

Evaluations of our international cooperation

Content:	page
Small Farmers Empowerment Program, India, 300007724	1
A chance for every child, South Africa, 300006773	5
iThemba Advocacy Campaign, South Africa 300007192	8
MOFI, Manyara Organic Farming Initiative, Tanzania, 300007760	9

Small Farmers Empowerment Program, India, 300007724

Partnership & Learning

1. Describe the division of roles between SvEO and LEO in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project.

Like in 2017 and previous years, LEO implemented the project in Tamil Nadu with support of SvEO when needed. Both SvEO and LEO organised many skype calls in the monitoring process and exchanged activity reports. Periodical review was also conducted for monitoring and evaluation and reports were sent through email and discussion took place over skype between LEO and SvEO. LEO has also been responsible for monitoring the economy of the project in India and have also carried through the monthly and quarterly progress reports as well as the annual and financial reports to SvEO. SvEO is overlooking operation both in India and Sweden. SvEO has been responsible for verifying the reports written by LEO as well as verifying the status of the project.

As implementing partner, ISS is totally responsible for upholding the terms & conditions of the agreement regarding implementing the project as well as the plan detailed along with the budget. This entails not only performing activities spelt out in the agreement but also monitoring and reviewing the project continuously along with the stakeholders periodically, and submitting quarterly and annual reports along with program, as well as financial statements. The annual report and following years' plan is reviewed and vetted with SOFIA annually in January. SOFIA representative plays an active role in this process and all plans are agreed upon through a consultative process, including important stakeholders.

In addition, annually ISS must make submissions to Indian Government – Society of Registrar, FCRA as a part of national level compliance. This includes carrying out statutory audit April-March every year. SOFIA account is audited separately and submitted every year, covering the period January-December.

2. How did the rights holders participate in the implementation and follow-up of the results?

As the target group always have been the implementors of the farming side of the project the sub-goal 1 has been done with great participation.

The Village Level Representatives have been filling a very productive and helpful role as mediators between the farmers and the staff of the project to include the target group property in the processes.

The farmers' federation executive committee members have been organized federation meeting and monthly subscription fees have been collected from federation farmers. The farmers group of president, secretary and treasurer have been organized farmers groups meeting and associated with field staffs and village level representative.

The farmers' federation meetings and seminars are examples of a direct pathway and access to the target group is involved in independently take charge of the projects aims and goals. During the final evaluation the target group where involved at a great stake, through interviews and meetings.

The previously mentioned Training of Trainers programme (TOT) is enabling teachers to continue to carry through the Environmental Awareness Programmes in the schools. The Kadavur Environmental Protection Forum is raising awareness regarding local environmental issues which the project staffs have considered in their work. During this year Kadavur environment protection forum independently approached to forest department and received 3500 numbers of saplings have been planted in different farmers' fields.

The local barber shop owners are also contributing voluntarily in the HIV Awareness Programmes by educating their customers on HIV/AIDS as well as supplying them with free condoms.

3. Reflect on how project's monitoring and evaluation process has been functioning.

Like in 2017 and the year previously, the monitoring and evaluation processes have overall been functioning well, a process consisting of weekly and monthly progress meetings with the project administration at the project office at ISS where reports from field visits and activities within the projects to monitor progress has been proved successful.

In addition, quarterly meetings have been conducted by project staff and external consultant, during which quarterly and/or annual reports have been drafted and sent to SvEO. The quarterly reports are inclusive of financial reports as well as monitoring of the project activities.

During the follow up visit from the coordinator from SOFIA the yearly evaluation and compilation of the project reports have been the focus which has been useful in addition to the other monitoring processes. Project.

Finally, external end-term evaluation was carried out during 2017 (attached to the final report) which thoroughly evaluated the whole programme.

4. Has the project led to a change in LEO's capacity to:

- a. work rights-based

The project has made the LEO aware of the right-based approach which have led to improvements in implementing the project with focus on the rights of the small farmers. ISS has been working with human rights and rights to land along other civil issues for nearly 40 years prior to the Small

farmers program so the experiences is there but this project has pin-pointed the importance of these issues and how the work can be carried out.

- b. operate in a more democratic, including, transparent way

Democratic

The sustainable farming activities and a functioning federation along with the organic certification process the project are examples of democratically run bodies and functions which have been introduced through the project. The internal control system process of ISS is democratically functioning as well. This year the federation farmers could be paying monthly members amounts towards the sustainability of federation where the decision are made in a democratic way.

The farming related decision and issues solving through federation meeting. During the meetings every point on the agenda is discussed with all the members attending the meetings. The farmers producing any agriculture commodities prize are being fixed by farmers and SFEP staffs. All environment related issues and approaching the government departments democratically The Kadavur environment protection are being taken decision. Furthermore, the number of female farmers has increased in last two years.

Including

The ToT training completed teachers are taking leading role to maintaining the waste management systems, kitchen garden and tree planting work. During this ToT training teachers have conducted environment al science exhibition by the experiences.

The Federation farmers mobile numbers give it to KVK (Farmers Science centre) and agriculture department in continuation of process farmers directly easily get the government schemes, trainings, workshops and weather report also received through mobile phone as freely and independently approached to government.

Transparent

Throughout the phasing out period the inputs from the Farmers' Federation have been considered when making up new project plans. The farmers are also informed on the budget and the phase out plan of the project. Also, the beneficiaries are always considered before making decisions or changes in the project. The work with the financial reporting has as well improved the transparent way of working.

- c. effectively implement its activity and manage the decision-making processes within the organization

During the quarterly meeting with the board of LEO presented and discussed project activity and financial reports and LEO board members are given suggestion. Furthermore, discussed with staff members of the project, the future for the project are also discussed in all monthly the staff meeting. SvEO is also regularly updated on the project activities carried through.

- d. finance its work using diversified financial sources more strategically and independently from SvEO?

As previously mentioned, the Village Level Representatives are expected to decrease the costs of the project. Also, the collaboration with the different departments of the government to supply free

of cost seminars, inputs, soil testing, sapling distribution, condom distribution etc. for the farmers are helpful to be able to, more independently from SvEO, maintain the project financially. However, the project main funding has always been through Forum Syd and is an area where improvements are needed to sustain processes.

5. Describe the sustainability of the project's results.

This ten-year project has had desired effects on the community/target groups as anticipated at the beginning of the project. The project had a specific component on organizational development and to enhance the capacity to forge linkages and to advocate the project initiatives widely. Furthermore, SOFIA played an active role in maintaining continuous interaction with ISS in ensuring that the program moved in the right direction and achieving the anticipated results. Particularly their participation in the annual review and planning, mid-term review and final evaluation contributed in ensuring that the exit-plan was designed and executed through active participation of stakeholders.

In 2016, the exit plan was developed (with a slight amendment in 2017) and the following have been done as a part of the exit plan to sustain the results: organic farmers' federation has been established, organic certification has been done, marketing linkages have been established, links have been established with the following institutions: Agriculture Extension, Agriculture Marketing Department, Local Governance Body, Forest Department, District Health Department (HIV/AIDS), ISS has agreed to provide support as and when required.

The Farmer federation is functioning with 271 farmers (93 female and 178 male) in future farmers' federation will converted into Farmers producers company with more than 400 numbers of organic farmers. The federation or farmers producers company will be club with Government agriculture department. In last two years all the sustainable farming activity like technical supports, soil testing, exposure visit and farmers capacity building activities collaboration with governments sectors are agriculture departments KVK (Farmers Science centre) and NABARD (National bank of agriculture and rural development).

However, the Federation requires further handholding from ISS until such time the market linkages are strengthened. This requires the current staff/ISS to support the Federation on a payment basis. ISS may have to provide storage and working space in the Kadavur premises on a rental basis.

When it comes to watershed and restoration of barren land the watershed group and environment protection form have been linked to the Local Forest Departments, NABARD and local panchayat to get financial and technical support in their work and they already have a good partnership. And finally, the local governance structures have been linked to the villages to undertake watershed-related issues.

The HIV/Aids side of the project the local panchayat, the Primary Health Centre (PHC) and the Integrated Counselling Testing Centre (ICDC) are helping to sustain the HIV programmes along with the local barbers. The Tamil Nadu Organic Certification Department will help to inform on the organic certification processes to the farmers in the valley.

The District Health Department under its programme has agreed to supply condoms to barber shops and petrol stations that have been linked to the project all these days. Thus, this intervention is totally sustainable. Barber shops and petrol stations see at as a useful intervention wherein they can contribute towards social causes.

The schools have trained teachers on HIV/AIDS and environmental awareness who will continue to engage with the children. Eco-clubs will continue to participate on environmental programs in the respective localities.

Through all these the ISS and SOFIA believes that the 10-year long project has achieved and will continue to achieve great sustainable results for the Kadavur valley.

6. Have the SvEO and LEO followed the phase-out plan/exit strategy? How has it functioned?

The activities in the phase out plan have so far been carried through and a small review of the plan was made in 2017 and was valid through until the end. The end-term evaluation is pointing this out as a challenge for ISS but that the exit plan has made the exit smooth.

A chance for every child, South Africa, 300006773

Partnership & Learning

1. Describe the division of roles between SvEO and LEO in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project.

LEO has been in charge of implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project. LEO has also engaged with Sveo to facilitate strengthening of partner relations. Quarterly reports have been sent to SvEO as well as an annual report for the first year. SvEO has responded to the reports by giving suggestions of changes in strategies, activities and monitoring processes. SvEO has also been giving support to financial reporting, budget calculations, reporting procedures and in relation to the Swedish trainees working within the project. SvEO also had an overall supportive role in guiding LEO on updates and new developments to funding requirements. The follow-up visits from SvEO has been important for talking together about implementation and achieved results and for SvEO to give more extensive feedback and support.

The involvement of the Swedish trainees in the project activities meant a great difference for the cooperation between LEO and SvEO from October 2015 and onwards. The trainees served as a link between the organization, demanding more communication between the two organizations. Reports from the trainees meant more information about project activities, seen through new eyes, were flowing to SvEO and more feedback and communication flowing back to LEO. It also meant more challenges for the cooperation, especially after the report from the trainees with suspicions about corruption. The boards on each side has been more involved because of the big concerns that were raised in the two organizations because of this process. It also meant that SvEO got more involved in the financial reporting process of LEO. Had it not been for the extremely long time it took for the suspicions of corruption to be cleared away and for Forum Syd to lift away the blocking of funds, all those challenges probably would have just been strengthening the cooperation. The blocking of funds had severe consequences for LEO, which had to take many risks in completing project activities and many times experienced lack of information and support from SvEO.

2. How did the rights holders participate in the implementation and follow-up of the results?

In the first place we want to mention that the project has explored how to best include and focus the voices directly from the right-holders without challenging ethics about bringing children's voices

into advocacy matters. Very often this is not an easy matter seen from a legal perspective. Thanks to the involvement of the Swedish trainees at NUI, children were able to be directly involved in some activities through a photographic project and exhibition. The Ithemba project has given rise to new ideas about how to invite right holders to participate directly in the implementation and evaluation of the project. Unfortunately those ideas were not so developed as we started A Chance For Every Child and can only be more elaborated and utilized in the future. The end target group in the ithemba project developed awareness about the role of youth advocacy by relating their personal experiences to articles in rights-based documents such as the Children's Charter, UNICEF and the Conventions of the Rights of the Child. They assisted us in identifying the reasons for dropout rates from their own perspectives and offered insight into the magnitude and challenges of intergenerational transmission of poverty in marginalized communities. They suggested ways of improving social media communication and establishing links with student publications.

3. Reflect on how project's monitoring and evaluation process has been functioning.

The project was continuously monitored through regular data collection of all activities, regular meetings and active engagement with the target group and Civil Society Organisations. The evaluation process happened on three levels, i.e. internally which ensured the project being evaluated throughout the project and externally providing an in depth overview of the project, as well as through regular on-site visits from SvEO project leader. Especially the annual report and on-site visits connected to that report, were important for making changes and improvements for the last year of the project. For example more structure and templates for reporting and monitoring, as well as some important strategic documents that were produced. External evaluators were provided with background information on the project, such as the baseline study 2013, quarterly reports 2015/16, annual report 2015 and events reports. The monitoring and evaluation process came with its own challenges. Time constraints of participants sometimes required evaluation forms to be sent electronically. However most times this led to a lack of response. Although it was suggested that people respond in their first language, only a few participants would use this option. In our experience the best response and feedback came through conversation. A clear indication over the last two years was that detailed feedback happened verbally (appreciative check out/circle work etc).

4. Has the project led to a change in LEO's capacity to:

a) work rights-based

Yes, the project has further improved LEO's capacity to work rights-based through internal capacity building on rights-based approaches to work ethic; participation in LEO's events from a rights focus; presentations at and networking with CSOs who promote human rights, gender rights and environmental rights; and inclusion of rights-based topics in LEO events that promote, youth, human, gender, environmental, community and children's rights.

b) operate in a more democratic, including, transparent way

Yes, the organisation has been operated in a more democratic and transparent way through monthly capacity building sessions with the staff; information sharing meeting with stakeholders; getting input from facilitators, teachers and caregivers in the training processes and curriculum development; involving staff in different phases of project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation; involving Board level, executive and management level of collaboration, reviews and inputs, and by using social media effectively.

- c) effectively implement its activity and manage the decision-making processes within the organization

Yes, by using the specific expertise of the different staff members in project teams; consulting with relevant or all staff around implementation of projects and project events; using social media effectively and promote the project Facebook page; and updating staff and stakeholders of new developments and deviations to project activities.

- d) finance its work using diversified financial sources more strategically and independently from SvEO?

NUI is constantly working on finding new partners and donors to work with. A 3 year resource mobilization strategy was created in 2014 and resulted in 3 new partners formed. Novalis was selected as one of four organisation as beneficiary of the Bizzpartner Foundation launched in 2015. The other three partners are involved in education, women empowerment and development, and is envisaged to become strategic stakeholders in the future. Novalis has reached out to US donor liaison possibilities as well as local philanthropic partners. A combined civil society, government and business reconnection day was planned in November 2016, but had to be postponed to 2017. Despite these efforts, NUI has remained heavily dependent on SvEO for its financial inflow during the time scope of the project. Still, venue hire maintained a steady inflow of funds to support the core administrative aspect of the organisation, and by the end of 2016 overperformed against budge

5. Describe the sustainability of the project's results.

Evidence indicates an immense need for building capacity of the target group and the on the one hand, the project has barely laid the foundation of improving the conditions for the rights holders and further work is required to support results from this project.. On the other hand, many results also support long term sustainability. As an example the completed course material lends itself to long term sustainability. A Holistic Education Framework was developed for distribution to teachers, caregivers (including parents) and youth leaders. An Advocacy Toolkit was designed and developed and will be distributed to the direct target group for further strengthening of their capacity to advocate for the rights of vulnerable children to basic education. What can further be mentioned is that 7 individuals (some of them selected from the Enrichment Programs) from varied and diverse cultures and professions completed the 8 facilitators training sessions and can be used for continued capacity building and trainings. Some of these facilitators had their first opportunity to share their skills in a session with social workers highlighting the effectiveness of the training process which was well received. Will be able to use them in coming trainings and work. 8 sessions. Lastly we want to mention the participation of teachers and caregivers that will take their learnings into their respectively organization, not to mention many governmental social workers, who are in a position to influence policies and practices.

- 6. Have the SvEO and LEO followed the phase-out plan/exit strategy? How has it functioned?

A Chance For Every Child started in 2013 and 2015-2016 project was a continuation of that first part of the project. In many ways the project developed as planned and the results are according to expectations. Perhaps we were somewhat too optimistic about how far we would reach and how much we could accomplish. Many challenges along the way of carrying through the enrichment programs required much attention and efforts. Still, we have managed to successfully complete the enrichment programs for teachers and caregivers, along with many other activities and results. NUI now has much

more capacity to support teachers, caregivers and social workers etc in their work with vulnerable children and advocate for children's rights. A curriculum for enrichments programs and materials has been developed and the network has been extended.

The phase-out plan was to continue with support through funds from Forum Syd for another 3 years in this project. However, the application for 2017 was declined by Forum Syd and the possibilities for future cooperation with Forum Syd has been very uncertain. Forum Syd chose to block the funds during the second part of 2016, due to suspicions of corruption, that in the end turned out to be groundless. The consequences of this decision was that NUI had small possibilities to seek other partners or even to conclude with project partners in a respectful way. Even if almost all the activities were completed, no proper conclusion of the work of the project team were possible. Basically from one day to another NUI had to let go of staff members who were key persons in the project. Some could continue to do some work on a voluntary basis and others could not.

At the moment of writing this report, the project keeps on living at Novalis and there are an eagerness amongst network members and participants in enrichment program for more activities and opportunities to meet. The main focus has been to complete the reporting of the project and rebuild the confidence in the work done within the project, also as a way to restore relationships between SvEO and LEO, internally within the two organizations and towards Forum Syd.

NUI is constantly seeking new partners that can support their work financially, as well as developing own means to produce incomes. During 2015 and 2016, NUI experienced a decrease in external contributions and have been mainly dependent on SOFIA Association and their own venue hire, to financially support their various projects. [SEP]

iThemba Advocacy Campaign, South Africa 300007192

Partnership & Learning

10. Describe the division of roles between SvEO and LEO in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project.

SvEO has been active as consultants in meetings related to strategy and basic survival budget according to the agreement with Forum Syd. The advocacy work and evaluation has been effectuated by LEO.

11. How did the rights holders participate in the implementation and follow-up of the results?

The rights holders, meaning the school children, have participated in a conference and given their opinion in a questionnaire afterwards. Attached

12. Reflect on how project's monitoring and evaluation process has been functioning.

The evaluation has been very rewarding, as it shows that iThemba is met with appreciation. The monitoring of activities gives us opportunity to reflect upon all contacts and a fundament for continued work within the network.

13. Has the project led to a change in LEO's capacity to:

- a. work rights-based –

this was already very clear for LEO

- b. operate in a more democratic, including, transparent way

this was already very clear for LEO

- c. effectively implement its activity and manage the decision-making processes within the organization

this was already very clear for LEO, however the financial management has been improved with new routines and more professional management.

- d. finance its work using diversified financial sources more strategically and independently from SvEO?

The basic survival budget has been developed and shows that Novalis to a large extent is independent of support from Forum Syd. However, if Novalis should be able to continue its work to improve the childrens rights additional funding would be needed.

14. Describe the sustainability of the project's results.

According to the response from the children with regards to the Human Rights Conference they have got knowledge about their rights and lots of inspiration for how to act, and also some hope for the future.

15. Have the SvEO and LEO followed the phase-out plan/exit strategy? How has it functioned?

The exit strategy has been followed up after the discussions during the strategy week with mail exchange where SvEO has given continuous input to point out shortcomings and possible improvements.

MOFI, Manyara Organic Farming Initiative, Tanzania, 300007760

Partnership & Learning

1. Describe the division of roles between SvEO and LEO in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project.

The Swedish project leader has visited the project three times during the first year and attended board meetings each time. The project leader has together with the board visited all the ten primary target groups and interviewed the members to get information on the progress of the project. The LEO has gathered data for the baseline study, made evaluations of each activity that has taken place, had specific evaluation workshops with rights holders as well as written the baseline and discussed the progress of the project at every board meeting.

2. How did the rights holders participate in the implementation and follow-up of the results?

The main channel for participation for the rights holders has been the workshops where discussions on the needs and expectations of the rights holders has been an integral part. The baseline study also triggered communication between the project and the recipients. Another important channel has been informal communication with board members through visits to MOFI and through mobile phone.

3. Reflect on how project's monitoring and evaluation process has been functioning.

The monitoring and evaluation process has been quite cumbersome. It has taken a lot of resources for the board to gather, structure and report the progress of the project. In monitoring the baseline study has been very helpful as data gathering has been made in conjunction with workshops held by different board members and subject matter specialists. All in all we think that this need to be routinized so that less effort is needed for monitoring and evaluation so that focus can be put on project activities.

4. Has the project led to a change in LEO's capacity to:

a. work rights-based

Yes the project has led to a change in MOFI's capacity to work rights-based. Focus on work in MOFI before the project was on regenerative organic farming and food systems among small scale farmers. The rights-based approach has injected new insights into how marginalised groups can be empowered and how to work with those groups.

b. operate in a more democratic, including, transparent way

MOFI was a democratic, including and transparent organisation also before the project initiation. The demands that the project brought to MOFI has further enhanced the importance of democracy, inclusion and transparency when working with marginalized farmers. Mostly it has given MOFI a structured way of enhancing these features in the daily work which was less so before the project.

c. effectively implement its activity and manage the decision-making processes within the organization

Project effectiveness has increased, partly of course due to the resources from Forum Syd, but also because planning, implementation and resource use have become more structured than before and that is because of the demands that Forum Syd has on a project. There has been a steep learning curve for the project leader, the MOFI board members and the MOFI activists that all have benefited project effectiveness and management.

d. finance its work using diversified financial sources more strategically and independently from SvEO?

MOFI has few financial resources aside Forum Syd. A one-time seed funding was given to MOFI by the Norwegian REMA 2000 food chain in 2017. Membership fees as well as donations cater for a small part of the economy of MOFI. It is however increasing; more members and more donation is expected in future. Most of the diversified resources are that engaged people borrow their cars, motor cycles and venues for free to MOFI activities. No estimation of these donations in monetary form has been made but it has increased the budget considerably. One specifically noteworthy input has been given by the ward and village officials, especially regarding the cost of venues but also preparation work to cater for workshops etc..

5. Describe the sustainability of the project's results.

The MOFI strategy for increasing sustainability has been to avoid permanent costs such as employments, offices, cars, office equipment etc. We have bought a computer and a book keeping soft ware that will need some resources to maintain. There is also an increased need to have a permanent office and we are now renting a small, cheap, office in Katesh town. But aside from that no permanent costs have been invoked up to now. We have also a strategy to start selling local seeds, organic fertilisers and workshops to farmers outside the MOFI network. This is included as part of the coming three years. How MOFI as an organization will benefit from the sales is not yet structured but farmer in the MOFI network will also benefit economically from these activities. The activities that MOFI has been implementing has up to now been performed on voluntary basis without remuneration for leaders. This is a good start to get MOFI sustasinable as and organization.

6. Have the SvEO and LEO followed the phase-out plan/exit strategy? How has it functioned?

The exit strategy is that MOFI will become self-sustaining within ten years which was indicated in the ten-year LFA that was performed in 2017. The idea is that the MOFI activities will give enough income to run the organization without outside support. Most of the ideas have been presented under question 13 above.