



CARE/USAID
Civil Society Expansion Program
Mid-Term Review Report
December 2002



Contact Person:

Lex Kassenberg
Assistant Country Director
E-mail: lex@care.or.ke

Yuko Yoneda
Sector Coordinator
E-mail: yuko@care.or.ke

CARE SOMALIA
P. O. Box 2039, KNH
Nairobi
Tel: 254-2-718405/2-726255

Fax: 254-2-718406

List of Acronyms

| | |
|----------------|--|
| CA | Civil authorities |
| CBO | Community-based Organization |
| CCS | Committee of Concerned Somalis |
| CHLE | Candlelight for Health Education |
| COSONGO | Consortium of Somali NGOs |
| CSEP | Civil Society Expansion Program |
| CSO | Civil Society Organization |
| DANDOR | Direct Aid to the Nature's Development Organization |
| DDW | Development Dialogue Workshop |
| DELTA | Development, Education, Leadership and Team in Action |
| DIP | Detailed Implementation Plan |
| DME | Design, Monitoring and Evaluation |
| KABP | Knowledge, Attitudes, Beliefs and Practices |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MoU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| NGO | Non-governmental Organization |
| NRO | Northern Relief Organization |
| ODA | Organizational Development Assessment |
| PLA | Participatory Learning and Action |
| RBA | Rights Based Approach |
| SACB | Somalia Aid Coordination Body |
| SADO | Sanaag Agricultural Development Organization |
| SDO | Somali Development Organization |
| SORERDO | Somaliland Resource and Agriculture Development Organization |
| SOYWA | Somaliland Young Women Association |
| TOR | Terms of Reference |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| UN | United Nations |
| WAWA | We Are Women Activists |

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Executive Summary | 3 |
| 2. Background..... | 5 |
| Project Design | 5 |
| Baseline survey..... | 7 |
| 3. Outline of the Mid-term Review | 8 |
| Purpose | 8 |
| Methodology | 8 |
| Constraints..... | 9 |
| 4. Findings | 10 |
| 4.1. Achievement of goals and objectives:..... | 10 |
| The extent to which civil society organizations influence civil authorities with relation to peace building and good governance activities..... | 10 |
| Economic and behavioral changes as a result of sectoral project implementation | 11 |
| The perception of respective communities towards CSOs..... | 12 |
| The level of participation by women in the program | 13 |
| The level of <i>participation</i> of CSOs in umbrella organizations | 13 |
| The level of interactions between CSOs and civil authorities..... | 14 |
| 4.2. Strength and challenge: | 15 |
| Strength of CSOs..... | 15 |
| Economic & behavioral changes..... | 16 |
| Community trust in partners..... | 16 |
| Sustainability | 18 |
| Gender/Right Based Approach..... | 19 |
| Capacity of umbrella organizations..... | 20 |
| Effectiveness of participation in networking activities | 21 |
| 5. Recommendations | 23 |
| 6. Lessons Learnt on the Baseline Survey and the Mid-term Review | 26 |
| Annex | |
| Annex 1: Civil Society Expansion Program Mid-term Review Terms of Reference | 29 |
| Annex 2: Somalia Civil Society Expansion Program Logical Framework | 37 |

1. Executive Summary

In October 2000, CARE began implementing the three-year USAID funded Civil Society Expansion Program (CSEP) in northern Somalia. The program final goal is to realize **strong civil society organizations that contribute to good governance and peace building with cooperative, productive, linkages with civil authorities**. As a means of meeting this goal, CARE has been working to strengthen the institutional capacity and sustainable linkages amongst civil society organizations (CSOs), as well as encourage a positive working relationship between civil authorities and CSOs. By partnering with CSOs and supporting them in the delivery of community-based development projects, the program is working to improve the ability of CSOs to effectively participate in the rehabilitation and rebuilding of communities in Northern Somalia. CARE is pursuing the program's final goal through three intermediate goals:

- **Intermediate goal 1:** Increased capacity of civil society organizations to design and implement sustainable projects that foster economic growth and food security.
- **Intermediate goal 2:** Improve cooperation between civil society organizations through support for local networking initiatives.
- **Intermediate goal 3:** Civil authorities are more actively involved in the coordination of development initiatives undertaken by civil society organizations.

The mid-term review was conducted in June and July 2002, and sought to assess progress made in meeting the program's goals and objectives. It provided staff, partners, authorities and communities with the opportunity to highlight areas which they felt should be focused on during the remaining program period. The methodology used was as participatory as possible, and used in-depth structured interviews and focus group discussions. The key findings and recommendations from the review are summarized below, and the entire report will be disseminated to all stakeholders.

Final Goal: Strong civil society organizations that contribute to good governance and peace building with cooperative, productive linkages with civil authorities.

Key Findings:

1. CSOs are becoming more actively engaged in advocacy and conflict resolution.
2. Efforts have tended to concentrate on influencing policy makers and/or decision makers at the community level.
3. The role of CSOs in mediation of inter/intra-community conflicts is effective where community participation and transparency was ensured in the process.

Key Recommendations:

1. Clarify what is meant by "strong civil society organizations".
2. Continue to support CSOs advocacy efforts

Intermediate Goal 1: Increased capacity of selected CSOs to design and implement sustainable projects that foster economic growth and food security.

Key Findings:

1. Anecdotal evidence of improvement in socio-economic status of beneficiaries.
2. Unclear to what extent community-CSOs relationships are participatory, and will continue beyond the life of the project.
3. Continued need to assist CSOs in incorporating gender analysis into their project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Key Recommendations:

1. Improve the program's M&E system, and work with partners to improve their M&E capacity, including data collection.
2. Increase on-the-job support for partners to ensure participatory programming methodologies are applied during project design and implementation.
3. Improve CSO accountability to communities, which would improve communities' capacity to determine the length and nature of their relationship with CSOs.
4. Continue to support the inclusion of sensitive topics such as gender and rights-based programming in partners' project in a culturally sensitive manner.

Intermediate Goal 2: Improved cooperation between CSOs through support to local networking initiatives.

Key Findings:

1. There has been an increase in the membership of umbrella organizations, but the degree to which this is due to CARE's intervention is unclear.
2. The ability of umbrella organizations to effectively represent the views of its members, not just the leadership, remains weak.

Key Recommendations:

1. The umbrella organization's members should formally indicate its agreement with the capacity building sub-grant before it is approved.
2. Improve understanding regarding the roles/responsibility of the umbrella and its leadership.

Intermediate Goal 3: Civil authorities are more actively involved in coordination of development initiatives undertaken by civil society organizations.

Key Findings:

1. There is greater understanding and acceptance between CSOs and authorities, leading to constructive relations at the local level in particular, but the high turnover rate amongst authorities at the central level has hampered the development of positive relations at a higher level.
2. Although all partners have signed MoUs with authorities, the implementation of the MoUs is not consistent.
3. Civil authorities have limited capacity in DME that hampers their effective participation in the project cycle.

Key Recommendations:

1. Further institutionalize the Development Dialogue Workshops.
2. CARE should explore means of improving the sharing of skills and knowledge within civil

authorities.

3. The program needs to ensure that there is a clear understanding amongst partners, CSEP program staff and civil authorities regarding the level of material and financial support that can be provided to civil authorities.

2. Background

Project Design

The emergence of civil society organizations (CSOs) is a relatively recent development in Somalia. Before and during the civil war, the top-down development planning was a norm, and any attempts by local communities to organize themselves were stifled by the Siad Barre regime. In consequence, the culture of dependency on the external assistance perpetuates the attitude among the communities and local organizations. Although the evolution of Somali CSOs presents a potential to promote participation of communities and accountability of the civil authorities in development process, CSOs have only limited capacity to engage communities and the civil authorities in programming in a participatory and transparent manner.

Out of a strong conviction that strong civil society organization will be the foundation for development of Somalia, CARE has been implementing the three-year Civil Society Expansion Program (CSEP) in northern Somalia since October 2000 funded by USAID. The program final goal is to realize strong civil society organizations that contribute to good governance and peace building with cooperative, productive, linkages with civil authorities. Informed by the wealth of CARE's experiences in partnering with emerging Somali civil society organizations since 1993, the CSEP builds on the achievement of the previous USAID-funded Development for All Project in Puntland, and further extends its scope to Somaliland and to a wider range of organizations including local NGOs, community based organizations (CBOs) and NGO umbrella organizations.

The program aims at strengthening institutional capacity and sustainable linkages among CSOs and the civil authority by partnering with CSOs and assisting them in delivering development projects in such a manner that promote good governance and democratic principles. The program strategy centers around institutional strengthening of CSOs, civil authorities and communities; improving linkages among them; integration of human rights into programming; identifying the population with critical needs; and addressing them through sub-grants in the agriculture, livestock, health and income generation sectors.

To date, the program has been partnering with 33 CSOs (Somaliland 17, Puntland 16) in total, providing capacity building sub-grants for 23 CSOs (Somaliland 12, Puntland 11) and sub-grants in agriculture, livestock, maternal health and income generation sectors for 23 CSOs (Somaliland 14, Puntland 9). Specifically, the program is designed to achieve three intermediate goals through the following main activities.

Intermediate goal 1: Increased capacity of selected civil society organizations to use participatory programming to design and implement sustainable projects that foster economic growth and food security.

- Selection of partners

Following the introduction of the program to respective civil authorities and CSOs, interested CSOs were requested to submit their organizational profiles. Their capacity was rated using the Organizational Development Assessment (ODA) tool. 33 CSOs were selected on the basis of their ODA scores for four key competencies (i.e. governance, finance, technical and managerial), experiences in project implementation in specified sectors and registration with the civil authority as a CSO.

- Capacity building for partner CSOs

Capacity building forms the core of the program approach. Based on the results obtained from six-monthly ODAs jointly conducted by CARE and CSO partners, training needs have been identified and synthesized across CSOs. The results of ODAs have informed development of appropriate training in programming, finance and administration, and organizational management that took place throughout the program cycle in the form of capacity building sub-grants for 23 CSOs (12 in Somaliland and 11 in Puntland), each ranging from \$2,332 to \$14,000. Specifically, CSO partners have been trained in PRA techniques, proposal writing, M&E, gender in development, rights-based approach,¹ and cost-recovery. The pre-award financial and administrative training and the sub-grant management workshops were targeted mainly at the implementing partners. As of 30 June, 2002, \$87,000 had been obligated as sub-grants out of \$96,000 allocated for the capacity building activities.

- Provision of sectoral sub-grants

Proposals were solicited from CSOs both in Year 1 and 2 of the program for projects in agriculture, livestock, health, and income generation sectors. After a lengthy proposal review process, 23 CSOs (Somaliland 14, Puntland 9) among the 33 selected CSO partners were granted \$ 1,062,366 in total, to which CSOs and communities contributed \$ 178,960 (17%) in matching funding.² Each sub-grant ranges in size (\$11,000 - \$70,000) and duration (3-9 months), and can be extended into another phase upon its successful completion. CARE have constantly assisted the CSOs throughout the project cycle in improving their project implementation as well as organizational management through programmatic and financial monitoring, auditing, and on-the-job training. CARE have conducted management system audits on quarterly basis to the sub-grantees to ensure their compliance with CARE/USAID regulations, to assess their strength and weakness and to assist them in improving their financial and organizational capacity and system.

Intermediate goal 2: Improve cooperation between civil society organizations through support for local networking initiatives.

- Capacity building for umbrella organizations

The selected partners originally included 4 umbrella organizations, 2 of them being women's umbrella organizations.³ One of the umbrella organizations in Puntland, Talowadaag, became inactive due to the poor leadership and management before preparation of a capacity building

¹ CARE's rights-based approach focuses on how the recognition of and respect for human rights can be reinforced through the process of development activities in the Somali context.

² Sub-grants are allocated as follows. Agriculture: \$372,411 to 10 CSOs (Somaliland 6, Puntland 4). Livestock: \$188,526 to 5 CSOs, (Somaliland 3, Puntland 2). Income generation: \$235,069 to 5 CSOs (Somaliland 3 and Puntland 2). Health: \$266,360 to 5 CSOs (Somaliland 2, Puntland 2).

³ COSONGO and Nagaad in Somaliland and Talowadaag and WAWA in Puntland.

sub-grant. Capacity building sub-grants enabled the other three umbrella organizations to participate in CARE's capacity building activities along with other CSOs and provide training and administrative services for their member CSOs.

- Partnership Day

Occasionally, CARE organized a "Partnership Day" among the CSO partners to discuss specific issues and/or to facilitate exchanges among them.

Intermediate goal 3: Civil authorities are more actively involved in the coordination of development initiatives undertaken by civil society organizations.

- Facilitation of the Development Dialogue Workshops

Development Dialogue Workshops (DDWs) have brought CSOs and the civil authorities into contact and explored different ways in which CSOs and the civil authority may work together in promoting development activities. In Somaliland, the workshops came to include the private sector and international organizations and be facilitated by the umbrella organizations that CARE partner with. DDWs count 7 (Somaliland 5, Puntland 2) since the start of the program.

- Involvement of CA in partners' projects

Upon the provision of sectoral sub-grants, the implementing partners have been urged to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with relevant line Ministries and local authorities at the outset of their projects, to continuously inform them of the progress and to actively engage them in project implementation and monitoring process.

- Capacity building of the civil authority

The capacity assessment of the civil authority was undertaken in Year 1 to determine the training needs of the civil authorities. It was followed by training in organizational management, strategic planning, internal control system, Development, Education, Leadership and Team in Action (DELTA), administration, and communication, funded by CARE's Africa Fund. The civil authorities, particularly district officials, have also been invited to various capacity building activities for the CSO partners, where appropriate.

Baseline survey

The baseline survey for the CSEP took place in September 2001, nearly a year after the start-up of the project, due mainly to the delay in overall program implementation. The baseline survey design was based on the findings from the Knowledge, Attitudes, Beliefs and Practices (KABP) survey in Somaliland that was meant to contextualize the meaning of the civil society. Insecurity in Puntland at that time resulted in the baseline surveys undertaken separately in Somaliland and Puntland by two external consultants, a Kenyan and a Somali, who had very different backgrounds and employed different approaches and methods. It had made the consolidation of the two baseline reports difficult, although the same Terms of Reference (TOR) was provided for the two consultants.

The baseline survey in both Somaliland and Puntland found immaturity of CSOs as a credible and influential civil society actor in the eyes of communities and the civil authorities. While some CSOs who long served a community were able to gain their trust, the relationships between CSOs and communities lasted only as long as the life time of a concerned project,

indicating the weak constituency base of CSOs. Generally, CSOs lacked the basic know-how to mainstream gender in their projects, yet there was an encouraging sign of relatively equitable participation of women's organizations in umbrella organizations. CSOs' membership and participation in local umbrella organizations were rather limited, and none were represented in the Nairobi-based Somalia Aid Coordination Body (SACB) that coordinates humanitarian and development agencies active in Somalia, mainly donors and international organizations. Distrust and disconnection characterized the relationships between CSOs and the civil authority, although the civil authority was found to be somewhat more receptive of CSOs at a local level than at a central level.

The baseline information on agricultural production, livestock, maternal health and income generation was to be collected by partners in their respective baseline surveys, and was not assessed in either of the baseline surveys by the consultants.

In all, the baseline survey findings reflect the historically embedded divisions between CSOs, communities and the civil authorities, and remind us of the novelty of CSOs that had yet to take roots in Somali context. The baseline findings underlined the magnitude of challenges the CSEP was to overcome in order to bring attitudinal and behavioral changes among the stakeholders to unlearn the habit of working in isolation.

3. Outline of the Mid-term Review

Purpose

The mid-term review was conducted internally in June-July 2002 in order to assess the extent to which the program goals and objectives have been achieved in the one and half year of implementation. Specifically, the review addresses:

1. The extent to which civil society organizations influence civil authorities with relation to peace building and good governance activities;
2. The level of interactions between CSOs and civil authorities;
3. The level of participation of CSOs in umbrella organizations;
4. The perception of respective communities towards CSOs and civil authorities;
5. The level of participation by women in the program; and
6. Economic and behavioral changes as a result of sectoral project implementation.

Methodology

As opposed to the baseline survey led by the external consultants, the mid-term review signifies the first attempt for the program staff to assess the program achievement. The TOR was prepared by the CSEP Program Manager in consultation with CARE Somalia's Design, Monitoring & Evaluation Unit, and was shared with the CSEP program staff in both sub-offices in Somaliland and Puntland who accordingly reviewed the relevant program documents, identified information gaps, and developed appropriate survey tools. Two 6-member teams were formed in each sub-office, comprised of CARE program staff and representatives from partner CSOs and the relevant line Ministries to collect information in four regions in Somaliland (Northwest, Awdar, Togdheer, Sanang) and three regions in Puntland (Bari, Nugal, Mudug).

The participatory data collection methodology was adopted for the purpose of exploring the perceptions of the respondents and obtaining the qualitative and explanatory information. The

teams conducted in-depth structured interviews with the partner CSOs, the civil authorities and the community representatives and held focus group discussions with the communities, which were complemented by their observation and the interaction with the various stakeholders during the field work.

The information was collected from 17 CSOs (Somaliland 8, Puntland 9) in total, including 3 umbrella organizations, which had been selected ensuring sectoral and regional diversity. Their beneficiary communities and 33 representatives (Somaliland 14, Puntland 19) from the local and regional governments and line Ministries with whom the above CSOs work were also interviewed to allow for triangulation of information collected. In addition, feedback on the program implementation process was solicited from relevant units in the CARE Nairobi office.

A workshop among the program staff from the two sub-offices was held in late October to finalize the key findings and recommendations based on the analysis of the preliminary findings that had been presented by different teams and units, to articulate lessons learnt on the baseline survey and mid-term review, which will inform the design of the final evaluation, and to develop the design and implementation plan for Year 3 and the project design for the possible next phase.

Constraints

The validity of the findings from the mid-term review may be limited by:

- Sample size

Given the time and resources available as well as the qualitative methodology used, the sample size for interviewed CSOs, civil authority officials and community members was relatively small. In order to ensure the selected interviewees were representative, sampled CSOs were stratified by sectors and regions.

- Absence of control groups

Strong civil society organizations is a rather broad goal, to which the CSEP along with various other factors contribute. The design of the baseline surveys and the mid-term review did not include a control group to isolate the effect of the CSEP from those of other factors, however, as it could have resulted in unexpected demand on the side of interviewed CSOs, civil authorities and communities. In this sense, the results obtained may not be entirely attributable to the CSEP.

- Bias in responses

Responses regarding the perceptions of and interactions between one another as well as achievements of sub-granted projects may have been influenced by what they are expected to say rather than what they really think. The survey was designed in a way that allows triangulation among different groups of respondents. The emphasis should have also been placed on explaining to respondents the purpose of the mid-term review. Bias may also be inherent in the fact that the CSOs, the civil authorities and communities were questioned by a team of CARE, CSO and civil authority staff. On one hand, staff and local consultants are conversant with local culture and environment, and are able to foster rapport with community and civil authority, and to acquire confidence of the respondents and collaboration from the stakeholders. On the other hand, a risk for staff bias remains when the use of M&E information

is not well defined and DME activities are solely seen by staff as a show-off of achievements rather than a learning opportunity. The information analysis was conducted in the workshop that brought together a combination of the staff, both new and old, and those directly and indirectly responsible for the program implementation.

- **Difference in the methodologies between Somaliland and Puntland**

Despite the efforts to promote cross learning and maintain consistency, coordination of DME activities between the two sub-offices has been always a challenge, let alone the baseline surveys. Preparation and communication of the mid-term review TOR may not have been as participatory as it could have resulted in the shared understanding of the TOR between the two sub-office staff. The data collection teams in each sub-office may have had different approaches in collecting the information, hence had initially presented the preliminary findings differently-from each sub-office and from the TOR. The workshop among the program staff was meant to reduce this effect by engaging them in jointly analyzing the collected information to present the findings in a coherent manner.

- **Coherence of the mid-term review design with the baseline survey designs**

The mid-term review findings should be compared against the baseline information while bearing in mind the different survey designs applied in the two surveys. The mid-term review design was not necessarily based on the baseline survey designs, partly affected by the complications in resolving differences in the baseline surveys between the sub-offices. But it was also in part necessitated by a question that arose after the baseline survey as to the appropriateness of quantitative methodology in measuring qualitative changes such as strong civil society organizations. While some improvement was made in the mid-term review design, however, many of the lessons from the baseline surveys reappeared in the mid-term review, implying that an opportunity should have been created to adequately reflect on the way the baseline surveys were conducted, and that efforts should have been made to use the lessons in the mid-term review design.

- **Scope of the TOR**

Although the mid-term review TOR was by no means expected to be exhaustive, it could have been more appropriate, had the program cycle and interventions been considered. On one hand, it did not capture the key components, including capacity building and DME. On the other hand, the indicators on the final goal were collected but proved not very useful at this point in time, only a year after the baseline surveys.

4. Findings

4.1. Achievement of goals and objectives:

Final Goal: Strong civil society organizations that contribute to good governance and peace building with cooperative, productive linkages with civil authorities.

The extent to which civil society organizations influence civil authorities with relation to peace building and good governance activities

At the time of the baseline surveys, CSOs had been seen as not an influential actor in governance and peace building. In the mid-term review, some partner CSOs were known to be

engaged in advocacy and conflict resolution not as political activities but in relation to their projects in the context of development activities. In Somaliland, for instance, the umbrella organizations, Nagaad and COSONGO, drafted legislation on the status of local NGOs for consideration under the Parliament. This would, if approved, institutionalize a linkage between local NGOs and the civil authorities beyond individual projects and create a supportive environment for development NGOs. Prompted by the concern about inadequate and uncoordinated training of nurses, Edna Adan, the founder of Edna Adan Hospital, now appointed to the Cabinet, drafted a policy on the standardization of the curriculum for the nurses training, based on the experiences of Edna Adan Hospital in training health practitioners. The policy has been approved by the parliament and is awaiting presidential assent. CCS, a long-standing partner of the CSEP advancing an income generation potential for vulnerable households from hides and skins processing, lobbied the local government in Burao to formulate a policy on public health, which was under discussion. This position was necessitated by the unhygienic use of the slaughterhouse in Burao, which was posing a health hazard to the resident community. In Puntland, NRO, a partner working in the livestock sector, resolved a conflict over access to grazing land and water between two communities by hosting a meeting among stakeholders, including elders and civil authorities. SORERDO, another partner that implemented a livestock project, resolved an intra-community conflict over ownership of a water point by establishing a water point committee. In these cases, CSOs attempted to influence policy makers and/or decision makers in the process of project delivery in order to achieve their developmental goals and objectives. Advocacy was not an objective in itself but a means relevant to their development activities. However small in its scale, these instances will disprove long held misconception of peace building and governance as being “dangerous, political” and demonstrate to other CSOs what may be accomplished by adding another layer to their ongoing development interventions at community level.

CSOs’ efforts were more concentrated at the community level, due mainly to the instability of and the frequent turnover within the civil authorities at the central level, especially in Puntland. Civil authorities at central and regional levels have low confidence in CSOs as compared to local authorities. The finding suggests that an initiative by CSOs to influence policies may become successful only when it is channeled through dialogue backed up by a trusted relationship between CSOs and the civil authorities.

CSOs facilitated dialogue between warring parties in the presence of all the stakeholders, including the civil authorities and communities. It was also clear from the cited incidences that the role of CSOs in mediation of inter/intra-community conflicts is effective where community participation and transparency was ensured in the process.

Intermediate Goal 1: Increased capacity of selected civil society organizations to design and implement sustainable projects that foster economic growth and food security.

Economic and behavioral changes as a result of sectoral project implementation

The baseline surveys had not included data to measure sectoral indicators. Sectoral M&E information collection has since been left in the hands of individual partner CSOs, whose capacity in M&E, not to mention the quality and appropriateness of the resultant information, diverges to a great extent. It also proved difficult to monitor and assess the outcome and not just output in the short project duration of six months on average.

As a result, the mid-term review relied on anecdotal evidences of improvement in socio-economic status of beneficiaries. In the agriculture sector, some farmers confirmed an expansion of their farm land due to the irrigation facilities provided by the project interventions, and expressed a hope for increased agricultural production. The Edna Adan Hospital and SDO, two of the four partners in the health sector, kept records of the attendance of women and children in maternal health facilities supported by them for the last 3-4 months. The records in each health facility showed an average monthly attendance of more than 400 respectively that had not drawn a definite trend and pattern yet within a limited time. Some livestock projects had just begun to record the livestock brought to veterinary services every month. In an income generation project that continued since the Year 1 sub-grant, CCS reported the project interventions resulted in an increase in the income of the cooperative through skin hides and processing business.

Although some information is made available through staff observation in the field and monitoring information regularly collected by partners, it does not capture overall sectoral achievements attributable to the CSEP. The program will require a consistent and coherent M&E framework according to which the sectoral information is generalized, aggregated and analyzed across different partner CSOs in a given sector.

The perception of respective communities towards CSOs

In the mid-term review, communities generally expressed a satisfaction with projects implemented by CSOs and a growing trust in them. CSOs were regarded by communities as an intermediary that stays “in touch with the people” and brings local problems/concerns to external sources of support.

Interestingly, however, some communities did not consider NGOs transparent or adding value to them, felt confident enough to implement projects on their own, and preferred to be given funding directly on the grounds that it would build capacity of CBOs and enhance community ownership and sustainability of the projects.

It remains to be seen if and to what extent community-CSOs relationships differ in nature from what the baseline surveys described as project dependent and time bounded. Mixed signals may suggest that community trust in CSOs is influenced in part by who the CSOs are and how they work with communities. Communities may develop a stronger trust in CBOs with which they can closely associate themselves rather than sometimes distant NGOs, many of which are staffed by the urban middle class. Composition and representation of CSOs alone do not determine the level of trust in their relationship with communities, however. A trusted relationship between communities and CSOs can be gradually cultivated, as the CSOs continue working with the communities. Community trust in CSOs is strengthened by the participatory approach to the design, implementation and monitoring of the projects, which ensures community ownership of the project and CSOs’ accountability and transparency to communities.

It takes a long time and efforts to build an effective and sustainable relationship between communities and CSOs, and sectoral projects by CSOs obviously earned positive recognition of CSOs by communities, and marked a starting point in developing a trusted relationship

between them. Given the relatively recent history of CSOs in Somalia, however, further work is needed to solidify this emergent relationship.

The level of participation by women in the program

Scarcity of gender disaggregated data available from CSOs makes it difficult to assess the level of women's participation in project activities at a community level, despite some indication of women's inclusion in sectoral activities. In this regard, the baseline survey noted CSOs' lack of basic know-how to mainstream gender in their projects. It seems CSOs are still not confident in incorporating gender analysis into their project design, monitoring and evaluation.

At an institutional level, on the contrary, an increased number of women were found to participate in CSOs since the baseline surveys. It is exemplified by the growth of women's NGOs in Somaliland and Puntland as well as of the two women's umbrella organizations, Nagaad and WAWA.

Nevertheless, the fact that increased women's participation in the organizations does not necessarily translate into a corresponding change at the project level brings us to question effectiveness and meaningfulness of women's *participation* in CSOs. Women are often not in decision-making role and not able to effectively participate. Consciously or not, CSOs themselves may perpetuate cultural and religious barriers against women and fall short of addressing women's self-confidence and competencies required for them to assume and stay in leadership and management positions.

Considering the deeply entrenched gender barriers in Somali context, the achievement of the program in increasing women's participation at the institutional level is remarkable. The findings point to the need for continuous efforts to lift gender barriers within CSOs and to enhance women's participation at a community level.

Intermediate Goal 2: Improved cooperation between civil society organizations through support to local networking initiatives

The level of participation of CSOs in umbrella organizations

In general, the footing of umbrella organizations is relatively well established in Somaliland and still evolving in Puntland. In Somaliland, on one hand, CONSONGO and Nagaad are joined by five other registered regional umbrella organizations. Puntland, on the other hand, counts only two registered umbrella organizations, WAWA and Talowadaag, with a momentum to found another regional umbrella organizations among local NGOs based in Nugal and Mudug Regions who felt under-represented in the leadership and membership of the existing umbrella organizations. Prior to receiving a capacity building sub-grant, the poor leadership had eventually failed Talowadaag to keep their member NGOs intact, although their individual members were considered strong. It remains to be seen if the member NGOs can reelect their leaders and revive the umbrella organization through internal discussion. The finding indicates that the strength and sustainability of an umbrella organization derive from accountability and transparency of the leadership and mutual trust among members.

Since the start of the program, COSONGO has seen an increase in their membership from 33 to 69 (109%), Nagaad from 25 to 32 (28%), and WAWA from 21 to 23 (9.5%). In the baseline

surveys, the majority of member CSOs seem to participate in networking activities by umbrella organizations. The umbrella organizations interviewed in the mid-term review demonstrate that they were able to deliver tangible benefits through networking activities, and as a result, further attracted new members. COSONGO extends the administrative and secretarial services to their members at a subsidized cost, thus enabling the individual member NGOs to pool and share their resources and cut down their operational costs. Nagaad brings their member NGOs in different sectors into contact, who are more inclined to complement than compete unlike those working in the same sectors, and helps foster and coordinate collaboration among the members in multi-sectoral programming. WAWA is able to develop linkages beyond CARE and secure funding from other sources, thereby channeling funding for their members. The findings confirm that umbrella organizations are able to promote cooperation and expand a circle of cooperation, especially when they are linked to and trusted by external sources of support.

In spite of the increased membership, however, a concern was raised how cohesive and strong an umbrella organization is internally to act as one. Meetings among members are rather infrequent and yet to become a routine. WAWA, for example, was described as strong externally with donors, but weak inside. It further leads us to question what we mean by *participation*. Capacity of umbrella organizations to realize effective and meaningful participation in local networking activities may partly depend on the strong leadership that is accountable and transparent to their members. In this regard, an increase in the number of women's NGOs participating in the umbrella organizations such as Nagaad and WAWA should be followed by a further work in advancing women's decision-making role in relation to that of men at an institutional level.

Intermediate Goal 3: Civil authorities are more actively involved in coordination of development initiatives undertaken by civil society organizations.

The level of interactions between CSOs and civil authorities

Animosity and distrust between the two which was prevalent in the beginning of the program seemed to have given way to greater understanding and acceptance of each other as complementary in development activities, leading to constructive interactions at a local level in particular. In Somaliland, the Ministry of Health agreed to provide its staff for an MCH center rehabilitated by CHLE's health project. In Puntland, Hamur CBO and SDO were able to mobilize contributions for their agricultural and health projects from the local authorities and the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs respectively as a result of years of the positive working relationships. It is significant that the civil authorities chose to use their little available resources in complementing CSOs' projects. These cases illuminate that the level of interactions between CSOs and the civil authorities depends on the length of their working relationship through different projects and the trust nurtured between them as a result.

CARE encouraged CSOs to define the roles and responsibilities with the civil authorities in a project cycle in the form of a MoU. Such an agreement was non-existent prior to the CSEP's intervention. MoUs have been concluded between all the partner CSOs and the relevant civil authorities, which made both CSOs and the civil authorities aware of the benefit of formalizing their relationships. A concern yet remains that this might have been due to CARE's requirement rather than out of their conviction of the need and value of MoUs.

This concern is reinforced by the lack of strong will by both parties to be bound by the MoUs and the varying extent of effectiveness of the MoUs in the project implementation process. The baseline surveys saw some evidences of involvement of local authorities in monitoring projects run by CSOs. The program intended to further the role of civil authorities in projects through joint monitoring and information sharing between partner CSOs and the civil authorities. It turned out, however, that effectiveness of monitoring activities by the civil authorities was often constrained by the availability of resources and the capacity of civil authorities in DME, overshadowing the chances wherein joint monitoring by CSOs and the civil authorities would continue long after CARE's interventions. Sharing of information between CSOs and civil authorities is rare and sporadic, and not institutionalized, without systematic data collection by CSOs or any reporting requirement set by the civil authorities, an area that demands an ongoing attention. In all, development of an effective linkage between CSOs and the civil authorities involves a long learning process for the both sides.

The finding marks a gradual departure from the negative sentiment and attitude long maintained between CSOs and the civil authorities, yet implies that the evolving partnerships between the CSOs and the civil authorities may be only project-dependent and may not be solid enough to be sustained after the project ends. High turnover rate among civil authority staff, especially at the central level in Puntland, is indicative of a risk for disconnection in information and relationships, and adds onto the challenges in developing and sustaining a long-term relationship between CSOs and the civil authorities. In this regard, the official recognition of local NGOs by the Somaliland government, as proposed by COSONGO and Nagaad, could signal an emerging relationship between NGOs and the civil authorities at the central level with a potential to outlive a particular project.

4.2. Strength and challenge:

The extent to which the goals and objectives have or have not been achieved can be attributed to the ways in which the program was designed and delivered. The above findings bring to light both strength and challenge in the program design and activities.

Final Goal: Strong civil society organizations that contribute to good governance and peace building with cooperative, productive linkages with civil authorities.

Strength of CSOs

Although the institutional capacity of CSEP partners was left out from the mid-term review TOR, it is important to explain a positive change in CSOs' organizational behavior on advocacy and conflict resolution in terms of capacity building under the CSEP. The average ODA scores of the partners in September 2002 indicate a steady increase in all four areas of organizational competence, i.e. governance, finance, management and technical capacity, by 24 percent over the baseline. In particular, the ODA scores exhibited significant progress in the partners' financial capacity, a trend which is also verified by a rise in their financial and administrative rating from 36% to 58% on average⁴ and a decrease in questioned or disallowed costs identified during the audits. The achievement is attributable to regular audits and follow-up on critical issues through on-the-job support.

⁴ While ODA is conducted by CSEP program staff and partners every six month, the financial and administrative rating is scored by auditors and partners during quarterly audits.

While improvement in the financial and other competencies may contribute to increased accountability and trust of stakeholders in CSOs, it is not clear how it leads to desired changes in the organizational behavior. It was questioned if and how the achievement in the four areas of competence would accurately indicate “strong CSOs that contribute to good governance and peace building with cooperative, productive linkages with civil authorities”, although it may be sufficient for the strength of organizations in general. A concern was also raised if it is appropriate to rely solely on the quantitative data to understand qualitative changes in organizational capacity. Although the ODA tool was able to trace overall improvement in scores over time, a reservation should be made that the scoring by different individuals in the same organizations may be distorted by subjective judgments without clear definition of scores and may not result in consistent, reliable information over time. The relevance and appropriateness of the ODA tool and the methodology should be reviewed in light of the program goals and objectives and constantly challenged as we gradually deepen the understanding of what strong CSOs really mean in the Somali context.

Intermediate Goal 1: Increased capacity of selected civil society organizations to design and implement sustainable projects that foster economic growth and food security.

Economic & behavioral changes

From the available information, it is difficult for the program to demonstrate the impact and effect of sectoral projects implemented by CSOs. While the DME training sensitized partner CSOs on the importance of DME to a varying degree, it was not appropriate to expect them to walk out of the training with full confidence and capacity to practice DME in their projects. It is laudable that many partners were able to collect baseline and monitoring information on their own after the training but it did not result in the analysis and use of the collected information in the project cycle. Clearly, the partners needed continuous on-the-job support throughout a DME cycle. The current DME capacity among the partners may be uneven, yet will lay a basis to develop coherent M&E frameworks according to which the existing information from partners will be synthesized and used.

| Strength | Challenge |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners are aware of the importance of DME as a result of the training. • Baseline and monitoring information on sectoral activities is collected by partners. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners still need continuous DME training. • Absence of coherent sectoral M&E frameworks at a program level to consistently collect, analyze & aggregate information from partners. • The existing information is not fully utilized. |

Community trust in partners

Only after the two cycles of the sub-grants, the partner CSOs have not integrated the participatory approach in their project cycle to the extent to be truly trusted by the communities they work with. Partners have been trained in the use of the participatory approach, but the training did not set a clear set of expectations for the partners in the beginning or to ensure their learning be transformed into action plans in the end.

Even when communities are involved in proposal development, it usually came in the last phase of the project design, depriving communities of an opportunity to make meaningful contribution. It results in part from the selection process for partners and proposals that placed the selection of CSOs ahead of that of communities. It was consciously decided in the program that choice of partners precedes that of communities in order to allow CSOs to be involved in the selection of the target communities. In fear of raising community expectations in vain, however, CSOs are often disinclined to fully consult with communities before the approval of their proposals. Willingness of CSOs to openly consult with communities can result from their identity with the constituency base. If CSOs are seen by communities as a part of them, they would equally share with a community the responsibility for getting their proposal funded. If CSOs act as an external patron for communities, their credibility rests with their ability to bring in resources. CARE can reinforce partners' incentive to involve communities in the project design by setting community participation as one of the key proposal review criteria.

Contrary to our message and value of community participation throughout the project cycle, neither the sub-grant agreement between CARE and a partner CSO nor the MoU between a CSO and the civil authorities requires signature from community representatives to verify the community's role defined in the proposals. As a result, communities do not formally commit themselves to fulfillment of responsibilities, nor have a formal means to hold others responsible. Training of partners in financial management and organizational control, along with quarterly auditing throughout the project implementation, has improved their accountability and transparency to all the stakeholders, including communities, possibly with a positive effect on the confidence they earn from stakeholders. CSOs would feel even more compelled, should there be a mechanism whereby communities are able to hold partners accountable.

| Strength | Challenge |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners are trained in participatory approach and proposal writing. • Communities are involved, but only in the last stage of the project design. • Partners are trained in financial management and organizational control and audited quarterly throughout the project implementation so that they demonstrate accountability for all the stakeholders, including communities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners are not able to adequately apply training on participatory approach in practice. Expectations/action plans from the training are not clearly defined. • Proposal design process does not allow effective participation of communities. Partners are often afraid of raising community expectations before proposals are accepted by CARE. Should we choose communities or partners first? Room for improvement in the selection process and criteria for our partners. • Does our proposal review criteria value community involvement in the design process? • A sub-grant agreement between CARE and a partner CSO and a MoU between a CSO and the civil authorities should be also signed by community representatives so that communities will verify their role defined in a proposal and formally commit themselves to fulfillment of their responsibilities. Need to develop a mechanism whereby communities are able to hold partners accountable. |

Sustainability

Experiences tell that project-created institutions and relationships were not likely to survive the end of the projects. In many cases, roles and responsibilities among the stakeholders are ambiguous in the beginning and do not take roots during a short project period. In fact, sustainability of sectoral projects is a shared concern among the staff. Incorporation of clear exit strategies in partners' projects can be within a range of CARE's influence, if we are to uphold it as a part of the proposal review criteria.

Sustainability of the CSEP's investment in partners' capacity building and local networking hinges on their ability to graduate from CARE, and extend their relationships with other international organizations and donors. CSOs CARE partnered with in the past gained good reputation and attracted trust and support from other donors. CARE was approached by other international organizations, including UN agencies, for the names of CARE's partner CSOs. The rigid selection of the partners and the emphasis on their capacity building by CARE are well known among the international organizations, positively influencing their willingness to partner with those CSOs that worked with CARE. Meanwhile, capacity building for the partners in producing quality proposals possibly contributed to their ability to access funding from other potential donors. Consequently, some partners were able to cultivate partnerships beyond CARE. In order to complement their livestock projects in Somaliland, for example, SADO and SOYWA sought and secured assistance from VET-AID, an international livestock NGO, for procurement of veterinary drugs. This partnership between the CSOs and VET-AID was a result of CSOs' own initiative and not because of CARE's deliberate efforts.

As the program move into the latter half of the three-year period, we need to recognize that CARE alone cannot do everything, and seek to ensure that our partnership with other international organizations is an integral part of our exit strategy. A more deliberate effort should be made to link our partners with other international organizations and help them diversify their funding sources beyond CARE. Primacy should be placed on the role of local umbrella organizations in doing so. We will be well positioned to facilitate more expanded and better established partnerships between CSOs and international agencies, if we are to strengthen partnerships with other international organizations ourselves. At present, CARE's role in facilitating SACB NGO Consortium in Bossaso is certainly an advantage.

| Strength | Challenge |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donors have more confidence in CARE partners than other CSOs. Some partners were able to cultivate relationships with donors outside CARE on their own. • Capacity building of partners in proposal development contributes to their fundraising from other sources. • CARE facilitates SACB NGO Consortium in Bossaso. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear exit strategies are not ingrained in the project design. Roles and responsibilities are not defined in the beginning of the project to ensure institutional sustainability. Should sustainability be considered in our proposal review criteria? • Need to recognize our own limitations in providing support to partners and to ensure our exit strategy as an integral part of the program design. • Stronger emphasis on linking CSOs to international organizations. |

Gender/Right Based Approach

In the cultural and social context where the language of gender and human rights is received with discomfort and often provokes immediate denunciation and dissension, it is a significant gain that the effort by the program to promote gender consideration and respect for rights in programming and in the organizations seems to have gained some ground. However, acceptance of gender and rights based approach (RBA) among communities and CSOs has been rather superficial and their implications in the projects as well as in the organizations have not been thoroughly understood. It may suggest still a long way forward in mainstreaming gender and human rights at all levels, above all within CARE and in our interactions with others. Gender/advocacy may have been received as another set of CARE's requirements "uniformly imposed" on partners and communities who eagerly court for their sponsor. A community committee was said to have included female representatives not as a result of an attitudinal change within the community, but because of their attempt to please CARE. Gender was often misconceived as "women's inclusion" and rarely understood as the relative status and relationship between men and women, thus misleading partners in incorporating gender analysis and further dividing the "included" women and the "excluded" men.

Gender/RBA training raised general awareness among partners, but the training could have been more effective if it were sequenced or tailored in such a way that partners can make use of it in a project cycle. Only when gender/RBA was contextualized in relation to specific issues, partners and communities were able to recognize the relevance of gender/RBA and integrate them into their ongoing projects. In a vocational training project, for instance, DANDOR introduced to the unemployed youth a range of skills that pertain to socially defined roles for both men and women, thus providing income generation opportunities for both boys and girls. Gender division of labor was also evident in the way an agricultural project involved men and women in the rehabilitation of shallow wells, to which men contributed their labor in excavation and collection of stones and women contributed by fetching water. CARE may build on the general orientation of gender/RBA to all the partners, and follow it through a gradual but solid learning process on gender/RBA, wherein selective attention and detailed guidance are provided for a limited number of partners throughout their project cycle and the learning generated on a small scale are disseminated to all the others.

The program also underestimated the persistence of some women in safeguarding traditional value related to gender. While recognizing the cultural belief and social custom so deeply embedded, the program should have devised specific strategies to address them. A lesson from other parts of the world indicates that a role model identified among respected local women is often effective in getting the message across and inducing an incremental change in the value, attitude and behavior among both men and women. If continuously encouraged and genuinely supported in their new role, those women who participated in the projects by CARE's requirement may potentially grow into a role model who will set a precedent by her deeds and leave behind a footprint that her peers can follow.

| Strength | Challenge |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners are exposed to the concept of gender/RBA through training. • A community can acknowledge a gender barrier and its consequence, where it was questioned in the context of a specific project in an appropriate manner. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of women may result from a CARE requirement rather than a change in community attitude. • Gender/advocacy is uniformly imposed on partners, without adequately examining the relevance of gender/advocacy in a given context. • Gender may be misconceived as exclusive attention to “women”, in effect creating a strain (instead of bridging a gap) in the relationship between men and women. • Women themselves are often strong defenders of traditional value associated with gender. They do not realize a range of options that women potentially have to choose from, unless being exposed to a role model with whom they can easily identify themselves. • Training is not adequately timed and disconnected from partners’ project cycle. Gender/RBA may be more successfully promoted in programming if we assist a selected pilot project in a thorough analysis of a context, provide it with a step-by-step guide in application of gender/RBA, and scale it up by using it as a demonstration for other partners. |

Intermediate Goal 2: Improved cooperation between civil society organizations through support to local networking initiatives.

Capacity of umbrella organizations

An increase in the membership of umbrella organizations has not been paralleled by a corresponding increase in the cohesion of umbrella organizations or the transparency and accountability of their leadership. Capacity building of umbrella organizations, on one hand, contributed to a growth of their membership. The capacity building sub-grants have enabled the partner umbrella organizations to participate in the training along with the individual CSOs, which in effect have exposed them to common needs and constraints across CSOs and have thus helped them better understand and serve member CSOs. An additional effort was exerted in Puntland, where the umbrella organizations are yet to gain recognition and CARE staff have been engaged in awareness raising among CSOs of the importance of the umbrella organizations.

On the other hand, capacity building activities fell short of bringing cohesion into an umbrella organization that consists of increasingly diverse CSOs. While the combined training for CSOs and umbrella organizations may have provided an opportunity for umbrella organizations to learn of CSOs, a question arises as to the appropriateness of the training for the umbrella organizations. Capacity building activities could have been tailored to specific role played by and distinct competencies required for umbrella organizations. Moreover, capacity building

activities should be planned and conducted in such a manner that reinforces the accountability of the umbrella leadership. Transparency should be stressed in the delivery of the capacity building sub-grants, ensuring that member CSOs are fully informed of and involved in the planning process and that their consent is secured before a sub-grant agreement is signed.

| Strength | Challenge |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity building of umbrella organizations/Awareness raising among CSOs towards umbrella organizations contributed to an increase in the membership of umbrella organizations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The process & contract of capacity building sub-grants to umbrella organizations needs to be transparent in the eyes of member CSOs so that they can hold their umbrella organizations accountable. What competencies do we expect of umbrella organizations? Are they different from individual CSOs? Need to review training in view of their specific role/competencies as umbrella organizations. |

Effectiveness of participation in networking activities

A message recurrently disseminated by CARE throughout the CSEP has seemingly raised an interest among CSOs in strengthening “linkage”, be it a relationship among other agencies (partnership), with policy makers (advocacy), and between men and women (gender). An extensive talk on gender, for instance, positively impacted representation of women in CSOs and their engagement in networking activities. An overemphasized notion of “linkage” seems to have left behind the justification and purpose of networking activities, however. As a result, the program lacked a way to ascertain effectiveness of linkage, such as so-called Partnership Days. Clearly defined objectives and explicitly agreed principles that unite different actors would have guided us in facilitating participation of stakeholders in networking activities, and would have focused our attention on outcome and process of networking activities in monitoring effectiveness of linkage.

| Strength | Challenge |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive discussion on and increased acknowledgement of the importance of strengthening “linkage”. Improved representation of women in networking activities at an organizational level. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose/expectation of the Partnership Day is not clear. The monitoring focuses on quantitative information and does not capture the effectiveness of networking/advocacy/women’s participation in decision-making. Is the way we monitor appropriate? |

Intermediate Goal 3: Civil authorities are more actively involved in coordination of development initiatives undertaken by civil society organizations.

A series of DDWs, especially the very first one, have marked a turning point in the once strained relationship between CSOs and the civil authorities, and have laid a general basis on which a Memorandum of Understanding was developed and agreed by a CSO and the relevant

civil authorities for collaboration on a specific project. The fact that a MoU has not always been observed by both parties may reveal a challenge in turning their willingness to work together to a real difference on the ground in their habit of working alone, a challenge that can be addressed only through a persistent and patient effort sustained by all.

Dialogue between CSOs and the civil authorities has been maintained, despite the frequent turnover of personnel on the part of the civil authorities (particularly at the central level and in Puntland). The program attempted to moderate the effect of staff turnover on the continuity of dialogue by including the civil authorities at all levels, central, regional and local in DDWs and other capacity building activities. Nonetheless, the workshops inevitably became repetitive at times, only recapping for the new participants rather than building on what has been already discussed. Constrained by the factor external to the program, the relationship between CSOs and the civil authorities on the whole is yet to fully mature, as so desired, to gradually deepen mutual understanding and trust. A stronger relationship emerged between CSOs and the civil authorities at the local level that has been less susceptible to a political climate, with a potential to be scaled up to the central level only if the organizational culture of the civil authorities allows bottom-up communications.

Discontinuity in the institutional memory of the civil authorities underlines their weakness as an institution. In Year 1, capacity building activities were implemented specifically for the civil authorities, funded by CARE's Africa Fund. In Year 2, the capacity building activities for CSOs were also attended by the civil authorities, so that the civil authorities will be able to understand and coordinate activities by CSOs. It is questionable, however, if inclusion of the civil authority representatives in the training and workshops contributed to their institutional capacity. The learning was contained at an individual level and not shared across within the organization, indicating that the selection process and criteria of participants did not effectively locate appropriate entry points within the civil authorities. Resources and efforts invested into the training for the civil authority may not be entirely wasted, although misplaced, by the staff turnover within the civil authorities, as long as the trained individuals continue to contribute to strong civil society in different capacities. It would take a separate study, however, to see if and how the acquired skills and knowledge are put into use by those individuals who left the civil authorities.

Furthermore, CARE's input into the capacity building for the civil authorities should have been realigned with an intended outcome in organizational behavior and culture. Capacity building activities raised a misled demand of the civil authorities for material and financial support beyond their expected role in coordination as opposed to implementation of development programming. It underlines the importance of upholding a consensus on the roles and responsibilities of the civil authorities and ensuring the relevance of capacity building activities to their roles and responsibilities. It also reminds us that training is not "the" solution to just any development needs, but a part of long-term capacity building process.

| Strength | Challenge |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DDW is effective in breaking ice between CSOs and civil authorities and raising willingness of the civil authorities to sign MoUs with CSOs. • Inclusion of all levels of civil authorities in DDWs/training contributed to continuity of relationships, despite staff turnover within the civil authorities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to ensure compliance with a MoU by both parties. • DDW is not yet institutionalized, negatively affected by staff turnover within the civil authorities. • The civil authorities are not strong as an institution. An intention is to strengthen civil authorities through training, but the benefit of training is not shared within the civil authorities but only limited to individual participants. • Our selection process and criteria for participants in DDWs/training for the civil authorities may not be appropriate to build institutional strength. • Mismatch in the expectations of training between CARE & the civil authorities. While CARE only wishes to see a positive attitudinal change in the civil authorities and a basis whereby CSOs can work with them, the training raises more demand from the civil authorities for capacity building. • Training is not a one-off activity but a part of the long-term capacity building process. |

5. Recommendations

Final Goal: Strong civil society organizations that contribute to good governance and peace building with cooperative, productive linkages with civil authorities.

1. Define “strong civil society organizations”.

Emerged in a relatively recent history, civil society organizations are yet to take a firm root and striving to identify their niche in Somali society. As such, there is only a limited understanding of civil society organizations, and so is the effort to strengthen them. The lessons learnt from the program have a potential to inform the context-specific meaning of “strong civil society organizations”. CARE currently relies on ODA tool to assess the strength of civil society organizations, yet feels it does not capture changes we intend to make. Common understanding for strong civil society should be continuously explored by all the stakeholders as well as by CARE staff. As a first step, CARE should internally review the information needs of the program with the assistance from CARE’s DME unit, and hence review the relevance of ODA tool. Partners will be requested to provide feedback for CARE on their understanding of “strong civil society organizations” and the refined ODA tool.

Intermediate Goal 1: Increased capacity of selected civil society organizations to design and implement sustainable projects that foster economic growth and food security.

1. Develop sector M&E frameworks and standardize monitoring tools accordingly. Establish a follow-up mechanism to ensure the best utilization of both the tools and the information.

Involve the partners in developing sectoral M&E frameworks and tools, based on the best M&E practice among them. CARE will facilitate sharing of M&E methods and tools among the partners in the same sector and let them come to a consensus on the most suitable M&E tools for their common use. The partners will develop joint sectoral M&E plans and continue exchanges of M&E findings and lessons learnt through regular sectoral meetings.

2. Encourage NGOs to involve the communities in the project design process. Promote community participation, exit strategies, transparency and accountability among all stakeholders.
3. Encourage NGOs to promote representation and effective participation of women at the community level, through awareness raising, empowerment, analysis of women's roles and responsibilities in a project cycle.

It is of critical importance that all the stakeholders are involved at all levels in the project design in the very beginning of a project cycle. In advance of proposal submission to CARE, partner CSOs will be trained in the Participatory Learning and Action (PLA)/gender in development during a proposal development workshop, with a clear aim to use their learning in developing a proposal for Year 3 sub-grant.

CARE should improve a proposal development and review process in such a way that will render partners transparent and accountable. CARE will make it explicit that partners' proposals will be assessed in terms of the set project proposal review criteria that include community participation, exit strategy and gender. Partners will be expected to develop MoUs with all the stakeholders, including the civil authorities and communities, in the course of (and not after) proposal development, and will be asked to present them when they submit the proposals. Community representatives will be involved in the on-site proposal review so that they will be fully informed of the intent of CSOs and be given a much stronger say in the project design.

The information sharing mechanism should be agreed between a partner CSO and a community before the project start-up. Throughout the proposal development and review process, CARE and partners will explore an appropriate mechanism through which a community will be able to monitor a project by a CSO. CARE will also ensure that all the monitoring information be disaggregated by gender.

In order to break from the misconception of RBA as an additional activity and better assist partners integrate RBA into their projects, CARE will provide detailed attention and step-by-step guidance in application of RBA for one selected pilot project in each sub-office in Somaliland and Puntland. The pilot projects will serve as a demonstration to the other CSOs of how RBA can enhance their ongoing development work in practice. The lessons learnt from the pilots can be consolidated into guidelines for CSOs to incorporate RBA, community participation, an exit strategy and gender in the project cycle.

Intermediate Goal 2: Improved cooperation between civil society organizations through support to local networking initiatives.

1. Organize partners by sectors, and jointly develop sectoral M&E frameworks at a program level. Use sectoral M&E frameworks as a means to identify a cross learning opportunity among partners in the same sector and to foster a “mentoring” relationship between strong and weak partners.

CARE should reorganize an occasional “Partnership Day” among all the partners into a regular monitoring meeting among the partners in the same sector in order to make the exchange more relevant and meaningful. Guided by the sectoral M&E frameworks, the partners will conduct the baseline and the evaluation as joint exercises, and share their progress against an agreed set of indicators on an ongoing basis throughout a project cycle. CARE will let the partners identify best practices among themselves through sectoral monitoring meetings, and facilitate a cross-learning opportunity between well established and new CSOs. Relevant line Ministries will be also invited to attend the sectoral meetings.

2. Organize partners by geographical areas, and promote collaboration among CSOs active in the same geographical area.

In place of “Partnership Day”, CARE should also facilitate an exchange among the partners implementing projects in the same geographical area. Initially, CARE may begin with an introduction to and application by partners of the Household Livelihood Security framework so that the partners will understand how different sectoral activities complement each other and contribute to the livelihood security of the same target communities. The holistic understanding of communities and of linkage among different sectors will be enhanced by the attendance of relevant local authorities in area specific meetings, and may lead to joint project interventions by different partners who works for the same communities. In the next phase, CARE should design a new sub grant scheme that allows joint projects by partners.

Involvement of the civil authorities in sectoral or area specific meetings among partners may help define a specific role for the civil authorities in their cross visits to and monitoring of CSOs’ activities.

3. Recognize the umbrella organizations as an integrated part of CARE’s exit strategy. Assess institutional capacity/relationships of the umbrella organizations, and develop specific capacity building activities tailored to the needs of the umbrella organizations, apart from those for individual CSOs.

CARE recognizes the potential of the umbrella organizations to sustain and take forward the accomplishment of the program long after the CSEP ends. CARE should deepen the understanding of the umbrella organizations and concentrate our efforts around their capacity building. As a first step, CARE will demonstrate to individual CSOs and umbrella organizations what can be achieved by joining different CSOs together in sectoral or area specific meetings, in the intent that they will see the value of institutionalizing such meetings within the functions performed by the existing umbrella organizations.

4. Further develop our understanding of SACB and other international organizations, and strengthen our partnership with them in view of linking CSOs to potential donors as a part of our exit strategy.

CARE should work with the umbrella organizations to undertake institutional analysis of international organizations and learn who they are, what they do, and how we can work together. CARE should actively participate in the existing coordination meetings and/or sectoral working groups among international organizations, if any, and seek opportunities to collaborate with them in support of local organizations in the relevant sectors. Where possible, CARE should engage the umbrella organizations in developing partnerships with international organizations.

Intermediate Goal 3: Civil authorities are more actively involved in coordination of development initiatives undertaken by civil society organizations.

1. All the stakeholders should identify their roles and responsibilities within a comprehensive framework that:
 - defines joint monitoring activities, information collection and sharing;
 - analyzes their incentives to sustain relationships;
 - establishes the relevant competencies; and
 - realigns capacity building activities, based on the understanding that training as a part of the long-term process to strengthen capacity.

CARE should inform the stakeholders of the CSEP mid-term review findings and recommendations through dissemination workshops, and use that occasion to discuss their roles and responsibilities, identify required competencies and resources, and develop a framework for collaboration to complement each other's role and capacity. Based on the outcome of the dissemination workshops, the subsequent DDWs will revisit and address the information needs of different stakeholders through development of an information sharing strategy, according to which the content of MoUs and the purpose of joint monitoring between CSOs and the civil authorities will be redefined. A follow-up mechanism should be developed to ensure the implementation of the information sharing strategy. Where deemed appropriate, CARE may consult with the civil authorities in carefully identifying appropriate and qualified civil authority representatives in workshops and training.

In the long run, CARE should look into a possibility of developing a project that aims at building institutional capacity of the civil authorities.

6. Lessons Learnt on the Baseline Survey and the Mid-term Review

1. Prepare TORs in a participatory manner (Nairobi, sub-offices, representatives from CSOs and the civil authorities, and donors).

While the process of the baseline survey and the mid-term review involved CARE staff in Nairobi and the sub-offices as well as representatives from CSOs and the civil authorities, the sub-office staff were not actively involved in preparation of TORs, and were not conversant on the purpose and use of the information, although they were involved in the information collection. Experiences from the baseline survey and the mid-term review points to the importance of shared understanding of the TOR between the staff and a consultant and between the sub-offices in analysis and presentation of the DME findings in accordance with the

purpose set in the TOR and consolidation of the findings in a coherent manner. Effective participation of the internal and external stakeholders in preparation of TORs is thus essential if the DME activities are to become truly a learning opportunity. Preparation of TOR should start with a review of an M&E plan that defines for whom the information will be useful/relevant and with whom it should be shared. Dissemination and use of the DME findings and recommendations should be considered in determining who should be involved and consulted with in preparation of the TOR.

2. Plan and set aside an adequate time for DME activities.

Staff participation in and understanding of DME activities were often constrained by time. Due to a delay in the program start-up, the Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) for Year 1 could not allocate adequate time for DME activities, including the review of logframe, development of an M&E plan and the baseline survey. As a result, the baseline survey took place a year after the start-up and after the partners completed their baseline surveys. This delay negatively affected the quality of baseline information collected (e.g. respondents had difficulty in recalling the conditions a year ago), and meant a missed opportunity to set up sectoral M&E frameworks for partners at the program level in the beginning and to use the baseline information early in the implementation process. It is important to set aside a quality time, where possible, and create an opportunity for reflection in the future program planning in order to fully make use of DME activities to improve program design and implementation.

3. Review the program logframe.

The baseline and the mid-term review both pointed out gaps in the logic of the program and in the methodology of the program DME. Identification of the information needs and monitoring of intended changes in capacity and relationships were clouded by lack of clarity in the program goals and objectives, combined with a staff misconception of DME as statistics/numbers. We should constantly revisit the program goals and objectives in view of our experiences and learning that have accumulated over time, use the newly gained understanding in identifying our information needs and use, and accordingly develop the M&E methods and tools that meet our information needs and balance quantitative and qualitative information in measuring (and not counting) the progress.

4. Use an external consultant in support of (not in replacement of) staff role in DME and as a resource person to enhance internal capacity.

Staff participation in the mid-term review proved an important learning opportunity for all of us and above all resulted in a staff commitment to implement the recommendations. Staff can contribute to DME activities through their familiarity with local culture and environment, and ability to maintain rapport with community and civil authority and to acquire confidence of the respondents and collaboration from the stakeholders in data collection process, but may lack analytical skills and objectivity. While an external consultant brings in important expertise and different perspectives and serves as a resource person to the program, reliance on an external consultant may deprive staff of their learning experiences through DME activities, limiting their reflection and use of DME findings in the program cycle. An internal review by staff with guidance from an external consultant can complement the benefits of internal and external

evaluations. In this sense, an external consultant should support and not replace staff role in DME, and is expected to enhance their capacity in DME. Staff capacity building can be a part of the TOR for an external consultant.

5. Improve coordination in DME between Somaliland and Puntland.

Due to resource and time constraints along with logistical complications, exchanges between the two sub-offices have been rather limited, making it difficult to assess and demonstrate the impact at a program level. A program staff who had worked with a baseline consultant in Somaliland joined the baseline survey in Puntland with an intention to harmonize two baseline surveys, yet it did not result in consolidation of the two separate baseline reports. The staff role in the baseline surveys in two sub-offices could have been more effective if there is a consensus on the TOR between two sub-offices and the consultants and if the consultants were used in a way that builds staff capacity in DME. DME activities should be conducted as teamwork between sub-offices and between staff and an external consultant. Further work is required to bring coherence in DME practice between in Somaliland and Puntland.

Annex 1: Civil Society Expansion Program Mid-term Review Terms of Reference

Introduction:

The Civil Society Expansion Program (CSEP) began in October 2000, when CARE received funding from USAID. CARE is working with the local authorities and CSOs in Somaliland and Puntland to strengthen civil society by supporting economic development activities that promote good governance and democratic principles, and to improve linkages between CSOs and civil authorities. The overall objective of the program is to have *strong civil society organizations that contribute to good governance and peace building with cooperative, productive linkages with civil authorities.* CARE provides capacity building and sectoral sub-grants to partner CSOs funded by USAID, as well capacity building support to civil authorities, which was funded by the Africa Fund.

At the start of the Program, it was envisaged that a review of program activities would be conducted annually with the results of such review being incorporated in the subsequent year's DIP. Due, however, to the late start up of program implementation occasioned by the festive season of Ramadhan, and slow adaptation of program concept by partners and civil authorities, it became clear that conducting the review at the close of the first year in October 2001 would have been unfeasible because implementation was still at its early stages. It was therefore agreed that a mid-term review would be conducted during the first half of the second year.

The mid term review will be conducted from June 15, 2002 and will be expected to take at most two weeks in each sub-office. CARE program staff in Somaliland and Puntland will conduct the review with the DM & E officer giving a lead and necessary guidance. A cross section of program stakeholders who include partners, members of beneficiary communities, respective civil authorities and USAID will be involved. The exercise will be carried out from June 15, 2001 and is expected to take two weeks in each sub-office

Scope:

The mid-term Program evaluation will involve review of the following:

- Program proposal
- Program DIP
- Program baseline
- Progress, monthly, quarterly and annual Program reports
- Monitoring activities carried out by CARE
- Monitoring activities carried out by selected partner CSOs
- Level of involvement of respective Civil Authorities in Program activities

Output:

At the close of the exercise, each team (Hargeisa & Bossaso) will produce and submit to the Program Coordinator a comprehensive report detailing review findings and relevant recommendations. The report will be shared with USAID and other interested parties.

Detailed review activities:

The review will focus on ascertaining to what extent program goals/objectives were achieved in the one and half years of program implementation. The program intermediate goals and respective indicators are outlined below:

Intermediate Goal 1: *Increased capacity of selected civil society organizations to use a participatory programming to design and implement sustainable projects that foster economic growth and food security.*

Indicators

- Increased agricultural production levels in target communities
- Increased awareness and use of safe motherhood practices
- Increased awareness and practice of better animal husbandry and range management practices
- Increased income for beneficiaries participating in income generation activities
- At least 70% of target CSOs are rated as competent on a standard capacity assessment tool by the end of the program period
- At least 70% of CSOs are rated as competent by their target communities in a participatory assessment process
- At least 50 % of CSOs incorporate gender analysis in their project design and monitoring activities

Intermediate Goal 2: *Improve cooperation between civil society organizations through support for local networking initiatives*

Indicators

- % increase in membership of a target umbrella organizations
- # of CSOs regularly participating in network meetings
- # of advocacy initiatives undertaken by local umbrella organizations with regional authorities
- % increase in the number of CSOs participating in SACB sectoral meetings in their regions
- % increase in the number of women actively participating in networking activities

Intermediate Goal 3: *Civil authorities are more actively involved in the coordination of development initiatives undertaken by civil society organizations*

Indicators

- % of local authorities with Memoranda of Understanding with target CSOs
- % of local authorities offering support to target communities and type of support offered (security, arbitration, resources)
- # of local authority staff participating in the monitoring of CSO projects

Sub-office review:

A team comprising the program staff, selected partners & civil authorities will conduct the review in both Somaliland and Puntland.

Hargeisa:

The group will be composed of:

CARE: Senior Program Officer and two Program Officers

Partners: SADO (Project Manager), HAVOYOCO (Project Manager)

Civil authorities: Majors (Hargeisa, Gabiley, Dilla, Borame, Burao) – to be involved in the review at their respective district level reps in the Ministries of Agriculture, Health, Livestock and Commerce – to be involved in the review at their respective sector level

Bossaso:

The group will be composed of:

CARE: Project Manager and two Program Officers

Partners: DANDOR (Project Manager), KAALO (Project Manager)

Civil authorities: Majors (Bossaso, Benda Beilla, Garoe, Galkaio) – to be involved in the review at their respective district level reps in the Ministries of Agriculture, Health, Livestock and Commerce – to be involved in the review at their respective sector level

Nairobi review:

A review will be conducted to ascertain program activities/achievements at the Nairobi level. The review will focus on activities related to support to the field by Nairobi program staff.

These will include:

- Sub-grant proposals review
- Sub-grants contracts preparation
- Support from M&E
- Support from Admin
- Support from Finance
- Donor reporting

Other tasks:

- Review the draft reports from the field
- Develop reporting format
- Prepare final report

The group conducting the Nairobi review will comprise of:

- Leslye Rost Van Tonningen (Partnership Coordinator)
- Timothy Muia (Program Manager)
- Paul Bradbury (Partnership Technical Advisor)
- Wairimu Gakuo (DM & E officer)
- Moses Kihoro (Sub-grants Controller)
- Lilly Omondi (Sector Coordinator)
- USAID representative

Review Guiding Instructions

Areas of Focus:

The review shall endeavor to determine the following:

1. The extent to which civil society organizations influence civil authorities with relation to peace building and good governance activities
2. The level of interactions between CSOs and Civil Authorities
3. The level of participation of CSOs in Umbrella Organizations
4. The perception of respective communities towards CSOs and civil authorities
5. The level of participation by women in the program
6. Economic and behavioral changes as a result of implemented sectoral projects

Methodology

The following methodologies will be applied in the course of the review:

- (i) Desk study
- (ii) Guided interviews
- (iii) Focus group discussions
- (iv) Observations/Informal discussions

For ii, iii, and iv above, appropriate samples will be selected to represent the target population (stakeholders). Sample selection will be based on the following criteria:

CSOs:

- At least one CSO per sector of involvement (health, agriculture, livestock and income generation)
- At least two CSOs per region
- The two umbrella organization

CAs:

- All the respective regional governments
- All the respective local governments
- The relevant Director Generals
- The relevant sector representative in the regions

Communities:

- All communities involved in projects implemented by the selected CSOs

Questionnaires and group discussions will be designed to get answers to the following:

- How and in what areas have CSOs been involved in civil authorities governance
- To what level do civil authorities have confidence in CSOs
- To what extend has agricultural production increased in target communities
- Is there increased awareness and use of safe motherhood practices
- Is there increased awareness and practice of better animal husbandry
- Has there been an increase income for beneficiaries participating in income generation activities
- To what extend has organizational capacity of partner CSOs increased
- What is the level of confidence by communities in CSOs
- To what level have women been involved in project design and monitoring activities
- Has there been any increase in membership of target umbrella organizations
- Number of CSOs regularly participating in network meetings

- Number of advocacy initiatives undertaken by CSOs with civil authorities
- Number of local authorities with Memoranda of Understanding with target CSOs
- Number of local authority staff participating in the monitoring of CSO projects

Review itinerary:

| Activity/Location | Period | Person responsible | Participants |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| <u>Puntland:</u> | | | |
| Review program proposal, DIP and baseline report | 15 – 16 June 2002 | Osman Hired – Project Manager | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Abdijabar – TL (If available) – Osman Hired - PM – Awad Salah – TO – Asili Mohamoud – PO – Ibrahim Aware – PM Dandor – Project Manager – KAALO – CA representative |
| Review internal & External program reports | 17 – 18 June 2002 | | |
| Interview RG – Bossaso | 19 June 2002 | | |
| | 19 June 2002 | | |
| Interview Mayor - Bossaso | 19 June 2002 | | |
| Visit DANDOR Project in Bossaso | 20 June 2002 | | |
| Travel to Benda Beilla | 21 June 2002 | | |
| Visit SORERDO Project in Dhuul | 22 June 2002 | | |
| Interview CA and Community in Dhuul | 22 June 2002 | | |
| Travel to Garoe | 23 June 2002 | | |
| Interview CA & community at KAALO project site Garoe | 24 June 2002 | | |
| Visit SDO Project in Garoe | 25 – 26 June 2002 | | |
| | 27 June 2002 | | |
| Visit NRO Project in Galkaio | 28 – 30 June 2002 | | |
| Travel to Bossaso | | | |
| Compile draft report | | | |

| | Activity date due | Responsible persons | Participants |
|--|-------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| <u>Somaliland</u> | | | |
| Review program proposal, DIP and baseline report | 18-19 June 2002 | Team 1 and Team 2 | Team 1 |
| | | Team 1 and Team 2 | – Faiza Ibrahim - SPO |
| Review internal & External program reports | 20 June 2002 | Team 1 | – Hussein - DME Officer |
| | 22 June 2002 | | – Project Manager – HAVOYOCO |
| Interview RG – Hargeisa | 22 June 2002 | Team 1 | – CA representative |
| | 22 June 2002 | | Team 2 |
| Interview Mayor - Hargeisa | 23 June 2002 | Team 1 | – Nuh Haji - PO |
| | | Team 2 | – Mohamed Abdi – PO |
| Visit Edna Hospital Project in Hargeisa | 22 June 2002 | | – Project Manager – SADO |
| | | Team 2 | – CA Representative |
| Visit ARDO Project in Gabiley | 22 June 2002 | Team 2 | |
| | 23 June 2002 | | |
| Interview Mayor - Gabiley | 24 June 2002 | Team 2 | |
| | | Team 2 | |
| Visit BAT project site in Baki | 25 June 2002 | | |
| | | Team 1 | |
| Interview CA Baki | 24 June 2002 | Team 1 | |
| Interview Waberi & Hodan Communities | 25– 26 June 2002 | | |
| | | Team 1 and 2 | |
| Visit CCS Project in Buroa | 27 – 30 June 2002 | | |
| Interview CA and Community in Buroa | | | |
| Compile draft report | | | |
| <u>Nairobi</u> | | | |
| Review program proposal, DIP and baseline report | 17 – 18 June 2002 | Leslye – Partnership Coordinator | Leslye, Paul, Wairimu, Moses, Lilly, USAID |
| Review Quarterly program reports | 19 – 20 June 2002 | | |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|--|
| Review M&E reports | 24 June 2002 | | |
| Review support given by Nairobi program staff & Sub-grant unit | 25 – 26 June 2002 | | |
| Compile draft report | 27 – 28 June 2002 | | |
| Review reports submitted by field review teams | 4 – 5 July 2002 | | |
| Compile final report | 8 – 10 July 2002 | | |

Annex 2: Somalia Civil Society Expansion Program Logical Framework

| Narrative Summary | Verifiable indicators | Means of verification | Assumptions |
|---|---|--|--|
| Final Goal: Strong civil society organizations that contribute to good governance and peace building with cooperative, productive linkages with civil authorities | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased influence of civil society organizations on civil authorities' good governance and peace building initiatives 2. Increased trust and belief by community members that CSOs can positively influence community activities and services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline survey , final evaluation • Baseline survey, final evaluation • Case studies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central government does not perceive civil society organizations as a threat in control of communities • Peace prevails in target areas |
| Intermediate Goal 1: Increased capacity of selected civil society organizations to design and implement sustainable projects that foster economic growth and food security | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Increase in agricultural production levels in target communities 1.2 Increase in awareness and use of safe motherhood practices 1.3 Increase in awareness and practice of better animal husbandry and range land management practices 1.4 Increase in income for beneficiaries participating in income generation activities 1.5 At least 70% of target NGOs are rated as competent on a standard capacity assessment tool by the end of the project period 1.6 At least 70% of CSOs are rated as competent by their communities in a participatory assessment process 1.7 At least 50% of CSOs incorporate gender analysis in project design and monitoring activities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline survey/assessments • Monthly/quarterly monitoring and progress reports • Capacity assessment reports • CSO proposals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security is maintained in target areas • Local authorities understand their roles and limitations in CSO activities |
| Intermediate Goal 2: Improved cooperation between civil society organizations through support to local networking initiatives | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1 % increase in CSO membership in umbrella organizations 2.2 # of CSOs actively participating in network meetings 2.3 # of advocacy initiatives undertaken by local umbrella organizations with civil authorities 2.4 % increase in the number of CSOs participating in SACB sectoral meetings in their regions 2.5 % increase in the number of women participating in networking activities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline survey • Monthly and quarterly progress reports • Site visit reports • Minutes of meetings • Umbrella organizations reports/newsletters | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civil authorities do not perceive the CSOs networks as a threat to their authority |
| Intermediate Goal 3: Civil authorities are more actively involved in coordination of development initiatives undertaken by civil society organizations | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1 % of local authorities with Memoranda of Understanding with target CSOs 3.2 # of local authority staff participating in the monitoring of CSO projects 3.3 % of local authorities offering support to target communities and type of support offered (security, arbitration, resources) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MOU documents • Minutes of meetings • Site visit reports • Monitoring reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local authorities do not use their increased capacity as an means of stifling community initiatives |

Program Logical Framework (cont.)

| Narrative Summary | Verifiable indicators | Means of verification | Assumptions/Risks |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Outputs:</p> <p>1.1 Target CSOs implement projects in agriculture, maternal health, livestock, and income generation</p> <p>1.2 Target CSOs trained in target capacity building areas of governance, finance, management, technical, and advocacy</p> <p>1.3 2 capacity assessments undertaken each year for every sub-grant project</p> <p>1.4 Quarterly audits conducted on each sub-grant project</p> <p>1.5 Target CSOs and communities contribute a minimum of 10% of the total project budget</p> <p>1.6 Local authority staff trained in public sector training, finance, management, strategic planning, good governance, conflict resolution and negotiation</p> <p>1.7 CSOs involve beneficiaries in monitoring activities</p> | <p>1.1.1 # of NGOs implementing sectoral projects by sector</p> <p>1.2.1 # of CSOs that receive capacity building training</p> <p>1.2.2 # of people benefiting from capacity building program (by gender)</p> <p>1.3.1 # of CSOs assessed at least twice during the year</p> <p>1.3.2 Capacity rating scores of each CSO</p> <p>1.4.1 # of audits conducted per CSO</p> <p>1.4.2 NGOs attain at least 85% rating on their audits by the end of the project</p> <p>1.5.1 % contribution to each community development project in cash or in kind</p> <p>1.5.2 % contribution by CSOs to community development project</p> <p>1.6.1 # of civil authority staff attending training</p> <p>1.6.2 Target local authorities demonstrate increased capacity on a standard rating tool to be developed jointly with CARE</p> <p>1.7.1 # and gender of beneficiaries involved in project monitoring activities (by gender)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training reports • Monthly monitoring reports • Quarterly progress reports • Baseline capacity assessment report • Capacity building assessment reports • CSO financial monitoring system • CARE monitoring system • Final evaluation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local authorities agree to participate in capacity building activities |
| <p>2.1 CSOs become members of and participate in umbrella organizations</p> <p>2.2 Networks develop transparent and participatory mechanisms for management of the networks</p> | <p>2.1.1 # of active networks in each region and membership</p> <p>2.1.2 # of network meetings held in each area and issues discussed</p> <p>2.1.3 # of networks implementing transparent and participatory mechanisms allowing full participation of members in management and decision making</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline assessment • Minutes of meetings • Final evaluation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Umbrella organizations independently manage and support their activities from local resources |
| <p>3.1 Civil authority staff are trained in public planning, finance, management, strategic planning, good governance</p> <p>3.2 Civil authorities participate in monitoring and evaluation activities with CSOs</p> | <p>3.1.1 % of local authorities approving the training of staff</p> <p>3.1.2 # of local authorities staff trained and topics of training</p> <p>3.2.1 # of local authorities staff participating in monitoring and evaluation</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training reports • Progress reports • Final evaluation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate numbers of local authorities and staff participate in training activities |

Program Logical Framework (cont.)

| Key Activities | Inputs | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>1.1 Develop guidelines for partner CSOs selection and select CSOs</p> <p>1.2 NGOs conduct assessments in target communities to sensitize communities and identify areas for intervention</p> <p>1.3 NGOs and communities develop proposals</p> <p>1.4 NGOs receive capacity building training</p> <p>1.5 NGOs implement projects together with target communities</p> <p>1.6 Review capacity assessment tools and conduct baseline assessment</p> <p>1.7 Develop participatory capacity assessment tool with local authorities</p> <p>1.8 Develop training plan for partner NGOs and local authorities</p> <p>1.9 Develop guidelines for local authority and NGO relations during project implementation</p> <p>1.10 Conduct capacity assessments for partner NGOs on a bi-annual basis</p> <p>1.11 Conduct audits for sub-grant project partners on a quarterly basis</p> <p>1.12 Mobilize communities to get commitments on community contributions</p> <p>1.13 Monitor community contributions</p> <p>1.14 Develop participatory monitoring tools with partners and communities</p> <p>2.1 Conduct baseline assessments on existing umbrella organizations</p> <p>2.2 Support network initiatives through facilitation of strategic planning processes</p> <p>2.3 Support training activities for network members on development of advocacy messages</p> <p>3.1 Conduct sensitization meetings with local authorities on project objectives</p> <p>3.2 Conduct training on public planning, finance, management, strategic planning and good governance</p> <p>3.3 Support linkages between local authorities and CSOs in training and monitoring activities</p> <p>3.4 Facilitate joint monitoring and evaluation activities with local authorities</p> | <p>USAID funding:</p> <p>CARE contribution:</p> <p>NGO/Community contribution:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSO monthly reports • CSO quarterly reports • Capacity assessment reports • Training reports • Monthly and quarterly monitoring reports • Mid term and final evaluations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local CSOs have an interest in project activities • Communities collaborate with CSOs to develop viable projects • Local authority staff participate in training activities • Communities and CSOs contribute to project implementation activities |