

Joint Evaluation

SUPPORT TO CIVIL SOCIETY ENGAGEMENT IN POLICY DIALOGUE

Mozambique Country Report



Joint Evaluation of
Support to Civil Society
Engagement in Policy Dialogue

Mozambique Country Report



COWI

November 2012

© Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark
November 2012

Production: Evaluation Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark
Cover photo: Stephane de Sakutin/Afp/Scanpix
Graphic Production: BGRAPHIC

e-ISBN: 978-87-7087-693-3

This report can be downloaded through the homepage of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs www.um.dk
or directly from the homepage of the Evaluation Department www.evaluation.dk.

Contact: eval@um.dk

Responsibility for the content and presentation of findings and recommendations rests with the authors.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	5
Acronyms and Abbreviations	6
Executive Summary	8
1 Introduction	15
1.1 Introduction to the Country Report	15
1.2 Some definitions	15
1.3 Purpose of the evaluation	17
2 Methodology	19
2.1 A conceptual framework	19
2.2 Methodology overview	19
2.3 The case study approach	20
2.4 Information sources	21
2.5 Evaluation tools	22
2.6 Theory of Change as a conceptual framework for the Case Studies	23
2.7 Study limitations	25
2.8 Country specific limitations – Mozambique	25
3 Key aspects of an enabling environment	27
3.1 The CSO landscape in Mozambique	27
3.2 Contributing factors	29
3.3 Changes over the past 30 years	32
3.4 Power relations	33
3.5 Key factors influencing policy dialogue	34
4 Overview of the two case studies	36
4.1 Case Study 1: District planning and budget monitoring	36
4.2 Case Study 2: Process leading to legislation on domestic violence	39
5 Policy dialogue	42
5.1 Policy dialogue in the Mozambican context	42
5.2 Types of Space for CS engagement in policy dialogue	44
5.3 Effectiveness of policy dialogue	45
6 CSO strategies on policy dialogue	47
6.1 Types of CSO strategies	47
6.2 Legitimacy and accountability	48
7 Lessons on Development Partner strategies	50
7.1 Role of ICSOs	52
7.2 Alignment to CSOs' own agendas	53
7.3 Dialogue with Government of Mozambique	54

TABLE OF CONTENTS

8 Overall conclusions	55
8.1 CSO effectiveness	55
8.2 Enabling and hindering conditions	56
8.3 DP policies and strategies	58
9 Lessons learned	59
9.1 CSO strategies	59
9.2 DP support strategies	60
Annex A Terms of Reference for Country Studies	62
Annex B Conceptual Framework	67
Annex C Evaluation Framework	81
Annex D Persons Met	86
Annex E Documents Consulted	91
Annex F Rationale and Approach for Selection of Policy Areas	96

The following annex to the Country Report can be downloaded from www.evaluation.dk and is also available on the CD-ROM.

Additional Annex G: Case Study Reports

Acknowledgements

The Mozambique Case Study is one of three undertaken as part of the Joint Evaluation on CSO Engagement in Policy Dialogue, the others being Bangladesh and Uganda.

The study team wish to thank all the many people, in particular the representatives of Civil Society Organisations, the Government of Mozambique, as well as the Development Partners (DPs) and other stakeholders who have contributed information and insights into the engagement of Civil Society in policy dialogue.

The Case Study has been carried out by a team of four consultants¹ with logistic support from the Danish Embassy, which was the lead coordinating agency in Mozambique. This report presents the findings, conclusions and lessons from the scoping and main study phases in Mozambique, which took place from September-December 2011.

1 For COWI: Bente Topsøe-Jensen/Bente Consulting ApS (team leader); For AustralCOWI: Padil Salimo /MAP Consultores (governance, district planning case); Paula Monjane/CECS and Sandra Manuel/UEM (civil society, legislation on domestic violence case study).

Acronyms and Abbreviations

<i>ADC</i>	Austrian Development Cooperation
<i>AMMCJ</i>	Associação de Mulheres Moçambicanas de Careira Jurídica
<i>AMODE</i>	Associação Moçambicana para o Desenvolvimento de Democracia
<i>AGIR</i>	Acções para uma Governação Inclusiva e Responsável (Swedish CS support program)
<i>CBO</i>	Community Based Organisation
<i>CCM</i>	Conselho Cristão de Moçambique
<i>CIDA</i>	Canadian International Development Agency
<i>CIP</i>	Centro de Integridade Pública
<i>CS (O)</i>	Civil Society (Organisation)
<i>CTA</i>	Confederação das Associações Económicas de Moçambique (private sector organisation)
<i>Danida</i>	Danish International Development Assistance
<i>DFID</i>	Department for International Development (UK)
<i>DO</i>	Development Observatory
<i>DP</i>	Development Partner
<i>EQ</i>	Evaluation Question
<i>FDC</i>	Fundação de Desenvolvimento Comunitário
<i>FONGA</i>	Fórum de Organizações Não-governamentais de Gaza
<i>FORCOM</i>	Mozambican Community Radio Forum
<i>FRELIMO</i>	Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (ruling party)
<i>G-15</i>	Group of DPs
<i>G-20</i>	Group of civil society actors
<i>GMD</i>	Grupo Moçambicano de Dívidas
<i>GOM</i>	Government of Mozambique
<i>ICSO</i>	International Civil Society Organisation
<i>IESE</i>	Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Económicos
<i>INGO</i>	International Non-governmental Organisation
<i>IPCC</i>	Instituições Participativas de Consulta Comunitária (Participatory Institutions for Community Consultation)
<i>IRPC</i>	Imposto sobre o Rendimento da Pessoa Colectiva (Income Tax for collective entities)
<i>KEPA</i>	Finnish ICSO
<i>LCCs</i>	Local Consultative Councils
<i>LDH</i>	Liga dos Direitos Humanos
<i>LOLE</i>	Lei dos Órgãos Locais do Estado (legislation on local government institutions)
<i>MAE</i>	Ministério de Administração Estatal (Ministry of State Administration)
<i>MASC</i>	Mecanismo de Apoio à Sociedade Civil
<i>MF</i>	Ministério de Finanças (Ministry of Finance)
<i>MINEG</i>	Ministério de Negócios Estrangeiros (Ministry of Foreign Affairs)
<i>MISA</i>	Media Institute of Southern Africa
<i>MMAS</i>	Ministério de Mulher e Acção Social (Ministry for Women and Social Affairs)
<i>MPD</i>	Ministério de Planificação e Desenvolvimento (Ministry of Planning and Development)

<i>NGO</i>	Non-governmental Organisation
<i>ORAM</i>	Associação Rural de Ajuda Mutua
<i>OSISA</i>	Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa
<i>PARPA</i>	Plano para a Redução da Pobreza Absoluta (PRSP)
<i>PO</i>	Poverty Observatory
<i>PRSP</i>	Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan
<i>RM</i>	Rádio Moçambique (state owned national radio station)
<i>SDC</i>	Swiss Development Cooperation
<i>Sida</i>	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
<i>TCV</i>	Todos Contra Violência
<i>ToC</i>	Theory of Change
<i>ToR</i>	Terms of Reference
<i>TVM</i>	Televisão de Moçambique (state owned national television station)
<i>UNAC</i>	União Nacional dos Camponeses
<i>UNCDF</i>	United Nation Capital Development Fund
<i>UNICEF</i>	United Nations' Children's Fund
<i>WLSA</i>	Women and Law in Southern Africa

Executive Summary

Introduction

This Mozambique Country Study of Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue has been commissioned by three international development agencies (ADC/Austria, Danida/Denmark and Sida/Sweden) on behalf of a larger group of bilateral Development Partners (DPs) (CIDA/Canada, Finland and SDC/Switzerland), which support the evaluation through their participation in a Reference Group.

The evaluation reviews the effectiveness of civil society organisations² (CSOs) in policy dialogue in order to provide information to DPs on how best to support CSOs across a broad range of countries and sectors. The purpose of the two case studies described in this report is to provide an analysis of how CSOs engage in policy dialogue, what outcomes they have achieved and what factors have contributed to them. This study is one of three (the others covering Bangladesh and Uganda). The field work was carried out in two phases during the period September to December 2011 following a scoping study carried out earlier in the same year.

Civil society landscape

CSOs in Mozambique comprise three major groups: 1) a small elite of urban-based, intellectual/ academic organisations, which are well-functioning and receive DP support. They have no direct constituencies, but are accountable to the public in general; 2) middle-sized organisations with limited policy dialogue potential. They are often opportunity driven and related to specific DP prioritised sector topics (gender, health, HIV/AIDS, climate change) with service delivery as the main focus; and 3) community-based organisations (CBOs) and other local organisations with generally weak capacity, limited resources and visibility, often defined around members' livelihood interests. The evaluation study concentrates on these groups. CS also comprises groups and movements outside the established CS organisations, such as the spontaneous groups reacting to rising prices, the ex-migrants from former German Democratic Republic, as well as the thousands of mutual self-help groups at community level.

Methodology

The country study was guided by the overall methodological framework for this evaluation, as given in the ToR, and informed by the conceptual framework for the case studies developed by the team. The study used various sources of information and data collection methods, including document review, interviews, focus group discussions and workshops. Field visits were undertaken in the Southern provinces of Gaza and Maputo. Telephone interviews were used to optimise time and outreach, and analytical tools including Power Cube, time lines and Theory of Change (ToC) were applied. The

2 The terms CSO (Civil Society Organisation) and ICSO (International Civil Society Organisation) are used in the report synonymously to NGO (Non-governmental Organisation) and INGO (International Non-governmental Organisation).

analysis of plausible linkages between civil society (CS) strategies and DPs' support strategies, intermediate outcomes and policy changes is based upon the use of ToC.

Factors affecting the enabling environment

The political, legal and socio-economic features of the country determine the enabling environment in which CSOs operate. It is influenced by cultural factors and the country's history, including the period of Portuguese colonial rule, the socialist liberation movement, civil war and transition from a one-party socialist state to a multi-party legal democracy, currently heavily dependent on DP funds in spite of a fast-growing, free enterprise economy.

The study has identified three main dimensions of enabling factors contributing to the CS environment:

Legal freedom including the constitutional guarantees of rights to association and freedom of expression is broadly established. However, some of the laws (e.g. the Law of Association) are outdated. The legal freedoms also include a relatively progressive Media Law, which establishes the right to information, press freedom, broadcasting rights and the right to reply. In reality, the independent media are facing financial problems in the current economic climate, with limited access to commercial funds. Outreach beyond urban centres is a serious restricting factor. In many districts, the legal procedures are not being observed and intimidation by government officials is a feature.

Political freedom. The electoral system reinforces the power of the ruling party and citizens' access to influence through elected representatives at national level is weak. The Government's practice of restricting information and its intimidating attitude towards critical voices are hindering factors, as is the dysfunctional judicial system which provides little or no protection for citizens who have been excluded through accusations of belonging to the Opposition.

Financial freedom for CSOs exists to some extent in Mozambique, but is exercised mainly through access to DP funds. Consequently, CSOs tend to align their activities with DP priorities, and opportunities for implementing their own agendas are relatively limited.

The formal institutions required for the full exercise of citizenship are to a large extent in place in Mozambique; there is a legal-constitutional framework for freedom of expression and of association, along with a stated commitment to citizens' engagement in governance. However, these formal elements are confronted by a culture and practice that works counter to the exercise of such freedoms. For example the lack of access to information and knowledge on rights, legislation and procedures with regard to associations is a general problem especially among small locally-based CSOs.³

3 Minor local CBOs are reported to have weak notion of citizenship and therefore difficulties in knowing where and how to access information. Interviews with Fernanda Farinha, CIP, IESE and ICSO.

Policy dialogue

CS has over the last decade gained valuable experience in engaging in policy dialogue through a number of major processes: the Land Campaign in the mid-90s, the formulation of Agenda 2025 in 2001, and the process around the Poverty/Development Observatories, which was started in 2003. Experience on what has worked for CS is drawn from these processes and points to key features for success which include joint action around common causes, inclusion of a variety of actors, (i.e. community and faith based organisations, private sector, trade unions, academics,) collaboration with state institutions, support from international non-governmental organisations (INGOs), strong leadership and use of influential contacts.

Over recent years, several invited spaces⁴ have been established, but there is limited decentralisation and central government's efforts to increase engagement and dialogue with CS do not cascade down to local and district level. The invited spaces are often met with scepticism by CSOs, which feel that the invitation to participate is issued only to legitimise decisions already taken. CSOs face problems in engaging in policy dialogue due to lack of adequate technical knowledge on public finance administration, legislation and anti-corruption, limited access to information and scarce human and financial resources.⁵ Well-established CSOs have a preference for claimed and informal spaces, which are not directly controlled by Government.

CSO strategies on policy dialogue

Interviews and the literature review revealed a range of CS strategies applied during policy dialogue processes, which are confirmed by the case study analysis. These include cohesion around common causes regardless of the ideological diversity, direct participation of CBOs and religious groups, collaboration with International CSOs (ICSOs), capacity building, the use of '*movers and shakers*' and charismatic leadership; acceptance of diverse opinions and common principles, production and dissemination of evidence and documentation collaboration with the media.

Direct and formal policy dialogue mainly through platforms and networks. CS engagement suffers from fatigue over time, and CS representatives who are often co-opted onto Government committees begin to follow their own personal agenda, losing contact with the constituency that they claim to represent. Platforms and networks are, however, still an important strategic choice of CS to create a united voice.

Direct and informal policy dialogue is the claimed space, where CS coalitions take action and engage in policy dialogue around specific topics of their own agenda. Research and academic CSOs provide evidence and documentation for quality engagement in policy dialogue.

4 *Invited spaces* are fora or platforms established on initiative of Government and/or DPs to which civil society are invited for dialogue, as opposed to *claimed spaces* which are fora or platforms established on the initiative of civil society. See Annex B: Conceptual Framework for explanation of the Power Cube.

5 Even CIP has only one person with an education in macro-economic and anti-corruption. Interview with CIP, November 2011.

Indirect contribution to policy dialogue is provided by organisations related to social communication and media, which play an important role in disseminating information. Community radio stations are important players, which often create spaces for dialogue through investigative journalism and open programmes.

Findings from the two case studies

Two policy processes serve as case studies for this evaluation: **District Planning and Budget Monitoring** and the process leading to adoption of **Legislation on Domestic Violence**. The two policy processes differ considerably and they provide the evaluation with different experience on CS's engagement in policy dialogue. The **District Planning and Budget Monitoring** case study provides a series of examples of how influencing can and cannot happen around these critical planning and budgeting processes at different levels. The **Legislation on Domestic Violence** case study documents a process which started in 2000 and was concluded with the adoption of the law against Domestic Violence in 2009.

District planning and budget monitoring: The case study found that the invited spaces which Government has created for information provision and dialogue have been used by the ruling party to legitimise decisions taken by the Government (and consequently to consolidate their power) rather than to genuinely engage with CSOs. The Development Observatories, a DP-supported government initiative to encourage national policy dialogue on poverty and development, are controlled by Government and are not in reality a space for open and inclusive debate.⁶ Local Consultative Councils suffer from poor representation of local interests and weak linkages between district planning and budgeting processes. Presidential interventions, such as the *7 millions* and the *Presidencia Aberta e inclusiva*, serve more to undermine local accountability than strengthen it. While the newly formed Local Development Committees offer the prospect of greater grass roots engagement in local governance, they are not formally linked into the district planning process and so their current potential remains limited.

Some *claimed space* actions have demonstrated success in identifying and addressing mismanagement by Government, through informal contacts with the ruling party, traditional authorities and religious leaders and through 'naming and shaming' by the independent media. But the main success in CS engagement in and influence over policy has been through more formally organised policy advocacy undertaken by largely national or provincial CSOs which bring research-based evidence into dialogue. This *claimed space* has been built through consolidation of CSO efforts, the development of shared platforms, and through strategic partnerships with ICSOs.

The existing CS-platforms at provincial level play an important role in providing access to information and a space for smaller CBOs to engage, although there is a risk that they will (over the mid-term) start acting as independent organisations rather than representing the interests of their members.

The consolidation of thematic working groups within CS platforms in very few provinces has shown that they stimulate a minimum of expertise in specific matters of policy and

⁶ Although improvements have been registered in terms of CS engagement and influence at the national level Development Observatory in early 2012 and in the provincial Development Observatories in 2011 in Manica, Nampula and Gaza, the agenda and the timing is still controlled by Government.

increase the capacity of CSOs to engage in policy dialogue with the Government (e.g. Nampula and Manica).

Nonetheless, significant organisational and capacity constraints within these CSOs, platforms and networks continue to undermine progress. The current tendencies for concentration that lead various DPs to support fewer and stronger CSOs (such as Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Económicos, CIP, Liga dos Direitos Humanos (LDH)) all based in Maputo do not favour the general strengthening of CS in Mozambique.

Legislation on domestic violence: The policy dialogue on legislation on domestic violence is recognised by all stakeholders as an initiative taken by CSOs. The space for dialogue was claimed; it happened mainly at national level and it is regarded as a completed process, i.e. from the start of the initiative to the adoption of law (policy change outcome).

It is possible to establish links between strategies and results demonstrating that the adoption of the law was influenced mainly by the women's movement. The fact of a common cause was a strong factor for effective mobilisation of CS. Strong leadership and the capacity to create coalitions with complementary strategic actors were also crucial.

CS has used diverse strategies including influential individuals and simultaneous campaigns at both the national and local level. But social and cultural norms were and are still a strong negative factor in the process. The law was passed but both rights providers and the majority of the population do not act as expected, influenced by existing social norms and aggravated by, in certain cases, a lack of information and training. There is an obvious need for follow-up and monitoring of law enforcement for the process to lead to lasting policy changes, but DP support for CS engagement beyond policy making has been limited so far.

CSO effectiveness and process outcomes:

The two cases study policy dialogue processes have revealed very distinct features in terms of *invited/claimed spaces*, Government/CS initiative, role of DPs, geographical outreach and time span. However, both processes have faced similar challenges in terms of constraints encountered, enabling and hindering factors, government reactions to confrontation and political control, as well as limited and not always sufficiently professional internal capacity of the CSOs involved. Common features in terms of process outcomes are the recognition of CSOs as dialogue partners, credit for solid evidence and research documentation, strengthened positions as a result of alliances with other actors, (including other CSOs, ICSOs, DP-embassies and the media). Both processes also demonstrate that continued attention from CS is important, as momentum is easily lost.

The study has not identified any particular cases where CSOs have chosen not to get involved in policy dialogue. However, the issue of non-involvement is related to the general problem of poverty, which has a negative influence on the engagement of citizens in political issues. Thus, the study found that many local level organisations and associations do not prioritise issues of political debate, while existing in a state of poverty, with more serious and pressing problems such as a lack of food and clean drinking water.

Lessons on DP strategies

There are three issues of key importance for the relationship between CSOs and DPs when it comes to supporting engagement in policy dialogue: harmonisation among DPs, support through intermediaries and need for alignment to CSOs' own agendas. Findings also highlight the need for a re-focus in development in the dialogue between DPs and the Government of Mozambique (GOM) on issues related to CS.

Direct support at country level is considered flexible and responsive by most DPs, as it allows for support to new initiatives and provides seed money. However, it involves high transaction costs for DPs and there is little or no evidence of its effectiveness. It is recognised by the DPs that this direct approach is time consuming and requires specialised capacity, which is not always available with reduced budgets.

Indirect support via harmonised DP funding mechanisms has been increasingly used. However, such support is still tied to projects and DP priorities, and alignment to CSOs' strategic priorities is limited. The joint mechanisms still suffer from many of the problems known from bilateral support: DP-specific priorities, special reporting and accounting formats and short-term project funding rather than longer-term core funding. Indirect support through ICSOs has been the preferred approach for many years. DPs see an advantage in collaborating with ICSOs (of which the majority are based in the DP's own country) as they are perceived to possess strong local and decentralised presence and in-depth knowledge.

CSOs, however, criticised support indicating it is often supply-driven and determined by DP priorities (themes such as environment, justice, governance etc.). The frequent change of DP policies according to new trends influences the CSOs to change their core activities to match the DP priorities. This may have severe consequences, as intermediaries are forced to close down partnerships, which is unsettling for the people employed by CSOs and undermines their efforts to build solid in-house capacity.

DPs policy dialogue on CS issues takes place directly with Government, but also indirectly, e.g. through ICSO-implemented CS support programmes where local CSOs are supported in their advocacy and policy dialogue endeavours. The fact that DPs have a strong focus on macro-level issues and that the policy dialogue is institutionalised in working groups has supported a tendency of "following the money" with focus on macro-level economics and overall MDG indicators.

Conclusions

CSO effectiveness: The successful strategies in terms of enhanced effectiveness used by CSOs include the use of platforms, networks and coalitions; use of informal spaces for obtaining influence; providing evidence; and identification of a common cause.

Enabling and hindering conditions: The main factors influencing the environment in which CSOs operate are the legal freedoms, freedom of expression, political and financial freedoms. The low human and financial capacity of CSOs, as well as necessary contextual knowledge and barriers imposed by social and cultural norms are likewise important factors in the environment for CSO engagement in policy dialogue.

DP policies and strategies: The following factors were identified as crucial for ensuring successful support to CS engagement in policy dialogue: harmonisation of support, efficiency of joint funding mechanisms, alignment to CSOs' own agendas and systems, diversification and maintaining a critical dialogue with Government on CS issues.

Lessons learned

The lessons learned provide the basis for drawing up recommendations in relation to both the successes of CSO strategies and challenges being faced.

CSO strategies: For CSOs to be successful in their policy dialogue, the following strategies have yielded positive results: establishment of platforms, networks and coalitions; collaboration with media; providing evidence and documentation; acting upon opportunities; engagement in both direct and informal dialogue; ensuring maximum exposure; establishing international partnerships; strengthening internal capacity and ensuring diversity of activities.

DP strategies: For DPs to be able to improve their support to CS engagement in policy dialogue, the following issues should be addressed: rethinking the aid architecture amongst other things to include more broad and diverse groups of CS actors; ensuring better harmonisation where joint funding is provided to lower transaction costs for CSOs; ensuring strengthened ownership by CSOs; working with a longer term perspective and ensuring the establishment of vertical links between regional, national and local organisations.

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction to the Country Report

This Joint Evaluation of Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue has been commissioned by three international development agencies (ADC/Austria, Danida/Denmark and Sida/Sweden) on behalf of a larger group of bilateral DPs (CIDA/Canada, Finland and SDC/Switzerland), which support the evaluation through their participation in a Reference Group. The evaluation took place between May 2011 and August 2012 and included three country studies (Bangladesh, Mozambique and Uganda).


The overall purpose of this evaluation is *lesson learning*, to help DPs to gain a better understanding of how best to support civil society organisations (CSOs) in the area of policy dialogue. This involves a dual focus on 1) how CSOs engage in policy dialogue and 2) how different DP support strategies that may influence CSOs' ability to engage in policy dialogue.⁷ The evaluation has a number of specific objectives: i) to establish understanding of how CSOs engage in policy dialogue and how the enabling environment influences CSOs' choice of approaches, ii) to assess CSOs contribution to policy dialogue (relevance, effectiveness, outcomes), iii) to identify enabling and hindering factors, iv) to discuss strengths and weaknesses of DP support strategies, and v) to identify lessons learned and presentation of recommendations.

1.2 Some definitions

Policy dialogue is defined in the Accra Agenda for Action (Section 13) as '*open and inclusive dialogue on development policies*'. The Agenda further states that '*Developing country governments will work more closely with parliaments and local authorities in **preparing, implementing** and **monitoring** national development policies and plans. They will also *engage with civil society organisations (CSOs)*.'* (13.a) and thereby making explicit that policy dialogue includes all these elements. The following diagram clarifies the cyclical nature of this process and postulates that **civil society engagement** can occur at each of the stages.

⁷ Tender document: 8 Appendix a: Scope of Services (Terms of Reference), pp. 40-66. Also shown as Annex A to the Synthesis Report.

Figure 1.1 Policy Cycle showing possible entry points for engagement



Civil society: Although a vibrant **civil society** is regarded as an essential feature in the democratic life of countries across the globe⁸, its definition still remains contested and variously defined. It is usually regarded as the third sector distinct from Government and business.⁹ As such it comprises a range of individual and associational activity which may be formal or informal, transient or long-term, collaborative or confrontational. Civil society organisations are defined as;

All non-market and non-state organisations outside of the family in which people organise themselves to pursue shared interests in the public domain. They include a wide range of organisations that include membership-based CSOs, cause-based CSOs and service oriented CSOs. Examples include community-based organisations and village organisations, environmental groups, women's rights groups, farmers associations, faith-based organisations, labour unions, cooperatives, professional associations, chambers of commerce, independent research institutes and the not-for-profit media'¹⁰

Non-government organisation (NGO): There is no generally accepted definition for an NGO and the term is not used consistently. As the term civil society organisation has become more utilised in development circles there is a growing tendency to define civil society broadly (see CS definition above) to include the whole range of formal and informal, transient, temporary and long-term organisations and associations operating in the space between family, state and market and to refer to development NGOs as a subset of this. NGOs are legally constituted organisations which are registered and regulated under the relevant government laws and controls. They may be national or international in scope and in the development sector context have come to mean those which employ staff to implement projects and programmes under a non-profit aegis. Throughout this study we have used the term NGO in this way (i.e. development NGO) when required to distinguish these from the other kinds of civil society organisations.

8 The Siem Reap CSO Consensus on International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness, June 2011.

9 What is Civil Society? civilsoc.org.

10 Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness, Findings Recommendations and Good Practice, 2009, 'BetterAid' series on aid effectiveness, OECD.

Civil society engagement in policy dialogue: It is generally accepted that civil society engagement in policy dialogue may be in **invited** or **claimed spaces**¹¹. Spaces are areas where interaction/engagement and where information exchange and negotiation can occur. They are spaces of contestation as well as collaboration¹². *Invited space* includes provided space (sometimes referred to as **closed** space if it is strictly controlled) such as official parliamentary consultations as well more open *invited space* such as public consultations. *Invited space* is often described as controlled *'from above'*. *Claimed space*, on the other hand, refers to space which civil society creates for itself (or *'from below'*), for example through lobbying, campaigning, education, public interest litigation among others. All three spaces for civil society engagement can be found anywhere in the policy dialogue cycle but are all expected to result in influencing Government so that policies are inclusive and equitable and Governments become more accountable and transparent to their citizens (i.e. for the common good).

CSO effectiveness: CSO effectiveness emphasises the effectiveness of CSOs as development actors¹³. In terms of policy dialogue it refers to the effectiveness in the processes adopted and outcomes achieved by CSOs in raising the voice of citizens to influence Government action and to hold Government to account. The study also recognises that beyond the organised action of CSOs there is also informal action¹⁴ which must be factored in to consideration of the overall impact of civil society on policy dialogue.

DP support: DP support for civil society engagement in policy dialogue refers to the **channel** of support (direct, through intermediaries, through budget and sector support) and **type** of support (core funding, contractual, project support (both targeted and untargeted) as well as non-financial support such as influencing space for policy dialogue.

1.3 Purpose of the evaluation

Although DPs have been actively promoting civil society engagement in policy dialogue for some time, there is little knowledge on the results of this support and the collective effectiveness of civil society efforts. There is also little known about how political will, critical to positive change, is generated and sustained. This study has been commissioned in order to understand both the **role of CSOs in policy dialogue** and the **role of the enabling environment** including the role of development partner support models in enabling and constraining CSO work.

The overall purpose of the study is **lesson learning** so that development partners can gain a better understanding of how best to support CSOs in the area of policy dialogue in different types of enabling environments.¹⁵

11 Gaventa, J, 2005 *Reflections of the Uses of the Power Cube approach for analysing the spaces, places and dynamics of civil society participation and engagement*. CFP Evaluation Series no 4.

12 Cornwall, A and V. S.P Coelho *Spaces for change? The Politics of Participation in New Democratic Arenas*, 2007

13 See OECD 2010, Civil society effectiveness.

14 CIVICUS notes that action and engagement can take place *'within a neighbourhood or faith-based community, online using social media or as a part of spontaneous protest, but is not directly associated with, or behalf of, a formal organisation'* Broadening civic space through voluntary action: Lessons from 2011, CIVICUS.

15 Evaluation of Support to Civil Society Engagement in Policy Dialogue ToR 2.1.

The study *seeks to increase the conceptual understanding of civil society and government interaction in different contexts and circumstances* (ToR 2.2.) as well as evaluate the strengths and weakness of different DPs strategies in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. Specifically the study has the following objectives;

- i. Establish an understanding of how CSOs engage in policy development and implementation at different levels (issues, strategies and type of interaction/engagement) including how aspects of the enabling environment (such as power structures, political, social and legal institutions) influence the approaches CSOs chose.
- ii. assess how CSOs have contributed to policy dialogue, the relevance, effectiveness and outcomes of their work, and the identification of what works and what does not.
- iii. identify the enabling and hindering factors which affect CSO ability and willingness to play an effective role in policy dialogue, including the enabling environment, capacity constraints and other key issues determined during the evaluation. This also includes an understanding of why some CSOs, who given their constituency and profile could be expected to be engaged in policy dialogue and chose not to.
- iv. discuss the strengths and weaknesses of different DP strategies both in terms of their efficiency (i.e. transaction costs involved as well as in terms of their effectiveness (i.e. ability to support effective CSO policy dialogue).
- v. identify lessons learned and provide recommendations for future support to CSOs in the area of policy dialogue.

The research was expected to take the form of a study (*generating new knowledge around objectives i-iii*) and to adopt a more conventional evaluative process to examine objective (iv.) (strengths and weaknesses of donor strategy). This was expected to use the DAC criteria¹⁶ of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability as an evaluation guide and was not intended to be confined to the six development partners involved in this study.

Roadmap for this report

Following the introduction (Chapter 1) and methodology (Chapter 2) the report provides a brief overview of the policy processes case studies (Chapter 3). Chapter 4 then examines the context for CS engagement in policy dialogue focusing on the legal and political factors and economic and social factors which determine the enabling environment for policy dialogue engagement.

Chapter 5 describes the policy dialogue in the country context as a prelude to the strategies adopted for engaging in the policy dialogue cycle (Chapter 6) and discusses how relevant, effective and efficient these are. Chapter 7 reviews DP strategies for supporting CS engagement in policy dialogue. Chapter 8 provides some conclusions and Chapter 9 lessons learned as pointers to the future in terms of both CSO and DP effectiveness.

16 DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance, OECD.

2 Methodology

2.1 A conceptual framework

Drawing on the ToR and the lessons learned during the inception and scoping phases, a conceptual framework was devised and documented to guide the case study approach and analysis, with the specific aim of providing direction and consistency of approach to the Country Teams during the main study phase. The Conceptual Framework document is given as Annex B with this section providing a methodological overview, the selection process for identifying the case studies, information sources, evaluation tools and the role of the Theory of Change (ToC) in the study. The validity and the study limitations are also described and discussed.

2.2 Methodology overview

The Country Study was divided into an Inception period (Phase1) which included a Scoping Study, followed by the detailed Case Studies phase (Phase 2). The findings from this study, together with the findings of the other two Country Studies, provide the primary source material for the Synthesis Phase (Phase 3). The objectives, timing and outputs of each phase are given in the following table.

Table 2.1 Methodological Overview

Phase 1: Inception	Phase 2: Country case studies	Phase 3: Synthesis
Objectives		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand different stakeholders perceptions of policy dialogue • Understand the context for CSO action • Provide recommendations for the policy processes which will provide useful insights into what works and what does not • Understand the current portfolio of DP support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the selected policy processes • District Planning & Monitoring • Legislation on domestic violence • Other case studies were conducted in Bangladesh and Uganda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyse and draw lessons learned from the country case studies • Situate findings within the debate on civil society engagement • Identify cross cutting findings and conclusions • present findings to broad group of DPs
Timing		
July-November 2011	December 2011-March 2012	May-September, 2012

2 METHODOLOGY

Phase 1: Inception	Phase 2: Country case studies	Phase 3: Synthesis
Main methods		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In country participatory workshops with CSO representatives • interviews with key informants in country • meetings and interviews with DP representatives • secondary data review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of policy processes • interviews and focus group discussions with stakeholders • observation of civil society engagement in action • review of project proposals, strategies and evaluations • findings validation workshop • sharing findings with DPs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International sharing workshop in Kampala • interaction with I-CSOs e.g. BetterAid, Open Forum • meta-analysis
Output		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inception Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mozambique Country Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synthesis Report • International presentations of the findings

2.3 The case study approach

A case study approach is used to assess policy processes to provide a more holistic understanding of the collective and diverse roles played by different actors within a particular process. The selection of policy processes for the case studies involved a careful consultative procedure based on the relevance of the policy process for the country and development partners as well as diversity of CS action involved in order to provide the best possible basis for learning lessons.

It is important to note that the cases were selected to help identify lessons learned regarding civil society effectiveness in policy dialogue within the policy themes as a whole rather than to examine the specific support of the commissioning DPs. The policy processes comprise a mix of CS action, only some of which is directly related to the specific programmes of the commissioning DPs. The lessons learned therefore cut across all forms of support and cannot be attributed to specific DP action. It is also important to recognise that they are not representative of the ‘universe’ of CS action which is extremely broad and diverse.

Phase 2 Case studies (policy processes) were selected through a consultative process with the following criteria in mind:

- **Range of CSOs** involved (to understand the diversity of CSOs and to ensure at least some of those policy processes finally selected would include ‘less usual’ CSOs such as faith based groups, professional associations and diaspora groups)

- **range of CS action** (to review the diversity of action from formal to informal (invited and claimed) so that this range could be captured in at least some of the case studies)
- the **level** at which CS action takes place (to ensure that at least one of the case studies included local, national and international experience and which involved action outside the capital)
- **types of funding modalities** (to be able to choose at least some case studies which would allow review of the benefits and constraints of different modes of funding)
- inclusion of CSOs currently funded by the DP reference group
- the **relevance** of the policy process (to people living in poverty and to the particular country context) i.e. policy processes which are of key importance to development and where CSOs have played a role
- **effectiveness** of the policy process (outcomes achieved bearing in mind that much could also be learned from mixed or poor achievements)
- availability of **documentation** on the policy process.

Based on the overall selection criteria two policy areas were selected and proposed by the evaluation team; discussed by the Reference Group and finally endorsed by the Evaluation Management Group:¹⁷ The policy areas are:

1. District Planning and Budget Monitoring
2. Movement for the approval of legislation on Domestic Violence

2.4 Information sources

For each policy process, a variety of sources of information were identified as follows:

- the key CSOs (regarded as *'movers and shakers'*) as well as others operating in the same context which had not engaged (documentation review of project proposals, evaluations etc, interviews and observation)
- sources of funding and support (development partners, fund managers, INGOs) for engagement in policy dialogue (documentation review of policies, disbursements and evaluations etc., interviews)
- the key government participants to policy dialogue in the selected policy process areas (interviews)
- research institutions, 'think tanks' and CS activists (interviews).

¹⁷ Evaluation Management Committee meeting 27.10.2011; see Annex F.

2.5 Evaluation tools

Evaluation Framework: In order to facilitate a comparison of the analysis and to ensure more analytical rather than descriptive reports the Case Studies were undertaken using a common Evaluation Framework and the Conceptual Framework (Annex B and Annex C). The Evaluation Framework comprises eighteen evaluation questions derived from the ToR. The framework specified specific evidence which would be required to answer the questions. The Conceptual Framework outlines the approach to case studies,¹⁸ the main analytical concepts and tools, such as the ToC and the Power Cube.¹⁹

Interviews and focus groups: Interview guidelines following the Evaluation Questions and reporting matrices were prepared to secure sharing of information within the team as well as uniformity in collection of information and data.²⁰ Interviews were semi-structured to allow for tailoring of the format depending on the situation and resources available. The majority of the approximately 50 interviews were conducted face-to-face, but telephone interviews were also carried out.

The chosen cases guided the selection of stakeholders for interviews, i.e. CSOs have been selected based on their engagement and their role in the case study, as well as their availability to participate in interviews. Interviews with government officials have likewise been determined by their connection to the case studies and served to ensure information from both sides. Additional key informants have been selected due to their specific knowledge of the cases and/or the CS-environment. Representatives from DPs were nominated by the agencies.

Some of the information was gathered during focus-group discussions to explore the synergy between informants from different categories (international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) and DP-representatives). In some cases, the identity of sources has been kept confidential due to concerns of possible political repercussions. The team had planned to use an appreciative enquiry approach in focus group meetings, but due to changes to team composition and logistical challenges it was not possible to apply this approach in this instance.


The Power Cube

Another key analytical tool used in the study is the Power Cube which provides a framework to analyse how power operates in the spaces and places for engagement. The diagram below provides a graphic representation of the different manifestations of power. The concept of closed, invited and claimed spaces have been explained above. The visibility of power is categorised as i. visible (i.e. the formal rules, structures and procedures which govern engagement), ii. hidden (i.e. the actual influence those engaging have over others within the engagement space) and iii. invisible (i.e. the power dynamics assumed by participants from their socialisation and societal norms). The conceptual framework helped in the analysis of power relations, levels of operation and understanding of spaces for CS engagement.

18 Two cases were selected by the Management Committee at its meeting on 27th October based on information collected during the Scoping Study in September 2011. For further details, see Annex F: Rationale and approach for selection of policy areas.

19 For further details on the analytical tools, please see Annex B: Conceptual Framework.

20 See Annex C.

Figure 2.1 The Power Cube

Source: Gaventa, 2003

The *Power Cube* was mainly used to provide the terminology for classifying different spaces for policy dialogue but also in the consideration of power operating in the policy dialogue engagement process.

Field visits were undertaken in the southern provinces of Gaza and Maputo to avoid time consuming travel to Northern Provinces. Stakeholders in other locations were contacted for telephone interviews. It is noted that there are major differences in the experience related to district planning and budget monitoring (Case 1) between Northern and Southern Mozambique, as the main programmes have been implemented in the North (Nampula). The empirical evidence gathered in the South (Gaza and Maputo) may therefore reflect a different situation. The team has counter-balanced this possible bias by applying the team's existing knowledge from previous assignments, supplemented with documented information on Central and Northern Provinces.

2.6 Theory of Change as a conceptual framework for the Case Studies

The study took an evaluative approach based on ToC. ToC is based on *programme theory* and is an approach which seeks to understand processes of change beyond the measurement of results to include more explicit reflection on the assumptions behind technocratic causal frameworks. In particular it examines the context, actors and processes of change to support learning about what constitutes effective strategies. Developing ToCs for civil society engagement in policy dialogue work has proved especially challenging as the complex nature and dynamics of both civil society action and its engagement with the State is not amenable to linear logic. The array of formal and informal, consensual and dissenting voices as well as the wide range of different incentives for and interests of policy dialogue stakeholders provides a complex web of interactions where causal relationships are hard to distinguish.

ToC is supposed to provide a flexible framework for critical and adaptive thinking rather than a product.²¹ There are many interpretations and visual representations of ToC available in recent literature but the fundamental principles are similar and include the need to understand i. the context, ii. the actors, iii. the desired-for change and iv. the linked events/processes leading to change. A model ToC for each of the two policy process case studies was developed by the Mozambique team (see the additional annex G for the Case Study Reports).

Evaluation and attribution

Establishing attribution is the most challenging element of any study on policy influencing. Policy and practice change is a result of highly complex interacting forces and actors. Different constellations of actors engage and disengage, work continuously over long periods of time or exploit moments of opportunity and undertake a wide variety of activities to influence change. Tipping points can be reached in a multitude of different ways.

The case studies used ToCs to capture the different elements contributing to change in policy and practice. These helped to ensure that the multiplicity of actions and actors were taken into account when trying to establish attribution and provided a focus for discussion among different actors regarding their relative contributions. However, they also served to highlight how linear and short-term models of change may lead to exaggeration of success as the contribution of others before and in parallel are generally overlooked. This alerted the team to the need for cautious interpretation of reported success in interviews, project reports and evaluations of individual organisations.

As well as examining impact level outcomes, the teams purposefully examined process outcomes as legitimate markers of achievement. These include legislation, creation of new or expanded participatory space and official platforms for civil society engagement, behaviour and attitude change of service providers and duty bearers.

Scope of work

The evaluation inevitably was limited in scope by practical considerations. While having the advantage of examining the complete cycle of policy dialogue it nevertheless was limited by selection of just a few policy processes. All three case studies looked at elements of governance which provided cross-cutting information for comparative purposes.

The time horizon suggested in the ToR was *policy dialogue in the last five years*. While this provides information on CSOs currently active and, in particular the ‘movers and shakers’ identified in the ToR it may have constrained the need to view the long-term perspective of change. Many of the achievements have not resulted from recent engagement but from longer term ‘drip-drip’ actions as well as incremental changes in the enabling environment. This limitation has been mitigated somewhat by the fact that all team members have long-term experience of the country context, civil society participation and CS action.

Validity of findings

Recognising the complex and often politically charged environment in which policy dialogue takes place, the Mozambique team was cautious about attribution and accepting accounts of processes at face value. They exercised care to triangulate findings in a number of ways:

21 Review of the Use of Theory of Change in International Development, Isabel Vogel, April 2012.

- 1) purposeful inclusion of a range of CSOs in each policy process,
- 2) interviews with Government (supply-side), key informants not connected with CSOs (independent view) and DPs
- 3) document review (especially during Phase 1) including websites
- 4) two verification workshops with participants representing different stakeholder groups to confirm and extend study findings
- 5) circulation of draft country reports to a variety of stakeholders for comment and further development.

Particularly important were the two verification workshops held to validate preliminary findings. Each workshop was attended by 8-10 participants invited for their specific knowledge on and engagement in the subject. Participants represented a broad range of CSOs, Government, academia, DPs and ICSO representatives. The workshops were characterised by lively, engaged discussions and served to test preliminary findings, verify information and consolidate the preliminary arguments.

2.7 Study limitations

Scope of work

The evaluation inevitably was limited in scope by practical considerations. While having the advantage of examining the complete cycle of policy dialogue and a variety of actors involved, it nevertheless was limited by selection of just two policy processes.

The time horizon suggested in the ToR was policy dialogue in the last five years. While this provides information on CSOs currently active and in particular the ‘movers and shakers’ identified in the ToR it may have constrained the need to view the long-term perspective of change. In fact as described in Section 3.3 to understand the political landscape a 30 year perspective is needed. Many of the achievements have not resulted from recent engagement but from longer term ‘drip-drip’ actions as well as incremental changes in the enabling environment. This limitation was mitigated somewhat by the fact that Mozambique team members had long-term experience of the country context and participation and civil society action in particular.

2.8 Country specific limitations – Mozambique

The timing of the study was not optimum since it took place during the period November-December when typically development organisations are busy with annual planning, headquarter visits and international delegations. Consequently many were not available for interview and when meetings were arranged they were only with one representative of the organisation. The opportunities for focus group discussions were severely restricted. Meetings with government officials were often cancelled or re-scheduled at short notice.

Translations from English to Portuguese and subsequently from Portuguese to Changana influenced the level of understanding of various terms and conceptual frameworks used

in the study as well as the level of detail in terms of information. In some cases it was difficult to steer interviews and maintain focus, as respondents provided chronological report of events, only rarely providing a view on processes or causal linkages.

Contact with organisations and institutions at district level in Mozambique must go through formal channels, which often serve as a filter for information. It is difficult to penetrate the formal, government-control to get beyond the barrier, especially with limited time available. For this reason, contact with constituents of community-based organisations (CBOs) has been limited to interviews with representatives of network members. Local CSOs and CBOs interviewed have had little or no information on DP strategies, as they often receive support through intermediaries.

The Mozambique study team suffered from turnover of members during the course of the study which led to some difficulties in ensuring a common understanding of the conceptual framework and continuity.

The construction of a ToC for each of the case studies took place only after data collection unlike the case in the other two study countries. It is recognised that drafting the ToC upfront would have been more fruitful in terms of providing an analytical framework for data collection and not only serve as an ex-post reconstruction. The Power Cube in its reduced form was mainly used to provide the terminology for classifying different spaces for policy dialogue. Timelines were useful to identify key events in relation to the two cases.

Due to the political nature of the subject matter, the validity and reliability of statements by CS-interviewees may in some cases need to be treated with caution as it may present a biased picture. To address this, the evaluation team has cross-checked and assessed the trustworthiness of statements, and where possible different points of views are given in the text in order to provide a balanced account.

3 Key aspects of an enabling environment

The ToC emphasises the key importance of the enabling environment (political, legal and social) for policy dialogue and this chapter attempts to unpack the enabling and hindering factors for productive engagement of CSOs in policy dialogue in the Mozambique context (summarised in Table 3.1).

This chapter analyses the different historical factors which have influenced the current environment for CS engagement in policy dialogue, and the power relations between CSOs and other actors which now exist. The information contained has been validated by many of the study participants and only controversial or differing views are attributed.

3.1 The CSO landscape in Mozambique

In order to fully understand the environment in which the Mozambican CSOs operate, it is important to have an appreciation of the key historic and contextual features. Immediately after Independence in 1975, the one-party state, led by the ruling party Frente de Libertacao de Mocambique (Frelimo), established so-called “democratic mass organisations”.²² The purpose of these organisations was to continue, albeit under a different ideology, the patterns of supervision and control used during the Portuguese colonial times under the guise of “Security of the State”. However, in addition to the state organised initiatives, independent developments took place, some of which dated back to the colonial era; e.g. the establishment of the Christian Council of Mozambique (CCM²³), *Cáritas de Moçambique* and the national peasants’ union *União Nacional dos Camponeses* (UNAC).²⁴ These CSOs still survive and represent some of the genuine member-based CSOs in the country today. The Mozambican CSO landscape and the different kinds of CSOs fall roughly into three main categories:²⁵

- i. Small elite of individual and platform organisations, which are capable of and invited to participate, comment and interact with state institutions. These are mainly based in Maputo city and are typically well-funded, as their level of performance has attracted the attention of DPs. They are professional, with the capacity to mobilise funding, they abide by their statutes, and hold more or less regular meetings with their individual or organisational members to which they are accountable. Many of these organisations have, however, no proper constituency, but act “on behalf of” certain groups and defend their causes, e.g. women’s and/or children’s rights, advocating to create awareness of the consequences of extractive industries and (district) budget monitoring etc.

22 The so-called democratic mass organisations are Organização das Mulheres de Moçambique (women’s organisation), OTM (workers’ organisation) and OJM (youth organisation), as well as the two professional interest organisations ONP (national teachers’ organisation) and ONJ (organisation of journalists).

23 CCM was established already in 1948 national journalists’ organisation).

24 José Negrão: “A Propósito das Relações Entre as ONGs do Norte e a Sociedade Civil Moçambicana” (2003), available on http://www.iid.org.mz/Relacoes_entre_ONG_do_Norte_e_Sociedade_Civil_do_Sul.pdf.

25 Interview with the NGOs Forum of Gaza, and with the representative of Magariro, the latter organisation based in Chimoio, Manica.

- ii. Considerable group of organisations of middle size, with potential but sometimes with no clear expression in terms of influencing policies and with limited funds. Many of these organisations are demand or opportunity-driven, i.e. the funding opportunities offered by the DP community's changing agendas (gender, HIV/AIDS, and, most recently, climate change) foster the establishment of these organisations. Often the main objective is service delivery (and employment), but also elements of advocacy and defence of specific rights issues are on their agenda. In spite of certain hands-on knowledge, these organisations in many cases have no constituency and run the risk of becoming personalised through their leaders and end up becoming one-man-organisations.²⁶
- iii. The majority of organisations are small, working only at provincial and district level, generally with limited capacity, comprising only a small number of staff or associates. They are usually not well known outside their immediate area. They are, however, committed to their members but usually lack the financial resources to meet their basic everyday costs. These organisations often have sector-specific scope with either economic or social objectives, e.g. community and farmers' associations, parents' groups, women's associations, sports and youth associations, local councils and community development committees.
- iv. An additional category in Mozambican CS, which is outside the organised groups, but is a factor in the CS landscape as clearly described in a recent report from the United Nations Development Programme:²⁷

Box 1 The fourth civil society category

When assessing civil society in Mozambique, it is imperative to mention the events that occurred in early September 2010. The violent demonstrations, which resulted in 14 deaths, are not only an important sign of the failed model of economic growth without distribution, but also may help us to reflect on the situation of the CS in the country. During the riots, a significant portion of the Mozambican population expressed their outrage against rising costs of living, and made use of violence to force the Government to withdraw the announced rises in fuel and food prices. A similar chain of events occurred in early 2008. The absence of interlocutors of this strong movement is an important sign not only of the gap between formal institutions (including DPs, the Government and its political opposition) and the 'unorganised' expression of civil society, but also of the long journey that the CS still has to make in order to build a pacific, yet strong voice to represent their claims.

UNDP, 2011.

This type of civil society action is characterised by spontaneous movements, which receives little or no attention from the established CS or from DPs. It is regarded widely

26 This category of CSOs was polemically designated "James Bond-organisations" referring to the fact that they have no office and everything is governed from the James Bond-like attaché case of the leader!

27 "The Mirror of Narcissus – knowledge and self-conscience for a better development of the Mozambican Civil Society. Lessons learned and recommendations from Mozambique on its experience in implementing CIVICUS Civil Society Index", UNDP Mozambique, March 2011.

as a potential threat and unconstructive in its means of expressing dissatisfaction. But it is a voice of the CS, which may be stronger or more significant in the coming years.

3.2 Contributing factors

The factors which contribute to CSO effectiveness in engaging in policy dialogue are multiple. It is important to consider not only the enabling factors, but also the hindering factors in order to fully understand the environment in which the CSOs operate. The contributing factors – positive and negative – are analysed in relation to legal, political and financial freedoms.

Legal freedoms

One of the most important enabling factors of engagement in policy dialogue is the legal right to free association and to information, the freedom of expression and the engagement of citizens and CS in the processes of governance. The rights of association and organisation are broadly guaranteed by the current constitution of 2004 and Law of Association of 1991 (8/91), which means that Mozambique in formal terms has advanced in guaranteeing citizenship rights.²⁸ It is critical to recognise that the existing law brought a new impetus to the emergence of a large number of non-governmental associations and organisations. However, there are several challenges that hinder the operation and growth of CSOs. The poor performance of justice institutions is one, and the current legislation on Associations not matching the dynamics of the growing CS in term of registration, types of CSOs and taxation is another. CS stakeholders are therefore advocating for a new law to be enacted. A draft proposal was discussed among CSOs during 2010 and presented to Parliament through the Commission of Social Affairs in September 2010 and the Ministry of Justice in November 2010. So far there has been no official reaction to the proposal.

By law, CSOs are required to be linked with a government organ (line ministry), as Government regards CSOs primarily as service delivery organisations supporting the implementation of government programmes within different sectors. In order to obtain formal registration, CSOs operating in governance issues are increasingly being pressured to be associated with a line ministry or specific sector. It is also a major problem that most of the CSOs, particularly the ones based at provincial and district level far from Maputo City face bureaucratic hurdles in registering with the Government. This has direct implications for the eligibility of CSOs to access funds. Registration requires cumbersome processes of providing documentation, which involves long-distance travel to district or provincial capitals, costs and often delays with possible consequences of disqualification.

Apart from the existence of explicit legislation on foundations and agricultural or farming associations, current legislation on associations does not differentiate between types of CSOs. Self-help (*ajuda mutua*) organisations are lumped together with charitable organisations and those that are dedicated to service delivery, advocacy and politics.²⁹ One interviewee commented that “...the Associations with an economic purpose (agricultural or farming associations) have less requirements and consequently easier access to register. One could question why it has to be the Government and not the Judiciary approving the

28 OSISA, 2009.

29 NGO sustainability Index, USAID 2009; Evaluation of Citizens Voice and Accountability, DFID 2009.

registration of other associations?” Some groups have no clear reasons for the refusal to register their organisations or receive contradictory messages on how they should be run; for example the Mozambique association for sexual minority rights, *Lambda* has for years received no response to its request for registration.

The lack of knowledge on rights, legislation and procedures with regard to associations is a general problem among CSOs and public servants, which constrains CSO operations, and in many districts, the legal procedures are not being observed. Part of the ignorance of the laws is also due to the fact that they are only available in Portuguese and not translated into local languages. The non-compliance and ignorance of the laws is characterised by systematic lack of regard of deadlines for the approval of official documents (*despacho do reconhecimento*), both at national, provincial, district and administrative post levels.³⁰

Access to information is important for active participation in policy dialogue, but there has been no progress in terms of free and easy access to information, especially in relation to public information held by State institutions. In Mozambique, secrecy in public institutions is a prevailing concern, a problem that is further aggravated by the fact that when information becomes public it is often too technical and provided too late to be properly used by CSOs. Several attempts for the Parliament to approve a law on access to information, submitted by CS in 2005, have failed, apparently because of lack of political interest.³¹ In 2011, the Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA) Mozambique chapter³² organised a debate on access to information and constitutional revision but no Member of Parliament from the ruling party attended.

Political freedoms

CS engagement in policy dialogue is increasingly hampered by a hostile and often intimidating political environment. The exercise of political freedom is strongly limited by the threats made by government authorities, aggravated by the weak performance of justice bodies. Political institutions are regarded by the citizens and CS as being intolerant to dialogue and confrontation. The limitation is neither legal nor formal, but consists of constraints and forms of social and psychological intimidation that produce feelings of inhibition, fear of reprisals and emotional unease. The almost total restriction on access to information and the intimidating practices used by government authorities, mainly at the local government level, increase the fears of CS stakeholders to engage in policy dialogue.³³

CS actors are often accused of belonging to the Opposition and are consequently “outlawed”³⁴. In an environment where the market is dominated by the political elite from the ruling party, alternatives that could provide an escape from marginalisation are rare. Examples of intimidation and shrinking political space were given by the Community Radio Forum (FORCOM) which has been frequently surprised by the strength

30 Civil society proposal to review the law 8/91, 2010.

31 Ismael Mussa, former member of Parliament for MDM (Movimento Democrático de Mocambique).

32 With the support from the Danish NGO IBIS under the Swedish-funded Access to Information Programme (Programa AGIR). <http://www.misa.org/>

33 MISA 2007; Forquilha 2009 and 2010. Confirmed by the interview held with a journalist from a community radio in Chókwe, and another held with a journalist from the Mozambican state television.

34 Being “outlawed” may result in loss of police protection in case of harassment and attacks, loss of employment and harassment of family members. Statements from interviews with CSO-representatives, whose identity is kept anonymous.

of the confrontation with Government when it has aired criticism. In particular examples were shared regarding the experience of radio stations operating in Gaza, Manica and Nampula Provinces, where FORCOM finds it difficult to protect the journalists.³⁵ Examples encountered during the Scoping Exercise also confirm this: In Gaza Province, the police showed up at a CS meeting in late 2010 to listen in on was being discussed; as a result the Queen (“*rainha*”) in Majune District from Niassa Province was interviewed by the police after being critical of the district government.³⁶

A particular aspect of the political environment in which CSOs operate relates to press freedom. The 1990 Constitution provides for press freedom but restricts this right according to respect for the Constitution, human dignity, the imperatives of foreign policy, and national defence. The Media Law 1991³⁷ establishes the right to independence of the media in the exercise of the right to information, press freedom, broadcasting rights and the right of reply. Reporters continue to face problems accessing official information. The 1991 Media Law considered one of the more progressive in Africa, was reviewed in 2006 by Gabinfo, the Government Press Office, which suggested possible “improvements” such as provisions for mandatory licenses for working journalists and pointed to the omission of much-needed freedom of information legislation. The private media have enjoyed moderate growth in recent years, and independent daily and weekly newspapers routinely provide scrutiny of the Government. However, journalists continue to be at risk of threat or harassment³⁸ and capital-based publications have little influence on the largely illiterate rural population. The State owns a majority stake in the main national daily, *Noticias*, and the largest broadcast networks, *Rádio Mocambique* (RM) and *Televisão de Mocambique* (TVM), although dozens of private radio and television stations also operate. While state-owned media have displayed greater editorial independence, the opposition still receives inadequate coverage and establishment views are favoured. According to the MISA African Media Barometer, the development of private commercial radio continues to be hampered by the fact that state advertisements are broadcast exclusively on RM. Instances have also occurred where newspapers have had advertising from State-owned companies withdrawn after publishing unfavourable stories.³⁹

Financial freedoms

Mozambican CSOs are relatively free to raise funds from different sources to pursue their objectives, but in practice they are influenced by international DPs’ priorities. The heavy dependence on DP funds may mean that CSOs’ own policies and strategic agendas may not be followed, as their activities are out of necessity shaped to suit the DP priorities and availability of funds.⁴⁰ During interviews, DPs recognised that their support to CSO agendas is determined by their own priorities.

CSOs, with the exception of youth associations, do not generally receive funds from the State. The resources allocated by the State for CSOs, and also the coverage and diversity of organisations that really benefit from these resources is almost insignificant; the State contributes 3% of the CSO funds.⁴¹ CSOs on the other hand, expressed reluctance to

35 Interview with FORCOM 29.11.11. See also www.forcom.org.mz.

36 Focus group interview with INGOs, September 2011.

37 Media Law 18/91, Article 48 of the Constitution and Article 50 of the statutes of the Higher Council on the Media

38 A media source which has been guaranteed anonymity stated bluntly that “We are afraid!”

39 Information from www.freedomhouse.org 2007 report on Mozambique.

40 INE Census, 2003, showed that about 70% of CSO funds were coming from foreign DPs.

41 INE Census 2003.

receive State funds (which is currently not available to most organisations), as they would fear influence on policies and strategies. Interestingly enough, there seems to be less reluctance towards receiving foreign States' funds, although this too is recognised as conditional.

In principle associations have tax obligations, i.e. they must have a Tax Identification Number, submit annual returns, and pay Income Tax (Imposto sobre o Rendimento da Pessoa Cole(IRPC)).⁴² Only the Public Utility Institutions, which need an authorisation from the Council of Ministers, are exempted from certain taxes. The IRPC Tax Code provides exemptions for non-Public Utility CSOs, e.g. in terms of VAT. However, to benefit from it, CSOs have to make a formal request. In practice, as CSOs do not have sufficient information on taxes, the bureaucracy limits their access to tax benefits. The CS sector is characterised by the need to compete for funds, which is seen by some as a hindering collaboration, whereas others see this as a stimulus to strengthening capacity and performance.

The study found that many local level organisations and associations do not prioritise issues of political debate, while existing in a state of poverty, with more serious and pressing problems such as a lack of food and clean drinking water.

3.3 Changes over the past 30 years

The environment is dynamic and changes over time. It is necessary to look back further than five years, as some of the important legal framework, as well as joint Government and DP initiatives, setting the scene for CSO engagement date as far back as Independence in 1975.

In the period from Independence in 1975 to the signing of the General Peace Agreement ending 16 years of civil war in 1992, economic reforms gradually prepared the transition from a state-controlled socialist economy to a market economy. In 1990, a new multi-party Constitution was adopted, paving the way for the 2004 revision and defining as fundamental civil rights freedom of expression and the right to association.

Decentralisation and the preparation of a legal framework for local government bodies at district and sub-district level took place from 2002-03, leading to the adoption of the law on local government institutions (Lei dos Órgãos Locais do Estado (LOLE)) and the establishment of community consultation and participation institutions.

2003 was also the year when the first Poverty Observatory was established at national level as a formal, *invited space* for Government and DPs to engage with CS and private sector in monitoring of implementation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan (PRSP/ PARPA) and Millennium Development Goals (MDG). In 2005, the Poverty Observatories were later rolled out at provincial level and the name was changed to Development Observatories (DOs). The establishment of DOs at provincial level led to establishment of CS platforms.

The most significant change over the recent years has been the increased power of the ruling party, which is characterised by most as a re-introduction of a de facto one-party

42 Imposto sobre o Rendimento da Pessoa Colectiva.

system. The ruling party's economic power has increased considerably, and political and social control mechanisms are in place to secure adherence to party politics at all levels.⁴³

3.4 Power relations⁴⁴

The GOM is a constitutionally-presidential system, where the president is elected directly by popular vote obeying the rule of an absolute majority. As for parliamentary elections, members are elected by political parties according to a system of proportional representation. Mozambique follows a closed list system to elect Members of Parliament, so the citizen votes for a party and not for a specific candidate. Consequently, Members of Parliament are loyal to their parties and are not accountable to a specific constituency. This electoral system reinforces the power of the ruling party and weakens the citizens' access to influence through elected representatives at national level. This situation demonstrates both the *visible* and *hidden* nature of power as defined by the Power Cube.

Knowledge and access to information are key aspects in determining power relations. Many local and minor CSOs do not have the academic capacity to engage in complicated issues like budget monitoring, legal revisions etc. Due to limited human and financial resources they may not have time available for often lengthy dialogue and processes, and the financial resources are often scarce, not allowing for participation in activities involving travel and over-night stays. In addition to this, the low level of citizenship, i.e. the lack of knowledge on rights and duties, legal frameworks and operation of the government institutions is a limiting factor for many CSOs. Students met during the course of an earlier study⁴⁵ indicated that they saw little point in participating as their views would not be taken seriously, they may be harassed and '*with most of us needing State jobs, it is not wise to be an activist*'. These limitations to engagement are indicative of *invisible power*. Information is power, and interviewed district government officials have expressed reluctance towards sharing e.g. budget information with the provincial CSO-platform, as the "information could be misused" once again demonstrating *hidden power*.⁴⁶

According to CS and DP interviewees, the fact that people – students, traditional leaders and ordinary citizens – are gradually being educated and starting to think for themselves, and becoming critical of governance issues, is viewed as a major challenge to Government. Community committees at district level have been established and people are participating actively and critically. The decentralisation of university institutions to all provinces in the country has given an enormous lift in terms of critical citizens and consequently an input to CS in the provinces. It seems that the lower the level of government, the more difficulty they have to deal with a critical constituency.⁴⁷

43 Presentation by Luis de Brito at Danish Embassy, December 2011; Forquilha (2009); see also www.cip.org.mz.

44 The study of power relations is a subject in itself. Within the limitations of the current evaluation, only brief information is included.

45 Personal communication.

46 Interview with Provincial Planning Department, Gaza Province, November 2011.

47 INGO focus group meeting, September 2011. Irae Baptista Lundin, September 2011.

3.5 Key factors influencing policy dialogue

Policy dialogue in Mozambique is strongly influenced by the political environment. In spite of official establishment of structural frame conditions for increased space for CS to act, the co-existence of CS and Government is increasingly characterised by difficulties during the last five years. Institutions that appeal for the full exercise of citizenship are in place, there is a legal-constitutional framework of freedom of expression and of association supported by an engagement promoting discourse. However, all these elements are confronted by a practice that imposes barriers for the exercise of such freedoms.

The findings of this evaluation are informed by several sources,⁴⁸ indicating structural enabling factors threatened by a relatively hindering and hostile political environment.

Figure 3.1 Summary of enabling and hindering factors for CS engagement in policy dialogue

	Enabling factors	Hindering factors
Legal aspects, including media and access to information	Constitutional rights on freedom of association and expression (1991/2004) Legislation on press freedom (1991)	Pressure on CSOs to be associated with government organs, to be involved in implementation of government plans and/or associated with ruling party. ⁴⁹ Cumbersome bureaucratic mechanisms in registering CSOs. Law of association broadly applied to all types of CSOs without distinction between those oriented to service delivery and those involved in advocacy and politics. Lack of knowledge on laws and procedures among CSO and public servants. Lack of specific law on access to information undermines the Media and public exercise of press freedom and right to information.

48 Francisco & Matter 2007; ACS 2010; Forquilha 2009 and a significant number of interviewees.

49 Interviews with CSOs in Moamba District and Gaza Province; sustained with earlier information collected by team members in Niassa Province and Magude District.

	Enabling factors	Hindering factors
Political aspects, including power relations	<p>Increasing recognition by Government, of the role of CSOs.</p> <p>Institutions of citizen consultation and participation (such as ODs and IPCCs) help to repair broken links in the minimal representative policy process.</p> <p>Informal relation with political elite has been more efficient in terms of results achieved.</p> <p>The emergency of research & advocacy organisations to provide evidence and information.</p>	<p>Administrative and political institutions influenced in particular ways by historical inheritance that reproduces unstable political culture, low tolerance of a contesting behaviour, and a culture of secrecy</p> <p>Strong control of the space of dialogue by Government</p> <p>Hostile and intimidating political environment, including accusations of belonging to the Opposition</p> <p>MPs are elected on party lists, with no direct accountability between MPs and a citizen constituency.</p>
Financial aspects and access to funding	<p>The freedom of CSOs to raise funds from different sources.</p> <p>The emergence of new financial mechanisms with the aim to support CSO (MASC & AGIR).</p> <p>More awareness among DPs in regard to the need for strengthened CS capacity.</p>	<p>Economic structure dominated by the political and party elites which discourages the active and critical spirit of engagement.</p> <p>High dependency on foreign funding.</p> <p>Non-existence or very weak budget management system and monitoring.</p> <p>DPs' indirect funding conditionality through specific priorities limits the capacity of CSOs to set their own agenda.⁵⁰</p> <p>Lack of information and knowledge by CSOs about taxes, including bureaucracy limits the CSOs to access to tax benefits.</p>

50 Interviews with CSO-platforms and ICSOs.

4 Overview of the two case studies

The two policy processes, (i) **District planning and budget monitoring** and (ii) Legislation on domestic violence differ considerably and they provide the study with different experience on CS's engagement in policy dialogue. The 'District Planning and Budget Monitoring' case study is an on-going process, which involves central, district and sub-district level. The '**Legislation on Domestic Violence**' case study is a process which started in 2000 and concluded with the adoption of the law against Domestic Violence in 2009. Table 4.1 provides a simple comparison of the two processes.

Table 4.1 Case Studies

Case 1: District Planning & Budget Monitoring	Case 2: Process leading to approval of Legislation on Domestic Violence
Invited space	Claimed space
Government initiative	Civil society initiative
Strong influence from DPs	Support from DPs
Central and decentralised level	Mainly at national level
An on-going process (2003-)	A process with a particular and intended result (2000-09)

4.1 Case Study 1: District planning and budget monitoring

(See the additional Annex G: Case Study Reports for the full report)

The policy dialogue issues

District Planning and Budget Monitoring are interlinked but distinct processes. District planning is a policy process that runs under the Law on Local State Institutions (LOLE)⁵¹ where participation of local communities is a basic principle in local governance and management of public goods and services. District planning is a straightforward process in which the local civil society is represented through the local consultative councils (LCC). Systematic budget monitoring by civil society is a recent exercise in Mozambique, although it has been carried out under the auspices of various ICSO-supported projects since the LOLE was adopted. The budget monitoring process is a major challenge, where controversial issues may arise.

Interviews with district government officials have confirmed the importance of engaging civil society in planning and budget monitoring. The broader population recognises the representation process and its role as a channel for information. Collaboration is, however, not always considered smooth and the district authorities complain about lack of information from CSOs on plans and activity implementation. Interviews indicated that local government authorities mainly see the role of CSOs as implementing agents of local development plans and that advocacy initiatives are regarded as a result of CSOs not

51 LOLE (Law on Local State Institutions) Law 8/2003, regulated by Decree 11/2005 led to the establishment of spaces for dialogue at the decentralised level of government.

understanding their role in local development.⁵² In this context it is important to stress that policy dialogue as an interactive and mutual process was not found in the visited districts, where engagement of CSOs by local government was rather one way diagnosis of CS problems rather than discourse.

Spaces for engagement

Policy dialogue in district planning and budget monitoring takes place in formal, *invited spaces* created by Government. Two *invited spaces* (both established in 2003 by Government and supported by DPs) are of crucial importance: The **Poverty Observatory (PO)**⁵³ which started at national level and later rolled out to provincial level (and re-named DOs) is, by design, a government consultation space, where Government and DPs are the main actors, and where civil society engages on an annual basis through platforms.⁵⁴ The agenda and timing is the sole responsibility of government, and a common complaint from other participants is the short notice, the lack of prior information on key documents and the unequal allocation of time, allowing civil society and private sector only limited time to prepare their participation and present their opinions. Experience has demonstrated that the *invited spaces* have a tendency of gradually being co-opted and less effective. The **local councils**⁵⁵ from which the LCCs have emerged are the space for consultation established at local level. The LCCs comprise community representatives and include community authorities, religious leaders and representatives of interest groups. The LCC also includes representatives from district government and is chaired by the District Administrator. Although the selection of local council members should be based on principles of representation of the different groups of interest, studies document that this does not occur.⁵⁶

Due to the limitations in these formally established spaces for dialogue, civil society seeks alternative channels for influence (i.e. *claimed spaces*). These include i) working through the **independent media** (radio, television, newspapers). Some radio stations and television channels have created spaces dedicated to the analysis of political events and policy and to providing exposure, ii) seeking influence through **influential people**, such as ruling party officials, traditional and religious leaders, iii) making use of the **open and inclusive presidency**⁵⁷, which, although criticised by development partners, media and civil society as being orchestrated, expensive and undermining the local planning system⁵⁸, may have stimulated citizens' participation in dialogue spaces⁵⁹, iv) confronting Government through **organisations engaged in policy dialogue** at national level (e.g. Fundação de Desenvolvimento Comunitário (FDC), CIP, Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Económicos (IESE), LDH and Grupo Moçambicano de Dívidas (GMD)) characterised

52 Interviews with district government officials, Moamba and Guija Districts, November 2011.

53 The poverty/development observatories comprise in general of members of government institutions, development partners, civil society, the private sector, trade unions and academic and/or research institutions.

54 G-20 is an umbrella organisation established to represent civil society vis-à-vis government in PO. Cruzeiro do Sul, a local civil society organisation was very active in the promotion of the initiative to establish the civil society platform to monitor PARPA, which became known as G-20 (Francisco & Matter, 2007). At provincial level, civil society is represented through provincial platforms/networks of local CSOs.

55 I.e. Community Participation and Consultation Institutions (IPCCs).

56 SAL CDS & Masala 2009; ACS 2010; Forquilha 2009 and 2010.

57 *Presidencia Aberta e Inclusiva* introduced by the current president since 2005.

58 DIE, 2011.

59 Interviews with district government representatives in Chokwe and Moamba Districts, November 2011.

by academic background, visibility and acceptance gained through research-based evidence and CSO-platforms or umbrella organisations at provincial and district level. At local level, grass root civil society may emerge through support to Local Development Committees.

Enabling environment

In terms of internal factors influencing CSOs possibilities for engagement in policy dialogue, some of the most important enabling factors are the existence of research and advocacy organisations (RAO) with capacity to provide evidence and documentation. Openness and strong leadership demonstrated by individual figures in the CSO-environment also enables policy dialogue due to general acceptance by CSOs as well as Government. At local level, the weak technical capacity and restricted notion of citizenship, as well as the low level of education, problems of interaction within the platforms, and the limited exchange of knowledge and information are hindering factors which hamper civil society's engagement in policy dialogue. Other hindrances are the co-option of community leaders, censorship and auto-censorship often practised.

The external factors in the political environment enabling civil society engagement in policy dialogue related to district planning and budget monitoring are the legislation and freedom of expression, as well as government initiatives to engage civil society through invited spaces. However, in practice the political environment is not conducive of critical dialogue and tends to inhibit active civil society engagement: the poor performance of the justice system, the challenge of access to information, and the government controlled publicity market limit the exercise of freedoms.

Effectiveness of CSO activity

Civil society strategies to strengthen its participation and influence in relation to district planning and budget monitoring have yielded limited results at local level. Despite their participation in spaces for policy dialogue (DOs and LCCs), CSOs' influence has, in practice, been limited. Document review and interviews have revealed that a more effective way for civil society to engage in policy dialogue has been the coalitions around specific issues and thematic working groups at district level. Direct and informal dialogue, however, takes place mainly at national level.

The establishment of formal mechanisms of engagement at all levels of governance has been considered by several actors as being an achievement of civil society, notwithstanding its relatively poor effectiveness. In recent years, the emergence of a few strong CSOs providing research-based evidence has brought change in the relations between Government and civil society. Government has started to pay attention to questions raised by CSOs. Two reasons can explain the shift of behaviour of the Government in relation to civil society: the risk of political cost if Government decided to ignore civil society produced evidence; and the fact that it offers a possibility of capitalising on expert knowledge otherwise not accessible to Government.

DP support

District planning and budget monitoring processes receive DP support at various levels and through different channels. The overall spaces for policy dialogue as well as the main civil society actors all benefit from DPs' support. ICSOs have played a major role over the last decade supporting local civil society to engage actively in policy dialogue at national and local level. Despite the keen interest to support civil society engagement in policy dialogue at a broader basis, there is, however, a tendency of DPs to focus

their support on a reduced number of organisations. The very limited DP support to independent media is identified by civil society actors as a major problem if open policy dialogue is to be achieved.

4.2 Case Study 2: Process leading to legislation on domestic violence

(See the additional Annex G: Case Study Report for the full report)

The policy dialogue issues

In 2000-01, as a response to the prevalence of gender-based violence and to the lack of legislation concerning domestic violence against women, a group of CSOs, working in the area of women's rights, pioneered a process to draft and advocate for a law against domestic violence. This process culminated with Parliament's adoption of a first Bill on domestic violence against women on June 30, 2009. In Mozambique, domestic violence against women is a widespread and, unfortunately, widely accepted practice based on strong cultural beliefs and traditional gender roles. This is testified by research studies and documented cases undertaken by CSOs (i.e. Women and Law in Southern Africa (WLSA), LEMUSICA), and statistics from the public casualty desks (*Gabinetes de Atendimento*) for women victims of violence.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, the cases of domestic violence against women are regarded as belonging to the domestic (private) sphere and as such not a public issue and until recently no legal framework existed.

Spaces for engagement

In relation to domestic violence, the women's rights organisations championed the problem definition and the agenda setting through largely *claimed spaces*. They were successful in bringing the issue of domestic violence against women into the public domain. With the adoption of the Law, the problem has gradually become recognised and addressed by Parliament and Government.⁶¹ The women's rights movement used a range of supplementary strategies for policy dialogue from direct and informal dialogue to indirect contribution to the dialogue that reinforced each other to achieve the outcomes.

Strategies used by the women's organisations addressed direct and informal dialogue spaces through the production of evidence-based studies, including position papers, which were published in the media, countrywide annual campaigns and community mobilisation, lobbying and alliance building with women parliamentarians. In terms of indirect contribution to dialogue, the CSOs based their interventions on community mobilisation, case documentation and training of parliamentarians to argue their case.

The study found that the policy dialogue took place mainly at national level, between the pioneer CSOs, personalities involved in the campaign and the parliamentarians. However, the women's rights groups at local level also provided an important indirect contribution to the dialogue particularly in documenting cases of violence and also disseminating the Bill among their peers.

60 MINT, 2008.

61 The campaign was championed by Fórum Mulher, WLSA, N'weti - Comunicação para a Saúde, Oxfam GB and a number of national CSOs.

Enabling environment

The success of the policy process was influenced by internal factors within the movement as well external factors from the legal, social and political environment. In terms of internal enabling factors, the strong leadership within the key CSOs, liaison with influential persons, coalitions and clear division of responsibilities based on key strengths, as well as strong research and advocacy capacity supplemented by documented cases were contributing factors to success. However, the tendency to competitive duplication of efforts among CSOs after the approval of the law and the low involvement of other key civil society actors were counterproductive to a sustainable, lasting change of practice and attitudes.

As for the external enabling factors, the existence of international instruments such as Conventions (of which most are ratified by Mozambique) sustained the initiative, as did partnerships with and financial support from ICSOs without jeopardizing the national ownership to the initiative. Extensive consultations among CSOs working on women's rights, the existence of strong leadership in Government towards the last stage of the process, the 2009-elections and the ruling party's fear to lose women's votes were all external enabling factors which in spite of an overwhelming massive hindering environment led to the approval of the legislation against domestic violence. The external hindering factors were first and foremost the non-recognition of the problem as being gender-based and public (a resistance based on cultural norms and traditional gender roles). The limited access to public information, citizens' low awareness of rights and duties, as well as male dominated perspectives against the Bill in the media also contributed to a hindering political environment.

While the weight of a single factor is difficult to tell, the sum of enabling factors counterbalanced the hindering factors and resulted in the adoption of the Bill. However, the main hindering factor still persists among duty bearers and the population in general, i.e. the resistance to accept gender-based violence as a problem in general and a public problem in particular, which is directly connected with social norms and socially constructed gender roles.

Effectiveness of CSO activity

In spite of yielding outcomes for the benefit of the broader society, the process that culminated with the adoption of the Law on domestic violence against women was in the first instance perceived as a struggle by a small urban-based elite group of women. It spawned serious debate in society and gradually people are becoming sensitised and verbal about the problem of domestic violence. The documented cases presented during the campaign were very crucial in sensitising the state institutions and the public at large about the importance and magnitude of the problem, and domestic violence has gradually been recognised as a public issue and moved from the private to the public sphere. During the process, the first institutions to attend victims of domestic violence were established by the police, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Women and Social Affairs and the CSOs. Over time, the critics from media have reduced and their positive involvement is increasing. After the adoption of the Law, various newspapers are reporting cases of domestic violence and discussing the matter. WLSA has been asked by some media houses to provide training on how to deal with and report on domestic violence cases.

Interviews have highlighted the following key strategies for influence and success of this process: a clear focus, visible leadership, social and political connections and support from individuals with strong political influence, complementarity among involved CSOs, strong links to women's groups at the base, and the application of diverse and reinforcing strategies. Furthermore, the political context of the country was conducive, since elections were up coming. Nevertheless, it was the capacity of the movement to take advantage of the momentum that was the key to success.

DP support

DPs and ICOSOs have played an important role in supporting CSOs engaged in the policy dialogue on legislation against domestic violence. The support has, however, been based on projects and after the approval of the Law, CSOs have complained about a strict interpretation of DP priorities, which has led to difficulties in obtaining continued funding for dissemination of knowledge about the law and law enforcement.

5 Policy dialogue

In the context of the present evaluation, policy dialogue relates to the involvement of CSOs and their influence on the Government's agenda in development and implementation of policies and strategies at national and local level.⁶² It is important to bear in mind that policy dialogue takes place at different levels and with different purposes, as well as the fact that it may include both formal, *invited spaces* for dialogue and informal, sometimes ad hoc, events and processes (*claimed spaces*). In this chapter we discuss how policy dialogue is perceived in the Mozambican context, whether it is effective, transparent and inclusive, and whether there is *de facto* space for CSO to effectively engage in policy dialogue.

5.1 Policy dialogue in the Mozambican context

The term 'policy dialogue' is not familiar or commonly used in Mozambique. The team experienced difficulties with establishing an appropriate Portuguese translation. The phrase adopted *Dialogo sobre Politica(s)* is not regarded as ideal since it denotes dialogue around specific policies which clearly limits the scope of the term. However, the idea of citizen participation is well established not least of all by a number of Government initiatives which have been taken to consult on policy.

In Mozambique, experience has been particularly gained from three processes⁶³ which have influenced the current perception and understanding of what policy dialogue is, how CS can strategically make best use of the accumulated experience, and how the current environment reacts: the Land Campaign Agenda 2025 and the Poverty Observatory. The experience from the three processes shows that the dialogue spaces were not simply *given* to CS but often result from a long process of negotiation and sometimes struggle.

The Land Campaign in the late 1990s involved a massive and genuine participation of CSOs and culminated in the enactment of a new Land Law. Two hundred NGOs, Churches and academics met to discuss the draft law and identified common concerns and principles regarding the rights of all rural dwellers to land through occupation. The carefully orchestrated campaign involving 15,000 trained volunteer activists and campaign messages led to the inclusion of these concerns in the Land Law. From this experience emerged the following lessons on how to successfully engage in policy dialogue:

- The importance of cohesion around a common cause regardless of ideological diversity;
- the possibility of direct participation of CBOs rather than through an urban association;

62 Tender documents, 8 Appendix A: Scope of Services (Terms of Reference).

63 José Negrão: "A Propósito das Relações Entre as ONGs do Norte e a Sociedade Civil Moçambicana" (2003), available in http://www.iid.org.mz/Relacoes_entre_ONG_do_Norte_e_Sociedade_Civil_do_Sul.pdf.

- effective participation of various religious groups – whether Christian, Muslim or local;
- an opportunity to define strategies compatible with those of the private sector;
- the use of State institutions (from the Legislative for the approval of the law to the Executive to formulate the law) without the necessity of seizure of power;
- equal participation with international CSOs.

In 2001 the Government undertook an initiative to formulate a national vision and strategy to 2025 (Agenda 2025). This Government initiative carried out consultations with civil society representatives in almost all districts of the country, convened provincial representatives and established national task forces to develop draft statements for each topic within what was finally developed as the *National Vision and Strategies*. This was finally approved by Parliament in 2004 and included a main focus of poverty alleviation particularly through developing the country's human capital. During the process of formulation of this **Agenda 2025**, the public image of CS changed but the lessons learned included recognition of:

- The problems of not having clear CS leaders;
- the capacity to conscientiously discuss the future of the public affairs by various groups of citizens, once their right to voice was recognised;
- the acceptance of different points of view once discussed and common principles agreed;
- the sense of commitment with the country, and particularly towards social justice.

The **Poverty Observatory (PO)**⁶⁴ was another government initiative in 2003 to engage in dialogue with CS around implementation of the anti-poverty strategy and the achievement of the MDGs. Given the specificities of Mozambique, the PO forum, which continues today, comprises GOM, DPs and CS. It was left to the group of CS to define by whom and how they should be represented in this forum and they decided on a broad CS representation including religious organisations, trade unions, private sector, networks, foundations and research institutions. The experience from the PO includes:

- i. as an invited space the PD/DO has certain limitations in terms of CS influence as Government sets the agenda and it is mainly a consultative forum with little room for influencing the agenda setting
- ii. at national level, the institutionalisation of CSO representation in the PO has been gradually co-opted and the representativeness of the G-20 group of non-state actors has been questioned

⁶⁴ The Poverty Observatory established in 2003 as a government mechanism allocating civil society space to engage in dialogue with Government and DPs. The Poverty Observatories were later re-designated as Development Observatories. It has resulted from a long struggle of civil society to engage with the GOM in policy dialogue but the prescription of participation of civil society in formulation of the Policy Strategy Paper – PARPA in Mozambique, where civil society had not fully participated in the process of formulation of the first generation of PRSP (PARPA I) – has catalysed the new dynamics of participation of civil society in policy dialogue.

- iii. at provincial level CSOs have gradually gained a platform especially through thematic working groups
- iv. recent experience (2011) shows a renewed engagement from CS at national level based on criticism raised of earlier representative bodies.

Government staff interviewed⁶⁵ stressed the importance of seeing policy dialogue as a non-confrontational interaction between different development stakeholders. However, several other key informants⁶⁶ have raised concerns regarding the genuine interest of policy makers and power holders in seeing policy dialogue as an instrument for actual involvement of citizens. The case studies have documented that policy dialogue is an ever-changing process, shaped by the current context as well as historical roots, culture and tradition.

5.2 Types of Space for CS engagement in policy dialogue

Using the Power Cube framework, spaces for engagement in policy dialogue are *invited* or *claimed*. Examples of *invited spaces* are the Development Observatories, the local government committees (IPCCs), and sector working groups. *Claimed spaces* are exemplified by the Land Campaign, the process leading to legislation on domestic violence (Case Study 2), the spontaneous riots around food prices in 2011, and the *Madjermanes*.⁶⁷

Various studies demonstrate that formal, invited spaces for policy dialogue did not promote effective participation of CSOs. The quality of participation within the local councils (IPCCs) still constitutes a major challenge, due to an absence of accountability, weaknesses in decision-making processes and the absence of monitoring of district plans and budget implementation. One defining factor has been the role of the paternalistic state itself, which seems to be transforming the local councils into controlled participation spaces.⁶⁸ Therefore, the *invited spaces* for dialogue – instead of working as arenas for the strengthening of dialogue and consolidating the role of CSOs – end up becoming instruments of manipulation and co-option of CS.

Thus, the *invited spaces* are government initiatives and often met by scepticism by CS, feeling that CSOs are only invited to participate in order to legitimise decisions already taken. The more technical and sophisticated the policy dialogue spaces become, the more difficulties CSOs face in engaging in dialogue given their lack of expertise and resources. Lack of timely information and working documents make CSO presence of little or no relevance. Some CSOs expressed their concern for limited circulation of information among CSOs themselves. Furthermore, the existing spaces are often captured by elites with specific interests and thus become partisan spaces. These interest groups are very much aware of the opportunities offered by the GOM under its policy of “approaching governance to the people” and they seize these spaces to their own benefit.

65 Interview with Permanent Secretary from Ministry of Planning and development, September 2001. Confirmed by other government officials from MPD.

66 ICSO focus group interview, December 2011; Irae Baptista Lundin, September 2011; interviews with various CSO-platforms and umbrella-organisations.

67 Group of former migrant workers demonstrating year after year every week to claim their pension schemes from former German Democratic Republic.

68 Forquilha (2009).

Various actors do not consider institutionalisation as an issue, because at provincial and local levels the dialogue depends on the will of the government officer in charge, i.e. in some places it may happen and in others not, depending on the personality of the person in charge, and it follows different patterns. Another factor that discourages CSOs using the institutionalised policy dialogue spaces is the tendency of institutionalisation of spokesperson from certain organisations (e.g. G-20) in detriment of the voice of the majority. This is reinforced by the fact that the so called representatives of the people in the invited spaces have no constituencies.

Experience has shown that the openness of the Government to dialogue depends on whether the issue is non-controversial or controversial. If non-controversial – the space widens; if controversial – the space shrinks: A consequence of the 2010-riots was the prompt Government response to make mobile phone registration compulsory.⁶⁹

Because of the above situation, well-established CSOs often prefer to make use of claimed, informal spaces for policy dialogue instead of using the formal spaces. Informal spaces of dialogue are being created, e.g. the process leading to legislation on domestic violence, the informal network on local governance and use of social media. However, the largest groups of people are not represented in any of these mechanisms and there is the perception that the 2010-riots in Maputo were triggered by this sentiment of exclusion from the dialogue – people were not represented, nor did they know where to voice their concerns.

The weaknesses identified by key informants confirm the findings of the Civil Society Index (2007) which reveals *weak structure characterised by limited financial and human resources*. This is reflected through the physical presence of CSO in policy discussions – working groups, as well as on the quality of their participation in spaces of policy dialogue. The lack of financial and human resources may be a factor of exclusion of those organisations that cannot access resources and a vicious circle that you need resources to get access to the resources, as only a well-formulated project will draw the attention of DPs.

But exclusion should not be seen solely from the point of view of lack of resources, but also from the point of view of the sophistication and technicality of the policy discussion fora. The geographical isolation of CSOs is another excluding factor because spaces for policy dialogue tend to be established in the major cities and Maputo is championing this trend, even its suburbia is not an exception to the exclusion. Invited spaces are most often found in big conference centres and hotels, ignoring the periphery.

5.3 Effectiveness of policy dialogue

Over recent years, the political discourse has become more refined, demonstrating Government's apparent openness and willingness to enter into dialogue. Several official spaces for invited dialogue have been established: the PO both at national and provincial levels, the establishment of local councils (IPCCs – Participatory Institutions for Community Consultation) at district and sub-district levels, and also the establishment of (sector) working groups. In spite of permissive tendencies, the legal environment seems to be favourable to the involvement of CSOs in advocacy and lobbying activities, and minor changes indicating greater openness and CS engagement in policy dialogue

69 See Box 3 in Section 3.1.

have been registered.⁷⁰ There is, however, limited decentralisation in terms of political space for policy dialogue. The majority of the interviewees stated that central government efforts to increase engagement and dialogue with CS do not cascade down to local/district level, except in the provinces where specific programmes have supported this, e.g. Nampula and Manica. As expressed by interviewees: *“the further from Maputo, the smaller the space for critical dialogue.”*

70 Afro Barometer 2009 report prepared by OSISA; Civil Society Index report published by FDC, 2007; several key informants interviewed in September and November/December 2011.

6 CSO strategies on policy dialogue

This chapter addresses the different types of CSO strategies on policy dialogue, as well as the legitimacy and accountability of the CSOs. Underlying is the question of the effectiveness of the chosen strategies on their own and in combination to achieve outcomes on policy change, given the enabling and hindering factors in the environment.⁷¹

6.1 Types of CSO strategies

Interviews and literature review provide a long list of CSO strategies applied during previous policy dialogue processes, which are confirmed by the case study analysis presented below: *cohesion around common causes regardless the ideological diversity, possibility of direct participation of CBOs, effective participation of various religious groups, participation together with international NGOs, the existence of 'movers and shakers' and charismatic leadership; the acceptance of diverse opinions and common principles.*⁷²

Within the invited and/or claimed spaces, the CSOs chose different strategies to engage in policy dialogue – direct and/or indirect, formal and/or informal, or no dialogue at all.

Direct and formal policy dialogue is predominantly undertaken by platforms and networks invited to engage in policy dialogue with Government and DPs. The role of CSOs in the dialogue process is generally perceived as dynamic, but main channels of communication or platforms have a tendency to lose momentum over time. Most of the well-known institutions that played an important role in the establishment of the formal dialogue between CSOs and Government are losing their prominence – e.g. G-20, as well as coalitions like LINK, TEIA and JOINT.⁷³ The case study on district planning and budget monitoring has also demonstrated that formalised spaces for dialogue have a tendency to become co-opted and non-efficient, reinforced by the lack of constituencies. The more technical and sophisticated the policy dialogue spaces become the more difficult for CSOs to engage in dialogue given their lack of expertise and resources. Limited and untimely access to information is a hindering factor when it comes to transparency and inclusiveness.

Direct and informal policy dialogue has been demonstrated as an efficient way for CS to engage in policy dialogue – often by forming coalitions around specific issues, e.g. legislation on domestic violence or thematic working groups at district level. There is however, a tendency for direct and informal dialogue to take place mainly at national level, e.g. through contacts to influential persons. Recent examples are initiatives from research-based organisations (IESE, *Centro de Integridade Publica* (CIP)) on emerging issues such as extractive industry and corruption. For the direct and informal policy dialogue to be effective, a high level of capacity and access to information and channels of communication is required from the involved CSOs.

71 Reference is made to Checklist 1 in the Conceptual Framework, p.3. See Annex B.

72 These strategies correspond wide to lessons learned on strategic approach from previous policy dialogue experiences, i.e. the Land Campaign in mid-1990es and the formulation of Agenda 2025 in 2001.

73 Interviews with various CS representatives have stated that the platform-initiatives of LINK, TEIA and JOINT have all suffered the loss of momentum over time. The acronyms are names: LINK – for linking organisations together; TEIA – means network in Portuguese; JOINT – for joint action.

Indirect contribution to policy dialogue is undertaken mainly by organisations related to social communication and media, playing an important role in disseminating information related to human and citizens' rights. Community radios are important players, often taking the responsibility not only of providing access to information, but also by creating space for dialogue through investigative journalism and open programmes, where citizens can speak out directly. Nevertheless, communication and media CSOs are still far from responding to the existing needs, and there is a strong urban bias in this field. Some recent initiatives to monitor corruption and budget execution at district level are being launched in 2012.⁷⁴

No dialogue is also the reality for a considerable segment of CS, i.e. the *Madjermanes* or the spontaneous riots that broke out as a response to economic pressure. It is also a fact that the Mozambican CS is still characterised by a large number of informal organisations, which operate in the entire country. With a predominantly rural population, spread over 399,400 km², and where the state faces huge difficulties in meeting basic social and economic needs, citizens still rely on diverse methods of mutual support as their only way of social protection. These mutual support groups constitute the major part of Mozambican CS. They are created spontaneously where there is a need, remain mostly unknown, and survive without external resources.⁷⁵

As noted earlier, most organisations⁷⁶ operate with multiple strategies and in various spaces. Some of the most frequent interventions are:

- i. Production of documents and information based on evidence-based research.
- ii. Establishment of local organisations and partnerships as vehicles for the strengthening of the citizens' voice.
- iii. Internal capacity-building of members of CSOs through the exchange of information and knowledge among members of platforms.
- iv. Exposure through publication of documents, reports and statements through media, e-mails, websites, and press briefings).
- v. Workshops, seminars and plays (e.g. the Oppressed Theatre Group).⁷⁷
- vi. Collaboration with media to maximise the information disclosure;

6.2 Legitimacy and accountability

The report of the Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa (OSISA) (2010) indicates that 71% of the CSOs' budgets derive from external support, mainly through international non-governmental organisations (ICSOs). CSOs are therefore accountable to DPs

74 MASC with support from Programa AGIR.

75 "The Mirror of Narcissus – knowledge and self-conscience for a better development of the Mozambican Civil Society. Lessons learned and recommendations from Mozambique on its experience in implementing CIVICUS Civil Society Index", UNDP Mozambique, March 2011.

76 E.g. CIP, the Governance Monitoring Forum, the Budget Monitoring Forum, FDC, LDH and IESE.

77 The Oppressed Theatre Group is an experience mostly being supported by Action Aid.

rather than to a social constituency. As a consequence they embrace a diverse mandate as a way to ensure their own survival.

CSO accountability is a disputed issue in Mozambique. On the one hand, CSOs accuse Government of lack of transparency and demand increased openness from Government and accountability to citizens. On the other hand, CSOs themselves are often not too willing to disclose information on budgets and sources of funding.⁷⁸

In terms of internal governance, the annual meeting is the extent of activity, with members presenting activity and financial reports, and occasional (re)elections. However, there are very few organisations that provide reports on their work for public consumption. Consequently, among DPs and ICOSOs there is a growing concern to demand the establishment of strong internal governance structures as a condition for funding. A possible negative consequence of a strong focus on internal governance and management capacity is the risk of squeezing out spontaneous, small risk demanding initiatives.⁷⁹

Accountability to communities or constituencies is unusual – accountability is mainly upwards and in relation to DPs. Interviews unanimously confirm that a majority of CSOs lack the constituencies that may ensure their legitimacy. Throughout the last decades numerous organisations have emerged often driven by the funding opportunities that appeared towards the end of the civil war and the country's adherence to the path of assistance and development. The majority of the organisations have had service delivery as their main focus, and organisations devoted to policy dialogue are still very recent and have emerged essentially during the last decade.

However, these are organisations that were established with a clear mandate on policy dialogue, although most of these do not have a social constituency. For instance, the LDH, one of the first organisations to deal with issues of policy dialogue, more precisely focused on the protection of human rights. The *Centro de Integridade Publica* (CIP) also emerged to act in the space of confrontation and policy dialogue. Since its establishment its focus has always been on issues of transparency and integrity, with an emphasis on corruption. Despite the lack of constituency, these CSOs are still organisations that defend legitimate interests, since in most cases the issues that they discuss coincide with the most critical concerns of society. As a consequence, these organisations are held accountable not by a constituency, but by the general public.

78 Interviews with the Permanent Secretary, Moamba District, CS-platform FONGA in Gaza Province, and Ministry of Planning and Development in November-December 2011.

79 Interview with Civil Society adviser of the World Wildlife Fund.

7 Lessons on Development Partner strategies

The scoping phase of the study compared DP policies and the extent to which they recognise and support the role of CSOs in policy change.

Sida's policy recognises the role of civil society as proposers of ideas, watchdogs of those in power and a counterweight to and force for democratisation vis-à-vis the State and it includes a commitment to "*promote representative, legitimate and independent civil society actors which contribute to poverty reduction, based on their role as collective voices and organizers of services*".

- SDC's policy places emphasis on role of NGOs as "implementer". It is not clear with regard to the role of local civil society and/or role that international CSOs should play to strengthen local civil society.
- ADC's policy describes the role of NGOs from partner countries to provide services and empower civil populations.
- Only Danida's and Finland's policy explicitly refer to CSO role in advocacy. Danida's policy includes advocacy as a strategic goal: "*promotion of capacity development, advocacy work and networking opportunities*". Finland's policy includes advocacy as priority.

Findings regarding DP strategies are mainly based on document review, interviews with DPs, ICOSOs and major Mozambican CSO. Interviews with minor CSOs and CBOs in particular have yielded limited information, as they have little knowledge about DP strategies because they are not directly exposed to them, but usually receive funds through intermediaries. Interviews with government officials have also not provided much information related to DPs' specific strategy for support to CSOs, as they tend to focus on the CSOs rather than on the DPs' support strategies. Linear linkages between the two case studies and the DPs' support strategies are not easily established, especially for Case 2 (process leading to approval of Legislation on domestic violence), as the policy process has come to a conclusion. In relation to Case 1 (District planning and budget monitoring) more substantial evidence was available.

The Scoping study identified three issues of key importance in the relationship between CSOs and DPs when it comes to supporting CSOs engagement in policy dialogue:

- The need to strengthen harmonisation
- having a critical view on support through intermediaries
- alignment with CSOs' own agendas.

Furthermore, findings from the case studies support the need for a re-focus in DPs policy dialogue with the Mozambican Government on issues related to CS.

Harmonisation and funding mechanisms

*"The worse that can happen is that DPs support completely uncoordinated programs."*⁸⁰

80 Interview with HELVETAS, 28.11.2011.

The Accra Agenda for Action (2009), recent bilateral CS strategies⁸¹ and a Nordic+ paper from 2010 emphasise DPs' recognition of and commitment to good partnership through principles of ownership, alignment, harmonisation and coordination, as well as management for results and accountability. Interviews have confirmed that Nordic+ DPs are perceived as flexible and with an in-depth contextual knowledge and they are recognised for their policy commitment to harmonise and align with national CSO agendas.⁸²

When it comes to support to CS in practice, DPs make use of a variety of strategies, modalities and mechanisms: through ICSOs, direct support at country level, coordinated funding mechanisms, and/or through dialogue.⁸³ Experience from the case studies has demonstrated that the support can be direct or indirect.

Direct support at country level: Although some of the interviewed DPs no longer operate with local grant mechanisms, several still administer direct funding at country level.⁸⁴ This modality is considered flexible and responsive by the DPs themselves, as it allows for supporting upcoming initiatives and provides seed money.⁸⁵ The support can be either core funding, e.g. to major CSOs capable of administering funds; funding to specific projects or programmes; and funding of small initiatives. It is recognised by most of the interviewed DPs that this modality implies high transaction costs as it is time consuming and requires specialised capacity, which is not always available with shrinking budgets.⁸⁶ In some cases, direct support to CSOs is provided as part of an overall sector programme support, e.g. CSOs receiving funds from the Danish Justice Sector Support Programme⁸⁷. Among the interviewed CSOs there is a clear perception that only the "elite" among national CSOs qualify to receive funds directly from the DPs. There is a tendency to support the same organisations, which have demonstrated their ability to administer funds and are considered "DP darlings" (CIP, IESE, FDC etc.).

Indirect support to coordinated funding mechanisms at country level (basket-funding): There has been a general shift in policy from bilateral to joint support and funding arrangements. However the move is gradual, as DPs are hesitant and timid to embark upon joint funding mechanisms, of which a number have been established during recent years (e.g. *Mecanismo de Apoio à Sociedade Civil* (MASC), *Programa Ações para uma Governança Inclusiva e Responsável* (AGIR), *Facilidade*). There is limited overall coordination among DPs when setting up joint mechanisms, e.g. with sector, thematic or geographical focus, and there is a risk of overlap and competition when it comes to identification of beneficiary CSOs.⁸⁸ GOM and CSOs share this recognition and stress the need for better coordination. In reality, much support is still tied to projects and DP priorities, and alignment to CSO's strategic priorities is limited.⁸⁹

The joint mechanisms still suffer from many of the problems known from bilateral support: DP-specific priorities, special reporting and accounting formats, and short-term

81 Denmark, Sweden.

82 Interviews with CSOs, November-December 2011.

83 The categories of funding mechanisms were used in the Inception Report.

84 Finland and Canada no longer operate local grant mechanisms, and Denmark is gradually downscaling, interviews with DPs, December 2011.

85 Especially Austria and Switzerland are advocating for the direct funding of CSOs.

86 Interviews with DP representatives, December 2011.

87 AMMCJ, LDH and CEPAJI.

88 Interview with MASC, December 2011; supplemented by information from previous studies undertaken by team members.

89 Interviews with CSOs, November-December 2011.

project funding. Interviewed CSOs gave examples of having to report by different formats to 5-6 different DPs. It is also a common complaint that the CSOs' strategic plans are used as a "shopping list" by DPs to select specific projects to be supported. Core funding is still the exception rather than the rule. Interviewed CSOs have clearly indicated their preference for basket-funding arrangements, which can allow them to fulfil their own strategic priorities, obtain core funding and optimise reporting requirements.⁹⁰

The Swedish funding mechanism *Programa AGIR* channels funds through intermediary ICSOs responsible for fund management – Diakonia, IBIS, Oxfam NOVIB and Swedish Cooperative Centre are responsible for the administration and implementation of the four funding windows of *Programa AGIR*. From the point of view of the DPs, working through funding mechanisms or pool-funds carries the advantage of delegated management and responsibility for results, as well as capitalisation on ICSO capacity to identify partners and engage in partnership. Sida, however, recognises that the establishment of the funding mechanism has brought new challenges and that time has not necessarily been freed up for substantive dialogue.⁹¹ CSOs have criticised the support as often being supply-driven and determined by DP priorities (environment, justice, governance etc.).

Cost efficiency is an issue within funding mechanisms operating through intermediaries, as the "value chain" is often very long. Chains with 5-6 links from back-DP to beneficiaries are not unusual. An example is the support provided to Community Radio stations through the Swedish funded *Programa AGIR*: SIDA, Swedish Embassy in Maputo, IBIS, FORCOM, ORAM, Radio Vembe in Chokwe.⁹²

7.1 Role of ICSOs

ICSOs are often funded directly from the DP headquarters and operate independent country programmes in addition to specific funding from in-country DP delegations. DPs see an advantage in collaborating with the ICSOs (of which the majority are hinterland CSOs⁹³) as they often represent strong local and decentralised presence and in-depth knowledge. SDC is an exception to this as they prefer to work without the use of intermediaries, allowing for more hands-on and interactive support to local CSOs, allowing for identification of organisations that may have the potential for influencing policy dialogue, in particular at decentralised level.⁹⁴

The CSOs interviewed recognise an added value from working with the ICSOs: access to international advocacy and information, mentoring and partnership, tailor-made capacity building, solidarity, credibility and protection.⁹⁵ The ICSOs are perceived as "soft DPs", i.e. they have a stronger focus on capacity building and partnership, and recognise the need for a gradual transition to strict adherence to rules and regulations. Several interviewees emphasised this and saw it as a thorough understanding of the

90 Interviews with MULEIDE, 22.11.2011; FONGA, 23.11.2011; FORCOM, 29.11.2011.

91 Interview with Swedish Embassy, December 2011.

92 It is outside the scope of the present evaluation to undertake concrete cost-efficiency analysis. The example serves to illustrate the many links, assuming that each link benefits from certain administrative costs.

93 For example: Helvetas/SDC; IBIS/ Danida; SCC and Diakonia/Sweden; KEPA/Finland; Jugend eine Welt/Austria; COCAMO/Canada etc.

94 Interview with SDC, December 2011.

95 Community Radio station, 24.11.2011.

context in which CS operate, i.e. low level of literacy, non-functioning private sector in remote areas etc.

It was recognised that the presence of ICSOs over long time and with consistent engagement with local CS strengthens the local CSOs and facilitates space⁹⁶. Provincial presence is generally valued by local CSOs, and a number of the ICSOs (e.g. Jugend eine Welt, Concern Universal and KEPA) have offices at provincial level. KEPA, however, is closing its delegation in Cabo Delgado as from 2012.

However, informants among the ICSOs questioned their own role and the added value, as national CSOs may in some cases have stronger administrative capacity than the intermediary. It was also recognised that the ICSOs may in some cases undermine the legitimacy of local CSOs.⁹⁷ A negative effect of operating through international intermediaries is that they act like a buffer between the Mozambican CSOs and GOM, protecting the CSOs from GOM requirements and exposure and thus impeding them from becoming independent and sustainable. As expressed by SDC: *“If DPs are too present, they can de-legitimise the non-state actors.”*

7.2 Alignment to CSOs’ own agendas

DPs using even the established funding mechanisms are reluctant to provide core funding for CSOs, and there is still much funding tied to specific activities (project approach) with measurement of detailed expected results. Alignment to local CSO agendas is also a question of tailoring the support and⁹⁸ DPs and support mechanisms are less able to accommodate these needs partly because the volume does not add up to much.⁹⁹

DPs are not apolitical entities, but pursue their own strategic and political agendas. There is a general perception among CSOs and some government officials that DPs have a tendency to change priorities very fast with little perseverance and endurance when it comes to supporting CSOs.¹⁰⁰ The frequent change of DP policies according to new trends (gender, HIV/AIDS, climate change etc.) influences CSOs to change their core activities to match the DP priorities and funding opportunities. This may have severe consequences, as intermediaries are forced to close down partnerships, which again creates chaos for the people employed by CSOs.¹⁰¹ CSOs are also not able to build solid in-house capacity, if focus is changed frequently. Long-term support is considered essential to allow for planning and stability. Examples were given on short-term project support to research on domestic violence¹⁰². Repetitive funding secured the build-up of considerable knowledge and evidence over time, but once the focus was changed by the CSO to deal with initiation rites (considered an important aspect to understand intra-family power relations), the DP withdrew its support, and only after reformulating the project proposal, was it possible to obtain continued funding.¹⁰³

96 Examples were given: SNV and Oxfam in Nampula; SCC and Concern Universal in Niassa.

97 Interview with ADELMA, 28.11.2011.

98 Examples were given during interviews of small CBOs’ modest needs in terms of financial support (e.g. a local CBO in Tete, working on community mobilisation).

99 Interview with WWF CS adviser, 6.12.2011.

100 Interview with Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Planning and Development, September 2011; interviews with CSOs, November-December 2011.

101 Focus group interview with ICSOs in September 2011.

102 Interviews with WLSA, Fórum Mulher and FORCOM, November-December 2011.

103 Interview with Fórum Mulher, 22.11.2011.

Within the Case Study 1 (District Planning and Budget Monitoring), two main DP support strategies prevail: 1) building and strengthening organisational and technical capacity; and 2) improving access to information through provision of evidence and documentation. Capacity building was encountered at decentralised level and supported either through funding mechanisms (e.g. MASC and Programa AGIR) or through programmes implemented by ICSOs. Support to access to information is mainly through national level CSOs or funding mechanisms. Support to e.g. community radios (free and independent media) is provided through locally administered funds or as part of other channels for support, but not as a specific priority.

7.3 Dialogue with Government of Mozambique

There is no clear entry point for DPs to a policy dialogue platform on CS, as the responsibility for CS is scattered among various GOM institutions: Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MINEG) is the main partner for some DPs (e.g. the European Union), others deal with MPD, Ministry of State Administration (MAE), Ministry of Finance (MF) or sector line ministries (health, environment, education etc.), and at provincial level, the Provincial Government is the main entry point to coordination and policy dialogue on CS.

DPs policy dialogue on CS issues takes place directly with GOM, but also through indirect channels, e.g. through ICSO-implemented CS support programmes where local CSOs are supported in their advocacy and policy dialogue endeavours. Furthermore, ICSOs may be more open and direct in their policy dialogue, albeit with increasing caution, as too critical voices may jeopardise, for example the renewal of their operations license .

The fact that DPs have a strong focus on macro-level issues and that the policy dialogue is institutionalised in working groups following a set *modus operandi* has supported a tendency of “following the money” with a focus on macro-level economics and overall MDG indicators. This draws attention away from decentralised development, which in practice gets very limited attention from DPs. An example mentioned by various sources is the limited dialogue on the application and administration of the district development funds (7 millions). Even though these only represent approximately 1% of overall development funds, the strategic use of district development funds by the ruling political party to create a local elite and co-opt local leaders is an issue which deserves attention.

8 Overall conclusions

This chapter presents conclusions related to CSO effectiveness, enabling and hindering conditions and DP policies and strategies. The chapter is deliberately kept short and reference is made to arguments and analysis in the previous sections.

8.1 CSO effectiveness

It is important to recognise that policy processes change over time and CSOs have to be prepared and experienced in applying a diversity of strategies. The two cases have revealed various strategies for engagement in policy dialogue:

The case study on **domestic violence legislation** has demonstrated specific choices, changing over time to adapt to the political environment. It has included strategic changes in activities, alliances and partnerships, and means of communication.

The case study on engagement in **district planning and budget monitoring** has, on the other hand, demonstrated little variety when it comes to choice of activities and means of influence, as the capacity to engage at local level is limited. The most successful strategic choice has been in relation to engagement through thematic groups at provincial level to strengthen technical capacity. At national level, the engagement is concentrated on providing evidence through research and documentation, as well as presentation of statements.

The successful strategies in terms of enhanced effectiveness used by CSOs in policy dialogue include:

- **Using platforms, networks and coalitions.** CS platforms at provincial level play an important role in providing access to information and provide a space for smaller CBOs to engage in dialogue with local authorities. The establishment of networks of CBOs and CSOs and platforms where they can meet officials meant a higher profile and hence visibility on the importance of CSOs and has influenced the Government's attitude to CSOs which for many years were regarded as hostile to Government. The emergence within the platforms of thematic groups in provinces as Manica and Nampula has meant a move toward specialisation on issues and strengthened the capacity of CSOs to engage in a qualified dialogue with Government. The capacity of CSOs with different agendas to join coalitions with complementary strategic actions was also key, for example in the Domestic Violence-legislation.
- **Use of informal spaces.** Working through and/or in alliance with politically accepted and influential individuals are strategically applied by CSOs at all levels to get access to influence and policy dialogue. Likewise, strong leadership has in many cases shown to be of crucial importance, as it increases the CSOs' visibility and likelihood to gain attention. *Claimed spaces* may change over time and become formalised, once the dialogue is established and accepted by Government.
- **Providing evidence.** Research and advocacy organisations, mainly in Maputo, have consistently engaged in preparing evidence, which has served as a strong

knowledge base for the policy dialogue and advocacy undertaken by CSOs. Examples are documentation on incidents of domestic violence, as well as documentation on (district) budget expenditures and implementation.

- **Identifying common cause** (e.g. small farmers' economic interests, children's and women's rights, improved education) is a strengthening factor for mobilisation of CS, where the focus area is clear. In the Domestic Violence legislation case, value could have been added to this process if other CSOs outside the women's rights movement working in complementary areas had been engaged.

The two case studies of policy dialogue processes have revealed very distinct features in terms of *invited/claimed* spaces, Government/CS initiative, role of DPs, geographical outreach and time span. However, both processes have faced similar challenges in terms of constraints encountered, enabling and hindering factors, government reactions to confrontation and political control, as well as limited and not always sufficiently professional internal capacity of the CSOs involved. Common features in terms of process outcome are the recognition of CSOs as dialogue partners, credit for solid evidence and research documentation, strengthened position as a result of alliances with other actors, including other CSOs, ICSOs, DP-embassies and media. Both processes also demonstrate that continued attention from CS is important, as momentum is easily lost. The case on Domestic Violence-legislation is illustrative, as there is still an alarming need for follow-up and monitoring of law enforcement for the process to lead to lasting policy changes.

The study has not identified any particular cases, where CSOs have chosen not to get involved in policy dialogue. However, the issue of non-involvement is related to the general problem of poverty, which influences negatively on the engagement of citizens in political issues. Many local level organisations and associations fail to prioritise political debate not related to their specific interest, when they face serious problems of malnutrition and other deprivations. Consequently, organisations defending economic interests e.g. the small farmers' associations are perceived as more relevant as other forms of organisations at local level.

8.2 Enabling and hindering conditions

The environment in which CS operates in Mozambique has three distinct dimensions important for creating an enabling environment: Legal, political and financial freedoms. Each of these dimensions is, however, characterised by enabling and hindering factors, and also other factors are of importance.

Legal freedoms: The legal rights to association, freedom of expression and the engagement of citizens and CS in governance are formally secured through legislation. However, there are several challenges that hinder the operation of CSOs such as the poor performance of the justice institutions, the legislation on associations, which does not match the current dynamics of the growing CS in terms of registration, types of CSOs and the taxation system. CSOs are for instance required to link to a line ministry and are hence primarily regarded as service delivery mechanisms, rather than independent policy-oriented organisations. Furthermore, organisations outside the urban centres face serious bureaucratic hurdles to register, involving long-distance travel to district or provincial capitals, costs and often delays with disqualifying consequences.

Freedom of expression is secured through the Constitution and the Media Law. However, journalists continue to be at risk of harassment and threats, which again is a hindering factor in relation to providing unbiased and accurate information and a hindrance for covering government-critical activities of CSOs. Community radio has played an important role in dissemination of information in both case studies, and has in some situations also raised critical debate and promoted dialogue with Government. Work through community radio is an efficient means to address the need for increased access to information, necessary for solid engagement in policy dialogue at local level.

Political freedoms: Policy dialogue in Mozambique is influenced by the hindering factors emerging from the political environment. The formal multi-party Constitution of Mozambique allows for political freedom, and there are several institutions designated to enhance policy dialogue and involvement of citizens, demonstrating Government's official willingness to enter into dialogue. However, the political legacy and the gradual regression towards a de facto one-party system points in the opposite direction and is a serious hindering factor for CSOs to critically engage in policy dialogue. Several examples of intimidation and shrinking political space were identified during the study just as studies have documented that formal, invited spaces for dialogue have yielded very little results. This is, however, also partly due to lack of capacity, fact-based policies and professionalism among CSOs to engage in policy dialogue on a qualified level.

Financial freedoms: CSOs are quite free to raise funds from different sources to pursue their objectives. In practice however, they are restricted to seek foreign funding and hence constrained by international DPs' strategic priorities, which may be rapidly changing due to prevailing political fashions in the home country. This can make it hard for CSOs to maintain their strategic choices, as they need to accommodate to such changes to secure continued funding. At the individual level, organisations and their members – especially outside the urban centres – struggle with poverty so that many CBOs fail to embrace issues of political importance, as their members face problems of lack of food and drinking water, malnutrition and other deprivations.

Low human and financial capacity is a common impediment to CSOs ability to engage in policy dialogue. Many organisations do not have the academic capacity to engage in complicated issues (e.g. budget monitoring, legislation) or they may not have time available for the often lengthy dialogue events and processes as their financial resources are often scarce, not allowing for participation in activities that involve e.g. travel. CSOs have recently tried to mitigate the lack of technical capacity to engage in policy dialogue, e.g. through technical working groups/networks at provincial level.

Contextual knowledge is of crucial importance to understand the specific conditions under which CS engage in policy dialogue takes place. **Social and cultural norms** can still play a strong negative role, as demonstrated in the case study on the process of adoption of the domestic violence law. Although the law was passed both duty bearers and the majority of the population do not act as expected, influenced by existing social norms and aggravated by, in certain cases, the lack of information and training¹⁰⁴. For CSOs it is important to strike a balance between promoting overall rights such as demonstrated in the domestic violence legislation and not offending local social norms as this will undermine the authority of the organisations which may be perceived as stooges for foreign norms or even interests.

104 As an example, a police officer interviewed in Gaza Province stated that “Women use the law as a mean of ”revenge” against their husbands”.

8.3 DP policies and strategies

The study has identified a number of key issues relating to DP support which are crucial for the successful support to CS engagement in policy dialogue.

Harmonisation of support: In spite of the intentions of various international and bilateral CS strategies and principles of good partnership, the study has flagged that harmonisation is still not exploited to its full potential. This is particularly the case when it comes to establishing mechanisms for CS support among international DPs. Several bilateral initiatives and funding modalities, as well as a number of parallel multi-DP funding mechanisms can be found in Mozambique¹⁰⁵ and CSOs highlight the heavy transactional costs related to elaboration of applications, reports and accounts following different DPs' formats and requirements.

Efficiency¹⁰⁶ of joint funding mechanisms: Funding mechanisms are often managed by intermediaries – either ICSOs or private consultants. Although this may mean added value in terms of delegated responsibility and professionalisation, cost efficiency should be a concern when operating through intermediaries, as the “value chain” can be very long from back-DP, through ICSO's to national CSOs or CBOs before they finally reach its end beneficiaries.

Alignment to CSOs own agenda and systems. DPs are often hesitant to provide core funding to CSOs; support is short-term and there are demands for specific reporting and accounting which do not align to existing systems. The lack of core funding makes it difficult for CSOs to adhere to their own strategic priorities and to retain staff, which is also a consequence of short-term funding. The specific reporting requirements of each DP imply high transaction costs for the CSOs in terms of time spent. Supporting CSOs own agenda's will allow for CS to take lead in policy dialogue with Government and counterbalance the risk of dominance by either DPs or ICSOs. Alignment is further important in terms of allowing local CS and not DP priorities to set the agenda.

Diversification: While harmonisation and alignment is important, diversification has also been identified as an important element in DPs support strategies. This includes e.g. seed money for identification of new initiatives and up-coming CSOs, new issues of importance (e.g. extractive industries), targeted geographical support to ensure a decentralised focus, as well as funds for CSOs in specific sectors where also Government is supported.

Critical policy dialogue with GOM on CS issues: DPs are perceived as being too soft and conflict-avoiding when engaging in policy dialogue with GOM. It is also a concern raised by CS that the recent years' focus on macro-economic support has diverted DPs' attention for example on the district development funds, which in numeric values are insignificant compared to GBS and SBS, but in relative terms impact directly on citizens' lives and opportunities for engagement in governance issues. DPs are accused of gradually having lost grip with reality outside Maputo, and consequently, dialogue with GOM does not address issues of direct importance for CS.

105 It is a fact that DPs are hesitant to join funding mechanisms established by others or to let new DPs in. For instance has MASC, which was established by DFID and Irish Aid, only recently opened for additional DPs (USAID) to join; Danida has been hesitant to get involved with MASC; Programa AGIR is to a certain extent overlapping with MASC in support to democracy and governance; in the field of HIV/AIDS, several funding arrangements exists, etc.

106 It is still very early to expect results related to effectiveness of joint funding mechanisms.

9 Lessons learned

9.1 CSO strategies

CSOs apply different strategies over time and are aware of the need to diversify to reach out to different segments and targets in the government structure, as well as to society in general. CSO strategies are direct or indirect, as well as formal and/or informal.

The main lessons learned on effective and operational strategies are:

- **Establishment of platforms, networks and coalitions**, which secure a diversity of capacities, have shown good results, as they ensure a diversified approach, drawing upon different actors' capacities. There is, however, an inbuilt risk of "petrification" (i.e. the platforms stop being a dynamic forum with active participation of its members) and co-opting of the leaders once the platforms/networks/coalitions become formal and well-consolidated.
- **Collaboration with media** is of specific importance. State, Government and party controlled media is often not the best partner for CSOs, whereas community radio stations and the independent written media have been responsive and often taken a proactive role in creating space for CS to engage in dialogue (and confrontation).
- **Providing evidence and documentation.** Research, documentation, publications, seminars, events etc. are all important elements of the CSO strategy of enhancing access to information, creating transparency and providing basis for decision-making by Government.
- **"Carpe diem"**. It has shown to be of major importance that CSOs themselves are aware of the contextual dynamic and know not only how but also 'when' to react to make the best possible results. The Domestic Violence-legislation case has provided evidence on this, where the coalition on several occasions acted tactically to make the best of the given political moment.
- **Engagement in direct and informal policy dialogue** (lobby) is an instrument used mainly by urban-based research and advocacy organisations, which have a substantial evidence base, as well as an extended network among influential individuals within the Government (and party) structure, Parliament and media. However, also local level influential leaders and personalities are addressed by local CSOs to obtain influence.
- **Maximum exposure.** The political environment in Mozambique is deteriorating and critical voices increasingly experience intimidation and threats. Public exposure – either through linkages to selected influential individuals or pro-CSO representatives of the ruling party – has however yielded good results.
- **International partnerships** is a dimension of exposure (and protection), but is also a strategic approach to strengthen the credibility and confidence of the national CSO. Many CSOs see international partnerships as an important channel for access to information.

- **Strengthening internal capacity** through training and exchange is an important strategic choice of many CSOs, acknowledging the limitations that low capacity imposes on their ability to effectively engage in policy dialogue. This is an area where ICSO's can play an important role to support CSOs.
- **Diversity in activities.** The use of different activities to advocate for a cause or disseminate information is a useful way of assuring a broad scope for a specific cause. In addition to the activities mentioned above (research, documentation etc.), also community mobilisation, marches and protests, theatre etc. are used by CSOs to engage in policy dialogue.

9.2 DP support strategies

The findings of the present evaluation call attention to the need for DPs and ICSOs to rethink and refocus their support to CS engagement in policy dialogue by addressing some of the structural impediments. The main lessons and recommendations on DP support to CSOs engagement in policy dialogue are:

- **A rethink of the aid architecture** is strongly needed when it comes to efficient support to CS policy dialogue. There is a need for a joint broad and in-depth vision for CS in Mozambique, as well as for understanding the diverse roles of different segments of CS.¹⁰⁷ DPs need to be risk willing and support innovation in terms of modalities and CS actors. Innovation in outreach might include more funding for non-traditional CSOs, including movements, minor ad hoc initiatives and groups, professional bodies, diaspora groups, trade unions etc. Innovation is also required in investigating the application of new technologies by CSOs and in CS support.¹⁰⁸
- **Harmonisation** of DP support to CS – in terms of choice of modalities and coordination of efforts – is strongly needed. Bilateral and joint strategies support this in principle, but there is also a need for a joint, broad and in-depth understanding of CS development. The absence of a shared vision hampers long-term strategic action by both CS itself and DPs.
- **Joint funding mechanisms** are important efforts in harmonised support to CS. However, attention must be paid to secure cost efficiency (avoiding long “value chains”). It is recommended that research on cost-efficiency of joint mechanisms is undertaken. Support through ICSOs as intermediaries represents added value in terms of exposure, protection and capacity building and is an important vehicle to enhance outreach at decentralised level.

107 The need for a joint vision for CS in Mozambique has been brought forward by both DPs and ICSOs during interviews. It is understood not as a need for a master plan, but for a shared understanding of characteristics, challenges and strengths of the Mozambican CS.

108 An interesting example of new initiatives in the field of CS-support is the recent MASC support to budget monitoring at sub-district level by use of mobile phones. With the use of new technologies, citizens are directly engaged.

- **Strengthening ownership** also means providing long-term core funding will allow the CSOs to plan and develop their own programmes and develop their organisations within a reasonable time horizon. For the major national CSOs, basket-funding arrangements and DP coordination and use of joint formats among the various DPs.
- **Long-term perspective:** Support to CS suffers from project thinking and short-term perspectives. Long-term engagement is required to secure true impact and development of independent CS agendas. Long-term support should be flexible in terms of follow-up on previous DP-priorities and avoid abandonment, once the issue is no longer a first priority.
- **Vertical links to regional and local organisations.** The tendency to focus support on a limited number of high-performing, often urban-based CSOs may cause a distorted development of CS. It is important to recognise networks and umbrella organisations as representatives of their member organisations and pay attention to the importance of vertical links between grass-root level organisations and CBOs and national level advocacy organisations if strong national advocacy and policy dialogue is to be developed and supported.

Annex A Terms of Reference for Country Studies

1.1 Background

For information regarding the general background to the evaluation of Civil Society engagement in Policy Dialogue, reference is made to Inception Report (draft 12.10.2011) and overall ToR for the evaluation.

The present ToR are specifically made to guide the team for the case study in Mozambique.

The three annexes are important instruments for guidance of the team's work and for understanding the assignment:

Annex 1: Evaluation Framework (revised November 2011), which lists the questions to be answered by the study as well as the evidence and sources required. The evaluation framework is as a standard tool for study design which is useful for two reasons:

- it provides an effective way of structuring issues, questions, indicators and methods in a comprehensive way
- it is also useful as a tool to present the issues and questions to be covered by this evaluation to stakeholders, thus enabling informed discussion around focus and potential gaps.

Elaboration of the evaluation framework is an iterative process to increase focus and clarity through a consultative approach. It serves as the backbone orientation for the country team. The evaluation framework contains questions, comments for clarification and discussion as well as proposed indicators and methods.

Annex 2: Conceptual framework for case study analysis,¹⁰⁹ which provides the guidance for case study analysis, as well as an overview of key concepts and linkages for the evaluation and clarifies key concepts related to policy dialogue. The conceptual framework includes a step-by-step overview of the case study phase.

Annex 3: Report outline provides the structure for the case study report and links the different issues with the Evaluation Questions. It also contains indications on length of chapters and annexes to be included.

1.2 Objective

The purpose of the case studies is to provide an in-depth analysis of how CSOs engage in policy dialogue, what outcomes they have achieved and what factors have contributed to them.

¹⁰⁹ Latest version from 15.11.11.

1.3 Scope

The main focus of the evaluation is **the effectiveness of CSOs in policy dialogue**. More specifically, the evaluation focuses on three key issues:

1. **CSO effectiveness:** What are the ways in which CSO engagement in (country) policy dialogue is most effective – and what does this mean for how this can be facilitated in the future?¹¹⁰
 - **Enabling and disabling conditions:** What are the enablers and barriers to CSO engagement (at country level) – and how could they be addressed?
 - **DP policies and strategies:** How can DPs most effectively support and facilitate (directly and indirectly) increased CS engagement at country level?

Based on the identification of a long-list of policy processes and discussions during the Scoping Exercise in Mozambique, two policy processes have been selected by the Evaluation Management Group¹¹¹ for the case study: 1) *District Planning & Budget Monitoring*, and 2) *Legislation on Domestic Violence (Access to Justice)*.

1.4 Sources of information and approach

The two policy processes cover a broad range of direct & formalised/invited spaces, direct and informal dialogue and indirect contribution to dialogue. The cases will include data collection at national/central, provincial and local level to ensure that a decentralised focus is included. The **District Planning and Budget Monitoring** policy process is an on-going and repetitive process, whereas the **Legislation on Domestic Violence (Access to Justice)** is a campaign, which was concluded by the adoption of the law in 2009. Challenges now include dissemination of knowledge about the law and monitoring of law enforcement.

The matrix below is a first overview of possible stakeholders and informants to be interviewed. One of the first tasks of the team will be to identify interviewees from the two policy processes:

110 The term “CSO effectiveness” emphasises the effectiveness of CSOs as development actors (see OECD 2010, Civil society effectiveness).

111 Evaluation Management Group meeting on 27.10.2011.

ANNEX A TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR COUNTRY STUDIES

Policy processes	District planning & budget monitoring	Access to Justice/ Domestic Violence legislation
a) Stakeholder to be consulted		
OSCs	<p>Central level: CIP, Sociedade Aberta, Cruzeiro Azul, AMODE, GMD</p> <p>Local level: local CBOs and networks/umbrellas, community members engaged in IPCCs, community radios, local traditional authorities</p> <p>Facilidade, Nampula; Margarido, Chimoio</p>	<p>Central level: WLSA, AMMCJ, LDH, Forum Mulher, N’weti, MULEIDE</p> <p>Local level: formal and informal women’s groups, local CBOs and networks/umbrellas, community members engaged in IPCCs, community radios, local traditional authorities</p>
Others	<p>Government sector: MPD, MAE, Provincial Government departments, District Administration, Provincial Secretariat; provincial planning unit</p> <p>Parliament: commissions on local government, MPs from different political parties engaged in specific working groups</p> <p>Academia: Centro de Estudos Africanos,</p> <p>Key informants: individual consultants with specific knowledge (IESE/Castelo-Branco; Annie Nielsen, Masala Lda....)</p> <p>Media: TVM and RM – selected journalists, screening of specific programs (e.g. “Ver Mocambique”, “Polo de Desenvolvimento”);</p> <p>ICSOs: Programa AGIR (Sweden), MASC (DFID CS-funding mechanism), Helvetas, IBIS</p> <p>DPs: joint working group on decentralisation, UNCDF, UNDP, WB, EU, SDC, GIZ etc.</p>	<p>Government sector: MMAS, MJ, Provincial Government departments, District Administration, District Courts and police authorities</p> <p>Parliament: commissions on local government, MPs from different political parties engaged in women’s issues</p> <p>Academia: Centro de Estudos Africanos</p> <p>Key informants: individual consultants with specific knowledge (Alicia Calane....)</p> <p>Media: TVM, RM – selected journalists, screening of specific programs (e.g. “Lei & Ordem”/TVM; “Agora sao elas”/Miramar); cultural groups/theater groups</p> <p>ICSOs: MASC (DFID CS-funding mechanism)</p> <p>DPs: joint working group on gender, UN Women etc.</p>

Policy processes	District planning & budget monitoring	Access to Justice/ Domestic Violence legislation
b) Other information (documents etc)	Evaluation reports, studies, articles etc from organisations and agencies involved in district planning support	Evaluation reports, studies, articles etc from organisations and agencies involved in women's programs Data from courts on domestic violence cases, study reports, articles Statistics from Instituto Nacional de Estatísticas
c) Cross checking	Verification workshop with key stakeholders at central level Systematic tracing of acquired information to follow-up on new information	
d) Practicalities: how this can be done within the available time and resource	Division of work within the team (Padil responsible for District Planning & Budget Monitoring; Paula & Sandra responsible for Domestic Violence Legislation (Access to Justice)) Telephone interviews with informants from Central and Northern Provinces to secure a broader range of informants than the field visits to Southern provinces allow for Rapid interview matrix based on Evaluation Framework (key questions cum report format) Frequent team meetings to follow-up, cross-check and decide on new tracks to follow Report formats and frequent team meetings will secure that collected information is registered and shared within the team.	

1.5 Activities and responsibilities

Within the overall process for the case study, the team will take the following **steps**:

- Preparation and document review; (document findings on results in template provided)
- Select key stakeholders and informants to be interviewed (Step 3)
- Individual interviews – based on Evaluation Framework, interview guidelines and reporting matrices (Step 4)
- Field visit to Maputo, Gaza and/or Inhambane Provinces to conduct interviews
- Verification workshops with CSOs involved in the two selected policy processes (Step 5 and 8)
- Team reflections and analysis (Steps 6-7)
- Debriefing with involved DPs (Step 9)

ANNEX A TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR COUNTRY STUDIES

The division of tasks and responsibilities within the team will be as follows:

Team leader (Bente)	Overall coordination and guidance of team; initiatives on discussions and team meetings; secure consistency with evaluation framework and conceptual framework; presentation of draft findings at verification workshop; compilation of draft report.
Team member (Padil)	Responsible for District Planning & Budget Monitoring policy process; undertake interviews, participate in field visit, team meetings, verification workshops and debriefings; provide written input to draft report.
Team member (Paula)	Responsible for Access to Justice & legislation of Domestic Violence policy process; undertake interviews, participate in field visit, team meetings, verification workshops and debriefings; provide written input to draft report.
Team assistant (Sandra)	Assist in undertaking interviews, participate in field visits and team meetings; responsible for writing up summaries.

For each of the policy processes, the team members will:

- Conduct documents review and preparatory interviews, to identify policy changes and key actors
- Identify CSOs for case studies
- Identify additional stakeholders and informants from among Government, INGOs, media, academia, individual key informants etc.
- Join team meeting to tentatively formulate the specific ToC (rationale) which has guided the different actors in engaging in policy dialogue
- With point of departure in Evaluation Framework for the Case Study Phase (Annex 1) undertake interviews, focus groups and collect information/data related to the policy processes
- Conduct community and/or institutional visits to crosscheck information, as feasible and appropriate
- Join team meetings to analyse the available information and data by applying the instruments presented in the toolbox below
- Organise verification workshop which includes a wider group of stakeholders (e.g. INGOs, media, academia, parliamentarians, donors, individual key informants)
- Join final debriefing/presentation with participating donors.

Annex B Conceptual Framework

Evaluation of civil society engagement in policy dialogue – conceptual framework to guide case study approach and analysis

The purpose of this paper is to present the key conceptual elements for this evaluation, the linkages between them and how they will be approached through the case study. The paper will serve as guidance for country teams during the main study phase.

1. Overview


This evaluation revolves around three key questions:

- **CSO effectiveness:** What are the ways in which CSO engagement in (country) policy dialogue is most effective – and what does this mean for how this can be facilitated in the future?¹¹²
- **Enabling and hindering conditions:** What are the enablers and barriers to CSO engagement (at country level) – and how could they be addressed?
- **DP policies and strategies:** How can DPs most effectively support and facilitate (directly and indirectly) increased civil society engagement at country level?

In order to answer these questions, the evaluation will have to develop an in-depth understanding of what CSO strategies for engagement in policy dialogue are, what outcomes they have achieved and what factors have contributed to their success or failure. In addition it has to review how DPs have supported CSO engagement in policy dialogue and how relevant and responsive their support of CSO was within the country context. In-depth analysis of policy processes and CSO engagement in them will be done through case studies.

The case studies will look at the links CSO effectiveness in policy dialogue, the enabling and hindering factors and the role that DP support has played. The three main conceptual elements for this evaluation and the specific concepts that will be used to analyse them are shown in the figure below.

¹¹² The term “CSO effectiveness” emphasises the effectiveness of CSOs as development actors (see OECD 2010), Civil society effectiveness).

Figure 1 Overview of key concepts and linkages for this evaluation

The key concepts that have been studied during inception include:

1. Types of CSO strategies to engage in policy dialogue;
2. Policy dialogue and what it means within a given context;
3. The enabling environment and how it defines the space for policy dialogue.

The key linkages which will be investigated through case studies during the main phase include:

- a) Key enabling and hindering factors and how they affect CSO choice of strategies
- b) Policy dialogue: How CSOs access and use the space for policy dialogue, and
- c) What entry points they use into policy cycle
- d) What are the successes and failures of CSO engagement in policy dialogue, and
- e) What are the (process) outcomes with regard to policy change?

In addition the figure contains several variables that influence CSO strategies and their outcomes on policy dialogue (indicated in grey). They will be an important part of the explanatory models describing how CSOs have influenced policy change (ToC, see below).

Below we present the key concepts for this evaluation, and then explain how we will investigate the linkages between them through the case studies. Since most of the

evidence for this evaluation will be collected through case studies of different policy areas set in the contexts of three different countries we will use checklists and standardised reporting formats to analyse and present the key concepts for this evaluation. This approach will support comparative analysis during the synthesis stage. We therefore developed detailed typologies and checklists for analysis of the key concepts which will help us to identify common features across case studies.

The evaluation will look at DP support from different angles: From a general perspective, whether DP policies and strategies (in principle) support effective CSO engagement in policy dialogue; and from a country perspective, whether DP support practices enable (or perhaps prevent) a more effective role of CSOs – thus becoming part of the enabling and hindering factors. The latter will be done as part of the case studies. Analysis of DP policies and strategies at HQ level will be done through an institutional assessment tool (7 Cs) which is presented separately.¹¹³

2. Key concepts

2.1 CSO strategies to engage in policy dialogue

Based on suggestions from CIDA during inception and other sources¹¹⁴ we have developed a typology of CSO engagement in policy dialogue. The typology contains a number of strategies, which CSOs use to – directly or indirectly – influence policy makers. This includes highly visible strategies, like advocacy, campaigning and demonstrations, but also less-visible strategies, such as networking and evidence-based studies. Policy dialogue is often perceived as direct engagement between CSO and Government only, but there are other ways (particularly highlighted by Northern CSO consulted during inception) through which CSO contribute to policy processes, for example through training, education, community mobilisation and projects that are piloting innovative practices. DPs often tend to focus on the formalised dialogue, which is more visible to them, but country stakeholders emphasised that it is often the informal forms of dialogue that are effective. This evaluation understands that there are different ways of engaging in policy dialogue. In order to be able to assess the effectiveness we need to understand (and structure) the diversity. Checklist 1 thus shows the different forms of CSO engagement, clustered into four main types.

113 The tool will also be used at the country level, but with a perspective of synthesising findings per DP at HQ level. The tool will focus on the six DPs participating in this evaluation.

114 OECD 2010: CS effectiveness and adapted from ODI 2006. Policy engagement – How CS can be more effective.

Checklist 1 CSO strategies for engagement in policy dialogue

<p>Direct & formalised dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy campaigns • Participation in sector or PRSP planning • Support social accountability • Evidence-based studies and research <p>Direct & informal dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ad-hoc communication at central level • Ad-hoc communication at local level • Insider lobbying • Protests and demonstrations • Policy analysis and debate <p>Indirect contribution to dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information, education and training • Projects piloting innovative practices • Community mobilisation for feedback and advocacy <p>No dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community mobilisation for policy implementation (no feedback mechanisms included) • Service delivery 	<p>How effective are these strategies on their own and in combination to achieve outcomes on policy change, given the existing enabling and hindering conditions?</p> <p>Relevant evaluation questions: EQ6, EQ11,</p>
---	--

The case studies will cover different types of dialogue, both formal and informal. We therefore used this typology to guide the selection of policy areas where different types of dialogue. For example, the Mozambique study selected “Budget Planning and Monitoring” as a policy area, where for direct and formal dialogue, and “Dissemination of the law on violence against women” as a case for direct and informal dialogue.

The case studies will revisit the typology in order to determine which strategies (on their own or in combination) have been effective in influencing policy dialogue, given the existing enabling and hindering conditions.

2.2. Policy dialogue


Policy dialogue is a broad concept which different stakeholders understand and interpret in different ways. For foreign governments and DPs policy dialogue often refers to the (formal) dialogue at government level. For country stakeholders, policy dialogue both refers to dialogue between Government and civil society and within civil society. The Uganda scoping study thus distinguishes between “vertical” and “horizontal” dialogue.

It is important to understand the process nature of policy dialogue. Policy dialogue involves ongoing negotiation of ideas, relations and power; thus, it is a process for establishing legitimacy (as pointed out by the Uganda study), for mutual learning and for influencing. The process nature of policy dialogue also means that it extends beyond “policy making” into implementation, review and revision of policies. The ToR for this

evaluation thus demand a study of policy dialogue throughout policy development *and* implementation.

In the context of this evaluation dialogue is understood as a way of influencing policy processes. In order to conceptualise how policy processes work and what the entry points for influencing are the evaluation uses the **policy cycle tool**. The policy cycle tool describes the phases of policy development and implementation at iterative process (see figure below). Effective CSO strategies use various entry points into the policy cycle to influence policy processes.

Figure 2 Possible CSO entry points into policy cycle tool



2.3 Enabling environment for CSO effectiveness

For “civil society to flourish it requires a favourable enabling environment, which depends upon the actions and policies of all development actors – DPs, governments and CSOs themselves.”¹¹⁵ The scoping study have conducted a systematic review of dimensions the defining the enabling environment in the context of case study countries, based on documents review and using Checklist 2 below.

115 OECD 2010: Civil society effectiveness.

Checklist 2 Enabling environment¹¹⁶

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal and judicial system and related mechanisms through which CSOs or their constituencies can seek legal recourse • Democratic parliamentary system and opportunities for CSO to build alliances with Members of Parliament • Power and power relations (between CSO and Government; relations between CSOs and citizens, CSOs and other CSOs and the private sector) • Measures to promote philanthropy and corporate social responsibility • Mechanisms to ensure the promotion and protection of the rights to expression, peaceful assembly and association, and access to information • CSO-specific policies such as CSO legislation and taxation regulations including charitable status provisions • Regulations and norms promoting CSO transparency and accountability to their constituencies • Access to funding (and role of DPs); ability to mobilise resources (financial, skills, people, in kind contributions) • Ethnic and social issues, economic structures 	<p>Whether certain aspects of the enabling framework can explain the success or failure of CSO strategies. (EQ15)?</p> <p>How elements of the enabling framework define the space for policy dialogue.</p> <p>To what extent DP strategies address critical aspects of the enabling framework in order to support an effective CSO role in policy dialogue (EQ 16)?</p> <p>What other factors have influenced CSO engagement in policy dialogue (EQ 14, EQ 15)</p>
--	--

For the purpose of this evaluation we understand “enabling environment” as the formal conditions under which CSOs develop their strategies. More specifically, certain elements of the enabling environment will determine the space for CSOs to participate in policy dialogue. The **power cube** is useful to conceptualise the power relations that – as part of the enabling environment- define the space for policy dialogue. It can help to explain how CSOs have been able to access and use spaces for influence (and power), such as policy dialogue. The power cube distinguishes between invited, claimed and contested spaces for participation. The conceptual aspects (and terminology) of the power cube are useful to map the inclusiveness of spaces for CSO participation. But the nature of policy processes transcending several spaces is often difficult to capture within the categories suggested by the power cube.

2.4 Enabling and hindering conditions

After the scoping studies it was felt that the concept of enabling environment was somehow restricted to covering the formal conditions for policy dialogue only. The conclusion was that a wider concept was needed to also cover the informal conditions that facilitate or restrain CSO engagement in policy dialogue. It was suggested to use the concept of enabling and hindering conditions instead which would cover a wider range of factors, including those relating to DP support and CSO internal factors. Checklist 3 (below) provides a selection of factors which have been identified during the inception phase.

¹¹⁶ Based on Advisory Group 2008, p 17-18; Jacqueline Wood & Real Lavergne. 2008 Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness.

The practical way of broadening the analysis beyond the concept of environment will be to look back at the contextual factors (both formal and informal) that have shaped CSO strategies and outcomes as part of the case studies. The case studies will revisit the analysis of the enabling environment prepared during the scoping studies in order to identify the formal factors that have determined the space for engagement in policy dialogue (using Checklist 2). Furthermore, the case studies will identify any additional factors that have affected CSO strategies and outcomes (using Checklist 3).

The identification of factors that have affected CSO engagement in policy dialogue will be a major element of the case study analysis. Naturally, this part of the analysis will be done in conjunction with the analysis of CSO strategies and outcomes. Key factors will be identified through CSO focus group discussions, using participatory tools, such as SWOT or force field analysis. Based on our initial understanding from documents review and scoping studies we have identified key factors explaining CSO effectiveness in policy dialogue. Our preliminary understanding is that CSO effectiveness is determined by a number of factors, some of them are external, and others are internal. Checklist 3 presents key factors for consideration during the case studies, some of them directly linked to the “enabling conditions” (space, government attitude); others are CSO-related factors (CSO legitimacy, capacity and networks). The case studies will use these (and any additional factors identified during the study) to identify which factors are key for CSO effectiveness and integrate them into the ToC for a given policy area.

Checklist 3 Factors explaining effective CSO engagement in policy dialogue¹¹⁷

Factors relating to the enabling conditions:

Spaces for policy dialogue

- Transparent, accessible and inclusive space
- Regular and systematic opportunities for participation, covering all stages of policy process
- Shared principles, including recognition of the value of each stakeholder group's voice, mutual respect, inclusiveness, accessibility, clarity, transparency, responsibility, and accountability

Government

- Attitudes and behaviour
- Capacities, skills and knowledge

Factors relating to the policy process itself:

Policy issue and process:

- Nature of the policy issue (e.g. how controversial)
- Timing of policy process
- Access to information

CSO internal factors:

CSO legitimacy, capacity and networks

- CSO strategic clarity and focus on opportunities
 - CSO capacities, funds and knowledge
 - CSO Strategic alliances and networks
 - CSO sound evidence and analysis
 - CSO legitimacy
-

What are the key factors influencing whether CSO engage in policy dialogue (EQ 14)?

What are the main enabling and constraining factors that affect CSO engagement (EQ 15)?

To what extent have DP support strategies addressed these factors (EQ 15)?

3. Establishing linkages through case studies

3.1 Towards a “practical” theory of change for case studies

The scoping studies have established the main conceptual building blocks; in the following, the main study will interrogate the linkages between CSO strategies on policy dialogue and policy change outcomes through a case study approach.


The purpose of the case studies will be to provide an in-depth analysis of how CSO strategies have contributed to policy outcomes. One challenge in measuring influence through policy dialogue is that organisations often claim to be influential (also to justify the support they receive) and that the evidence to support these claims often relates to low-level outcomes or even outputs. Furthermore the very nature of policy work, involv-

117 Adapted from *Jacqueline Wood and Real Lavergne. 2008. Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness – An exploration of Experiences and Good practice, p. 11*; ODI 2006. Policy engagement – How CS can be more effective, p. 15-16.

ing multiple interventions by numerous actors and a wide range of external factors, complicates the analysis of causality and attribution. It will therefore be critical to establish **plausible links between CSO strategies and policy change**. This will be done through a “practical” theory of change for each policy area, which we will develop through a participatory process involving various stakeholders and sources to enable crosschecking and verification.

The theory of change (ToC) is a technique to structure our understanding how CSO strategies have contributed to policy outcomes. As a visual tool the ToC depicts the pathways that lead from specific activities of individual CSOs to wider policy changes, thus establishing causal linkages through interactive stakeholder analysis.

Figure 4 Linking strategies to outcomes through a “practical” theory of change



A major aspect in developing the ToC is to test the plausibility of perceptions (and claims) around policy dialogue outcomes, using a two-way approach:

- Working forwards **from strategy to outcomes**: We review CSOs and their achievements vis-à-vis objectives and any evidence on outcomes achieved. This will be done through meta-analysis of the available data in CSO reports, using the checklist on outcome indicators above (see Checklist 2). Claims about outcomes and impacts made in the documentation can be cross-checked through interviews and focus group discussions. However, where documentation is limited, the use of other techniques, such as Appreciative Inquiry, can be used to inquire into the aspiration of CSOs and pathways towards achieving those. To triangulate CSO self-perceptions with other sources, we will conduct short “reality checks” by visiting other organisations, communities etc. as feasible and appropriate. Through participatory analysis the team will assess what issues led to identified policy changes by a process of tracing and uncovering the steps through which outcomes have been generated, exploring how and why decisions or practices were executed and what the role of the different stakeholders were in that process. This will be done through the process analysis tool.
- Working backwards **from impact to outcomes**: This means we identify key policy changes (impacts) and identify the role that CSOs have played in it. As a first step

we will review the available literature (studies, evaluations etc.) to establish wider policy changes. We will then interrogate any linkages between those changes and the outcomes that CSOs have achieved through group discussions, which involves a wider range of (CSO and non-CSO) stakeholders, including representatives from Government, think tanks etc. Force field analysis will be a useful tool to understand the dynamics of change and the role different actors have played in it through a process of interactive analysis.

3.2 Outcomes of policy dialogue

For the case studies it is important to break down the concept of influence into (intermediate) outcomes from specific CSO strategies that can already be observed and long-term policy changes. Intermediate (process) outcomes are important to trace CSO influence in policy dialogue. In some cases it may be possible to link policy changes, like the adoption of new policies or the implementation of policies, directly linked to CSO inputs, e.g. through provision of policy papers or proposals that have been taken up. In other cases, CSOs only had an indirect influence, e.g. through framing issues or raising awareness through media campaigns. However, in most cases it may only be possible to measure the intermediate (process) outcomes of CSO strategies that will eventually lead to more effective engagement in policy dialogue. Intermediate outcomes leading to more effective engagement of CSOs in policy dialogue include strengthened organisational capacity, strengthened alliances and strengthened base of support.

The checklist below will serve as guidance for the identification of (intermediate and policy change) outcomes through the case studies.

Checklist 2 Measuring influence – Possible outcomes of CO engagement in policy dialogue¹¹⁸

<p>Strengthened organisational capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved management including transparency and accountability • Improved capacity to communicate messages • Increased voice and demands for accountability • Increased participation in civil society-state space <p>Strengthened alliances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased number of partner supporting an issue • Improved level of collaboration • Improved harmonisation of efforts • Increased number of strategic alliances <p>Strengthened base of support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased public involvement in an issue • Changes in voter behaviour • Increased media coverage • Increased awareness of messages among specific groups • Increased visibility 	<p>Direct Inputs into policy dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research • “White papers” • Policy proposals • Lessons from pilots projects • Policy briefings • Watchdog function 	<p>Policy changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy development • Policy adoption • Policy implementation • Policy enforcement <p>Indirect inputs into policy dialogue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting an agenda • Framing issues • Media campaign
--	--	--

4. The case study approach

4.1 Process for case studies


The advantage of using case studies for this evaluation is that they will enable an in-depth and contextualised analysis of complex concepts and linkages surrounding CSO engagement in policy dialogue by focussing on a specific policy area. Case studies tend to take a more open approach which allows factors and issues that are not anticipated or well understood at this stage to be explored. The evaluation will conduct 2-3 case studies in each country. The case study approach needs to be flexible and adaptive, based on the conceptual framework outlined above.

118 Adapted from Jane Reisman et al. *A guide to Measuring advocacy and policy*, Organisational Research Services, 2007.

The case studies will make use of existing documentation to the extent possible; however, we expect that the linkages will mainly be assessed on the basis of information derived from stakeholder interviews and focus groups. Analysis therefore needs to be systematic and involve steps for crosschecking and verification.

The case study process will use nine basic steps which are illustrated in the figure below.

Figure 5 Process for case studies



4.2 Principles for data collections

Triangulation: Time and resources for the country studies are limited. The teams will need to focus their efforts on capturing a variety of data sources on each topic and triangulate findings between different resources and perspectives to the extent possible. The main data sources that will be consulted include the following:

- CSOs working within the policy areas: The selection of CSOs for case studies will include different types of CSOs (national, local, networks, CBOs etc.) and CSO strategies (as identified through the typology above). CSO own documents and reports will provide evidence on their strategies, the activities conducted and any results achieved. Gaps within the written documentation will need to be filled in through CSO oral accounts. Focus groups with CSOs selected as case studies will help to identify the key enabling and hindering factors that have led to their success or failure. These findings must be crosschecked through consultation of other sources, such as those listed in the following.
- Other civil society actors engaged in the policy area: Representatives from movements, associations, self-help groups, campaigns etc. will be a valuable source for gaining additional insights on how the existing space for policy dialogue

has been used by other organisations. These sources should be used to the extent possible to triangulate findings from case studies, in particular with regard to the enabling and hindering conditions. In addition, journalists and parliamentarians with a good knowledge of the policy area should be consulted as source of information and for verification of findings.

- Members of CSO constituencies should be consulted where possible to clarify issues around case study CSO strategies, in particular with regard to questions around CSO accountability and legitimacy.
- Independent think-tanks and experts with a specific knowledge of the policy can provide analysis into what has been achieved (outcomes) and what the key barriers have been. They may also have (independent) views on what the achievements of different types of CSOs have been. The team will identify academics and/or consultants as resources persons.
- Government departments at central and local level with specific responsibilities within the policy area can provide (written and oral) information to verify outcomes on policy changes (e.g. budgets that have been revised; decisions that have been taken; plans that have been developed through a consultative process). The team should in particular look out for those in charge of innovative government initiatives that are likely to spearhead future policy change. In addition visits to government department might be required to cross-check CSO information on barriers resulting from government action. (Government laws and regulations contributing to the enabling and hindering conditions have already been reviewed as part of the scoping studies, but the team might identify additional documents in relation to the selected policy process.)
- DPs and International NGOs will be consulted not only as stakeholders for this evaluation, but also as a source of information. They may have undertaken previous analysis on certain policy issues already and they probably have a good overview of who the main actors are, which can guide the selection of CSOs for case studies.
- Media reports and websites are also an important source to consult during the preparation of case studies.
- Any additional sources will be identified for specific policy areas as part of the case study preparation.

Selectivity: Because of the limited time and resources available the team needs to be selective in the way it uses different sources. Selectivity means that the team has to be conscious what the minimum amount of sources is to allow qualified findings. The implication of this is that the quality and utility of individual sources must be critically assessed and potential biases be addressed.

Spread: What the available sources are will depend on the country and policy issues. Whatever the sources are, it is important to ensure a good spread across a variety of sources, geographical, social, economic and political. Within the short time available a good spread can be achieved through careful selection of informants (during prepara-

tion), use of online communication tools (Skype) or phone interviews and use of focus groups.

Innovation: The teams should be innovative in their approach to data collection, look outside those data sources that have been well covered by previous studies and consult people, organisations and initiatives that may bring in a fresh perspective and add new insights.

Labour division: For each team, team members will spread out to cover different policy areas. There will be similar issues cutting across several policy areas (such as the enabling and hindering conditions) where team members will be able to collect data from different sources. Cross-check their findings.

4.3 Analysis, crosschecking and verification

The final analysis will bring together the various elements of the case studies, establishing a plausible link between CSO strategies, policy dialogue and outcomes. As part of the final analysis the evaluators will use analytical tools, such as power cube and policy cycle tool, to analyse the various elements that contribute to CSO effectiveness. The power cube will be used to analyse the inclusiveness of spaces for policy dialogue; the policy cycle tool to determine which entry points CSOs have used to influence policy dialogue. The analysis will be shared and further deepened during the final verification workshops, which will include a wider range of stakeholders, including representatives from Government, media, INGOs, parliamentarians and academics. During the final verification and feedback workshops the team will also present their theories of change for the selected policy areas for verification by a wider group of stakeholders.

Annex C Evaluation Framework

Evaluation questions	Indicators (specific evidence required)	Data sources and methods for data collection	Reporting format
2. Enabling environment for CSO engagement in policy dialogue and key changes over the past five years within case study countries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of factors that contribute to CSO effectiveness in the country context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country documents describing the legal and political framework for CSOs. 	Country report (revised from scoping study)
2.1 The legal, political and financial freedoms of CSOs and how they have changed over the last five years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes of the last five years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing analysis of enabling framework (from DPs, think tanks, CSOs) 	
2.2 The relationship between Government and civil society in practice – including the power dynamics at play and how this has changed over the last five years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of power relations and how these affect the space for policy dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSO feedback on enablers and constraints 	
2.3 Key issues determining the enabling environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use Checklist 3! 		
Level 3 (Case studies) – CSO effectiveness			
CSO strategies:			
6. How do the CSOs (selected for case studies) engage in policy dialogue (within the chosen policy areas)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types of CSO strategies (see Q4) (Use Checklist 1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSO strategy documents • CSO focus group discussions 	Country report
6.1 What strategies are used by CSOs to achieve their objectives on policy dialogue?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theories of change for case study CSOs (Phase 2) 		
6.2 What is the scope of policy dialogue? What does it cover?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of policy dialogue space as part of the case study (Phase 2) 		
6.3 To what extent do CSO use networking or cooperation with other CSO as part of their strategies? Is there an advantage in having joint NGO platforms or does this rather dilute their impact on agenda setting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether NGO networks and platforms are effective for policy dialogue 		
6.3 What is the intervention logic behind the CSO strategies/ approach? What do they want to achieve and how?			

Evaluation questions	Indicators (specific evidence required)	Data sources and methods for data collection	Reporting format
<p>Accountability and Legitimacy:</p> <p>7. To what extent is CSO engagement in policy dialogue supported by their mandate?</p> <p>7.1 Whose interests do CSO engaged in policy dialogue represent? How do they obtain legitimacy?</p> <p>7.2 To what extent are CSOs engaging in policy dialogue accountable to their constituencies? How transparent are CSO procedures and operations? What are the feedback mechanisms?</p> <p>7.3 How do CSOs obtain legitimacy to speak for the people they claim to serve or represent? To what extent are CSOs' political demands supported by "numbers" (size of constituencies)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the CSOs' mandate supports engagement in policy dialogue • Whether there the CSOs are accountable to their constituencies on their engagement in policy dialogue • Whether the CSOs have established feedback mechanisms with their constituencies • Whether CSOs have the "critical mass" to support their political demands • Whether CSOs present the interests of poor and marginal groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSO mission statements • CSO institutional visits and interviews • Crosschecking through interviews with groups representing CSO constituencies • Crosschecking through interviews with independent thirds (e.g. think tanks, parliamentarians) 	Country report

Evaluation questions	Indicators (specific evidence required)	Data sources and methods for data collection	Reporting format
<p>Results (Process outcomes and policy changes):</p> <p>11. How effective are the CSOs in asserting influence on government (at national and local level) through policy dialogue? How effective are CSOs in influencing policy change? How effective in holding Government accountable for policy the implementation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which policies changes occurred in selected policy areas • Evidence that CSOs have been substantially engaged in policy dialogue • Evidence that CSOs contributed to policy change in selected policy areas • Evidence that CSOs are holding Government to account for the implementation of policies • Use Checklist 2! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of policy outcomes documented by CSO • Review of available analysis of policy processes (DP sources and evaluations; independent research and studies; media) • Stakeholder workshop (including government representatives, think tanks, parliamentarians, other relevant organisations etc.) to review policy change and contributions 	<p>Country report</p> <p>Separate documentation of process outcomes and policy changes (with evidence)</p> <p>Documentation of CSO workshop</p> <p>Documentation of stakeholder workshop</p>
<p>Results:</p> <p>12. How effective are the CSOs in achieving their own specific policy objectives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that CSOs achieve their stated policy objectives • Cases where CSOs failed to achieve their objectives (and why) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of results documented by CSOs • CSO focus groups (workshops), using process analysis, ToC. • Crosscheck findings through stakeholder interviews/ workshop 	<p>Country report</p> <p>Documentation of CSO workshop</p> <p>Documentation of stakeholder workshop</p>
<p>Results:</p> <p>13. What were the unexpected results of policy dialogue?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that CSOs have achieved results beyond their stated policy objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Q11 	<p>Same as above</p>

Evaluation questions	Indicators (specific evidence required)	Data sources and methods for data collection	Reporting format
<p>Enabling and hindering factors:</p> <p>14. What are the factors influencing whether CSOs engage in policy processes or not? Why are some CSOs who – given their constituency and profile could engage in policy work – not doing so?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key factors (drivers, breakers) influencing CSO engagement in policy processes • Practices that have enabled CSO outcomes in policy dialogue 	<p>CSO workshops using tools such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – power cube – SWOT analysis – Force field analysis <p>Synthesis of key factors determining outcomes of CSO engagement</p>	<p>Country report</p> <p>Documentation of CSO workshop</p>
<p>Enabling and hindering factors:</p> <p>15. What are the main enabling and hindering factors that affect the relevance and effectiveness of CSOs in policy dialogue, both in general and in relation to CSOs own goals and objectives? (e.g. what role do aspects of the enabling environment, CSO capacity, resource constraints and degree of networking play?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of enabling and constraining factors affecting CSO strategies and results • Use Checklist 4! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Same as Q 15</i> 	<p>Country report</p> <p>Using separate template on enabling factors (from scoping study)</p>
Level 4 – DP support on policy dialogue (country level)			
<p>DP support:</p> <p>17. How responsive are DP strategies to the priorities of the CSOs and what role did this play in the effectiveness of CSOs?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons (and examples) on responsive support; Lessons (and examples) on responsive support: what worked and what didn't? 	<p>Feedback from CSOs and other stakeholders</p> <p>(Country web survey)</p>	<p>Country report</p> <p>(Feedback form/ survey for synthesis)</p>
<p>DP support:</p> <p>18. What value do specific support strategies add? In particular, what value does support provided through different channels (Northern CSOs, local CSOs) add? What value does DP engagement in policy dialogue add?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether DP strategies support diversity of CSOs • Whether DP strategies support learning, innovation and focus on results • Whether partnerships with Northern CSOs provide opportunities for networking, dialogue and information sharing? 	<p>Feedback from CSOs and other stakeholders</p> <p>(Country web survey)</p>	<p>Country report</p> <p>(Feedback form/ survey for synthesis)</p>

Evaluation questions	Indicators (specific evidence required)	Data sources and methods for data collection	Reporting format
<p>DP support:</p> <p>8. What is the relevance of DP support vis-à-vis CSO priorities on policy dialogue?</p> <p>8.1 What do DPs perceive as the main needs of CSOs, particularly in relation to policy dialogue?</p> <p>8.2 To what extent has DP support been driven by CSO demands?</p> <p>8.3 To what extent does DP support respond to changing conditions for policy dialogue? To what extent is DP support informed by sound contextual analysis?</p> <p>8.4 To what extent do DPs pursue their priorities through support of CSO engagement in policy dialogue (whose agenda)? Or where relevant: do what extent do Northern CSOs pursue their agenda through cooperation with local partners (who sets the agenda)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether DP support is aligned to CSO priorities (priorities evidenced through CSO internal strategies, planning and communication) • Whether DPs are responsive to CSOs demands • Evidence of DP analysis and response to changing framework conditions • Cases where CSO priorities changed in response to DP support • Whether DPs (or Northern CSOs) pursue their strategic priorities through CSO support in policy dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DP and CSO interviews • (Country web survey) 	<p>Country report</p> <p>(Feedback form/ survey for synthesis)</p>
<p>DP support:</p> <p>16. To what extent have DP support strategies addressed the enabling and constraining factors that CSO face?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that DP strategies have addressed those enabling and constraining factors 	<p>Stakeholders</p> <p>(Country web survey)</p>	<p>(Feedback form/ survey for synthesis)</p>

Annex D Persons Met

	Name	Organisation / institution	Position
Individual interviews in Denmark			
11.11.11	Connie Dupont	Masala Lda. (IBIS)	Consultant
Briefing with involved DPs			
17.11.11	Anders Bitch Karlsen	Danish Embassy Maputo	Head of Cooperation
	Maja Tjernström	Swedish Embassy Maputo	Head of Governance
	Laura Leyser	Austrian Development Coopera- tion	Attaché / Programme Officer
	Sirkku Kristina Hellsten	Finnish Embassy Maputo	Counsellor
Interviews in Maputo			
19.11.11	Teresinha da Silva	Women and Law in Southern Africa (WLSA)	Executive Director
	Maj-Lis Foller	Gothenburg University	Researcher
21.11.11	Josefa Langa	Ministry of Women and Social Affairs (MMAS)	National Director/ Coordinator of CGC
	Alicia Calane	KWEST Consultores	Independent gender consultant
	Carvalho Cumbe	Sociedade Aberta	Program Officer
	Pires Capece Zingombe	ACREMO	Director
	Elísio de Melo	ACREMO	Focal Point
	Cacilda Cossa	ACREMO	Focal Point
	Salomão Zitha	ACREMO	Focal Point
	César Zimba	ACREMO	Focal Point
22.11.11	Rafa Valente Machava	MULEIDE	Executive Director
	Graca Julio	Fórum Mulher	Coordinator of Gender Violence Program
	Shaista Araújo	UN Women	Program Officer
	Fransisco Baessa	IBIS	Program Director, COCIM
	Paulo Gentil	AMODE	Executive Director
	Josefa Langa	MMAS	National Diretor
23.11.11	Xai-Xai, Gaza Province		
Fórum de Organizações Não-governamentais de Gaza (FONGA)			
	Sr. Matavel	FONGA	Coordinator
	Elinda Nhatave	FONGA	
	Bernardo Vasco Rui	FONGA	

Name	Organisation / institution	Position
Sonia Delfina Tembe	FONGA	
Egelina Alberta Manhique	FONGA	
Andre Constantino	FONGA	
Jaime F. Paluane	FONGA	
Mauricio Malanjane	FONGA	
Rebeca David M.	FONGA	
Inácio Mucavele	FONGA	
Filipe Domingos Moiane	FONGA	
Luis B. Cossa	Acosade	
DPPF Gaza		
Alipio Vaz Pereira	DPPF/PNPFD	Advisor
Romao Antonio Cossa	DPPF/DPO	Technician
DPMAS Gaza		
Maria João Baptista Mathe	DPMAS	Gender & Development
Isabel Vasco Langa Mpupa	DPMASG	Women & Family
Filomena Carlos Buque	DPMAS	Women & Gender
Gab. de Atendimento de Violência Domestica		
Arlete Fancisco Jamaio	DAMC-Gaza	
Flora António Simango	DAMC-Gaza	
Anastacio Machava	DAMC-Gaza	
24.11.11 Guija District		
Argentina Manhique	District Government	Permanent Secretary
ArturMarcelino Ctiuge	PRM	Chief of Operation
Lorenco Massinga	Associação 7 de Abril	President
Elias Macuácue	Concelho Consultivo	Secretary
Leandro Jamine	World Vision	Supervisor
Basilio Fernando Muianga	SDSMAS-Guija	Medical Doctor
Mariana Rufino	Save The Children	Program Officer
Justino Mugabé	Concelho Consultivo	Member
Alberto Massingue	Community Court	President
Sebastião M.Macamo	Samora Machel Tomanine Ass.	President of Association

ANNEX D PERSONS MET

Name	Organisation / institution	Position
Alice Mário Conjo	M.C.C.D.	Spokesman
Aventina Albino Jamine	GGCD	Member
Martinho F. Manhique	Samaritaria's Purse	Program Officer
Costa Manuel Siteo	PRM	Police Officer
Gerson Norte	Radio Vembe	Manager
Jossias Novela	Acassociacao Amparo, Chokwe	Member
25.11.11 Moamba District		
Sebastião Gabriel Muchanga	Government of Moamba	Permanent Secretary
Stélio Guambe	District Secretariat Moamba	Member of District Technical Team
Rafael S. Ussivans	District Secretariat Moamba	Assistant Secretary
Ernesto Besnardo	Association	Secretary
Hermelinda Vembane	M.C.C Distrital	
Anastacio dos Santos	M.A.P	
Valecina Eugamo		Secretary of Bairro
António Paulo Saínda	M.C.S.P.A	
Caetano Alberto Jalane	M.C.C. District	Secretary of Bairro South
Abel Jorge Dabula	C.C. Districtal	Spokesman
Gabriela Manjate	Gov. Districtal de Moamba	Secretary Chief
Filipa Ganje	DMAS	Medical Doctor
Arão Vilanculos	Red Cross (Cruz Vermelha de Moçambique)	District Technician
28.11.11 Individual interviews in Maputo		
John Barnes	MPD / UNDP	Adviser
Fernanda Farinha		Consultant
Aly Bachir Macassar	Ministry of Justice	Human Rights Director
Custódio Duma Vasco	Danish Embassy	Program Officer Justice Sector
Denise Namburete	N'WETI	Executive Director
Manuel Q. Dos Santos Jr.	ADELMA, Manica	Executive Director
Lourino Dava	CIP	Budget Monitoring Program Coordinator
Joaquim Oliveira	MAGARIRO, Manica	Director
29.11.11 INGOs – Focus Groups interview		
José Jocitala	3F	Official Progr.
Ritva Parvianen	KEPA	Representative

	Name	Organisation / institution	Position
	Simão Simbine	SASK	
	René Celaya	CARE International	
	Individual interviews		
	Karin Fueg	Helvetas	Program Director
	Ilídio Nhantumbo	Helvetas	National Program Officer
	Boaventura Veja	Faith Based Organisation	Governance Monitoring Project Manager
	Vivaldino Banze	AMA, Cabo Delgado	Executive Director
	Floriberto Fernandes	TVM	Journalist
	Benilde Nhalivilo	FORCOM	Executive Director
	Ana Loforte	WLSA	President of Board
	Achia	LIMUSSICA, Manica	General Coordinator
30.12.11	Salvador Cadete Forquilha	SDC & IESE	Decentralisation Program/Researcher
	Armando Ali	Facilidade, Nampula	Coordinator
	Inez Hackenberg	NOVOB, Holland	Program Officer
1.12.11	Verification Workshop – District Planning and Budget Makng		
	Neila Momade	CIP	Social Coordinator
	Nilza Chipe	G-20	Manager
	José Cassamo	PNDFFD/MPD	
	Jonas Fernando Pohlman	Dutch Embassy	
	Solomão Muchanga	Juvenile Parliament	
	Quitéria Anícia G.	Juvenile Parliament	
	Olivia Gervasoni	European Union	
	Christian Kappensteiner	GIZ	
	Verification Workshop – Domestic Violence		
	Iraé Baptista Lundin	Diakonia / CEEI-ISRI	
	Conseicao Osorio	WLSA	
	Arminda Vombe	Parliament Working Group on Gender CASGA	
	Suzumi Sónia de Conceicao	AMMCJ	Communication
	Josefa Lopes Langa	MMAS DNM	
	Albino Francisco	FDC	
	Anders Karlsen	Danish Embassy	
	Graca Julio	Forum Mullher	
5.12.11	Individual interviews		

ANNEX D PERSONS MET

Name	Organisation / institution	Position
Joao Pereira	MASC	Executive Director
Debriefing		
Mogens Pedersen	Danish Embassy	
Maja Tjenstrom	Swedish Embassy	
Chloé Baudry	Canada/CIDA	
Bram Naidoo	Swedish Embassy	
Anders Karlsen	Danish Embassy	
Sirkku Hellsten	Embassy of Finland	
Eva Kohl	Austrian Development Agency	
6.12.11	Individual interviews	
Nathalie Grimoud	World Wildlife Fund	Technical Assistance Civil Society
Francesca Bruschi	Italian Cooperation	Decentralisation Working Group

Annex E Documents Consulted

General:

- African Association of Political Science, *The Concept of Policy Dialogue and Gendered Development: Understanding its institutional and ideological constraints*, 1977, <http://archive.lib.msu.edu/DMC/African%20Journals/pdfs/political%20science/volume2n2/ajps002002005.pdf>
- AFRIMAP, several documents at www.afrimap.org <http://www.afrimap.org/library-SearchDisplay.php>
- Afrobarometer reports 2008 www.afrobarometer.org
- Bellucci, S., 2002, *Governance, Civil Society and NGOs in Mozambique*, published by the MOST (Management of Social Transformations) Programme, UNESCO.
- Biza, A.M., 2007, *Associações de Jovens, Estado e política em Mocambique – Da herança a Novos Desafios*, Conferência Inaugural do IESE “Desafios para a investigação social e económica em Mocambique”, 19 de Setembro de 2007.
- Cahen, M., Waniez, P. & Brustlein, V., 2002/1, *Pour un atlas social et culturel du Mozambique*, Lusotopie 2002/1.
- CIDA, 2008: Assessment of the Local Context and Recommendations for the Support to Civil Society (Mozambique).
- CIDA, March 2010: Notes on Aggregate results and Responsive Programming: reflections on the Issue and the Way Forward.
- CIDA, February 2011: Trip Report – Mozambique, CIDA.
- CIVICUS, 2007, *The Role of Civil Society Organisations in Promoting Social Justice and Sound Developmental Policies in SADC – A case study of Mozambique, South Africa and Zimbabwe*, prepared by Keith Muloongo, June 30, 2007.
- CMI (Chr. Michelsen Institute), 2005, *Poverty in Mozambique – Discourse, Analysis and Monitoring – Suggestions for National Stakeholders and the DP Community*, R 2005:9 (mainly pp 12-13).
- Danida, 2008: Strategy for Danish support to civil society in developing countries.
- DfID, 2008, *Citizens’ Voice and Accountability Evaluation: Mozambique Country Case Study*, Evaluation Report EV688, July 2008.
- FDC (Foundation for Community Development), 2007, *Mozambican Civil Society Within: Evaluation, Challenges, Opportunities and Action*, UNDP, Aga Khan Foundation, EU, CIVICUS
- Fozzard, A., 2002, *How, When and Why does Poverty get Budget Priority – Poverty Reduction Strategy and Public Expenditure in Mozambique*, Case Study 5, Working Paper 167, ODI (mainly page 47-49).
- Francisco, A., 2010, *Sociedade Civil Em Mocambique: Expectativas e Desafios, Desafios Para Mocambique*, 2010: pp. 51-105.
- Francisco, A., 2010, *Sociedade Civil Em Mocambique: Expectativas e Desafios*, Presentation.
- Francisco, A. & Matter, K., 2007, *Poverty Observatory in Mozambique: Final Report*, Gerster Consulting for SDC and WB.
- Francisco, A., 2009, *Sociedades Civil Em Mocambique e no Mondo, IDeLas Boletim No. 24*, Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Económicos, Maputo 27. Nov. 2009.
- Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2004, *Baseline Survey – Trade Unions in Mozambique*, by Maria José Artur, Maputo 2004.

- Government of Sweden: Strategy for the development cooperation with Mozambique, September 2008 – December 2012.
- Hayes, L.(IBIS), Moiana, A. (CCM), Zaquau, H. (GMD), 2009?, A Eficácia da Ajuda em Mocambique – “*Background paper*” para seminário da sociedade civil sobre a eficácia da ajuda em Mocambique – 13 de Maio de 2009.
- Instituto Nacional de Estatísticas (2006): *As Instituições sem Fins Lucrativos em Moçambique: resultados do primeiro censo nacional (2004/5)*. Maputo: Instituto Nacional de Estatística.
- Isaksen, J. & Weimer, B. , 2010, *Centro de Integridade Pública (CIP): An Agent of Change at the Crossroads*. Review of CIP’s Strategic Plan 2007-10. Centro de Integridade Pública, Maputo.
- Karlstedt, C., U. Modeer and A. Ingelstam (2008), “Strategic Directions: The Swedish Embassy’s Support to Mozambican Civil Society Organisations – Concept Paper.” October 2008.
- KAS (Konrad Adenauer-Stiftung), 2004, *Controle social do Poder Político em Moçambique - Divisão de Poderes*, Nampula, Setembro de 2003, (mainly pp. 61-69).
- LaChartre, B., 2002/1, *Qui a peur des ONG au Mozambique? La reliance d’une controverse*, Lusotopie 2002/1: 161-169.
- Massala Consult Lda: *Análise das Experiências Relacionadas com a Participação Comunitária e Consulta na Planificação Distrital em Moçambique. Relatório Final Consolidado*. Regiões Norte, Centro e Sul (Províncias de Niassa, Nampula, Tete, Zambézia, Manica, Inhambane e Gaza). Março 2009.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, 2008, Evaluation of Development Cooperation between Mozambique and Denmark, 1992-2006:
- Working Paper 07, *Public Financial Management and Reform*, Alex Warren-Rodríguez, September 2008, Mokoro Ltd and ECORYS.
- Working Paper 08, *Justice, Governance, Democratisation and Human Rights*, Simon Norfolk and Alícia Calane, September 2008, Mokoro Ltd. and ECORYS.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland, 2010: *Guidelines for Civil Society in Development Policy*.
- Ministry of Planning & Development, Mozambique, *Mozambique: Poverty Observatory and the Program Aid Partnership (PAP): Policy Dialogue, Civil Society Consultation, and Mutual Accountability of DPs and Government*, by Momade Saide and Virgulino Nhate in Sourcebook: Second Edition 69, <http://www.mfdr.org/sourcebook/2ndEdition/3-5MozambiquePAP.pdf>
- Mozambican Constitution. Preamble of the Constitution of the Republic. Mozlegal translation available in [http://confinder.richmond.edu/admin/docs/Constitution_\(in_force_21_01_05\)\(English\)-Mozlegal.pdf](http://confinder.richmond.edu/admin/docs/Constitution_(in_force_21_01_05)(English)-Mozlegal.pdf)
- Mulando, F., 2007, *O Papel das Organizações da Sociedade Civil na Formulação de Políticas Públicas em Moçambique: Caso de G-20 e o Parpa II*, Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Económicos, Conference Paper No. 25 prepared for the Conference “Desafios para a investigação social e económica em Moçambique”, 19 Sept. 2007.
- Negrão, José, *A Propósito das Relações Entre as ONGs do Norte e a Sociedade Civil Moçambicana*, 2003, available in http://www.iid.org.mz/Relacoes_entre_ONG_do_Norte_e_Sociedade_Civil_do_Sul.pdf
- OECD, *Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness, Findings, recommendations and good practice*, 2009, BetterAid-series on aid effectiveness.
- OSISA <http://www.afrimap.org/librarySearchDisplay.php>
- Shankland, A. & Chaimite, E. (2010) *Avaliação Externa da Iniciativa de Monitoria da Governação Local*.

- Sida: Swedish Embassy's Support to Mozambican Civil Society Organisations. Guidelines. 2009; http://www.swedenabroad.com/Page_____109105.aspx
- Southern Africa Trust: "(Dis)enabling the Public Sphere: Civil Society Regulation in Africa. Volume 1", www.southernafricatruster.org Chapter 13: The Legislative Environment for Civil Society in Mozambique
Matias Capapelo (Can be downloaded for USD).
- Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation SDC. Cooperation Strategy. Mozambique 2007-2011.
- The Informal Governance Group and Alliance 2015, 2010, *Aid and Budget Transparency in Mozambique, Constraints for Civil Society, the Parliament and the Government*, May 2010.
- UNDP Mozambique (2011), "The Mirror of Narcissus – Knowledge and Self-conscience for a better development of the Mozambican Civil Society. Lessons learned and recommendations from Mozambique on its experience in implementing the CIVICUS Civil Society Index." March 2011. <http://www.undp.org/mz/en/Publications/National-Reports/The-Mirror-of-Narcissus-Knowledge-and-Self-conscience-for-a-better-development-of-the-Mozambican-Civil-Society>
- UNDP: *Decentralised District Planning and Finance Programme as a World Class Success*, available in <http://www.undp.org/mz/en/Newsroom/News-and-press-releases/News-2007/Decentralised-District-Planning-and-Finance-Programme-as-a-World-Class-Success>
- USAID: NGO Sustainability Index, 2009.
- Van EYS, T., 2002/1, *Solidariedade com os pobres ou comércio no mercado do desenvolvimento? As organizações não governamentais em Mocambique*, Lusotopie 2002/1: pp. 145-159.
- USAID, 2009, *Índice de Sustentabilidade das ONG 2009, Para a África Subsaariana*, (including Mozambique summary).
www.beyondintractability.org/essay/policy_dialogue/
www.caledoninst.org/Publications/PDF/540ENG.pdf

Case A

- ACS (2010). Estudo de Governanação de Nampula. Versão Final, Maputo, 07 de Julho de 2010.
- Akilizetho-ADS (2009). *Relatório Específico de Monitoria dos CLPAs*. Março de 2009.
- CIP (2010). Rastreo da Despesa Pública 2010. Monitoria do Orçamento, Rastreo da Despesa Pública e Auditoria Social.
- CIP et al. (2010). Governanação Local em Moçambique: Desempenho de distritos e autarquias locais aquém do planificado. Um olhar a partir dos distritos de Bilene, Mabalane, Búzi, Cheringoma, Montepuez, Chiúre e autarquias locais de Manjacaze, Marromeu e Mocimboa da Praia. Maio de 2010.
- Diploma Ministerial 67/2009, de 17 de Fevereiro. Guião para Organização e Funcionamento dos Conselhos locais.
- FDC (2008). Civil Society Index, Mozambique 2007.
- Forquilha, Salvador Cadete (2009). Reformas de Descentralização e Redução da Pobreza num Contexto de Estado Neo-patrimonial. Um olhar a partir dos Conselhos Locais e OIIL em Moçambique. In: IESE (2009). II Conferência do IESE, "Dinâmicas da Pobreza e Padrões de Acumulação em Moçambique", Maputo 22 a 23 de Abril de 2009.

- Forquilha, Salvador Cadete (2010). Governação Distrital no Contexto das Reformas de Descentralização Administrativa Em Moçambique: Lógicas, Dinâmicas E Desafios. In: IESE (2010). Desafios para Moçambique. Maputo.
- Francisco, A. e Matter, K. (2007). *Poverty Observatory in Mozambique. Final Report*. Commissioned to Gerster Consulting by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and by the Participation and Civic Engagement Team in the Social Development Department of the World Bank. Mau 2007.
- Francisco, António Alberto & Matter, Konrad (2007). Poverty Observatory in Mozambique. Final Report. Commissioned by Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) and the Participation and Civiv Engagement of the Word Bank.
- HODGES, Tony & TIBANA, Roberto (2005). *Economia Política do Orçamento em Moçambique*. Lisboa: Principia.
- Lei 8/2003, de 19 de Maio. Lei dos Órgãos Locais do Estado.
- Massala Consult Lda (2009). Análise das Experiências Relacionadas com a Participação Comunitária e Consulta na Planificação Distrital em Moçambique. Relatório Final Consolidado. Regiões Norte, Centro e Sul (Províncias de Niassa, Nampula, Tete, Zambézia, Manica, Inhambane e Gaza). Março 2009.
- Norfolk, Simon & Calane, Alicia (2008). Avaliação da Cooperação para o Desenvolvimento entre Moçambique e a Dinamarca, 1992-2006. Documento de Trabalho No.08. Justiça, Governação, Democratização e Direitos Humanos. Setembro de 2008.
- Pijnenburg, B. (2004). *Keeping it Vague: Discourse and Practices of Participation in Rural Mozambique*. PhD Thesis Wageningen University.
- Rede de Governação das Organizações da Sociedade Civil de Nampula (2009). Resumo de constatações e factos do uso e aplicação do OIIL no País e recomendações. Documento elaborado para servir de contributo para o debate nacional. Março de 2009.

Case B

- Andrade, Ximena (2009), Proposta de lei contra a violência doméstica: processo e fundamentos`, In : *Outras Vozes*, nº 26, (Março de 2009) –download at http://www.wlsa.org.mz/?__target__=tex_vdprocessos on 01/12/11.
- Arthur, Maria José (2009). 'Aprovação da "Lei Sobre a Violência Doméstica Praticada Contra a Mulher"'. Que resultados? In: *Outra Voze,s nº 28 (Novembro de 2009)* – download at http://www.wlsa.org.mz/?__target__=tex_vdaprovada on 01/12/11.
- Arthur, Maria José (2008). 'A propósito da discussão da proposat da Lei contra a violência doméstica: de que vale ter um grande número de mulheres no parlamento?' In: *Outra Vozes* Vol. 22 (Fevereiro de 2008).
- Arthur, Maria José and Margarida Mejia (2006). *Coragem e Impunidade: Denúncia e Tratamento da Violência Doméstica Contra as Mulheres em Moçambique* Maputo: Women and Law in Southern Africa (WLSA).
- Arthur, Maria José and Margarida Mejia (eds.) (2007). *Rebuilding Lives: The Strategies of Women Survivors of Domestic Violence*. Maputo: Women and Law in Southern Africa (WLSA).
- Imprensa Nacional* (2009), 'Lei sobre a Violência Doméstica Praticada Sobre a Mulher` In: *Boletim da República*-BR I Serie-número 38 (de 29 de Setembro de 2009, 2º suplemento) – dowanloaded at http://www.sislog.com/ta/IMG/pdf/Lei_n._26_2009.pdf on 01/12/11.
- Loforte, Ana Maria (2009), Os movimentos sociais e a violência contra a mulher em Moçambique: marcos de um percurso` In: *Outras Vozes* (nº 27, Junho de 2009)

- downloaded at http://www.wlsa.org.mz/?__target__=Tex_MovimentosViolencia on 01/12/11.
- MMAS (2008), 'Plano Nacional de Acção para Prevenção e Combate à Violência contra Mulher 2008-2012.
- Ministry of Interior/Comando Geral da Polícia, Departamento da Mulher e Criança (2008), 'Dados dos Gabinetes de Atendimento à Mulher Vítima de Violência. Relatório, Maputo
- Tvedten Inge, Paulo, Margarida, Montserrat Georgina (2008), Gender Policies and Feminisation of Poverty in Mozambique` a CMI: Chr. Michelsen Institute publication –downloaded at <http://www.cmi.no/publications/file/3326-gender-policies-and-feminisation-of-poverty-in.pdf> on 01/12/11.
- WLSA (2010), Testemunhos de mulheres que sofrera de violência doméstica`, In: *Outras Vozes*, (nº 29-30, Fevereiro-Maio de 2010) – downloaded at http://www.wlsa.org.mz/?__target__=tex_testemunhos on 01/12/11.
- WLSA (2009), 'Proposta de lei contra a violência doméstica: ponto de situação`, In: *Outras Vozes* (nº 24-25, Fevereiro de 2009) downloade at http://www.wlsa.org.mz/?__target__=Tex_VDPontoSituacao on 01/12/11.
- WLSA (2008), Ante-projecto de lei contra violência Doméstica ` downloaded at http://www.wlsa.org.mz/?__target__=violencia on 01/12/11.

Annex F Rationale and Approach for Selection of Policy Areas

The initial long-list of key policy processes has been discussed extensively during all interviews and focus group discussions. The list has expanded and later been narrowed down to a prioritised shortlist (*see Chapter 2 on Methodology*). At the debriefing meeting with involved DPs, the prioritised long-list included 21 policy processes of which nine were subject for further analysis (in bold):

1. African Peer Review Mechanism
2. **PRSP/PARP formulation**
3. Sector working groups
4. **District planning and budget monitoring/LOLE/decentralisation/deconcentration**
5. Revision of the Constitution
6. **Formulation of National Rural Development Strategy**
7. Education policy
8. **Land legislation & land management**
9. **Legislation on mega-projects/Extractive industries/Corporate Social Responsibility**
10. Legislation on anti-corruption
11. **Access to justice/Human rights (Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights; nutrition)/ Legislation on domestic violence/women's and children's rights/Family Law**
12. **Labour market legislation**
13. **Legislation on access to information**
14. Legislation on radio and television
15. Penal code auscultation
16. Revision of the electoral package
17. **Formulation of agricultural policies**
18. CS initiative for revision of NGO-legislation

19. International trade discussions
20. Social protection/social protection within regional integration
21. Social/spontaneous movements

Further analysis applying a decision matrix tool (see below) was based on specific and simple selection criteria:

Selection criteria:

- Relevance for the Mozambican development agenda. This included considerations on which policy processes had been important during the past five years, but with strong emphasis on areas, which are expected to be of key political interest in the coming years.
- Degree of CSO involvement in the policy process. Based on the classification of CSOs, it has been important to ensure that different kind of CS-actors are involved, i.e. the research and media organisations, sector specific advocacy groups, implementing service delivery organisations, CBOs and if possible, also INGOs.
- Inclusion of decentralised policy processes. Acknowledging the urban and capita bias of the Scoping Exercise, it has been important to look for policy processes, which have taken place and/or involved decentralised CS-actors.
- Type of policy dialogue. Invited space or civil society initiative.
- Availability of documentation is a pragmatic concern, which is nevertheless of importance, considering the limited time available for the field study.

Based on the short listing process, selection criteria and discussions with key informants and within the team, the **decision matrix** below was used to analyse the eligibility of a number of policy processes:

	Policy process	Relevance for Mozambican development agenda (national/local level)	Degree of CSO involvement (list involved CSOs)	Decentralization	Which kind of space?	Availability of documentation of the process? (documents/reports/evaluations, key informants)
1.	Development Observatories (PRSP/PARP formulation and 'Plano Económico Social' implementation)	Pivot for the overall development agenda Annual planning cycle	National level: G-20, FDC, GMD, MEPT, Confederação das Associações Económicas de Moçambique, Fórum Mulher, Abiodes, Cruzeiro de Sul..... Provincial level: FONGA (Gaza), Sociedade Aberta (Maputo), Fórum de Associações de Sociedade Civil (Niassa)..... MPD, Provincial and district governments	Provincial Development Observatories	Invited space on initiative of GOM; influenced by donor agenda.	Several evaluations PQG PARP (indicators, M&E) Sector plans
2.	District planning and budget monitoring	Annual planning cycle	CIP, Sociedade Aberta, MASC, Programa AGIR, Facilidade, PASC, Centro de Aprendizagem e Capacitação da Sociedade Civil, District Platforms IPCCs, Cruzeiro do Sul Identification of specific actors depends on the local context (district) MPD, District Administration / Government	IPCC in all provinces and districts involving local CBOs	Invited space on initiative of GOM; influenced by donor agenda.	District Development Strategy, Economic and Social Plan and District Budget (PESOD)

Policy process	Relevance for Mozambican development agenda (national/local level)	Degree of CSO involvement (list involved CSOs)	Decentralization	Which kind of space?	Availability of documentation of the process? (documents/reports/evaluations, key informants)
3. Land legislation & land management	Land legislation in place, but the law enforcement is weak. Strong economic interests in accumulation of land property. Land administration is not facilitating registration of community property.	UNAC, ORAM, Cruzeiro do Sul, Centro de Formacao Juridica & Judiciaria, SCC – study in Niassa MCA – support, CCM Rede das Mulheres Rurais..... MINAG (Terras & Florestas)	UNAC has a national outreach and Farmers' Associations at district level engaged.	Strong CSO drive in the providing access to information and secure law enforcement.	Land policy, Land Law, Regulation of the Land Law, Urban Soil Regulations, Research Reports
4. Access to justice / legislation on domestic violence	Access to justice may include different aspects related to Human rights	WLSA, AMMCJ, LDH, Forum Mulher	Outreach through provincial NGO platforms	Strong civil society initiative on auscultation process and involvement of CSOs.	Legislation on Family Law, Domestic Violence, Penas Alternativas, Inheritance Law
5. Legislation on mega-projects and extractive industries	Legislation on mega-projects under revision Economic and environmental development, including community level EITI – approval process – increased transparency /ant-corruption	IESE, CIP, Justica Ambiental, GMD, G-20, Centro Terra Viva, Livaningo, LDH, G20 MICOA, MRN, MPD	Any examples of provincial/district organizations?	Top-driven process by “elite CSOs”.	The legal framework EITI report (2011) IESE research report A very recent process, which may not provide much basis for lesson learning.

	Policy process	Relevance for Mozambican development agenda (national/local level)	Degree of CSO involvement (list involved CSOs)	Decentralization	Which kind of space?	Availability of documentation of the process? (documents/reports/evaluations, key informants)
6.	Legislation on access to information	Expression of freedom – access to information	Sindicato Nacional de Journalistas, MISA, Coligacao, Direito ao Acesso a Informaçao Concelho Superior de Comunicacao Social, Parliament	Provincial NGO platforms	Top-driven process by “elite CSOs”.	Proposal of Law on Freedom of Information/Access to Information. A very recent process, which may not provide much basis for lesson learning.
7.	Labor market legislation	Policy of access to employment	Organizaçao de Trabalhadores de Moçambique, Conselho de Sindicatos Independentes de Mocambique, SINTIA, CTA, MITRAB, Youth Associations		Limited CSO scope.	Law of Labour Employment and Professional Training Strategy
8.	Legislation on agricultural policies	Support to agriculture as a priority sector of the economy	ROSA, ABIODES, ORAM, UNAC, CCM, Universidade Eduardo Mondlane		Not implemented.	Agrarian policy; rural development strategy. Too recent a process.
9.	Formulation of National Rural Development Strategy	Pivotal for Development as 60% of population are in rural areas	UNAC, ORAM, G20, AMODE, ABIODES, Cruzeiro do Sul		Not implemented.	Estratégia de Desenvolvimento Rural.

e-ISBN: 978-87-7087-693-3

Printed reports:

Synthesis Report (in English):

ISBN 978-87-7087-676-6

Bangladesh Country Report (in English):

ISBN 978-87-7087-680-3

Mozambique Country Report (in Portuguese):

ISBN 978-87-7087-682-7

Commissioning Development Partners

The evaluation is commissioned by members of the Development Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness, comprising three development partners; Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC), Danish International Development Assistance (Danida) and Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida). They have commissioned on behalf of a larger group of bilateral development partners including Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland and Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (SDC) which support the evaluation through their participation in a Reference Group, which also includes Open Forum and BetterAid.

