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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Christian Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community Based Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERD</td>
<td>Committee on the Elimination of Radial Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>Danish Church Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>UK Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIIS</td>
<td>Danish Institute of International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>Finish Church Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>Global Advocacy and Strategy (Department in DCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Inter-church organisation for development cooperation (Dutch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally displaced person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>Midterm Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA</td>
<td>Norwegian Church Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCCD</td>
<td>Partnership Center for Development &amp; Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT (1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>Programme Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Regional Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Main Messages

DanChurchAid’s Programme Type 1 (PT1), Political Space, operates within a very broad policy framework.

The issues addressed by PT1 are highly relevant and PT1 is the only programme type able to address key issues like shrinking political space for civil society that affects all programme types in a systematic manner.

There is a need for harmonizing concepts and programme types with sister agencies, but as none of them have allocated resources for this DCA should as far as possible attempt to use the terminology and concepts applied by sister agencies when updating the PT1 policy. However, different use of concepts and different definition of programme types have not been major obstacles for alignment and collaboration.

The broad framework for PT1 presents an obstacle to programme management and programme development. It has resulted in poor monitoring rendering results-based management impossible. DCA’s PT1 advisors cannot possibly acquire deep professional knowledge and are bound to remain governance and human rights generalists; cross-learning between PT1 programmes is difficult and evidence-based advocacy above national level becomes unfocussed.

The main recommendation is that the PT1 policy framework gets a sharper focus, this could be done by defining a thematic mainstream cluster that PT1 programmes should belong to and decide whether outliers should be phased out or move towards the mainstream cluster.

The table below provides an overview of the consequences of a sharper thematic focus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value added by DCA</td>
<td>With a more narrow thematic focus it will be easier for the PT1 PTAs to obtain solid competence, provide inputs for programme development and to monitor programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy between PT1 programmes</td>
<td>Narrow thematic focus will enable relevant exchange of experiences and learning between programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and global advocacy</td>
<td>A more focused programme will strengthen evidence-based advocacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Sharper focus will give less room of maneuver for placing new programme where funding opportunities are best. But sharper focus and a stronger competence will enhance ability to gain competitive tenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation with sister organisations within ACT</td>
<td>Concepts should as far as possible be common and comparable. But focusing is not a major issue in relation to cooperation with sister agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>A more narrow focus makes it easier to communicate the policy and to report on the results of the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Executive Summary and Recommendations

DanChurchAid’s Programme Type 1 (PT1), Political Space, operates within a very broad policy framework. The overall objective of the policy defines the Political Space as a very broad demand-side governance programme:

“Impoverished and discriminated women and men have enhanced their capabilities and opportunities for upholding and claiming their right to participate for effecting social, political and economic change.”

The programme type is focussed around widening the political space for impoverished and discriminated women and men around three broad main themes: political participation; access to justice; and discrimination, including gender-based discrimination. The focus of the PT1 programmes are fairly equally spread on these three broad main themes.

Scope of PT1 Programmes

A major part of the PT1 programmes include activities beyond governance and human rights as they also include support to income generating activities, educational activities like literacy classes and provision of education equipment and improvement of teaching methodology. One programme includes aids prevention and environmental conservation. Programme officers and programme type advisors need to be well versed in these additional fields in order to ensure that the programme is professionally implemented.

Recommendation

1. DCA should undertake a critical review of the non-governance and human rights activities of the PT1 programmes like livelihood, education, aids prevention and environmental conservation.

Relevance

Limited or shrinking space for civil society is a major problem in practically all PT1 programmes. The PT1 programme officers and the DCA regional representatives have reported a wide range of problems related to governments that try to control or restrict the room of manoeuvre of the civil society organisations. Nearly all find that limited or shrinking space for civil society is a major problem.

Civil society organisations need space to perform their role and it is therefore essential for DCA to address the issues. Some of DCA’s partners are well positioned to fight for space for civil society. Church councils and other organizations with clear national constituencies might be the most effective defenders of the political space of civil society because they cannot easily be dismissed as mouthpieces of foreign interests.

It is essential for DCA to support civil society organisations addressing these issues. In fact all DCA’s programme types, are in principle are rights-based and address them from specific angles. However, PT1 is the only programme type able to address these issues comprehensively because it focuses on human rights including the right to participate. This does in other words indicate the need for a stand-alone PT1 with a focus on governance issues.

Important new trends in development research emphasize emerging short-term opportunities. They put less emphasis on structural factors that are difficult to change and look for pragmatic solutions that build upon what already exists. The poor are typically not the prime driver of change although they may be so under particular circumstances. Thus, while there is good
evidence for putting emphasis on the poor’s agency at least in the long run, current discussions emphasize the windows of opportunity that might emerge, e.g. when ruling elites are regrouping and are open for certain changes.

The search for pragmatic solutions based on what already exists and the possibility to cooperate with a wide range of stakeholders is especially important in fragile states. For fragile states practitioners should build on what is already working and think less normatively about what ought to be happening.

Recommendation

2. In the reformulation of the PT1 policy DCA should take account of current thinking among development researchers by emphasizing ability (flexibility) to adapt programmes to the specific context, to exploit emerging windows of opportunity and to search for pragmatic solutions especially in fragile states. In this connection advocacy and forging of alliances at various levels (local, national, regional and global) as an important means should be reflected.

Alignment with Sister Agencies

DCA’s sister agencies Christian Aid (CA), Norwegian Church Aid (NCA) and ICCO have or have had programmes that resemble PT1. But key staff of sister agencies and DCA staff in regional offices do not know the programmes of other agencies well enough to make a well-founded comparison of PT1 with similar programmes of the sister agencies. There is consequently no basis for establishing what DCA is able to bring into the cooperation with sister agencies.

The need for using the same concepts and having compatible programme types, which will ease alignment and collaboration is recognized, but none of the sister agencies have allocated resources to ensure that their programme policies are coordinated with the programme policies of their partners.

Recommendation

3. In the reformulation of the PT1 policy DCA should attempt to use the terminology and the concepts used by sister agencies in order to facilitate future alignment and cooperation.

Results Achieved by the Political Space Programme

Despite the fact that DCA has a well-defined monitoring and evaluation system oriented at results and based on annual programme reporting, internal mid-term reviews and external evaluations it has not been easy to identify the results of the PT1 programmes with the exception of advocacy related results, such as policy change, passing of legislation, avoidance of restrictive NGO law etc. This is mainly because the ones writing these reports often tend to describe processes instead of measuring and describing results. It is surprising that the evaluations have been the least useful for identifying results.

The review team is of the opinion that the lack of capacity to use the monitoring and evaluation system is connected with the fact that the PT1 is very broad: The widely different programmes produce different kinds of results and make possibilities for cross-learning between programmes limited and make it impossible for programme type advisors to suggest standard ways to measure and describe results.

Despite these difficulties the team has found that the target group has in many cases been empowered by PT1 programmes. Often members of the
target groups have formed CBOs and where CBOs have already existed they have been strengthened. In some cases like in Central America it was found that the PT1 empowered and capacitated NGOs established by the target group and that these organisations have strengthened their administration and their advocacy and they have consequently been able to put their issues on the political agenda.

The documentary evidence furthermore indicates that some of the PT1 programmes have not received their most important results within the area of empowerment. Some of the programmes are in fact at some distance from the target group and many have not even involved representatives from the target group in the design of the programme. But these programmes have nevertheless through lobby and advocacy directed at national institutions achieved substantial results.

A response from Central America indicates that the DCA partner platform’s combination of organisations constituted by the target group on the one hand and organisations specialised in lobby and advocacy but not necessarily representing the target group on the other is fruitful. The advocacy organisations acting in the name of the impoverished and discriminated “assume that they represent the target group but they are not aware of the issues of the target group because they are staffed and led by people from a much different social background (middle or upper class based in cities). These organisations benefit from the interacting with the indigenous (and other) organisations which has made them realize that they need to know the target group better – and to take account of its real priorities.”

Recommendation

4. A reformulated PT1 policy should emphasize the importance of a partner platform combining organisations constituted by the target group – the impoverished and discriminated – as well as professional lobby organisations that might be working in the name of the target group.

Synergy with other Programme Types

It has been difficult to define PT1 thematically due to its very broad scope. Thus, the Political Space Programme Policy sees the programme as defined more by method than by theme.

It is a policy of DCA to provide rights-based assistance and the DCA programmes have for some time been moving from being needs-based to being rights-based. In this process the methods of the political space programme for strengthening the claiming and the upholding of rights like organisation of the target group, advocacy and lobbyism are relevant for other programme types that are in the process of becoming more effectively rights-based.

The team has found that these method and the approach have in fact influenced DCA’s other programme types at various levels (headquarters, regional and field).

At regional office level it is widely recognised that the PT1 has specific competencies. Nearly all find that advocacy is a specific competence of PT1. The two country offices that did not mention advocacy in the interview survey mention somewhat related competencies like awareness raising and community mobilisation. Specific tools like budget tracking are also mentioned by some and a few mention that PT1 is able to make a strong context analysis.
The PT1 has influenced other programme types and has been instrumental to the move towards rights-based programming at headquarters level.

A few regional offices see PT1 as just a programme in line with other programme types; most regional offices are of the opinion the PT1 has specific competencies or tools to bear on other programme types. In many countries PT1 have been able to apply their specific competencies and have contributed to the strategic directions of the interventions of other programme types. However it has been found that this potential synergy effect is far from fully realised.

Synergy between programme types is weak at field level. There are only a few cases, where the programme types have worked together. Most often lack of shared geographical coverage is the main problem.

Recommendation

5. DCA should consider more joint programming or a common framework for programming within a country to increase synergy between programme types.

Communication

The name “Political space” represents a challenge communication wise both at national and international level. At the same time, the name and themes covered by the PT1 programme are sensitive in certain contexts.

In general, there is a need for objective oriented communication strategies for the PT1 programme at national and at international levels.

Recommendations

6. At national level, it is proposed that objectives and a strategy for the Info Bank theme “Democracy” is prepared jointly between those responsible for the Info Bank and the PT1 Advisors. This would provide a natural platform for collaboration between the PT1, the Communication division, and the Information and Fundraising officers at the Regional Offices, who among other things will be responsible for delivering information from the field to the Info Bank.

7. At international level it is proposed that the PT1 POs review the need for strengthening the communication with partners and other actors, and accordingly develop target oriented communication strategies. (Steps in formulating a communication strategy is appended in Annex 5).

Joint Advocacy Theme

A joint advocacy campaign to counter the limited or shrinking political space experienced by all DCA partner countries aiming at explaining the positive role of civil society and creating the necessary space for undertaking this role is relevant. Collectively, the PT1 programme has experience and access to documentation and cases of best practice, and therefore in a good position to run a joint advocacy campaign if the necessary human capacity and financial resources are available.

Despite the fact that PT1 themes are not among the prioritised themes for Advocacy in DCA, the shrinking political space is a problem that affects all programme types, and it is proposed that the Advocacy Unit considers regarding this theme as an important ad hoc theme and that human resources are allocated to assist PT1 in preparing and implementing joint advocacy activities with the goal that governments in DCA partner countries adapt...
sound policies and legislation based on the rights and duties of Civil Society Actors.

The successful implementation of a joint advocacy campaign depends on thorough analysis of the causes and effects of the shrinking space in each region, timely planning, and availability of adequate human and financial resources.

Recommendation
8. If DCA decides to embark on a joint advocacy campaign it is recommended that PT1 in cooperation with the Advocacy Unit prepares an overall joint advocacy strategy with context specific inputs from the regions. This strategy could be implemented stepwise, i.e. starting with country specific research and then gradually develop country strategies, involving more and more countries as the results of implementation of initial strategies have been reviewed and adjusted.

The Need for a Sharper Focus
The very broad framework for PT1 presents an obstacle to programme management and programme development. DCA’s PT1 advisors cannot possibly acquire deep professional knowledge of the whole thematic field defined by the policy. They are bound to remain governance and human rights generalists. The obstacles to programme management, programme development is serious as these are the areas where DCA adds value and this points to the need for a much sharper focus for the PT1.

Recommendations
9. It is recommended to sharpen the focus of the policy framework for PT1. This could be done in two steps:
   i. DCA could define a thematic mainstream cluster that PT1 programmes should belong to and decide whether outliers should be phased out or move towards the mainstream cluster.
   ii. Within the mainstream cluster DCA could define sub-themes and approaches where it will focus further capacity development and programme development.

10. PT1 programmes in fragile states should if possible be within or close to the mainstream cluster, but they should have a large degree of flexibility to adapt to their context and to search for pragmatic solutions.
3. Introduction

The DCA Programme Type 1 - Political Space

The Political Space Programme of DanChurchAid (DCA) is a (demand-side) governance programme comprising human rights, including systemic discrimination (gender, indigenous people, Dalit) and budget monitoring. Political Space is named Programme Type 1 (PT1).

The other development programme types are Right to Food (PT3) and HIV/AIDS (PT5). DCA’s humanitarian assistance is composed of two programmes types namely Humanitarian Assistance and Humanitarian Mine Action.

It has been DCA policy to establish a PT1 programme in all focus countries and DCA consequently has more Political Space Programmes than any other programme type and PT1 is the development programme receiving the largest share of DCA’s development funds (23%). There are programmes in Guatemala, Zambia, Uganda, Ethiopia, Malawi, Palestine, Central Asia, Cambodia, India, Myanmar/Burma and the Regional Safe Migration programme in Asia. DCA also has political space projects in Honduras. However, it should be noted that some of the PT1 programmes are hybrids like in Uganda where a joint PT1/PT3 has been implemented and Sudan, where a more general programme has been implemented and Palestine where a country programme has been established (and where PT1 has been mainstreamed into the general programme).

Purpose of the Review and Methodology

This review is to undertake a systematic analysis of DCA’s Political Space Programme. The review will be the basis for designing a new programme policy in the second half of 2011. In 2012 six new programmes based on the new programme policy are to be designed.

The Terms of Reference specify nine objectives. The first two objectives are focused on relevance in view of the current situation for civil society engagement and how far the Political Space Policy is aligned with other ACT Alliance/APRODEV agencies’ governance-related policies. One objective deals with lessons learnt from Political Space programme evaluations and DCA Political Space Programme Midterm Reviews. Four objectives deal with overlaps and specialisation in relation to other DCA programme types. The last two objectives deal with communication and the possibilities for a joint ‘advocacy campaign’.

DCA has ambitious growth goals and any proposal on specialization needs to take account of this: turn-over was 361 million DKK in 2009 and DCA plans to increase this to 700 million DKK. In addition to this, DCA is working towards joint programmes with other ACT agencies in a number of countries, particularly with Norwegian Church Aid (NCA) and Christian Aid (CA). The implications for DCA programme policy and the need for specialization or not within the Political Space Policy and what DCA is able to bring to the cooperation has to be clarified.

In the inception phase a desk study of external evaluations and mid-term reviews of seven of the thirteen political space programmes were undertaken. This desk study focussed on results, especially how far the agency of the impoverished and discriminated has been strengthened. In addition to this the
review team has looked for assessments of synergies between programme types within a country/region.

In the main phase qualitative data was collected and pre-analysed through semi-structured interviews with staff at the DCA headquarters in Copenhagen and through Skype and telephone interviews with representatives from the ACT Alliance/APRODEV sister agencies. An interview survey was conducted with the implementers of PT1 programmes: the PT1 programme officer (PO) and the DCA regional representative (RR). The implementers first completed a questionnaire and when this was received a follow-up Skype interview was made. 11 PT1 programmes were covered (Myanmar/Burma, Cambodia, Central Asia, Ethiopia, Honduras/Central America, India, Malawi, Palestine, Sudan, Uganda, and Zambia). In addition to this documents were studied and an expert panel addressed some of the overall issues and provided guidance for the further process. It is important to note that this review is primarily based on the perceptions of DCA staff as expressed in interviews and documents. The team has not made any field visits and has not been able to consult various stakeholders in order to make reality checks.

The team developed a review matrix based on the objectives in the Terms of Reference. This has been guiding data collection.

Key to the ensuing analysis process has been a series of meetings involving the review team, the two DCA political space advisors, and other DCA staff members.

4. Focus and Conceptualisation of the Programme

Focus

The conceptual framework for the DCA Political Space Programme Type was developed based on research carried out by the then Danish Centre for Development Research which in 1998 was published the book entitled In the Name of the Poor: Contesting Political Space for Poverty Reduction. Since then the political space programme has undergone changes and the Political Space Policy was revised in 2007. The overall objective of the policy defines the essence of Political Space as a very broad demand-side governance programme:

“Impoverished and discriminated women and men have enhanced their capabilities and opportunities for upholding and claiming their right to participate for effecting social, political and economic change.”

The programme type is focussed around widening the political space for impoverished and discriminated women and men around three broad main themes: political participation; access to justice; and discrimination, including gender-based discrimination.

Though the overall objective could give the impression that the Political Space Programme Type only supports empowerment, the PT1 programmes in fact also support lobby and advocacy conducted by civil society organisations constituted by persons outside the target group.

This very broad framework has given rise to a wide range of programmes and when two other DCA programme types, Peace and Reconciliation and Access
to Basic Services, were “discontinued” the Political Space Programme Type simply subsumed some of their components.

The DCA programme advisors have made an analysis which is illustrative of the wide diversity of programmes. Based on a rough assessment they categorised the political space programmes according to thematic focus.

The categories related to **accountable governance** are:
- Political participation;
- Gender governance;
- Public expenditure and budget tracking;
- Accountable and inclusive public services;
- Local governance; and
- Media/right to information.

The categories relating to **access to justice** and **discrimination** are:
- Justice and security; and
- Violence, including gender-based violence

The first group of categories described as accountable governance; while the second group of categories are outside the core governance area and probably area would be more adequately described as pertaining to human rights.

Table 1 shows that the political space programmes are focussed on many different issues. The diversity (or lack of common focus) is actually larger than indicated in the table as some programmes have focus on issues not included in the table (e.g. the Uganda programme has a focus the right to natural resources).

Based on the overall objective of the political space policy which is focussed on empowerment of rights holders it could be expected that most projects would focus on accountable governance, however the political space programmes have stronger focus on justice and discrimination. This is summarised in Table 2 below where the highest indication of focus in the two main areas, accountable governance and justice and discrimination are indicated.

**Table 1: Thematic focus of political space programmes by sub category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Accountable Governance</th>
<th>Access to Justice and Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Participation</td>
<td>Gender Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low/Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In Table 1 the original assessment made by the PT1 Programme Advisors has been adjusted somewhat by the programme officer in Malawi as well as by the Review Team.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Accountable Governance</th>
<th>Access to Justice and Discrimination</th>
<th>Main Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low/medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low/Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Low/None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium/Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Low/Low</td>
<td>Medium/Low</td>
<td>Low/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR Congo*</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Safe Migration</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To explain how Table 2 was constructed take the example of the programme in India. For this programme ‘low/medium’ is indicated for two of the subcategories of political participation; ‘low’ is indicated for the other subcategories. Thus ‘low/medium’ is the highest indication for Political Participation. For the programme in India the indications for Justice and Discrimination subcategories are ‘high’ and ‘low’. Thus the Main Focus (the last column of Table 2) is ‘Justice and Discrimination’ for the programme in India.

Table 2: Thematic focus of political space programmes by main category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Accountable Governance</th>
<th>Access to Justice and Discrimination</th>
<th>Main Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Low/medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Access to Justice and Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Access to Justice and Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Equal weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Accountable Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Access to Justice and Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Accountable Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountable Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Access to Justice and Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Access to Justice and Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Accountable Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Equal weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Access to Justice and Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Access to Justice and Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Safe Migration</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Equal weight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rough categorisation made in tables 1 and 2 shows that:
- for four programmes the main focus is Accountable Governance;
- for seven of the programmes the main focus is Access to Justice and Discrimination with a fairly equal distribution between Access to Justice and Discrimination;

---

*The programme in DR Congo will expire by the end of 2011 or by mid-2012 if a no-cost extension is made.*
for three programmes there is equal focus on Accountable Governance on the one hand and Access to Justice and Discrimination on the other.

Based on this it can be concluded that focus of the PT1 programmes are fairly equally spread on the three broad main themes defined in the Space Policy: political participation; access to justice; and discrimination.

**Scope of PT1 programmes**

The political space policy defines a broad thematic framework for the PT1 programmes. The section above gives an indication of how broadly the thematic focuses are spread. The spread is actually wider than this because some programmes focus on issues not included in Table 1; e.g. the Uganda programme has its focus on the right to land.

Another indication of how widely spread the PT1 programmes is the wide range of target groups for the programmes. The target groups include internal migrants in Central Asia, marginalized pastoralists in Uganda, indigenous people in Guatemala and the most marginalized people living under Israeli military occupation in Palestine. The definition of the target group is often quite complex like in the Uganda programme the target group is defined as the most marginalized people in the Karamoja and Teso regions including the youth, women, mobile populations, pastoralist dropouts and those worst affected by the known natural disasters including droughts and floods, and those whose livelihood is at stake or grossly susceptible to vulnerability. In addition to this the PT1 programme in Uganda targets the displaced and recently resettled populations in Teso and Karamoja. In contrast to this the PT1 in Zambia simply defines the target group as poor rural women and youth, and the PT1 programme in Cambodia defines it as young women and girls affected by gender based violence.

A major part of the PT1 programmes (Myanmar/Burma, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Malawi, Sudan, Uganda, and Zambia) include activities beyond governance and human rights as they also include support to income generating activities, educational activities like literacy classes and provision of education equipment and improvement of teaching methodology. One programme includes aids prevention and environmental conservation.

The wide scope of the PT1 programmes within the field of governance and human rights and the consequences for value added and synergy between the programmes are issues that will be dealt with later. At this point we will just emphasize that the inclusion of non-governance issues in the PT1 programmes like livelihood and education makes management and supervision quite demanding. Programme officers and programme type advisors need to be well versed in these additional fields in order to ensure that the programme is professionally implemented.

**Recommendation**

6. DCA should undertake a critical review of the non-governance and human rights activities of the PT1 programmes like livelihood, education, aids prevention and environmental conservation.

---

3 Complex definition of target groups was never mentioned as a problem by the POs and the RRs interviewed by the review team.
4 Two of these PT1 programmes in question are recognized as hybrids or country programmes (Uganda and Sudan) and are therefore supported by PT3 and other programme type advisors.
5. Relevance

The Role of Civil Society

It has been widely recognised that civil society can play a key role for the development of democracy, for giving voice to the discriminated and for giving them opportunities, and for contributing to poverty reduction.

The aid effectiveness agenda has provided new challenges to civil society. It has led to pressures for civil society organisations to move out of the role as a implementers of development projects and service providers which according to this line of thinking mainly should be the role of governments. The aid effectiveness agenda has on the other hand attempted to strengthen civil society in the role of contributing to holding governments accountable. However, it is highly problematic that the donors, who are the drivers of the aid effectiveness agenda, push civil society into a specific technical role. Civil society should be diverse and should express all kinds of ideas.

In the 1990'es democratisation processes in many countries of the developing world opened space for civil society and many organisations were created. Some of the organisations worked on a rights base and some of these criticized government for not fulfilling a number of rights. But during the last decade more or less authoritarian states have challenged the civil society organisations (CSO) by implementing restrictive legislation and by otherwise restricting their room of manoeuvre. NGOs have often been seen as mouthpieces of the Western donors (that often finance them). These governments want NGOs to restrict themselves to needs-based service delivery and do not want rights-based assistance and advocacy on behalf of ‘rights-holders’, which they see as synonymous with politics, from them.

Limited or shrinking space for civil society is a major problem in practically all PT1 programmes. The PT1 programme officers and the DCA regional representatives have reported a wide range of problems related to governments that try to control or restrict the room of manoeuvre of the civil society organisations. Nearly all stated that limited or shrinking space for civil society is a major problem.

From Sudan it was reported that there is “fear among Civil Society organizations to engage with political issues like rights and access to justice – because the political space for civil society is limited.”

From one country it was emphasized that “There has never been an open space for civil society. The right for civil society to participate was only there on paper when a small window seemed to open. For the past couple of years it has become clear that the space for civil society has been shrinking. Civil society is regarded as opposition to government and it is not allowed to support human rights and advocacy.”

Only a programme in a country where the space is extremely restricted reported increasing political space for civil society: “There has been a significant increase in the number of national NGOs and CBOs in the last three years. The boundaries for what and how civil society can engage with in terms of community development and even empowerment are being pushed every month. There are no clear guidelines or streamlined enforcement of laws in the country, which in some cases gives opportunity for a widening space and in others less so. But the situation has improved even though the space available is still narrow and highly depending on the approval or ignorance by the government.”
Kyrgyzstan is the only country seeing the political space for civil society as open: “despite difficulties in Kyrgyzstan civil society has an open space – partners are free to do what they want. The situation is quite different in Kazakhstan, where the space is very limited.” However, a restrictive NGO law has been on the table. A new government might in the future try to restrict the political space for civil society.

Civil society organisations need space to perform their role and it is therefore essential for DCA to address the issues. The current situation seems bleak but the current Arab Spring does inspire civil society in many developing countries and the current trend could soon be reversed. Some of DCA’s partners are well positioned to fight for space for civil society. Church councils and other organizations with clear national constituencies might be the most effective defenders of the political space of civil society because they cannot easily be dismissed as mouthpieces of foreign interests. DCA’s role would be to provide training in advocacy techniques, linking partners from different countries etc.

**Current thinking on political change and poverty reduction**

Development research has tended to focus on structural factors suppressing the poor. The adherents of the theory of the neo-patrimonial state can be seen as belonging to this group. Such theories explaining why change is difficult (or not possible at all!) can help practitioners to look critically at their interventions. Based on the theory on the neo-patrimonial state practitioners can investigate how far local partner organisations have become subject to patrimonial relations etc. But such theories do not provide positive guidance to practitioners.

Among development researchers the most important trend in current thinking on political change and poverty reduction is to put emphasis on the various short-term opportunities that emerge and to put less emphasis on structural factors that are difficult to change.

Three examples of this trend will be presented: ‘drivers of change’, Centre for the Future State which has a specific focus on fragile states, and working with the grain.

The ‘drivers of change’ is based on the idea that particular actors, organisations, structures, etc. may have a particular potential for progressive change in the short run. It is an analytical approach developed within DFID to enable it to interact with the politics of development. At the heart of this theory is the proposition that reducing poverty is about intervening in historical processes and not simply rational planning. It reflects the wider recognition of the inherently political nature of development and poverty reduction. The theory is driven by the idea that each country has its own particular agents, institutions and structures that drive change, and these need to be understood and addressed.

In practice, the ‘drivers of change’ approach has led to the commissioning of broad-based country-specific political analyses to identify the drivers of

---

5 Direct involvement of DCA could be counter-productive as an example from India indicates: The government is very sensitive to critique of its treatment of Dalit and other minorities from DCA and other international organisations. It sees this as attempts at tarnishing its international image and it acts extremely defensively. However the same kind of critique coming directly from Dalit organisations is tolerated to a much higher degree.
change. The attempt to identify drivers of change furthermore signals the need to collaborate with elites, as well as important actors not typically involved in donor activities, such as political parties.

Evolving thinking within the drivers of change team (controversially) suggests that the initial focus should be on significant change and not pro-poor change per se, since it is not obvious in advance which sorts of progress are most favourable from the point of view of poverty eradication.

Research from the DFID-funded Centre for the Future State has a focus on fragile states and state building and emphasizes that donors need to stop viewing the world through the lens of the experience of the developed world, and instead look in a much more open-minded way at what is actually happening in a particular 'fragile' contexts.

It has been recognised that 'state building' is a local political process, that outsiders have limited influence on. Researchers argue that it is necessary to start to see elements of public authority being created in a great variety of ways, through the interaction of state and society, politicians and investors, formal and informal institutions. The key is to understand the incentives that drive elite interests, the way sources of revenue shape relations between governments and taxpayers, the relationship between people who hold political power and people who hold economic power, and the way informal 'traditional' institutions operate at a very local level.

While the orthodox approach of creating formal, rules based political and market institutions may be a valid long-term goal, it is ill suited to helping poor countries with weak governance to improve stability and security or to increase productive investment in the short to medium term. Assuming that 'west is the best', can get in the way of discovering more unorthodox, incremental ways of making progress.

Perhaps the single most important message for practitioners from this research is to think less normatively about what ought to be happening, and much more politically and historically about what is actually happening, why, and how to build on what is already working.

Work with the grain: A research initiative termed the Africa Power and Politics Programme whose central purpose is to generate a body of new knowledge on the difficult question of the way forward in African governance can be seen as the most recent branch of this trend. It recognizes that in most parts of sub-Saharan Africa most of the time; governance is failing to work for development. But although there is a long list of obstacles to be overcome including both the vested interests of powerful elites in the continuation of the present arrangements, and the mixed motives of the international community, the focus of the research projects is not on the elements of the situation that have to do not with power or ill-will, but rather with the lack of understanding and a shared inability to conceive alternative scenarios and pathways.

The researchers are dissatisfied with the conventional appeal for ‘good governance’ and would rather identify solutions that are ‘good enough’ to meet the immediate challenges facing Africa’s peoples. They find that institutions work better when they build on what exists, make use of indigenous institutional creativity or are otherwise rooted in their sociocultural context.
This is expressed metaphorically in the working hypotheses that better results are obtained by institutions that 'work with the grain' of the host society. In other terms, the researchers are interested in how Africa's own institutional resources and historical legacies might be harnessed for developmental purposes, rather than sidelined or viewed merely as barriers to changes whose desirability has been defined a priori.

Conclusion

It is essential for DCA to support civil society organisations addressing the issues mentioned in this chapter: development of democracy, giving discriminated and impoverished a voice, promoting accountable governance, and political space for civil society organisations. In fact all DCA's programme types, which now in principle are rights-based, address these issues from specific angles. However, PT1 is the only programme type able to address these issues comprehensively because it focuses on human rights including the right to participate. This does in other words indicate the need for a stand-alone PT1 with a focus on governance issues.

Important new trends in development research emphasize emerging short-term opportunities. They put less emphasis on structural factors that are difficult to change and look for pragmatic solutions that build upon what already exists. The poor are typically not the prime driver of change although they may be so under particular circumstances. Thus, while there is good evidence for putting emphasis on the poor’s agency at least in the long run, current discussions emphasize the windows of opportunity that might emerge, e.g. when ruling elites are regrouping and are open for certain changes.

The search for pragmatic solutions based on what already exists and the possibility to cooperate with a wide range of stakeholders is especially important in fragile states. For fragile states practitioners should build on what is already working and think less normatively about what ought to be happening.

This implies that a thorough analysis of the local situation and stakeholders (an analysis that might identify actors that are not easily classified into the duty bearer-rights holder dichotomy) is needed. The review team has observed that DCA in fact does undertake thorough context analyses for guiding the PT1 programmes and that some of these are of very high quality. On this point PT1 is in line with current thinking among development researchers.

The Political Space Policy’s focus on the agency of the poor as emphasized in the overall objective is less in line with current thinking which emphasize the various windows of opportunity that might emerge for other groups to take action. However, the PT1 is in fact not only focussed on empowerment it does include lobby and advocacy and the Political Space Policy does mention advocacy. Many of the programmes focus on both structural issues as well as on strategic short term opportunities like lobby in relation to new legislation and working with duty-bearers in a non-confrontative manner. A reformulated policy should take account of this situation by giving more equal weight to empowerment on the one hand and advocacy on the other.

Recommendation

7. In the reformulation of the PT1 policy DCA should take account of current thinking among development researchers by emphasizing ability (flexibility) to adapt programmes to the specific context, to exploit emerging windows of opportunity and to search for pragmatic
solutions especially in fragile states. In this connection advocacy and forging of alliances at various levels (local, national, regional and global) as an important means should be reflected.

6. Alignment with Sister Agencies

DCA’s sister agencies Christian Aid (CA), Norwegian Church Aid (NCA) and ICCO have or have had programmes that resemble PT1. Both CA and NCA have used the term accountable governance for programmes similar to but more narrowly defined than PT1 (roughly corresponding to the political participation theme). CA found that accountable governance has been a rather vague framework and now focus more on power. For NCA ‘Civil society for accountable governance’ was a thematic priority, but with the Global Strategy 2011-2015 accountable governance has become a part of the strategy for change. This means that accountable governance, which is seen as closely connected to rights-based approaches, now is an important method that is being mainstreamed into all other programmes.

ICCO has a much broader programme called Conflict Transformation & Democratization (CT&D) which roughly covers the same issues as the PT1 programme of DCA.

Comparing PT1 with the similar programmes of the sister organisations has proved to be difficult. POs and RRs who were asked to make a comparison mostly said that they did not know the programmes of sister agencies well enough to make a solid comparison. The ones who responded indicated that DCA has a stronger partnership approach and stronger ownership by partners and more emphasis on learning.6 They did in most cases not indicate a substantial difference between DCA’s programmes and those of sister agencies.

Likewise the key staff in these sister agencies interviewed stated that they do not have a clear view of DCA’s programmes and are not able to make a well-founded comparison between PT1 and their own comparable programmes.7 Key staff in sister agencies in principle recognize the need for using the same concepts and to have compatible programme types in order to ease cooperation and alignment but none of the organizations has the necessary resources to ensure that this is coordinated. One of the key staff found that collaboration has mainly been a means towards driving down costs and that there has been too little collaboration based on synergies and added value.

However, despite the fact that they use different concepts and define their programmes differently DCA, CA and NCA have managed to integrate their programmes and to establish joint programme offices in some countries. Due to flexibility among the partners it has been possible to do so without major difficulties.

---

6 This comes out most clearly in responses from Malawi, Sudan, Uganda and Central Asia.
7 They found that it is difficult to understand what the content of the political space programme is, but they also emphasize that it is difficult to explain what is meant by their own programme types like accountable government to people who are not specialists in the field of development.
Conclusion

Key staff of sister agencies and DCA staff in regional offices do not know the programmes of other agencies well enough to make a well-founded comparison of PT1 with similar programmes of the sister agencies. There is consequently no basis for establishing what DCA is able to bring into the cooperation with sister agencies.

The need for using the same concepts and having compatible programme types, which will ease alignment and collaboration is recognized, but none of the sister agencies have allocated resources to ensure that their programme policies are coordinated with the programme policies of their partners. However, despite differences experience shows that the sister agencies have been able to integrate programmes without major difficulties. This indicates that different concepts and different scope of programmes are not major obstacles for alignment and collaboration. DCA should however as far as possible attempt to use the terminology and concepts applied by sister agencies when the PT1 policy is updated.

Recommendation

8. In the reformulation of the PT1 policy DCA should attempt to use the terminology and the concepts used by sister agencies in order to facilitate future alignment and cooperation.

7. Results Achieved by the Political Space Programme

The review team has studied the external evaluations of the political space programmes in Uganda and Zambia as well as the mid-term reviews of the programmes in Uganda, Zambia, Ethiopia, Malawi, India, Guatemala, Cambodia and Central Asia. In addition to this the review team has interviewed PT1 programme officers and regional representatives of all DCA programme offices.

This review has focused on results, especially how far the agency of the impoverished and discriminated has been strengthened. In addition to this the review team has focused at assessments of synergies between programme types within a country/region.8

Unfortunately the only two available external evaluations (on Uganda and Zambia) have only made relatively superficial assessments of results. The mid-term reviews have had fewer or no resources for data collection and verification of information provided by partners and for deep analyses. However, some of them have nevertheless attempted to assess results of the programmes systematically.

This section shall present and analyze results from the PT1 programmes in countries where evaluations and/or mid-term reviews have been made, namely Uganda, Zambia, Ethiopia, Malawi, India, Guatemala, Cambodia and Central Asia.

The following section shall present a summary of a broader range of findings on all the above-mentioned programmes plus the programmes in Palestine.

---

8 The review team has also looked for documentation of synergy at the global level between programme policies but has not found any in the documents reviewed.
Myanmar, Sudan and Honduras primarily based on interviews with DCA’s regional offices and the annual reports from the PT1 programmes.

The programme in Uganda is a joint political space/right to food programme with the objective of enabling the agro-pastoral Karimojong to exercise their right to participate for increased influence and control over the distribution of resources.

The programme was designed on the basis of consultations with civil society organisations but the target group was not directly involved. NGOs and CSOs were seen as voicing needs and interests of the target group. Some of these organisations see themselves as representing segments of the target groups like an organization for pastoralists, women’s groups and a minority group organization.

The evaluation describes the following results related to food security:

- Resilience to drought due to treatment of animal diseases and better care of animals and cereal banking.
- Vegetable growing due to water harvesting.
- Increased status of women due to provision of goats.

These results are all in line with needs-based programming. The only result related to political space is that "A few women have been able to register land in their own names."

Interviews with the regional office identified an additional result in Teso (an area adjacent to Karamoja) where the target group has engaged with local government on service delivery based on budget monitoring methodology.

Furthermore the Evaluation emphasized that results in Karamoja were not achieved because people are extremely poor and their chief priority is securing basic needs for survival and just are expecting free inputs from NGOs.

The mid-term review has no information on results but adds that there is limited evidence of synergy with the other programme in the country, HIV/AIDS, mainly due to differences in geographical focus. It seems clear that this programme has had difficulties in moving from needs-based to rights-based programming. ⁹

The evaluation of the PT1 programme in Zambia makes a very positive assessment of results achieved by stating that “the program has been able to realise achievements which have resulted in rights holders claiming their rights. There have also been steps taken to change some laws that if and when the process is successfully completed will result into major changes in the status of marginalised and poor women. The programme has also contributed to broadening participation of citizens in political space by means of civic education in the in the targeted communities.”

Unfortunately the evaluation does not provide a critical assessment of facts that would substantiate the overall statements on rights holders claiming their rights though a few indicators are presented in the report like: “In Chief Monze’s chiefdom some women have been given land to grow their own choice of crops.” It does, however, point out why change is difficult and thus why only few results should be expected (refer to page 27 in the evaluation report).

⁹ The PT3 advisor dealing with the Uganda programme has corroborated the critical conclusion and has added that a re-planning of the programme is now on the table.
DCA in Zambia stated that although the PT1 programme was not formulated in consultation with representatives of the target group but with partners and other stakeholders it had contributed to empowerment of the rural poor. Some projects have promoted the participation of the poor in local decision making and in having their voices heard, through various mediums, most notably the community radios. Women in particular have made strides in their empowerment at community level.

The evaluation recognises (implicitly) that few partners reach the target group by stating that “There is a need to strengthen those organizations that actually reach the poor and vulnerable …”

The mid-term review found that synergy between programme types is more potential than real: “There is potential for a lot of synergy between the three programme types: Civil and political Space (PT1) Food security (PT3) and HIV and AIDS (PT4) … However, there have been limited efforts so far towards achieving synergy between the programmes …”

The political space programme in Ethiopia is strongly concentrating on economic and social empowerment. The mid-term review found that the model combining economic empowerment of women with social mobilization appeared successful. Positive results such as poor women and girls participating in decision making due to the programme intervention were identified.

Interviews with DCA Ethiopia corroborated this positive picture: representatives from the target group took part in formulation of the programme and women and girls have established self-help groups, groups with women monitoring harmful traditional practices have been established, and women have acquired a role within traditional structures.

The mid-term review also identifies synergy with the other DCA programmes, Food Security and HIV/AIDS.

DCA Malawi informed that the target group was not directly involved in the formulation of the PT1 programme in Malawi. However, the partners involved have a deep understanding of gender issues and have consulted with women in communities. They have among other things found that customary justice is important to them and the programme has accordingly been focussed on this.

DCA Malawi furthermore stated that the programme has contributed to establishment of committees at community level that have defined rights important to them and have attempted to hold politicians in local government accountable.

The mid-term review of the political space programme in Malawi corroborated this when it found evidence of groupings organised due to the programme like advocacy committees, water development committees at village level, women’s groups, and citizen’s forums. The report noted that members were called upon to assist traditional leaders in justice and domestic violence issues which could facilitate more gender and rights sensitive treatment and judgement in the long-term. The report also found that empowerment of women was emerging in some areas - but only in one area had the empowerment advanced to the stage of seeking redress for rights abuse. All in all, the programme’s result appeared rather weak and this could be partly explained by the fact that in some areas the target group had not been properly reached. Women did not seem to be proactively targeted in the sensitization activities and often chose not to attend the community meetings. "Many partners predominantly use broad-based community sensitization techniques and do not seem to proactively target and design their
sensitization activities to ensure the inclusion of the more marginalized within the community” (p 13).

DCA is implementing three programmes in Malawi: Food Security, HIV/AIDS and Political Space. However the lack of geographical overlap limits the synergy between them. Programme forums to promote learning across programmes and to enhance synergy have however been established. These forums have facilitated the use of expertise within the office on different technical areas and have led to joint activities across programmes.

DCA India has stated that the PT1 programme in India was formulated along with civil society organisations that work with the minority groups Dalit, forest dwellers and Muslims as well as with some organisations constituted by these target groups of the programme. The PT1 has greatly empowered the target group. E.g. Dalits have developed their own projects. Dalit women have set up their own small organisations etc.

The mid-term review of the political space programme in India observed the following key results:

- Speedy justice for Dalit, better working conditions for sewerage workers etc. due to public interest litigation
- Human rights education in the curriculum of some districts in Orissa
- New draft standards and a number of resolutions and calls by the European Parliament for action against caste-based discrimination due to Lobby/advocacy work at the UN and the EU.
- Dalit atrocities and human rights abuse, covered in the media, particularly at state level and in non-mainstream newspapers
- Increased availability of information materials against discriminatory discourse and communal violence
- Women’s groups (including of Muslim women) and committees formed
- Peoples’ tribal organisations strengthened

Though these results seem considerable it should be taken into account that the Review noted difficulties in identifying change as a result of activities. It should also be noted that only the two last points refer to the agency of the target group for the programme.10

The Review of the programme in India seems to be one of the few reports addressing communication issues. It is stated that almost all partners work on the media. “Most of this work is used to increase pressure on duty-bearers to respond. The Review Team heard of a number of cases where this strategy had yielded results, particularly at the local level and through local print media. However, there has been little change in the discourse of these media houses during the period.” (p. 14).

The Review recommends that the programme focus on strengthening work on access to justice for violations and atrocities based on Dalit, tribal, Muslim or gender identities and on furthering the political participation of these groups.

The Review found that although there is a potential for synergy between the political space and the other DCA programmes in India, Right to Food, this synergy has yet to be fully maximized. There are no links to the PT1

10 Comment from the RR of DCA India: In general DCA – and others- have had difficulties in attribution and documentation of impact of advocacy. Especially in countries where there may be people who have developed and own their social movements.
programme Safe Migration Programme, which includes India along with a number of other Asian countries.  

The target group of the PT1 programme in Central Asia, which is designated Access to Basic Services, is a mix of vulnerable children and their parents, elderly people and, internal migrants. DCA Central Asia has informed that partner organisations took part in formulating the programme and that some of the partners (30% roughly) are organisations established directly by the target group (e.g. an organisation established directly by internal migrants themselves, or another established by elderly people). According to DCA Central Asia the organisations established by the target group have been strengthened and been enabled to advocate for their rights. The mid-term review of the programme in Central Asia furthermore found that some groups had achieved access to services due to negotiations from partners. However, the degree this could develop into models for wider replication had yet to be established.

Work has been done in terms of documenting that lack of ‘propiska’ (a kind of ID card) is a major problem to migrants and partners had developed relationships with government officials. But the mid-term review does not indicate whether the programme has influenced laws and general administrative practices and whether this had led to outcomes for the target group.

Little seems to have been achieved in relation to agency of the poor, though the mid-term review indicates “some” mobilisation of migrant communities. It is also stated that there has been a considerable activity to form groups but that it is unclear how far these groups take responsibility for own development.

In Guatemala, where the final beneficiary group is indigenous people particularly women, the mid-term review of the programme in Guatemala identified the following key results:

- Establishment of a Commission for the Investigation of Impunity in 2007 – partly attributable to advocacy of a partner and other civil society organisations
- New Access to Public Information Act and the Framework Law for a National Security System among other things due to Partner contributions.
- Release of military files about the counterinsurgency strategy as part of major genocide case
- Partner invited to contribute to a Departmental Security Agenda on the invitation of the Ministry of Interior
- Halting of a permissive draft Law on Arms and Ammunition among other things due to partners.
- The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) has taken on 3 cases presented by partners around the right for indigenous peoples to be consulted on the use of natural resources.

However, the mid-term review found that despite these successes, there is no compelling evidence suggesting that access to justice for indigenous women is improving and racism and impunity is decreasing.

Comment from the RR of DCA India: The MTR should perhaps have looked more at potential synergies with the Right to Food Programme, India. Safe Migration programme has little geographical overlap – even in India – and different right holders all together
In relation to strengthening the agency of the poor and marginalised, particularly the indigenous population and indigenous women, the mid-term review found that local communities participated in elaboration of the documentation/cases and took first steps towards demanding their (collective) rights at the local level (p. 11).

The mid-term review found that the programme is strong on addressing institutional frameworks and contributing to changes in these but is weaker on ensuring access to justice at the community level for indigenous peoples. Many programme partners are skilled in human rights lobby and litigation at the regional and international levels. Only few partners working at the departmental level, although considerable effort has been made by the DCA office to encourage/facilitate links between national and local organisations. Consequently the mid-term review recommends a much stronger focus at the community level and more legal empowerment activities within indigenous communities.

There have been joint initiatives between PT1 and PT3 programme officers to develop synergy: joint monitoring visits and joint partner meetings. However, this has not been developed partly due to limited shared geographical coverage of the programmes.

The target group for the PT1 in Cambodia is young women and girls affected by gender based violence. According to DCA Cambodia the target group was not involved in the design of the programme but the target group has been empowered to take part in measures to prevent trafficking, in activities to raise awareness of GBV and trafficking, and in local government structures.

The mid-term review of the PT1 in Cambodia named “Reducing Gender Based Violence in Cambodia: A multidimensional approach to the Empowerment of Women” did not find solid indications of results but found that several partners and other stakeholders including local authorities report that domestic violence is on the decrease. There is also anecdotal evidence of higher awareness as well as increased engagement by some men.

An important contributing factor to this could very well be that the existence of the new domestic law has had an impact in challenging domestic violence as an internal issue in the family. However, programme partners continue to challenge the lack of implementation of this law as well as the anti-trafficking law and the civil procedure code.

Communication is also touched upon in this report as it is mentioned that awareness-raising through the media, drama and other innovative approaches, has increased understanding of human rights and gender equality. Some partners raise awareness in the radio about the international human rights instruments of preventing violence against women. However, the majority of vulnerable women and girls are illiterate and this limits their access to this information.

Is seems that there was no or little synergy between DCA programme types in Cambodia as the mid-term review found little evidence to suggest any systematic sharing across the three DCA/CA programmes. The mid-term review consequently recommends adaptation of a cluster approach to generate geographical synergy with the food security programme.

Conclusion

Despite the fact that DCA has a well-defined monitoring and evaluation system oriented at results and based on annual programme reporting, internal mid-term reviews and external evaluations it has not been easy to identify the
results of the PT1 programmes with the exception of advocacy related results, such as policy change, passing of legislation, avoidance of restrictive NGO law etc. This is mainly because the ones writing these reports often tend to describe processes or to write small essays instead of measuring and describing results. The reviews are not expected to engage in data collection, but it is surprising that the evaluations which by definition should focus on results have been the least useful for this exercise.

The review team is of the opinion that the lack of capacity to use the monitoring and evaluation system is connected with the fact that the PT1 is very broad: The widely different programmes produce different kinds of results and make possibilities for cross-learning between programmes limited and make it impossible for programme type advisors to suggest standard ways to measure and describe results.

Despite these difficulties it has been possible to identify results in relation to empowerment of the target group from the documentary evidence supplemented by interviews with POs and RRs. The team has found that the target group has in fact in many cases been empowered by PT1 programmes. Often members of the target groups have formed CBOs and where CBOs have already existed they have been strengthened. In some cases like in Central America it was found that the PT1 empowered and capacitated NGOs established by the target group and that these organisations have strengthened their administration and their advocacy and they have consequently been able to put their issues on the political agenda.

The documentary evidence furthermore indicates that some of the PT1 programmes have not received their most important results within the area of empowerment. Some of the programmes are in fact at some distance from the target group and many have not even involved representatives from the target group in the design of the programme. But these programmes have nevertheless through lobby and advocacy directed at national institutions achieved substantial results. This might in fact be the area where PT1 programmes have achieved their most substantial results.

A response from Central America indicates that the DCA partner platform’s combination of organisations constituted by the target group on the one hand and organisations specialised in lobby and advocacy but not necessarily representing the target group on the other is fruitful. The advocacy organisations acting in the name of the impoverished and discriminated “assume that they represent the target group but they are not aware of the issues of the target group because they are staffed and led by people from a much different social background (middle or upper class based in cities). These organisations benefit from the interacting with the indigenous (and other) organisations which has made them realize that they need to know the target group better – and to take account of its real priorities.”

**Recommendation**

9. A reformulated PT1 policy should emphasize the importance of a partner platform combining organisations constituted by the target group – the impoverished and discriminated – as well as professional lobby organisations that might be working in the name of the target group.

---

12 This is also related to partner monitoring reports and systems. DCA focuses on PME capacity-building but there is a long way to go before the majority of our partners can document at the outcome level, particularly on long-term processes covered under PT1 programmes.
8. Synergy with other Programme Types

It has been difficult to define PT1 thematically due to its very broad scope. Thus, the Political Space Programme Policy sees the programme as defined more by method than by theme: “The Political Space Programme, unlike other Programme Types within DCA, is less of a thematic focus and more of a methodological focus for supporting the widening of the political space for certain marginalized groups through institutional change, through changes in discourse, and through strengthened organizational practices.”

It is a policy of DCA to provide rights-based assistance and the DCA programmes have for some time been moving from being needs-based to being rights-based. In this process the methods of the political space programme for strengthening the claiming and the upholding of rights like organisation of the target group, advocacy and lobbyism are relevant for other programme types that are in the process of becoming more effectively rights-based.

The team has found that these method and the approach have in fact influenced DCA’s other programme types at various levels (headquarters, regional and field).

At the DCA headquarters the PT1 advisers have advocated for rights-based assistance and have helped some of the other programmes in the move from needs-based to rights-based assistance. One programme type advisor stated: ‘PT1 is sometimes seen as the rights-based aspect of DCAs programme, but this is not correct – all programmes are rights-based and they themselves ensure it. However PT1 has been an inspiration to this process.’ But another programme type advisor saw PT1 as decisive to the process of moving towards rights-based programming and stated: ‘DCA would not have had rights-based programmes without PT1!’ It is the assessment of the review team that PT1 has influenced other programme types to various degrees and that it overall has been instrumental to the move towards rights-based programming.

At regional office level it is widely recognised that the PT1 has specific competencies. Nearly all find that advocacy is a specific competence of PT1. The two country offices that did not mention advocacy in the interview survey mention somewhat related competencies like awareness raising and community mobilisation. Specific tools like budget tracking are also mentioned by some and a few mention that PT1 is able to make a strong context analysis.

In many countries PT1 have been able to apply their specific competencies and have contributed to the strategic directions of the interventions of other programme types. For Sudan it was stated that the PT1 programme has “contributed to ensure that all interventions are rights-based and that the approach is participatory. It is believed that all DCA’s programmes will have more impact if they are integrated with PT1.”

The regional office in Malawi also indicated a very positive influence from PT1: “it steps up quality of programming and supports the more strategic approach of empowering the beneficiaries to take control of their future. This moves programming away from only service delivery approaches.”

On the other hand a few regional offices see PT1 as just a programme in line with other programme types and thus not having a specific role in relation to the overall programming.
Regardless of the fact that it is widely recognised that PT1 programmes have specific competencies or tools to bear on other programme types it has been found that this potential synergy effect is far from fully realised. Many regional offices have indicated that such opportunities are missed. The response from e.g. Malawi indicates that “the potential for using the PT1 platform strategically also to air advocacy issues originating from the PT3 or PT4 activities is not fully exploited.”

The main reason for not exploiting synergetic effects between programme types seems to be that POs are too busy to cooperate. The response from Central America indicates that practical measures can be decisive: When different programme types in Guatemala got the same programme officer the synergetic effects were increased.

The reports reviewed as well as the interviews with country offices indicate that the synergy between programme types is quite weak at field level. There are only a few cases, where the programme types have worked together. Most often lack of shared geographical coverage is the main problem. Joint programming or a common framework for programming within a country would be the way to address this problem.

Conclusion

The PT1 has influenced other programme types and has been instrumental to the move towards rights-based programming at headquarters level.

At regional office level it is recognised that the PT1 has specific competencies or tools to bear on other programme types, however this potential synergy effect is far from fully realised. The main reason for not exploiting synergetic effects between programme types seems to be that POs are too busy to cooperate.

Synergy between programme types is weak at field level. There are only a few cases, where the programme types have worked together. Most often lack of shared geographical coverage is the main problem.

Recommendation

10. DCA should consider more joint programming or a common framework for programming within a country to increase synergy between programme types.

9. Communication

National level

A central information bank in DCA is the basic tool in the communication, advocacy and fundraising work at national level. The Info Bank is divided into various selected themes (Hunger, Climate, Humanitarian disasters, Demining, AIDS, and Democracy) and the target groups are selected stakeholders within the Danish public (young and elderly men and women, politicians, companies and media).¹³

The PT1 activities are grouped under the heading “Democracy”. The term “Political Space” is not considered expedient for external communication purposes as it is not easily understood by the target groups. Thus, for the time being, “Democracy” is accepted by the PT1 Programme Advisors,

although a more precise term covering the PT1 programme would be preferred.

Some of the challenges in communication of the PT1 to a wider public are:
- It is difficult to describe the programme concept and to document tangible results of most of the PT1 activities.
- Some of the PT1 themes are difficult to communicate openly and publicly in Denmark partly because the official representatives from some partner countries would limit the possibilities of operating in the countries, and partly because of political sensitivity in Denmark.
- The communication between PT1 and the media unit is limited, and the media unit does not always get important news and information on the PT1 activities.

In general, the review team has not been able to identify difficulties in communication of the PT1 programme concept internally in the organization, i.e. among Programme and Information staff, Advisors, Regional Representatives and Programme Officer.

Fundraising wise, communication of the PT1 activities are not considered suitable for initial donations, i.e. humanitarian disasters, hunger, etc. are more appealing to first time donators. Thus, information on PT1 activities is in most cases used for those who have been receiving information from DCA over a longer period.

**International level**

Most of the partner countries are as mentioned experiencing a shrinking political space, which among other things impedes open communication on the themes/activities covered by the PT1 programme.

In some countries, especially in fragile states, the name itself is sensitive in relation to authorities and some of the partner countries have chosen to use another name in order to avoid problems. This is accepted by the DCA and it does not in itself create internal communication problems. With the shrinking political space experienced by almost all partner countries, it is envisaged that the naming of the programme will raise the level of sensitivity, and all Regional Offices except one find that the PT1 should have another name depending on the focus/specialisation of the program.

Table 3 lists the alternative names proposed by the Regional Offices together with those that are currently used in some regions.

**Table 3: Proposed and presently used names for PT1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>PROPOSED NAME</th>
<th>PRESENTLY USED NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Civil and political rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Good Governance and Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Good Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Accountable Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>Access to basic services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Governance and Civic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Good governance/ Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Access to Social and Economic Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras/Guatemala</td>
<td>Political Space (No problem in using the generic name)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programmes in sister organizations (e.g. NCA, CAID, ICCO, FCA) similar to PT1 are termed Democratisation and Peace building, Accountable Governance/Economic Justice, Rights and Participation, Gender Justice (Gender based violence/Women in Governance), Human Rights/Democratisation. Irrespective of what the programmes are called, it is mentioned that often the organisations have to explain outsiders what their programmes are about.

In general, changing the name will not alter the fact that it is difficult openly to communicate the themes covered by the programme both in Denmark and in the partner countries.

Some Regional Offices experience a limited capacity among partners and other stakeholders to fully understand the essence of the programme and to translate the understanding of Rights Holders and Duty Bearers into something “realistic, meaningful and tangible”.

**Conclusion**

The above findings indicate that the name “Political space” represents a challenge communication wise both at national and international level. At the same time, the name and themes covered by the PT1 programme are sensitive in certain contexts.

There is little doubt that for communication purposes both nationally and internationally, it would be an advantage to find a name which

1. is compatible with the terminology used by other international agencies and alliance partners
2. can be accepted in most of the partner countries
3. is signalling the PT1 priority themes/objectives

To this end, the issue of specialisation or broadening the programme is of crucial importance. When goals, main focus/themes, main rights-holders and main duty-bearers have been defined in a possible reformulation of the PT1 programme, the process of identifying a new name would be easier. It should be noted that it might be difficult to find one name which serves the communication needs both at the national and at the international levels. It is the opinion of the review team that it is important to select a name or maybe two names that serves the individual purposes. In accordance with the choice of focus, the review team has suggested some names (see Chapter 11).

Irrespective of which name is chosen, it needs to be tested among selected stakeholders.

Although, a majority of the Regional Offices do not have problems in communicating the Political Space programme to partners several mention that some partners and actors have limited capacity to understand the essence of the programme. This emphasises the role of communication and the need for context related communication strategies.
Recommendations
To facilitate the communication on the PT1 programme and diminish the sensitivity caused by the name, PT1 should initiate a process of identifying a name based on the objectives and main themes defined in a possible reformulation of the programme (refer to Chapter 11 for proposed names).

In general, there is a need for objective oriented communication strategies for the PT1 programme at national and at international levels.

8. At national level, it is proposed that objectives and a strategy for the Info Bank theme “Democracy” is prepared jointly between those responsible for the Info Bank and the PT1 Advisors. This would provide a natural platform for collaboration between the PT1, the Communication division, and the Information and Fundraising officers at the Regional Offices, who among other things will be responsible for delivering information from the field to the Info Bank.

9. At international level it is proposed that the PT1 POs review the need for strengthening the communication with partners and other actors, and accordingly develop target oriented communication strategies. (Steps in formulating a communication strategy is appended in Annex 5).

10. Joint Advocacy Theme
There are mixed opinions on the advantages and possibilities of having a joint global advocacy campaign. Some find that a joint advocacy campaign would be quite ambitious and requiring resources that are not easily available while others find that the idea has interesting perspectives. A few of the respondents, however, have suggested a possible theme for such a campaign. Some of the suggestions are: “Citizens’ rights” or a campaign on “The Role of Civil Society”.

There is little doubt that one theme which is relevant for all partner countries is the shrinking political space in terms restrictive NGO-legislation resulting in harassments of human rights defenders and other civil society actors. The feedback from the Programme Officers’ meeting in Honduras in March 2011 also pointed to this issue focusing on two to three themes which would be relevant:
- “Human rights defenders (protection, strategic advocacy)”;
- “Strengthening of the democratic institutions (legislation, judicial reform)”;
- “Enjoyment of national resources”.

If relevant and if there is a momentum, it is assessed that target oriented joint advocacy activities might enhance the effect at global level. Such joint efforts provide opportunities of linking the various regions together, and they imply certain advantages in terms of exchange of documentation materials and best practice cases, exchange of experiences between the regions, and the possibility of developing mutual methodologies and strategies with common goals and indicators which eventually will facilitate the evaluation of the campaign.

It is our assessment that there are perspectives and that it would make good sense to embark on a joint advocacy campaign based on regional context related themes within the same goal, e.g.: A sound policy and legislation
based on the rights and duties of Civil Society Actors (human rights defenders, trade union, CBO, CSO, and NGO representatives, etc.) are adapted by governments in DCA partner countries.

A joint global advocacy campaign is a major undertaking requiring professionalism and adequate human and financial resources. In the first place, the PT1 would need the support of the DCA Advocacy Unit (recently termed Global Advocacy Strategy (GAS)) to plan and implement the campaign and to participate in advocacy at national as well as at the international level.

The resources of the DCA Advocacy unit are quite limited, and the main focus is on 4 themes (Climate change, Agriculture, Global Food Security, and Human Disasters) which do not include PT1 themes as such. The unit may, however, take up ad hoc themes if found relevant. The key target groups for Advocacy in DCA are the public in Denmark and Europe. The Advocacy Unit is not responsible for advocacy in partner countries, which is at the responsibility of the Regional Offices and local partners. The Advocacy Unit, however, may, if decided and planned, assist the Regional Offices in capacity building, forming strategies, etc. to the extent that such capacity is not available at regional levels. To this end, it should be noted that the DCA in cooperation with PACT and PCCD has published a manual on advocacy "The ABC’s of Advocacy" that among other things outline a strategic framework for advocacy campaign action plans.

Conclusion
A joint advocacy campaign to counter the limited or shrinking political space experienced by all DCA partner countries aiming at explaining the positive role of civil society and creating the necessary space for undertaking this role is relevant. Collectively, the PT1 programme has experience and access to documentation and cases of best practice, and therefore in a good position to run a joint advocacy campaign if the necessary human capacity and financial resources are available.

Despite the fact that PT1 themes are not among the prioritised themes for Advocacy in DCA, the shrinking political space is a problem that affects all programme types, and it is proposed that the Advocacy Unit considers regarding this theme as an important ad hoc theme and that human resources are allocated to assist PT1 in preparing and implementing joint advocacy activities with the goal that governments in DCA partner countries adapt sound policies and legislation based on the rights and duties of Civil Society Actors.

The successful implementation of a joint advocacy campaign depends on thorough analysis of the causes and effects of the shrinking space in each region, timely planning, and availability of adequate human and financial resources.

Recommendation
9. If DCA decides to embark on a joint advocacy campaign it is recommended that PT1 in cooperation with the Advocacy Unit prepares an

---

overall joint advocacy strategy with context specific inputs from the regions. This strategy could be implemented stepwise, i.e. starting with country specific research and then gradually develop country strategies, involving more and more countries as the results of implementation of initial strategies have been reviewed and adjusted.

11. The Need for a Sharper Focus

The very broad framework for PT1 presents an obstacle to programme management and programme development. In Chapter 7 the lack of capacity to use the monitoring and evaluation system and the ensuing difficulty in identifying the results of the widely different programmes was identified. It was argued that this is connected to the fact that the PT1 programme type spans many widely different programmes and therefore produces many widely different results difficult to monitor. The poor monitoring renders results-based management impossible. One symptom of this is the difficulty to aggregate results for DCA’s annual report.

The broad framework covering most of the wider governance and human rights field also impedes programme development. DCA’s PT1 advisors cannot possibly acquire deep professional knowledge of this whole field and they cannot keep themselves abreast with developments within the field, be conversant with the relevant tools etc. They are bound to remain governance and human rights generalists.

Each one of the PT1 programmes within the broad PT1 policy framework is thematically focussed (and therefore manageable from the point of view of the PO), but cross-learning between PT1 programmes is difficult. Among the broad bouquet of PT1 programmes exchange of experiences and cross-learning easily becomes diffuse and less relevant unless it is kept on a very general level. Thus, when the PT1 programmes meet they discuss and exchange experiences on very general issues like methods for advocacy, for monitoring and how to approach rights-based assistance. In other words: the synergy between this broad bouquet of PT1 programmes is – and is bound to remain – limited.

The broad bouquet of diverse PT1 programmes is bound to encounter a wide range of very different issues to be addressed through advocacy at regional and global levels. A series of more similar programmes would encounter more related issues and be able to produce compatible evidence for regional and global advocacy from a number of countries.

The obstacles to programme management, programme development and to advocacy is serious as these are the areas where DCA adds value. A study of value added through DCA’s partnership approach identifies the key areas where value is added as: policy and strategic development, the programme approach with partner platforms, and engagement in evidence-based advocacy through vertical links from grass roots level through partner organisations to national, regional and global level. As value added is a \textit{raison d’être} for DCA this points to the need for a much sharper focus for the PT1 to overcome the obstacles identified. Then how could PT1 be focussed?

When the review team suggested a much sharper focus based on developing a future PT1 into either an accountable governance programme or an access

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textit{15} This is based on a critical interpretation of this study which includes a broad range of areas where value is added. But some of these are questionable, e.g. even flexible funding is seen as a value added.
\end{flushright}
to justice programme DCA indicated that the organisation prefers a process of gradual change of the existing PT1 programmes. The review team therefore suggest that DCA takes two steps to sharpen the focus. The first step is to identify similar programmes and to map clusters of similar programmes. The programmes that do not belong to a cluster are the outliers. DCA should decide either to phase these programmes out or to make them similar to clustered programmes. This process is outlined below where clusters and outliers are preliminarily identified on the basis of the information in Table 4.

Table 4: Thematic focus and target group of political space programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Accountable Governance</th>
<th>Access to Justice and Discrimination</th>
<th>Target group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Participation</td>
<td>Gender Governance (political participati on)</td>
<td>Public Expend. and Budget Tracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Low/- Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low/- Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia safe migration</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar/Burma</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PT1 programmes in Malawi, Ethiopia, Zambia, Cambodia and DR Congo can be seen as a cluster. All these programmes target women and girls, all of
them have a strong focus on justice & security as well as on violence – especially on gender-based violence.

The PT1 programmes in India, Guatemala and Honduras can be seen as another cluster targeting excluded or discriminated groups including women with a main focus on justice and security. The second cluster can be seen as close to the first cluster, or they could be seen as forming a greater ‘mainstream cluster’ of programmes targeting excluded groups including women with a thematic focus on access to justice and discrimination.

The PT1 programme in Central Asia and the Asia safe migration programme are outliers. The Central Asia programme targets internal migrants or internally displaced persons and its thematic focus is accountable and inclusive public services. The Asia safe migration programme targets international as well as internal labour migrants and its thematic focus is also accountable and inclusive public services. DCA should phase out these outlying programmes or if possible move them into the main cluster of PT1 programme.

The programmes in Palestine, Sudan, Uganda and Myanmar/Burma are hybrid programmes or programmes where PT1 is integrated into wider country programmes. The Palestine is relatively close to the mainstream cluster due to its targeting of women and its thematic focus access to justice and discrimination. The programme in Uganda is an outlier as it targets a complex group and focuses thematically on the right to natural resources (not included in Table 4), accountable and inclusive public services and budget tracking. It has recently been decided to split the hybrid programme into two. A new PT1 programme should be established within or close to the cluster of main-stream programmes.

The programmes in Sudan and Myanmar/Burma target very broad groups and their thematic focus does not correspond to that of the mainstream cluster. If possible they should move towards the mainstream cluster. However, Sudan and Myanmar/Burma are fragile states. This means that these programmes should have a large degree of flexibility to adapt to their context and to search for pragmatic solutions.

Many of the programmes in the mainstream cluster focus on specific sub-themes and most of them address these sub-themes in similar ways. One of the sub-themes many PT1 programmes have focused on is gender-based violence. A second step for focussing PT1 should therefore be to identify and detail the approaches and sub-themes of the PT1 programmes within the mainstream cluster. DCA should then decide which of these sub-themes and approaches it will develop.16 This will identify the specific areas where the PTAs and the POs will develop their capacity further. It will furthermore be a catalogue for formulating new programmes where the current policy just

16 At a meeting in Honduras in March 2011 the POs for PT1 suggested that a future PT1 policy should include the following themes:

1. Citizen participation (Freedom of expression, right to assembly, freedom of association, right to information, access to information),
2. Access to justice
3. Accountable and inclusive public services (distribution of national resources)
4. Gender justice - a) Political participation for women (gender), b) Gender based violence

These themes could be a starting point for the second step of the focusing process. However, it is necessary to detail the four themes much further.
defines a very broad thematic area and does not provide any handles on how new programmes could or should be formulated.

### Table 5: Possible Names for an Updated PT1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>DANISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountable Governance and Access to Justice</td>
<td>Demokrati / Ret til indflydelse / Indflydelse for alle - og Lige ret for alle / Retfærdighed for alle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The English terms are compatible with the terminology used by other international organizations and can easily be understood internationally.

It is a bit more difficult to find Danish terms. The selection of the above proposed names are based on their simplicity to communicate, realizing that it is not possible to find one name which covers the full PT1 programme and the fact that the concepts cannot be translated directly from English to Danish.

The word "Demokrati", which is presently used to cover the PT1 programme, is a term that is understood by most Danes, and therefore suitable to be used in a Danish context although the connotation of "demokrati" refers to a specific political system that might not be compatible with the systems or programmes in the partner countries. But basically it covers both the governance and participation themes. The terms "Ret til indflydelse" or "Indflydelse for alle" are straight forward and reflect the right holders’ right to participate in the political, socio-economic, and cultural life. Thus, these terms signal a broad perspective within participation, but are focusing less on the governance theme. It should be noted that MSActionAid is using the term "indflydelse" in marketing its democracy programme. It might be an advantage that Danish NGOs are using the same terms to cover the same type of programmes but it may also cause some problems in branding the different NGOs.

"Lige ret for alle" is a straight forward and easy understandable term covering the "Access to Justice" theme. "Retfærdighed for alle" is also a possibility but "Lige ret for alle" signals a known concept which "Retfærdighed for alle" does not quite do.

### Recommendations

11. It is recommended to sharpen the focus of the policy framework for PT1. This could be done in two steps:
   i. DCA could define a thematic mainstream cluster that PT1 programmes should belong to and decide whether outliers should be phased out or move towards the mainstream cluster.
   ii. Within the mainstream cluster DCA could define sub-themes and approaches where it will focus further capacity development and programme development.

12. PT1 programmes in fragile states should if possible be within or close to the mainstream cluster, but they should have a large degree of flexibility to adapt to their context and to search for pragmatic solutions.
12. Consequences of a Sharper Focus for Global Funding

DanChurchAid follows a growth strategy and in order to grow DCA needs to acquire funding from international donors (in addition to funds collected in Denmark and funds provided by Danida through a framework agreement). Typically a (PT1) programme in a country applies for additional funding from international donors for activities within the thematic area or close to where it already operates.

The review team is of the opinion that a narrowing of the thematic focus will not necessarily limit possibilities for funding. First and foremost it should be understood that the policy for a programme type is only indirectly determining funding possibilities. The policy defines the framework for PT1 programmes in the various countries which are much more focussed than the framework. These more narrowly focussed programmes are the basis for applications for additional funds – not the policy. (An application for funds refers to the existing programme and the programme document could be annexed, it would not be relevant to annex the programme policy.)

![Diagram of Broad Policy framework and Focussed Policy framework](image)

Compare the situation of a programme within a broad policy framework and a programme within a more focussed policy framework as described in the drawing above. If Programme C in the broad policy framework applies for additional funding it will do so for activities within fields where it is already active or for activities adjacent to these fields. It would not be relevant to apply for funds in areas that are far from these fields even though this would still be within the policy framework.

Now look at Programme C in the focussed policy framework. If Programme C in the more focussed policy framework applies for additional funding it will likewise be able do so for activities within fields where it is already active or for activities adjacent to these to these fields. Thus, in this sense a more focussed policy framework does not limit funding possibilities.\(^{17}\)

\(^{17}\) It has been stated that a more focused policy would result in a situation where more PT1 programmes compete for a global call. But as DCA is a relatively small global player the effect of this seems to be limited.
DCA’s Global Funding Unit agrees with this analysis but adds that country programmes tend to choose a thematic focus (place themselves) where there is possibilities for funding. With a more narrow policy framework DCA will have less room for manoeuvre for defining a new PT1 programme or move an existing programme to where the best funding possibilities are. Thus, a more focussed policy framework narrows the possibilities for placing new programmes where funding possibilities are best.

On the other hand a more focused policy framework will as argued increase value added and give the PT1 programmes a sharper professional profile. This will increase the success rate for applications.

The review team would tend to see these tendencies as outweighing each other, while DCA’s Global Funding Unit is of the opinion that a more narrow policy framework might limit funding possibilities.
Annex 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

REVIEW OF THE DCA PROGRAMME TYPE POLITICAL SPACE

BACKGROUND

DanChurchAid (DCA) has Political Space programmes in Guatemala, Zambia, Uganda, Ethiopia, Malawi, Palestine, Central Asia, Cambodia, India, Myanmar and the Regional Safe Migration programme in Asia. DCA also has political space projects in Honduras. The Political Space Programme Type (PT1) focuses on discrimination, political participation and access to justice issues. It supports most of DCA’s governance and human rights work, including work on systemic discrimination (gender, indigenous peoples, Dalits) and national and district budget monitoring. It is the Programme Type that receives the largest share of DCA’s development funds. It is the also the Programme Type that in terms of partnerships and focus is strongest in national advocacy, gender and human rights work.

Research contributing to DCA Political Space Programme Type

The conceptual framework for the DCA Political Space Programme Type was developed based on the results of research carried out by the then Danish Centre for Development Research under their LORPA research programme. This research programme had as the overall objective “to analyze and assess the role and capacity of different types of local organizations to bring about poverty reduction” (Webster 1998: 7). Much of this research was published in a book entitled In the Name of the Poor: Contesting Political Space for Poverty Reduction which was edited by Neil Webster and Lars Engberg-Pedersen from the then Danish Centre for Development Research. In the formation of the Political Space Programme Strategy, the Danish Centre for Development Research provided comments and advice on the manner in which these research conclusions could be formulated into an operational strategy. DCA has worked at ensuring that its emerging thinking on rights-based development was incorporated into this conceptual framework.

DCA Political Space Programme Policy taking on new components

Since the policy formulation, many other considerations have been taken into the programme policy. Two other DCA programme types, Peace and Reconciliation and Access to Basic Services, were “discontinued” and it was suggested that the Political Space Programme Type subsumed some of the components that were under the aforementioned programmes. In addition, there was a strong intention from the start of programme policy development around Political Space, that DCA’s work on the “political diakonia” of churches and church organisations be emphasised in this programme type together with a strong focus on national gender policy work. Furthermore there is a call for an inclusion of a focus on particular governance issues in “failed states” or states with “failed governance”.

The Political Space Programme, unlike other Programme Types within DCA, is less of a thematic focus and more of a methodological focus for supporting the widening of the political space for certain marginalised groups through institutional change, through changes in discourse, and through strengthened organisational practices. In contrast to
the original conceptual frame of the LORPA study, DCA has included protection/security interventions (physical, legal, economic etc.) based on the premise that marginalised groups will a) find it difficult to maintain mobilisation activities without their security/protection needs having been met b) for ethical reasons i.e. to ensure that protection/security is available to groups that are advocating/mobilising for social, economic and political changes.

Communication challenges in current Political Space Programme Type
However, internally within DCA, there has increasingly been a concern that the Programme Type Political Space is not tangible/concrete enough to communicate to a wider public or even to our own colleagues. This has been reflected in the number of titles given to this programme within the organisation i.e. human rights programme, democratisation programme, good governance programme etc. In addition, in some country programmes, there has been a concern that the term Political Space suggests involvement in party politics and is too overtly political in its name (e.g. for the programme in Burma). Other names/titles have been given to the programme in countries e.g. Access to Social and Economic Justice (India), Access to Justice (Guatemala), Access to Basic Social Services (Kyrgyzstan) etc. DCA’s position on this has been that once the overall policy framework was maintained, countries could choose a more context-specific and sensitive title.

Harmonisation with ACT Alliance/APRODEV sister agencies
At present, there is also a call for specialisation within DCA and that DCA’s policies are harmonised/co-ordinated with other ACT/Aprodev sister agencies (e.g. Christian Aid, Brot Für die Welt, Norwegian ChurchAid, ICCO, FinnChurchAid, Church of Sweden). Any changes in DCA policy intents should therefore take into consideration this aspect.

To date, there has never been a systematic analysis of DCA’s support to Political Space interventions. In view of the fact that six Political Space Programmes are to be evaluated in 2010/2011, DCA views it as opportune to carry out a review of its Political Space Programme interventions, including the recommendations from the six external evaluations that will be carried out.

CONTRACT OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED RESULTS

Objectives:
a) Assess whether DCA’s Political Space Policy is still relevant in view of the current situation for civil society engagement and any larger geo-political changes; and is in keeping with current thinking and evidence-based research.
b) Assess the degree to which DCA’s Political Space Policy is aligned with other ACT Alliance/APRODEV agencies’ governance-related policies.
c) Assess actual and potential synergy between the various DCA Political Space Programmes.
d) Assess potential overlaps between DCA’s Political Space Programme Type and other Programme Types in DCA and the key added value of a stand-alone Political Space Programme Type.
e) Assess whether a further specialisation is needed within the Political Space Policy, taking into consideration other DCA Programme Types, key added value, actual/potential synergy within DCA Political Space Programmes, and areas evaluated where DCA’s Political Space partners and DCA have developed particular skills/competencies.

f) Assess the consequences of any further specialisation and suggest a potential way forward that respects DCA’s commitment to rights-based partnerships.

g) Summarize key lessons learned and recommendations from the Political Space programme evaluations and DCA Political Space Programme Midterm Reviews.

h) Take into consideration issues regarding communication of the Political Space Policy.

i) Assess possibilities for having a joint ‘advocacy campaign’ that can be the same in all DCA countries, suggesting possible themes for this campaign and any organizational implications.

Results to be achieved by the consultant:

1. Produce preliminary Review Report for comments by DCA Programme Type Advisors and Task Force
2. Preliminary Debriefing session with DCA
3. Review Report
4. Final Debriefing session with DCA

SCOPE OF THE SERVICES

The consultant/consultancy firm will be hired to work closely with the two DCA Political Space Advisors and a Task Force, consisting of two DCA Regional Representatives and two DCA programme Officers, to carry out an external review of the DCA Political Space Policy and Programmes.

The consultant/consultancy firm will produce a desk review report.

METHODOLOGY

It will be the responsibility of the External Consultant to finalise the methodology in collaboration with the two Political Space Advisors and the Task Force. While it will be the responsibility of the External Consultant to develop the final report and recommendations, it is expected that the Political Space Advisors and local programme officers actively participates in the review team.

With regard to the methodology, DCA requires the following:

- That a facilitation takes place where DCA Political Space partners are actively involved in the review process and in the recommendations
- That the methodology is participatory and facilitates organisational learning
- That the methodology facilitates involvement of regional offices, including local PT1 programme officers, in an efficient and non time-consuming manner
That the methodology chosen ensures that inputs are received from:

- relevant DCA staff, including respondents from the National Department
- external stakeholders
c- other ACT Alliance/APRODEV agencies

That the methodology is largely based on document reviews, skype interviews and face-to-face interviews with DCA HQ staff. The following should be included: Political Space Programme Officers, DCA Political Space partners, DCA Regional Representatives, Programme Type Advisors, DCA Management, Representatives from DCA National Dept. especially Communications Group.

That a specific emphasis is laid on drawing on lessons learned and recommendations from the Political Space programme evaluations taking place in 2010 and DCA Political Space Programme Midterm Reviews.

That DCA Review Guidelines are drawn upon where relevant for this specific exercise

**MATERIAL**

The consultant will as a minimum read and analyze the following documents:

- DCA Global report 2008 and 2009
- DCA Political programme documents from Guatemala, Zambia, Malawi, Uganda, Ethiopia, Cambodia, India, Palestine, Central Asia, Sudan, Burma, Congo, Kyrgyzstan
- All Political Space Programme Mid-Term Review and Programme Evaluations
- Annual Programme Reports from the above mentioned countries.
- DCA Political Space Policy and other Programme Policies
- DCA Gender and Rights Audit Report
- Relevant Programme Policy papers from ACT Alliance/APRODEV agencies
- DCA Vision and Plan 2011-15
- Evaluation: “DCA Partnership Approach – any Added Value?”

**TIMING, LOGISTICS AND FACILITIES**

The contract will begin 1 January 2011 and will be finalised 1 June 2011. Period of implementation is thus January until May 2011.

The contract will be carried out partly in consultant’s own home country and partly in Copenhagen in DCA Headquarters for interviews, debriefing and meetings with DCA.

The consultant will carry out a desk study, so there will be no field visits as part of the task.

The consultant will be expected to work from own office. However, office space for interviews, skype conversations and meetings can be provided by DCA.

After the final report has been approved by DCA, a final debriefing session with DCA stakeholders will be organised by the consultant in collaboration with DCA Programme Type Advisors on Political Space.

**REPORTING**

One Short Review Report in English with key findings and recommendations, including specific recommendations for any future specialisation within DCA’s Political Space Pol-

QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The External Consultant must have:

- A university degree in development studies or a related field
- Good interpersonal and communication skills
- Be flexible, self motivated and able to organise work independently
- At least 5 years experience in development projects and programmes centered around good governance and democracy, particularly from the perspective of particularly discriminated groups
- Strong competencies in gender governance work and in integrating human rights into governance projects and programmes
- Knowledge of Paris Declaration and Post-Accra process is desirable
- Fluent command of both written and verbal English.
- International field experience
- Experience of working with and assessing governance projects and programmes of civil society organisations
## Annex 2: List of Persons Consulted

### EXPERT PANEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lars Engberg-Pedersen</td>
<td>Ph.D. Senior Researcher, Danish Institute for International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Peter Dejgaard</td>
<td>Consultant Inka Consult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TASK FORCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cecilie Bjørnskov Johansen</td>
<td>Head of Programme Policy, International Department, DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Rask</td>
<td>Advisor Political Space and Rights based Commitment, International Department, DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Rosenkilde</td>
<td>Advisor Political Space Programme, International Department, DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berit Gade</td>
<td>Administrator, International Department, DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Elona Ellinger (skype interview)</td>
<td>Regional Representative, South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopika Dass Elmegaard (Skype interview)</td>
<td>Regional Representative, Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Murru (Skype interview)</td>
<td>Programme Officer, Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome d’Souza (Skype interview)</td>
<td>Programme Officer, South Asia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DCA COPENHAGEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birgitte Quist Sørensen</td>
<td>International Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Løkkegård</td>
<td>Global Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbeth Engbo</td>
<td>Head of Media Division, Communication Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Henry</td>
<td>Relief Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilie Bjørnskov-johansen</td>
<td>Head of Programme Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stine Leth Nissen</td>
<td>Head of Advocacy, Communication Department (now GAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malene Haakonsson</td>
<td>International Advocacy Advisor, Communication Department (now GAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mads Klaestrup Kristiensen</td>
<td>Head of Communication Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semine Bojsen Hansen</td>
<td>Programme Documentation Officer, International Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Duelund Jensen</td>
<td>Head of Unit, Global Funding Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Kamp Butzbach</td>
<td>Head of Supporter Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carsten Høj</td>
<td>ACT Alliance Coordinator, Global Advocacy and Strategy Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steffen E M Rasmussen</td>
<td>Programme Advisor for Food Security, Organisational Development and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsebeth Gravgaard</td>
<td>Programme Advisor for Gender and HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Ringgaard</td>
<td>Humanitarian Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Duelund Jensen</td>
<td>Head of Global Fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mette Lund Sørensen</td>
<td>Programme Advisor for Food Security and the Right to Food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REPRESENTATIVES REGIONAL OFFICES (QUESTIONNAIRES/SKYPE INTERVIEWS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mads Lindegård</td>
<td>RR - Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Majaj</td>
<td>PO – Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome d’Souza</td>
<td>PO – South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeta Sharma</td>
<td>PO – South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadja Saracini</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator - Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antony Grange</td>
<td>RR - Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Kapwepwe/Caroline Sekyewa</td>
<td>PO – Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Carmen Murru</td>
<td>PO – Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uffe Gjerding</td>
<td>RR - Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Sein Dwe</td>
<td>PO – Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonas Nøddekær</td>
<td>RR - Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholpon Akmatova</td>
<td>PO – Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatiana Zorina</td>
<td>PO – Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michel Ouko</td>
<td>PO – Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna Abate</td>
<td>PO – Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilie Winter</td>
<td>RR – Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugede Chiumya</td>
<td>PO – Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Pineda Hansen</td>
<td>RR – Central America, Hounduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Verónica Ágreda Ajquí</td>
<td>PO – Central America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Notes on Sister Agencies

Norwegian Church Aid:
For NCA ‘Civil society for accountable governance’ was earlier a thematic priority, but with the Global Strategy 2011-2015 accountable governance has become a part of the strategy for change. This means that accountable governance, which is seen as closely connected to rights-based approaches now is a method that is being mainstreamed into all other programmes. Public expenditure tracking was a tool used by the former programme. This tool is now to be used by the other programme types.
The five thematic programmes of NCA (of which the first two broadly speaking correspond to PT1) are: The Rights to Peace and Security, Gender Justice, Economic Justice, Climate Justice, and Right to Water and Health.
Three NCA thematic advisors focus on areas that correspond to PT1: One deals with women in governance, one deals with economic justice, and one deals with gender-based violence.
In addition to this NCA has a Development Policy Division focussing on influencing decision making in Norway and at international level with 6-8 people. The two priorities for advocacy are climate justice and tax justice.
NCA strength: NCA sees itself as having a particular strength in the area of gender-based violence, where its particular strength is awareness raising, and it is somewhat weaker in relation to the juridical aspects. Budget tracking (for example in Tanzania) is also a strength as is women’s participation (Mali and Bangladesh).
Coordination/alignment: High on the agenda should be coordinated actions to address the issues of shrinking political space, which is a reality in many countries. This undermines the way we operate especially our efforts at making the assistance rights-based. There is a definite need to take common action. Too little has been done up to now, but the working groups under ACT could become arenas for coordination of common action. The ACT working group on aid effectiveness plans to address the issues of shrinking political space.
Future perspectives: NCA challenges now are: to mainstream accountable governance and rights-based work; to establish complaint procedures and to be more transparent; and to be better at strengthening civil society (our partners) – which is a priority for NCA’s main partner, Norad).

Christian Aid:
For CA ‘accountable governance’ has been a thematic focus area since 2005. The management of CA’s programmes is undertaken by geographical divisions within the headquarters. From headquarter level one advisor (with some support from the policy division) is coordinating and supporting the accountable governance interventions.
Accountable governance has been a rather vague framework, which has, however, been made clearer along the way. CA now functions on relating the whole issue to power. The decisive points in the analyses made are: who holds power? - and who has a power deficit?
Strength: CA sees itself as having a particular strength in India (around caste exclusion), Palestine (international advocacy to keep the pressure up and to involve political parties and church leaders), Central America (macro-economic issues and political participation) and the DR Congo (civil society strengthening for political participation and accountability.
Perception of DCA: DCA may have a specialization in relation to its sister agencies: If DCA is developing specialisms this is not (yet) clear to the
sister agencies. “DCA does not feature prominently on our radar.” Programmatic collaboration is limited (with the exception of Central America).

DCA supported programmes do not necessarily have the scale or the level to carry real weight and influence, although the potential is there. **Coordination/alignment:** Too little effort has been placed on sharing our specific analysis; collaboration is often a means towards driving down costs and there is too little collaboration based on synergies and added value. I suspect there will be only relatively small differences but there is insufficient sharing of frameworks and strategies. Things may happen at country-level but this is not done systematically. **Future perspectives:** We will continue to focus on governance, especially since our new strategy is likely to be formulated around “power”. We tend to be stronger on NGO capacity building and working with national NGOs on governance but less on specific conflict issues (apart from DRC and Palestine).

**ICCO**

ICCO has a programme called Conflict Transformation & Democratization (CT&D) which broadly corresponds to the PT1 programme of DCA. The CT&D programme includes most of the themes DCA has under PT1. The Democratisation subprogram concentrates on the themes grass root participation, legal security and accountability. Related to these themes are: women participation, UNSCR 1325\(^{10}\), local government, decentralization, human rights defenders. At the moment ICCO does not have a specific policy on media and access to information, but this will be developed in the near future.

ICCO is undergoing fundamental changes for the time being. It is developing from a Dutch to a more international organisation with regional councils and more decentralised implementation though it will still have its legal basis and headquarters in Holland. Earlier the CT&D programme was implemented by some 80 people based in Holland. It was planned that a team of 8 responsible for policy development, advisory services and back stopping and research should remain in Holland. However, due to drastic budget cuts on the part of the Dutch government this team will now have to be cut down to two persons. Now it has to be reconsidered which areas can be kept alive.

ICCO sees itself as having relative strengths with governance and social movements in Latin America, land rights and access to natural resources from a civil society perspective in south east Asia, while there is a broader mix of interventions in Africa. **Perception of DCA in relation to its sister agencies:** There is not a clear view of this but it is perceived that DCA has a strong role in relation to rights and development. **Coordination/alignment:** There is a need for stringer coordination. One of the main fields where coordination is needed is in relating to the shrinking political space for civil society. This should lead us to reconsider discourses around civil society which is now accused by governments not representing the ones they say they do. There is therefore a need to establish stronger internal representation mechanisms within civil society. And there is an

\(^{10}\) United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325, adopted 2000, called for the adoption of a gender perspective that included the special needs of women and girls during repatriation and resettlement, rehabilitation, reintegration and post-conflict reconstruction.
urgent need for rejuvenating civil society organisations where a particular generation (now in its 50s dominates

*Future perspectives:* are uncertain due to the drastic budget cuts. But there might a process of more concentration on land and natural resources and other common goods. The programme will continue to work on budget tracking and accountability with the department dealing with access to basic services.
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Annex 5: Formulating a Communication Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPS IN FORMULATING A COMMUNICATION STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 SELECT STAKEHOLDERS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify and prioritize the stakeholders. The stakeholders should be selected in terms of those who are expected to take action (primary target groups), and those who can facilitate action and transmit information (secondary target groups). Specifying and prioritising stakeholders mean that it is determined who they are, i.e. by mentioning the specific functions, names of the groups and organisations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 DEFINE COMMUNICATION OBJECTIVES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define what should be achieved by communicating with the various identified stakeholders or groups of stakeholders. Note that communication objectives are those that can be achieved through information and communication activities e.g.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Awareness created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Knowledge and understanding promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 RESEARCH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to ensure that the information provided and the choice of communication channels are target oriented, some research on the information needs, media habits, and communication patterns have to be done through interviews with representatives of the various stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 DEFINE INDICATORS AND TARGETS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to measure the success of the strategy or need for adjustments, it would be desirable to define simple indicators and related targets for the communication initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 DEVELOPMENT OF MESSAGES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the research, the needed information and key messages should be developed for each of the identified stakeholder group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 CHOICE OF MEANS OF COMMUNICATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In accordance with the media habits of the various target groups, the means of communication should be chosen. Depending on the number and location of the persons that should be involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the communication process, the channels and activities can be selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 PLAN OF ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decide who is doing what, when and where and at what cost. It is important that the timing of the activities is coordinated so that they reinforce each other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8 PRODUCE COMMUNICATION MATERIALS AND PRE-TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and produce possible support materials, e.g. power point presentations, radio/TV/internet programmes, or print publications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials for distribution in big quantities or to large audiences should be pre-tested by representatives of the specified stakeholders and subsequently adjusted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement the planned communication activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 MONITORING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitor the communication interventions regularly against the indicators, and adjust the activities accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>