approach oriented intervention that would, apart from the technical devices, also ensure that market information becomes reliable. This would improve the project design.
7 Conclusion

Changes in the civil society arena of the SPO
In the 2012 – 2014 period the two most important changes that took place with regards to the level of organisation and the perception of impact dimension of CIVICUS.

ERSHA’s Farmer Market Organisations became more independent since the baseline. Eight of these, having access to electricity, were equipped with ICT tools to conduct digital transactions, which helped them to improve their bargaining position when negotiating with traders. In the meanwhile they became a member of the Oromia Cooperatives Association. More women are said to take leadership positions in the FMOs, and female membership increased slightly from 27 % since the baseline to 27-30 %.

The union, endorsed by the government, managed to diversify its financial resource base. In the meanwhile it adhered to the Federation of Oromia Cooperative Unions.

ERSHA itself became a member of the East African Food Security Network of ICCO partners and engaged with their Kenya partners on ICT.

With regards to perception of impact, in particular the relations with the local administration are constructive: both the administration, the FMOs, the Union and ERSHA together explore how they can access potential market chains. Apart from this the local administration gave a clearance to the 14 MFOs to create their own union: officially only one union per district is allowed, but when the existing union refused the adhesion of the FMOs, these were allowed to create their own union. Additionally ERSHA has worked to link the union to different stakeholders such as the financial sector and to the Federation of Oromia Cooperative unions. In particular the relations with the Bank helped the union to diversify its financial resource base and to do investments that help the further marketing of agricultural produce.

These findings were obtained through an analysis of documents, a workshop and follow-up interviews with ERSHA, and interviews with external resources persons working in civil society organisations that receive support from ERSHA; other civil society organisations with whom ERSHA is collaborating; public or private sector agents and; external resource persons capable of overlooking the MDG or theme on which ERSHA is concentrating.

Contribution analysis
The first outcome achieved that the evaluation team looked at was the increased capacities of the FMOs to serve their members: at least 6 of the eight FMOs are said to have improved their performance. The most plausible explanation of this outcome consists of both projects implemented by ERSHA and the other members of the C6NGO consortium; an ICCO funded project to create value chains and create FMO and Unions and; the ICT project implemented with IICD and the Connect4Change Alliance. Both together seem to provide a sufficient and necessary explanation of the outcome. The ICT component helps FMO leaders to track their financial situation, to more easily obtain price information to negotiate better prices and to increase relations of trust between FMO members and the management. However the enabling environment provided by the local government is to be seen as a condition to this success.

A second outcome achieved consists of the wider network in which the FMOs and the Union currently engage. These networks have both a business character (access to finance and to markets) and a civil society character (membership of the Federation of Oromia Cooperative unions and of the Oromia Cooperatives Association). Also in this case both project contributed to the outcome.

Relevance
With regards to the baseline ToC, the interventions and outcomes achieved are relevant because FMOs have been capacitated in terms of skills and knowledge of ICT, but also in taking ownership of their work and forming a union. In terms of the second condition ERSHA has not increased the networking much. This is largely due to the fact that they are already regularly meeting with the C6NGOs network. The largest change in this respect is the effort to form a partnership with Kenya. The area
where ERSHA is lacking behind is the organisational development. The issues which were identified during the baseline have not been resolved.

The changes identified helped to increase farmers’ trust in cooperative structures and to make access to markets easier to some extent and therefore are relevant; however their relevance would increase with the availability of a full-fledged market information system. The fact that one FMO, not on the power grid, managed to mobilise contributions from his members as a means to run a generator for electricity is to be interpreted as an indicator of the relevance of ICT as perceived by farmers.

With regards to IICD’s and C4C’s policies the changes are relevant because they contribute to its social innovation policy, in particular with regards to the creation of trust amongst stakeholders and increased connectivity.

**Explaining factors**
Most important internal factors that explain the findings consist of a positive level of motivation of staff, but field staff missing the experiences necessary to engage with the private sector.

The most important external factor that explains the findings is that market information available is not always relevant. Access to mobile data networks is generally low in Ethiopia, as well as having access to electricity.

**Design**
The design of the intervention is replicable for other FMOs that have access to electricity, whose managers have the appropriate educational background and whose organisational performance is strong. Apart from this, similar interventions need to take into account the quality of the data entered into the market information system.

**Table 4**
**Summary of findings.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When looking at the MFS II interventions of this SPO to strengthen civil society and/or policy influencing, how much do you agree with the following statements?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The CS interventions were well designed</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CS interventions were implemented as designed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CS interventions reached their objectives</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The observed outcomes are attributable to the CS interventions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The observed CS outcomes are relevant to the beneficiaries of the SPO</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score between 1 to 10, with 1 being "not at all" and 10 being "completely".
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**Documents by Alliance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICT consortium annual report</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT terminal report</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT donor biannual update</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT 1st quarter report</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT 4th quarter report narrative</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other documents**


Lixi M. and Dahan M. 2014. ICT as an Enabler of Ethiopia. World Bank


Webpages


Social Watch, Basic Capabilities Index 2011. The boom and the busted,
Social Watch, Social and Economic Rights Fulfillment Index,
Transparency International, Global Corruption Barometer: Ethiopia,
http://www.transparency.org/gcb2013/country/?country=ethiopia, 2014
Heritage, Economic Freedom Score: Ethiopia,
University of Oslo, Students’ and guardians’ views and experiences with the Alternative Basic Education (ABE) program in the Amhara, National Regional State of Ethiopia,
https://www.duo.uio.no/handle/10852/31206, 2009
World Bank, Governance Indicators: Country Data report for Ethiopia 1996-2013,
Institute for Future Studies, World Values Survey Wave 5: 2005-2009,
http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSOnline.jsp, 2009

### Resource persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of key informant</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Function in organisation</th>
<th>Relation with SPO</th>
<th>Contact details including e-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eshetu Yimer</td>
<td>ERSWA</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Executive leadership</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eshetuyimer@yahoo.com">eshetuyimer@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibebe Alemayehu</td>
<td>ERSWA</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Executive leadership</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ersha@ethionet.et">ersha@ethionet.et</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuri Mersha</td>
<td>ERSWA</td>
<td>Finance and Administration director</td>
<td>Executive leadership</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ersha@ethionet.et">ersha@ethionet.et</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aynaddis Abebe</td>
<td>ERSWA</td>
<td>Gender and Social Service Coordinator</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ersha@ethionet.et">ersha@ethionet.et</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fikadu Gebeyehu</td>
<td>ERSWA</td>
<td>Planning, monitoring, evaluation and knowledge management coordinator</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ersha@ethionet.et">ersha@ethionet.et</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digafe Eyana</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>FMO and union secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dereje Teressa</td>
<td>Toke Kutaye</td>
<td>distribution process leader Input supply and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jifara</td>
<td>Bedasa Former</td>
<td>Chair person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workingeh</td>
<td>Marketing Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Muleta</td>
<td>Bedasa Former</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jujuba</td>
<td>Marketing Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jadelte Teressa</td>
<td>Bedasa Former</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olaf Erz</td>
<td>Interview Olaf Erz IICD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 | Report CDI-15-072
Appendix 1  CIVICUS and Civil Society Index Framework

CIVICUS, the World Alliance for Citizen Participation is an international alliance of members and partners which constitutes an influential network of organisations at the local, national, regional and international levels, and spans the spectrum of civil society. It has worked for nearly two decades to strengthen citizen action and civil society throughout the world. CIVICUS has a vision of a global community of active, engaged citizens committed to the creation of a more just and equitable world. This is based on the belief that the health of societies exists in direct proportion to the degree of balance between the state, the private sector and civil society.

One of the areas that CIVICUS works in is the Civil Society Index (CSI). Since 2000, CIVICUS has measured the state of civil society in 76 countries. In 2008, it considerably changed its CSI.

1.1  Guiding principles for measuring civil society

Action orientation: the principal aim of the CSI is to generate information that is of practical use to civil society practitioners and other primary stakeholders. Therefore, its framework had to identify aspects of civil society that can be changed, as well as generate knowledge relevant to action-oriented goals.

CSI implementation must be participatory by design: The CSI does not stop at the generation of knowledge alone. Rather, it also actively seeks to link knowledge-generation on civil society, with reflection and action by civil society stakeholders. The CSI has therefore continued to involve its beneficiaries, as well as various other actors, in this particular case, civil society stakeholders, in all stages of the process, from the design and implementation, through to the deliberation and dissemination stages.

This participatory cycle is relevant in that such a mechanism can foster the self-awareness of civil society actors as being part of something larger, namely, civil society itself. As a purely educational gain, it broadens the horizon of CSO representatives through a process of reflecting upon, and engaging with, civil society issues which may go beyond the more narrow foci of their respective organisations. A strong collective self-awareness among civil society actors can also function as an important catalyst for joint advocacy activities to defend civic space when under threat or to advance the common interests of civil society vis-à-vis external forces. These basic civil society issues, on which there is often more commonality than difference among such actors, are at the core of the CSI assessment.

CSI is change oriented: The participatory nature that lies at the core of the CSI methodology is an important step in the attempt to link research with action, creating a diffused sense of awareness and ownerships. However, the theory of change that the CSI is based on goes one step further, coupling this participatory principle with the creation of evidence in the form of a comparable and contextually valid assessment of the state of civil society. It is this evidence, once shared and disseminated, that ultimately constitutes a resource for action.

CSI is putting local partners in the driver’s seat: CSI is to continue being a collaborative effort between a broad range of stakeholders, with most importance placed on the relationship between CIVICUS and its national partners.

1.2  Defining Civil Society

The 2008 CIVICUS redesign team modified the civil society definition as follows:
The arena, outside of the family, the state, and the market – which is created by individual and collective actions, organisations and institutions to advance shared interests.

Arena: In this definition the arena refers to the importance of civil society’s role in creating public spaces where diverse societal values and interests interact (Fowler 1996). CSI uses the term ‘arena’ to describe the particular realm or space in a society where people come together to debate, discuss, associate and seek to influence broader society. CIVICUS strongly believes that this arena is distinct from other arenas in society, such as the market, state or family.

Civil society is hence defined as a political term, rather than in economic terms that resemble more the ‘non-profit sector’.

Besides the spaces created by civil society, CIVICUS defines particular spaces for the family, the state and the market.

Individual and collective action, organisations and institutions: Implicit in a political understanding of civil society is the notion of agency; that civil society actors have the ability to influence decisions that affect the lives of ordinary people. The CSI embraces a broad range of actions taken by both individuals and groups. Many of these actions take place within the context of non-coercive organisations or institutions ranging from small informal groups to large professionally run associations.

Advance shared interests: The term ‘interests’ should be interpreted very broadly, encompassing the promotion of values, needs, identities, norms and other aspirations.

They encompass the personal and public, and can be pursued by small informal groups, large membership organisations or formal associations. The emphasis rests however on the element of ‘sharing’ that interest within the public sphere.

1.3 Civil Society Index- Analytical Framework

The 2008 Civil Society Index distinguishes 5 dimensions of which 4 (civic engagement, level of organisation, practice of values and perception of impact), can be represented in the form of a diamond and the fifth one (external environment) as a circle that influences upon the shape of the diamond.

Civic Engagement, or ‘active citizenship’, is a crucial defining factor of civil society. It is the hub of civil society and therefore is one of the core components of the CSI’s definition. Civic engagement describes the formal and informal activities and participation undertaken by individuals to advance shared interests at different levels. Participation within civil society is multi-faceted and encompasses socially-based and politically-based forms of engagement.

Level of Organisation. This dimension assesses the organisational development, complexity and sophistication of civil society, by looking at the relationships among the actors within the civil society arena. Key sub dimensions are:

- Internal governance of Civil Society Organisations;
- Support infrastructure, that is about the existence of supporting federations or umbrella bodies;
- Self-regulation, which is about for instance the existence of shared codes of conducts amongst Civil Society Organisations and other existing self-regulatory mechanisms;
- Peer-to-peer communication and cooperation: networking, information sharing and alliance building to assess the extent of linkages and productive relations among civil society actors;
- Human resources, that is about the sustainability and adequacy of human resources available for CSOs in order to achieve their objectives:
  - Financial and technological resources available at CSOs to achieve their objectives;
International linkages, such as CSO’s membership in international networks and participation in global events.

**Practice of Values.** This dimension assesses the internal practice of values within the civil society arena. CIVICUS identified some key values that are deemed crucial to gauge not only progressiveness but also the extent to which civil society’s practices are coherent with their ideals. These are:
- Democratic decision-making governance: how decisions are made within CSOs and by whom;
- Labour regulations: includes the existence of policies regarding equal opportunities, staff membership in labour unions, training in labour rights for new staff and a publicly available statement on labour standards;
- Code of conduct and transparency: measures whether a code of conduct exists and is available publicly. It also measures whether the CSO’s financial information is available to the public.
- Environmental standards: examines the extent to which CSOs adopt policies upholding environmental standards of operation;
- Perception of values within civil society: looks at how CSOs perceive the practice of values, such as non-violence. This includes the existence or absence of forces within civil society that use violence, aggression, hostility, brutality and/or fighting, tolerance, democracy, transparency, trustworthiness and tolerance in the civil society within which they operate.

**Perception of Impact.** This is about the perceived impact of civil society actors on politics and society as a whole as the consequences of collective action. In this, the perception of both civil society actors (internal) as actors outside civil society (outsiders) is taken into account. Specific sub dimensions are
- Responsiveness in terms of civil society’s impact on the most important social concerns within the country. “Responsive” types of civil society are effectively taking up and voicing societal concerns.
- Social impact measures civil society’s impact on society in general. An essential role of civil society is its contribution to meet pressing societal needs;
- Policy impact: covers civil society’s impact on policy in general. It also looks at the impact of CSO activism on selected policy issues;
- Impact on attitudes: includes trust, public spiritedness and tolerance. The sub dimensions reflect a set of universally accepted social and political norms. These are drawn, for example, from sources such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as CIVICUS’ own core values. This dimension measures the extent to which these values are practised within civil society, compared to the extent to which they are practised in society at large.

**Context Dimension: External Environment.** It is crucial to give consideration to the social, political and economic environments in which it exists, as the environment both directly and indirectly affects civil society. Some features of the environment may enable the growth of civil society. Conversely, other features of the environment hamper the development of civil society. Three elements of the external environment are captured by the CSI:
- Socio-economic context: The Social Watch’s basic capabilities index and measures of corruption, inequality and macro-economic health are used portray the socioeconomic context that can have marked consequences for civil society, and perhaps most significantly at the lower levels of social development;
• Socio-political context: This is assessed using five indicators. Three of these are adapted from the Freedom House indices of political and civil rights and freedoms, including political rights and freedoms, personal rights and freedoms within the law and associational and organisational rights and freedoms. Information about CSO experience with the country’s legal framework and state effectiveness round out the picture of the socio-political context;

• Socio-cultural context: utilises interpersonal trust, which examines the level of trust that ordinary people feel for other ordinary people, as a broad measure of the social psychological climate for association and cooperation. Even though everyone experiences relationships of varying trust and distrust with different people, this measure provides a simple indication of the prevalence of a world view that can support and strengthen civil society. Similarly, the extent of tolerance and public spiritedness also offers indication of the context in which civil society unfolds.
Appendix 2  Methodology

This appendix describes the evaluation methodology that was developed to evaluate the efforts of Dutch NGOs and their Southern Partner Organisations (SPO) to strengthen Civil Society in India, Ethiopia and Indonesia. The first paragraph introduces the terms of reference for the evaluation and the second discusses design issues, including sampling procedures and changes in the terms of reference that occurred between the 2012 and 2014 assessment. The third paragraph presents the methodologies developed to answer each of the evaluation questions. The evaluation team uses the qualitative software programme NVIVO and how this is being used is presented in paragraph 1.4.

2.1  Introduction

2.1.1  Terms of reference for the evaluation

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

One component of the MFS II programme addresses the extent to which the Southern Partners of the Dutch Consortia are contributing towards strengthening civil society and this evaluation assesses this contribution for Southern Partner countries in Indonesia, India and Ethiopia. The evaluation comprised a baseline study, carried out in 2012, followed by an end line study in 2014.

The entire MFS II evaluation comprises assessments in eight countries where apart from a civil society component, also assessments towards achieving MDGs and strengthening the capacity of the southern partner organisations by the CFAs. A synthesis team is in place to aggregate findings of all eight countries. This team convened three synthesis team meetings, one in 2012, one in 2013 and one in 2014. All three meetings aimed at harmonising evaluation methodologies for each component across countries. CDI has been playing a leading role in harmonising its Civil Society and Organisational Capacity assessment with the other organisations in charge for those components in the other countries.

This appendix describes the methodology that has been developed for the evaluation of the efforts to strengthen civil society priority result area. We will first explain the purpose and scope of this evaluation and then present the overall evaluation design. We will conclude with describing methodological adaptations, limitations and implications.

2.1.2  Civil Society assessment – purpose and scope

The overall purpose of the joint MFS II evaluations is to account for results of MFS II-funded or -co-funded development interventions implemented by Dutch CFAs and/or their Southern partners and to contribute to the improvement of future development interventions.

The civil society evaluation is organised around 5 key questions:

- What are the changes in civil society in the 2012-2014 period, with particular focus on the relevant MDGs & themes in the selected country?
- To what degree are the changes identified attributable to the development interventions of the Southern partners of the MFS II consortia (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?
- What is the relevance of these changes?
• Were the development interventions of the MFS II consortia efficient?
• What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?

Furthermore, the evaluation methodology for efforts to strengthen civil society should:
• Describe how a representative sample of Southern partner organisations of the Dutch CFAs in the country will be taken
• Focus on five priority result areas that correspond with dimensions of the Civil Society Index (CSI) developed by CIVICUS (see paragraph 6.4 - Call for proposal). For each of those dimensions the call for proposal formulated key evaluation questions.
• Should compare results with available reference data (i.e. a CSI report or other relevant data from the country in question).

The results of this evaluation are to be used by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Dutch Consortia and their partner organisations. The evaluation methodology has to be participatory in the sense that Dutch Consortia and their partner organisation would be asked to give their own perception on a range of indicators of the adjusted CIVICUS analytical framework in 2012 and in 2014.

2.2 Designing the methodology

2.2.1 Evaluation principles and standards

The overall approach selected is a participatory, theory-based evaluation through a before and after comparison. This paragraph briefly describes these principles and how these have been translated into data collection principles. It also describes how a ‘representative sample’ of Southern Partner Organisations was selected and how the initial terms of references were adjusted with the consent of the commissioner of the evaluation, given the nature of the evaluation component and the resources available for the evaluation.

Recognition of complexity
The issues at stake and the interventions in civil society and policy influence are complex in nature, meaning that cause and effect relations can sometimes only be understood in retrospect and cannot be repeated. The evaluation methods should therefore focus on recurring patterns of practice, using different perspectives to understand changes and to acknowledge that the evaluation means to draw conclusions about complex adaptive systems (Kurtz and Snowden, 2003)27.

Changes in the values of the Civil Society Indicators in the 2012-2014 period are then the result of conflict management processes, interactive learning events, new incentives (carrots and sticks) that mobilise or demobilise civil society, rather than the result of a change process that can be predicted from A to Z (a linear or logical framework approach)28.

A theory-based evaluation
Theory-based evaluation has the advantage of situating the evaluation findings in an analysis that includes both what happened over the life of the project as well as the how and why of what happened (Rogers 2004). It demonstrates its capacity to help understand why a program works or fails to work, going further than knowing only outcomes by trying to systematically enter the black box (Weiss 2004).

Theory-based evaluations can provide a framework to judge effectiveness in context of high levels of complexity, uncertainty, and changeability when traditional (impact) evaluation methods are not suitable: the use of control groups for the civil society evaluation is problematic since comparable organizations with comparable networks and operating in a similar external environment would be quite difficult to identify and statistical techniques of matching cannot be used because of a small n.

Because SPO’s theories of change regarding their efforts to build civil society or to influence policies may alter during the 2012-2014 period, it requires us to develop a deep understanding of the change process and the dynamics that affect civil society and policies. It is important to understand what has led to specific (non-) changes and (un)-expected changes. These external factors and actors, as well as the SPO’s agency need to be taken into account for the attribution question. Linear input-activities-outputs-outcomes-impact chains do not suffice for complex issues where change is both the result of SPOs’ interventions as those by other actors and/or factors.

Therefore, the most reasonable counterfactual that can be used for this evaluation is that of considering alternative causal explanations of change (White and Philips, 2012). Therefore the SPO’s Theory of Change constructed in 2012 is also related to a Model of Change constructed in 2014 that tries to find the ultimate explanations of what happened in reality, including other actors and factors that might possibly explain the outcomes achieved.

**Triangulation of methods and sources of information**

For purposes of triangulation to improve the robustness, validity or credibility of the findings of the evaluation we used different types of data collection and analysis methods as well as different sources of information. The CIVICUS analytical framework was adjusted for this evaluation in terms of providing standard impact outcome indicators to be taken into account. Data collection methods used consisted of workshops with the SPO, interviews with key resource persons, focus group discussions, social network analysis (during the baseline), consultation of project documents; MFS II consortia documents and other documents relevant to assess general trends in civil society.

**Participatory evaluation**

The evaluation is participatory in that both baseline and end line started with a workshop with SPO staff, decision makers and where possible board members. The baseline workshop helped SPOs to construct their own theory of change with regards to civil society. Detailed guidelines and tools have been developed by CDI for both baseline and follow-up, and these have been piloted in each of the countries CDI is involved in. Country based evaluators have had a critical input in reviewing and adapting these detailed guidelines and tools. This enhanced a rigorous data collection process. Additionally, the process of data analysis has been participatory where both CDI and in-country teams took part in the process and cross-check each other’s inputs for improved quality. Rigorous analysis of the qualitative data was done with the assistance of the NVivo software program.

**Using the evaluation standards as a starting point**

As much as possible within the boundaries of this accountability driven evaluation, the evaluation teams tried to respect the following internationally agreed upon standards for program evaluation (Yarbrough et al, 2011). These are, in order of priority: Utility; Feasibility; Propriety; Accuracy; Accountability. However, given the entire set-up of the evaluation, the evaluation team cannot fully ensure the extent to which the evaluation is utile for the SPO and their CFAs; and cannot ensure that the evaluation findings are used in a proper way and not for political reasons;

2.2.2 Sample selection

The terms of reference for this evaluation stipulate that the evaluators draw a sample of southern partner organisations to include in the assessment. Given the fact that the first evaluation questions intends to draw conclusions for the MDGs or the themes (governance or fragile states) for each countries a sample was drawn for the two or three most frequent MDGs or themes that the SPOs are working in.

The Dutch MFS II consortia were asked to provide information for each SPO regarding the MDG/theme it is working on, if it has an explicit agenda in the area of civil society strengthening and/or policy influence. The database then give an insight into the most important MDG/themes covered by the partner organisations, how many of these have an explicit agenda regarding civil society strengthening and/or policy influence. For Indonesia, 5 partner organisations were randomly selected for respectively MDG 7 (natural resources) and 5 for the governance theme. For India 5 SPOs were selected for MDG 1(economic or agricultural development) and 5 others for the theme governance. The sample in Ethiopia
consists of 3 SPOs working on MDG 4,5 and 6 (Health); 3 SPOs for MDG 2 (education) and 3 SPOs for MDG 1 (economic or agricultural development).

2.2.3 Changes in the original terms of reference

Two major changes have been introduced during this evaluation and accepted by the commissioner of the MFS II evaluation. These changes were agreed upon during the 2013 and the 2014 synthesis team meetings.

The efficiency evaluation question:
During the June 2013 synthesis meeting the following decision was made with regards to measuring how efficient MFS II interventions for organisational capacity and civil society are:

 [...] it was stressed that it is difficult to disentangle budgets for capacity development and civil society strengthening. SPOs usually don’t keep track of these activities separately; they are included in general project budgets. Therefore, teams agreed to assess efficiency of CD [capacity development] and CS activities in terms of the outcomes and/or outputs of the MDG projects. This implies no efficiency assessment will be held for those SPOs without a sampled MDG project. Moreover, the efficiency assessment of MDG projects needs to take into account CD and CS budgets (in case these are specified separately). Teams will evaluate efficiency in terms of outcomes if possible. If project outcomes are unlikely to be observed already in 2014, efficiency will be judged in terms of outputs or intermediate results (e-mail quotation from Gerton Rongen at February 6, 2014).

Attribution/contribution evaluation question
During the June 2013 NWO-WOTRO workshop strategies were discussed to fit the amount of evaluation work to be done with the available resources. Therefore,

1. The number of SPOs that will undergo a full-fledged analysis to answer the attribution question, were to be reduced to 50 percent of all SPOs. Therefore the evaluation team used the following selection criteria:
   - An estimation of the annual amount of MFS II funding allocated to interventions that have a more or less direct relation with the civil society component. This implies the following steps to be followed for the inventory:
   - Covering all MDGs/themes in the original sample
   - Covering a variety of Dutch alliances and CFAs

2. The focus of the attribution question will be on two impact outcome areas, those most commonly present in the SPO sample for each country. The evaluation team distinguishes four different impact outcome areas:
   - The extent to which the SPO, with MFS II funding, engages more and diverse categories of society in the 2011-2014 period (Civicus dimensions "Civic engagement" and "perception of impact")
   - The extent to which the SPOs supports its intermediate organisations to make a valuable contribution to civil society in the 2011-2014 period (Civicus dimension “Level of organisation” and “perception of impact”)
   - The extent to which the SPO itself engages with other civil society organisations to make a valuable contribution to civil society in the 2011-2014 period (Civicus dimension "level of organisation"")
   - The extent to which the SPO contributes to changing public and private sector policies and practices in the 2011-2014 period (Civicus dimension "perception of impact")

3. The CS dimension ‘Practice of Values’ has been excluded, because this dimension is similar to issues dealt with for the organisational capacity assessment.
The aforementioned analysis drew the following conclusions:

### Table 5
**SPOs to be included for full-fledged process tracing analysis.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>SPO in the in-depth analysis</th>
<th>Strategic CS orientation to include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Indonesia | Elsam, WARSI, CRI, NTFP-EP, LPPSLH | 1. Strengthening intermediate organisations AND influencing policies and practices  
2. If only one of the two above mentioned is applicable, then select another appropriate impact outcome area to look at. |
| India | NNET, CWM, CECOEDCON, Reds Tumkur, CSA | 1. Enhancing civic engagement AND strengthening intermediate organisations  
2. If only one of the two above mentioned is applicable then select another appropriate impact outcome area to look at. |
| Ethiopia | OSSA, EKHC, CCGG&SO, JeCCDO and ADAA | 1. Strengthening the capacities of intermediate organisations AND SPO’s engagement in the wider CS arena  
2. If only one of the two above mentioned is applicable then select another appropriate impact outcome area to look at. |

Source: Consultation of project documents

## 2.3 Answering the evaluation questions

### 2.3.1 Evaluation question 1 - Changes in civil society for the relevant MDGs/topics

**Evaluation question 1:** *What are the changes in civil society in the 2012-2014 period, with particular focus on the relevant MDGs & themes in the selected country?*

**Indicators and tools used**

In line with the CIVICUS Civil Society Index, a scoring tool was developed in 2012 which comprises 17 indicators. The selection was inspired by those suggested in the terms of reference of the commissioner. Each indicator was, also in line with the CIVICUS index accompanied by an open evaluation question to be used for data collection in 2012 and 2014. In 2012 the scoring tool contained four statements describing the level of achievements of the indicator and scores ranged from 0 to 3 (low score - high score).

A comparison of the scores obtained in 2012 informed the evaluation team that there was a positive bias towards high scores, mostly between 2 and 3. Therefore during the 2014 assessment, it was decided to measure relative changes for each indicator in the 2012 – 2014 period, as well as the reasons for changes or no changes and assigning a score reflecting the change between -2 (considerable deterioration of the indicator value since 2012) and +2 (considerable improvement).

In 2012 and based upon the Theory of Change constructed with the SPO, a set of standard indicators were identified that would ensure a relation between the standard CIVICUS indicators and the interventions of the SPO. However, these indicators were not anymore included in the 2014 assessment because of the resources available and because the methodology fine-tuned for the attribution question in 2013, made measurement of these indicators redundant.

Also in 2012, as a means to measure the ‘level of organisation’ dimension a social network analysis tool was introduced. However this tool received very little response and was discontinued during the end line study.

**Key questions to be answered for this evaluation question**

In 2012, SPO staff and leaders, as well as outside resource persons were asked to provide answers to 17 questions, one per standard indicator of the scoring tool developed by CDI. In 2012, the SPO staff and leaders were given the description of each indicator as it was in 2012 and had to answer the following questions:
1. How has the situation of this indicator changed compared to its description of the 2012 situation? Did it deteriorate considerably or did it improve considerably (-2 \(\rightarrow\) +2)

2. What exactly has changed since 2012 for the civil society indicator that you are looking at? Be as specific as possible in your description.

3. What interventions, actors and other factors explain this change compared to the situation in 2012? Please tick and describe what happened and to what change this led. It is possible to tick and describe more than one choice.
   - Intervention by SPO, NOT financed by any of your Dutch partners ...............
   - Intervention SPO, financed by your Dutch partner organisation ........(In case you receive funding from two Dutch partners, please specify which partner is meant here)
   - Other actor NOT the SPO, please specify.......  
   - Other factor, NOT actor related, please specify......  
   - A combination of actors and factors, INCLUDING the SPO, but NOT with Dutch funding, please specify...  
   - A combination of actors and factors, INCLUDING the SPO, but WITH Dutch funding, please specify...  
   - Don’t know

4. Generally speaking, which two of the five CIVICUS dimensions (civic engagement, level of organisation, practice of values, perception of impact, environment) changed considerably between 2012 – 2014? For each of these changes, please describe:
   - Nature of the change
   - Key interventions, actors and factors (MFS II or non-MFS II related) that explain each change (entirely or partially).

Sources for data collection
During the baseline and the end line and for purposes of triangulation, several methods were used to collect data on each (standard) indicator:

- Self-assessment per category of staff within the SPO: where possible, three subgroups were made to assess the scores: field staff/programme staff, executive leadership and representatives of the board,, general assembly, and internal auditing groups if applicable completed with separate interviews;
- Interviews with external resource persons. These consisted of three categories: key actors that are knowledgeable about the MDG/theme the SPO is working on and who know the civil society arena around these topics; civil society organisations that are being affected by the programme through support or CSOs with which the SPO is collaborating on equal footing, and; representatives of public or private sector organisations with which the SPO is interacting
- Consultation and analysis of reports that relate to each of the five CIVICUS dimensions.
- Project documents, financial and narrative progress reports, as well as correspondence between the SPO and the CFA.
- Social network analysis (SNA), which was discontinued in the end line study.

During the follow-up, emphasis was put on interviewing the same staff and external persons who were involved during the baseline for purpose of continuity.

2.3.2 Evaluation question 2 – "Attribution" of changes in civil society to interventions of SPOs.

Evaluation question 2: To what degree are the changes identified attributable to the development interventions of the Southern partners of the MFS II consortia (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?

Adapting the evaluation question and introduction to the methodology chosen
In line with the observation of Stern et al. (2012) that the evaluation question, the programme attributes, and the evaluation approaches all provide important elements to conclude on the evaluation design to select, the teams in charge of evaluating the civil society component concluded that given the attributes of the programmes it was impossible to answer the attribution question as formulated in the
Terms of References of the evaluation and mentioned above. Therefore, the evaluation teams worked towards answering the extent to which the programme contributed towards realising the outcomes.

For this endeavour explaining outcome process-tracing\(^\text{29}\) was used. The objective of the process tracing methodology for MFS II, in particular for the civil society component is to:

- Identify what interventions, actors and factors explain selected impact outcomes for process tracing.
- Assess how the SPO with MFS II funding contributed to the changes in the selected impact outcomes and how important this contribution is given other actors and factors that possibly influence the attainment of the outcome. Ruling out rival explanations, which are other interventions, actors or factors that are not related to MFS II funding.

**Methodology – getting prepared**

As described before a limited number of SPOs were selected for process tracing and for each country strategic orientations were identified as a means to prevent a bias occurring towards only positive impact outcomes and as a means to support the in-country evaluation teams with the selection of outcomes to focus on a much as was possible, based upon the project documents available at CDI. These documents were used to track realised outputs and outcomes against planned outputs and outcomes. During the workshop (see evaluation question on changes in civil society) and follow-up interviews with the SPO, two impact outcomes were selected for process tracing.

**Steps in process tracing**

1. **Construct the theoretical model of change – by in-country evaluation team**

   After the two impact outcomes have been selected and information has been obtained about what has actually been achieved, the in-country evaluation team constructs a visual that shows all pathways that might possibly explain the outcomes. The inventory of those possible pathways is done with the SPO, but also with external resource persons and documents consulted. This culminated in a Model of Change. A MoC of good quality includes: The causal pathways that relate interventions/parts by any actor, including the SPO to the realised impact outcome; assumptions that clarify relations between different parts in the pathway, and; case specific and/or context specific factors or risks that might influence the causal pathway, such as for instance specific attributes of the actor or socio-cultural-economic context. The Models of Change were discussed with the SPO and validated.

2. **Identify information needs to confirm or reject causal pathways as well as information sources needed.**

   This step aims to critically reflect upon what information is needed that helps to confirm one of causal pathways and at that at same time helps to reject the other possible explanations. Reality warns that this type of evidence will hardly be available for complex development efforts. The evaluators were asked to behave as detectives of Crime Scene Investigation, ensuring that the focus of the evaluation was not only on checking if parts/interventions had taken place accordingly, but more specifically on identifying information needs that confirm or reject the relations between the parts/interventions. The key question to be answered was: "What information do we need in order to confirm or reject that one part leads to another part or, that X causes Y?". Four types of evidence were used, where appropriate:\(^\text{30}\)

   - **Pattern evidence** relates to predictions of statistical patterns in the evidence. This may consist of trends analysis and correlations.
   - **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. However, if we found that event B took place before event A, the test

\(^{29}\) 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. The aim of process tracing is not to verify if an intended process of interventions took place as planned in a particular situation, but that it aims at increasing our understanding about what works under what conditions and why (Beach & Pedersen, 2013).

\(^{30}\) Beach and Pederson, 2013
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 meeting minutes, if authentic, provides 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.

3. Collect information necessary to confirm or reject causal pathways
   
   Based upon the inventory of information needs the evaluation teams make their data collection plan after which data collection takes place.

4. Analyse the data collected and assessment of their quality.
   
   This step consists of compiling all information collected in favour or against a causal pathway in a table or in a list per pathway. For all information used, the sources of information are mentioned and an assessment of the strength of the evidence takes place, making a distinction between strong, weak and moderate evidence. For this we use the traffic light system: **green letters mean strong evidence, red letters mean weak evidence** and **orange letter mean moderate evidence**. The following table provides the format used to assess these issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal pathway</th>
<th>Information that confirms (parts of) this pathway</th>
<th>Information that rejects (parts of) this pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 1</td>
<td>Information 1</td>
<td>Source of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1.1</td>
<td>Information 2</td>
<td>Information 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1.2</td>
<td>Information 3 et c</td>
<td>Information 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 2</td>
<td>Information 1</td>
<td>Source of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2.1</td>
<td>Information 2</td>
<td>Information 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2.2</td>
<td>Information 3 et c</td>
<td>Information 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Source of information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6**

Organisation of information collected per causal pathway and assessing their quality

**Table 7**

Nature of the relation between parts in the Model of Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the relation between parts and other parts or outcome</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The part is the only causal explanation for the outcome. No other interventions or factors explain it. (necessary and sufficient)</td>
<td><img src="images/arrow1.png" alt="arrow" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The part does not explain the outcome at all: other subcomponents explain the outcomes.</td>
<td><img src="images/arrow2.png" alt="arrow" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The part explains the outcome but other parts explain the outcome as well: there are multiple pathways (sufficient but not necessary)</td>
<td><img src="images/arrow3.png" alt="arrow" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The part is a condition for the outcome but won't make it happen without other factors (necessary but not sufficient)</td>
<td><img src="images/arrow4.png" alt="arrow" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The part explains the outcome, but requires the help of other parts to explain the outcome in a sufficient and necessary way (not a sufficient cause, but necessary) → it is part of a causal package</td>
<td><img src="images/arrow5.png" alt="arrow" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Dieuwke Klaver, Mayne, 2012; Stern et al, 2012
6. Write down the contribution and assess the role of the SPO and MFS II funding

This final step consists of answering the following questions, as a final assessment of the contribution question:

- The first question to be answered is: What explains the impact outcome?
- The second question is: What is the role of the SPO in this explanation?
- The third question, if applicable is: what is the role of MFS II finding in this explanation?

**Sources for data collection**

1. Information necessary to answer this evaluation question is to be collected from:
   - Interviews with resource persons inside and outside the SPO
   - Project documents and documentation made available by other informants
   - Websites that possibly confirm that an outcome is achieved and that the SPO is associated with this outcome
   - Meeting minutes of meetings between officials
   - Time lines to trace the historical relations between events
   - Policy documents
   - etc

2.3.3 Evaluation question 3 – Relevance of the changes

**Evaluation question 3:** *What is the relevance of these changes?*

The following questions are to be answered in order to assess the relevance of the changes in Civil Society.

- How do the MFS II interventions and civil society outcomes align with the Theory of Change developed during the baseline in 2012? What were reasons for changing or not changing interventions and strategies?
- What is the civil society policy of the Dutch alliance that collaborates with the SPO? And how do the MFS II interventions and civil society outcomes align with the civil society policy of the Dutch alliance that collaborates with the SPO?
- How relevant are the changes achieved in relation to the context in which the SPO is operating?
- What is the further significance of these changes for building a vibrant civil society for the particular MDG/ theme in the particular context?

**Sources for data collection**

For this question the following sources are to be consulted:

- Review of the information collected during interviews with the SPO and outside resource persons
- The 2012 Theory of Change
- Interview with the CFA liaison officer of the SPO;
- Review of reports, i.e: the civil society policy document of the Dutch Alliance that was submitted for MFS II funding, relevant documents describing civil society for the MDG/ theme the SPO is working on in a given context.

2.3.4 Evaluation question 4, previously 5 - Factors explaining the findings

**Evaluation question 4:** *What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?*

To answer this question we look into information available that:

- Highlight changes in the organisational capacity of the SPO
- Highlight changes in the relations between the SPO and the CFA
- Highlight changes in the context in which the SPO is operating and how this might affect positively or negatively its organisational capacity.

**Sources for data collection**

Sources of information to be consulted are:

- Project documents
Communications between the CFA and the SPO

Information already collected during the previous evaluation questions.

2.4 Analysis of findings

A qualitative software programme NVivo 10 (2010) was used to assist in organizing and making sense of all data collected. Although the software cannot take over the task of qualitative data analysis, it does 1) improve transparency by creating a record of all steps taken, 2) organize the data and allow the evaluator to conduct a systematic analysis, 3) assist in identifying important themes that might otherwise be missed, and 4) reduce the danger of bias due to human cognitive limitations, compared to "intuitive data processing" (Sadler 1981). The qualitative data in the evaluation consisted of transcripts from semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions workshops, field notes from observation, and a range of documents available at the SPO or secondary information used to collect reference data and to obtain a better understanding of the context in which the CS component evolves.

To analyse this diverse collection of data, several analytical strategies are envisioned, specifically content analysis, discourse analysis, and thematic analysis. Although each of these strategies can be understood as a different lens through which to view the data, all will require a carefully developed and executed coding plan.

Data have been coded according to: standard civil society indicator; outcome included for in-depth contribution analysis; relevance; and; explaining factors.

This qualitative analysis will be supported by a limited amount of quantitative data largely arising from the score assigned by the evaluation team to each performance indicator described in the civil society scoring tool. Other quantitative data in this study are drawn information provided in background literature and organisational documents as well as the Social Network Analysis method.

2.5 Limitations to the methodology

2.5.1 General limitations with regards to the MFS II evaluation

The MFS II programme and CIVICUS

Although the MFS II programme stated that all proposals need to contribute to civil society strengthening in the South, mention was made of the use of the CIVICUS framework for monitoring purposes. The fact that civil society was to be integrated as one of the priority result areas next to that of organisational capacity and MDGs became only clear when the MoFA communicated its mandatory monitoring protocol. In consequence, civil society strengthening in the MFS II programmes submitted to the ministry is mainstreamed into different sub programmes, but not addressed as a separate entity.

This late introduction of the Civil Society component also implies that project documents and progress reports to not make a distinction in MDG or theme components vs those of civil society strengthening, leaving the interpretation of what is a civil society intervention our outcome and what not to the interpretation of the evaluation team.

At the same time the evaluation team observes that SPOs and CFAs have started to incorporate the organisational capacity tool that is being used in the monitoring protocol in their own organisational assessment procedures. None of the SPOs is familiar with the CIVICUS framework and how it fits into their interventions.

---

Differences between CIVICUS and MFS II evaluation

CIVICUS developed a Civil Society Index that distinguishes 5 dimensions and for each of these a set of indicators has been developed. Based upon a variety of data collection methods, a validation team composed of civil society leaders provides the scores for the civil society index.

Major differences between the way the Civil Society Index is been used by CIVICUS and for this MFS II evaluation is the following:

1. CIVICUS defines its unit of analysis is terms of the civil society arena at national and/or subnational level and does not start from individual NGOs. The MFS II evaluation put the SPO in the middle of the civil society arena and then looked at organisations that receive support; organisations with which the SPO is collaborating. The civil society arena boundaries for the MFS II evaluation are the public or private sector organisations that the SPO relates to or whose policies and practices it aims to influence.

2. The CIVICUS assessments are conducted by civil society members itself whereas the MFS II evaluation is by nature an external evaluation conducted by external researchers. CIVICUS assumes that its assessments, by organising them as a joint learning exercise, will introduce change that is however not planned. With the MFS II evaluation the focus was on the extent to which the interventions of the SPO impacted upon the civil society indicators.

3. CIVICUS has never used its civil society index as a tool to measure change over a number of years. Each assessment is a stand-alone exercise and no efforts are being made to compare indicators over time or to attribute changes in indicators to a number of organisations or external trends.

Dimensions and indicator choice

The CIVICUS dimensions in themselves are partially overlapping; the dimension ‘perception of impact’ for instance contains elements that relate to ‘civic engagement’ and to ‘level of organisation’. Similar overlap is occurring in the civil society scoring tool developed for this evaluation and which was highly oriented by a list of evaluation questions set by the commissioner of the evaluation.

Apart from the overlap, we observe that some of the standard indicators used for the civil society evaluation were not meaningful for the SPOs under evaluation. This applies for instance for the political engagement indicator “How intense is your (individual staff or organisational) participation in locally-nationally elected bodies and/or sectoral user groups?”.

Measuring change over a two-year period

The MFS II programme started its implementation in 2011 and it will finish in 2015, whereas its evaluation started mid-2012 and will end in the beginning of 2014. The period between the baseline and the end line measurement hardly covers 2 years in some cases. Civil society building and policy influence are considered the type of interventions that requires up to 10 years to reap significant results, especially when taking into account attitudes and behaviour. Apart from the fact that the baseline was done when MFS II was already operational in the field for some 1,5 years, some SPO interventions were a continuation of programmes designed under the MFS I programme, hence illustrating that the MFS II period is not a clear boundary. Contracts with other SPOs ended already in 2012, and practically coincided with the baseline assessment being conducted at the moment the relationship with the CFA had practically ended.

Aggregation of findings

Although working with standard indicators and assigning them scores creates expectations of findings being compared and aggregated at national and international level, this may lend itself to a quick but inaccurate assessment of change. Crude comparison between programs on the basis of findings is problematic, and risks being politically abused. The evaluation team has to guard against these abuses by ensuring the necessary modesty in extrapolating findings and drawing conclusions.

Linking the civil society component to the other components of the MFS II evaluation

The Theory of Change in the terms of reference assumes that CFAs are strengthening the organisational capacity of their partners, which is evaluated in the organisational capacity components, which then leads to impact upon MDGs or upon civil society. Because the evaluation methodology designed for both the organisational capacity and the civil society evaluation require considerable time investments of the SPOs, a deliberate choice was made not to include SPOs under the organisational capacity component in
that of Civil Society. This may possibly hamper conclusions regarding the assumption of capacitated SPOs being able to impact upon civil society. However, where information is available and where it is relevant, the civil society component will address organisational capacity issues.

No such limitations were made with regards to SPOs in the MDG sample, however, apart from Indonesia; none of the SPOs in the civil society sample is also in that of MDG.

2.5.2 Limitations during baseline with regards to the methodology

A very important principle upon which this evaluation methodology is based is that of triangulation, which implies that different stakeholders and documents are consulted to obtain information about the same indicator from different perspectives. Based upon these multiple perspectives, a final score can be given on the same indicator which is more valid and credible.

For Ethiopia this has not always been possible:

- A Survey Monkey questionnaire was developed to assess the intensity of the interaction between stakeholders in the Basic Education Network of Ethiopia. Out of 85 actors that were invited to fill in this 5 minute questionnaire, none of them effectively filled in the questionnaire. The online Social Network Analysis aims at having both the opinion of the SPO on the intensity of the interaction with another actor, as well as the opinion of the other actor for triangulation. Important reasons for not filling in this form are that actors in the network are not technology savvy, or that they have difficulties in accessing internet.

- With regards to filling in offline interview forms or answering questions during interviews a number of civil society actors did not want to score themselves because they do not benefit from the interventions of the MFS II project. Having the scores of their own organisations will help to assess the wider environment in which the SPO operates and possibly an impact of the SPO on other civil society organisations in 2014.

- All respondents working for CSOs are working on a voluntary basis. It has not been easy for the evaluation team to fix appointments with them. Voluntary work so high staff turn-over \(\rightarrow\) new staff is not knowledgeable about the interview topics (loss of institutional memory)

- SPOs in Ethiopia are not influencing public sector policies but are implementing these public sector policies. This means that most often there will be no efforts to influence those policies, but efforts are made to make those policies operational at local level and to revitalise them.

2.5.3 Limitations during end line with regards to the methodology

*Project documentation*

The methodology assumed that project documents and progress reports would be helpful in linking project interventions to the CIVICUS framework and obtaining an overview of outputs-outcomes achieved versus planned. These overviews would then be used to orient the in-country evaluation teams for the quick or in-depth contribution analysis.

In practice the most recent progress reports were hardly available with the CFAs or were made available later in the process. These reports often were not helpful in accumulating outputs towards to the planned outputs and even outcomes. Hardly any information is available at outcome or impact level and no monitoring systems are available to do so. Key information missing and relevant for civil society impact (but also to track progress being made on effects of project interventions) is for instance a comprehensive overview of the organisational performance of organisations supported by the SPO. For a number of SPOs the reality was different than the progress reports reflected which meant that constant fine-tuning with the in-country evaluation team was necessary and that CDI could not always provide them with the guidance needed for the selection of impact outcomes for contribution analysis.

A number of organisations that the evaluation team looked at for the civil society component are working in a programmatic approach with other partner organisations. In consequence reporting was organised at the programme level and to a lesser extent at the level of the individual partner, which seriously
hampered the possibilities to get oversight on outcomes and output achieved. This was the case with EKHC and MKC-RDA, ERSHA, EfDA and JeCCDO.

The Ethiopian evaluation team made the following evaluation remarks with regards to the methodology.

1. **What worked?**
The team had no difficulties in triangulating information obtained from different resource persons (Government, beneficiaries and SPOs) which helped to cross check information. The document analysis by CDI, including providing guidance for the fieldwork has been helpful for the team. The use of the Models of Change for process-tracing helped both the evaluation team as the SPO staff in obtaining a clear picture of the inputs, outputs and outcomes and to get a general picture of the evaluation.

2. **What didn’t work and why?**
There was repetition in a number of questions in the evaluation methodology, such as the forms used during the workshop with the SPO, the interviews with the SPO after the workshops; questions were interpreted by the SPO staff of being more or less the same and therefore made them less interested to go into detail or be specific. The workshop form to be filled in for the CS indicators was long and therefore answers given may have been too general. Some of the questions were not clear and seemed similar to the others and therefore were misunderstood and got wrong responses.

3. **Challenges encountered**
The team observes that it was very difficult to obtain exact information from resource persons, including those representing the SPOs. Resource persons were able to give facts based upon general observations in most cases but were not able to provide figures. Therefore the in country team suggests to identify a number of indicators during the baseline and to ask the SPO and their headquarters to monitor those indicators since the baseline as a means to inform the end line study.

Some beneficiaries were not aware or did not keep track of numbers and figures, making it also difficult to confirm or reject quantitative information from the SPO. The in-country evaluation team suggests to incorporate quantitative analysis in the evaluation of the CS component.

The partner organisations do not keep records of progress and what they document is available in hard copy. They also keep (monthly) records but do not aggregate these.

High staff turnover within the SPOs also hampered the evaluation.
## Civil Society Scoring tool - baseline

### Civil Society Assessment tool – Standard Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Outcome domains</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>What are factors (strengths, weaknesses) that explain the current situation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
<td>Needs of marginalised groups</td>
<td>How does your organisation take the needs of your beneficiaries/target groups, in particular marginalised groups into account in your planning, actions, activities, and/or strategies?</td>
<td>Are NOT taken into account</td>
<td>Are POORLY taken into account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
<td>Involvement of target groups</td>
<td>What is the level of participation of your beneficiaries/target groups, in particular marginalised groups in the analysis, planning and evaluation of your activities?</td>
<td>They are INFORMED about ongoing and/or new activities that you will implement</td>
<td>They are CONSULTED by your organisation. You define the problems and provide the solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political engagement</td>
<td>How intense is your (individual staff or organisational) participation in locally-nationally elected bodies and/or sectoral user groups?</td>
<td>No participation</td>
<td>You are occasionally CONSULTED by these bodies</td>
<td>You are a member of these bodies. You attend meetings as a participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Organisation</td>
<td>Practice of Values</td>
<td>Relations with Other Organisations</td>
<td>Frequency of Dialogue with Closest CSO</td>
<td>Defending the Interests of Marginalised Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5                     | In the past 12 months what has been the most intensive interaction you had with other CSOs? | No interaction at all | Networking - Cooperation: Inform each other; roles somewhat defined; all decisions made independently | Coordination - Coalition: ideas and resources shared; roles defined and divided; all have a vote in decision making | Collaboration: organisations belong to one system; mutual trust; consensus on all decisions. | Question not relevant, because ..... | (
<p>| 5                     | In the past 12 months how many meetings did you have with the CSO that you have most intensive interaction with? | No interaction at all | Less than 2 times a year | Between 2 and 3 times a year | More than 4 times a year | Question not relevant, because ..... | |
| 6                     | Which CSO are most effective in defending the interests of your target groups? In the past 12 months, how did you relate to those CSOs? | No interaction at all | Networking - Cooperation: Inform each other; roles somewhat defined; all decisions made independently | Coordination - Coalition: ideas and resources shared; roles defined and divided; all have a vote in decision making | Collaboration: organisations belong to one system; mutual trust; consensus on all decisions. | Question not relevant, because ..... | |
| 7                     | How does your organisation finance institutional costs such as workshops of the General Assembly (if applicable); attendees to workshops of other CSOs; costs for organisational growth and/or networking? | Depends on 1 international donor | Depends on few financial sources: one fund cover(s) more than 75% of all costs. | Depends on a variety of financial sources: one fund cover(s) more than 50% of all costs. | Depends on a variety of sources of equal importance. Wide network of domestic funds | Question not relevant, because ..... | |
| 8                     | To what extent can mandatory social organs (steering committee, general assembly, internal auditing group) ask your executive leaders to be accountable to them? | (financial) information is made available and decisions are taken openly | They fulfil their formal obligation to explain strategic decisions and actions | They react to requests of social organs to justify/explain actions and decisions made | Social organs use their power to sanction management in case of misconduct or abuse | Question not relevant, because ..... | |
| 9                     | What % of members of your mandatory social organs belong to the marginalised target groups you are working with/for? | Between 0-10 % of all members of the social organs | Between 11-30 % of all members of the social organs | Between 31-65 % of all members of the social organs | More than 65% of all members of the social organs | Question not relevant, because ..... | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th><strong>External financial auditing</strong></th>
<th><strong>How regularly is your organisation audited externally?</strong></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally, upon request of funders</th>
<th>Periodically and regularly, because our external funder asks for it</th>
<th>Periodically and regularly, because it is part of our code of conduct</th>
<th>Question not relevant, because .....</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Client satisfaction</strong></td>
<td><strong>What are the most important concerns of your target groups? How do your services take into account those important concerns?</strong></td>
<td>Majority of target groups are NOT satisfied</td>
<td>Majority of target groups are POORLY satisfied</td>
<td>Majority of target groups are PARTLY satisfied</td>
<td>Majority of target groups are MOSTLY satisfied</td>
<td>Question not relevant, because .....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Civil society impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>In the past 12 months, what impact did you have on building a strong civil society?</strong></td>
<td>You have not undertaken any activities of this kind but there is no discernible impact</td>
<td>You have undertaken activities of this kind</td>
<td>You have undertaken activities of this kind but impact is limited</td>
<td>You have undertaken activities and examples of significant success can be detected.</td>
<td>Question not relevant, because .....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Relation with public sector organisations</strong></td>
<td><strong>In the past 12 months, what interaction did you have with public sector organisations to realise your programme and organisations' objectives?</strong></td>
<td>No direct interaction</td>
<td>You have been invited by public sector organisations for sharing of information</td>
<td>You have been invited by public sector organisations for regular consultations (but public sector decides)</td>
<td>Formal and regular meetings as a multi-stakeholder task force.</td>
<td>Question not relevant, because .....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Relation with private sector organisations</strong></td>
<td><strong>In the past 12 months, what interaction did you have with private sector organisations to realise your programme and organisations' perspective?</strong></td>
<td>No direct interaction</td>
<td>You have been invited by private sector organisations for sharing of information</td>
<td>You have been invited by private sector organisations for regular consultations (but public sector decides)</td>
<td>Formal and regular meetings as a multi-stakeholder task force.</td>
<td>Question not relevant, because .....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Influence upon public policies, rules, regulations</strong></td>
<td><strong>How successful have you been in influencing public policies and practices in the past 2 years?</strong></td>
<td>No activities developed in this area</td>
<td>Some activities developed but without discernible impact</td>
<td>Many activities developed in this area, but impact until so far has been limited</td>
<td>Many activities developed in this area and examples of success can be detected</td>
<td>Question not relevant, because .....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Influence upon private sector agencies’ policies, rules, regulations.

**Question:** How successful have you been in influencing private sector policies and practices in the past 2 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities Developed</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No activities developed in this area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some activities developed but without discernible impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many activities developed in this area, but impact until so far has been limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many activities developed in this area and examples of success can be detected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question not relevant,** because ......

### Environmental context

**Question:** In the past 2 years, how did your organisation cope with these changes in the context that may have been positive or negative consequences for civil society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No analysis of the space and role of civil society has been done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are collecting information of the space and role of civil society but not regularly analysing it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are monitoring the space and role of civil society and analysing the consequences of changes in the context for your own activities. Examples are available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are involved in joint action to make context more favourable. Examples are available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question not relevant,** because ......

### Coping strategies

**17.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No analysis of the space and role of civil society has been done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are collecting information of the space and role of civil society but not regularly analysing it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are monitoring the space and role of civil society and analysing the consequences of changes in the context for your own activities. Examples are available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are involved in joint action to make context more favourable. Examples are available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question not relevant,** because ......

---
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## Appendix 3  Civil Society Scores

This table presents the appreciation of the evaluation team regarding changes occurred for each indicator between 2012 and 2014 on a scale of -2 to +2

- 2 = Considerable deterioration
- 1 = A slight deterioration
0 = no change occurred, the situation is the same as in 2012
+1 = slight improvement
+2 = considerable improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Change in the indicators in the 2012 – 2014 period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
<td>Needs of marginalised groups</td>
<td>How does your organisation take the needs of your beneficiaries/target groups, in particular marginalised groups into account in your planning, actions, activities, and/or strategies?</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
<td>Involvement of target groups</td>
<td>What is the level of participation of your beneficiaries/target groups, in particular marginalised groups in the analysis, planning and evaluation of your activities?</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
<td>Political engagement</td>
<td>How intense is your (individual staff or organisational) participation in locally-nationally elected bodies and/or sectoral user groups?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of organisation</td>
<td>Relations with other organisations</td>
<td>In the past 12 months what has been the most intensive interaction you had with other CSOs?</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of organisation</td>
<td>Frequency of dialogue with closest CSO</td>
<td>In the past 12 months how many meetings did you have with the CSO that you have most intensive interaction with?</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of organisation</td>
<td>Defending the interests of marginalised groups</td>
<td>Which CSO are most effective in defending the interests of your target groups? In the past 12 months, how did you relate to those CSOs?</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of organisation</td>
<td>Composition current financial resource base</td>
<td>How does your organisation finance institutional costs such as workshops of the General Assembly (if applicable); attendance to workshops of other CSOs; costs for organisational growth and/or networking?</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice of Values</td>
<td>Downward accountability</td>
<td>To what extent can mandatory social organs (steering committee, general assembly, internal auditing group) ask your executive leaders to be accountable to them?</td>
<td>+0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice of Values</td>
<td>Composition of social organs</td>
<td>What % of members of your mandatory social organs belong to the marginalised target groups you are working with/for?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice of Values</td>
<td>External financial auditing</td>
<td>How regularly is your organisation audited externally?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Impact</td>
<td>Client satisfaction</td>
<td>What are the most important concerns of your target groups? How do your services take into account those important concerns?</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Impact</td>
<td>Civil society impact.</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, what impact did you have on building a strong civil society?</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Impact</td>
<td>Relation with public sector organisations</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, what interaction did you have with public sector organisations to realise your programme and organisations’ objectives?</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Impact</td>
<td>Relation with private sector organisations</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, what interaction did you have with private sector organisations to realise your programme and organisations’ perspective?</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence upon public policies, rules, regulations</td>
<td>How successful have you been in influencing public policies and practices in the past 2 years?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Influence upon private sector agencies’ policies, rules, regulations.</td>
<td>How successful have you been in influencing private sector policies and practices in the past 2 years?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Coping strategies</td>
<td>In the past 2 years, how did your organisation cope with these changes in the context that may have been positive or negative consequences for civil society?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4  Changes in civil society indicators between 2012 and 2014

1. Civic Engagement

1.1 Needs of marginalised groups SPO

The ultimate target groups of the ICT project with the C6NGOs are 16,440 small holders and their households. Those of ERSHA are 14 FMOs, including one Union, 1400-1800 small scale households and 2700 indirect beneficiaries. 27-30% of FMO members are women and their membership is promoted by bylaws within the FMOs. According to ERSHA it takes the considerations of women and that of children in other projects into account in its project cycle. This was confirmed by the Union; FMO members are small farmers, including women, who face problems of market access due to lack of market information, in ability to use mobile phones and some other constraints. The same Union however observes that due to its early stage of formation, it has itself not yet engaged sufficiently enough with the 14 FMOs and their members. Since the baseline period an improvement in the number of women’s in leadership of FMOs has observed.

Score: +1

1.2 Involvement of target groups SPO

Stakeholders’ participation was the main feature of the project design cycle where by all members of the C6NGO consortium, government officials, and technical advisors from donor and other organizations are represented. In the process, farmers are represented by the FMO leaders. Women’s are also represented through the women at the FMO management committee. Similarly, the union has the same structure to represent women. In general, more women take leadership positions during the end line as compared with the baseline. This is not true for all the FMOs, rather some FMOs are lagging behind in the inclusion of marginalized groups like women.

Score: +1

1.3 Intensity of political engagement SPO

SPOs that get funding from external donors are not allowed to engage in politics of the country.

Score: 0

2. Level of organization

2.1 Relations with other organizations SPO

Since the baseline period ERSHA has been actively collaborating with members of C6NGOs. It also took part in other civil society networks, such as the Consortium of Christian Relief and Development Association (CCRDA), Poverty Action Network Ethiopia (PANE), Sustainable Land use Forum. Effort has been made to create partnership with NGOs working particularly in Kenya and Uganda where by the outcome is to form an East Africa food security network (East African ICCO Partners network). The executive director and one technical team member of ERSHA went to Kenya to collaborate on areas of ICT which enabled ERSHA to learn more and share their best experiences too.

Score: +1
2.2 Frequency of dialogue with closest civil society organization SPO

ERHSA indicated that in the last 12 months it had 6 meetings with the C6NGO consortium. In addition the organization is closely interacting with the FMOs at least once in a month. The bi annual meeting is continued to be held as well.

**Score: +1**

2.3 Defending the interests of marginalized groups SPO

Since the baseline ERSHA and consortium are effective in defending the interests of the target groups. But these days the FMOs and the Union are capacitated to take over the role of ERSHA through their Union, so that they can defend the interest of their members. They are now even more capable in defending the interest of the member farmers since they became a member of the Oromia Federal Cooperatives Union.

**Score: +2**

2.4 Composition of financial resource base SPO

Despite the frequent efforts to diversify the funding base, ERSHA is not successful in doing so. Rather, ERSHA lost its former donors such as Oxfam Novib and Help a Child.

**Score: -1**

3. Practice of values

3.1 Downward accountability SPO

Similar to the baseline situations the executive leader of ERSHA is accountable to the General Assembly and the Board of Directors. However, these are less frequently informed than the government and donor organizations. It is also reported by the FMO and the Union leaders as they are informed about the projects and the project phase out.

**Score: 0**

3.2 Composition of social organs SPO

Like during the baseline two farmers are members in the general assembly of ERSHA. Currently, there are four men and one woman in ERSHA’s Board of Directors.

**Score: 0**

3.3 External financial auditing SPO

ERHSA has continued to be audited annually by an external audit firm.

**Score: 0**

4. Perception of impact

4.1 Client satisfaction SPO

A union leader has mentioned that, ERSHA has given them several management and accountancy training and which enables them to be capacitated and to be successful. The same is true for the FMOs. Hence, these target beneficiaries are satisfied by ERSHAs efforts. Compared to the pre intervention period, members get a better access to market and market information. In addition, ERSHA has tried to link the union with different stakeholders. Currently, to diversify its financial
source, the “Torban kutaye” union purchased share from Oromia Cooperative Bank. It is also a member of Federation Oromia Cooperative unions to get loans and other services. The program also supported around 1.16 million Eth birr to construct a store and an office; at present construction of both store and office is finalized. Beyond storing union and FMOs inventory, the store is expected to generate additional income to the union as they can rent it to other organizations.

Score: +2

4.2 Civil society impact SPO

The FMOs and its union that are established by ERSHA are capacitated. Since the baseline period the FMO’s ICT knowledge has improved and now started a digital recording of transaction. Their bookkeeping has also improved. They have got now a better bargaining power in the market and also are in a better position to assess the market situation. These 14 FMOs established their own union and the union is performing good and got recognition from the cooperatives agency as a best performing newly established Union. They have their own store building and truck. They purchased share from Oromia cooperative bank and accessed loan twice. They are also now a member of the Oromia cooperatives association. However, there are some FMOs who still have a weak performance.

Other members of the C6NGO consortium consider ERSHA to be one of the strong local NGOs in Ethiopia, which is trustworthy organisation that has a proven track record in development. ERSHA is aware of key thematic areas and ‘best practices’ and has a sound understanding of factors that contribute to effective, efficient and sustainable performance.

Score: +2

4.3 Relations with public sector organizations SPO

ERSHA is working with the public sector throughout the project cycle. Most frequent collaboration consists of joint planning and implementation of activities. This was confirmed by Gourder Woreda Cooperative Promotion Office that states that it has a good working relationship. In the last 12 months ERSHA has carried out a project inception workshop with local government office representatives. Both FMOs, the woreda cooperative promotion office and ERSHA share a common problem of market access for farmers’ produce which the union as well as the FMOs are trying to solve. As a result the “Access to Market Information” project is seen as a foundation for easy access to market information developed by Oromia marketing agency with the financial support of the project. FMOs were linked with the source of market information i.e., Oromia Marketing agency and other related sources and with unions as well.

Score: +1

4.4 Relation with private sector agencies SPO

Though ERSHA is exerting some effort to connect FMOs with the private sector, it is usually short lived. ERSHA tried to integrate the FMOs in the appropriate value chain by connecting them with Oil factories and flour factories. One of the constraints that ERSHA is facing currently is that field staff lacks sufficient capacity in the field of value chain development and the role of private sector organizations. In addition, it has also worked with DOT Ethiopia for supplying market information via SMS but DOT Ethiopia and ERSHA do not agree on the ICT management ownership and they are still in negotiation. On the other hand the FMOs/ Union are working with the private sectors/dealers and buyers/ to sell their produces and to get inputs.

Score: +0

4.5 Influence upon public policies, rules, regulations SPO

The 2009 Ethiopian law on registration and regulation of charities and societies does not allow NGOs to influence policies, rules and regulations and ERSHA in consequence is not involved in any lobby and advocacy. But one scenario is reported a successful policy influence on the government organ, particularly in the woreda cooperation office. The 14 FMOs requested to become a member of the
AMBO cooperatives union which was refused by this union. Although the cooperative law only allows one union per district, they managed to influence the regional and zonal offices and obtained a clearance to establish their own union.

Score: +2

4.6 Influence upon private sector agencies’ policies, rules, regulations SPO

ERSHA has not (yet) succeeded in influencing the policies of private sector organizations. It’s most important strategy for doing so is however by bringing together different actors in the value chain and their service provided to discuss and establish a win-win solution helps. Since it is not well planned in the project proposal, ERSHA find it difficult to influence policies of private sector organizations. Though it is not successful, it was reported that there was an attempt to link the producers with flour factory.

Score: 0

5. Environment

5.1 Coping strategies

The new civil society legislation on the allocation of administration cost (30/70) has delayed the start of the ICT project and as a result new administrative arrangements had to be taken by ICCO to accommodate for these inconveniences. Also, the unavailability of reliable and dependable private firms in the ICT sector, poor internet connection and availing reliable market information were major challenges.

Score: 0
The Centre for Development Innovation works on processes of innovation and change in the areas of food and nutrition security, adaptive agriculture, sustainable markets, ecosystem governance, and conflict, disaster and reconstruction. It is an interdisciplinary and internationally focused unit of Wageningen UR within the Social Sciences Group. Our work fosters collaboration between citizens, governments, businesses, NGOs, and the scientific community. Our worldwide network of partners and clients links with us to help facilitate innovation, create capacities for change and broker knowledge.

The mission of Wageningen UR (University & Research centre) is 'To explore the potential of nature to improve the quality of life'. Within Wageningen UR, nine specialised research institutes of the DLO Foundation have joined forces with Wageningen University to help answer the most important questions in the domain of healthy food and living environment. With approximately 30 locations, 6,000 members of staff and 9,000 students, Wageningen UR is one of the leading organisations in its domain worldwide. The integral approach to problems and the cooperation between the various disciplines are at the heart of the unique Wageningen Approach.