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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>ODF</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Semi-arid, Food Grain Research and Development Coordination</td>
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<td>SSH4A</td>
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<tr>
<td>STBM</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuSanA</td>
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<td>SWA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>WASH</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

Funded by the Dutch Directorate-General for International Cooperation (DGIS), SNV Netherlands Development Organisation leads the Voice for Change Partnership (V4CP) in close collaboration with the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). By increasing the capacities of local actors to advocate for an enabling environment, V4CP contributes to embedding the interests of low-income and marginalised communities into selected policies and practices of government and businesses. The creation and use of evidence to support the advocacy efforts by Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) is a key component of the V4CP approach.

The V4CP programme is implemented in a strategic partnership of SNV, IFPRI, DGIS (and EKNs) and 51 CSOs (a list of partner CSOs can be found in Annex 1). The V4CP programme addresses four themes: Food & Nutrition Security (FNS), Renewable Energy (RE), Resilience, and Water, Sanitation & Hygiene (WASH) and is implemented in Burkina Faso, Ghana, Honduras, Indonesia, Kenya and Rwanda with support of the Embassies of the Kingdom of the Netherlands (EKN).

Nearly half of the CSOs we work with are membership organisations, such as associations, movements, platforms, or alliances. While not explicitly measured, their members and/or constituencies are likely to indirectly benefit to a some extent from the V4CP capacity strengthening and advocacy interventions.

This report covers the third year of the V4CP programme with the interventions building on the achievements, experiences and learnings of 2017. 2018 also saw the completion of the Mid-Term Review (MTR), which provided guidance and useful recommendations for further improvement of the V4CP interventions.

1.1 Main achievements

The main achievements in 2018 are summarised below:

- The majority of the 51 CSOs reported an increase in assessed capacities in 2018 vs 2017. The capacity of the CSOs to conduct evidence-based advocacy was strengthened further through joint capacity development workshops and learning.
events, as well as targeted support to CSO’s through mini-workshops, coaching, on-the-job support, peer-to-peer learning, and exchange visits.

- Through their increased capacity, the use of evidence, and coalition building, the credibility and negotiating position of CSOs, and with that their ability to influence governments and other stakeholders, continued to improve.

- The position of the CSOs within the programme has continued to grow. While they continue to be fully involved in decision-making on work-plans and advocacy agendas, the CSOs are now also increasingly involved in agenda setting for capacity strengthening and evidence generation.

- The CSOs are also increasingly taking ownership of the M&E system with some applying (part of) the methodology to other projects as well. However, while indications are good this continues to require attention.

- The advocacy initiatives undertaken by the CSOs gained momentum and resulted in increased participation, influence, improved collaboration, enhanced accountability and stronger political will (see Chapter 3). Also, the first concrete outcomes on improved policies and budget allocation have been observed. However, CSOs also encountered challenges affecting progress (see Chapter 7).

- Eight Stories of Change were prepared and uploaded on the V4CP website, highlighting achievements in evidence-based advocacy. Regular newsletters have been sent out and brochures created.

- Advocacy plans, context analyses, and Theories of Change (ToCs) were reviewed and updated by the CSOs, SNV, and IFPRI in line with new developments.

- A total of 75 evidence products were produced by IFPRI and other research institutes, CSOs, and SNV to support advocacy efforts. Furthermore, 76 themed portals and websites that generate evidence were shared with the CSOs (70% FNS, 18% RE, 5% Resilience and 7% WASH).

- Global advocacy plans have been refined for each of the four themes and have been discussed with sector experts from DGIS. The global advocacy activities have created channels through which country advocacy issues could be brought forward at a global level, and alignment amongst global stakeholders was sought in support of in-country advocacy efforts.

- 17 CSOs representing V4CP advocacy issues participated in eight international events gaining exposure and sharing field level experiences and practical concerns.

- The annual partnership meeting with IFPRI, SNV, and DGIS was held in May. Operational issues were addressed and an agenda was agreed to address MTR recommendations.

## 1.2 Learnings from the MTR

The MTR was conducted in the first half of 2018 and had a strong learning objective. It covered all six countries from the programme’s inception up to March 2018, carrying out detailed case studies in Honduras, Burkina Faso, and Ghana. The MTR positively evaluated the first two years of the programme and concluded that the V4CP programme is relevant, well organised, efficiently implemented, and effective in terms of the CSOs’ capacity development. Concerning the programme’s effectiveness, it was noted that it was too early to assess performance regarding advocacy, however it was found that the programme has good potential to contribute to policy change.

The actions taken to address the attention points raised by the MTR are summarised below.

- Strategies to engage more with private sector actors were discussed in the learning events and mini-workshops and opportunities were actively pursued in, for instance, Ghana (engagement with cookstove producers), Rwanda (food processing companies mobilised to be part of a task force to review regulations on food fortification), and in Kenya (involving the National Chamber of Commerce & Industry to establish a county level community of practice for food safety towards self-regulation).

- Alignment and integration with SNV sector programmes was further enhanced where possible, e.g. alignment with the DGIS funded P2P WASH Project (Ghana), and the Hortinvest project
(Rwanda).

- The financial sustainability of the CSOs continued to be addressed in the coaching trajectory. Some CSOs managed to diversify income sources by winning new projects or by setting up social enterprises. Others were less successful and this remains a point of attention.
- Substantial progress was made in enhancing the collaboration between IFPRI and the CSOs to ensure relevance of evidence to CSOs. CSOs are now actively involved in the development of the research agenda in all countries through in-person discussions, consultations, and feedback channels.
- Outcome harvesting and ToC reviews during the learning event helped, where necessary, to achieve a clearer focus in terms of content, as well as the formulation of clearer and achievable targets.
- The acceptance of the M&E framework by CSOs was reviewed. Feedback from the CSOs showed that they were generally pleased with the M&E framework, hence there was no need for substantive changes. A M&E workshop for CSOs and SNV country staff will be conducted early 2019 with specific attention to making better use of the framework for learning purposes.
- Peer-to-peer monitoring and learning was enhanced both in-country and through exchange visits in renewable energy, WASH and resilience.
- A decentralisation of some of the global programme functions to country level was reflected upon, but not effected, as the current set-up is seen as the optimal arrangement with available resources in terms of providing technical support to the country programmes and the global advocacy agenda.
- The development and implementation of a ‘Theory of Efficiency’ approach was considered. Taking into account the considerable investments required for the development of such a ToE and the limited time left in the programme, it was decided not to move forward with this in the current phase of V4CP.
- As described in the previous section, CSOs were already fully involved in decision-making on work plans and advocacy agendas. In 2018, they have also become more actively involved in agenda setting for capacity strengthening and evidence generation by IFPRI and other research organisations, and have shown ownership of the M&E system. Piloting changes in the organisational set-up to further strengthen the involvement of CSOs in organisational and strategic decision-making, particularly on finance, as suggested by the MTR, would have implications for accountability and was not deemed necessary and realistic at this stage of the project and under the current financing structure.
2. Intervention strategies to support CSOs

The V4CP programme supports CSOs through three intervention strategies:

- Capacity development trajectory
- Evidence generation
- Advocacy plans

2.1 Capacity development trajectory

The capacity development trajectory for the CSOs focuses on five capabilities: leadership, advocacy, evidence, thematic knowledge and organisational sustainability.

During 2018, two workshops were held with the CSOs in each country:

- Capacity development workshop linked to fieldwork for the MTR (Mar/Apr 2018)
- Learning Event (Sep 2018)

The capacity development workshop focused on strengthening the capacities of CSOs with regards to using evidence in advocacy, including communications and media aspects. During the Learning Event, there was ample space for reflection on achievements and for the review of the Theory of Change and Advocacy Strategy. Specific attention was given to working with the private sector and gender and social inclusion; CSOs identified opportunities to include the private sector and inclusive approaches in their respective ToCs and advocacy activities, where deemed relevant.

CSOs also received external coaching on a regular basis, i.e. coaching by professional, local coaches/mentors that do not have a line responsibility within the project but support CSO leadership sharpening their approaches. The coaches provide a safe place for self-reflection to the CSO’s.

Horizontal learning has been stimulated in several exchange visits among V4CP countries and CSOs:

- The CSOs working on renewable energy came together in Ghana in November 2018. They participated in a rich programme which included a range of field visits on energy and cooking in communities and institutions, a meeting with the parliamentary committee on energy, and V4CP internal learning.
- The CSOs working on WASH came together in Kenya in December 2018. There they visited two related sanitation projects, met with county stakeholders to discuss the value of social audit reports prepared by the CSOs, and strengthened their joint learning and collaboration.
- A group of CSOs working on FNS was brought together for an exchange and learning day preceding the conference on "Accelerating the End of Hunger and Malnutrition" in Bangkok, in November 2018 to share progress and experiences on nutrition-focused advocacy.

Early 2019, the capacity self-assessment first executed in 2016 was repeated by all participating CSOs (including their leaders), to reflect upon and discuss progress in their personal leadership skills as well as their organisational capacity through an advocacy lens, looking specifically at their advocacy skills (including use of evidence), their thematic knowledge, as well as their organisational sustainability. Results can be found in Annex 4. The capacity of the CSOs is developing steadily, as can be seen in their increased ownership and confidence in the implementation of their advocacy plans. For

“Innovative solutions promoted through a clean cooking policy can be home-grown, but other communities across Africa can benefit from those solutions and learnings. We could only hope that in the near future, cross-country learning will increase access to improved clean cookstoves and fuels, as well as off-grid energy solutions, also in Kenya.”
Anne Songole, CCAK Kenya after the RE exchange visit
example, the CSOs in Burkina Faso reported that thanks to the capacity strengthening, the advocacy is now – in contrast to a few years ago – based on an agreed and regularly updated advocacy strategy. The V4CP programme has also helped remove barriers in Burkinabe CSOs’ advocacy efforts, enabling them to contact decision-makers directly.

**Examples of additional capacity development activities**

In addition, smaller workshops were held in thematic groups that were tailored to specific needs:

- An increased number of peer-to-peer learning sessions were organised in 2018. In Kenya, CSO PACJA shared their expertise in a training workshop on Gender & Climate Change for the other CSOs. Several peer-to-peer sessions were highly appreciated by the Honduran CSOs: on Gender (by ASONOG), on Local Advocacy (youth from CDH and FOPRIDEH), on Clean Cookstoves and the relation to FNS (by F.VIDA and HnH), and on Communication Strategies (by RDS). In Ghana and Honduras, coaches facilitated peer-to-peer learning on leadership amongst the CSOs. In mini-workshops in Rwanda and Indonesia on how to use the Business Model Canvas (BMC), CSOs shared their experiences in using the BMC (which was introduced to most of them in 2017).
- A research training by IFPRI to the Indonesian CSOs increased research skills on methodology, data collection, and analysis which were applied both in V4CP and other programmes.
- Focused face-to-face sessions or write-shops on M&E (outcome harvesting, reporting) in Burkina Faso and Ghana have helped to increase understanding and appreciation of the tools and their purpose, which led to improved reporting.
- The CSOs in Indonesia and Burkina Faso benefited from a focused communication training programme. After the workshop, the Indonesian CSOs developed annual communication strategies and workplans for their organisation, and appointed staff for communications activities.

**Lessons learned**

- Generally, the 2018 period reflects an improvement in all five capacity development areas: leadership, thematic knowledge, use of evidence, advocacy skills, and organisation sustainability. The increase in thematic knowledge is seen to have a positive relation with the improved advocacy skills. Across the board, there is a deeper understanding and appreciation of the PME (Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation) framework of the programme. Periodic review and updating of the context analysis, ToC, and advocacy plans based on harvested outcomes is a particularly high value learning experience, which various CSOs now also apply in their other projects.
- The workshops have served as a learning and collaboration platform for CSOs resulting in increased coordination and joint actions. Their strengthened capacities, combined with enhanced influence and connections, have given CSOs the confidence to take the lead in organising events and meetings, and to build stronger relations with key stakeholders.
- There is increased recognition across the V4CP partnership that CSOs all vary in levels of skills and expertise, and that they can be stronger together through peer-to-peer learning and/or using their complementary skills in joint activities. For example:
  - In Burkina Faso, the complementary skills and capacities (such as useful networks, powerful...
communicators) were analysed within the thematic groups in order to make the most efficient and effective use of them in their advocacy activities.

◊ In Kenya, the lead CSO in sanitation now includes sanitation in the annual national pre-budget hearings it has been organising, where CSOs from other sectors participated and submitted their proposals. These were included in the Alternative Budget Memo to be submitted to the National Treasury.

◊ In Rwanda, more joint events were organised at national and local level whereby CSOs learned from each other on different advocacy aspects. ADECOR has helped DUHAMI-ADRI to perform well in food fortification advocacy issues, while IMBARAGA has learned a lot from Caritas in designing a long-term strategic plan as well as network building.

- All CSOs strengthened their leadership capabilities thanks to an effective coaching trajectory. In Ghana, the level of improvement in leadership is observed to be proportional to the level of participation in the coaching trajectory. Also, CSOs with improved leadership skills tend to have an improved score in organisational sustainability. A few Kenyan CSOs score lower on organisational sustainability and the actualisation of their business plans. Some other Kenyan CSOs though, have managed to acquire additional funding.

2.2 Evidence generation and dissemination

Our second intervention strategy focuses on evidence creation and dissemination in support of the advocacy agenda. In 2018, evidence products were made available to CSOs by IFPRI, SNV, and other research institutes, based on an agreed list of evidence needs. In case of Food & Nutrition Security and Resilience, IFPRI played the leading role in supporting the CSOs.

The experiences over the past year underline the importance of using evidence in advocacy. It helps CSOs to build convincing cases and increases CSOs’ sector knowledge, thereby strengthening their confidence to engage with government officials and politicians. The information provided is often valued by government.

Lessons learned

- From evidence for advocacy to evidence in advocacy: the development and use of evidence is an integral part of the advocacy strategy. To ensure that evidence is fully aligned to their advocacy agendas, CSOs should own the formulation of research questions and be a partner in the development of the evidence. In 2018, this was supported by fostering closer and direct collaboration between research institutes, like IFPRI, and the CSOs. The work done jointly by IFPRI and RDO on the development of the budget tracking tool and the analysis and reporting of the findings over the last five years is illustrative in this respect.

- Capacity development on evidence: Related to the

“I appreciate how the skills gotten through V4CP have enabled my organisation to develop a more robust strategic plan with clear goals and objectives to be attained in the next five years and how the organisation will obtain these”  
NDIZEYE Damien, Executive Secretary, ADECOR

“Everyone will join the movement if they know what the issue is, what exactly stunting is. And how can they know? The answer is our research results. Our evidence-based advocacy has been acknowledged as the pioneer of stunting raising awareness in our region!”  
Mr. Tarsisius Hurmali, Director of Ayo Indonesia.
first point, capacity development of CSOs on evidence is considered key. The V4CP capacity development components and the generation and dissemination of evidence are thus closely connected and interrelated. This concerns both the development and understanding of evidence products as well as the use of evidence. IFPRI supported this through a range of workshops linked to individual evidence products. In Kenya, for instance, IFPRI presented the initial studies on milk safety and discussed with CSOs how this work could be used for advocacy.

- **Credibility of CSOs:** In 2018, CSOs were increasingly involved in data collection. This is vital to strengthen the capacity of CSOs in data collection methods, but also to enhance their credibility when presenting the results to policy makers. For instance, in Indonesia, a food and nutrition security survey of households in East Lombok was conducted. IFPRI offered a training course on survey design, implementation, and analysis and provided backstopping to SNV and the CSOs in conducting the survey. CSOs used this evidence generated by the survey to push the stunting agenda at district and provincial level. Results were also presented at a national seminar.

- **Focus on high potential evidence products:** V4CP has been supporting a significant number of evidence deliverables. Although this broad evidence support to the advocacy agenda has advantages, more intensive collaboration on fewer high potential evidence products may be more effective in increasing understanding and transforming that increased understanding into evidence-based actions of CSOs.

- **Local researchers:** For the development of evidence for WASH and energy, SNV and CSOs worked with local consultants or research institutes. CSOs are increasingly effective in writing clear Terms of Reference. However, the quality of the studies varied a lot, which was mainly due to varying quality of the researchers and partly due to the lack of data availability. Detailed quality control throughout the evidence creation process is essential and the use of reputable researchers (that are often more expensive) is recommended.

- **Quality and relevance of existing data:** The approach applied in evidence generation is to make as much use of secondary data as possible. This limits the programme’s ability to be responsive to CSOs’ requests for evidence as the necessary data are not always available and there is limited time and resources to collect primary data.

Examples of evidence generated and used in advocacy during the reporting period are provided below. A full list of evidence products is given in Annex 2.

**Food and Nutrition Security**

- The weakness of public support to family farms in Burkina Faso was highlighted in evidence generated by IFPRI and presented during workshops organised by one of the CSOs (FEPAB) with the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Finance, and parliamentarians. The Ministry of Agriculture has put in place a technical committee to follow up on the recommendations of these workshops.

- In Ghana, a sector policy brief was developed by IFPRI focusing on potential business opportunities for private sector investment in post-harvest losses. This was linked to a national event on

"The partnership with IFPRI in the process of food and nutrition budget tracking has enabled my organisation to gain more knowledge and credibility in our advocacy work both at central and local level. RDO is now recognised as one of the key CSOs when it comes to tracking the government’s budget. We were even requested by the Ministry of Finance to train other CSOs on budget formulation and tracking."  
**RWIBASIRA Eugene, Executive Secretary, RDO, Rwanda**
post-harvest losses in which the private sector supported the V4CP ambition for increased investment in limiting post-harvest losses.

- IFPRI supported the collection of evidence on Food and Nutrition Fortification and other Micronutrient Strategies in Rwanda. This evidence was used in a roundtable on the production and consumption of bio-fortified nutritious crops, attended by the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources and the Dutch Ambassador. A position paper with recommendations was shared with relevant stakeholders.

- In Kenya, evidence products were developed by IFPRI in support of the advocacy on food safety and losses in dairy and horticulture for three CSOs (CUTS, SOCAA, and SACDEP).

- IFPRI supported the generation and dissemination of a report on Poverty and Nutrition in Honduras. This report was used by CSOs as input in the design of municipal policies on food and nutrition security.

Resilience

- ILRI supported a study on index-based livestock insurance and the economic benefits of pastoralism in Kenya. This was used in reviving the discussion with the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and Irrigation on the National Livestock Insurance Policy.

- The CSO Kenya Livestock Market Council (KLMC) generated policy briefs on budget tracking for the pastoral sector in Isiolo and Marsabit County, and a Tax and Hides policy paper on the impact of increased taxation. This was used to advocate for increased budget allocation for the livestock sector.

Renewable Energy

- In Burkina Faso, a study on the relation between the qualification of technicians and the quality of renewable energy services was presented to policy makers to convince them of the need for RE curricula in vocational training centres.

- The 'Business case analysis of selected improved cookstove producer companies in Ghana' was well received and will be shared with market stakeholders including financial institutions to gain more support for the improved cookstoves sector.

- The report ‘Gender approach in the value chain of improved stoves’ was presented by the Honduran CSOs in an official event at the UPNFM university in Tegucigalpa and will be presented as a poster in the 3rd Latin American Forum for Clean Stoves. The report has already been cited in other studies.

- In Kenya, the Kiambu context analysis on clean cooking was presented in combination with a policy brief to advocate for allocation of county budgets towards clean cooking. Kiambu county government subsequently included one of the community clean cooking champions in the Technical Committee to develop the county climate and energy policy.

WASH

- A study on the effects of poor sanitation on the health and wellbeing of communities in three counties in Kenya was finalised and presented at different fora. The evidence was also packaged in advocacy-ready products for CSO to use in their efforts to improve policies.

- Studies were done on sanitation supply chain development and on sanitation governance in Indonesia. The results of the studies were used by the CSOs to push for universal access to sanitation, with specific focus on the supply side of sanitation and regulation.

- An assessment of existing national WASH policies and strategic documents was done in Ghana. This analysis was presented to government and private sector, which resulted in government committing to more private sector engagement and focus during the review of the sanitation policies.
2.3 Support to design and implementation of advocacy plans

The third intervention strategy relates to supporting the design and implementation of the CSOs’ advocacy plans. For every country theme, the advocacy plan was reviewed and updated in 2018 by CSOs, SNV and IFPRI. The thematic advocacy plans were translated into individual CSO action plans. Below we describe overall learnings taken from the different countries, supported by some key examples.

**Benchmarking:** the benchmarking of services has helped in achieving progress across districts. For example, cross-learning between districts in Indonesia had great impact on changing the government mindset to plan better for sanitation development. CSOs facilitated district government (at mayor level) exchange visits to learn from the implementation of Community Based Total Sanitation (STBM) in more progressed districts (from West-Sumatra to Lampung).

**The power of media:** building on the reflections of 2017 experiences, the collaboration with the media was intensified and interactions took place between media houses and CSOs on the V4CP advocacy agenda. In Ghana for example, 28 journalists were informed of the V4CP programme and its results. The journalists were also trained on how to base their stories on evidence to compel policy makers to act. This resulted in more media attention for the various advocacy issues of the CSOs.

**SNV as a connector to national government:** Apart from giving support to the CSOs in the design and implementation of the advocacy plans, SNV also plays a role in making connections and/or facilitating meetings between and with national government bodies. Making use of these connections has helped CSOs raise their advocacy agenda to a wider audience. In Indonesia, for example, SNV introduced CSOs to the National Government to request support for the CSOs’ advocacy activities in the districts. The Direct of Community Nutrition of Indonesian Ministry of Health came to support the campaign event of one of the CSOs operating in Flores and strengthened the commitment of the Bupati (Head of Region) in Flores Timur to invest in the prevention of stunting.

**Links between private sector and government:** Creating an enabling environment for the private sector in rural development, for example in sanitation and energy access, is often challenging. V4CP can play a role to recognise and address potential obstacles and opportunities better. V4CP Ghana supported the CSOs to organise private sector engagement forums. For the WASH theme, the private sector, government, and other stakeholders where brought together to discuss how the private sector can be involved in sanitation access in the country, and to identify constraints as well as expectations from government and civil society. The Environmental Services Providers Association (ESPA) made a strong appeal for an improved enabling environment to improve investment in sanitation and hygiene. In response to the evidence presented, the government agreed to include more private sector engagement and focus in their review of the sanitation policies.

**Generating and utilising evidence:** The generation and utilisation of evidence continues to be of great importance in strengthening the credibility of CSOs in their advocacy efforts. CSOs were increasingly involved in the data collection process, and this has helped to strengthen their use of data when presenting and describing the results to policy makers (see section 2.2).

**Learning visits to other countries/programmes:** The learning visits help CSOs set their advocacy agendas.

“After the cross-learning events, the district government started to follow up the STBM plan and adapted its approach.”

Ms. Ramadhaniati, Director LP2M, Indonesia
WASH CSOs from Indonesia went on a learning trip to Nepal to learn from the multi-country Sustainable Sanitation and Hygiene for All (SSH4A) programme there. Similarly, RE CSOs and government representatives from Honduras went on a learning trip to El Salvador to visit clean stove producers and energy authorities.

Strategic coalition building: Coalition building continues to be an effective way to strengthen the voices of CSOs and to build a critical mass to influence national and local policies. Apart from CSOs working together within the V4CP programme, CSOs are increasingly building coalitions or strategic platforms with other organisations (both at national and district level) to share information, create evidence, jointly organise activities and advocate for common goals. In Honduras, SNV continued to facilitate the meetings of the Inter-institutional Platform for the development of the value chain of improved cookstoves, where the CSOs interact with other stakeholders, lead the development of evidence, and influence governmental authorities. The Platform reviewed the draft proposal of the national strategy framework that was jointly analysed with the Director and technicians of the National Division of Climate Change (NDCC), contributing to increased recognition of the Inter-institutional Platform by the NDCC. As a result, the policy framework has been improved.

2.4 Global advocacy

The global advocacy activities have created channels through which country advocacy issues were brought forward at a global level, and alignment amongst global stakeholders was sought in support of in-country advocacy efforts. An overview of international events can be found in Annex 3.

Food and Nutrition Security

In the Netherlands, V4CP has been an active member of the Netherlands Working Group on Nutrition and the Policy Working group of AgriProFocus. Aim of the V4CP membership in these groups is to include food and nutrition security interventions and targets in policies and strategies of Dutch stakeholders, building on country experiences. At global level, V4CP was involved with Compact2025 and ReSAKSS activities in collaboration with IFPRI. Key activities that V4CP contributed to in 2018 included:

- The organisation of an expert meeting in The Hague on “How to make agriculture programmes work for nutrition”; results were presented at the refresher days (‘terugkomdagen’) for embassy staff.
- The organisation of a side event at the SDG Conference in Wageningen on “Nourishing the SDGs” with the objective to discuss lessons learned from innovative partnerships across the Dutch Diamond (government, civil society, private sector and knowledge institutes) to advance SDG 2.
- The submission of a Letter to Parliament as an input to the discussion on the new Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation policy.
- Growing attention to nutrition-sensitive agriculture among major donors, as also reflected in the SNV portfolio (funding from Dutch Embassies, SDC, EU, USAID).
- The co-organisation by SNV and IFPRI of a side event with CSOs from Kenya, Indonesia, and Rwanda on Scaling Up “Solutions on Food & Nutrition Security at Sub-National Level Through Evidence-Based Advocacy” at the IFPRI Conference in Bangkok.

Resilience

A large part of the advocacy activities at global level in 2018 were related to East Africa. Being part of the core group of CELEP, a coalition of European and African organisations, including two V4CP CSOs, focusing on pastoralism in East Africa, enabled us to put the effects of climate change on pastoralism better on the advocacy agenda of this influential
platform. We organised and supported several events together with CELEP and its members. These included a learning visit in which West African pastoral organisations, including one V4CP CSO from Burkina Faso, learned about pastoralism and dairy production in Kenya. One CSO from V4CP Kenya participated as well (CUTS).

For West Africa, a policy brief was developed by SNV to inform DGIS programming in the Sahel, illustrating how with the right policies and practices in place, pastoralism can be a production system that is highly adaptive to climate change and that can drive sustainable development in the drylands. Next to that, CSOs from Burkina Faso contributed to important regional events concerning cross-border transhumance in the Sahel, e.g. through the African Union’s SAFGRAD (Semi-arid, Food Grain Research and Development Coordination) of which APESS is a steering committee member.

Renewable Energy

Advocacy activities at the global level in 2018 have focused on targeted lobby meetings with key stakeholders, and active participation in partnerships related to the in-country advocacy. This included close interactions with DGIS as a key ally in influencing other global stakeholders. Two key activities:

- With support of DGIS, SNV has become an associate member of the NDC Partnership, a strong coalition of countries and institutions that leverage resources and expertise to provide countries with the tools they need to implement their NDCs\(^1\). Most V4CP countries are engaging with the NDC Partnership, and by linking the V4CP advocacy issues on energy, resilience, and/or agriculture to climate policy both at country and global level can increase political will and resource allocation. V4CP advocates for increased recognition of the role of decentralised renewable energy and climate smart agriculture in climate policies and funding, both at country and global level. At the COP24 in Katowice, SNV organised a side event on Multi-stakeholder Involvement in NDC implementation, where two representatives from the V4CP CSOs (CEAS from Burkina Faso, PACJA from Kenya) and a representative from the NDC Partnership presented.

- Thanks to the new leadership of the global Clean Cooking Alliance (previously GACC), encouraging meetings took place with the Dutch Spark coalition for clean cooking solutions and with EnDev (Energising Development) partners and the CCA, discussing transition pathways for the clean cooking sector. Global partners strive to increase alignment on clean cooking sector development, which will result in clearer guidance to sector development in countries. The aim is to jointly develop evidence on cooking sector transition pathways for V4CP countries in support of the country level advocacy.

WASH

At the global level, the main activities in 2018 were targeted meetings with government and other Dutch stakeholders. There have been regular policy meetings, the so-called kitchen table meetings, with members of the IGG department of DGIS, to ensure government commitment to SDG6 and to discuss priorities of DGIS and the role of the Netherlands in

\(^1\) NDC Partnership is aimed at the implementation of the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) of countries, i.e. the country strategy to cut greenhouse gas emissions and build resilience to changing climate.
global discussions on WASH. SNV has also been an active member of the Netherlands Water Platform (NWP)-NGO Platform and the NWP-NGO Policy Group, with the aim to keep WASH, and especially sanitation, on the agenda and as targets in policies and strategies of Dutch stakeholders. Furthermore, SNV was involved in several international conferences and platforms like Sanitation and Water for All (SWA) and Sustainable Sanitation Alliance (SuSanA). Key activities in 2018 included:

- V4CP Indonesia staff (and their government liaisons) attended the WASH Futures conference in Australia to learn more on gender and social inclusion. V4CP also participated in the WEDC conference in Kenya where the V4CP Kenya team presented their research and how to use evidence to advocate for sanitation prioritisation and budget allocation. At the Stockholm World Water Week, SNV presented the results from implementing 10 years of SSH4A, and V4CP global staff interviewed government officials on their progress and challenges to meet SDG 6.

- On request of DGIS, the V4CP global team contributed to the drafting of the agenda of the WASH & Nutrition workshop hosted by DGIS. SNV shared country experiences of programmes on WASH & Nutrition, as well as examples of how other donors, like USAID, contribute to these topics.

- With regards to sustainability, SNV, together with Emory University and the University of Reno, shared the initial findings of a 4-year evaluation on reaching sustainable sanitation and hygiene for all (including leaving no one behind) with the global WASH sector during the international WASH conferences in Brisbane and Stockholm. Because the SSH4A and V4CP programmes are closely linked (working in the same districts or together with SSH4A staff) the outcomes of this study and the approaches used under SSH4A to target vulnerable groups are taken up within the V4CP programme. SNV thus informs CSOs of lessons learned and best practices, and supports CSOs in advocating for inclusive planning and budgeting by local government.

- With regards to gender and social inclusion, SNV together with the Institute for Sustainable Futures published the comparative study of approaches to leaving no one behind (LNOB) across five countries, prepared for the SSH4A programme. This research was shared to influence current thinking on LNOB and what it means in the SDG-era of achieving access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all.
3. Planning, monitoring and evaluation

The regular harvesting of outcomes by the CSOs and the reflection sessions organised at country level, as well as the bi-annual quantitative and qualitative reporting on the identified indicators, foster a culture of learning and adapting programming to new insights and changed conditions as well as provide good insight into the progress of the country themes to date. This chapter summarises key outcomes and lessons learned. All aggregated result data on outcome and output indicators can be found in annex 4. For details per country theme, we refer to IATI.

3.1 Key outcomes

Capacity development
The overall increase in capacities of CSOs has been calculated as the difference in scores between 2017 and 2018, averaged over four capacities: leadership, advocacy, thematic knowledge and organisational sustainability.

- Three-fourths (76%) of the CSOs showed an increase in assessed capacities in 2018 compared to 2017 (see figure 1). This is a significant increase from the progress recorded in 2017. It is also interesting to note that 76% of the 51 CSOs have given themselves a score between 3 and 4; in 2017 this was only the case for 51% of CSOs.
- Eight CSOs recorded a decrease in capacities (16% of the 51 CSOs).
- Three CSOs’ capacities remain unchanged between 2017 and 2018.

The notable increase in CSOs’ capacities over the course of 2018 is reflected in all four advocacy areas and denotes a clear trend in effective and targeted capacity development. The largest increase in capacity was seen around individual leadership skills, with 90% of CSOs scoring a 3 or higher. In Honduras, this has led to the decision amongst CSOs and SNV to no longer focus on providing trainings on leadership and instead to focus more on strengthening advocacy capabilities.

Regarding the eight CSOs that recorded a lower capacity for 2018, for the Kenyan CSOs, this can be explained by the changing donor climate in Kenya and the adaptations that CSOs need to make in order to remain viable. This is especially relevant for the CSOs that only joined the V4CP programme in 2017 or CSOs that are less well established. Meanwhile, in Honduras, the low scoring appears to be a strong
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**Figure 1** CSOs’ changed capacities
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reflection of the difficult political climate in which the CSOs operate and the frustration induced as a result. A Honduran CSO noted that despite many meetings, debates, and advocacy efforts to form public opinion, the political processes are unpredictable. Looking at the breakdown of the eight CSOs’ different capacity areas, it is also worth noting that the majority maintained their capacity skills’ level in leadership and advocacy, while thematic knowledge and organisational sustainability will require further attention going forward.

As CSOs’ capacities increase, their credibility amongst stakeholders seems to have strengthened as well. Generally, CSOs’ enhanced thematic knowledge and the production of high-quality evidence has led to their ability to constructively participate in meetings and their inclusion in decision-making processes which enabled them to drive evidence-based policy changes.

In Indonesia, for example, a CSO’s ability to share substantiated research with the regional government has led to the CSO gaining trust and becoming a strategic partner in the government’s development agenda in nutrition. Meanwhile, in Burkina Faso, a CSO operating in the Resilience sector is no longer dependent on external consultants to implement projects or organise events, stating “previously, we asked specialists to conduct activities but since 2018 we have been doing it ourselves.”

**Number of advocacy initiatives**

Together, CSOs have developed over 1200 advocacy initiatives (participation, mobilisation, activation) in 2018. This is a combination of the number of informal and formal encounters with government and/or businesses as well as the evidence products shared with stakeholders (see figure 2). Please note that in addition to encounters and the sharing of knowledge products, other advocacy initiatives were also carried out, such as the involvement of the media and the building of coalitions with other CSOs. These initiatives, however, are not structurally measured by the programme and therefore not reported here.

The difference in number of advocacy initiatives with last year (over 1000 initiatives) is largely explained by the increase in encounters with relevant stakeholders in 2018. More than in 2017, the CSOs were invited for meetings, workshops, and platform discussions by governments, and development partners, which can be seen as a proof that the CSOs are increasingly considered as a knowledgeable and credible discussion partner. We noticed that the focus of the meetings shifted from predominantly relationship building towards more content discussions. The
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**Figure 2** Advocacy initiatives 2016 - 2018
number of knowledge products shared remained more or less the same in 2018.

**CSOs’ influence on agenda setting**

CSOs’ interests are increasingly put on the agenda and being discussed among government and private sector stakeholders. The level of CSOs’ influence on agenda setting is measured by evaluating 36 cases across the V4CP countries. For example, in Burkina Faso, CSOs working on resilience measure their degree of influence at the national level by evaluating how effective they have been in putting pastoralist issues on the national agenda (i.e. influencing politicians and policy makers to discuss the adoption of policies beneficial to pastoralist farmers). In 2018, 23 cases referred to national level agenda influencing by CSOs, and 13 cases measured the agenda influencing at sub-national level. At national level, progress has been established for 16 out of the 23 targeted cases. At sub-national level, the CSOs succeeded to increase their agenda setting influence in 11 cases. Influencing the agenda setting of the private sector was measured for two cases of which there was an increase recorded for one, while for the other the situation remained the same.

Figure 3 shows the shift in levels of influence of CSOs on agenda setting over time. While at the time of the baseline (end 2016) most of the CSOs did not have regular interaction with relevant stakeholders, this has changed considerably in the subsequent two years. At the end of 2017, all CSOs had at least regular meetings with key stakeholders and at the end of 2018 the majority of the CSOs succeeded in getting their topic on the agenda and discussed among key stakeholders. Further, the CSOs appear to be slightly more successful at influencing the agenda at subnational level compared to national level, which point at relationships being generally more easily established at sub-national level than at national level.

In Kenya, the CSOs succeeded in getting milk safety and post-harvest losses on the agenda of the national and sub-national governments. At national level, following a presentation by the involved CSO on the
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**Figure 3** CSOs influence on agenda setting.
- Level 0: CSOs have no or only occasional interaction with key stakeholders in government and/or the private sector.
- Level 1. CSOs have regular interactions with key stakeholders in government and/or the private sector
- Level 2. CSOs get opportunity to explain their interests towards key stakeholders in government and/or the private sector
- Level 3. CSOs’ interests are ‘put on the agenda’ and are discussed among stakeholders in government and/or the private sector.
importance of milk safety measures, the Kenya Dairy Board took leadership in convening the national actors forum on milk quality to discuss collaboration to promote milk quality and safety. At county level, the strengthened influence is evident from the initiation of the development of dairy strategic plans with a focus on safety, quality and loss reduction, as well as the joint capacity development workshops for involved parties.

In Ghana, the CSO advocating for mini-grids has deepened its collaborative relationship with relevant stakeholders. In 2018, it made several interventions, appeals, and proposals on how to accelerate the deployment of mini-grids for rural electrification. The CSO’s push to strengthen the involvement of the private sector in the development of mini-grids led to the tabling of a public debate by the Energy Commission (EC). Shortly after the debate, the Executive Secretary of the EC is reported to have said that government will partner with the private sector to develop mini-grids to extend electricity to island and lakeside communities.

**CSO collaboration with government, private sector and other CSOs**

The CSOs collaboration with the government, the private sector, and other CSOs considerably improved over the years, as is shown in figure 4. Whereas in 2017 hardly any joint plans were made that included
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**Figure 4** Collaboration between CSOs, government and private sector in 2018
the interests of the CSOs, in 2018 in 57% of the cases these plans were developed, and in 4% of the reported cases these plans were followed up by joint actions.

Cooperation with the government has intensified over the years and we see that CSOs are increasingly regarded as respected partners by the government. This is demonstrated by the increase in invitations by government bodies for CSOs input in meetings, in the development of strategic plans and policies, as well as in the organisation of activities that are of mutual interest.

An example of such intensified cooperation is the CSOs working in the area of FNS in Indonesia, who have been able to work jointly with district governments in different activities. They collaborated with the district government in conducting a stunting baseline survey as input for the development of regulations and a roadmap to reduce stunting. They supported the district government in developing district plans and budgets that incorporated the stunting issue, and organised together with the district government activities to raise awareness on stunting towards key stakeholders at district level.

The CSOs active in the energy sector in Honduras succeeded in creating space for dialogue, evidence creation, sharing and validation within the Inter-institutional Platform for the Development of the Improved Stoves Value Chain. The platform includes stakeholders from different sectors: academia, local CSOs, international organisations, the private and public sector. A roadmap has been developed that guide the actions of the platform targeted at the development of the National Strategy for the Adoption of Efficient Stoves. The roadmap is a product of a participatory process led by the CSO Hermandad de Honduras. The creation of the roadmap is remarkable since the platform was created originally to only exchange information. The cooperation with the government also intensified in 2018, in particular the relationship with MiAmbiente (Secretariat of Natural Resources and Environment) improved. MiAmbiente is now playing a protagonist role in support of the National Strategy and the platform.

The CSO collaboration with other CSOs and the private sector is further illustrated in Chapter 4.

Policy development

In 2018, the number of policies, laws, frameworks, strategies being monitored and targeted by CSOs decreased from the original 71 to 56. This was for many cases a conscious decision on the part of the CSOs, who opted to focus their advocacy efforts on policies where there was either more political will or on policies deemed more relevant for achieving their advocacy objectives. A good example is the case of Rwanda, where CSOs had been working to develop a policy that would achieve a tax exemption on food fortification products and raw materials. After conducting further research on the policy it became clear to the CSOs that the taxes on fortificants would only result in a 7% price increase; such a price increase is insignificant compared to other prices on the local market. Consequently, the CSOs decided to drop this strategy and to focus more heavily on the adoption of a mandatory food fortification regulation. In 2019, CSOs will be working closely with the Rwanda Food and Drug Authority (FDA) in order to accelerate the process of adoption for this new regulation.

In addition to increased focus, CSOs’ enhanced advocacy capacities and credibility amongst stakeholders have translated into the significant progress of the remaining policies in development, for example, for resilience CSOs in Kenya. In Isiolo county of Kenya, CSOs supported the passing and implementation of the Disaster Risk Reduction policy. The policy provides for a contingency fund to combat drought emergencies and the establishment of a county-based disaster response unit to mitigate (climate change related) adversities.
Indonesia, WASH-sector CSOs saw the further adoption and development of the STBM programme by the government in four districts (Sijunjung, P. Pariaman, Pringsewu, and Lampung). The relevant CSOs helped the districts develop and adjust roadmaps to implement the national strategy for Community-based Total Sanitation, contributing to the overall target of achieving ODF. The number of policies monitored are not entirely representative of the total number of policies, laws, frameworks, and strategies that have been developed. The national nutrition policy in Ghana, for example, is counted as one policy developed. However, CSOs in Ghana have worked in several districts to implement the national nutrition policy, with each district developing their own regulations and guidelines to do so.

**Lessons learned on PME process**

- The ToC approach is considered innovative and important for focused and effective advocacy interventions. It guides the CSOs to achieve the expected outcomes and impact, and at the same time it is flexible enough to accommodate the contextual and programmatic dynamics. The CSOs increasingly apply the ToC methodology to other projects and proposals, and even support other organisations in developing a ToC (and related PME framework) for their programmes.
- During the annual learning events held in the month of September, all ToCs were reviewed based
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on the achievements so far and the context of each theme. It was again a great learning process between CSOs, the SNV country team, IFPRI, and the SNV global team. This year, limited changes have been incorporated in the different ToCs. Where needed, the formulations of outcomes and assumptions underlying the expected outcomes were further sharpened.

- **CSOs’ ownership of the PME process** has significantly increased in the past year. An increasing familiarity with the PME approach as well as increased PME capacities largely explain this change in felt ownership. CSOs appreciate the space provided to jointly develop, apply, and review methodologies such as the context analysis, stakeholder mapping, and the ToCs.

- The **outcome harvesting approach** is also increasingly valued by the CSOs. It allows them to closely monitor the progress of the programme, and the regular review of the harvested outcomes, ultimately resulting in learnings, helps them in fine-tuning their advocacy strategy and action plans.

- CSO staff stated that the periodic **self-assessment of the CSO capacities** encouraged reflection within their organisations on their current organisational and leadership capacities, which provided valuable insights in their strengths and weaknesses and input for future (capacity development) strategies.

- **Learning is taking a prominent place in the programme** which is appreciated by the CSOs. At least once a year, during the learning events, the CSOs critically reflect on the achieved results, their contribution to these results, their advocacy strategies, and accordingly make adjustments where needed to reach the overall goal of their projects. There was an expressed need for more regular PME review meetings, instead of one heavy annual exercise, to allow for a continuous learning process.

- The main challenge for the CSOs is the **time required to gather, analyse, reflect and report** on the results achieved. In most organisations, PME is insufficiently institutionalised, often leading to insufficient resources for conducting a proper PME process.

- **Access to reliable and up-to-date data** is another challenge CSOs are confronted with. In particular, data on budgets and expenditures are difficult to get access to.

### 3.2 Stories of Change

Over the course of the second half of 2018, the V4CP programme completed eight Stories of Change (SoC). The stories cover the range of V4CP sector areas and countries, documenting some of the programme’s accomplishments and detailing the process by which these accomplishments were achieved. Written with extensive input from the relevant CSO(s), the SoC offer an opportunity to delve further into the reported results and to contextualise the outcomes harvested by CSOs. The SoC draw on lessons learned and provide additional insights into the contexts in which the CSOs are operating and the advocacy tools that they employ. In a few cases, videos were produced to showcase these achievements further, such as the video on GROOTS Kenya’s work with women community champions to stimulate the use of clean cookstoves.

The SoC are listed in Annex 5, and available to read via the Online Platform.

“The most important benefit I have gained from the capacity development trajectory workshops is how to develop the ToC. The process of doing it ourselves has improved my understanding. It has helped me to really focus in achieving organisational objectives. As an organisation we are using the same theory for the implementation of other projects.”

Ibrahim Akalbila, programme Coordinator Ghana Trade and Livelihoods Coalition (GTLC)

“The M&E and the logbook have given me a new dimension in capturing my journey and has made reporting easier. Although M&E looks difficult at first site. Consist practice with genuine acceptance of the challenges made me perfect my skills. The logbook has become an organisation tool for all staff in IF.”

Nora Ollenu, The Executive Director of IF, Ghana
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4. Partnership with CSOs and other stakeholders

Connection between CSO, IFPRI (and other research institutes) and SNV

The Mid Term Review concluded that:

a. The V4CP programme is professionally implemented by the V4CP SNV staff members at country and global team, by IFPRI staff members and management, and staff of CSOs;
b. There exists a high degree of complementarity among the main programme partners (CSOs, SNV, IFPRI); and,
c. There exists a high level of commitment and ownership among CSOs, SNV V4CP, and IFPRI staff to make the programme a success.

Apart from these positive conclusions, a number of recommendations were also provided, and these were followed up in 2018. One of these focused on establishing more direct relationships and communication channels between IFPRI and CSOs, which led to more co-creation.

CSOs have not only increasingly collaborated with IFPRI, but also with other research organisations. CSOs are more closely involved in the design of research, the formulation of the Terms of References, as well as the implementation of the research. This contributes to their capacity and credibility (see also Chapter 2.2). To address the challenge of the availability of local data, there is now more emphasis on the collection of primary data.

Nice examples are the Budget Allocation and Expenditure Tracking Tool and Analysis Report in Rwanda, which is the result of collaboration between IFPRI and the Rwanda Development Organisation (RDO); the East Lombok Stunting Survey with the collaboration between IFPRI and Transform; and the collaboration between the CSO IEA (Institute of Economic Affairs), SNV and CPHRM (Centre for Population Health Research and Management) in Kenya, where the study into the effects of poor sanitation was used to jointly develop and disseminate advocacy products.

As a follow-up from the Mid Term Review, we can conclude that co-creation, capacity development, and contextualised research are important elements in increasing ownership, credibility, and effectivity of the CSOs when implementing their advocacy agenda.

Connection with EKNs and DGIS

At global level, regular meetings between V4CP and the responsible departments within DGIS (DSO and IGG) took place. These comprised general progress meetings, as well as broader meetings with thematic specialists within IGG to align plans and priorities. Also, a partnership meeting was organised with IFPRI, SNV, and DGIS in May 2018 to evaluate cooperation between the partners, assess the progress being made, share research highlights, and align planning (in combination with discussing the findings of the Mid Term Review).

At country level, the Mid Term Review concluded that the involvement of Dutch Embassies is generally limited but growing, and that embassies are increasingly alert in looking for the complementarity of the programme with their bilateral programmes and networks. There were regular interactions between respective EKNs and V4CP in Burkina Faso (EKN Mali), Ghana, Rwanda, Kenya, Honduras (EKN Costa Rica) and Indonesia. This as part of already existing ties between SNV and the EKNs, and additionally between V4CP staff and embassy staff with regards to strategic partnership meetings organised by EKNs.

In Rwanda, the EKN was invited to various events organised by CSOs within V4CP and the Ambassador participated in a round table on promoting the availability and consumption of bio-fortified crops. The EKN is familiar with the V4CP approach on evidence-based advocacy and is interested in linking this with other interventions supported by the EKN.

In Indonesia, the First Secretary of Water from the
EKN came to Pringsewu district for the Open Defecation Free (ODF) declaration. Following the EKN advice to strengthen collaboration between the strategic partnerships working on the same SDGs, V4CP invited all strategic partnerships working on SDG 2 and SDG 6 to a learning event. During this meeting, various strategic partnerships agreed on how to support CSOs to conduct advocacy at the national level.

In Ghana, the EKN has been invited to the different capacity development workshops and learning events. The ambassador and other embassy staff have joined several times. In September 2018, the Ambassador attended the V4CP learning event and shared his insights on the importance of a vibrant civil society and the role CSOs have to play in development.

Regular contact also exists between V4CP and the EKN in Costa Rica (which also covers Honduras). The Ambassador and his team visited Honduras in June and met with the Strategic Partnerships (including V4CP) to discuss the declining civic space and help strengthen the collaboration among the SPs.

The EKN in Kenya was one of the embassies that has been involved in the strategic partnerships right from the start. They organise yearly partnership meetings in which the V4CP participated. In addition, SNV has been in regular contact with the EKN in Kenya. These connections have always been there, as part of several EKN funded programmes to SNV, but also specifically on V4CP. For instance, the EKN visited V4CP’s CSOs involved in clean cookstoves.

The EKN based in Mali opened a representation in Burkina Faso. The V4CP programme was introduced to the representative.

**Connection and collaboration between CSOs**

CSOs increasingly experience the power of collective action and that it is easier to gain access to decision-makers when acting in the name of a coalition or platform. CSOs have, consequently, increasingly reached out to collaborate with other CSOs not participating in V4CP.

Collaboration between CSOs has increased their credibility and recognition at both national and district level. In Ghana, for example, CSOs jointly organised Regional Nutrition Forums that benefit all districts as well as a Private Sector Sanitation and Hygiene Forum at the national level.

In line with the above, CSOs in the V4CP programme are increasingly aware of their respective strengths and how they complement each other. In Kenya, for example, two CSOs jointly organised a workshop with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry during consultations in the formulation of Kenya’s second Climate Change Action Plan 2018-2022, ensuring the rights and position of pastoralists in this plan, as well as clean cooking objectives. Meanwhile, in Ghana two CSOs combined their strengths of a national outlook and reputation (GHACCO) with the local presence and outreach (ORGIIS) in advocating for increased support for the clean cooking sector both at national and district level.

Finally, collaboration between CSOs also creates platforms and mechanisms for learning. It is interesting to note that next to collective learning, CSOs also started to ask their peers for feedback and input. V4CP will further build on and strengthen these dynamics in the coming year.

We can conclude that CSOs increasingly make use of the power of coalitions for collective action, for learning, and for complementary work. There is scope to further strengthen and build on these emerging coalitions.

**Connections with governments at various levels**

In 2018, engagements of V4CP CSOs with the various government entities at national and sub-national level intensified in most countries. There was an increased
number of in-depth meetings between CSOs and government officials, and increased participation in and influence on (sub-)national working groups and committees to develop and monitor policies. There seems to be a change in government perception of CSOs as well. This is illustrated by various cases presented in Chapter 3.

A new development is that CSOs are increasingly regarded as partners for government entities for specific policy implementation. In Kenya, for example, one CSO (CCAK) was approached by the Ministry of Energy to lead in the hosting of data and keeping track of actions towards attainment of Sustainable Energy for All, which strengthens the position of the CSO in the clean cooking sector. In Indonesia, CSOs had various joint activities with government entities at national, provincial, and district level, e.g. on the design of the Food and Nutrition Security Action Plan at provincial level including a focus on climate and gender. This had a spill-over effect for involvement of CSOs in other programmes such as the design of a SDG roadmap at district and provincial level. In WASH, CSOs presented and shared lessons learned on achieving ODF and implementing post-ODF strategies on safely managed sanitation. In Rwanda, a joint review of District Plans to Eliminate Malnutrition (DPEM) was conducted by the SUN alliance, the National Early Childhood Development programme (NECDP), and District Governments. In Burkina Faso, focal points for pastoral resilience and for renewable energy were appointed at government level, which contributes to better communication and accountability.

In some countries we see a possible shift from intensified connections between CSOs and government towards joint activities and sometimes even partnerships on specific issues. These are considered to be mutually beneficial and go beyond dialogue. We will monitor closely if these are one-off successes or sustained changes.

**Connection with private sector**

The scope for connections with the private sector (either as an ally or as a target) for advocacy is very context specific and depends, amongst others, on the geographical area, the thematic area, and the character of the CSO. In view of this, the relationship with private sector has been further investigated and selectively intensified where feasible and instrumental to the advocacy agenda.

In Ghana, a private sector engagement forum was organised for each thematic area. This revealed the gaps, challenges, and opportunities for private sector engagement. Partnerships with cookstove manufacturers (Envirofit, Man & Man and Cook Clean) led to demand creation for improved cookstoves and the establishment of retail points.

In Rwanda, CSOs are actively engaging with food processing companies on food fortification. Three big food processing companies are now involved with the CSOs in a taskforce to review the regulations on food fortification. In Kenya, CSOs are working with the Kenya National Chamber of Commerce & Industry to establish a county level community of practice for food safety towards self-regulation.
5. Inclusiveness

For the V4CP programme, inclusion of the interests and views of vulnerable groups in planning and implementation is of key importance. During the development of the ToCs and advocacy plans, particular attention has been paid to issues that potentially affect disadvantaged groups.

Here, we provide lessons learned and examples of how gender and social inclusion is addressed in the ToCs and advocacy plans:

- In 2017, despite the fact that all ToCs and advocacy plans are (indirectly) taking into account marginalised groups, extra effort was still needed to ensure inclusive services through changes in e.g. laws, regulations, capacity. Special attention to gender and social inclusion was given in the capacity development trajectory. In continuous discussion with CSOs, gender and social inclusion are now more explicitly incorporated in the revised ToCs and advocacy plans. Efforts and progress will be monitored.

- CSOs are increasingly aware that in order to achieve inclusion of the views of vulnerable groups in planning and implementation, these groups need to be part of the decision-making processes as well; no policy should be decided by any representative without the full participation of members of the group(s) affected by that policy, nothing about us without us. This was, for example, applied in Kenya, where the CSOs had several opportunities to influence the formulation of Kenya’s second Climate Change Action Plan 2018-2022 of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. Representatives of three marginalised groups (fisher folks, hunter gatherers, and pastoralists) were present, and these representatives gave their inputs into the action plan on increased adaptive capacities and resilience.

- Evidence being generated also supports the inclusivity of the advocacy agenda of CSOs, by focusing on those potentially disadvantaged groups. This information is included in specific advocacy products to influence policy development and implementation. For example, the “Study into the Effects of Poor Sanitation” identified, per Kenyan County, specific groups of people who are left behind. This information was included in the county specific advocacy plans and products, and resulted in advocating for People with Disability -friendly public toilets in Kericho County, among others.

- The focus of CSOs on integrating gender and social inclusion (GESI) into their advocacy activities has also resulted in government staff recognising the importance of inclusiveness. WASH CSOs have successfully advocated for the inclusion of GESI Officers at the various Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies (MMDAs) to be part of the strict Interagency Coordinating Committee on Sanitation at MMDA level. This to ensure gender and social inclusion are a component of the planning and review meetings.

- Women specifically come to the fore in the advocacy agenda of the CSOs and are active in relevant discussions with government and other stakeholders. In Indonesia, CSOs facilitated the women movement group to become active in the stunting campaign. In Ghana, advocacy engagement deliberately targeted the involvement of women with relevant government bodies and female Assembly members are championing issues of clean cooking and heating in their districts. In Kenya, women champions were selected to participate in the National Renewable Energy Conference in the discussion on county roles and responsibilities on clean cooking technologies and fuels.

"Targeting the vulnerable especially women in sanitation and hygiene service delivery has been a bit of a challenge due to cultural practices. However Dr. Rose Kutins presentation on GESI during last year’s CD has helped us in re-targeting stakeholders at the District Level. Now the Gender officer is included in the sanitation platforms and supports in planning in improving S&H service delivery." Osman Sumani - Manager, New Energy, Ghana
6. Implementation challenges

While all planned results have been achieved in 2018, challenges were encountered on the way. This paragraph summarises the main challenges.

- Kenya, Ghana, Indonesia and Rwanda had to deal with significant changes of decision-makers. After elections in 2017 in Kenya, the re-engagement with new county government posed a challenge in the implementation of county policy engagement activities. In Ghana, changes in leadership at the District Assemblies affected continuity of advocacy interventions. Also the relationship between the CSOs and their government liaisons in Indonesia is affected by staff rotation among governmental institutions. Changes in high level authorities at central and local level in Rwanda caused delays as well.

- Changing government priorities affected the advocacy efforts in Burkina Faso and Ghana. Advocacy for budget allocation to FNS or Energy is difficult when the Burkina Faso government is reallocating budget to ministries of defence and security to fight increased terrorism. In Ghana, it is difficult to push for district level implementation with a changing political agenda in combination with limited decentralisation of budget by the national government. The district level actors are willing to implement V4CP issues but are constrained by the limited funding from central government.

- In Kenya, advocacy is hampered by the lack of cooperation by key stakeholders. The chair of dairy processors has not been ratifying the sector actors’ strategic plan, which has held back the launch for two years. Also, a conflict between the three horticulture industry associations has hampered efforts for a common front to implement the horticulture standard.

- Several countries struggle with the lack of coordination among different government institutions. For example, in Burkina Faso, the advocacy focuses on vocational training for renewable energy, but this falls under and between three different ministries. It is not easy for CSOs to influence them all effectively.

- The polarised political situation in Honduras remains, as well as the threats against CSOs, especially the ones that deals with defence of human rights. Internally, one of the CSOs is perceived by the other CSOs as being too close to the government, which affected the collaboration between the CSOs and the achievement of their objectives.

- Indonesia struggles with increased phenomena of extreme climate and natural disasters, such as the earthquake in Lombok and tsunami in Lampung in 2018. These events are affecting access to water, sanitation and hygiene as well as food production and, consequently, food availability, which has a direct relation to the high levels of stunting. As the priorities in the worst affected District (Lombok Utara) shifted to relief support, V4CP interventions were adjusted accordingly. The CSO involved supported the district government in finalizing the District Action Plan for Food and Nutrition security) and has since shifted its interventions to the provincial level as well as to another District (Mataram City).

“...The natural disaster could not be predicted, but after that tsunami we would like to advocate the government to be more resilient and include climate change and disasters as one of the risks when planning interventions. We tried to involve various people also to discuss about sanitation in coastal communities which is one of the groups vulnerable to climate change.”

Mr. Mashabi, Director of Mitra Bentala, Indonesia
7. Enabling environment & space for CSOs

The political context, and with that the civic space, varies considerably among the countries we work in. We have seen changes over time within individual countries, both positively and negatively, mostly linked to elections. In some of the V4CP countries, the political environment is posing challenges to the work of civil society. However, the space in which the CSOs under V4CP operate remained relatively open and receptive in most of the countries. This was aided by the collaborative advocacy approach, the focus on sector development, and the evidence generation bringing in credible information to (local) government. Specific observations on the enabling environment and civic space in the various countries in 2018 include the following:

**Burkina Faso**: The security risk has worsened and a large part of the country, in the north and east, is now under a state of emergency, which is detrimental to pastoral and economic activities in general. In addition, it has diverted public investments from development into security, and in connection with the high level of insecurity, development actors are no longer very present among the population. The humanitarian situation has rapidly deteriorated and there are now more than 100,000 internally displaced persons. Fortunately, the food situation is relatively good thanks to the exceptional rainy season which allowed good harvests. Despite these adverse developments, the general political environment remains favourable for CSOs. Both the national and local authorities are receptive to the CSOs’ advocacy.

**Honduras**: While relationships with government on thematic issues under V4CP are slowly improving, the general situation in Honduras has remained largely unchanged following the 2017 elections, which have led to a political crisis, shrinking space for civil society, and a polarisation among the CSOs and the population in the country. The polarisation also affected trust among V4CP CSOs as one of them was seen by the others as overly supportive of the government.

**Ghana**: Civic space has remained open and free. The role of CSOs as development partners is fully recognised and CSOs are seen not only as service providers in achieving the Ghana’s development agenda, but critical in enhancing transparency and accountability. There are, however, no formal procedures for engaging CSOs in government decision-making processes. This favours those close to the government or those that are very vocal.

**Indonesia**: Political tensions increased over the last year with the upcoming presidential and legislative elections in 2019. At the same time, there are positive developments regarding public participation, and enhanced access to information. With regard to the themes that the CSOs are working on (sanitation and stunting), the government shows its commitment through national policies and targets that support the achievement of the SDGs, and by increasingly involving CSOs in decision-making processes.

**Kenya**: Post-2017 elections and with the political heat gone, the earlier observed government pressure on CSOs has now reduced and CSOs resumed to undertake their mandate in a free environment. However, the Public Benefits Organizations (PBO) Act that would provide a legal mandate for CSOs and was passed in 2013, still has not been published into Law by respective government agencies thereby leaving CSOs in a legal vacuum. Furthermore, there have been proposed amendments to the PBO Act that are perceived to weaken CSOs, e.g. putting a maximum limit to foreign funds that CSOs can receive. There is a big move to push for greater public rights on a number of issues in the realm of economic justice and inclusion.

**Rwanda**: The political situation in Rwanda has remained stable over the past year. Even though there are boundaries within which the CSOs have to operate, the role of civil society in Rwanda’s development agenda is growing. For instance, existing Civil Society Platforms were given space to participate and provide inputs in the process developing different policies and strategies.
8. Overall lessons learned and conclusions

The work in 2018 built on the positive results of 2017 and satisfactory progress was made with capacity strengthening, evidence creation and dissemination, and advocacy work, as shown in this report. The overall conclusion is that V4CP remained well on track and no major changes were deemed necessary in the approach and structure of the programme over the reporting period. However, further refinements were made based on the 2017 learnings as well as on the findings and recommendations of the MTR.

Key observations and conclusions are:

**Enhanced collaboration between IFPRI and CSOs to ensure that the evidence addresses the needs of the CSOs.** During the course of 2018, IFPRI increasingly engaged directly with the CSOs to solicit feedback at the various stages of evidence generation, and more time was allocated to discuss the results and assist CSOs in using the evidence effectively in their advocacy efforts. In addition, CSOs were actively involved in setting the research agenda for 2019 (see also Chapter 4).

**Differentiated capacity strengthening programme.** 2018 saw an improvement in the capacity development areas leadership, thematic knowledge, advocacy skills, and organisation sustainability. The capacity strengthening programme became more attuned to the specific needs of the CSOs through, for instance, peer-to-peer learning sessions, exchange visits, write shops, individual coaching, as well as the IFPRI workshops on generating, understanding, and analysing specific evidence. It also became clear that the joint capacity development workshops and learning events remain important as well, as they provide scarce opportunities for all CSOs to come together and exchange experiences and best practices across the thematic areas.

**Engagement with private sector.** Opportunities to engage more with private sector were addressed in the learning event and actively pursued. It has also become clear that the scope for connections with the private sector (either as an ally or as a target) for advocacy is very context specific and depends, amongst others, on the geographical area, the thematic area, and the character of the CSO. In view of this, the relationship with the private sector has been further investigated and selectively intensified where feasible and instrumental to the advocacy agenda.

**Alignment with SNV programmes.** Over the past year specific attention was paid to further improve the alignment and collaboration with other projects within the SNV country programmes. Experiences from Kenya show that this has enabled CSOs to present their advocacy agenda more convincingly on milk quality and on sanitation. There are also good examples from Rwanda and Ghana. It became clear that in a project-based environment, alignment is not always possible for very practical reasons, e.g. where intervention areas do not overlap. More can be done to improve this during the design phase of projects.

**Organisational sustainability of the CSOs.** While V4CP is not an organisational development programme, this was recognised as an important issue and added as an element to the capacity strengthening approach in 2017. Specific support to the CSOs on their organisational sustainability was (and still is) provided, mainly through the coaching trajectory. In general, CSOs reported that their organisational sustainability had improved over 2018, but there are considerable differences between CSOs within countries, and longer term financial viability remained a serious concern for many of them. This is partly fuelled by the reducing traditional funding opportunities in countries with or transitioning to a lower middle income status (e.g. Kenya).

**Clearer focus in some of the advocacy plans.** The outcome harvesting and ToC reviews, as well as the
use of evidence, helped CSOs to further sharpen their approaches where needed. Good progress has been made (for instance with the nutrition agenda in Ghana) but attention to this continues to be required.

**Ownership of M&E system by CSOs.** Follow up with the CSOs reconfirmed our earlier findings presented in the previous annual report in that the monitoring and evaluation framework is appreciated by most of the CSOs, and is seen as a solid and useful basis for advocacy work. CSOs have started using the ToC approach in other projects. Outcome harvesting and reporting are labour intensive, but are valued as the CSOs appreciate how these M&E activities contribute to their learning and advocacy plans. However, further support remains necessary in the analysis of data to steer their work.

Experiences in 2018 reconfirmed that working in coalitions increases effectiveness of advocacy efforts. Coalition building with external stakeholders has shown to be effective and has immediately led to new opportunities to create impact. Furthermore, the V4CP collaboration among SNV, IFPRI, and the CSO partners is a small coalition in itself, which allows for strong cross-organisational learning and inspiration. The CSOs are highly motivated when working together, especially in undertaking joint advocacy activities.

Also, the importance of the use of evidence in the advocacy strategies was reconfirmed. Access to high quality evidence increases the CSOs’ credibility, and it has the potential to increase civic space. Stakeholders are more inclined to consider information and solutions that are based on verifiable facts. Evidence generation has also helped CSOs to strengthen their knowledge and with that their confidence.
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