

Part 2 Background

I Context and rationale

- 1.1 Why assess results?
- 1.2 Why is this issue on Hivos' agenda now?

II Hivos' vision on result assessment

- 2.1 What does Hivos mean by result assessment?
- 2.2 Dealing with complexities
- 2.3 Points of departure

III The wider perspective: use of result information

- 3.1 The link with Hivos' processes
- 3.2 Use of result information

I Context and rationale

1.1 Why assess results?

In theory, development organisations try to keep track of results in order to:

- monitor if they have done what they set out to do;
- be accountable for the way they use (public) resources and for the trust placed in them by constituencies;
- to see if change has occurred;
- to learn how change happens and intervene more effectively;
- to build new theories of change.

The reality is different: organisations too often pay attention to results mainly because donors require it and in order to obtain funding to sustain their organisations and programmes. Result assessment is rarely shared with primary stakeholders: intended beneficiaries are seldom involved in setting goals, in shaping the frameworks of evaluation and in the actual assessment processes. Little critical reflection on and re-casting of our theories of change take place, for many reasons. We all live this reality daily – to a large extent it holds true for Hivos too – we recognise it and understand how it works, but it fosters behaviour that sometimes is contrary to our goals.

The value of assessing the results of our efforts surpasses that of accountability, effectiveness and credibility, it is about 'development' itself. The objectives of change we are aiming for should materialise in positive changes in the lives and opportunities of poor and marginalised people and communities, and in society as a whole. Improving our capacities for result assessment can help us to sharpen our approach in working towards the achievement of those goals.

This also implies that the discussion on results of our interventions should not stop at the level of communication between Hivos and its partner organisations. Partner organisations should intensify the interaction with their members, constituencies, beneficiaries and other stakeholders on this issue.

"Tracking results of interventions means learning about social change, means knowledge. This knowledge should not be monopolised or remain at the level of professionals. It should be (and often is) jointly generated and should be a shared resource. To be used as a tool for mobilising and empowering marginalised groups, and to advocate and negotiate people-centred and justice-oriented change."
(Srilatha Batliwala, facilitator partner consultation India).

It is Hivos' ambition to put the discussion on result orientation and result assessment in this perspective of knowledge building for social change.

1.2 Why is this issue on Hivos' agenda now?

The discussion on 'measuring' results of development co-operation is ongoing for more than twenty years. Why does Hivos feel the need to change the procedures it has used up to now? There are internal and external reasons for that.

Internally: a growing need for focus, a growing need for knowledge

Hivos' practices and guidelines for monitoring and evaluation of partners have been regularly updated and improved over the years. However, increasingly the quality and options for use the existing instruments offered, was felt to be insufficient for purposes of learning and effective monitoring of results. Hivos receives each year more than 800 Annual reports of partner organisations, which are often quite extensive and provide a lot of valuable information. But they are mostly of a rather descriptive and less analytical nature. Giving constructive feedback to those reports is a huge task, and sometimes partners feel that not enough attention is being paid to their work. In addition to Annual reports, Hivos staff receives a lot additional information during visits, in workshop and evaluation reports, etc. A considerable amount of this information relates to results, but not always in a very structured way. Hivos didn't have the instruments to process all this information in a way that facilitates analysis or learning at a level beyond that of the individual partner. While the need – and opportunities - to learn about social change, share that knowledge and build new theory and practice is increasing.

More focus and analysis in partners' reports, more technical possibilities for Hivos to process the information and a practice of analysing and exchanging experiences and results with partners in a more systematic way, should lead to more insight in effective intervention strategies, better opportunities to learn for all involved and a higher quality of Hivos' support to partners.

Externally: growing pressure

Hivos, as many development organisations worldwide, experiences an increasing external pressure to demonstrate results. In the Netherlands, but internationally as well, political actors, media and the general public are increasingly questioning the relevance and effectiveness of development co-operation.

There are two sides to this: on the one hand, it is perfectly reasonable that spending of public funding ("tax payers money") should be accounted for, and the increased attention for effectiveness is also noticeable in other public sectors. On the other hand, in the case of development co-operation these critical voices do not always acknowledge the complex interrelation of international relations and interests, poverty and injustice: 'aid' is often looked at in isolation, without considering the influence of economic and political decision-making in the North. More often than not, problems of migration, refugees, (religious) minorities, the 'threat' of Islam and terrorism are all thrown in the same basket. Short-sighted as this may seem to us, it leads to inward-looking policies, reduced public trust in the merits of development co-operation and pressure on development budgets in the North. It poses a direct threat to the political and public support base for international co-operation and for the availability of funds in the future. In the Netherlands, this political atmosphere is reinforcing an already existing public management style of increasing control and a focus on short-term and simple results.

Hivos and partners improving their result assessment practices is not going to change this. But we cannot ignore these trends, for the sake of the people and partners we work with and the goals we stand for together. Hivos will continue to contest unreasonable and unrealistic demands for (simple) results, but at the same time we need to address weaknesses in our own performance and that of partners. Firstly, the quality of our interventions can be improved and critically monitoring our own work will help. Secondly, we could do a better job in presenting results, confronting critical voices and using our increased knowledge to lobby for more just policies.

Of course, there is a relation between internal and external factors: the more we know about the effects of our work and learn from it, the better we perform and the more convincingly we can show the results and value of our work to critical in- and outsiders.

II Hivos' vision on result assessment

2.1 What does Hivos mean by result assessment?

Language and the use of terms in discussing development and results assessment proved to be a very important issue during the partner consultations. Words can have very different connotations for different people and reflect (perceptions of) relations of dominance and inequality. The terms result measurement or result assessment is often experienced as very much donor- and funding-related. Hivos consciously chose for the term result assessment instead of result measurement, because in Hivos' perception the term 'measurement' stresses the quantitative aspects of the process, and 'assessment' leaves more room for the qualitative and 'appreciatory' aspects.

It is important to use language that is reflecting what one intends to express. Instead of using the term result assessment, one might use the phrase "tracking change" or "capturing change". A point of attention should then be that "change" is in general used for results at effect or impact level, while result assessment in Hivos perception encompasses all levels, including the output level. "Tracking progress" expresses more the intermediary status of some type of results.

Hivos uses the term result assessment as a broad, 'umbrella' notion: "all ways and forms of appreciating and registering results (i.e. all type of outcomes of activities or interventions) aiming at a specific objective or a more general goal". It refers to results at different levels and time frame: output, effect, impact; and of different quality: quantitative and qualitative.

Hivos prefers the term result assessment, because it encompasses more than the more regularly used "M&E". Monitoring is often understood as an internal process to "check if we are doing what we planned to do", and evaluation as an ex-post assessment of results achieved, most of the times performed by external actors (i.e. consultants, donors).

Hivos is in favour of a more integral, more internal, ongoing and self-determined organisational process of result assessment, with the involvement of various stakeholders, for purposes of sharpening policies and strategies, "capturing change" and learning from experiences at different levels.

2.2 Dealing with complexities

The debate on how to 'measure' results of interventions in development processes has been ongoing for a long time. Practitioners, funding agencies and academics have racked their brains in developing methods and instruments that would be appropriate to assess the value and contribution of the work of development organisations to goals of social change and reduction of poverty. This has resulted in a range of approaches, methods and tools. However, reality tends to escape theoretical models and some difficulties in assessing results prove to be persistent. The full complexity of development co-operation comes to the fore in discussions about result assessment. Problems in result assessment are partly technical/ methodological, but also related to the nature and functioning of the 'aid system'.

Context of development interventions by civil society organisations

Civil society organisations with objectives of social change and poverty reduction operate in a context where international political and economic relations and the interventions of multilateral organisations, especially the IFI's, in general have a much greater impact on the achievement of objectives of structural poverty reduction than development activities of civil society organisations. That's why influencing international and governmental policy-making is part and parcel of international co-operation as Hivos and many of its partners define it. From local to international level, CSOs organise and represent voices that otherwise would not be heard, oppose policies that are aggravating instead of improving conditions of poverty and inequality, and try to develop alternatives from the perspective of the non-dominant actors in the power play. That they don't always succeed is not surprising. The fact of this unequal balance in impact can never be an excuse for not looking critically at the effectiveness of civil society organisations, but it does play a role when assessing the results of civil society interventions, particularly at impact level, and in comparing them to those of other actors in the field. There are plenty of examples where promising developments were reduced to nothing by external factors completely out of control of the intervening organisation and the people they were working with. The question of one of Hivos' partners during one of the partner consultations on result assessment illustrates this also: "How do I measure that I have to run hard just to stay in the same place (and not go backwards)?"

At the same time, this underlines the need and challenge for CSOs in those circumstances to analyse and monitor these contextual factors closely, to set their objectives realistically and to be very inventive in choosing their strategies, in order to use their limited means in ways that at least have a chance to make a difference.

The aid chain

Hivos and its partners are part of the so-called "aid chain", at different levels. Basically, the aid chain is a system of channelling financial resources from rich countries to (groups within) poor countries, in order to achieve 'development' or to mitigate the consequences of crises (humanitarian aid). Some see it as a rightful redistribution of resources after a history of colonialism, others as one way of working towards worldwide equality and freedom, others as charity. These visions influence to a large extent how questions of ownership and accountability in the aid chain are viewed.

Difficulties in result assessment in the aid chain are partly related to the structure itself and partly to how power is working through it. The achievement of results in the aid chain is necessarily indirect and is partly depending on the capacity and performance of other parts of the chain. The number of parties and influencing factors increase along the chain.

Power: the 'politics' of result assessment

In result assessment in the aid chain and in donor-partner relationships, the issue of judgement and (unequal) power relations in decision-making on funding plays a role. Inevitably, financial connections imply dependencies. At the end of the day, the power to set conditions and standards, to formulate reporting requirements, to judge which results are good enough and to decide on the continuation of funding, lies with the actor providing the funds. This influences processes of result assessment through the whole chain. Some examples.

With regard to programme formulation, organisations can feel caught in the middle between setting their goals (too) high in order to attract donors and compete for funds, or to set them (too) low, in order to stay on the safe side and not end up not achieving them. Reporting openly about disappointing results becomes a problem when you feel you might be presented with budget cuts or ending of the contract. Tensions can arise between upward and downward accountability, when the donor's demands conflict with priorities of other stakeholders. The well-known tendency of organisations to accept all sorts of 'projects' or adapt programmes along the latest fashion for the sake of survival, may compromise consistent monitoring of their longer-term goals.

In evaluation processes power relations play a role both in the process and in the outcomes. Who judges who and who defines what should be considered a result? The objectives and criteria of evaluation are generally determined by the donor, in consultation with the partner organisation, or not. Beneficiaries are seldom actively involved. The way the evaluation process is structured, who is participating, and whose perception of results and positive or negative impact is heard and valued, are determined by power relations between donor/evaluator and partner, partner and communities, and within communities. To understand this we only need to think of gender bias. The evaluator is generally in a position to greatly influence the outcomes by the choices made during the process and in the presentation of results and conclusions.

When result assessment is done for the donor alone or the organisation feels judged by standards it cannot influence, it will be experienced as a burden. Staff will go for the information that is easiest to measure (but not necessarily the most relevant), information risks to be unreliable or incomplete, thorough analysis will not take place, but – most important – the organisation will learn little or nothing from the whole exercise.

"If developmental measurement is experienced as being first for someone else, the potential to learn from the process will be minimised."

"There is a major difference being measured by someone who has power over you, and measuring yourself."

(James Taylor and Sue Soal, CDRA)

But unequal power relations do not only exist between donors and organisations in the South, they are also at play between the latter and their constituencies. The role of NGO's in development processes as an intermediary between donors and groups of poor and marginalised people is also

power-related. They control to a certain extent which needs are prioritised and 'get up the chain' and how 'aid' funds are spent. Accountability remains an issue at all levels.

Power inequalities in the aid chain pose challenges to donors and 'recipients' alike. Hivos knows both positions from own experience, some of the partner organisations might too.

During the consultations, partners expressed the fear that Hivos will go the way of other donors and impose a uniform model and format for result assessment to all its partners, and change its partnership approach and values. Hivos strives to live up to principles of partnership, good donorship, and autonomy of its partners, and continues to do so. It does not see partners as implementers of Hivos policy and seeks real co-operation for the achievement of shared goals. Hivos hopes that the presented framework and procedures will strengthen the trust that the process will be based on negotiation, partners shaping their own result assessment practices, and jointly set standards.

Methodological issues

Methodologically and technically, result assessment is not easy and it is never uncontested. Methods and instruments are often experienced as inadequate or (too) time consuming. Attribution and aggregation of results is sometimes impossible.

Attribution refers to the question: to what extent can change in a situation be considered a result of - and be attributed to - activities or interventions of a specific organisation? Attribution is a fundamental problem, because development processes are influenced by many actors and factors. Output results (20 farmers trained) or short-term effects (10% increase in production) can more or less easily be attributed to a specific activity of an organisation. But in other cases attribution becomes more difficult: when interventions aim at more complicated and long-term processes, like advocacy or awareness raising activities; when it concerns longer-term effects and impact, and also in case of donor activities: the contribution of different donors can most often not be linked to a specific result of the programme. In case of non-earmarked institutional support this is even more complicated.

Aggregation refers to the use of result information: the way in which we accumulate and analyse results of different activities and interventions at different levels, and draw conclusions about our results as an organisation. Firstly, in processing result information there is always a loss of diversity and meaning of that information, especially when results are being reported from one level to the other: from groups to partner, from partner to donor. Secondly, and especially at donor level, it is practically impossible to 'add up' the results of different partners: their objectives, nature of activities, scale and context are too different to be expressed in comparable 'units' of result, even if it's possible to 'measure' results in a quantified form. Let alone results of a more qualitative nature.

Impact assessment and so-called 'intangible' results pose their own methodological problems. Many Hivos partners are working for objectives of awareness and consciousness raising, change in attitudes and behaviour, strengthening self-esteem of marginalised groups. These types of results take time to become observable, are often contested if not confirmed by research of larger groups, and they can never be attributed to the activities of one particular organisation. For organisations active in the field of arts and culture, working to open up space for alternative visions and debate in society, it is in most cases very difficult to indicate how their work has affected individuals, the larger public, society. Which doesn't mean that there have been no effects.

Impact, long-term, significant and sustainable change in people's lives or society as a whole, is always the outcome of multiple social and political forces and circumstances. With some exceptions, it can hardly be measured at the level of one organisation. It demands another type of research (and financial investment) than the regular evaluation, and than is realistic for the average development organisation. Impact assessment in general asks for long-term research and should be a concerted effort of different actors.

Quality issues

But not all factors that make result assessment complex are that difficult to solve: some issues relate to the quality of organisations and their priority setting and policy decisions. Development organisations at all levels are often too ambitious in their objectives and (sometimes) too broadly focused. A lack of focus complicates result assessment because of the large range and diversity of objectives and activities to be monitored and evaluated.

Often, there is an asymmetry between attention to means and ends: budgets and projects, rather than change, dominate the discourse and relational interactions. Disbursement and financing processes are the basis for incentives, organisational behaviour and a proxy for performance. Organisational investment in financial procedures far outweigh investment in performance tracking, investment in capacity building and instruments for result assessment and in practices of ongoing analysis and reflection is often inadequate.

2.3 Points of departure

Based on the complexity and 'politics' of assessing results of development interventions as described in the previous paragraphs, and as stated in the Introduction to this paper, Hivos does not (cl)aim to develop a result assessment system that is all-embracing and produces indisputable outcomes. It goes without saying, that a reasonable level of accountability for funds received is a basic requirement. Beyond that, Hivos considers it of greater importance that partners and Hivos are stimulated to develop meaningful ways of tracking change that contribute to the quality of their interventions, and learn from it and each other in doing so.

Some points of departure have been formulated.

- Result assessment processes are value-based and influenced by power relations and dominant visions on development. An 'objective' assessment of change doesn't exist, as the interests, perception and appreciation of change by different stakeholders differ.
- In development processes a complete and indisputable attribution of results to specific interventions and actors is not possible, in particular for relatively 'small' (civil society) players. Linking results to interventions of partners or of Hivos will take place on the basis of *contribution* and *plausibility*, in the sense that there is sufficient 'evidence' that the interventions have contributed to the changes that partners aimed for and that have actually occurred.
- Assessment of change only has meaning in relation to the socio-political, geographical and historical context in which it is achieved, the actually existing opportunities for change in that specific context, and the perception of the people involved. What is a huge step in one context, doesn't mean much in another. This means that result assessment must be 'contextualised' and implies the use of location-specific indicators. It should leave room for and do justice to the different realities of partner organisations.
- Learning and using (new) knowledge to achieve our goals is part of human development, both individually and collectively. Assessing where and why we achieve what we aim for and where we don't – and learning from it – is part of our daily life and work.
- Mutual trust, a critical attitude and a focus on learning, quality and transparency are considered conditions for genuine accountability, both upward and downward.

Actors at all levels of the aid chain tend to give priority to accountability to funders. However, donor-driven systems often function poorly, because most of the times they don't respond to the needs and priorities of the people who have direct access to the information the system asks for.

The diversity of Hivos' partner organisations, the different needs of Hivos' stakeholders, the complexity of result assessment in development processes, and widely accepted notions with regard to good practices in result assessment all point in the direction of a flexible approach that – in its operationalisation – can be adapted to specific needs at different levels and for different actors. For a donor as Hivos is, some way of aggregation and analysis of the very diversified result information it receives is necessary for reasons of external accountability, policy evaluation and knowledge building. This implies a system with different levels of information, that offers the possibility to retrace information to actual activities, processes and people.

The challenge is therefore to develop an approach that:

- is manageable and meaningful for both Hivos and its partners;
- is balanced with regard to accountability and learning purposes;

- leaves enough room for and stimulates partner organisations to develop and use a result assessment practice that suits their needs and enhances their knowledge and effectiveness;
- is transparent and offers information that can be retraced to activities, processes and people;
- allows for a certain level of systematisation and generalisation.

Methodological options

There are many visions and theories on how 'development' or social change comes about and how those processes can be influenced. They differ in their vision on social dynamics, the causality and predictability of change, notions such as 'reality' and 'truth', and the roles and perspectives of different actors. To name but a few. These different social theories have resulted in a range of different approaches, methods and instruments for problem analysis, objective setting, planning, monitoring and evaluation.

People's and organisations' actions are guided by their theory of change (ref. Part 4), which also influences their affinity with and choice for specific approaches and instruments.

Some of those are more dominant than others. Over the last 20 years, the demand for improved quality of planning, monitoring and evaluation in development co-operation has led to a wide acceptance and use of planning and management models, especially by the (larger) donors. They introduced methods such as Objective-oriented Project Planning (ZOPP/OOPP), Project Cycle Management (PCM), Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) and Results-based Management (RBM), which are based on a linear/logical line of thinking. The focus is on steering for results by consistently formulating goals and objectives, identifying assumptions and risks, using indicators, monitoring activities, in- and outputs, etc. The use of Logframe has often enhanced analytical thinking and skills, and has improved the quality of formulation of objectives, planning and information management. But the Logframe matrix is also often experienced as top-down and donor-driven, an example of western thinking, reductionist, not 'covering' the complexity and dynamics of reality, neglecting qualitative aspects and the perception of the people involved, etc. Many organisations find it more useful for a project approach than for other types of interventions. Although Logframe in itself does not exclude a participatory use, the focus on management and the perceived complex nature of the matrix often leads to a top-down, 'professional' and/or bureaucratic use.

Defenders of explicitly participatory, bottom-up approaches often take quite a different point of departure. They state that problem analysis, programme design, monitoring and evaluation are part and parcel of change processes, and that the people concerned (primary stakeholders) should define the changes needed, and be actively involved in the collection and analysis of result information. Active participation in those processes potentially has a strong capacity building effect: people develop skills, gain insights and get access to information they didn't have before. This can lead to 'empowerment', enhance self-respect and foster new leadership. Downward accountability and learning is expected to be better ensured, as it is part of the process. Of course, the intention of using participatory methods does not automatically lead to all these results.

Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) is an umbrella term for a wide range of participatory approaches, methods and behaviours to enable poor people to express and analyse the realities of their lives and conditions, and to plan, monitor and evaluate their actions themselves. It will be clear that these approaches are especially relevant in case of programmes directly dealing with actors/beneficiaries at community level. Other approaches that can also be used at other levels of intervention and allow for participation of a broad range of stakeholders, are for example Outcome Mapping, Soft Systems Methodology, Multistakeholder Processes, etc. (For more information on methodologies, ref. Part 5).

Hivos' position

Hivos encourages partners to choose the approach, methods and instruments that correspond to their vision and type of objectives and activities, and otherwise suit their needs. Hivos supports the importance of participation of primary stakeholders in the whole process from problem analysis and priority setting to assessment of results. However, one should note that for partners who are engaged in the cultural sector, research, media-based work or activism related to controversial issues in society, a participatory approach might not be feasible for political or practical reasons.

Hivos also appreciates elements from Logframe analysis. The intended procedure uses elements of Logframe 'thinking': making assumptions about change and the intervention logic explicit, breaking down longer-term objectives into intermediate steps, using indicators because it forces us to reflect

more in-depth on how we expect the intended change to 'express itself' and helps to sharpen the focus of our programmes.

But Hivos does not ask from partners to use the Logframe matrix if they are not comfortable with it. Within the framework presented in this paper, partners are invited to explore and use the methods that suit them best and that provide them (and Hivos) with the result information that they need.

III The wider perspective: use of result information

The subject of this paper largely focuses on result assessment processes in the relation between Hivos and partner organisations. Two questions are important in placing this process in a wider perspective: How does the process with individual partners fit into the larger picture how Hivos deals with results at its own level? and How will Hivos use the information on the results and performance of its partners and how will partners benefit of this system?

3.1 The link with Hivos' processes

How does the process with individual partners fit into the larger picture how Hivos deals with results at its own level?

In its database, Hivos registers the following type of information:

- basic information of the partner organisation (type of organisation, country, sector of intervention, staff capacity, gender quality), that will be updated throughout the whole period of the partner relation with Hivos;
- information on the actual contract/ programme with the partner: financial information, objectives, type of activities, expected outreach, type of beneficiaries, sector specific information, result indicators agreed upon, etc.;
- information on Hivos' interventions and support to the partner.

When a contract is signed with a partner, the objectives of the co-operation are linked in Hivos' database to higher level goals of Hivos' policy domains Civil Society Building and Economy/ Sustainable Development, to which the activities of the partner is expected to contribute. Annually and at the end of the contract, the progress made towards the achievement of the objectives of the contract is assessed in a qualitative way (by way of a score from 'highly satisfactory' to 'highly unsatisfactory'), enabling Hivos to aggregate the performance of its 850 partners in terms of the general progress they are making. This information can be related to other data such as region and sector, type of partner, etc. This will enable Hivos to analyse strong(er) and weak(er) performance in specific sectors, with regard to specific objectives or strategies, of a specific type of organisation, etc. and the possible reasons for these outcomes, in order to adjust policies or strategies where necessary.

This implies that the monitoring of results by Hivos is based on processes of linking and clustering information collected and interpreted by different people within and outside Hivos. The assessment by Hivos programme officers is a subjective 'judgement', although it should be justified by verifiable data from Annual reports and other available sources, and will be subject to internal quality control. So, how will Hivos justify the statements it will make on the basis of these diverse data and qualitative assessments? There are two answers to that: firstly, Hivos does not pretend to give an exact picture with this 'system': its purpose is to monitor *the overall performance* and *trends* of Hivos and its partners as a network of actors in development and to provide an information base for further research. Secondly, this is where evaluation comes in. Project evaluations, programme evaluations and impact assessments should be used to check, confirm and justify the 'subjective' assessments made on the basis of appreciation and scoring, and fill in the picture of the long(er) term effects and impact of the work of partners. For example by involving a group of partners working on the same objective(s) in an evaluation of the consistency of policies and strategies of Hivos and those partners and of the results achieved.

In the coming years, Hivos will invest in adequate evaluation instruments and a programme of (external) evaluations in order to be able:

- to confirm and show that the system – at large – is providing us (and others) with sufficiently reliable outcomes,

- to make more explicit statements on the effects of Hivos' and partners' interventions in a specific sector or context, based on external evaluation.

3.2 Use of result information

How will Hivos use the information on the results and performance of its partners and how will partners benefit of this system?

Knowledge building and sharing

Systematically and critically tracking results of interventions of partners (and Hivos itself) results in learning about social change. Result information forms the basis for knowledge building and knowledge sharing, both within and between Hivos and partners (and other interested parties). Hivos strives to put the discussion on result assessment in the perspective of this learning approach and intends to invest in knowledge sharing and to become part of a knowledge network with its partners.

Improved Hivos practices

Within Hivos as an organisation, the focus on results is expected to lead to better analyses of reports of partners, and to improved and more focused monitoring, feedback and follow-up. Result information will be used as input for internal learning processes, policy development, and improved quality of the portfolio and the support to partners.

Improved partner practices

An increased focus on results is expected to contribute to a growing capacity of partners to monitor, assess and present results to their various stakeholders, to enhance organisational reflection and learning and thus improve the quality, relevance and sustainability of the organisation.

Accountability

Externally, the outcomes of analysis will be used by Hivos to report at an aggregated level to its funders and other stakeholders on the general progress Hivos and its partners are making. These statements will be justified and illustrated by outcomes of evaluations and other research and by examples of good practice.

NB The external use of information on the performance of partners will always be anonymous: statements will be made at the level of groups of partners, for example in terms of percentages. Of course, examples of good practice will be attributed to the rightful 'owner'.

Lobby and advocacy

Result information will be used as an input for lobby and advocacy, firstly in activities and campaigns focused at specific issues Hivos and partners are lobbying for at national and international levels. Secondly, for lobby in the North to promote the value of international co-operation and enlarge the support base for changed policies in the North and (continued) funding for organisations in the South.