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The aim of the Partner DevelopmentSelf-Assessment Tool is to help partner organisations to review how the SAFM programme supported them to build their capabilities to influence forest and land governance in their country. In addition to its monitoring and evaluation purpose, this process is intended to reflect on lessons learnt since the start of the SAFM programme and help your organisation to think about its capacity building needs.

The overall goal of the SAFM programme from December 2011 to November 2014 is to develop sustainable and accountable forest and land use management which reduces poverty, instability, environmental degradation and conflict. A core component is to support partners so that *“citizens are better able to demand strategic forest and land-use decisions by governments, who are responsive and accountable to their needs”.*  The specific objectives include:

1. Engaging multi-stakeholder forums(i.e. with government, industry and civil society representatives) to influence policy processes
2. Advocating for the rights of marginalised groups, in particular women and/or forest peoples
3. Gathering data and presenting evidence from field investigations, in particular on the issues faced by local communities
4. Building stronger networks and coalitions across civil society
5. Developing links with media to publicise findings and issues
6. Conducting civil society independent forest monitoring (IFM) and other oversight measures to hold authorities and companies to account
7. Promoting civil society engagement in the negotiation or implementation of Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPAs) for Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade (FLEGT) with the European Union

As part of the end of programme monitoring and evaluation, we would like partners to carry out a self-assessment of their effectiveness in relation to these seven objectives. **You only need to complete an assessment for the ones that are applicable to your organisation**, for example only a few organisations have conducted IFM or contributed to VPA processes. Objective 3 on investigations may also cover the collection of data for the preparation of maps or other graphics.

The assessment tool consists of a set of ratings from 1 to 5. Guidance is provided in the following page on the criteria. You should then use the template to indicate your score and give one or two bullets points explaining why you have chosen it, including concrete examples where possible. In addition, you are then invited to reflect on what score you would have given your organisation at the start of the SAFM programme (i.e. when you first started receiving a grant) with some reasons why your capabilities have improved, stayed the same, or worsened, and to consider the lessons learnt.

It is recommended that you complete the tool in a participatory manner with project staff and possibly an external person playing interviewer. It takes time and needs discussion to build consensus about what level your organisation is operating at. Remember to keep a record of who takes part. This will increase the validity of the scores and the potential for further learning and planning.Where your work is part of a larger organisation with various other funding sources, please complete an assessment only for your specific team or project that has been supported by SAFM. **Please reflect critically on how the capabilities of your organisation have developed and what really happened, as opposed to what you hoped to achieve. Lower scores do not in any way mean that the project has failed, but should help to identify needs and areas to strengthen.** Global Witness will provide feedback on your assessment (and will help conduct the assessment if making a final visit to your organisation), keep a record of the final version, and use the findings for overall programme reporting.

#### Guidance for the scores in the SAFM Partner Development Self-Assessment Tool

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Areas of effectiveness** *(What is your organisation doing?)* | | | | | | |
| **Level of effectiveness** *(How well are you doing it?)* | **Engaging multi-stakeholder forums better to influence policy processes** | **Advocating for marginalised groups rights** | **Producing stronger evidence from investigations** | **Developing closer links with media to publicise issues** | **Playing stronger role in civil society networks** | **Conducting IFM and other measures to hold companies and authorities to account** | **Promoting greater civil society engagement in VPAs** |
| **5** | **On-going forums**   * You play an active role in on-going multi-stakeholder forums with established rules for representation, process and transparency | **Lead role themselves**   * You facilitate the ability of marginalised groups to playa lead role themselves in advocating for their rights | **Skilled high quality**   * You are skilled in designing and conducting investigations that produce high quality evidence on forest and land use issues and trends | **Proactive links**   * You play a proactive role in speaking to media, have relationships with key journalists, and regularly produce media materials. | **Leadership role**   * You have a recognised lead role within national level networks with broad-based memberships | **Consistent**   * You carry out regular civil society IFM with clear procedures and reporting, and press for actions by companies and authorities | **Coordinating**   * You have a recognised role in the coordination of civil society inputs into VPA negotiation and/or implementation |
| **4** | *On the scale between 3 and 5* | | | | | | |
| **3** | **One-off meetings**   * You facilitate multi-stakeholder forums but they are usually one-off meetings or consultations on specific issues | **Represent them**   * You represent the needs of marginalised groups in policy positions and involve them where possible | **Conduct with support**   * You are able to conduct investigations but rely on external support and guidance to improve its quality | **Some contacts and materials**   * You have a list ofmedia contacts and occasionally produce media materials including social media (facebooketc). | **Active participant**   * You actively participate within networks and are invited to join events | **Supported**   * You carry out local civil society IFM and report findings, but need support on the procedures and holding other to account | **Participating**   * You have taken part in VPA discussions |
| **2** | *On the scale between 1 and 3* | | | | | | |
| **1** | **Occasional dialogue**   * You have only occasional dialogue with government on specific issues, and rarely participate in multi-stakeholder forums | **Limited connection**   * You make little reference to marginalised groups’ needs in policy positions and have few direct links to them | **Little experience**   * You may collect some local data but have little knowledge or experience of investigation design and methods | **Limited contact**   * You rarely, if ever, have a media story about your work and only occasionally talk to journalists when they contact you | **Basic awareness**   * You have an awareness of networks working on similar issues, but have little regular contact with them. | **Uncoordinated**   * You may carry out local monitoring, but it is uncoordinated and has no established reporting systems | **Little knowledge**   * You have little or no knowledge of VPA |

##### Your Assessment

Please complete with your score and couple of short backing points against each of the relevant areas, then indicate how this may have changed since the start of the project (i.e. attempt to re-set a baseline score with some details) and suggest short lessons learnt for capacity building. You should confine your rating to just one box in each column, and agree which box (or level of effectiveness) through discussion.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Areas of effectiveness** *(What is your organisation doing?)* | | | | | | |
| **Level of effectiveness** *(How well are you doing it?)* | **Engaging multi-stakeholder forums better to influence policy processes** | **Advocating for marginalised groups rights** | **Producing stronger evidence from investigations** | **Developing closer links with media to publicise issues** | **Playing stronger role in civil society networks** | **Conducting IFM/land monitoring and other measures to hold companies and authorities to account** | **Promoting greater civil society engagement in VPAs** |
| **5** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **4** | * Share Mercy normally participated in more than half of the events held by self or multi-stakeholders in Governance Sector (e.g., involved actively in World Bank strategic plan formulation for 2015-2018 inviting key partners, welcome World Bank visits to the SM office, actively involving in Farmer Interests Protection and Upgrading by-laws advocacy by FSWG and LCG monthly meetings facilitating other partners. * SM will also be formally facilitating the amendment of 2012 farmland law and 2013 farmers interest protection law.. | * Systematically using legal frameworks to advocate for individual communities and collectively. Recommend level 4 not 3, very strong progress! * Many examples of support and direct involvement in advocacy supporting for land-lost peasants. * Recognised by some communities and other organisations as leading land advocates. | * Share Mercy is doing assessments on Land Disputes in Ayarwaddy and collection on the peasants voices against the legal framework and producing second Legal Analysis Case book with some technical assistance from LCG for more and stronger analysis * Produced initial case study book and video documentary. * Now refining methodologies to produce more strategic evidence based materials * Training of community groupings (farmer unions etc) on evidence gathering and the value of well evidence arguments. | * Share Mercy is proactive talking to the media, everyone is open to media representation according to their responsibility * The media now contacts Share Mercy for opinion on issues | * We are very active in LCG, FSWG, MNN, MNGO CPR and inactive role in ALWG |  |  |
| **3** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2** |  |  |  |  |  | * Protecting Environment is one of our values, we put and think always of putting as mainstream in every project and play a good team player in environmental events * Recording cases but no systematic monitoring of cases in place (not their primary function). |  |
| **1** |  |  |  |  |  |  | * We have little aware of VPA here but more interests in EITI |
| **What was the level at the start of SAFM?** | * Level 2- SM were involved in one of meetings/stakeholder forums but mainly in coalition with others. | * Level 2 - (*text taken from previous assessment from Sept 13*)‘Share Mercy are working with land dependent people in a structured They are meeting some elements of level 3 but not quite there yet.’ | * Level 1-2 at the start – Not much experience of investigation design or methods. | * Level 2(just).(*text taken from previous assessment from Oct 13*)Share Mercy currently only have direct engagement with media around a few big events. They produce a monthly newsletter but don’t have regular media contact yet. | * Level 3 – (*text taken from previous assessment from Oct 13*) Active members of the Land Issues Working Group and Myanmar Peoples Forum | * Level 1 – Not Share Mercy’s main function. | * Level 1 - SM weren’t aware of the FLEGT/VPA process. |
| **What lessons learnt for building capacity?** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Who participated in assessment?** | * Global Witness – Brett Prowse & Rebecca Lee * Share Mercy - Ni Ni & William (Wayan, Director) * Plus community (peasant union) representatives: * Yin Oo (from case study no. 6 from Share Mercy’s book “Stories of Terrible Land Concessions”) * Han Win Sein (chairman of Myaungmya Peasants Union) | | | | | | |

1. This assessment tool is adapted from a tool developed by the Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD) for its programme in the DFID Global Transparency Fund, and subsequently adopted by Global Witness for its *Making the Forest Sector Transparent* programme. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)