

Evaluation Report

Thematic Evaluation of Save the Children Norway's Cooperation with Partners

Mozambique Case Study

**Maggie Brown - Freelance
Padil Salimo- Freelance**

**15th August 2011 (revised
30th September.2011)**

Contents

Executive Summary	i-vi
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background to Evaluation	1
1.2 The Principles of Partnership	1
1.3 Terms of Reference and Summary	2
1.4 Methodology	3
1.5 Constraints of Evaluation	4
1.6 Structure of Report	4
2. Programme Description	4
2.1 Historical Development	4
2.2 Context	5
2.3 Summary of Strategy	6
2.4 Partner Policy and Strategy	7
2.5 Number and Type of Partners	8
2.6 SCiMoz Structure and Staffing	9
3. Relationship between SCiMoz and Partners	10
3.1 Conceptual Issues – Understanding of Partnership	10
3.2 Characteristics of SC’s Partnership Approach in Practice	10
3.3 Selection of Partners	12
3.4 Development of Proposals	14
3.5 Visits, Communication, Accompaniment	15
3.6 SCN Systems and Procedures	16
3.7 Capacity Building	16
3.8 Children as Partners	18
3.9 Monitoring and Evaluation	19
3.10 Exit Strategies and Sustainability	20
3.11 Horizontal Partnerships	21
4. Changes in Capacity and Behaviour of Partners	21
4.1 To Be – Identity and Internal Functioning	21
4.2 To Do – Programming	22
4.3 To Relate – Linkages with Others	23
5. Contribution to Overall Capacity to Address Child Rights	24
6. Good Practices	26
7. Implications of Changes within Save the Children	26
8. Conclusions and Recommendations	27
Appendix A - Terms of Reference	
Appendix B – Interviews conducted	
Appendix C - List of Partners in Mozambique	
Appendix D - Coverage based on Total Reach	

Abbreviations

CBO	Community Based Organisation
CNAC	Conselho Nacional da Criança (National Children's Council)
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CRG	Child Rights Governance
CSO	Civil Society Organisations
INGO	International Non Governmental Organisation
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
REPSSI	Regional Psychosocial Support Initiative
SCD	Save the Children Denmark
SCI	Save the Children International
SCN	Save the Children Norway
SCUK	Save the Children United Kingdom
SCUS	Save the Children United States
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UP	Unified Presence

Executive Summary

Building local and national capacity to secure children's rights is a key working principle for Save the Children Norway. SCN's global strategy for 2010-2013 states that: 'Our primary goal is achieving results for children. Lasting change is dependent on building local capacity and, in certain situations, increased capacity for partner organisations is in itself a goal'. As Save the Children has come together as one international organisation, SCN has identified the strengthening of local and national capacity as a working principle to develop in the new fellowship. In addition, Save the Children International's (SCI) Global Strategy 2010-2015 has put partnership at the centre of the Theory of Change making partnership especially important in the future.

In view of this, SCN aims to provide insights into partnership issues through the current evaluation drawing on the work of SCN and other Members over a ten to fifteen year period. The evaluation will inform the future partnership policy of SCN and possibly that of SC International. The Mozambique evaluation is one of four case studies, the others being Zimbabwe, Nepal and Nicaragua.

In Mozambique partnership was the principal approach for SCN from the early to mid 1990s so there is lengthy experience on which to review practice. The Mozambique country programme was brought together into a unified presence of SCN, SCUS and SCUUK, with SCUS as the Managing Member in July 2008. The programme will be integrated under the management of SCI from July 2012.

The fieldwork for the current evaluation took place in Mozambique in July 2011 and focused on the two Provinces of Manica and Sofala, as well as including Maputo based partners. Sixteen state and CSO partners participated in in-depth interviews, including a cross section of fourteen partners initiated by SCN, plus one partner initiated by SCiMoz and another by SCS (Sweden). In addition, a children's parliament and other children's groups participated with their views but due to distance, it was not possible to include partners in the Provinces of Nampula and Zambézia.

Types of partners

In 2010, SCiMoz had a total of 54 partners, of which 38 were civil society and 16 public bodies. Of the 54 partners, 33 received funds from SCiMoz while 21 work in collaboration with SCiMoz but do not manage funds. All 16 partners included in the evaluation manage funds and were broken down evenly between state and CSO partners. Most partners managed relatively small sums, between US\$30-50,000 per annum. Half of the partners in the evaluation had established partnerships in the period 2006-9 most others were from earlier periods. They were concentrated in the thematic areas of protection, education and HIV/AIDS.

Understanding of Partnership

SCN's policy sets out the principles on which partnerships should be based, emphasising that *sustained* impact on children's rights requires building the capacity of state and civil society organisations (CSOs). Recognising that the state bears ultimate responsibility, the role of CSOs is to demonstrate new models for service delivery as well as carry out advocacy work and constituency building. The principles on which partnerships should be based include common goals for the long or short term, mutual

learning, adjustment to local contexts, child rights programming as a basic framework and quality assurance/value for money.

Partners were asked for their perceptions of what constitutes good partnership. Their views matched closely with SCN principles. The focus was on mutual respect, working together to achieve shared objectives and regular communication. All partners considered that SCN had shared the same overall understanding of partnership and that this had mostly been fulfilled in practice. The majority of partners considered these values and principles had been retained with the unification process although four partners expressed concerns that included the notion that a shift to sub-granting had meant implementing a donor-defined agenda rather than their own and that communication had reduced in some cases.

State partners particularly appreciated SCN/SCiMoz's willingness to provide broad based funding to existing plans, the transparency with which budget ceilings are shared and SCN's knowledge of local issues. Civil society partners particularly recognised the importance of long term institutional support, training and technical assistance all aiming at sustainability.

Partner Selection

Partner selection was found to be appropriate in terms of the main issues identified in relation to children's rights and SCN/SCiMoz achieved and has maintained a good mix of state and civil society partners, working at national and district levels. However, there is a need to develop a clearer model for 'bottom up' advocacy that will shape partner selection, while the possibility of partnering at Provincial level should be considered given that state budgets are increasing at Provincial level and falling to Districts. The model of integrated partnering of district governments was contested by other district governments on the grounds of Education and Social Affairs Departments losing autonomy. Very few faith-based organisations were included although the national study identified FBOs as the most numerous; this could be a possibility for the future to expand CSO partnership.

Only two partners reported having undergone an assessment of administrative capacity before partnering, even though SCN had required an initial analysis of shared values, policies and practice followed by an assessment of administrative and technical capacity. Procedures to review managerial and governance capacity are being strengthened under the unified presence and SCI's Grant Management Manual will be the guiding document from 2012. The SCI Manual emphasises that partners should not be selected principally on the basis of already having the capacity to implement programmes as building the capacity of weaker partners with the potential to grow is extremely important. In line with SCN's policy, the Manual requires an assessment to identify weaknesses followed by a capacity action plan.

Proposal Development

Only two of twelve partners in Manica and Sofala, plus those based in Maputo, had prepared proposals; all other partners had prepared joint annual plans with SCN/SCiMoz. On the positive side, this resulted in close collaboration at District level between partners that prepare plans jointly. Negatively, however, there was no problem analysis or change indicators and the process limited the experience of partners in proposal development and in establishing shared objectives from HQ to country office to partners. Partners had previously worked to a three to four year time frame but this has

been reduced to one year more recently due to funding uncertainties. There was a universal call from partners to return to medium term planning and agreements. Although a medium term vision is more difficult in a context of funding uncertainties, it may be possible to engage longer term partners in strategic planning processes so they can feed into SCiMoz's vision and to provide medium term *framework* partnership agreements subject to funding availability. In the future, more capacity investment in proposal writing will be important and will support partners diversifying funding sources and sustainability.

Following up with Partners

SCN/SCiMoz had visited partners very frequently spending up to two weeks in every month in the field until staff were reduced in 2010. Currently staff visiting ranges from 4-5 times a month to twice in 3 months. Partners were keen on frequent visiting and did not consider it excessive. Three state partners claimed that reduced visiting had had an effect on motivation and that some Programme Managers were currently over committed. Three CSO partners (Maputo and Manica based) also registered reduced communication and two considered that reduced communication had had a negative impact on the level of understanding of partner issues. Most partners considered, however, that phone communication had remained very regular and partners receive rapid responses to written queries.

Financial Accountability

Systems for financial accountability are robust and allow very little room for inappropriate practice. Original receipts are submitted on a monthly basis and these plus a monthly workplan trigger the release of further funding. All cheques are countersigned between SCiMoz staff and the partner. SCiMoz staff consider that most partners work hard to understand systems but high turnover, especially with the government, requires frequent repetition of training. There were mixed perceptions of the change from three monthly to monthly accounting. Most partners considered the system to be reasonable and two felt it was an improvement. However, four considered it difficult to complete activities within a monthly plan and one had incurred increased travel expenses to submit monthly justifications. For most partners, fund disbursement has continued as always to be rapid and efficient while six noted that there had been delays in recent years, although one considered that their own late submission of reports was the principal cause. Annual partner audits were found (by the evaluator) to be limited in scope covering a simple review of funds in and out with no deeper analysis of expenditure against budget lines or systems reviews.

Capacity Building

SCN/SCiMoz has made considerable investments in capacity building (training, technical assistance, exchange visits) that were highly valued by partners and have clearly had an impact on mission, technical and some organisational aspects, especially financial management. However, there has not been a systematic assessment of each partner's needs nor of SCN/SCiMoz staff capacity to provide training. There has also been limited investment in organisational development, including monitoring and evaluation, although SCiMoz has plans to strengthen training in this essential area. Building capacity in identifying and occupying spaces for dialogue and advocacy has also been limited.

Children as Partners

SCN/SCiMoz has supported the development of children's parliaments in all Districts where SC is working, as well as children groups (*núcleos infantis*) and provided

technical assistance and training to the Ministry of Education's strategy to establish Schools Councils (each with 2 child representatives). The objective of all child participation mechanisms is to strengthen children's opportunities for meaningful dialogue on issues that concern them. While the parliaments are active, have a large membership and do have opportunities to dialogue with authorities, children were not yet fully able to articulate their purpose. Further, children have recommended the development of procedures for children's parliaments. Children from Schools Councils had been appointed not elected, had not received adequate training for their role or preparation before meetings with adults. Part of the problem is the short (annual) mandate that necessarily requires regular and repeated training. These experiences demonstrate that considerable investment is required to achieve meaningful participation.

Monitoring and Evaluation

SCN/SCiMoz monitoring systems had focused on process monitoring of planned activities; there were few change indicators and only two examples of developing baselines. SCiMoz has developed change indicators that have yet to be rolled out through training staff and partners and SCI is developing a set of global indicators that will be monitored in all countries. In addition, the global Total Reach system that measures coverage has already been rolled out to partners through training. For partners and SCiMoz to be effective in evidence based advocacy, there will need to be considerable investment in monitoring, analysis and narrative report writing.

Exit Strategies and Sustainability

SCN's policy expects staff to work with partners on an exit strategy from the beginning of the partnership as a normal part of the project cycle. SCN/SCiMoz had not explicitly analysed and registered exit strategies however, significant investments had been made in institutional development through infrastructure (offices), equipment and training to whole organisations both state and CSO. One former CSO partner had managed to diversify sources of funding from donors and built on the firm foundations left by SCN. State partners are more sustainable in that salaries are covered, however, they are highly dependent on SCiMoz for revenue funding to provide services. The only sustainable course of action in the future is to supporting state and CSO lobbying for greater budget allocations to those services at District level. Establishing exit strategies for all partners at the time of agreements should be reviewed in future and for CSOs should focus on diversifying funding sources from as early a stage as possible.

Horizontal Partnerships

Several forms of horizontal partnerships were identified including long term working groups of SCN/SCiMoz partners at District level and issue based groups such as the trafficking reference group established prior to the World Cup. In addition, there were regular meetings and workshops sponsored by SCN/SCiMoz. It has been more difficult, however, to establish horizontal partnerships from Manica/Sofala across to other Provinces including Maputo due to the cost of traveling.

Changes in the Capacity of Partners

Changes in partner capacity were reviewed against three dimensions: 'to be', 'to do' and 'to relate'.

- 'To Be' reviews the identity and internal functioning of organisations. Through SCN/SCiMoz support, state and CSO partners had developed a much stronger and clearer sense of mission, while some CSO partners, particularly at national

level, have developed a strong understanding of their role in advocacy. In relation to organisational development overall, most progress had been made in financial management and in joint planning/coordination but there is room for further investment, as already noted, in monitoring, analysis and documentation.

- 'To Do' identifies programming capacity changes, especially in relation to partner capacity in identifying models for replication. Major achievements were in identifying an effective model by Police Special Units to address violence at community level, reduce corporal punishment in schools and provide a channel for child support on divorce. Social Affairs had produced models for community committees (including guidelines with SCiMoz support) and had also modelled children's parliaments and children's groups at community level. The Departments of Education had modelled systems for testing outcomes in reading and writing with a view to enhancing quality while CSO partners had introduced good practices in homes based care, nutrition and prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV and community based systems to prevent trafficking.
- 'To relate' analyses linkages with others. State and CSO partners had strengthened downward accountability but there is more work to be done on linkages for bottom up advocacy.

Contribution to Overall Capacity to Address Children's Rights

SCN/SCiMoz with partners have made significant achievements including contributing to the Children's Act (2008) and to the Anti Human Trafficking Act (2008), adoption of the model of Schools Councils (including child representation), increase in classroom capacity and reduction in drop out rates, reduction in child marriages, strengthened support models for the most vulnerable that have been scaled up through community committees, and expansion of the children's parliaments.

Factors that have contributed to enabling children's rights through partnership are the relationships based on mutuality, transparency and trust; secure and predictable funding through SCN and NORAD; medium term funding over a strategy period and flexibility. Constraining factors are the lack of investment in monitoring and evaluation, the distance between partners in Manica/Sofala and Maputo that limited contact with policy makers, and a weak civil society.

Good Practices in Partnership

The principal good practices that should be sustained were: a) the significant investment made in capacity building through training and infrastructure b) partner relations characterised by mutual respect c) partner self-determination in terms of goals within the broad parameters of child rights d) engaging children through structured systems of the parliaments and children's groups. Practices that could be replicated are: a) strategically selecting districts then identifying both CSO and state partners in those districts and holding joint planning sessions b) close liaison by state services with community level committees c) developing partners as national technical experts within a specific field.

Conclusions

The major strengths of SCN's partnership approach were in strong relationships of mutual respect, the focus on technical capacity building and establishing permanent infrastructure and in allowing partners to develop their own agenda within the parameters of child rights. The mix of state and CSO partnerships was also positive, as was working at different levels of administration and within a context of secure funding.

Through partner relations SCN/SCiMoz has made significant contributions to children's rights as described above.

The principal weaknesses of the partnership model were in monitoring, analysis and reporting/documentation by partners, not obliging partners to present proposals and strategic plans, the lack of a *systematic* approach to capacity building and the fact that exit strategies were not designed from the beginning. In terms of children's participation, more investment is required in understanding the purpose and procedures of the children's parliaments and schools councils.

Most of the positive aspects have been sustained following unification and some weaknesses are being addressed, especially in strengthening the monitoring of change indicators. However, systems of monthly financial reporting have had a mixed response from partners and there are concerns about reduced communication and visiting. The principal issues for the future will be in sustaining the sense of partner self-determination within a context of donor funded programmes with fixed objectives that regard partners as sub grantees. Maintaining the investment in partner capacity building is also an issue with donor constraints.

The recommendations are a contribution to SCiMoz but many of the issues will be addressed more fully in the overall report from this evaluation.

Evaluation Recommendations

Detailed recommendations in Section 8 propose:

- Ways of feeding SCN's partnership principles into the forthcoming SCiMoz strategy for partnership
- Strengthening capacity building through participatory organisational assessments with partners and strengthened investment in organisational development and advocacy
- Promoting sustainability through training in fundraising and proposal writing, contacts with donors and supporting possibilities for income generation
- Continuing to improve monitoring and evaluation by supporting partners to undertake situation analyses and establishing baselines as well as training for data collection and analysis.
- Strengthening partnership with children through procedures for children's parliaments and training on those procedures, helping to children to share ideas through the Children's Network website, linking activities to the Children's report to the CRC and strengthening training for Schools Councils.
- Improving accountability by strengthening auditing
- Extending partner's access to the internet, especially the Children's Network website.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background to Evaluation

Building local and national capacity to secure children's rights is a key working principle for Save the Children Norway, as it has been since the 1990s. SCN's global strategy for 2010-2013 states that: 'Our primary goal is achieving results for children. Lasting change is dependent on building local capacity and, in certain situations, increased capacity for partner organisations is in itself a goal'. As Save the Children has come together as one international organisation, SCN has identified the strengthening of local and national capacity as a working principle to develop in the new fellowship. In addition, Save the Children International's Global Strategy 2010-2015 has put partnership at the centre of the Theory of Change within SC's role as an innovator, voice for children and in achieving results at scale.

In view of the importance of partnership in the future, SCN aims to provide insights into partnership issues through the current evaluation drawing on SCN's work with partners over a ten to fifteen year period. In addition, it will feed in some analysis through current partner perceptions and expectations of partnership. In Mozambique, the partnership approach began within SCN quite early, from the early to mid-1990s so there is lengthy experience on which to review practice.

This Mozambique report is one of four case studies being carried out as part of this evaluation – the other countries being Zimbabwe, Nepal and Nicaragua¹. These countries will each have a report like this, and there will also be a global report bringing all these experiences together, synthesising the key learning points. Within the current report, references to the work of SC Norway in Mozambique (up to unification in July 2008) will use the term SCN while references to partnerships since that time will be described as SCiMoz or SCN/SCiMoz where findings apply both before and after unification. Specific references to other SC Members use their title e.g. SCUS.

1.2 The Principles of Partnership

The key SCN document on partnership is the *Policy for Strengthening Local Capacity 2007-2009*. The main points are as follows:

- *Sustained* impact on children's rights can only be achieved when national and local government and local people take responsibility for their future.
- SCN recognises that the State bears the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that children's rights are implemented. SCN can work with the State directly as an important partner, especially ministries of education, social welfare and justice.
- The goal of SCN with civil society partners² is to *build their competence to influence State duty bearers* to fulfil, respect and protect the rights of children. Influencing the State can be through highlighting potential abuses or demonstrating new models to address a problem. Partners are supported to become change agents within their society and carry out advocacy work, constituency building and service delivery. Civil society also has an important role to play in informing the public about their rights and much advocacy work is built on evidence generated from direct interaction with children.

¹ In addition, a parallel but separate evaluation is being carried out in Ethiopia, which will also feed into the overall learning.

² Principally NGOs, faith based organizations and child led groups

- SCN considers a mix of state and civil society partners as a strength although working with civil society would normally be prioritised. When supporting the State directly, SCN will facilitate dialogue and participation between civil society and the state on the realisation of children's rights.

This perspective implies that building a *child rights based civil society* is a goal in itself. This is quite different from working with partners as a means to achieve a specific project objective.

The policy also sets out a number of principles on which partnerships should be based including common goals in the short or long term, equity and respect, transparency and trust, sharing information, mutual learning, adjustment to local contexts, child rights programming as a basic framework and quality assurance/value for money. It should be noted that the principles that form the basis of SCN's work in partnership are in close harmony with the priorities identified by southern partners in a 2010 survey on partnership conducted by Keystone³. Partners in the Keystone survey emphasised mutual respect and accountability, transparency in programmes and finance, clarity of procedures, openness in discussion, not being treated as a sub contractor, flexibility and openness to changes, support to strategic planning and promoting the position of the southern partner in advocacy.

The *practice* of partnership will be tested against these approaches and principles in the evaluation.

1.3 Terms of Reference and Summary

The main purpose of this evaluation as expressed in the Terms of Reference (ToR) – is to provide an insight into SCN's work with partners, build learning and ensure accountability by:

1. Providing evidence of impact (positive and negative, intended or unintended outcome/impact) of SCN's cooperation with partners in five different countries⁴; to what extent and how a) partners have been strengthened as providers of and advocators for children's rights, and b) how SCN through partner cooperation has added value to the overall capacity of key actors in the society where we work to address and fulfil children's rights.
2. Provide an oversight of different implementation models and identify and document good practices in cooperating with partners, both government and civil society, appropriate to the aim of the partnership and capacity building of the partner. This assessment should also provide evidence of enabling versus obstructing factors in different contexts and discuss how this could be taken into account when setting the objective for partnerships and selecting partners and modalities.
3. Contribute to increased knowledge and understanding by bringing the organisation up to date on research/evaluation findings on partner cooperation (short state of the art report) and bring insight into and awareness of different and sometimes multiple objectives in partner cooperation.

³ In 2010, Keystone, a consortium of UK, South African and US based non profit organizations, undertook a large survey of southern partner perspectives on partnership. SCUS and SCUK participated in the survey. *NGO Partner Survey, 2010* available at: <http://www.keystoneaccountability.org>

⁴ This includes a parallel study in Ethiopia.

4. Based on the above, provide input to the formation of future partnership cooperation in SCN supported programmes and SCI.

The full ToR is shown in Appendix A. The first, second and fourth objectives are covered in this report with respect to Mozambique. The third has already been addressed by a separate paper on current thinking on partnership more widely, which will be incorporated in a summarised form into the global report.

1.4 Methodology

The methodology for the evaluation was initially outlined in the ToR issued by SCN (Appendix A) and further developed by INTRAC through its Inception Report, which was then revised in the light of comments made by SCN staff and other stakeholders. The key aspects of the methodology can be summarised as follows and most data was collected from 4-18th July 2011.

- An initial meeting with SCiMoz staff in Maputo and subsequently with staff and partners in Chimoio (Appendix B) to identify the main issues. Also semi structured interviews with SCiMoz staff.
- Semi-structured interviews with a sample of sixteen partners as follows:
 - Twelve partners that had been initiated by SCN covering a cross section of: a) length of partnership by strategy period (older than 2000; 2000-5; 2006-9; 2010/2011), b) government and civil society breakdown equivalent to the proportional breakdown in country c) amounts of funds managed and thematic area.
 - Two partners initiated by other SCs with a view to identifying good practice lessons, being one former SCS partner and a partner initiated by SCiMoz (however, there were constraints to this, see section 1.4).
 - Two former partners, one of which had re-engaged with SCiMoz with a different sub agreement.

(Partner list in Appendix B and Section 2.5).

- In terms of children's participation, the following methodology was used:
 - A workshop at the Children's Parliament in Gondola with a total of seven members of the Children's Parliament, twenty members of the children's *núcleo infantil* (children's group) plus other children, volunteers and staff. During the workshop, groups of children analysed the extent of their participation in projects and commented on their expectations of partnership.
 - A focus group with the Children's Parliament in Guro that also analysed children's perspectives on participation and a group of child beneficiaries of a CBO, Bvute re Wana that reviewed their knowledge and perspectives on the project.
 - A focus group with children of the Schools Council in Bárue and with the Schools Council (teachers, parents and one child representative) in Guro.
- Meeting with one Community Committee (CBO partner of Social Affairs in Guro).
- Interviews with external stakeholders: Ministries of Social Affairs and Foreign Affairs, plus UNICEF.
- Preliminary feedback meeting in Chimoio with staff and partners and discussion of draft conclusions.
- Analysis of some key documentation from SCiMoz as well as analyses of civil society development plus the official and CSO (Civil Society Organisation) report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child.

1.5 Constraints of Evaluation

There were three constraints to the evaluation. *Firstly*, we had intended to include good practice examples of partnerships initiated by other Members of the SC family. However to travel to the principal practice areas of other partners, Nampula, Zambezia or even Gaza would have been extremely difficult in terms of cost and time. For that reason, we interviewed only one current partner that had been principally supported by SCS, plus a partner that had been principally supported by SCiMoz since unification. *Secondly*, we had intended to compare adult perspectives on child participation with those of children but the adult questionnaire used was not well understood (in a multiple choice questionnaire, partners selected several options instead of a single choice). For that reason, only children's perspectives on participation have been included. *Thirdly*, partners had very limited documentation available that had tracked experiences and achievements over time.

1.6 Structure of Report

As mentioned, this is one of four case study reports, which all in turn feed into the global report. It is thus meant to stand alone, but also be part of a broader process. The report follows the same questions as in the ToR, but in some the order is adjusted to help the logical flow as follows:

- Programme description (brief overview of partnership in Mozambique – descriptive part of Objective 2)
- Relationship between SC and its Partners (analytical part of Objective 2).
- Changes in Capacity and Behaviour of Partners (first part of Objective 1)
- Contribution to Overall Capacity to Address Child Rights (second part of Objective 1)
- Summary and Recommendations (Objective 4).⁵

2. Programme Description

2.1 Historical Development

In Mozambique, SC Norway, SCUUK and SCUS each have a long history dating back to the 1980s during the armed conflict. SCN worked principally in Manica and Sofala, SCUS in Gaza and Nampula and SCUUK in Zambézia.

In Mozambique, the principal approach to programming was through partnership from the early 1990s and this became global policy from the late 1990s. Up to unification of the SCs in Mozambique on 1st July 2008, SCN had accumulated ten to fifteen years of experience of working with state and civil society partnerships in the Provinces of Manica and Sofala. In recognition of the weakness of civil society in Mozambique, SCN chose to provide close and regular technical assistance to partners and to extend the number of state partners from 2005, focusing along the corridor of the Districts most affected by HIV and AIDS.

Following unification, SCUS has become the Managing Member with Norway and UK as Participating Members. SCiMoz has continued to work in Manica and Sofala and most of the partnerships initiated by SCN remain the same. In the other Provinces of the country, SCiMoz implements programmes with partners but relatively few receive SC funds to

⁵ Objective 3 is addressed in the separate 'State of the Art' report, but the lessons learned from this are reflected in the analysis throughout the report.

manage (see **Appendix C**). Save the Children International will gradually assume managerial responsibility for all country programmes and Mozambique will be under SCI management from July 2012.

2.2 Context

This section provides the background to assess the relevance of the partner portfolio adopted in Mozambique. Specifically, it reviews: a) priorities for children's rights, b) the development and role of civil society c) the legislative framework relating to INGOs and d) decentralization and the role of the Districts.

Priorities for Children's Rights

Analysing priorities for children's rights from the perspective of the CRC Report⁶, including the children's report, provides the background to review whether the partner portfolio selected has been the most appropriate to address rights issues.

Children in their report to CRC Committee⁷ prioritised protection from sexual exploitation, violence and corporal punishment, including negative traditional practices, the need to extend birth registration, the enormous demand for greater social protection of orphaned and vulnerable children (OVC) and their foster families, improved parenting practices and training for state authorities to understand their duties in practice. Finally they called for the establishment of procedures for the Children's Parliament.

The official CRC Report and response from the Committee focused on the problem of falling state budgets to priority children's services and poor budget monitoring, the desperate need to increase funds to the Ministry of Women and Social Affairs that is responsible for vulnerable children (currently only 1% of the national budget), the need to regulate the children's parliament to promote democracy and mechanisms for incorporating children's views on policies, the importance of strengthening support to OVC and treatment access (currently only 18%), protection issues (trafficking, harmful traditional practices, corporal punishment) and serious limitations in education (high drop-out rates, the vast need for school construction and strengthened teacher training).

As will be noted, SCN partner selection corresponded closely to these priorities.

Development and Role of Civil Society

SCN's partnership policy underscores the importance of developing a child rights based civil society. However a large FDC and UNDP study⁸ in 2007 concluded that Mozambican CSO development is especially weak compared to other African countries. The study covered four dimensions of development (structure, the environment for civil society, values and impact) and Mozambican CSOs scored at a low level in all dimensions. The study also notes that some 70% of CSO funding is external leaving them vulnerable in terms of sustainability and that 70% of registered CSOs are based in five Provinces⁹ of the country with very limited coverage outside those areas. These do

⁶ Report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child last submitted for Mozambique in 2009.

⁷ Rede da Criança, 2009, *Relatório da Sociedade Civil sobre a Implementação dos Direitos da Criança*, Maputo, Rede da Criança.

⁸ Índice da Sociedade Civil em Moçambique, 2007, FDC, UNDP, Civicus and others.

⁹ Nampula, Gaza, Inhambane, Maputo (city) and Maputo (Province). This means in practice that 80% of these are located in the southern region.

not include either Manica or Sofala where SCN was based. In terms of the *levels* of CSO work, 42.4% of CSOs work at community level (effectively they are CBOs), 33.5% at District level and only 5.7% at national level. In relation to the type of CSOs, religious organisations are in the majority, followed by policy and advocacy based organisations.

Recommendations to strengthen civil society included adoption of a voluntary code of conduct by CSOs to demonstrate accountability and good governance, effective occupation of spaces for policy debate by civil society, including strengthening research capacity, and reinforced coordination and networking between organisations. These recommendations will be considered later in the report in relation to the challenges to building a child-rights based civil society.

Legislative Framework for NGOs and INGOs

In terms of the legislative context for international NGOs in Mozambique, Decree 55/98 recognizes their work and has created the space for them to operate but advocates for skills and capacity transfer to national civil society. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in interview considered that SCN had fulfilled that role and has gone a step further than most in supporting national NGO *and* Government partners at central and local levels.

Decentralization

Decentralization processes are relevant to partnership in the sense of reviewing whether the level at which partners work are the most effective to influence on children's rights.

The administrative system in Mozambique has four levels: i) *central government*, ii) 11 *provincial governments* – including Maputo City which has the statute of a Province – (not elected), iii) 128 *district governments* (not elected), and iv) 43 locally elected *autarquias (local council)*. Consultative councils established at District level should influence district planning and budgets but, as yet, these spaces are not effectively occupied, as CSOs observed. The percentage of funding to non-elected Provincial Governments grew from 22% to 32% of all state funds from 2007-8 while only 3% of total expenditure is spent at District level and 1% in the municipalities¹⁰. The tendency is towards increased *centralization* of the power base as Frelimo holds a very large majority in parliament together with a strong President of the ruling party.

2.3 Summary of Strategy of SCiMoz

The SCiMoz strategy for 2008 to 2012 aims to achieve impact at scale reaching at least 10% of the population of 20mn. Four strategic approaches are specified: i) developing evidence based and replicable solutions, ii) advocating for better practices, programmes and policies iii) supporting effective implementation and iv) working with Alliance members, communities, government and other partners.

The strategy has five priority results and planned coverage rates against a 2007 baseline.

¹⁰ Reaud, B. and Weimer, B., 2010, *Mozambique Decentralization Assessment*, Washington, USAID.

Anticipated Beneficiaries of SCiMOZ 2008-2012 by Priority Result

	Priority Result	Baseline Reach 2007	Projected Cumulative Reach 2008-12	% Change
1	Children protected from harm via psychosocial and physical assistance	185,000	275,000	49%
2	Children learning and developing with age-appropriate care and education	100,000	150,000	50%
3	Children healthy and well-nourished	1,400,000	2,500,000	78%
4	Children thriving in food secure and economically viable households	210,000	396,000	88%
5	Children live in a society that respects and monitors children's rights	50,000	150,000	200%

Programmes remain largely based on the respective thematic and geographical focus of the Members prior to unification. SCUS continues to support largely health, education, nutrition and livelihoods in Nampula and Gaza, mostly as direct implementation or with partners (but not through fund transfer to partners). SCN largely continues to support partners in Manica and Sofala with a focus on protection, education, HIV/AIDS (support to children affected by HIV/AIDS) and child rights governance and SCUK has a growing focus on child survival and largely in Zambézia. In all programmes, HIV/AIDS and child participation are cross cutting.

The total value of programmes over a 2-3 year period as stated in the 2010 annual report was \$45,203,410. Within these funds, SCN Core funding and Royal Norwegian Embassy funds, approximately \$1.4mn for 1 year, provided the largest amount of funds disbursed to partners to manage. From the annual SCN/NORAD funding, the division of funding disbursed to partners compared to support costs broke down at approximately 62/38% but it should be noted that support includes programme staff costs and travel to follow up programme activities¹¹.

In terms of monitoring and evaluation, a set of change indicators have been developed around priority results in addition to the Total Reach system that measures coverage but have not yet been rolled out through training.

2.4 Partner Policy and Strategy

A Partnership Policy is currently being developed in Mozambique but remains at a preliminary stage. However, an early concept paper refers to the fact that there has been a shift in policy perspective by donors in Mozambique (especially NORAD) towards an *expectation* of capacity building with local civil society and also draws attention to the results of the Keystone survey. There is a plan to develop *long term strategic partnerships* within SCiMoz and to strengthen partners' capacity in participatory governance, good financial stewardship and greater accountability to constituents. It aims to extend the partnership approach to all Districts where SCiMoz is active.

The paper recognises the importance of the NORAD approach however it draws attention to the risks resulting from the weakness of civil society partners. To mitigate against the risks with CSO partners, SCiMoz has adopted a strategy of strengthening CBOs, especially Community Committees, and supporting the strongest to legalise as associations, effectively extending civil society from the bottom up. The implementation of the strategy has yet to be applied uniformly across the country programme.

¹¹ Calculated from the budget breakdown for Manica/Sofala.

2.5 Number and Type of Partners

In 2010, SCiMoz had a total of 54 partners (based on the partner list from the Annual Report, Appendix C) divided between 38 civil society partners and 16 public bodies.

Of the 54 partners, 33 receive funds from SCiMoz and identify/manage their own projects while 21 are supported by SCiMoz but do not manage a grant. The large majority of partners that manage funds (28 or 85%) were initiated by SCN and receive Norwegian funding¹² (core SCN funding or NORAD). All but one of the State or Public Body partners that receive funding was initiated by SCN.

Of the partners initiated by SCN, there was an even breakdown between civil society (15) and state/public bodies (14). Of the partners initiated by other SCs there was a strong tendency towards civil society partners (23) with only two State/Public Body partners.

Breakdown of Partners by Funding/non Funding

	Funded Partner (sub grantee)		Supported Partner		Total
	Civil Society	State	Civil Society	State	
SCN Core Funding or Royal Norwegian Embassy	15	13		1	29
EC, Scale Up, MAMA	4	1	19	1	25
Totals	19	14	19	2	54
	33		21		

In terms of thematic areas, most civil society partners initiated by SCN were in protection, CRG or HIV/AIDS while most public body partners were in education or CRG. A different pattern emerged for partners initiated by other SCs, strongly focused on HIV/AIDS through civil society partners, followed by nutrition/livelihoods and health.

Partners included in the Evaluation

Of the 16 partners included within the evaluation, 8 were civil society partners and 8 State partners.

State Partners			CSO Partners		
Name	Year started	Budget 2011 US\$	Name	Year started	Budget 2011 US\$
District Social Affairs Gondol	1997	31,036	Children's Network	2000	54,196
District Education, Guro	1995	44,776	OMES	2001	¹³
Special Police Unit Beira	2004	20,690	ASVIMO	2002	Terminated
District Govt Tambara	2006	57,672	Rede Came	2004	34,019
District Social Affairs, Bárue	2006	35,017	Rudo Kubatana	2006	50,555
District Ed Gorongosa	2006	49,966	SANTAC	2007	230,350
District Social Affairs Guro	2007	44,138	Irmaz Scalabrianas	2009	16,226
District Education, Bárue	2007	52,431	Bvute re Wana	2011	33,996

¹² Either core SCN funding or Royal Norwegian Embassy funding i.e. NORAD

¹³ OMES had been terminated then restarted as an implementing partner in a health programme but was not managing a budget.

Within the above table, partners are organised in date order covering strategy periods 2010 onwards (1 CSO partner); 2006-9 (5 State and 3 CSO); 2000-5 (1 State, 4 CSO); before 2000 (2 State).

Although this group does not include all partners initiated by SCN, it is a representative sample and shows a deliberate strategy of increasing State partners in education and social services in the period 2006-9 in various Districts of Manica and Sofala.

The sample includes two partners largely supported by other SCs: Rede Came, mostly supported by SC Sweden and Irmãs Scalabrianas largely supported by SCiMoz since unification. In addition, two former partners were included: ASVIMO had terminated after a lengthy period of working with SCN. OMES had terminated a partnership with SCN but had a current agreement with SCiMoz for a health project in which it implements activities but no longer directly manages funds.

In terms of funding, in 2011 the total disbursed to CSOs within this group was US\$419.342 and to State partners was US\$335.726. Most CSO and State partners managed between US\$30,000 and US\$55,000. Irmãs Scalabrianas and Rede Came were also supported by SCS so received a higher sum in total. Only one civil society partner had signed a contract to receive a very large volume of funding: USD230,350¹⁴.

The total volume of funding for both civil society and State partners within in the evaluation had fallen between 2010 and 2011¹⁵ largely due to global economic constraints.

2.6 SCiMoz Structure and Staffing

SC has a central office in Maputo and sub offices in Gaza, Manica/Sofala, Nampula and Zambezia. There is a striking difference between the number of staff in each of these offices, with the lowest number of staff in a Provincial office being in Manica/Sofala where the great majority of funded partner projects are based (see chart below).

However, reviewing coverage figures from the Total Reach system (see Appendix D), it is evident that coverage is high in Manica and Sofala relative to the staff investment (based on SCN investments in Education, Protection and Child Rights Governance).

<i>Office</i>	<i>No. Staff</i>	<i>% staff</i>
Central Office	35	11%
Nampula	116	36%
Gaza	86	27%
Zambezia	60	19%
Manica and Sofala	23	7%
Director HACI	4	1%
Total	324	100%

¹⁴ However, those funds had not yet been disbursed and the total volume was under negotiation.

¹⁵ Funds for civil society had fallen by US\$6,000 and for State partners by almost US\$60,000.

3. Relationship between SCN and its Partners

The following analysis is based principally on the semi structured interviews with partners and respondents. In all cases, the issues raised have been analysed against the typology of partners (state/CSO, size of budget, length of partnership and thematic area). Where there are tendencies in responses or perceptions in relation to the typology, these have been stated.

3.1 Conceptual Issues – Understanding of Partnership

Partner perceptions of what constitutes good partnership matched closely to SCN principles (section 1.1) and to the expectation of partners in the Keystone survey. Key concepts referenced by the majority of state and civil society partners were about sharing objectives and working together to achieve them with a clear division of responsibilities and in a context of mutual respect. Regular communication was considered to be essential and the value of joint planning was particularly referenced by state partners (five out of eight). One state partner commented: *'SC is completely different from other partners. They respect what we consider most relevant as long as it fits with their broad goals. There is strong dialogue, joint plans and they transfer funds to us'*.

The majority of civil society partners recognised the importance of opportunities for capacity building and continuous learning, considering these as fundamental for sustainability. Two civil society partners referred to the importance of flexibility and being willing to negotiate on plans and priorities.

Two District state partners emphasised the importance of partners' understanding of the local context and the real problems of communities and SCN/SCiMoz were considered to be exceptional in that respect. The Ministry of Social Action and Ministry of Foreign Affairs referred to the importance of coordination by INGOs with the state and considered that SCN/SCiMoz had always been strong in this respect and in terms of openness, dialogue, joint planning, valuing local partners and having a close understanding the needs of local organisations. One state partner considered that an understanding of the *limitations* of partner capacity was also important.

All partners considered that SCN had shared the same overall understanding of partnership and that this had mostly (but not always) been fulfilled in practice (section 3.2). There were no significant differences in perceptions by thematic area, strategy period or size of budget. However, the former partner whose programme had terminated in 2005 but was given an opportunity to participate as a sub grantee in a new programme from 2010 was unhappy with the changed status, largely on the grounds of feeling that the organisation was implementing SCiMoz plans rather than their own.

3.2 Characteristics of SCN's Partnership Approach in Practice

SCN provided a range of support in practice including joint planning, very regular follow up and technical assistance, training in child participation and children's rights, curricula support to teacher training, motorbikes for transport, emergency support (such as to school roofs when they were lost to high winds) and office equipment. Perhaps the most striking and unusual form of support provided was the construction of a vast range of social infrastructure with the aim of achieving sustainable institutions.

SCN built: i) many schools, classrooms and teacher housing ii) administration blocks for education, social services and specialist police units dealing with violence against children iii) housing for vulnerable families iv) child parliamentarian buildings and v) administration buildings for some civil society partners. SCN purchased and renovated the building for the *Rede da Criança* in Maputo and offices and infrastructure for at least three further civil society partners.

State partners particularly appreciated five aspects of SCN's support and all of these have been sustained as SCiMoz: i) the willingness to provide funding towards the District's existing plans (virtually as local budget support) and not to impose SCiMoz's own agenda; ii) providing *broad based* support unlike most other partners that had narrower objectives; iii) the level of transparency in budgets (they observed that SCiMoz is the *only* partner that provides a budget ceiling at the beginning of the year and allows partners to analyse their priorities within that ceiling); iv) a good knowledge of local issues, partner limitations and of the sectors they support and v) being treated with respect by virtually all staff. Although a very few staff had attempted to impose their own views or agendas, state partners recognised these as largely individual, not institutional, issues.

Two state partners acknowledged that they were able to provide services largely as a result of SCN/SCiMoz support. The Social Affairs District Departments have no recurrent budget so although their staff is guaranteed, they are virtually unable to provide services. The District Specialist Police Unit for victims of violence is very similar in that SCN built their premises, provided the equipment and trained staff to establish a service. In the case of the Police, the service receives some, although limited, recurrent funding so is sustainable.

Civil society partners also recognized the importance of the long term institutional support they had received from SCN/SCiMoz. They referred more than State partners to the importance of the infrastructure and equipment to their long term sustainability. They also referred to the importance of training and technical assistance both in terms of programme and administration and in helping to define their mission more clearly. They were appreciative of the *style* of relationships: '*SC is different in the way it works with us ... flexible and works in a friendly way*'. They also referred to the level of dialogue in establishing a common position with SCN and to SCN's strong investment in children's rights including child participation.

There were no critiques of SCN/SCiMoz's institutional approach, only of some individual approaches while some partners were not happy with changes in communication and procedures in the last two years (see sections 3.5 and 3.6).

Negative or Unintended Effects of Partnership

The major potential pitfalls of INGO partnership are in questions of the asymmetrical power balance between the INGO and local partners, the difficulties in achieving impact with partners with weak institutional capacity, questions of the extent of local ownership of goals and whether the INGO is taking over the development agenda.

In relation to these complex issues, there was some recognition by partners of the asymmetrical power balance but the recognition of SCNs efforts in terms of equity, mutuality and transparency was much stronger. For the current context, four CSOs (including the former partner and the partner that had been reinstated after termination)

raised issues about the quality of the relationship in recent years, particularly in terms of the degree of communication and style of relationship (see section 3.5).

Certainly there were issues of the difficulties of achieving impact and these come both from relatively weak institutional capacity but also through spreading relatively limited funds quite thinly. Crucially, however, no questions were raised amongst SCN initiated partners about the extent of local ownership; indeed they considered that SCN had respected their agendas with the exception of the partner that was now 'sub contracting'.

3.3 Selection of Partners

Partner selection in relation to impact on children's rights

SCN focused on the thematic areas of education, protection, HIV/AIDS and child rights governance and these have been sustained with SCiMoz. These were thematic areas prioritised in the CRC report and in the children's report so the choice of sectors was immediately relevant but the question is whether there was a strategic choice of type and level (national, district, provincial) to achieve the best results for children.

The chart below demonstrates that SCN/SCiMoz has a mix of state and CSO partners at both national and district levels although no partnerships were made at provincial level. A strategic decision was taken to promote integrated services at district level partnering with education, protection and special police units in selected districts. In two Districts (Tambara and Caia), SCN established agreements with the District Government rather than individual Departments to further promote the integration of services.

DIRECT PARTNERS	
National Level	District Level
Strategic State partners in which the principal modality was policy debate (Social Affairs Ministry)	State partners through which SCN provided local budget support to existing plans as well as introducing new approaches (District level Education, Social Affairs and Special Police Units)
NGO partners focused on policy debate (Children's Network, SANTAC, Rede Came)	NGO partners that SCN supported in service provision and modelling effective practices (Manica/Sofala: OMES, Rudo Kubatana, Bvute re Wana, ASVIMO). (Maputo: Irmas Scalabrianas).
NGO partner at national level focused on service provision (Linha Criança)	
INDIRECT PARTNERS (through above partnerships)	
Children's Parliament periodically working at national level	Children's Groups and Parliament
	CBO partners (through most of which are self help organisations, at community level providing services to vulnerable children

SCN only partnered with four NGOs in the Provinces of Manica and Sofala in view of the scarcity of potential CSO partners, although this masks the degree of civil society engagement as those partners worked with large number of Community Committees. The recently adopted approach of helping to legalise the strongest of these CBOs has already begun in Manica and Sofala and three CBOs have been legalised with at least

three more waiting. While this is helping to build civil society, there could be a risk to the internal dynamic and relationships between members of these organisations if they are encouraged to grow faster than they would have done 'organically'.

Partnership with the Children's Network (*Rede da Criança*) was a strategic move to channel advocacy and the organisation has grown and strengthened as a result of SCN/SCiMoz's institutional support. SCN/SCiMoz also supported SANTAC, the southern African regional network combating trafficking that has built linkages with other key agencies in the region and played an important role in preventing trafficking during the World Cup in S.Africa in 2010.

In summary, SCN's selection of partners provided a balance between state and CSO and between national and district levels, as well as reaching down to community through local committees. However, four points could be considered by SCiMoz for the future:

- i) The model for 'bottom up' evidence based advocacy from district to national level could be more clearly articulated for staff such that partner selection is made in the light of the model. This would mean SCiMoz and partners defining key issues for advocacy, ensuring that the most effective mix of state/CSO partners are selected at district and national levels to channel evidence from experience and also ensuring they are linked into appropriate structures (especially district consultative councils and CNAC¹⁶).
- ii) According to partners, the model of partnering the district government as a whole has reduced the independence of each department (education, Social Affairs) and there was an appeal that this model should not be extended.
- iii) Consideration could be given to advocacy at provincial level given that budgets are increasing at provincial and decreasing at district levels.
- iv) There appears to be only one faith based organisation in the group in spite of the fact that the national survey on civil society observed that faith based organisations make up the majority of CSOs. Further analysis of this group in relation to children's rights could open possibilities for expanding CSO partnerships in the future.

Processes to assess and select partners

Within the SCN Policy for Strengthening Local Capacity, the process for assessing partners emphasises an initial analysis of shared values, policies and practices related to child rights followed by an assessment of administrative and technical capacity to achieve impact. While all partners were selected on their shared values in terms of child rights, of the 16 partners interviewed for the evaluation, only 3 referred to an administrative assessment process and no partner described an analysis of technical capacity before the agreement was signed. The fact that the majority did not undergo a formal administrative, management and governance assessment was true across all budget sizes and strategy periods.

There were some differences in the way in which partners were selected by strategy period. The 'oldest' partnerships dating back from before 2000 were with state partners from collaboration during the armed conflict. In the period 2000-2005 all but one new partner was CSO (Special Police Unit) and based on actively seeking partnerships with

¹⁶ Although CNAC is considered to be a particularly weak structure at present, it remains the designated body to address children's rights in terms of policy, legislation and the follow up to the CRC. To become more effective it must be used and driven, especially by bottom up evidence based advocacy.

child rights agencies, both for testing service provision and overall advocacy at national level. In 2006-9, in recognition of the need to have a more effective balance with state partners, SCN held a conference with District representatives of Education and Social Affairs and invited them to apply for partnership. A special focus was given to the corridor of districts most affected by HIV/AIDS. These partners remain. As already noted, a different strategy for selecting new partners has more recently come into use such that the one partner (within the evaluation group) introduced in 2010/11 was through legalisation of a former community committee.

Countries under the unified presence should be using the Partner Assessment and Selection process set out in the Grants Management Manual published in February 2010 but these procedures are not yet well known. A Pre Award Survey form for use in Mozambique, based on SCUS procedures as the Managing Member, was more familiar to SCiMoz staff. This pre award survey focuses strongly on institutional capacity rather than a notion of shared missions and addresses expectations that would exclude the majority of Mozambican NGOs (such as a written organisational chart, having a policies and procedures manual, attendance and time sheets, qualified bookkeepers, bank reconciliations, cash flow projections etc).

The SCI Grants Management Manual importantly points out that partners should not be selected principally on the basis of already having the capacity to implement programmes given that building the capacity of weaker partners with the potential to grow is extremely important. In line with SCN's policy, the Manual requires an assessment to identify weaknesses followed by a capacity action plan.

3.4 Development of Proposals

Within the group of 12 partners in Manica and Sofala, only 4 partners, all CSO, had prepared proposals (including those that received the largest volume of funds). The only proposals prepared by State partners were initial 'bids' made following the conference referred to in section 3.3. Instead of independent proposals, partners worked with SCN and latterly SCiMoz on joint annual plans and in many cases these were developed in close collaboration with other partners in the same Districts. There are positive and negative results from this process.

On the positive side, it led to strong inter agency coordination at District level and partners usually came together at the beginning of the year and a monthly basis to review progress with the implementation of plans. Importantly, child representatives were included in that process.

However, there were four negative implications of this approach. First, there was no problem analysis or data collection on issues for children to form the justification for proposed interventions, secondly, no *change* indicators were set (monitoring focused on the extent to which activities had been implemented and on coverage), thirdly, partners did not gain the experience of preparing fully worked proposals that would be useful for sustainability beyond SC's support and fourthly, the planning process limited the extent to which it was possible to establish shared objectives between HQ, CO and partners.

Partners and SC staff observed that SCN had in previous years developed projects within a longer time frame (3-4 years) within the strategy period of SCN globally. This allowed for greater security and continuity of interventions. The current system of planning for one year periods only was universally considered too short and has limited

developing a strategic vision to programming with partners. Clearly this change is due to greater uncertainty in funding overall and is likely to remain the case for the foreseeable future. While funding will continue to be agreed and disbursed for annual periods, it may still be possible to extend overall mutual plans for the strategy period as part of a broader framework agreement (much as INGOs have with the EC, for example), *subject to the availability of funding*. The point would be in having a joint commitment to the thematic goals and openness and transparency in relation to funding opportunities and constraints.

In terms of the flexibility of SCN/SCiMoz at the point of planning, partners appreciated the transparency and clarity of what could and could not be covered and understood the argument that there were specific items that could not be included (such as sports equipment for schools and vehicles).

3.5 Visits, Communication, Accompaniment

SCN staff had visited very frequently. Prior to reducing staffing in 2010, project staff had spent around two weeks every month with partners in the field. Although staffing has been cut to reduce costs, all but three partners reported continued frequent visits ranging from 4-5 times each month to twice in 3 months, depending on the distance.

The majority of partners made positive observations about communication up the present such as the following: *'With SC we have frequent communication and rapid replies. They treat us with respect and the Coordinators make their own decisions. They don't have to wait for bosses'*.

Four partners, however, considered that visits were not sufficiently frequent. Three state partners noted that visits and meetings had reduced and, of those, one observed that there had only been three organized meetings in the previous year. Two partners referred to the effects of reduced visiting: one observed that the reduced visiting schedule affected motivation, especially of teachers and parents and a second claimed that Programme Managers were now over-committed and that this had been influential in SCiMoz not being present at a crucial planning meeting with community committees.

The interest in frequent visits appeared to be principally based on good communication and rapid project implementation but two further possible reasons emerged for partners being keen on visits, particularly for State partners. First, state partners have no transport and only get to the field with SCiMoz and secondly, because they are entitled to claim per diems during field visits. These latter points are a concern in terms of sustainability and motivation.

In the context of sub granting, a CSO partner observed that communication was currently focused on addressing specific issues as opposed to broader regular follow up while two further CSO partners considered that the extent and quality of communication had changed in recent times *'Close contact meant they understood our problems and issues well. This is not so now.'*

Two partners raised issues of rapid staff turnover. One had worked with four focal points in as many years and the other with three. They made the point that in general there was continuity but it was nevertheless disruptive.

There was no significant difference by strategy period, budget size or thematic area.

3.6 SCN Systems and Procedures

Within SCN financial systems prior to unification, partners had received funds and produced financial reports on a three monthly basis. The funds were treated as expenditures (as opposed to advances) within the accounts. Since unification, based on a global system, funds to partners are treated as an advance and justifications (receipts and a financial report) are submitted on a monthly basis (although the transfer may still cover three months' of expenditures).

Currently, as before, partners propose the expenditures they want to make based on a monthly plan. They then obtain pro forma invoices and cheques (jointly signed by SCiMoz and the partner) are paid to suppliers. All partners had been provided with training on financial procedures and many had received refresher training.

SC systems and procedures (pre and post-unification) were considered by partners to be straightforward but robust and sufficiently demanding to allow limited room for corruption. SCiMoz staff informed the evaluation that most partners work hard to comply with the procedures but that there are issues of the turnover of trained staff especially amongst State partners. This requires very regular follow up.

There were mixed perceptions on monthly accounting. Two partners (one state, one CSO) preferred monthly accounting, '*monthly accounting is best*', and one partner also noted that they preferred the new system of only getting estimates over a specified limit. Most partners (8) considered the system to be reasonable '*procedures are fine, monthly accounting is no problem*' while four were not happy about the system mostly because of synchronising activities with the mid-month accounting period ('*we don't have time to get things done on a monthly basis*' – two partners) but also because of the expense of traveling to Chimoio to close the accounts. In one case, the journey is over two hours on the bus and the per diem far from covers the costs of having to stay the night (per diem is around 900 Meticaís, about US\$30).

Six in sixteen partners observed that funds continue to be transferred normally and on time while a similar number noted that fund disbursement has been slower in recent years, although one partner admitted that they themselves had been part of the delay as they had submitted reports late. SC staff observed that late submission of reports is the reason for delayed disbursal in most cases. One partner whose transfer was delayed informed that this had only happened in 2010, that they had received an apology and that the situation returned to normal in 2011. For another partner, the issue related to negotiation of the budget more than to disbursal systems.

No specific tendencies in responses were observed by thematic area, size of budget, or strategy period.

In relation to auditing, the evaluator was concerned that the report appeared to be superficial (a simple review of funds in and out). No analysis was made of expenditures against agreed budget lines, or possible opportunities for double accounting (such as presenting high quality copies of receipts).

3.7 Capacity Building

The SCN Policy for Strengthening Local Capacity emphasises strengthening whole organisations in terms of technical, operational and cultural competencies, tying capacity closely to the local context and recognising that there is no 'quick fix'. The policy

includes support to the partner's own capacity building activities and requires Country Offices to assess their own staff team's abilities and resources to commit to capacity building.

SCN/SCiMoz largely followed this approach through long term capacity building using a mix of methodologies with the strongest emphasis on close follow up and technical assistance through SC staff. Partners were included in relevant training events within the region and new written materials were shared with partners. Efforts were made to ensure that interventions were tailored to the needs of each specific partner and the partner's own initiatives in capacity building (especially in the education sector) were frequently supported. In relation to staff training needs, SCN/SCiMoz derives training plans from annual performance evaluations; each staff member has a development plan and these plans are implemented. One example of structured training for staff was the engagement of two staff members on the regional REPSSI (Regional Psychosocial Social Support Initiative) training of trainers course on psychosocial support to vulnerable children.

There are a number of examples of good practice in capacity building with partners through, for example, training of all actors in the justice system (judges, prosecutors, specialist and non-specialist police) on children's rights, strengthening materials for distance learning for teachers and providing training materials for social activists that had a positive impact on the retention of volunteers as they became clearer about their role. No specific tendencies were observed in capacity building by type of partner; there appears to have been consistent investment across state/CSO partners, size of budget, thematic area and length of partnership.

Overall, however, while the *approach* is in line with the policy, the implementation was not as *systematic* as the policy implies. There were no written analyses of the capacity needs of each of partner nor comparisons with staff capacity in those areas. Three further areas could be considered for capacity building in the future: i) additional investment in organisational development beyond training in financial management ii) training on the role of partners in advocacy and which consultative spaces could be occupied and how, and iii) training specific CSO partners to systematically develop strong technical expertise in a chosen area and eventually be called upon as local experts (such as the experience with the Anti-Violence Network, Rede Came).

Are modern technology and social media offering any potential to strengthen or change the way SCN work with local partners and networking?

At the present time, very few children and only around half of partners in Manica and Sofala have access to the internet and most of these rarely open emails. A growing number of people, especially the younger generation, have access to mobile phones and this will gradually extend beyond the wealthier groups. Only one child in the parliament in Gondola had access to Facebook or similar.

However, it is important to ensure that children and youth especially are not excluded from the global trend towards social media and options to strengthen their engagement and provide improved possibilities for networking are provided in the recommendations.

3.8 Children as Partners

Providing opportunities for children to participate in issues that concern them is one of the four pillars of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and a cornerstone principle of SCN globally. In Mozambique, SCN/SCiMoz has supported the establishment of three mechanisms for children's participation: i) children's parliaments ii) children's groups in communities and schools (*Núcleos Infantis*) and iii) schools councils that include elected child representatives. This section reviews those structures and analyses one example of the extent of child participation with children as beneficiaries.

The children's parliaments have now been established in most Districts of the country where SCiMoz. The Ministry of Social Affairs and UNICEF consider that the most important contribution of the children's parliaments to date (with SCiMoz support) has been their work on children's report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child. The parliaments hold ordinary and extraordinary sessions and work together with the community level children's groups (*núcleos infantis*). Parliamentarians are elected through schools or *Núcleos Infantis* (usually only the President, Vice President and Secretary) however procedures are not yet entirely democratic as children informed us in Gondola that teachers tend to select the most suitable candidates. Procedures of children's parliaments have not yet been standardized (although this was a recommendation both by the Children's Report and the CRC Committee).

Through the children's workshop and focus groups for this evaluation, children of the parliaments and *núcleos infantis* analysed the extent of their participation at each phase of the project cycle. They were asked to identify a project they had worked on and then consider their role throughout the project. Projects identified were local dissemination of children's rights, collecting clothes for distribution to OVC and a children's talent contest in which they created songs and theatre to disseminate rights. Although the exercise was not easy for them, the results do appear to be a good reflection of the reality. A total of 10 groups of children participated in the exercise, through sessions in Gondola and Guro. The consolidated results show that in most cases children had been consulted by Social Affairs staff or the youth counsellors or had collaborated with them. But they did not consider the projects to be child led.

	Situation Analysis	Strategy	Action Plan	Implement	M&E
Not involved or not done yet	6	1	0	0	
Consulted	1	4	5	1	6
Worked together with adults	3	5	5	8	2
Child led	0	0	0	1	2
Total	10	10	10	10	10

In contrast to similar groups in other countries, child parliamentarians in Manica and Sofala were from relatively poor areas and the President, VP and most Parliamentarians were in the 6-8th class. In addition, children had received training on children's rights but less so on the role of the parliament perhaps because the 'official' procedures have not yet been defined. These two factors will have contributed to children not considering their actions to be child led.

Overall, the coverage of children's parliaments and recognition given to them by official structures is impressive. They provide an excellent channel in which children can be partners in realising children's rights. However, they could be stronger if children were clearer about their purpose, how to follow up on the children's report to the CRC and

how to create linkages between parliaments. A number of proposals are included in the recommendations.

Two Schools Councils were included in the evaluation. They are potentially a very important structure as the Ministry of Education is required by law to ensure that they are established in all schools and have three child representatives as well as including parents. The children should be elected by peers. However, in both groups visited, children have been nominated by teachers, were not clear of their role and had been given no preparation for participation in meetings with adults. This was very unfortunate as they had a great deal to say especially about corporal punishment and forced marriage leading to school dropout. Clearly there was an issue of how seriously the Education Department had taken this responsibility and children rights to participation. While the concept is excellent, more work will be required to have an impact in practice (further addressed in the recommendations).

These experiences demonstrate that considerable investment is required to ensure meaningful participation.

3.9 Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring through SCN tended to focus on *process* monitoring of the extent to which activities have been implemented as planned rather than reviewing results and impact. On the positive side, as noted above, this led to strong systems for exchange between partners in some Districts as they met on a monthly basis to view progress. However, the fact that change indicators were not established meant that there was relatively limited data available for reporting and no baselines against which to measure change. In the absence of a focus on reliable data and evidence, there was also a tendency for some partners to present figures in reports that were based on supposition rather than fact.

This was true across typologies of partners, although since unification there has been greater investment in the thematic area of education. A selected group of teachers across two Districts were trained to assess basic reading and writing skills in 2010 to improve teaching quality in basic reading and writing skills and this was followed up in 2011 with an analysis of the reading/writing capacity of 700 school children being taught by those teachers. Although the results were extremely worrying, the District Directors of Education took the exercise very seriously as a prompt to defining new strategies to improve the quality of basic skills.

Also since unification, one former CBO that has been legalised with SCiMoz support has undertaken a simple annual house to house survey in the community collecting information on basic indicators for example, children with/without birth registration, in/out of school etc. to measure change. This was an important exercise that merits further analysis but has not yet been captured in narrative reports.

SCiMoz has designed a set of impact indicators that are in the process of being rolled out but will require considerable investment in training of both SCiMoz staff and partners. SCI is also developing *global* outcome indicators that will create a framework against which to monitor change in each thematic area. In addition to outcome indicators, SCI globally has introduced the Total Reach system that aims to produce detailed information on coverage and most partners have already been trained to collect this data.

To be effective in evidence based advocacy for children's rights, improvements in the area of monitoring, analysis and documentation are essential and specific proposals, tied to existing SCiMoz and SCI initiatives, are made in the recommendations.

3.10 Exit Strategies and Sustainability

SCN's Policy for Strengthening Local Capacity refers to the importance of sustained impact on children's rights. In that sense, sustainability for SCN goes beyond sustainability of the immediate project towards sustainable institutions. The Policy acknowledges the importance of establishing exit strategies at the beginning of the working relationship and considers that exit should be looked upon as part of the normal project cycle. To analyse these aspects, sustainability and exit strategies were reviewed with all existing partners and with the two former partners.

SCN had not explicitly analysed and registered exit strategies with any of the partners from the beginning of the agreement. However, significant efforts had been made towards institutional sustainability with the following examples.

- Most of the State partners and some of the civil society partners had office blocks that had been built and equipped with SCN funding. For civil society partners especially this contribution was exceptionally important. Comments included: *'Many civil society organisations disappear because they have no installations. For us, everyone knows where to come and we can use the office as co-funding with donors i.e. the equivalent to a rental contribution'* and, simply, *'the office has made a huge difference to our sustainability'*.
- Sustainability has been addressed from the beginning with the Community Committees by introducing projects such as the initial costs of setting up a small shop, horticulture, grain mills and similar projects.

There were differences in the question of sustainability between state and civil society partners. For state partners, salaries are covered and the issue is principally whether there will be ongoing funding for recurrent costs to provide services. In the case of civil society partners, no aspect of funding is guaranteed and salaries are always the most difficult to fund and the most substantial fixed cost.

Social Affairs made the point that SCN and now SCiMoz is their *only* source of recurrent funding and the same issue applied (to a lesser extent) to the specialist Police Service for Women and Children Victims of Violence. Service provision will inevitably suffer when SC eventually withdraws budget support. This inevitably calls for a stronger emphasis on advocacy for budgets to social services, as recommended by the CRC Committee.

In the case of the civil society partners where the agreement had terminated, they had been advised beforehand although they did not have a lengthy time to prepare for exit. Significant contributions had been made to the sustainability of one of the former partners in the form of the office block built and equipped with SCN funding and much of the work had continued after SCiMoz's withdrawal as a result of the organisation successfully diversifying with project funding from other donors.

In the case of the second former partner (civil society), the organisation had subsequently become a sub-contractor to SCiMoz and they were especially frustrated with the lack of a sustainable *relationship* with SC. Although they had continued funding, they were no longer involved in capacity building activities or active follow up and had no

control over the budget. They also had very little idea of what was likely to happen in the future and no real plans for institutional sustainability.

None of the partners had received support on proposal writing or how to seek funding from other donors. On a different note, the Ministry of Social Affairs drew attention to a general point – not specifically related to SCiMoz – that the Government had sometimes been blamed by communities when NGOs have withdrawn without sufficient work to ensure continuity of service provision and advised SCiMoz to ensure that this was taken into consideration.

There was no significant difference in responses across thematic, strategy period and budget typologies in relation to sustainability.

3.11 Horizontal Partnerships

Several forms of horizontal partnership were identified that can be divided between:

- Long term working groups of SCN/SCiMoz partners that support planning and coordination in service delivery at district level. Some of these partners also hold seats on the district consultative council so can feed in practice experience or advocacy issues to those formal bodies. The Children’s Network has also set up working groups and can take issues into the National Children’s Council as it has a seat on that body.
- Short term reference groups established to address specific issues, such as the trafficking group that was established prior to the World Cup or the working and consultative groups established to prepare the Children’s and CSO reports to the CRC.
- Regular meetings and training workshops between partners and SCN/SCiMoz.

Meeting with peers is extremely valuable to exchange ideas and also to link into advocacy. While there have been regular exchanges through SCN partner meetings in Manica/Sofala, it has been more difficult to bring partners into Maputo to meet with peers in the capital or elsewhere in the country due to the high costs of travel. It may be helpful to explore possibilities of greater exchanges through web-based opportunities, even if they could only be used by partners with poor connections while physically present in SCiMoz offices.

4. Changes in the Capacity and Behaviour of Partners

This section examines what differences have resulted from SCN’s approach to partnership. How has the capacity and behaviour of partners changed? This question is answered at three levels, using the ‘three circle’ model developed by INTRAC to understand organisational capacity: ‘to be’ referring to the level of internal organisation of partners, including understanding of their mission and strategy, ‘to do’ referring to the programme performance and ‘to relate’ covering external linkages¹⁷. Each part is interrelated and all are based within a specific external environment.

4.1 ‘To be’ – Identity and Internal Functioning

In relation to mission and strategy, all CSO partners described ways in which Save the Children had helped to strengthen their sense of direction. Some examples are: ‘SC helped us to grow our institution and become a national point of reference on how to

¹⁷ Referenced in Lipson, B and Hunt, C, 2008 *Capacity Building Framework*, Praxis Series, INTRAC

address sexual abuse of children'. One former partner observed that through becoming much clearer about their role with communities affected by HIV and AIDS, they had stopped losing volunteer activists and had become more effective in service delivery to households. Another observed that they had been unclear about how to address issues of trafficking and how to prevent HIV transmission in a very complex and risky context. SCiMoz had been the major influence in their development on those issues.

Some civil society partners stood out in being clear about their role in advocacy in relation to the state. In particular the partners in Maputo, Children's Network, Anti Violence Network and SANTAC were very clear about their role in advocacy on policy and legislation.

Some state partners also stood out in the extent to which they have translated SCN/SCiMoz's influence on children's rights into practice. The specialist Police Unit in particular clearly stated that children had a right to be protected against violence and that their service was responsible both for responding to and preventing violence. They had devised a set of highly effective and practical actions that did not happen prior to SCN's engagement and created a model that is being replicated across the country. Indeed, the Police Units would probably not exist without SCN's intervention as they began life as a programme in the aftermath of the Beijing Conference on Women's Rights but gradually became units as SCN supported them in all aspects from training to the construction and equipping of an office unit. They currently have adequate staffing, some limited revenue funding and a clear mission.

The Education Department was shifting in its perception that over and above the duty to provide access to primary education, there is a responsibility to ensure that the *quality* is sufficient to improve results. SCN/SCiMoz have been highly influential in this respect by working on teacher training and pedagogical approaches for many years but especially in testing children's reading and writing abilities. There was, however, less evidence of the recognition of the duty of Education Departments to *protect* children in school or of children's right to *meaningful* participation.

Within Social Affairs, staff were able to clearly articulate children's rights to protection as a result of SCN's work, but their role as duty bearers is frustrated by the weakness of their own Ministry and lack of resources, especially in terms of supporting the most vulnerable children.

In relation to organisational development, the strongest impacts have been in financial management and in joint planning/coordination. While Maputo based partners had undertaken analyses of issues for children, there was very little evidence of this in the Provinces. This is fundamental for effective project development. There was also very limited evidence of effective monitoring, analysis and documentation across the board and SCiMoz is already addressing these issues.

4.2 'To do' - Programming

SCN/SCiMoz's objectives in programming are to develop effective service delivery models with a view to scale up, and to advocate for and contribute to policy and legislative change. This section reviews the ways in which partners have changed in these capacities.

- i) The Police special units combating violence have developed many valuable models that have been scaled up including: being trusted with cash transfers between separated parents to ensure child support, going into schools to alert children and teachers that corporal punishment is an offence (and corporal punishment appears to have abated considerably as a result) and directly going into communities to address violence at any time of the day or night, pressing charges against perpetrators and providing emergency protection to children.
- ii) The Departments of Social Affairs with SCN/SCiMoz support and training have developed models for two types of community organisation. First, Community Committees working on child protection and support to families affected by HIV and AIDS. For the Community Committees, guidelines have recently been produced to ensure that approaches are scaled up and it is clear that this is happening in practice. These include the children's groups that are part of the Community Committees. Secondly, Social Affairs is promoting the Children's Parliament in all Districts where SCiMoz is active that are both addressing issues for children as providing a focus for youth groups (theatre, dance).
- iii) The Departments of Education are moving towards more effective teacher engagement in basic skills of reading and writing, use of the syllabic chart and teacher-pupil relations. SCN/SCiMoz has also worked with the Ministry of Education on the model of Schools Councils.
- iv) NGO partners at local level have introduced good practices in working with Community Committees on home based care of those affected by HIV, treatment follow up, advice on nutrition and prevention of mother to child transmission. They have also developed more effective structures for follow up and supervision of volunteer activists.
- v) NGO partners at central level have been important in feeding into policy debates and in drafting legislation. The Children's Network in particular helped to organise consultations for the CRC Report and for the Children's Act (approved in 2008). The network against violence fed into the debate on the Children's Act in the National Assembly. According to both the Ministry of Social Affairs and UNICEF, they have played an important role in bringing the legislation into line with the CRC.
- vi) The network that addresses violence against children (supported by SCS) has helped to introduce good practices in interviewing children subject to violence and has changing the approach of the press towards protecting children's confidentiality.
- vii) The regional trafficking network raised awareness of all actors (including children) especially during the World Cup period and helped in the detection of a trafficking network that was abducting children for internal organs. Another SC NGO partner has raised the awareness of even very young children (around 4 years) to the risks of trafficking in the border area where the NGO is active and trafficking is extremely well organized with identified *marianos* (people who support traffickers). Many trafficked children have been detected and returned to families and schools and all children in local schools now have birth registration.

4.3 'To Relate' – Linkages with Others

The question of relationships between partners and others is both 'vertical' and 'horizontal'. For state partners at District level, this implies the extent of their

relationships and influence with higher levels (Provinces and Central level) and downward accountability to constituents: children and communities. For civil society partners it implies the quality and impact of relationships with consultative bodies at District, Provincial, National or International levels as well as downward accountability to children and communities. For both state and civil society, horizontal relationships mean the quality of work with other sectors and partners at the same level (largely District).

In relation to State partners, there is limited evidence of them gaining a significant voice within senior bodies or of using the experience with SCN/SCiMoz to make the case for greater investment in children's services. The joint State services and CSO planning sessions that SCN has promoted at District level represent an opportunity to develop briefing papers on effective practices for presentation in District Consultative Councils but there is little evidence that this is happening. There is broad acknowledgement that District Consultative Councils have not yet been fully used (see section 2.2).

There is more evidence of growing downward accountability to children and communities through Community Committees and the Police Units, although Schools Councils do not yet appear to be engaging community representation and child representatives adequately.

In relation to civil society partners, there is evidence of their engagement in consultative processes initiated at central level. In the process to develop the Children's Act and the report to the CRC, the National Children's Council (CNAC) and the Children's Network proactively engaged CSOs in the Districts, including children. However there is less evidence of an upward process of influence, driven by CSOs/State partners in the Districts drawing on good practice examples. The District level partners could provide briefings on service delivery models for the District Consultative Councils and for CNAC.

There is evidence of CSO downward responsiveness to families affected by HIV/AIDS through networks of community activists.

5. Contribution to Overall Capacity to Address Child Rights

SCN/SCiMoz with partners has made considerable contributions to address children's rights and in the words of one partner, '*SC has helped to raise the agenda of the child within the Mozambican Government*'. The impact of the service delivery models and advocacy described above has been to contribute to the following significant changes:

- i) Introduction of the Children's Act in 2008 that is comprehensive legislation on children's rights developed with considerable intervention from partners. SCN/SCiMoz continues to work with partners to press for approval of the procedures to implement the legislation.
- ii) Introduction of the Anti Human Trafficking Act also in 2008, which had considerable input from three or more SCN/SCiMoz partners.
- iii) Adoption of the Schools Councils model through national legislation in 2007 that includes two child representatives as well as parents. This measure was promoted by partners in the Ministry of Education with SCN support.
- iv) Increase in classroom capacity of schools to provide access to children and reduction in drop-out rates through a mix of measures including classroom building and repair and supplying school materials to the most vulnerable.

SCN/SCiMoz direct support to partners has allowed for these measures especially in Manica and Sofala.

- v) Within school Districts supported by SCN/SCiMoz, recognition of the need to strengthen basic reading and writing skills by specialist teacher training.
- vi) Reductions in child marriages in school children by Community Committees and Children Groups quickly tracing girls as they drop out of schools. Similarly a reduction in other negative traditional practices, such as girls being handed over as a 'gift' to sons-in-law. The model, as described above, was developed by Social Action and CSO partners with SCN/SCiMoz support and has been set out in guidelines.
- vii) Strengthened support models for the most vulnerable including treatment follow up (although very high percentages still have limited or no access to treatment for HIV), psychosocial support, housebuilding, food aid, support to family farms and self-help groups.
- viii) Strengthened voice for children through the children's parliaments established by Social Action with SCN/SCUK/SCiMoz support.

The most important factors that enabled SCN's capacity to promote children's rights through partnership were:

- i) The most important factor has been the relationships of mutuality, transparency and trust that SCN/SCiMoz developed with partners. Strong respect for the local context and culture also allowed for greater acceptance of proposed approaches.
- ii) The fact that SCN was secure in its own funding through internal sources and NORAD and could predictably provide budget ceilings at the beginning of each year. This predictability provided greater security to civil society organisations and allowed the State to use SCN assistance effectively as local budget support to existing plans. Funding has become less secure for all in recent years.
- iii) SCN was able to provide medium term funding that allowed for stable partnerships over strategy periods that allowed for sufficient time for real impact.
- iv) SCN was flexible and ambitious in the way it used funding, including investing in infrastructure in a way that very few INGOs were willing or able to do.

Factors that constrained SCN's capacity to promote children's rights through partnership were:

- i) The lack of investment in effective monitoring and evaluation using change indicators.
- ii) The distance between Manica/Sofala and Maputo that constrained the extent of exchange between partners and policymakers.
- iii) A weak civil society and limited choices in potential CSO partners.

Opportunities to build on the enabling factors and mitigate the constraints are outlined in the conclusions and recommendations.

6. Good Practices

Good practices in partnership that should be sustained include the following:

- The significant investment made in the sustainability of both state and CSO partners through long term capacity building and infrastructure.
- Partner relations clearly characterised by mutual respect and supporting partner's own goals.
- Ideally, partner self-determination in terms of goals and objectives within the broad parameters of child rights. However, this requires the context of secure and flexible funding described above. This issue is addressed in the conclusions and recommendations in the light of a more constrained funding environment.
- Engaging children through structured systems in the children's parliament (with further investment in training and procedures for the parliament).

Good practices that could be replicated include:

- Monthly District level planning and review sessions including all SCN partners with representation from child parliamentarians and children's groups. This allowed for good practices in service delivery to be extended out across CSO and state partners.
- Strategically selecting specific Districts and aiming to promote both state services and civil society intervention in the same Districts for maximum dialogue and impact.
- Close liaison between the state (Social Affairs) and community (through community committees) to identify families most in need of WFP food and other forms of support.
- Linkages between the Special Police Units and Community Committees to create local level alert system to violence against children and develop community confidence to report perpetrators.
- SCS work in developing one partner as a national expert in violence against children through supporting research, training, campaigns and publicity.

7. Implications of Changes within Save the Children

The principal implication of the changes within SCiMoz since unification is that the ethos of partnership is shifting towards sub-granting to achieve project or programme goals rather than developing a *child rights based civil society and state* as an end in itself. Internal analysis of partnership has recognized the importance of working towards the principles that the partners in the Keystone survey set out, which are in close harmony with those of SCN, but there remain concerns about the degree of accountability of partners and of their responsiveness to constituencies. If partnership is at the centre of the SCI Theory of Change for the future, it is essential that these differences in perspectives are clarified.

One further aspect has changed in Mozambique since unification. Largely due to the global economic crisis, overall budgets have fallen so most partners have seen a reduction in funds and less security in funding. Medium term funding and agreements for a strategy period have no longer been possible. However, some opportunities have also arisen for partners as a result of unification in that some SCUK funds have been allocated to health programmes in Manica.

8. Conclusions and Recommendations

The major strengths of the SCN partnership approach in Mozambique were in the strong relationships of mutual respect developed with partners, the focus on building technical capacity and establishing permanent institutions (infrastructure, equipment and training) and, fundamentally, in allowing partners to develop their own agenda within the parameters of child rights. The mix of state and CSO partnerships was also a strength as was working at different levels of administration. This was possible within the context of secure multi-year funding with broad goals.

Through these approaches SCN/SCiMoz has made significant contributions to realising children's rights as set out in Section 5.

The principal weaknesses of the SCN approach were in monitoring, analysis and reporting/documentation by partners, not obliging partners to develop proposals or strategic plans, the lack of a *systematic* approach to capacity building and the fact that exit strategies are not designed from the beginning of a partnership. In terms of children's participation, understanding of the purpose and procedures of the children's parliament and schools councils was also relatively weak.

Most of the positive aspects have been sustained following unification and some weaknesses are being addressed, especially in strengthening the monitoring of change indicators in which there will be a significant investment in the medium term. There remains a focus on technical capacity building while the mix of state/CSO partnerships is still in place. Total budgets have fallen due to overall funding constraints and, for the same reason, agreements are now annual with reduced security for partnerships. Systems have changed to monthly accounting, meeting a mixed reaction from partners. Some concerns were also expressed about reduced communication and follow up.

The principal issues for the future will be how to sustain the sense of partner self-determination within a context of donor funded programmes with fixed objectives and in which partners are being included as sub grantees. Maintaining the investment in partner capacity building will also be a challenge in the context of more constrained donor funding. These are issues also arising within other country case studies. The recommendations that follow aim to contribute to the debate in Mozambique but will also be taken further forward in the overview report from this evaluation, including in relation to head office initiatives in addressing partnership issues with donors.

Recommendations

Partnership Strategy

SCiMoz is developing a partnership strategy and issues raised in this report should be taken into consideration in that process. Specifically the following points should be considered:

- i) Concepts of partnership in the light of the values and principles identified by respondents in the Keystone survey, within SCN policy and endorsed by partners in this evaluation (especially mutuality, respect and transparency). The policy could usefully begin with a statement of the values and principles to be agreed by both partners.
- ii) Analyse how to retain the concept of building sustainable institutional capacity to realise children's rights as an end in itself. This could be reserved as an

- objective for strategic partners with which SCiMoz expects to maintain a medium term partnership agreement.
- iii) Debate the possibility of introducing framework agreements to coincide with strategy periods with medium-term strategic partners. Within the partnership, SCiMoz would provide annual funding as a grant for specific goals *subject to the availability of funding*. The aim would be to value partners, reduce the feeling of sub-contracting but retain the flexibility of annual funding based on the availability of funds.
 - iv) Sub grants would remain as a stand-alone for shorter term sub-contractors or those in the early experimental stages of partnership.
 - v) Engage strategic partners at the stage of drawing up large proposals to donors and/or objectives for strategy periods or thematic areas such that they have greater ownership over the goals.
 - vi) Review the partner portfolio in working with state and civil society partners and at which levels of administration to achieve maximum impact on children's rights. Maintain a mixed portfolio but work with partners to articulate more clearly their roles (and that of SCiMoz) in realising children's rights (drawing on SCN's Policy and Common Understanding).
 - vii) Review the partner selection and assessment process with the fundamental criterion being a strong commitment towards children's rights and, secondly, interest in further developing organisational capacity to realise rights.
 - viii) Monitor carefully the newly established CBOs emerging from Community Committees to ensure that internal dynamics and 'norming and storming' do not risk the stability of such organisations.

Capacity Building

- ix) In line with the Grants Management Manual, SCiMoz could assist partners (especially civil society partners) in undertaking a participatory organisational assessment to identify their own strengths and weaknesses and help them to devise a capacity action plan. This could include the key areas of strategic and operational planning, NGO governance, HR management, monitoring and evaluation (see separate recommendation), fundraising and financial management). Partners could have a budget line within funds to cover internal OD. Providers could be mostly drawn from within SCiMoz staff on the basis of one to one technical assistance following an assessment of staff skills. Peer support could possibly help in this process by identifying partners with the strongest systems in each area to serve as point of reference. Progress could be reviewed with partners on an annual basis.
- x) In the spirit of mutuality, value the specialist knowledge of some partners and invite them to provide talks to SCiMoz on their area.
- xi) Consider with each civil society partner whether they are in a position to develop recognised technical expertise in a particular area and to be called upon to provide technical advice to state services. This is a strong form of advocacy but can be deliberately identified and nurtured through learning opportunities.
- xii) A further area of capacity building that would be beneficial to both state and civil society partners is in understanding the spaces that exist at different levels for consultation and advocacy and how to most effectively use those spaces through evidence based advocacy. In addition, SCiMoz could support civil society development by helping to follow up the recommendations from the CSO analysis including a voluntary code of conduct and reinforcing networking amongst child focused agencies.

Sustainability

- xiii) Ensure that a discussion on the probable length of the partnership takes place at the beginning of each partnership, includes an expected end date and plan towards sustainability of the organisation and of the specific programmes being supported. The plan could consider a) training in fundraising and practice with proposal writing during the partnership b) contacts with potential donors and encouragement to diversify during the partnership c) opportunities for developing expertise in a particular area and d) possibilities for income generation. At a later stage, once partners have demonstrated their commitment, ensuring that they have stable premises has been shown to be highly effective in promoting sustainability.

Monitoring&Evaluation and Evidence Based Advocacy

- xiv) Support partners to undertake a) *situation analyses and baselines* in their particular sector and geographical area and b) to *identify change indicators* and methodologies for data collection and analysis. This can be guided by SCiMoz change indicators and the new global indicator system. This will require training and capacity building with SCiMoz staff first and then with partners. The linkages with report writing based on evidence should also be made and possible assistance to publications. SCiMoz has internal capacity to provide this training but requires a recurrent budget to facilitate the work. SCN could assist SCiMoz with funds to provide training in this respect.
- xv) This work should be organized in conjunction with the analysis of occupying spaces for public consultation and which data would be most powerful in each context.

Partnership with Children

- xvi) Support children in their recommendation for more formalized procedures for children's parliaments. Together with the children's parliaments in different areas (and drawing on many international examples) gradually develop a set of recommendations on procedures to be shared between children's parliaments until agreement. These should include the purpose of the parliament (and núcleos), system for elections, mandates, and recommendations on which adult councils and officials should meet with children and with what frequency. Ideas from different children's parliaments could be shared with SCiMoz support by email or as a section of the Children's network website.
- xvii) Once the regulations are prepared, SCiMoz could support Social Affairs to set up a child-friendly training curriculum based on the regulations that could be delivered each year to child parliamentarians in view of the frequent turnover. The main facilitators could be the youth Councillors and former parliamentarians.
- xviii) To provide more clarity and continuity to children's parliament activities, some principal activities could be structured around follow up to the children's report to the CRC. Children could vote on which are priority issues for the parliaments locally and nationally. Then decide what more information needs to be collected on those issues. Children could design their own project around the issue, analyse which are the state duty bearers and make recommendations for what they could do. They could organize meetings with local representatives of the duty bearer to present children's views and steps

children are already taking. Children should be fully prepared for these meetings beforehand.

xix) Consider whether there are any existing consultative spaces where children's voices could be heard.

xx) In relation to Schools Councils, SCiMoz could usefully advocate with Education Departments about the importance of meaningful child participation in Schools Councils drawing on real and concrete examples on how children's voices and action have provided positive change. In addition, analyse with representatives of Education Departments and Schools Councils how to establish a sustainable training system for child representatives (eg. by producing child-friendly training materials and having outgoing representatives train the incumbents). The materials should include mechanisms for children working together *in advance of Schools Council meetings* to prepare issues and proposals. It should also include how to present issues in an effective way.

Accountability

- In the spirit of positive partnership and transparency, it would be helpful to have an open discussion with partners about all potential issues with accountability and the types of systems that are expected from civil society and state partners. This should also include information on the types of checks that will need to be made periodically. Ways of conducting audits should also be reviewed to ensure that possibilities of double accounting are addressed and to assess expenditures against budget lines. Occasional evaluations should also take place to review outputs and outcomes against plans and expenditures.

Use of Technology

While this has not yet been done in Mozambique, it may be possible to link children's parliaments from different Districts through installing computer and internet capacity in the parliament buildings that SCN has built. This would allow children to link on campaigns related to the Children's Report on the CRC. Through this medium, they could learn about the work of children's parliaments in different countries of the world.

In relation to partners, while not all have regular access to the internet, SCiMoz could facilitate partner access to the Children's Network website where they could download key national policy documents and legislation, access information on campaigns and exchange messages with other children's organisations. Monthly visits to the SCiMoz offices could provide that opportunity.

Appendix A – Terms of Reference - SCN's thematic evaluation of cooperation with partners

Background

Building local and national capacity to secure child rights is a key working principle in SCN's global strategy, as it has been since the 1990s. SCN's global strategy 2010-2013 states that:

'Our primary goal is achieving results for children. Lasting change is dependent on building local capacity and, in certain situations, increased capacity for partner organisations are in itself a goal.'

As a working principle, 'building local and national capacity' acknowledges the role of local duty bearers and civil society in advocating for children's rights and achieving sustainable results for children in the long run. Local ownership is essential to this thinking. SCN aim to strengthen local and national authorities as well as civil society including child-led groups, both in terms of their administrative capacity and competence, their professional skills, and capability to plan, implement, monitor, coordinate and interact as stakeholders in the development processes. Furthermore, a specific objective on building local capacity is set in the Child Rights Governance thematic priority area in the strategy: "strengthened capacity within civil society, including child led groups, to promote children's rights". SCN's Policy for Strengthening Local Capacity (2007) gives guidance to how country programmes should approach and engage with local partners.

In Save the Children International's Global Strategy 2010-2015 the Theory of Change puts building partnerships at the centre when exercising SC's role as the innovator, the voice and the organisation that achieves results at scale for children. In the strategy, it is stated that SCI will "collaborate with children, civil society organisations, communities, governments and the private sector to share knowledge, influence others and build capacity to ensure children's rights are met."

Challenges

Building local and national capacity is essential for a locally owned and sustainable development and yet very complex and challenging to achieve. SCN want to assess how and to what extent our strategies and policies are being implemented and effective in strengthening local capacity in the countries where SCN work, and how partnership cooperation could develop in the future in order to maximize the development effect.

INGOs' added value in development in general and more specifically in building the capacity of governments and civil society is central to both public and professional discourse in Norway and globally. Some voices from the South and North alike are critical to what could be called an INGO-ification of development countries and lack of local ownership, the taking over of development agendas, the outside influence on power structures, the asymmetry of partnerships, etc. Donors have multiple interests in terms of strengthening local capacity whilst also requiring value for money, efficiency and results corresponding to their home public and donor development agenda and requirements. Issues such as corruption and financial control have increased the technical requirements on partners. This focus is paralleled by a drive in many development countries to take control over the development agenda, and also some times over the understanding and implementation of human rights. Many countries have issued laws and restrictions on INGO influence and activity. An INGO like Save the Children has to constantly prove our added value both to donors, host governments, partners and the children we work for. Additionally, SCN has to balance the roles of being both a trusted capacity building partner to governments and conducting the 'watchdog role' together with local and national civil society as advocates for child rights. Therefore, we need to understand and develop the way we cooperate with partners under different and changing contexts to maximize the positive effects of partner cooperation and avoid unintended negative effects.

In the evaluation of SCN's cooperation with partners conducted in 2001, the evaluation team (INTRAC), made several recommendations addressing key challenges in North - South partner cooperation:

- the need for more flexibility in setting objectives in order to be more responsive to local needs and initiative and not stifling local ownership
- the need for long term development with partners, a broader and more coherent approach to capacity building
- a need to redefine SCN's role in the capacity building of partners and especially the role as facilitator rather than 'manager' or 'supervisor'.

In Norad's Organisational Review of SCN, conducted in 2008, the review team found some evidence of instrumental relationships with civil society partners in the two programmes studied. In some cases, partners seemed to be considered a means to reach Save the Children Norway's own objectives, while the team emphasized that strengthening the capacity of local partners should be an objective on its own. Norad strongly emphasizes the need for partnerships built on equality and transparency, respecting local ownership. Building the capacity and competence of partners should contribute to building a strong civil society in the countries where Save the Children Norway operates. These findings and comments have already had an impact in the way SCN defines its goals related to building local and national capacity, by feeding into the discussions and drafting of the global strategy 2010-2013. As shown in quotations from the strategy earlier, SCN concluded that it is legitimate to say that in some instances building capacity of partners is a means to an end, a way to ensure that we reach our target groups and in other instances it is the building of capacity which is the end. The review findings were nevertheless of such an importance to SCN that further follow up is needed to assess the impact (both intended and unintended, positive and negative) of SCN partner cooperation, hence reflected in this evaluation.

Fundamental to any relationship between SCN and a local partner (whether government or civil society) is to define the objective for the relationship: What do SCN and the partner want to achieve? Whether the objective is to strengthen the knowledge and understanding of children's rights in a particular target group, provide a service to children or it is to strengthen a particular partner as a voice for children in a society, capacity building should be pack and parcel in order to increase the likelihood that these objectives are achieved effectively in a sustainable manner and the partner is strengthened as an actor in the local development process. The main question is if and how SCN actually add value to the partners in terms of strengthening them in delivering on their objectives, and beyond that, as empowered, competent and sustainable actors anchored in the development process in their societies.

As Save the Children has come together as one international organisation, SCN identify the strengthening of local and national capacity as a key working principle which we would like to see develop in this new fellowship. Several Save the Children members (SC Sweden, SC UK and SC US) as well as several of the country programmes supported by SCN have engaged in evaluations and studies in this field lately, hence the interest to contribute to an increased understanding and development of partner cooperation is shared by many.

This evaluation will build on previous evaluations and studies, e.g. SCN's thematic evaluation of cooperation with partners in 2001, conducted by INTRAC, and coordinated with recent and ongoing work in other SC member organisations.

Purpose/Objectives

The main purpose of this evaluation is to provide an insight into SCN's work with partners, **build learning and ensure accountability** by:

1. Providing evidence of **impact** (positive and negative, intended or unintended outcome/impact) of SCN's cooperation with partners in five different countries; to what extent and how a) partners have been strengthened as providers of and advocates for children's rights, and b) how SCN through partner cooperation has added value to the overall capacity of key actors in the society where we work to address and fulfil children's rights.
2. Provide an oversight of different implementation models and identify and **document good practices** in cooperating with partners, both government and civil society, appropriate to the aim of the partnership and capacity building of the partner. This assessment should also provide evidence of enabling versus obstructing factors in different context and discuss how this could be taken into account when setting the objective for partnerships and selecting partners and modalities.
3. Contribute to **increased knowledge and understanding** by bringing the organisation up to date on research/evaluation findings on partner cooperation (short state of the art report) and bring insight into and awareness of different and sometimes multiple objectives in partner cooperation.
4. Based on the above, provide input to the **formation** of future partnership cooperation in SCN supported programmes and SCI.

This evaluation will go parallel to and be informed by an ongoing SCN mapping of administrative routines in partner cooperation in supported country programmes, aiming to identify gaps between current practises and the new requirements coming with the roll out of SCI programme administration and suggest corresponding adjustments.

The evaluation will start out with a desk review to 1) provide a short update on literature and knowledge on partner cooperation, 2) review SCN (HO and CPs) and SC policies in this field, and 3) map the nature of SCN partnership across supported country programmes, examining numbers and types of partners, etc., complementing the information gathered the above mentioned mapping.

Scope

Four country programmes where SCN have presence or provide support are invited to participate in the evolution as case countries: Nepal, Nicaragua, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. Additionally, Ethiopia will be offered financial and technical support to conduct a parallel external evaluation/study designed particularly for a context where government has applied an NGO law restricting the cooperation between local civil society and INGOs.

These cases are chosen because all have considerable experience in partner cooperation that the whole organisation can learn from and they differ on several dimensions assumed to influence on the implementation of good partnerships, helping to illustrate possible models in different contexts. Relevant dimensions are: conflict/post conflict/stable context (hence illustrating differences in partner cooperation in

humanitarian versus long term interventions); # and nature of partners (government vs. civil society partners); level of government regulations and control of civil society; different level of civil society activity; SCN holds different roles (Managing member/Participating member/SCN country programmes), only to mention some. An acknowledgement of the uniqueness of each country context in which SCN work has lead us to play down the comparative approach and concentrate on analysing the impact, relevance and potential of partner cooperation in each case country.

The evaluation will cover both government partners (duty bearers), civil society partners in general and child organisations more specifically (representing right holders).

The evaluation will look at partner cooperation per 2011, selecting examples of both

- 1) long term partnerships, dating back to the previous strategy period 2006-2009 and before, to assess impact and identify good practices, and
- 2) partnership established since the beginning of the new strategy period 2010-2014, to assess if any changes in practises has taken place and give input to the formation of future partnership models.

Examples should be drawn that illustrate a wide range of partnerships. Criteria for selection of sample partnerships has to be carefully developed, but important dimensions are differences in terms of implementation of humanitarian and long term development interventions, small/large partner, different thematic areas (education and CRG are strategic priorities), delivery of services to children vs. innovation vs. advocacy/awareness raising, etc.

In search of good practises, examples can be drawn from both SCN partnerships and those of other SC members present in a country.

The question of self implementation versus working through partners is not within the scope of this evaluation. Although SCN promotes implementation of development projects with local partners, there are circumstances where self implementation is the only choice (unable or unwilling state actors, non-excising or weak civil society etc).

Objectives and Key Evaluation Questions

1. Assess impact:

- a. What impact has different modes of partner cooperation had, and how, on the capacity of partners, both government and civil society, to implement and advocate for children's rights?
- b. How effective have SCN's support been in terms of strengthening the capacity of each individual partner organisation beyond the achievement of the defined/common objectives for the partnership?
- c. Has SCN through its cooperation with partners contributed to the overall capacity of society in general, and civil society in particular, to voice, address and fulfil children's rights?
- d. To what extent are clear and consistent objectives set for the partner cooperation in each case, which impact can be assessed against? And are the objectives known and shared by HQ, Country Offices and partners?
- e. Are SC partnering with key actors in government and civil society when compared to the actual child rights issues in each case country? Which processes are followed in order to assess and select strategic partners

corresponding to the human rights situation and the intended objectives for partner cooperation? Are the selections of partners ensuring sustainability as well as strengthening the new and weaker voices and actors in the field of child rights?

- f. Are there any negative or unintended effects to be found in the selected sample of partner cooperation? Special attention should be paid to the most prominent known pitfalls of INGO presence.

Impact should be assessed against intentions/objectives for the partnership, and the contextual and organisational setting. Key dimensions of impact are *relevance* and *sustainability*.

1. Document **good practices**:
 - a. Through a mapping of partner cooperation in practice and the assessment of impact, identify and document some good practices which could serve as examples to be replicated. Examples should apply to government and civil society cooperation respectively, and illustrate different contextual settings.
2. Contribute to **increased knowledge and understanding**:
 - a. Produce a short 'state of the art' on partnership cooperation, based on acknowledged research, evaluations and studies.
 - b. Structure the different intentions/objectives for partner cooperation found at different levels of the organisation (in writing and in practice) and discuss (i) potential conflicting vs. mutually reinforcing objectives and (ii) how different modes of partner cooperation contribute to the different objectives.
3. Input to **future partner cooperation** policy and practice:
 - a. Based on finding in this evaluation, with a special request for input from children, partners and stakeholders in general, what changes should be made to current modes of partnership cooperation in order to strengthen local capacity, ensure local ownership and sustainability in the future?
 - b. Which modes of partner cooperation are particularly strengthening civil society in promoting child rights?
 - c. Are modern technology and social media offering any potential to strengthen or change the way SCN work with local partners and networking?

Methodology

The main focus of this evaluation will be on how SCN has and can strengthen local capacity through partnership. With capacity we mean both the capacity of partners (both government, private and civil society) to implement development projects effectively, the capacity to play a role/be the voice as advocates for children rights in line with the common objectives of SCN and the partner, and the ability of the partner organisation to develop, define and perform according to their own full mandate (to manage their affairs successfully, to perform the functions, solve problems and set and achieve objectives for themselves in a sustainable manner).

Assessing impact will mainly focus on the change in the capacity and potential of partners to perform better according to the common objective for the partnership. Capacity and potential will be analysed as strategic and organisational, relevance, sustainability and independence. This evaluation will not be a full assessment of partners' impact in terms of positive changes in the lives of children and society as a whole. Nevertheless, secondary sources (evaluations, project reports etc) and stakeholders should be consulted to a certain extent to get an impression of partner's ability to deliver according to their purpose.

The methods for data collection, analysis, review process and participation will be detailed in a dialogue between consultants and as outlined in the evaluation plan (Inception Report) to be produced by the consultants. A key principle in SCN evaluation is, however, child participation, which should be integrated in the research methodology. The methods will be finalized in detail in start up workshops in each country. Selection of sample cases of partnerships will be done by the consultants with assistance and advice from CO staff, based on pre-approved criteria for selection.

Deliverables

- Evaluation Plan / Inception Report to be approved by the Steering Group
- Participatory workshops/meetings
 - Start up workshop in Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Nepal and Nicaragua, settling the evaluation teams and involving stakeholders, and detailing/adopting the evaluation plan and data collection in country
 - Sharing findings and analysis with SMTs and staff upon return from data collection
 - Share draft reports and facilitate participatory review processes
- Data collection in the four case countries
- Draft and final country reports and global synthesis report
 - The country report should present the main findings, lessons learned, analysis and recommendations in accordance with the TOR and IR per country
 - The final global synthesis report should not exceed 30 pages, including an executive summary of 2-4 pages.
- Presentation of the final report(s) at one workshop/conference

All documentation and reports should be in English, and the Inception Report and final reports will be subject to approval by the Steering Group.

Criteria for selecting international consultant(s)

- Proven record of excellent competence in evaluations and assessments
- Excellent competence in development partnership models and practices involving both civil society and government partners, as well as capacity building with partners.
- Good team leader skills
- Good writing skills
- Preferably have knowledge of SCN and/or child rights' programming (at least one of the consultants) Preferably be familiar with the concept of children's participation (at least one of the consultants)
- Preferably have knowledge of Spanish/(Portuguese) (at least one of the consultants)

Reference documents

Key documents, but not exhaustive:

SCN strategies, especially 2006-2009 and the current strategy 2010-2013

SCN's Policy for Strengthening Local Capacity (2007)

Norad's 'Organisational Review of Save the Children Norway' (2008)

INTRAC's 'SCN- Thematic Evaluation of Co-operation with partners' (2001)

Time Frame

Organisation, Roles and Responsibilities

Please see the organisational set up for a detailed outline of the formal organisation of the management of the evaluation. In brief, the evaluation will be anchored with the SCN International Programme Director, Gunnar Andresen, as project owner. The evaluation

December 2010 – January 2011	Case Country to confirm participation and give input to evaluation questions Set Evaluation Organisation Finalize Terms of Reference
February 2011	Call for consultants Decide Evaluation Team Desk review
March 2011	Inception report/evaluation plan First kick off workshop in one case country
March – June 2011	Field work and data analysis
July – August 2011	(Summer vacation in Europe) Draft country reports due by end of August
August – September 2011	Sharing and discussing findings with stakeholders and Reference group
October 2011	Draft Global Report and review process
November 2011	Final country reports and global report
December 2011 (January 2012)	Approval and sharing

process will be managed by a project group, headed by the project manager. Most communication within the project group will happen by email and telephone, but we aim at 1-2 F2F meetings. A steering group will make decisions about budget, consultants and approval of reports, based on input from the reference group. A reference group with representatives from among SC staff from SCN HO and CPs, from other SC members and NORAD, will input to the substantial discussion on ToR, draft findings and conclusions. The Terms of Reference is approved by the Senior Management Team (SMT) of SCN and the Board of Directors will be kept informed. The organisational set up for the evaluation in Ethiopia will be decided by the SMT there.

This should be an external evaluation, and external independent consultant(s) (hereafter called international consultants) will lead the evaluation process, analyse the data, and write up country reports and a final global report. Details will be outlined in a contract between SCN and the international consultant(s). To assist the international consultant(s), local national consultants and data collectors can be hired. As always in SCN managed evaluations, the evaluation will involve staff and stakeholders' participation, and special efforts will be made to ensure meaningful child participation. Evaluation teams will be set up for each country. One SCN focal person has been

appointed in each of the case countries and in Ethiopia to facilitate the process in countries. These focal persons are also part of the project group. Although participation is encouraged, it will ultimately be the external global consultant's responsibility to ensure an independent and high quality evaluation process and reports. The SCN organisation will support them to the best of our ability to reach that end.

The interest and dedication of Country Directors and SMTs are always highly conducive to good evaluation processes.

Appendix B – Interviews Conducted

Partners in Maputo

State

Francisca Salles	Deputy Director	Ministry of Social Action
Esperança dos Santos Cuna	Head NGO Dept	Ministry Foreign Affairs

CSO

Amélia Fernanda	Executive Director	Children's Network
Rui António Mutemba	Information Officer	Children's Network
Francisco Perruque	Manager Public Info	Children's Network
André Nhatsave	Finance Manager	Children's Network
Sisters	Coordinators	Irmãs Scalabrianas
Matilde Zitha	Program Manager	Rede CAME
Daniel Noa	Manager Comms	Rede CAME
Margarida Guitunga	Executive Director	SANTAC
Cristiano Pernambuco	Programme Officer	SANTAC
Luis Clemente	Communication Offr	SANTAC
Henriques Serafim	Finance Officer	SANTAC

UN

Mariana Muzzi	Protection Spec.	UNICEF
---------------	------------------	--------

Partners in Manica/Sofala

State

Celestino Niquisse	Chief of Section	Education Department, Bárue
Carlos Motapa	Chief Culture/Sports	Education Department, Bárue
Júlio Luciano	Chief of Section	Social Action Bárue
Eduardo Macheque	Technical Asst	Social Action Bárue
João Baptista	Technical Asst	Social Action Bárue
Antonio Vegove	Chief of Section	Social Action Gondola
Palmira Namoja	Chief of Section	Social Action Guro
Rodrigues Mafione	Director	Education Department Guro
Tito Daniel	Professor	Education Department Guro
Gilberto Canhese	Administrator	Tambara
Victoria Manuel	Special Programmes	Tambara
Rosario Queface	Head of Section	Social Action Tambara
Juliasse Ligonha	Director	Social Action Tambara
Melo Nhampa	Chief of Section	Education Department Gorongosa
Anita João Rapouso	Gender Specialist	Education Dept Gorongosa
D. Odethe	Chief of Section	Police Unit: Women and Children Victims of Violence

CSO

Hortencia Joaquim	Coordinator	Associação Bvute
Joiro Chadrique	President	Associação Bvute
Caetano Giopane	Finance Manager	Associação Bvute
Raul Quembo	Coordinator	Rudo Kubatana
Eva Matanda	Programme Officer	Rudo Kubatana

Zeca Teque	Secretary	Rudo Kubatana
Mariano Fábrica	Presidente	Rudo Kubatana
Domingas Silva	Finance Officer	Rudo Kubatana
Edna Mualeve	Youth Representative	Children's Parliament, Gondola
Maria Lurdes	Head of Department	PRM
Maria Clara Paulo	Coordinator	OMES
Isabel Sabino	Counsellor	OMES
Elisabete Sigaúque	Field Asst.	OMES
Gimo Lourenço	Coordinator	ASVIMO

SCinMoz Maputo

John Grabowski	General Director
Carmen Ramos	Director Programme Implementation
Abubacar Selemangy	Programme Coordinator
Mela Gomes	Coordinator COSACA/DCCRA
Carla Come	Manager Trafficking Project
Judas Massingue	Coordinator Child Participation
Nelia Ombe	Grants Manager
Armenio Xavier	Coordinator Health Programme
Damien Englehurst	Volunteer Intern
Sophie Chotard	Programme Manager FPM
Chris Mclvor	Regional Programme Manager (Southern Africa)
Alex Pak	Super Fellow Intern
Ndanatseyi Sande	Grants Director
Sra. Silvia	Finance Manager

SCinMoz Manica

Ana Dulce Chiluvane	Programme Director
Antonio Feniase	Head of Project, Caia/Tambara
Tomas Pereira Viageiro	MandE Officer
Emmett Costel	MandE Coordinator
Eunice Chivava	Project Manager
Lurdes Lindo	Project Manager
Isabel Mateus	Project Manager
Brigida Mutemba	Finance Coordinator
Marcelino Kincardett	GSS
Cassiano Conjo	Education Coordinator
Quisito Bastos	MandE Officer
Ernesto Sechene	GC/FPM

Appendix C –

SCiMOZ Partner Co-Operations 2010 Q3

#	Name of partner	Type of organisation	Theme / Subtheme Areas	Issued under Project / SOF	RECEIVED FUNDS Y/N
1	Rede da Criança	Civil Society	Child Protection	84039776- Royal Norwegian Embassy / 57810000 SC Norway-NORAD	Y
2	Ministry of Justice	Public body	Child Protection	84039776- Royal Norwegian Embassy	N
3	MINT/ Dept. Mulher e Criança	Public body	Child Protection	84039776- Royal Norwegian Embassy	N
4	GAMCVVD Manica	Public body	Child Protection	84039776- Royal Norwegian Embassy	Y
5	GAMCVVD Sofala	Public body	Child Protection	84039776- Royal Norwegian Embassy	Y
6	Brigada Anti-Tráfico	Public body	Child Protection	84039776- Royal Norwegian Embassy	Y
7	SANTAC	Civil Society	Child Protection	84039776- Royal Norwegian Embassy	Y
8	Amazing Grace Centre (SA)	Civil Society	Child Protection	84039776- Royal Norwegian Embassy	Y
9	Rede CAME	Civil Society	Child Protection	84039776- Royal Norwegian Embassy	Y
10	Linha Fala Criança	Civil Society	Child Protection	84039776- Royal Norwegian Embassy	Y
11	Theatre for Development	Civil Society	Child Protection	84039776- Royal Norwegian Embassy	Y
12	SDSMAS-Moamba	Public body	Child Protection	84039776- Royal Norwegian Embassy /84010358 - Scale Up Hope	Y
13	Irmãs Missionárias Scalabrinianas	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope / 84039776 Royal Norwegian Emabssy	Y
14	ONP	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	N
15	ADRC	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	Y (thro HACI)
16	AJCDC	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	N
17	Reencontro	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	N
18	SWAA	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	N
19	Magariro	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	N
20	Kindlimuka	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	N
21	AMIMO	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	N
22	Malhalhe	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	N
23	MUCHEFA	Civil	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up	N

		Society		Hope	
24	ADCR	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	N
25	TCHAVELELO	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	N
26	NTWANANO	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	N
27	Associação AMPARO ESPERANÇA	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	N
28	AREPACHO	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	N
29	Community Developte centred in School DDEC Gorong	Public body	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	Y
30	Integrated Education for Children in Guro	Civil Society	Education	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
31	Child integrated Social Project in Tambara, Administr	Public body	Education	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
32	Integrated Education for Children in Barue	Civil Society	Education	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
33	Community Development centred in schools DDEC Gond	Public body	Education	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
34	Child protection in Guro - DDMAS Guro	Public body	Education	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
35	Child Integrated Social Project in Caia, Administr	Public body	Child rights governance	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
36	Child Protection in Gondola	Civil Society	Child rights governance	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
37	Protecting Children against Voilence, Nhamatanda	Civil Society	Child rights governance	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
38	OVC Protection in Gondola; Kubatana	Civil Society	Child rights governance	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
39	Mvute re mwana	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
40	ASVIMO Dondo	Civil Society	Child rights governance	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
41	EC Des Comunitario - Projecto Construção de Escolas- Gondola -	Civil Society	Education	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
42	Direcção Distrital de Acção Social- Guro	Civil Society	Child rights governance	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
43	Direcção Distrital de Acção Social de Gondola	Civil Society	Child rights governance	57810000 - SC Norway Core funds	Y
44	ASVIMO Nhamatanda	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84039776- Royal Norwigan Embassy	Y
45	ASVIMO Gorongosa	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope	Y
46	CARITAS	Civil Society	HIV/AIDS	84010358 - Scale Up Hope / 38000102- Manane	N
47	Samaritans Purse	Civil Society	Health	38000102 - MAMANE	N
48	Doleurs Sans Frontiers	Civil Society	Health	38000102 - MAMANE	N
49	EGPAF	Civil Society	Health	38000102 - MAMANE	N
50	Medicus Mundi Catalunya AECI	Civil Society	Health	38000102 - MAMANE	N
51	CLUSA	Civil Society	Nutrition/ Livelihoods	84010385 - 202e	Y

52	AFRICARE	Civil Society	Nutrition/ Livelihoods	84010386 - Monetization	Y
53	Kyeema Foundation	Civil Society	Livelihoods	84039777 - EC Food Facility Gaza	Y
54	INCAJU	Public body	Livelihoods	84039777 - EC Food Facility Gaza	N

<p>HACI is an NGO that is based on a former project from SCUS. Until end 2010 it was integrated inside Save the Children - officially a part of our organisation but we considered them as partner NGO. They are now an independent NGO</p>

Appendix D – COVERAGE FIGURES SUMMARISED FROM TOTAL REACH, ANNUAL REPORT 2010

PLEASE NOTE, THESE ARE APPROXIMATE FIGURES BASED ON ADDITIONS OF DIRECT COVERAGE FIGURES ONLY BY SC MEMBER AS THEY WERE DEFINED IN THE TOTAL REACH REPORT.

The objective is to give a sense of scale rather than detailed information.

Coverage by Thematic Area and sponsoring SC Member based on Annual Report								
2010								
	Protection	Educat	Health	Nutrit	HIV/AID	Livelihood	CRG	Total
SCN	14,215	61,183			20,521		10,196	106,115
SCS							6,646	6646
SCD								
SCUS	173	155,365	125,826	105,260		8,617		395,241
SCUK	143	4,722			17,928			22,793