



# PARTNERS FOR RESILIENCE

Working together on disasters, climate, ecosystems



In cooperation with  
Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken

## Annex 7

# Country Case Study Mali

External End Evaluation

Partners for Resilience

2016-2020 programme

**Final**

**25 June 2020**

**Volker Hauck & Djoumé Sylla**

By the European Centre for Development Policy Management

***ecdpm***

# Table of Contents

Table of Contents .....	1
1.Introduction .....	1
2.Methodology.....	2
3.The PfR Mali programme – an overview.....	2
3.1. PfR I in Mali.....	2
3.2. From PfR I to PfR II in Mali .....	3
3.3. Development of a Theory of Change for Mali 2016-2020.....	3
4.Replies to the Evaluation Questions .....	5
4.1. EQ 1 – Relevance and coherence .....	5
4.2. EQ 2 – Efficiency and coordination.....	10
4.3. EQ 3 – Value added and complementarity .....	13
4.4. EQ 4 – Effectiveness of engagement .....	16
4.5. EQ 5 – Effectiveness and direct outcomes.....	19
4.6. EQ 6 – Longer-term outcomes and impact (change) .....	23
4.7. EQ 7 – Sustainability.....	24
5.Emerging observations .....	26
Bibliography .....	32
Annexes .....	33

## 1. Introduction

This report describes findings and analysis from the evaluation of the PfR II Mali case. It is one of five case studies which were requested in the ToR and subsequent exchanges with the PfR Evaluation Management Team (EMT) during the Inception Phase. The report starts with a short description of the PfR II Mali programme, followed by a clustering of findings and judgements along the structure of the evaluation matrix which had been agreed upon with the PfR EMT during the Inception Phase. The report ends with a section that lists a number of emerging observations and preliminary conclusions from this case. The annex compiles the documents reviewed, the persons interviewed and the results of the outcome harvesting workshop which was conducted at the end of the Mali country visit. This visit was carried out by Mr. Volker Hauck, ECDPM, and Mr. Djoumé Sylla, local consultant. The Mali evaluation was supported by desk research conducted by ECDPM staff member Sophie Desmidt prior to the country visit.

## 2. Methodology

Findings and analysis are based on desk research, PfR project document reviews, face-to-face and Skype-based interviews as well as focus group discussions with PfR stakeholders in The Hague, other parts of the Netherlands and Paris. Interviews were also conducted with a wide range of PfR stakeholders in Bamako, Mali, as well as with stakeholders based in different parts of the country (Mopti and Kayes) where the PfR programme is implemented. The latter group, i.e. stakeholders based in different parts of the country, were conducted mostly via telephone. Interviewees included PfR project staff, officials from central, regional and local government (one Préfet, regional sector directors, majors), parliamentarians, coalition leaders and one journalist. A total of 18 interviews were conducted, involving 45 persons. The list in Annex 2 marks which persons were interviewed via telephone/Skype. Annex 3 lists the persons participating in two half-day Focus Group Discussions.

The country visit took place between 3 and 11 March 2020 and was limited to Bamako due to security reasons. Interviews and focus group discussions with PfR staff and coalition leaders who are based in the four principal sub-regions (Bankass, Djenné, Mopti, Kayes) where the PfR Mali programme is implemented, could be conducted face-to-face in Bamako. These persons had come to Bamako for the PfR Programme Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) workshop which takes place regularly in March and September of each year.

One day of the PME workshop was devoted to the outcome harvesting workshop which was prepared and facilitated by the consultants. Some 30+ persons participated. During this one-day exercise, participants were asked to look from a bird's-eye perspective at the broad outcomes of the programme since its start in 2016 in terms of capacity strengthening for lobbying and advocacy, policy, investments and practice. Participants were also asked to identify which of these changes (outcomes) had been particularly significant and which role the PfR II programme played in achieving them. This exercise was undertaken to facilitate learning of PfR Mali stakeholders, also with a view towards a possible continuation of the PfR programme (PfR III), and to deepen the evaluation's insights with regard to EQs 4 to 6 of this evaluation, in particular.

## 3. The PfR Mali programme – an overview

### 3.1. PfR I in Mali

PfR I in Mali focused on sustainable economic growth in downstream Inner Niger Delta (IND) by harmonising different sectoral needs (rice farming, livestock, herding, fishers), finding trade-offs between water allocation in upstream versus food production downstream, the maintenance of healthy ecosystem and clean drinking water, and root causes for recurrent droughts (including climate change) to be addressed from local to regional level. PfR I in Mali was strongly focused on addressing water scarcity and was limited to the IND region. PfR II expanded to Senegal (Kayes) and Souro river basin (still in IND region but more towards the border with Burkina Faso).

The main result was that stakeholders, communities and CSOs which PfR I Mali engaged with had an increased understanding of action that could address water scarcity in the IND. A flood warning tool, OPIDIN (and early warning system) developed by Wetlands International was implemented which helped communities to better predict floods and draught. PfR Mali established also "Local Committees for Prevention and Disaster Risk Management" in 20 villages, and facilitated the establishment of the "Platform Interventions Climate Change" consisting of 8 CSO in the Mopti region. The network also

established a network called 'Friends of the Inner Niger Delta' with CSOs, universities and influential individuals to put the issue of water allocation to the IND on the national policy agenda. The PfR partners, together with these CSOs, organised workshops to improve the understanding of hydrological flows for livelihoods and the economy in the IND. These CSOs were trained on how to use the flood prediction tool OPIDIN and other tools such as 'agro-meteorological gauges', which the CSOs now use when engaging in villages and for policy dialogues with regional and national governments.

### 3.2. From PfR I to PfR II in Mali

The implementing partners of the alliance under PfR I were GRAT, ODI Sahel, AMPRODE, and other CSOs. However, a SWOT analysis/baseline study conducted in 2016 pointed to some weaknesses in their capacity to engage with communities - as national level NGOs. This analysis led to a *strategic change of direction to focus on grassroots organisations*, as it was felt they were better placed than national level CSOs to lobby local authorities at the level of 'cercles' and towns, "as they were believed to be the most sustainable investment, due to their local ownership and direct link to livelihood interests."<sup>1</sup> This meant that the PfR Alliance in Mali had to build up the IRM expertise, lobbying and advocacy capacity of these grassroots organisations from the bottom up. Based on the IRM principles of working across sectors, a broad range of grassroots organisations were brought together in so-called 'IRM coalitions'.

PfR II in Mali could build on the work of Wetlands International and CARE Mali implemented during PfR I, the Red Cross Mali (with support provided by the Netherlands Red Cross) joined this programme as of 2016. Wetlands and CARE work principally in the IND region, in which both organisations had worked during PfR I already. Mali Red Cross started PfR from scratch in Kayes, where the Netherlands Red cross is supporting the branch. Kayes is situated in the Western parts of Mali.

### 3.3. Development of a Theory of Change for Mali 2016-2020

The 2016 Mali Country Planning document describes a Theory of Change (ToC) which aims to achieve the following impact: "*Vulnerable households of fishermen, pastoralists and farmers living in the wetlands of the Niger, Sourou and Senegal basins are more resilient to crises in the context of climate change and environmental degradation, enabling sustainable inclusive economic growth and ecosystem conservation.*"<sup>2</sup>

This ToC was adapted during two PfR workshops in September 2017 and March 2018. The principal objectives and hypotheses of the 2016 Country Planning Document were confirmed but the impact to be achieved was reformulated as follows: "*Users (fishermen, farmers, pastoralists) become an inclusive collective force, integrated and connected to umbrella / strategic entities at the national level to ensure the effective application of the favourable provisions of the fisheries laws, land rights and local livestock (pastoral charter) and the national Disaster Risk Reduction strategy (la SNRRC, stratégie nationale pour la Réduction des risques et des catastrophes), through rules of concerted management (based on landscape approach) that preserves the interests of all sectors.*"<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Partners for Resilience, Global Ambitions, Local Answers, Annual Report 2017, Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016 2020, 31 May 2018.

<sup>2</sup> Programme de pays : Dialogue en GIR au Mali, 2016.

<sup>3</sup> PfR Annual Report Mali 2018.

The ToC in the Annual Report PfR Mali 2018 (page 27) reflects the change of strategic direction from PfR I to PfR II, i.e. that grassroots organisations are better placed to advocate for improved IRM policies and investments. It assumes that the following assumptions underpin the engagement and will lead to the above stated impact:

*“If PfR strengthens the capacities of IRM coalitions in the knowledge of laws already quite favourable to IRM, this will lead to a better diffusion between members of these organizations and they will ensure citizen watch in legality. Because these organizations are representative and maintain good relations with their members.*

*If IRM coalitions strengthen their collaboration with other civil society entities/organizations such as National DRR Platform, AOPP/CNOP, CNU, GNDRR Mali, this will lead to the creation of a social movement around IRM focused on users.*

*If PfR establishes collaboration agreements with Technical Services and elected officials, for support and proper application of the laws on natural resource management (NRM) in force, this will lead to good collaboration between the technical services, elected officials and users around conventions because with transparency and mutual agreement (state-citizens) on rules of management and criminalization, the laws will be better respected.”*

The three trajectories, all directed towards achieving the above formulated impact, were the following:

**Trajectory 1:** *Promote the rational and equitable management of water resources that secures vulnerable groups, including anglers, against the risks of natural disasters and the effects of hydro-agricultural development, by maintaining the ecosystem services of wetlands in river basins.*

**Trajectory 2:** *Contributing to the development of local policies and mechanisms that secure access of vulnerable groups (herders, anglers, women, young people) to land: strategic areas during drought and flood crisis (refuge sites, fisheries, corridors and pastures).*

**Trajectory 3:** *Improve the National Strategy for Risk and Disaster Reduction (SNRRC) through the introduction of Integrated Risk Management (IRM)*

Following the understanding of the three PfR Alliance partners, as confirmed during the outcome harvesting workshop, Wetland International takes the lead on trajectory 1, CARE Mali takes the lead on trajectory 2 and the Red Cross takes the trajectory 3. Though it was stated, that none of these organisations is supposed to work on its own and can build on the capacities and expertise of the other Alliance partners when implementing activities.

According to the Annual Report PfR Mali 2018, the national stakeholders to be targeted by PfR II in Mali are:

- The working committees (development and environment) of the National Assembly which hold the Minister accountable for the application of the law.
- The specialized committees of local elected representatives who should take IRM into account in the local planning process through PDSEC (i.e. Mali's Social, Economic and Cultural Development Plans) at all levels.
- National Coordination of users of the Niger Basin (CNU-BN): A CSO source that monitors the rational use of water resources along the Niger River at the national level.

- Association of Professional Peasant Organizations (AOPP): An association of CSOs that monitors the development of the agricultural sector in Mali through advocacy and capacity building of its members at the national level.
- Network of Environmental Journalists for Sustainable Development in Mali (RJEDD): a network of journalists from print, audio, audio-visual, online press that monitors the environment through sustained and real communications at the national level.

## 4. Replies to the Evaluation Questions

### 4.1. EQ 1 – Relevance and coherence

**To what extent was the PfR II programme relevant and coherent for the promotion of IRM?**

The PfR II programme in Mali was relevant and coherent for the promotion of IRM at country level. Its focus on the communal and community level has been the primary of area of attention. The programme has been less successful so far to establish and strengthen effective vertical linkages in support of IRM, which is a stated aim of Mali’s Theory of Change. Despite words of praise received by a range of officials about the programme and its achievements so far, the weak vertical linkages were pointed out as an overall missing element by various interviewees. Though there is evidence that some linkages have been made with government actors at the national level, primarily in relation to DRR and civil protection. For illustration, the critical role of PfR was underlined by the officials about PfR’s role in promoting the disaster prevision tool and the implementation of the National Disaster Plan. Promising local resilience practices, in particular with regard to local coalitions representing stakeholders with competing demands on natural resources, were also shared beyond Mali at the West-African regional level and during global events. In terms of programmatic coherence, PfR II in Mali focused systematically on the concerns of herders, fishermen and farmers across these three productive sectors in all regions of engagement. Micro-credits for women were promoted primarily in the Mopti regions. Gender issues were addressed overall coherently across the sectors though there is space for further improvements. As for the programme’s coherence with international agreements, there is good alignment in the domain of DRR (Sendai Framework) and there is alignment in support of vulnerable populations (SDGs) and their needs in relation to water management (Ramsar Wetland Convention). The programme’s alignment with the Paris Climate Agreement is also confirmed.

---

***JC 1.1: The PfR II programme was adapted to local context and has shown responsiveness and adaptiveness to the priorities and needs of their implementing partners and communities in terms of their capacity strengthening and to communities in terms of tackling IRM challenges***

**Summary:** Based on lessons learned during PfR I, the PfR II programme was adapted to the needs and priorities of vulnerable people at the community level in selected parts of the country. This was highly appreciated by a variety of stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation. The three PfR Alliance partners took a lead in this change and started to work with coalitions of stakeholders which were able to assemble community leaders from different

**strands of society, including different ethnic groups, helping also to reduce tensions and conflicts relating to scarce natural resources. The primarily local orientation of PfR II was however felt as an insufficient approach by leaders at the sub-regional and national levels. There is scope, according to interviews conducted, for making PfR relevant at a broader because the notion of IRM was considered relevant for different parts of the country.**

The PfR programme in Mali went through various stages of learning and adaptation. Building on the experiences of PfR I, a decision was taken to put the local context much more central in the implementation of the programme and to support communities through the structuring and capacity strengthening of associations, unions and coalitions in support of a more IRM at the local level. The three PfR Alliance partners undertook this change from PfR I to PfR II through an inclusive and multi-stakeholder review process during which it was concluded that the PfR Alliance partners should work more directly with these community-based coalitions as these were felt to be better placed to advocate for IRM at the local level. The previous approach, working through national-based NGOs in Mali by strengthening their capacities, proved too weak and unspecific to reach down to the local level and to strengthen the capacities of communities in support of IRM and their lobbying for IRM.

This coalition-based approach, in which representatives of sector-specific associations and unions (fishermen; agriculturalists; pastoralists) are brought together, facilitates a direct contact between different strands of societies, including different ethnic groups who compete for the same natural resources. This approach was considered as highly relevant by many official as well as community-based stakeholders interviewed, in particular as tensions between communities have substantially increased over the recent years in the IND region but also in other regions of the country, such as Kayes where the Red Cross Mali started its work. The origins of the conflict are multiple, including the radicalisation of young people being exposed to ideas brought into Mali from outside, but the struggle for the use of scarce water and land resources – a struggle which exists since generations – is a key component of this conflict. Dealing with conflict was not the primary goal of the programme but the rising number of conflicts in the central parts of Mali, in particular as of 2018, forced the programme to deal more with conflict prevention. This had been a blind spot in the original set-up of the programme. Meanwhile, a study was commissioned on how to integrate conflict sensitivity in the Mali context.

While this focus towards the local and community levels in the three regions is highly appreciated, questions were raised by government officials at the sub-regional as well as national levels in Mali about the PfR II's work from the bottom up, i.e. its orientation towards the lobbying and advocacy for IRM-relevant policies and investments in different parts of the country and its potential to help spread information about relevant IRM-related practices more widely. This 'scaling-up' has so far been little addressed despite relevant connections made with the Directorate for Civil Protection of the Ministry of Security and Civil Protection as well as Members of Parliament. Connections with the West-African regional level, ECOWAS and the Niger Basin Authority, were established but so far with rather limited results.

The concept of IRM fits well with Mali's national priorities on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and government officials welcomed this concept as an important element to be taken account of in the context of the country's national prevention strategy. PfR's lobbying and advocacy for IRM in the context of the National Platform for DRR was also appreciated. Though no connections in support of IRM have so far been made with the Ministry of Environment which has become one of the entry points for international cooperation on resilience-related support to counter the effects of climate change. There are also no records of any contacts being established with other (sector) ministries, such as agriculture, water or on social cohesion, peace and national reconciliation. Information within

PfR about potentially relevant national policies that might provide entrance points for IRM lobbying and advocacy is so far absent.

---

***JC 1.2: The PfR alliance programme has been aligned with the regionally and globally agreed priorities on IRM***

**Summary: The PfR II programme in Mali is broadly aligned with regionally and globally agreed policy frameworks which contain references and objectives to DRR and resilience. These are in particular the SDGs, the Paris Agreement on Climate Change and the Sendai Framework. Additionally, why not a principal focal area of the PfR Alliance programme, objectives of the Ramsar Wetland Convention are promoted in the context of PfR's work in Mali. The PfR Mali programme also aims to contribute to the implementation of the ECOWAS DRR Strategy by integrating IRM principles into this strategy. While referring to these various frameworks, the PfR II Mali programme focused mainly on the implementation of the Sendai Framework.**

There is good evidence that the Mali country programme is in line with regionally and globally agreed priorities. Annual reports and the outcomes database include an analysis of how activities contribute to global policy frameworks such as the Sendai framework, the Paris Agreement and the SDGs. Reference is also made to the Ramsar Wetland Convention. The New Urban Agenda is referred to but there are no activities which would directly connect to this Agenda. The first and second trajectories of the PfR Mali programme aim to contribute to Mali's National Action Plan for the Paris Agreement, for example by influencing the 'Plans de Développement Social, Economique, et Culturel (PDSEC) to integrate IRM at the level of municipalities. The West Africa regional programme, which only started as of 2018, is focused on contributing to the implementation of the ECOWAS Disaster Risk Reduction strategy by integrating IRM principles and the development and implementation of a cross-border contingency plan for Mali, Guinea and Burkina-Faso. The latter is linked to the regional plans of the Niger Basin Authority (NBA) is was deemed the best target actor to lobby and advocate for promoting IRM principles and which has a space for civil organisations to be involved.

This alignment has operationally translated into the participation of PfR Mali programme staff in several global and regional meetings to promote the Sendai Framework, such as the Africa-Arab DRR preparatory conference in Mauritius (2016), the Global Platform for DRR in Cancun (2017) and the Africa-Arab DRR preparatory conference in Tunis (2018) during which PfR Mali staff participated in panels and knitted regional and international contacts to gradually promote IRM and shared experiences in supporting resilience originating from the Mopti region. At the national level, PfR assisted the government with the evaluation of the implementation of the Sendai Framework whereby PfR reviewed and evaluated NGOs and it shared experiences from other countries with the dissemination of civil society response plans or the simulation of contingency plans. All actions in relation these international frameworks underline that PfR II in Mali mainly focused on the Sendai Framework though other activities, such as the strengthening of community-based coalitions in support of IRM, can also be seen as a contribution to the SDGs or the Paris Agreement on Climate Change.

---



### **JC 1.3: PfR alliance partners in Mali share and align their approach regarding IRM**

**Summary: PfR alliance partners in Mali share a common approach about IRM though this understanding seems to centre primarily on the creation and functioning of coalitions at the local level and their interactions with communes to promote IRM principles and improved IRM practices. This apparently rather limited framing of the IRM approach comes at the expense of activities that would be necessary to connect the local levels with decision makers higher up at the sub-regional and national levels. Those were undertaken to some extent but remained overall rather fragmented. While some interviewees recognised the need to work also vertically and with broader strategic IRM objectives in mind, questions need to be raised whether this is a shared understanding among all PfR Alliance partners in Mali.**

The three principal PfR alliance partners in Mali (Wetlands, CARE Mali and Red Cross Mali) work in support of IRM and they work closely together. But it is difficult to say whether they have all the same understanding of the concept of IRM. The common nominator for all three partners is that IRM needs to promote coalition building and disaster risk preparedness in an integrated manner at the local and community levels. Coalition building and enhancing the social cohesion between strands of civil society which are potentially in conflict over the same scarce resources, water and land, is at the centre of all activities irrespective of the regions in which PfR activities are implemented. As such, there is a focus on strengthening the horizontal linkages and social cohesion at the local level. But the PfR II programme also aims to establish and strengthen vertical linkages and forms of collaboration in support of IRM which is expressed in the third trajectory of the Mali Programme, that focuses on the improvement of the National Strategy for Risk and Disaster Reduction. The PfR Mali programme, overall, has formulated as impact that users (fishermen, farmers, pastoralists and loggers) can get their voices heard on IRM at the national level which suggests that the programme needs to do more than working mainly at the local level.

The promotion of IRM at the national level is done to some extent, mainly by collaborating with the Directorate of Civil Protection in the context of the National Platform on DRR, but not much beyond that. The same appears from the PfR Mali programme activities in relation to the West-African regional as well global levels where PfR Mali staff members engage occasionally. This focus on the local level at the expense of the sub-regional, national and regional levels appears also from the results of the outcome harvesting workshop whereby the majority of changes/ outcomes were noted with regard to the communal and lower community level. Red Cross Mali, which has the lead on trajectory 3, highlighted valuable work implemented at the local level in Kayes, but apparently has misinterpreted what it takes to work towards “*improving the National Strategy for Risk and Disaster Reduction (SNRRC) through the introduction of Integrated Risk Management (IRM)*” as stated in the PfR Mali country planning documents. While Alliance staff members engaged with national stakeholders in relation to DRR and SDG-related international summits, there is further no strong record which would suggest that PfR Mali has pro-actively promoted joint strategic dialogue about approaches, results and lessons learnt in support of IRM at the national level.

---

***JC 1.4: Gender considerations and inputs from vulnerable and marginalised groups have been included, represented, addressed and mainstreamed in design, implementation and M&E***

**Summary:** The PfR II Mali programme has put considerable attention to the inclusion of gender-related issues into the design, programming, implementation and monitoring of the programme. There is some evidence that considerations relating to youths and disabilities as potentially vulnerable groups were included in the programme. This is documented in various PfR reports but was also manifested during the outcome harvesting workshop during which female representatives of coalitions who are concerned with micro-credits for women actively engaged in the discussions. At the representational level, in national and district level risk management bodies, women are not very present and PfR Mali staff members acknowledged that this is an area in need of more attention.

Gender considerations do feature in the PfR Mali programme and are reflected in annual reports and outcome reporting documents which contain also disaggregated data on gender. The approach to capacity strengthening and the Dialogue Capacity Framework include gender and inclusiveness considerations at the organisational levels.

Women are specifically targeted during implementation, for example, by actions to strengthen their participation in decision-making within IRM coalitions. The role of women in the Mali context is particularly addressed in trajectories 1 and 2, on water/fisheries and on land/agriculture. Female coalition members who are promoting micro-credits for women have been identified and trained and a network of women's groups dealing with micro credits were set up. Land access for women received specific attention. For example, between April and June 2018, landowners and village chiefs of three communes in the Mopti region granted 109,25 ha of land irrevocably to women which was codified by 16 land transfer deeds signed between 1531 women and the landowners, countersigned by the respective majors and formally recognised by the Deputy Prefects or the Prefects. At the local level, disaster prevention and management committees record a female participation of 40 percent

At the local level, witness to Annual Report 2017, women are considered essential in the management of the household for site protection, health and food as well as in the management and wise use of natural resources which makes attention to gender considerations essential. But it is recognised that the exposure of women to hazards is not indicated specifically in the national DRR strategy and planning. Women are also insufficiently present in district level and national risk management bodies and in citizen's associations which are areas of engagement that demand for more attention and engagement according to PfR Mali staff.

## 4.2. EQ 2 – Efficiency and coordination

To what extent were the internal governance mechanisms, management approaches and working processes of the PfR alliance efficient and well-coordinated?

The PfR II programme in Mali was overall well-coordinated and managed. The internal governance and operational structures are well understood, responsibilities are well delineated and agreement exists about the roles of the respective Alliance partners. Though the programme has been comparatively costly to set up since the introduction of the new PfR concept in 2016, which aimed at the strengthening of lobby and advocacy capacity for IRM. There are also signals that the programme has been spread too thinly. The start of activities in the Kayes region made it challenging for all PfR Alliance partners to create synergies in this region where the PfR programme is not yet fully implemented. Horizontal exchanges (in terms of sharing experiences and supporting each other) as well as vertical engagement (forming coalitions in support of IRM that can make their voices heard at the national level) have so far not fully exploited. New IRM cross-border activities were also started with funding from the West-African regional programme. These activities are too young to judge their relevance, but questions need to be raised also here whether funds are invested strategically. As for the overall monitoring and learning of the programme: intense and regular exchanges at different moments throughout the year take place among PfR Alliance partners and IRM coalitions which supports learning and innovations. But the monitoring is mostly workplan and activity related while the more strategic monitoring has been rather minimal and not sufficiently shared among partners. There is clear scope to exploit opportunities for creating more vertical and horizontal synergies.

*JC 2.1: The PfR programme has been delivered in a timely manner, against reasonable overhead costs and, given the resources available, been spread appropriately across regions and countries (incl. the focus on facilitating Southern ownership and South-South cooperation, and linking/ creating synergy of our work at the different levels, i.e. local to regional to global)*

**Summary:** The PfR II Mali programme required quite some time to take off and first results and outcomes could only be realised as of 2018. The new concept, i.e. lobbying and advocating for IRM had to be introduced and understood by all parties concerned, a dedicated Theory of Change had to be formulated, different stakeholders had to be trained and new structures at the community level had to be set up. Ownership among (national) PfR partners and coalitions to promote IRM at the local level is high but the opportunity to create synergies at the different levels, horizontally among PfR Alliance partners and coalitions, as well as vertically, to make coalition voices heard at the sub-regional and national levels, have not yet been fully exploited. Cross-border South-South cooperation started in the context of the Red Cross Mali's work but experiences so far are still too young to be fully judged.

The PfR Mali programme was substantially revised when the new PfR II programme was started as of 2016. It took a considerable time to reorient the programme as the new concept, including a theory of change, had to be worked out and agreed upon among PfR Alliance partners. It took also efforts to strengthen capacities among PfR Alliance partners to understand the new concept to an extent that they could effectively help to structuring the different coalitions and train coalition members. In addition, a new partner – the Red Cross Mali – had to be brought into the PfR Alliance and find its role. This process took close to two years and included a re-discussion of the Theory of Change which was adapted as of early 2018.

In essence, the full PfR II Mali programme took off as of 2018 resulting, so far, in outputs and several outcomes at the communal level. Wider ambitions of the Theory of Change, the promotion of IRM in the domains of policy, investments and the dissemination of good practices at sub-regional and national levels, has been addressed but not with the vigour this would deserve. Given the considerable amount of time and overhead costs having gone into this process, one should judge that the programme has not been cheap so far. Investments made into this approach will likely be justifiable if the programme continues into a third phase with funding for activities that can help to lobby and advocate for IRM more comprehensively.

The PfR II Mali programme is implemented in three different localities, two in the Mopti region and one in Kayes. The two localities in the Mopti region are coordinated by Wetlands International and CARE Mali, each taking the lead in one of the two. Work in this area could build on the previous collaboration of the two organisations during the implementation of PfR I Mali and is facilitated by the relative geographic proximity of both regions. Exchanges between both organisations are intense and experiences can be shared. The Red Cross Mali, which is equally present in this region joins in the implementation of activities pertaining to the two principal trajectories, the ones relating to water/fisheries and other relating to land/agriculture.

Implementation of PfR II Mali in the Kayes region has proven more challenging. First, because of its later start (effectively as of mid-2018) and second, because of its location: close to the Senegalese border and some 1,200 km away from Mopti. The Red Cross Mali is the only PfR Alliance partner with a presence in Kayes, exchanges with the other two PfR Alliance partners takes mainly place via meetings in Bamako (half-way between Mopti and Kayes) or via telephone/Skype. This relative remoteness does not facilitate exchange and a joint implementation of the PfR programme, comparable to the Mopti region. The key observation from these findings is that resources appear to be spread rather thinly hindering the creation of horizontal as well as vertical synergies. Horizontal, because experiences gained by CARE Mali and Wetlands International in the Mopti region do not filter as directly down to the Kayes region. Vertically: because the creation of joint coalition voices in support of IRM at the national level are more difficult to organise.

South-South cooperation has started in the context of the West-African regional programme. One part of this programme aims to set up and run cross-border collaborations in support of IRM between the Red Cross Mali and national Red Cross organisations in the neighbouring countries Burkina Faso and Guinea. This is laudable but the programme is still very young and Red Cross Mali staff has just started to build this up. A full judgement cannot be made at this stage but questions need to be raised also whether scarce resources are well allocated and not spread too thinly.

***JC 2.2: The PfR programme has been operationally coordinated across the three PfR alliance partners at global, regional as well as national levels***

The operational coordination between the three PfR Alliance partners works fine, though it is costly because all principal decisions, including the mobilisation of key PfR staff for example, is decided by all three partners involved. Some weaknesses exist with regard to the implementation of the PfR II Mali programme in Kayes, as described under JC 2.1. Links and possible synergies between the different activities implemented by PfR Alliance partners have not been fully exploited so far, also described under JC 2.1.

---

***JC 2.3: The PfR support has been monitored for accountability and learning on a regular basis to identify and report on results and blockages/problems at the three intervention levels (national, regional, global) and notably at South-South cooperation level***

**Summary:** The PfR II Mali programme has been regularly monitored in-country and learning has taken place along close and regular meetings among PfR Alliance partner staff as well as exchanges between PfR staff and IRM coalition members – the latter during the bi-annual PME workshops which are highly appreciated by all stakeholders concerned. Though monitoring has been mostly focused on the implementation of workplans, strategic monitoring about the direction of the programme has been rather minimal. Monitoring documents, such as annual reports but also the outcome database in which learning and outcomes are recorded are difficult to understand for readers who had not an opportunity to dig deep into the nature of the programme. Consequently, stories about the relevance of the programme and outcomes achieved have so far not been told to the extent they would deserve. Though efforts were made more recently to give more attention to capture relevant stories and outcomes.

The PfR II programme in Mali benefits from intense exchanges between key staff of the different organisations involved. Such exchanges take place during regular meetings but also during the PME workshops which are held twice per year during which PfR staff as well as representatives of coalitions and other PfR stakeholders are invited. These exchanges facilitated learning and have led to revisions (such as the formulation of a revised Theory of Change), adaptations (e.g. more focus on gender and women related issues), and new initiatives to further improve the programme (such as the study on how to deal with the increasing number and intensity of conflicts in areas where PfR II is implemented).

Another feature has been the regular monitoring of project activities. This monitoring has been strongly workplan oriented and was regularly performed – mostly during the two PME gatherings per year. The more strategic monitoring has been rather piecemeal and not appropriately shared. The interpretation of the third trajectory, discussed under EQ 1, serves as a key evidence in this regard.

The documentation of the results of this monitoring, the recording of results and outcomes and the formulation of the revised Theory of Change are however sub-optimal. The documents which are communicated to PfR global management in The Hague can be understood if one digs deep into the logic and work done at country level, but for a distant reader these documents are very difficult to understand. The logic of certain activities is difficult to trace and why certain outcomes have been relevant and what role PfR played in reaching these outcomes are not evident from all documents which the evaluation team received. This makes it difficult to tell a story about what precisely has been the added value of the programme and why it is relevant at this particular time in Mali. For

example, the important role which the programme plays in highly conflict-ridden parts of the country does not appear from the documents, but has been underlined during several interviews.

Key staff from PfR II Mali are aware of these deficiencies and initiatives were taken to better document the country stories and the outcomes of the programme such as the recent write-workshop which aims to capture stories in support of the current fund application for PfR III. But such stories will need to be told as elements of a more strategic communication of PfR towards national authorities as well as funding agencies with a view to enhance policies and regulations in support of IRM and to mobilise funding and investments for relevant IRM-related infrastructures, awareness raising campaigns or knowledge sharing activities.

---

***JC 2.4: The PfR alliance was governed and managed appropriately and ongoing and past lessons related to governance and management were identified and taken up***

**Summary: Overall, the PfR II programme in Mali was governed and managed appropriately, structures are clearly delineated and relating roles and responsibilities appear to be accepted by all parties concerned. No concerns were expressed that the PfR programme at the global level is inappropriately managed.**

The basic conditions for an appropriate governance and management of the PfR II programme in Mali have been met. There are clear governance and managerial structures, roles have been divided and accepted by all parties concerned and there are no indications that tensions exist between different PfR Alliance partners. The extent to which past lessons relating to governance and management were taken up cannot be judged. Though it has been evident during the country visit, that all parties work closely together in a constructive manner. An important “connector” between the three principal PfR Alliance partners are their humanitarian principles and related concerns for the well-being of vulnerable groups in society. Concerns about a possible inappropriate management of PfR at the global level were not recorded.

### 4.3. EQ 3 – Value added and complementarity

**To what extent has the PfR’s support been of added value and complementary to what non-PfR programme actors have been doing in support of IRM and have the efforts of the PfR alliance and the NL MFA been complementary to each other and of added value to both?**

There is very little evidence about the extent to which PfR’s support has been complementary to what non-PfR programmes have implemented in areas that are complementary to the promotion of IRM such as environmental management, food security, water management or resilience. Efforts were made at the start of PfR II in 2016 to engage more strategically with other projects funded by the Netherlands government. This was facilitated by the Dutch Embassy in Mali but there is no evidence that this resulted in any follow-up or complementarity of action. The Embassy suffers from a high turn-over of staff and a lack of staff to strategically engage with the partnerships on a regular basis. PfR Alliance partners implement several other projects that might provide opportunities for complementarity, such as PADIN II in support of resilience and implemented by CARE Mali, but discussions within the PfR Alliance on how such synergies could be created, for example relating to investments, have not taken place so far.

***JC 3.1: The PfR support has been complementary and of added value to efforts of non-PfR supported actors for IRM at local, national, regional and global levels***

**Summary: PfR Alliance partners are aware of some other programmes and projects in support of resilience, DRR and environmental management but no systematic investigation of opportunities for collaboration has taken place so far. There are incidents of exchange and some form of collaboration across programmes, but these have been minimal. Targeted exchanges in search for complementarity, such as the funding of investments identified under PfR II via the CARE Mali implemented and PADIN II, funded by the Netherlands Embassy in Mali, have not taken place so far.**

To this stage, there is little evidence that PfR II Mali has taken steps to search for complementarities with other actors implementing activities in the domain of resilience, DRR, water management or environmental protection. The PfR Alliance in Mali cooperates very closely with government, in particular at the communal level, but government is de-facto absent in many sub-regions due to the lack of own resources to implement agreed-upon programmes and projects but also because of the security situation.

Opportunities to collaborate with other externally-funded programmes exist and have been a topic of discussion within Wetlands International. Witness to PfR Annual Reports for Mali, synergies were sought with the WATERSHED and BAMGIRE partnership implemented by Wetlands but there is no record of collaboration or any other evidence of results from these discussions with the exception of one reference: "PfR has contributed through the Wetlands International (WI) team in reading and taking into account the importance of Integrated Management in the document, through a cross reading of the document under the responsibility of the WI Programme Officer in May 2018."<sup>4</sup>

Another example is PADIN II (Projet d'Aménagement du Delta Interieur au Niger) which is funded by the Netherlands Embassy in Mali implemented by one of the PfR Alliance partners, CARE Mali. But intra-Alliance exchanges about possible synergies between PfR and PADIN II, for example by making funds available for investments identified in the context of the PfR II Mali programme, have so far not taken place. The PADIN II funding which CARE Mali works with on an annual basis is US\$ 18 m, while the CARE Mali PfR funding is US\$ 350,000 per year but are implemented as silo's next to each other. Attempts to leverage money for investments from PADIN II are not recorded. There might be options to seek complementarities with other externally funded activities in the domain of resilience, environment, water or food security as one interviewee mentioned. The World Bank, for example, collaborates with the Ministry of Environment to implement a climate change related programme. But those have not been investigated so far.

---

<sup>4</sup> Partners for Resilience Outcomes Database, 3 February 2020, #51.

***JC 3.2: The PfR programme and the resilience-related efforts of NL MFA were complementary to each other and of added value to both the PfR alliance and NL MFA***

**Summary:** There is little evidence that the Netherlands Embassy has seen the PfR II Mali programme as a strategic or complementary programme for its support to resilience in Mali. There is hardly any reference to particular strategic dialogue and/or dissent-related exchanges between PfR and the Embassy in relation to IRM. The Embassy's principal instrument in support of resilience is the PADIN II funded project. While the Embassy recognises that PfR is active in relation to resilience and DRR in a region which is prioritised by the Netherlands in Mali, little efforts have been made to reinforce the work of PADIN II, nor of PADIN II reinforcing the work of PfR.

The principal funding of the Netherlands in support of strengthening resilience in Mali is the PADIN II project (Projet d'Aménagement du Delta Interieur au Niger). This project is funded via the Netherlands Embassy in Mali and seen as the principal instrument to support this sector in terms of policy as well as investments. PfR II Mali is funded by the Ministry in The Hague and has received less attention by the Embassy, witness to various interviews with PfR Alliance staff and the Embassy. In 2016, a mapping exercise was done with the Netherlands Embassy in Mali of IRM planned aims and actions, to identify synergies between all strategic partnerships, especially those active in the Mopti region. But there is no evidence that this was followed by any further exchanges or actions taken to convert this mapping into concrete forms of collaboration.

PADIN II is seen today as a comprehensive instrument in support of resilience relating to water, environment and food security while the role which PfR should take in support of resilience and disaster preparedness and the PADIN II funding has not been well through by the parties concerned. Contacts between the Embassy and the PfR management in Mali exist on average once per year and during occasional visits of Dutch Embassy staff to the Mopti region. But there is no evidence that PfR is seen as a particularly strategic partnership that could help to complement other Dutch support or leverage investments, including Ministry-funded other partnership. Strategic discussions on how funding from PADIN II, or a possible follow-up programme, could potentially help to complement PfR in the domain of IRM, for example with regard to investments, have not taken place so far.

This situation in Mali mirrors the findings of the 2019 IOB evaluation about the implementation of the 25 Dutch partnerships<sup>5</sup> and how they fit into the wider policy of the Netherlands. The Embassy is confronted with a regular turnover of staff and has difficulties to accompany such a project over a longer period of time. The Embassy has also not sufficient staff in place to work with the different actors, include PfR implementers, in a more strategic manner. Broadly speaking, PfR's promotion of IRM is complementary to what other Dutch support for resilience aims to do, but there has been no dialogue nor any dissent at country level which might have enriched the resilience related policies and practices which are funded by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

---

<sup>5</sup> IOB study 2019.



#### 4.4. EQ 4 – Effectiveness of engagement

**(From inputs to results/ capacity strengthening support) To what extent has the PfR alliance been effective in applying good practices in the design, delivery and monitoring of capacity strengthening support for IRM to PfR contracted and non-contracted partners working at national and sub-national levels?**

The PfR Alliance in Mali was effective in strengthening the capacity of CBO's working at the local level in support of IRM. Lessons from the past and good participatory processes were applied to identify suitable actors and capacity gaps. Workshops and trainings were held to bring the various IRM stakeholders up to speed while gradually engaging with them on the lobbying and advocacy of IRM-related legal and programming issues as well as the dissemination of IRM-related information about new practices and experiences. The focus all activities deployed was on the structuring of communities and the creation of multi-stakeholder coalitions whose capacity change was monitored with the PfR headquarters created Dialogue Capacity Framework (DCF). Non-contracted partners, such as national NGO's, were not specifically targeted by these capacity strengthening activities. A country-level capacity strengthening plan on how to promote IRM more strategically beyond the local and communal levels in line with the existing Theory of Change was not developed. The absence of such a tool did not allow to more thoroughly reflect and discuss among PfR stakeholders what capacities would be needed, and how to engage beyond the communal level.

---

***JC 4.1: The PfR has designed capacity strengthening interventions at country level on the basis of a structured and participatory capacity diagnostic exercise that has examined different dimensions of capacity and engaged local stakeholders in the diagnostic process, including taking account of local contextual/ political dynamics.***

**Summary:** The PfR II Mali programme has designed and implemented a capacity strengthening approach which was implemented gradually over some 12 months. It was an inclusive and participatory process that brought different interest groups together in coalitions which became the fora for learning and capacity strengthening. PfR headquarter tools to analyse the actors to work with and to identify capacity gaps in need of strengthening were applied but adapted to the local context. Complementary contextual analyses were undertaken to better understand how and with whom to promote IRM principles.

Learning from experiences gained during the implementation of PfR I, the PfR Alliance partners took a decision in 2016 to focus on the communities and their organisations to promote IRM in selected areas of the Mopti region as well as Kayes. This decision was taken jointly by the three principal partners in consultation with several PfR stakeholders which PfR had worked with from 2011 to 2015. The PfR II Mali programme subsequently invested in a thorough analytical process to identify actors and organisations to work with and to map capacity gaps in need of strengthening. This process included a SWOT analysis of various CBOs as well as an analysis of the context in which the new programme was supposed to be implemented. The contextual analysis was supported by a study on the status quo of the decentralisation process in Mali to better understand how the future coalitions could engage meaningfully in the promotion, lobbying and advocacy of IRM principles.

The construction of the new concept was a participatory and inclusive process whereby PfR Alliance partners and representatives of different CBOs agreed to form coalitions in which different natural resource user groups, i.e. fishermen, farmers, herders, etc. were brought together. As such, representatives of different sectorial groups, all having an interest in the use of the same resources (water and land) got together, learned from each other and laid the basis for jointly engaging with local authorities but also to discuss potential tensions and conflicts about the use of these resources. In essence, it was an emerging process of capacity strengthening which was supported by the PfR Alliance partners but also by the application of analytical tools and capacity mapping instruments which were brought into Mali by the PfR leadership in The Hague.

This process took approximately one year but helped to fully anchor the essence of IRM among stakeholders and to create ownership for the work ahead. To begin with, there was a need to tune in all PfR Mali Alliance partners into this new concept. Trainings were provided to PfR staff to bring them up to speed. The construction of the new approach with representatives from different communities and interest groups happened via a series of meetings and complementary trainings. The promotion of the IRM principles were not entirely new for the stakeholders concerned as they had been exposed to various exchanges about the use of natural resources in the past. But getting together with different interest groups, all competing for the same natural resources, was an innovation and opened avenues for learning and enhancing insights which contributed to a shared capacity strengthening of all stakeholders involved.

---

***JC 4.2: The PfR has developed a capacity strengthening change strategy/ capacity strengthening plan at country level that reflects the findings of the capacity diagnostic process and which applies a range of complementary capacity strengthening tools/ instruments appropriate to addressing the identified capacity needs***

**Summary: During PfR II Mali, no particular capacity strengthening plan was developed. But an integral capacity strengthening concept, founded in the analysis that community-based stakeholders need to be the drivers of IRM, was developed and implemented which was supported by a Dialogue Capacity Framework (DCF). This framework, provided by PfR management in The Hague, was adapted to the Mali context, used and regularly updated. Complementary coalition trainings and the identification of IRM Champions supported this capacity strengthening approach. The principal attention of this approach was directed at the communal levels. A strategy or particular approach on how to go beyond was not developed.**

Based on the SWOT analysis and participatory process with representatives of user groups, described under JC 4.1, a capacity mapping along a selected number of capabilities was formulated for the respective coalitions which were created. Ten capabilities relevant to strengthen the coalitions and their ability to promote IRM through lobby and advocacy activities were identified. These were derived from the overall DCF formulated by PfR management in The Hague but adapted to the context in Mali. Most notable is the inclusion of a capability to 'negotiate' which points at the need to resolve different interests of sectoral and/or ethnical groups. The DCF helped to map in a succinct way the activities to be undertaken for strengthening capacities and the capacity level per coalition per each of the 10 capabilities identified. In the beginning, the DCF was new and perceived as not easy to work with by the parties concerned but the PfR Alliance partners could eventually associate with it and use it as a tool for accompaniment and monitoring of coalition capacity strengthening.

Complementary to the DCF, CARE Mali developed a guide and training on how to establish coalitions which functioned as an instrument for capacity strengthening. Various workshops and seminars were organised to help in the creation of these coalitions. Leaders were identified which became so-called 'IRM champions' and another instrument for capacity strengthening. Champions came from the communities concerned, including five parliamentarians from the Mopti region who associated themselves with the objectives and principles of IRM. Another tool created was a What's App Group that helped to shared news, information and experiences widely. Coalition members described this Group as highly relevant and useful for their IRM-related work but also for their own purposes, such as agricultural information. Those tools and instruments were described as not particularly innovative but sufficient enough for the local context in Mali. No particular capacity strengthening tools or approaches were developed to promote IRM in terms of policy change, enhanced investments and the sharing of good practices beyond the communal levels.

---

***JC 4.3: The PfR has developed a results framework and arrangements for progress monitoring (dialogue) that facilitate the tracking of changes in capacity over time, adjusting the sequencing and prioritisation of interventions (flexibility and responsiveness), and for reviewing the quality of the partnership (mutual accountability for results)***

**Summary: Capacity changes over time are monitored via the DCF and during the bi-annual PME meetings. The DCF is used as a basic tool for reflection about the IRM coalition's capacity and for annual country reporting. It focuses on change at the communal level per coalition. In the absence of a country-wide capacity strengthening capacity that would need to be linked to the trajectories and the overall Theory of Change, a more strategic monitoring of capacity change and what is required in terms of lobby and advocacy capacity to promote IRM beyond the immediate environment in which these coalitions function, does not take place regularly.**

The principal tool for monitoring and tracking capacity changes over time is the DCF which was written up per coalition. The DCF is a rather basic tool but serving its purpose according to interviews conducted with PfR stakeholders. The DCF allows to map capacity changes of the respective capabilities over time and has a space to note expected changes that need to be monitored. But it is not linked to the workplans of the respective coalitions and does not spell out what outputs and longer-term outcomes are supposed to be reached.

The extent to which the DCF has become a shared tool of dialogue about capacity strengthening, used among PfR Alliance partners and between PfR partners and the coalitions, could not be assessed. The respective DCF's are updated once a year, in English, and function as such as a tool for the PfR manager in Mali to monitor and reflect on capacity change and as a tool to annually report about progress of the PfR II Mali programme. This accountability reporting, the Annual Reports, contains a section called 'reflection on capacity building' with information on what type of capacity was built, and how, which coalitions and CBOs benefited from capacity building activities and what the effects of the capacity building were on the overall implementation of the national PfR programme.

Discussions about change among PfR Alliance partners and IRM coalition members, however, take place primarily during the two PME workshops held every year. During such exchanges, which are largely focused on the realisation of workplans, reflections take place about possible adjustments of sequencing or prioritisation of interventions. Though these exchanges are focused on the particular areas of engagement in the Mopti region and in Kayes but, because of the absence of a wider capacity strengthening plan at country level, do not allow to reflect more strategically about the IRM coalition's capacity to engage on IRM beyond the local and regional levels.

#### 4.5. EQ 5 – Effectiveness and direct outcomes

**(Capacity strengthening results & processes): To what extent have PfR implementing partners and communities built internal capacities and reached out, including with support of the five PfR partners, to advocate and lobby for IRM at local, national, regional and global levels?**

The PfR Alliance partners in Mali worked directly with community-based organisations and strengthened their capacities to better organise themselves. 12 IRM coalitions were set up at the communal level and to some extent at the district (4) and regional levels (2). PfR II Mali did not work with contracted partners. Capacities of the IRM coalitions were strengthened in terms of their organisational functioning as well as their ability to lobby and advocate for IRM principles and objectives at – primarily – the communal level. These were targeted and to some extent strategic engagements but could only be undertaken with the strong support and accompaniment of PfR Alliance partners. Major outcomes were realised with regard to improved IRM practices and to some extent in relation to legal and policy related issues. IRM investment-related outcomes were minimal. – The capacities of coalitions could not be strengthened to a level that would allow these IRM coalitions to advocate or lobby for better IRM policies or investments at the national level. PfR Alliance partners focused their work with the coalitions at the community and communal level, in particular. Though PfR Alliance partners engaged on IRM, primarily in their own name and without the participation of coalitions, at the national level and worked with government to provide inputs to pan-African and global events, mainly in relation the Sendai framework. In terms of positive unintended effects, the project's contribution to the reduction of tensions and conflict between different interest groups at the communal and community level, in particular herders and farmers (an aspect not intended in the original set-up of PfR II Mali), was appreciated by various stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation.

---

***JC 5.1: The PfR support contributed to strengthening capacity of PfR contracted partners and other CSOs for IRM at local, national, regional and global levels***

**Summary:** In line with the principal objectives set out under PfR II Mali, the programme helped to structure associations and unions active at the local level to form and engage in IRM coalitions. Coalitions were formed at the communal level, some also at the district and provincial levels. Capacity strengthening was also realised through technical advice and training provided by PfR Alliance partners to help setting up these coalitions, to understand the essence of IRM and to learn about the lobbying and advocating for IRM among decision makers at the communal and regional levels. But the coalitions could not strengthen their capacities towards a more sophisticated level that would allow them to express views about

**IRM at the higher policy level or to engage with different funders on the mobilisation of larger investments at the regional level. - Dedicated capacity strengthening of actors working at the regional and national levels on how to engage with the coalitions, with decision makers at the national level or with IRM-related processes at the pan-African or global levels did not take place.**

The PfR support focused in the first instance on the structuring of community-based and interest driven organisations whereby a bottom-up strengthening process was initiated to stimulate alliances and unions of interest groups to form IRM coalitions. To date, there exist 12 communal, 4 district and 2 provincial IRM coalitions. Various interviewees from government and the parliamentarians expressed their appreciation for this work because it enabled them to interact with representatives from different interest groups in a more structured way. The capacity of a system of community actors was thereby strengthened.

PfR also contributed to the strengthening of lobby and advocacy capacity of the IRM coalitions through the provision of organisational advice and training as well as study visits. A variety of training activities were launched to better understand the legal and policy dimensions of IRM-related matters, gender aspects or the contextual situation, including the governance and administrative environment in which these coalitions have to function.

As such, PfR's support contributed to the strengthening of coalition-internal 'enabling capacities' for IRM and to better understand the multi-actor environment in which they are functioning (including actors from interest groups that are competing for the same resources, i.e. water and land). This targeting of the local level took place in line with the primary objective of the PfR II Mali strategy. Another objective was the strengthening of partners (government actors) and coalitions to engage on IRM at the regional and national levels which happened only to some extent.

This rather basic capacity strengthening of IRM stakeholders should not come as a surprise because the PfR II Mali programme only started with its new approach as of 2016. The strengthening of more sophisticated capacities which would be required to achieve the impact as formulated in the PfR II Mali programme, to voice and advocate the concerns and needs of IRM coalitions from different parts of the country towards policy makers at the national level, has not yet started. Such capacities would also be necessary to lobby for IRM-related investments from government and/or international agencies.

PfR Alliance partners, basically without the involvement of coalitions, engaged on IRM at the national level. This took place primarily in the context of the national DRR platform meetings and through the sharing of information. But PfR did not have a specific action plan or dedicated activities in place at the regional or national levels to strengthen the capacity of government partners or national NGOs working in the domain of IRM.

---

***JC 5.2: The PfR supported PfR contracted partners and other CSOs strategically engaged with IRM stakeholders in their environment at local, national, regional and global levels to promote IRM in policies, influence investment mechanisms in support of IRM and influence practice that takes of IRM.***

**Summary: IRM coalitions, strongly accompanied by PfR Alliance partners, lobbied on IRM related matters that led to tangible outcomes. This engagement happened primarily at the communal and to some extent at the regional level and was targeted and undertaken from a strategic perspective. Examples are the inclusion of IRM budget lines into the PDSECs (the Social, Economic and Cultural Development Plans) at communal and regional levels, or the access of women to land which will reduce the vulnerability of the population. Outcomes and changes were mainly realised in the legal sphere (including a better understanding of policies) and in the IRM practice area, including a better management of natural resources by different interest groups (in particular herders, farmers and fishermen). The more strategic engagement on IRM at the national level was primarily realised by PfR Alliance partners, though this was more relating to information provision as well as the provision of inputs to the Malian government for their DRR/Sendai-related engagement at the pan-African and global levels.**

The PfR supported coalitions engaged strategically with partners in support of IRM, such as majors, directors of sector departments of prefects. This happened with a strong support of PfR Alliance partners who, according to coalition members, would be further needed to accompany their work if PfR is prolonged. PfR Alliance partners accompanied these coalitions in the domain of legal issues, in essence to better understand the laws and regulations and to some extent, though rather limited, to mobilise resources for investments. Most changes were realised in the IRM-related practice area which were most welcome by coalitions and its partners as they had a direct effect on their daily life, such as increased agricultural production or better fish. The focus of these activities was directed at the communal level though some engagements took place at the higher levels, including the national level. In terms of advocacy and lobbying, the most notable outcomes were the increased access of women to land (also legally confirmed and certified) and the inclusion of specific IRM budget lines in the PDSECs (the Social, Economic and Cultural Development Plans) at communal and regional levels. The following list of engagements illustrate the type of short- and medium-term changes and outcomes which were realised during PfR II in Mali, some of these are also mentioned in Annex A which displays the results of the evaluation's Outcome Harvesting workshop:

- Improved social cohesion at community level; the coalitions became a platform for different interest groups (herders and farmers in particular) to dialogue and negotiate, thereby also reducing tensions about the use of precious resources (land and water) and increase of security.
- Better understanding of legal texts which allowed IRM stakeholders to better implement reforms, leading also to increased production.
- Increased production through better information provision, in particular via What's App messages; for example about better production techniques or whether forecasts.
- Budget lines on IRM are included in the PDSECs (the Social, Economic and Cultural Development Plans) at communal and regional levels, though the government has no funds to plan substantial investments in this domain.
- Access of women to land, which helped to reduce vulnerability; land access documents were legally certified by authorities.
- Improved contingency plans at communal and regional level, allowing a better response to possible disaster.

- OPIDIN, the early warning flood system which was created during PfR I, is regularly used by authorities at the national level but also by sector departments and coalitions (though the production of OPIDIN data remains in the hands of Wetlands International and not the national authorities).
- Recognition of the role of the added value of IRM coalitions by public authorities, e.g. coalitions were invited to take part in the regional phase of the National Political Dialogue.
- The PfR Alliance, but not the IRM coalitions, are perceived to have an added value for the National Platform on Disaster Risk Reduction (RCC) which is chaired by the Director General for Civil Protection functioning under the Ministry of Security and Civil Protection (inputs provided to the National DRR Plan [ORSEC] i.e. strengthening of ties between communal and regional levels, as well as to the Mali government's engagement at pan-African and international events relating to Sendai).

---

***JC 5.3: The five PfR alliance partners assisted and facilitated lobbying and advocacy for IRM beyond national borders with a view to influence decisions at regional and global levels***

**Summary: The PfR Mali Alliance partners engaged at the West-African regional, pan-African and global level in the lobbying and advocacy for IRM. This engagement mainly manifested itself through inputs provided to conference outcome papers and the organisation of side events or panels to share relevant experiences on how to promote resilience at the local levels. Most activities centred around the promotion of the Sendai framework on DRR. These activities were principally carried out by staff from PfR Alliance partners. The voices of local partners in such events were absent. There is no evidence of new learning on IRM policies, investments and practices from the global and regional levels shared with partners at national and local levels.**

The three principal PfR Mali Alliance partners, Wetlands International, Red Cross Mali and CARE Mali, plus the Red Cross Climate Centre engaged in the lobbying and advocacy for IRM beyond the national context. As explained under JC 1.2, activities focused largely on the promotion of the International DRR framework (Sendai) and included engagements during the Africa-Arab DRR preparatory conference in Mauritius (2016), the Global Platform for DRR in Cancun (2017) and the Africa-Arab DRR preparatory conference in Tunis (2018) during which PfR Mali staff participated in panels and knitted regional and international contacts to gradually promote IRM and shared experiences in supporting resilience originating from the Mopti region. PfR Alliance partners provided also inputs to the African Union – EU Ministerial Conference called “AU-EU investing in a Food Secure Future” (July 2016). PfR’s inputs related to the outcome document that stressed the importance of focusing more on food security in Africa. As a follow up to this meeting, PfR was invited to participate in the Drought Conference in Namibia, organised by the African Union in August 2016. PfR organised a side event titled: “Partnering to end drought emergencies”, which zoomed in on Integrated Risk Management. PfR could substantially contribute to the final outcome document of this Ministerial Conference.

There is no strong evidence that PfR alliance partners assisted PfR-supported CSOs (also supported communities) to obtain and share feedback and new learning on IRM investments and practices from the global and regional levels back to the national and local levels. Though feedback to the local level on the new policies communicated in relation to the Sendai framework could be traced. This happened during ongoing meetings but there were no dedicated feedback sessions or workshops organised to specifically feedback knowledge and new insights in this regard.

**JC 5.4: Potentially unintended positive and negative effects of PfR support have (not) been identified and addressed by the PfR alliance and its contracted partners and other CSOs**

Findings on unintended effects of PfR support are rather limited. According to several interviewees, an unintended positive effect was that the communication between different (agricultural) producer groups and the MEPs improved so that local concerns could be more directly shared with actors operating at the national level. Another positive effect, not foreseen in the original set-up of PfR II Mali, was the project's contribution to the reduction of tensions and conflict between different interest groups, in particular herders and farmers. Unintended negative effects of PfR support were not reported.

#### 4.6. EQ 6 – Longer-term outcomes and impact (change)

**To what extent has the enhanced advocacy and lobbying capacity (and activities) among PfR contracted partners and other non-contracted CSOs led to enhanced policies, better investment mechanisms and improved practices for IRM at national, regional and global levels and to more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level?**

It is too early to tell whether IRM related intermediate outcomes have resulted in long-term outcomes or impact. Though preconditions have been shaped that allow IRM to stay. These have been mainly realised in the legal and policy related field as well as in the practice area. The approach to name engaged IRM stakeholders from local communities but also from parliament "IRM Champions" is a smart step to make IRM-engagements sustain. The strengthening of the capacities of a community which can help to promote and mainstream IRM principles and objectives has become an asset that can be built on for the future. Though it is far too early to say whether this will lead to enhanced policies, better investment mechanisms or the sharing of practices for IRM at the national level.

---

**JC 6.1: Over the course of the past 5 years, IRM policies have been enhanced, IRM investment mechanisms improved, and IRM practices changed for the better at national, regional and global levels and resulted in more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level**

It is too early to tell whether IRM related intermediate outcomes have resulted in long-term outcomes or impact. Though preconditions have been shaped that allow IRM to stay. There is evidence that leaders, policy decision makers and implementers are aware of IRM and have started to defend the principles and objectives of IRM on different occasions, for example at the level of the national parliament. IRM has also been recognised, though not formally, as a relevant add-on to the National Disaster Plan (ORSEC) and IRM-budget lines have been included in the PDSECs (the Social, Economic and Cultural Development Plans) at communal and regional levels. At the communal level and among communities, IRM has become a recognised concept and an approach around which different stakeholders can come together, exchange on problems and find, or negotiate, solutions. The nomination of IRM champions at the coalition level but also among parliamentarians bears the possibility for IRM and its promotion in different areas, to stay for a longer time.

---



**JC 6.2: The enhanced capacity among PfR implementing partners and their networks and communities has contributed to the mainstreaming of IRM in sector policies, improved IRM investment mechanisms, changed IRM practices for the better at national, regional and global levels and resulted in more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level**

IRM stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation perceive that their strengthened capacity, their networks and their way of working has helped IRM to get mainstreamed in better community and communal practice and into an improved application of legal texts. The project has helped in particular vulnerable communities, including the female population, to become more resilient to crisis in the face of climate change and environmental degradation. There is no perception that the project has so far led to changed IRM policies or investment practices. According to coalition partners, their engagement at the district and provision levels has been minimal and has not helped so far to mainstream IRM principles and objectives in policies, investments and practices at higher levels.

#### 4.7. EQ 7 – Sustainability

**To what extent has the PfR support contributed to a structurally strengthened and sustainable engagements of its implementing partners to promote IRM at national, regional and global levels?**

The PfR II Mali programme has contributed to strengthening a more sustained engagement of IRM coalitions at the local level. Ownership among IRM stakeholders is high because they see the direct relevance of this support for their daily work. Government officials at primarily communal, but also higher regional levels, appreciate their engagement and see them as a genuine and practical add-on to their tasks relating to a better natural resource management, countering disasters and dealing with tensions and conflicts at community level. While capacities have been strengthened, coalitions do not feel confident enough to sustain their activities fully on their own at the local level, further support by PfR Alliance partners will be required. Capacities are so far too weak to upscale such activities to higher levels at the regional, provincial and national levels and to build capacities for a more strategic engagements in support of better IRM-related policies and more investments.

---

**JC 7.1: The effects of the PfR support are owned by the PfR implementing partners**

**Summary:** The effects of PfR's support starting as of 2016 are highly owned by coalition members and other stakeholders which associate themselves with the necessity to promote IRM. This ownership has also resulted in regular exchanges with government officials, including mayors, technical sector heads as well as leaders of regions (Prefects), who highly appreciate the work of PfR. The preconditions for a more enhanced engagement at local level as well as with potential stakeholders higher up in the bureaucratic hierarchy have been shaped. Ownership with regard to IRM-related engagements at the national level exists so far principally among PfR Alliance partners.

The approach of PfR II in Mali has been developed against the experiences of PfR I which showed that the strengthening of national NGOs will not automatically trickle down to a strengthening of community-based coalitions in support of IRM. The revised approach, implemented as of 2016 and focusing on the structuring of civil society, supporting social cohesion and strengthening the

capacities of coalitions, has so far resulted in a high ownership of actors who associate themselves with the promotion of IRM. This ownership has been created by a close accompaniment of these coalitions by PfR Alliance partners through the provision of training and the initiation of dialogue in support of IRM with, primarily, local authorities.

This approach has so far led to an enhanced social cohesion among strands of civil society and different groups in selected communities. The strengthening of social cohesion and the building of bridges across different (ethnic) interest groups has been much appreciated because it has helped to reduce tensions and conflicts at community level. Coalitions have also strengthened their organisational structures and are partly funded through the collection of membership fees which have allowed to fund smaller activities at community level. With the support of PfR Alliance partners, they found entry points to dialogue government officials and to engage on technical matters, bottom-up, with technical departments at the communal and sub-regional levels. One of the outcomes which will help to shape sustainability has been the creation of budget lines in the PDSEC, the Social, Economic and Cultural Development Plans, at the communal and some sub-regional levels.

This capacity strengthening of coalitions, the creation of an identification of coalitions with the objectives of IRM as well as concrete lobby and advocacy activities resulting in selected outcomes has shaped the preconditions for engaging more strategically and for upscaling activities to higher policy, administrative and investment levels in Mali. Ownership among IRM stakeholders is high and there is an interest to engage more in the future because the work which has been initiated by PfR at the local level has been of direct benefit of coalition members (e.g., women benefit from micro credit; agricultural producers have more secured access to water; arrangements have been found to manage access to water and land between agriculturalists and herders).

At the national level, there exists the National Platform for Civil Protection, chaired by the Ministry of Security and Civil Protection, in which PfR is a member and to which PfR Alliance partners have actively contributed. This Platform is an important forum to sustain exchanges and possible actions in relation to resilience strengthening and DRR but it is to be seen whether the Government will be able to sustain this Platform once the international support gets reduced or finished. So far, PfR Alliance partners are the principal IRM-stakeholders to represent IRM views from the local level at the national level. There have been no records of IRM coalition partners engaging by themselves in this Platform.

---

***JC 7.2: PfR partners are able to lobby and advocate for IRM on their own and without the support of the PfR***

**Summary: A good base has been laid for IRM coalitions to sustain lobby and advocacy activities in support of IRM at the local level but coalition members and other stakeholders did not express confidence to undertaken such activities fully on their own in the future without the support of PfR Alliance members. It will also require substantial efforts to upscale such activities to higher levels at the regional, provincial and national levels and to build capacities for a more strategic engagements in support of better policies and more investments at these levels.**

Some emerging evidence regarding this judgement can be noted. IRM coalitions have been able to fund some initiatives on their own and from their own funds. While these at times seem to be limited to more practical issues, such as purchasing rain gauges and printing and disseminating information pamphlets, these help them to make their point on IRM during information sharing activities, for

example on weather and climate related aspects during radio broadcasting at national level. There is also some evidence that IRM coalitions have started to upscale their lobbying activities, for example by forming a regional IRM delegation made up of 13 members from their 45 members to advocate at the provincial level.

While these are clear outcomes from PfR supported capacity strengthening activities, IRM coalitions have undertaken these actions mostly with the direct support of PfR Alliance partners. Various interviewees also mentioned that future support will be needed to sustain these types of lobby and advocacy activities at the local level. During focus group discussions, IRM coalition stakeholders did not express confidence to undertake such activities fully on their own in the future. While one can judge that a good base has been laid for IRM coalitions to sustain lobby and advocacy activities in support of IRM at the local level, it will take substantial efforts to upscale such activities to higher levels at the regional, provincial and national levels and to build capacities for a more strategic engagements in support of better policies and more investments at these levels.

## 5. Emerging observations

This section summarises a number of points emerging from the findings across EQs as well as from findings pertaining to the PfR I Mali programme and the West-African regional programme. These are case specific findings and emerging observations, structured around 10 headings, which will feed into the overall/global evaluation of the PfR II programme. They can also be used to inform PfR internal reflections on the design and approach of the future PfR programme in Mali in case funding for a PfR III programme is granted.

- 1. Relevance and added value:** Throughout the 18 interviews conducted for this evaluation, stakeholders from IRM coalitions but also government officials working at the national, provincial and communal levels underlined the relevance of the PfR II Mali programme and the approach that had been chosen for promoting the principles and objectives of IRM. Since the onset of the new programme in 2016, a community of IRM stakeholders, mostly organised in the form of coalitions, has been gradually built up. This community, situated in two different regions of Mali, maintains close contacts which are facilitated through regular meetings, workshops and other forms of exchange organised by the PfR Alliance members. The outputs and outcomes originating from the PfR II Mali programme are of direct benefit to the IRM stakeholders at the communal and community level which suggests that there is scope for sustainability over the longer term. Though the programme is still young and capacities to sustain activities are not to a level that the PfR programme could terminate its programme in Mali with the end of PfR II.
- 2. Theory of change (ToC):** Building on the experiences of PfR I and learning from positive as well as negative experiences, a new ToC was formulated in 2016 and reformulated in the beginning of 2018. This ToC is highly ambitious with goals which have by far not been reached during implementation of the PfR II Mali programme. It proposes a bottom-up process of capacity building and lobbying and advocating for IRM, all departing from the coalitions that have been established so far at communal, district and provincial levels. The goal is to make voices heard at the national level in support of improved IRM policies, investments and practices. But the ToC does not clearly spell out which intermediate steps are to be taken to make the journey from bottom to the top, nor does it clarify how the three trajectories are linked

with each other so that these higher goals can be reached and which role each PfR Alliance partner has in promoting and implementing this ToC.

The workshop at the end of the evaluation mission displayed that there is a considerable level of incoherence in this ToC and not all PfR Alliance partners appear to have a clear understanding what needs to be prioritised in order to reach the goals of the ToC. Apparently, PfR Alliance partners have engaged considerably from their own ideas and perceptions and interpreted the ToC very widely, without reflecting more thoroughly about the written text of the ToC and the intentions underpinning its implementation. For a young programme, this finding should not be a surprise. But lessons should be learnt so that a thorough reflection on the ToC can take place with a view to reformulate it for PfR III (if financed), in line of what the PfR Alliance can and cannot do in the context of Mali which is marked by a multidimensional conflict which affect the state stability on the long term. A more realistic and clearly formulated ToC can then become a tool for all PfR Alliance partners to further improve the implementation of IRM related capacity strengthening and lobbying/advocacy activities.

- 3. Capacity strengthening:** In line with the intention of the PfR II Mali, to work bottom up, a participatory and inclusive approach has been chosen which was most appropriate for the building of the programme and the creation of capacities for promoting IRM at the community and communal levels. This has resulted in structures and forms of cooperation among different interest groups, e.g. farmers, fishermen and herders, which have the capacity to sustain (and have, though not intended, originally, helped to reduce tensions and conflict between these interest groups). The relevance of these coalitions has been underlined by different government officials and is seen as an important contribution of the PfR II Mali programme to existing processes and projects to address resilience at the local level.

The capacity strengthening activities have so far not addressed questions on how to scale the programme up to higher levels and no specific initiatives have been planned in this regard. Such capacities would be necessary to identify which policy changes might be needed at the national level to address IRM more effectively, what type of capabilities the coalitions or cooperating actors would need to mobilise resources from the government and/or existing funds or programmes financed by international cooperation agencies and what mechanisms would need to be in place to disseminate good IRM-related practice more widely across the country. In essence, to realise such a scaling up, a more sophisticated approach to capacity strengthening would be needed which would differ from the current rather straightforward approach consisting of training, study visits and workshops.

- 4. Policy & practice:** In terms of *policy engagement*, the PfR II Mali programme focused so far mainly 'downward', i.e. disseminating and explaining existing legal texts and regulations to stakeholders at the coalition and community level. This was necessary, as the texts are in French which is not read nor spoken by all stakeholders concerned. This was relevant and helped to increase production, access of women to land, etc. Though, as it appears, there were no demands for change in the legal domain which would have motivated stakeholders to formulate ideas for policy change and to address these to the level of policy makers at the national level.

Regarding engagements at the national level, contacts were made with parliamentarians (i.e. five MPs who became IRM champions), but the aims of this engagement were primarily directly towards sensitising wider stakeholder groups about the necessity of deploying an IRM perspective. There are no records of these MPs lobbying for particular changes in legal texts.

The most obvious IRM lobby and advocacy activity at the national level was the PfR Alliance member's engagement with the Directorate of Civil Protection. This resulted in 2016 in a verbal commitment of the national focal point for Disaster Risk Reduction to take Integrated Risk Management into account in the National Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction in Mali, but this has not materialised so far.

The IRM *practice* area is most appreciated by all stakeholders at the national level (e.g., the provision of flood prediction data, via OPDIN which is operated by Wetlands International) or the local level. Information shared about improved practices or technical advice provided by PfR Alliance partners have helped to enhance production, increase access of women to land, receive early warning about floods or droughts, weather forecasts, more regulated access to water, etc. The What's App Group, set up by PfR Alliance partners, was described as a most effective tool of assistance. The coalition members but also government staff in sector departments, like agriculture or fisheries, expressed their hope that funds could be made available under PfR III to respond to the very practical needs of all parties concerned. The idea of engaging in more strategic exchanges with existing funding mechanisms for investments in various practical domains had not been discussed so far between PfR Alliance members and the coalitions, or other IRM stakeholders so far.

5. **Complementarity and investments:** Contrary to PfR I, PfR II has no funding for the implementation of projects on its own. PfR II departed from the notion that comparatively little money was needed to leverage change if strategically if IRM stakeholders would use this little money for funding at the right time, possibly also in connection with targeted lobby and advocacy activities. This idea has not been followed up in the PfR II Mali programme so far. Most speaking is the funding of PADIN II, a resilience programme for Central Mali funded by the NL Embassy and implemented by CARE Mali with a budget of US\$ 18 m per year. CARE Mali is a partner of PfR II and has an annual budget of US\$ 350,000 but both projects are implemented in parallel to each other. No discussions have so far taken place about using the PfR II Mali project to leverage funding from PADIN II for needed investments which have been identified in the context of the various IRM consultations.

The focus of the *investment*-related work of the PfR Alliance partners and its stakeholders has been mainly oriented towards governmental structures. Most speaking is PfR's successful lobbying for including IRM-related budget lines in PDSECs (Social, Economic and Cultural Development Plans). This is, in principle, tactically smart but the government has no substantial funds available to support IRM objectives at different levels. To mobilise funds for investment, the attention of the PfR II Mali programme would need to be directed to the mobilisation of funding from funds and programmes sourced by international cooperation agencies or banks. There is scope to work more strategically on investments and the mobilisation of resources for IRM.

6. **Lobby and advocacy (L&A):** L&A in the context of the PfR II Mali's programme is so far interpreted as the dissemination of IRM related information and evidence about the well-functioning of coalitions which can bring different stakeholders around the table. This includes

the targeted sensitisation of policy makers and MPs at different government/administrative levels about the benefits of IRM. The PfR Alliance also shared good practices about collaborative IRM-related work, in particular from the wetlands in the Mopti region, during pan-African and global events dealing with DRR, climate change and the SDGs. This interpretation of L&A **corresponds** with the very character of the PfR Alliance partners which have all along practiced a collaborative, collegial and non-challenging relationship with government officials at different levels. PfR II Mali follows this transactional approach and has thereby received recognition and appreciation from government but questions should be raised whether this approach is sufficient to promote change in the IRM domain.

This L&A practice is, however, far away from the “dialogue & dissent concept” which underpins the Netherlands funding for the 25 partnerships which are funded as of 2016. A more strategic, national level oriented and policy change orientation has not been chosen in the context of Mali. Neither a more strategic engagement and collaboration of PfR II Mali with other programmes funded by the Netherlands. Regular “dialogue and dissent” with the Netherlands Embassy was absent, though occasional contacts between staff of the Embassy and the PfR Alliance partners existed to map the areas of engagement and – on an annual basis – to share information about progress. This is largely due to an Embassy which has not enough staff to work more intensely with the various Netherlands Partnerships in Mali and which is faced with a regular rotation of officers who do not have the ability to accompany such a programme long term.

7. **Knowledge management and learning:** All actors of the PfR II Mali programme has continuously learned and developed the programme further. The exchanges at various levels, in-country through regular workshops and trainings, but also outside Mali, including meetings at the global level and participation in global policy events, have promoted this learning dimension. While lessons have been shared in different fora and promising practices mentioned in the PfR Annual Reports, there was not a more systematic approach deployed with a focus on knowledge capturing. Such work would allow to document how PfR II Mali has been conceptualised, the approach taken towards its operational work, outcomes received, opportunities grasped or missed, etc. This deficiency has been signalled and some work was undertaken more recently to capture relevant stories, but the issue would need to be addressed on a more structural level to document relevant information, including the important role that PfR II plays with regard to conflict prevention at the local, that is needed for an effective lobbying and advocacy work at the provincial, regional and national levels.
  
8. **Promoting international policy frameworks:** At the national policy and implementation level, the PfR II Mali programme has mainly promoted the Sendai framework on DRR and the inclusion of IRM into existing disaster plans. This happened principally through existing contacts with the Directorate of Civil Protection and the participation in the National Platform for Civil Protection chaired by the same Directorate. Contacts were established with the Ministry of Energy and Water, through the National Directorate of Hydraulics, to integrate the **challenges** of integrated water resources management into the diagnostic report of the water sector in Mali. It is not clear whether this engagement took place to promote the international RAMSAR framework on wetlands (this framework was initially not listed as an international framework which the PfR II Alliance, globally, would promote). There were no contacts established with the Ministry of Environment to seek for collaboration on the Paris Climate Change Agreement. Some contacts existed with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the SDGs which resulted in the preparation of a volunteer report to be presented at the United Nations in New York.

The relative one-sided engagement with the Sendai framework and limited engagement on the other frameworks confirms other findings that the IRM engagement at the national level was not comprehensive and mainly undertaken by PfR Alliance partners (without the involvement of coalition partners). A structured feedback from the PfR Alliance partner's participation in these global and pan-African events back to the national level was not reported.

9. **The PfR Alliance:** Wetlands International and CARE Mali have worked together under the PfR I programme, the Red Cross Mali joined only as of 2016. The latter focused on the Kayes region, towards the border of Senegal, while Wetlands and CARE continued to work in the Mopti region, each with their respective focal areas but geographically not located far away from each other which helped to stay professionally in close contact with each other. Their respective staff also meets regularly in Mopti town where Wetlands has its main office for Mali. While the leads of all three PfR Alliance partners regularly meet in Bamako and share the same perspective on IRM, there is a geographic (and expert) divide between Wetlands International and Care Mali on one side and the Red Cross Mali on the other which is not to the benefit of the PfR II Mali programme. According to the set-up of the programme in Mali, the work pertaining to the three trajectories is meant to culminate into a joint engagement in one PfR selected area, be it Kayes or Mopti. But technical expertise from Wetlands (relating to the restoration of eco-systems) and Care (adaptation to climate change) does not sufficiently filter into the Kayes region which benefits so far mainly from the Red Cross Mali expertise on disaster risk reduction. This situation led interviewees comment that the initiation of the work in Kayes was strategically not well chosen as resources for Wetland's work as well as CARE's work were mainly programmed for the Mopti region. This divide will require attention when discussing a continuation during the a possible PfR III in Mali.
10. **Southern Governance:** PfR Alliance partners feel that they have so far sufficient opportunities to engage on all-PfR programme issues at the global level. On average two Wetlands International staff members from Mali participate in the annual Leads Week in The Hague. An arrangement whereby Mali would be present in the PfR Governance structure could strengthen Mali's voice but such engagement would require additional time and resources which would be missed at the country and regional levels in Mali and the West-African region. Overall, however, PfR Alliance partners and IRM stakeholders welcome to idea of a stronger involvement of southern leaders in the future set-up of PfR.
11. **Context:** In the case of Mali, context matters strongly on how the PfR II programme is interpreted and implemented in the country. The deliberate choice to start working with community-based organisations and other stakeholders at the local level, though with the intention to gradually scale this up, means that the programme is on a very long path before the coalitions can raise their voice jointly and strongly at the national in support of IRM and to obtain funding for IRM-related investments. This path has been chosen because the earlier approach of strengthening the capacities of national NGOs in support of promoting IRM and working with local organisations, did not work out. The context is also characterised by an overall shortage of capacities among organisations and individuals with whom a strong and strategic engagement beyond the communal and community levels could be kicked off. Moreover, the rising conflict in central Mali but also in other parts of the country with strong competitions for land and water, and the absence of the State in substantial parts of the country make it at this point in time very difficult to work along a more structured and sophisticated manner with the government at the different levels. When preparing for a possible PfR III

programme, a more thorough reflection about what is at all possible in the current situation in Mali and whether the Theory of Change, discussed above, will need to take these realities more strongly into account.

12. **The West-Africa regional programme:** The PfR II regional programme West-Africa is not a specific object of this evaluation. But the ToR for the global evaluation of the PfR programme asks the evaluators to look at the entire programme and to signal issues which might need attention during the PfR II programme or the possible PfR III programme. The evaluators for the Mali case came across some information about this regional programme which result in the following brief observations:

- With an amount of some EUR 600,000 budgeted for the period 2016 to 2020, a substantial amount had been set aside for starting a new programme at the regional level in West-Africa. Until the end of 2018, i.e. after three of the five PfR II years, some EUR 200,000 had been spent. This raises questions about the way this programme is set up, its leadership, management, coordination, ability to spend and, in particular, its strategic direction.
- There exists a 7-page strategic document which was shared with the consultants during the latter part of the evaluation. The annual planning and reporting on this regional programme has however been sub-optimal and does not reflect to what effect this programme has been sufficiently thought through and conceptualised, staffed with appropriate professionals and supported from an all-PfR programme angle.
- The information received and reviewed, as well as interviews conducted with PfR stakeholders suggests that this programme is so far highly fragmented and not clearly linked to the national dynamics of Mali. The promise of the PfR overall programme and its theory of change, to go from local to national to regional to global, and reverse, can hardly be traced in this case.

It is therefore recommended that this programme is going to be thoroughly reviewed, ideally by a joint mission consisting of PfR staff working at the overall and global level, together with staff responsible for the West-African regional programme.



## Bibliography

- Dialogue Capacity Framework 2016-2018 Mali
- Dialogue Capacity Framework 2019 Coalition Bankass
- Dialogue Capacity Framework 2019 Coalition Djenné
- Dialogue Capacity Framework 2019 Coalition Kayes
- Dialogue Capacity Framework 2019 Coalition Mopti
- Dialogue Capacity Framework 2019 CRU
- Dialogue Capacity Framework RJEDD September 2019
- IOB Study. 2019. Strategies for partners: balancing complementarity and autonomy. Evaluation of the functioning of strategic partnerships between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and civil society organisations. IOB Study no. 431, September 2019
- Mali Capacity Strengthening Goals 2020, word document
- Netherlands Red Cross / Partners for Resilience, *Annual Report 2016*, Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016-2020, May 2017
- Partners for Resilience Mali, Country Leads Week 2020, PowerPoint presentation.
- Partners for Resilience, *A new vision for community resilience: the case for change*, November 2012. <https://www.climatecentre.org/downloads/files/PFR/PfR%20Resilience%20vision.pdf>
- Partners for Resilience, *Accelerating for Sustainable Impact*, Annual Plan 2019, Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016 2020, 31st October 2018
- Partners for Resilience, *Annual Report 2016*, Mali Country Program
- Partners for Resilience, *Annual Report 2017*, Mali Country Program, 25 March 2018
- Partners for Resilience, *Annual Report 2018*, Mali Country program, 25 April 2019
- Partners for Resilience, *Annual Report 2018*, West Africa programme,
- Partners for Resilience, *Global Ambitions, Local Answers*, Annual Report 2017, Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016 2020, 31 May 2018
- Partners for Resilience, *Local Realities, Global Ambitions* Annual Report 2018 Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016 - 2020, 29 May 2019
- Partners for Resilience, Outcomes database, 3 February 2020
- Partners for Resilience, *Semi Annual Report 2019 and Annual Plan 2020*, Mali Country program, 25 September 2019
- Programme de pays: Dialogue en GIR au Mali, 2016
- Programme Working Group, Meeting Report 11 November 2019 **and** Annex 2: Proposal for improved governance and decision for SG
- The Netherlands Red Cross, *Programme Report Inception Phase, January-August 2016*, Netherlands Red Cross/ Partners for Resilience, September 2016

## Annexes

### Annex 1: Results of the Outcome Harvesting workshop, Mali – 11 March 2020

#### *PfR Mali – Trajectories – outcomes/importance/contributions PfR*

#### TRAVAUX DE GROUPE SUR LA Trajectoire 1

	<b>CHANGEMENT</b>	<b>IMPORTANCE</b>	<b>CONTRIBUTION PfR</b>
<b>Changements Capacité : acteurs</b>	Meilleure structuration des organisations des producteurs (pêche) Exemple : unions, coalitions.	- La mise en coalition répond au souci d'intégration de l'approche GIR, les unions et coalitions fédèrent leurs efforts dans la défense d'intérêt commun, - Les coalitions influencent les décideurs pour améliorer les services publics .	Renforcement des capacités (formations, visites d'échange, documentation, mise en connexion avec les services techniques).
	Prise de conscience des acteurs par rapport à la pêche durable (mise en défend des marres et bras de fleuve).	Augmentation des revenus, Amélioration de la qualité et de la capture (poissons), Sauvegarde des espèces.	
<b>Changements Politiques</b>	Élaboration et mise en application de deux(2) conventions de pêche dans les cercles (Djenné, Mopti) et celle du cercle de Bankass en cours.	- Préviend des conflits entre les usagers de la pêche, - Meilleure application de la loi de pêche N°0014-062 du 29/10/2014 (pêche, agriculture).	Appui financier et technique de l'élaboration, diffusion, validation et mise en application
	Adoption de bon comportement de pêche suite à la connaissance des textes..		
<b>Changements investissements</b>	Dans les casiers rizicoles « office riz-Mopti » interdiction des pêches dans les ouvrages lors de la mise en eau afin d'assurer une gestion durable de la ressource halieutique	- Gestion rationnelle de l'eau, - Augmentation de revenu et la qualité de poissons	- Appui conseil  - Renforcement des capacités en technique de plaidoyer.
	Acquisition des mares pour la pisciculture à travers les	- Lutte contre la malnutrition - Respect des textes de	

	plaidoyers.	pêche.	
<b>Changements pratiques</b>	Augmentation des étangs piscicoles et cases flottantes...	- Augmentation des revenus de pêche	- Formation sur les techniques piscicoles et les visites d'échanges,
	Bonne pratique dans la conservation mise en glace, fumage et transformation.	- Renforcement de la résilience.	- Documentation sur la pisciculture

## TRAVAUX DE GROUPE SUR LA Trajectoire 2

	<b>CHANGEMENT</b>	<b>IMPORTANCE</b>	<b>CONTRIBUTION PfR</b>	<b>Brainstorming</b>
<b>Changements capacités des acteurs</b>	Valorisation du statut et de la position de la femme (Participation au processus de prise de décision : foncier, ACC...)	Amélioration de la résilience du ménage et de la communauté  Cohésion sociale, réduction des conflits entre usagers (objectif commun qui tient compte des intérêts de tous).	Renforcement de capacités des usagers : mise en place unions, coalitions, formation en planification, plaidoyer, conflits.	Leadership des femmes/femmes capables de porter la voix des femmes.
	Changement dynamiques entre acteurs (concertations au lieu de compétition, conflits/tensions).			
<b>Changements politiques</b>	Connaissances / Appropriation et application effective des lois/textes sur le foncier : Accès des femmes à la terre, mise en place des COFOs niveaux commune, village.	-Amélioration des revenus/diversification des sources de revenus/ embouche : Cas de Mariam Fofana et Fanta Bocoum.	Renforcement de capacités des usagers : Connaissances et diffusion des lois et textes en langues locales avec les services techniques.	
<b>Changements investissements</b>	Prise en compte et financement de la GIR dans les PDESC : Mise en valeur de 2 ha de terre à Ouenkoro (Bankass), digue à Sofara (Djenné), point de vente sécurisé dans la commune de Liberté dembaya (Kayes).	Résilience des communautés (amélioration des moyens d'existence, redevabilité, collaboration entre élus et société civile.	Renforcement de capacités des usagers : techniques de mobilisation de ressources ; plaidoyer/influence. Création de cadre de concertation/dialogue Elus-Coalition.	Réalisation d'infrastructure de protection (Digue, 520m, de 1 à 1.50 à Kaka/Sofara) Mobilisation des ressources financières extérieures.

<b>Changements des pratiques</b>	Pratiques agricoles améliorées et résistantes (valorisation des infos agro-Hydro-météos grâce au partenariat avec Mali-Météo : station de Bankass)-semences améliorées, respect du calendrier agricole, des passages des animaux.	Réduction de l'exode rurale Amélioration de la production agricole Sécurisation des actifs productifs du ménage (bradage des biens de valeur comme les bijoux des femmes etc.).	Renforcement de capacités des usagers : Données agro-hydro-météos ; RRC ; ACC, conservation et restauration des écosystèmes.	Systèmes de production plus résilients (Prise en compte des infos agro-Hydro-météo).
	Accès sécurisé des femmes à la terre (actes délivrés par les.			

### TRAVAUX DE GROUPE SUR LA Trajectoire 3

	<b>CHANGEMENT</b>	<b>IMPORTANCE</b>	<b>CONTRIBUTION Pfr</b>
<b>Changements capacités des acteurs</b>	La connaissance des risques majeurs périodiques dans chaque localité par tous les acteurs.	Préparation à la mitigation de la RRC (Élaboration des plans de contingence.	Renforcement des capacités des différents acteurs (États, OSC, Coalitions).
	Développement de partenariat stratégique entre les acteurs (Administration, ST, OSC, Leaders communautaires etc.).	Participation multisectorielle et inclusive avec représentativité équitable dans les cadres de concertation (Plateforme RRC).	Mise en place et mise en connexion des unions/coalitions avec les autres acteurs.
<b>Changements politiques</b>	Prise en compte de la GIR dans le plan d'action de certains PDSEC.	Existence de lignes budgétaires et source de financement sûre afin de mieux faire face à la RRC.	IEC sur la GIR au profit de tous les acteurs dont les élus communaux.
	La prise de décision par les Gouverneurs, les Préfets et les Maires en vue de l'application de la décision 2016-0974-P-RM.	Existence d'un cadre réglementaire de collaboration et d'intervention.	IEC sur le décrets au près des acteurs clés (Administration, Elus, Services Techniques étatiques).
<b>Changements investissements</b>	Meilleure protection et retenue d'eau (Cas des villages de Sabé dans la commune de Dialoubé et	Renforcement de la résilience des communautés et de protection et régénération	Formation des leaders des coalition en techniques de mobilisation de

	Bogo dans la commune de Borondougou).	de l'environnement.	ressources.
<b>Changements des pratiques</b>	Mobilisation massive de toutes les forces vives pour réparer la partie de la digue du casier Nord de Djenné qui a cédé sous la pression de l'eau.	Renforcement de la résilience des communautés et de protection et régénération de l'environnement.	Formation des leaders des coalition en techniques de mobilisation sociale et des ressources et de développement de partenariat.
	Collecte et diffusion des informations Agro-météo-Hydrologiques par les leaders des coalitions (Radios et WhatsApp).	Amélioration du rendement par la maitrise du calendrier agricole et prévenir les risques.	
	Capacité des membres des coalitions à mobiliser des fonds au niveau local (cas des femmes vendeuses de poisson de Djenné).	Meilleure gestion de l'environnement (Exploitation adéquate).	Formation des leaders des coalition en techniques de mobilisation des ressources.

### Participants Outcome Harvesting Workshop (11 March 2020)

<p><b>Group trajectoire 1 (eau/ pêche):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr Mama Djénépo</li> <li>2. Mr Moussa Cissé</li> <li>3. Mr Amadou Cissé</li> <li>4. Mr Saidou Barro</li> <li>5. Mme Oumaïssa Timbo</li> <li>6. Mr Nouhoum Traoré</li> <li>7. Mr Moussa Diagne</li> <li>8. Mr Garba Tapo</li> <li>9. Mr Ibrahima Fofana</li> </ol>	<p><b>Group trajectoire 2 (terre/ foncier):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mme Mariam Fofana</li> <li>2. Mme Korotimi Seri</li> <li>3. Mme Fanta Bocoum</li> <li>4. Nouhoum Dembele</li> <li>5. Mr Adama Barro</li> <li>6. Mr Barema Sankaré</li> <li>7. Mr Mme Sakiné</li> <li>8. Mr Ibrahim Traoré</li> <li>9. Mr Souleymane Katilé</li> <li>10. Mr Hama Sankaré</li> <li>11. Mr Oumar Diarra</li> </ol>	<p><b>Group trajectoire 3 (Strat. RRC):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fatou Camara</li> <li>2. Mr Samaké</li> <li>3. Mr Mariko</li> <li>4. Mr Aly Dia</li> <li>5. Mr Amadou Sow</li> <li>6. Mr Youssouf Sinayoko</li> <li>7. Mr Abdoulaye Maiga</li> <li>8. Mr Ousmane Haidra</li> <li>9. Mr Ismaila Haidara</li> </ol>
---	---	---

## Annex 2 : Interviewees

N°	Name	Function	Organisation	Interview date
1	Karounga Keita	Director regional office	Wetlands Institute	March, 3th 2020
2	Ibrahima Fofana	National Coordinator PfR	Wetlands Institute	
3	Oumar Diarra	Plaidoyer Coordinator	CARE	
4	Hamma Aly Sankare	PfR project staff	CARE, Mopti	
5	Souleymane Katilé	PfR project staff	CARE	
6	Abdoulaye A Maïga	PfR project staff	Croix Rouge	
7	Al Mahady Touré	PfR project staff	Croix Rouge	
8	Roger Aubé	Représentant Pays	Croix Rouge	
9	M Balla Moussa Sidibé	Country Director	CARE	
10	Madame Beata	Programme Director	CARE	
11	Mamadou M Traoré	Secrétaire Général CRM	CRM	
12	Ousmane A Haidara	Chef dépt Communication	CRM	
13	Colonel Major, Seydou Doumbia	Directeur Général	Protection Civile	March, 5th 2020
14	Dr Colonel Cheick Koné	Point Focal PfR		
15	Seydou Coulibaly	Directeur par intérim	Division des relations multilatérales du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères et de la Coopération Internationale	March, 5th 2020
16	de M. habib Traoré			
17	Honorable Paul Damango	Député élu à Bankass,	Membre commission Education	March, 5th 2020
18	Honorable Youssouf Aya	Député élu à Koro	membre de la commission Mine Energie et industrie et membre du Parlement ECOWAS	
19	M.Ousmane Koumaré	Maire Adjoint	Commune de Sokoura (Mopti)	March, 5th 2020
20	M.Amadou Coulibaly	Maire Adjoint	Commune de Segala (Kayes)	
21	M. Hussein Sankaré	Maire Adjoint	Commune Ouenkoro (Bankass)	
22	M. Bakary Sangaré	Directeur Regional	Eaux et Forêts, Région de Mopti	March, 6 <sup>th</sup> 2020
23	Moumini Damango	Conseiller Sécurité Alimentaire/ développement durable	Ambassade des Pays Bas-Bamako	
24	Lieutenant-Colonel Namaké Dembélé	Directeur Régional	Direction Régionale protection civile Mopti	

25	M Boubacar Koné	Préfet de Bankass	Région de Mopti	
26	M Bokary Guindo	Directeur Régional de la pêche	Région de Mopti	
27	Mahamane Maiga	Secrétaire à l'organisation	réseau des journalistes pour l'environnement et le développement durable	March, 9th 2020

**Annex 3: Focus Group 9 mars 2020 Bankass-Kayes**

<b>N°</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Function</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Interview date</b>
1	Moussa Diagne	Member	Coalition Kayes	March 9th 2020
2	Fatou Camara			
3	Aly Dia			
4	Amadou Sow			
5	Saidou Barro			
6	Madame Fanta Bocoum	Member	Coalition Bankass	
7	Souleymane Konaté			
8	Korotimi Seri			
9	Nouhoum Dembélé			
10	Barema Sankare			

**Annex 4: Focus Group 9 mars 2020 Djenné-Mopti**

<b>N°</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Function</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Interview date</b>
1	Ibrahima Traoré	Member	Coalition Djenné	March 9th 2020
2	Madame Nientao Aminata			
3	Mariam Fofana			
4	Amadou Cissé			
5	Moussa Cissé			
6	Mama B Djenepe	Member	Coalition Mopti	
7	Madame Oumaissa Timbo			
8	Amadou Haidara			