

OXFAM
Evaluation Report

AWARENESS RAISING AND PROBLEMS OF PROTECTION:

**EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF THE *WITHIN
AND WITHOUT THE STATE* PILOT IN THE
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO**

Janvier Ngambwa
Oxfam in the DRC
February 2019



OXFAM

As part of our commitment to accountability and learning, Oxfam will share conclusions and recommendations from evaluations. We will first share them internally with relevant stakeholders, ensuring that they have an opportunity to participate in discussion of those results in meaningful ways. We will then publish the evaluation reports on our website in accessible language.

As a rights-based organization, accountability, particularly to the communities we seek to serve, is of the highest importance to us. For Oxfam, accountability requires Oxfam to regularly and honestly assess the quality of its work, share and learn from its findings with primary stakeholders, and apply that learning in future work.

This is an evaluation of Oxfam in the DRC's Within and Without the State pilot program. The program has been operating in the Democratic Republic of the Congo since 2015 and this evaluation covers the work undertaken between 2015 and 2017.

The major evaluation activities took place between April 2018 and February 2019. The evaluation was carried out by Janvier Ngambwa, Country MEAL Coordinator for the Oxfam in the DRC, and reflects the findings as reported by him as validated with stakeholders. The evaluation was commissioned by the Learning, Evaluation and Accountability Department (LEAD) through its country-led evaluation (CLE) fund.

For additional information regarding the evaluation Terms of Reference, please refer to the report appendices.

CONTENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	3
Executive Summary	4
Section I: Introduction	6
Project Context and Presentation.....	6
Evaluation Aims and Objectives.....	7
Evaluation Questions	8
Section II: Evaluation Methodology	9
Data Collection Methods	9
Data Analysis Techniques.....	12
Section II: Presentation of Evaluation Results.....	13
Section III: Analysis and Discussion of the Results	32
Section IV: Conclusions, Implications, Lessons Learned, and Recommendations	34
Conclusions and Implications.....	34
Lessons Learned	36
Recommendations	37

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

NGO	Nongovernment Organization
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DFiD	(U.K.) Department for International Development
WWS	Within and Without the State

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From September 2015 to June 2017, Oxfam implemented the *Within and Without the State* (WWS) pilot project in four communities in the Équateur province: Wendji Secli, Bikoro Centre, Ingende and Bokatola. The project adopted and adapted the approach of the protection program that Oxfam implements in conflict zones in the DRC. Through this approach, Oxfam and its partners raise awareness among citizens and local authorities of their rights and obligations. They also help these local actors convene and engage in regular consultations to solve protection challenges. The WWS pilot project primarily sought to test the efficacy of this methodology in resolving governance problems in a province not affected by the conflict.

At the beginning of 2018, the Oxfam team in DRC received funding from Oxfam America to measure the lasting impact of this project. A mixed-method, comparative approach, combining quantitative and qualitative techniques, was used to conduct this evaluation.

The evaluation indicates **a distinct difference in knowledge of governance and protection** between respondents from pilot communities and those of comparison communities. This is knowledge of the rights, duties, obligations, responsibilities, and processes necessary for effective governance and protection. In both groups, **men had an advantage over women**.

The results of the survey do not clearly indicate that pilot communities have closer relations with, or have greater confidence in, local authorities. In fact, comparison communities are more likely to express confidence that the authorities listen to citizens and find satisfactory solutions. However, the focus groups' responses clearly differ from those of the poll in satisfaction with, and mutual respect of, the authorities.

The authorities' responses to questions about their interactions with the public do not show a clear difference between those whose constituents participated in the pilot and those who did not. Both groups identify dialogue as the means of interacting with citizens, but neither clearly indicate the frequency of this interaction. Similarly, both groups unanimously report trust in citizens, with a majority stating that citizens trust the authorities. Mechanisms allowing citizens to interact with the authorities are not regular in both groups, but they do function promptly when there is a problem to be resolved.

The evaluation **does not definitively indicate that the WWS pilot project has realized its desired outcomes of increased citizen-state engagement and positive state action** to resolve public problems. The evaluation nevertheless shows several lasting results for the project in terms of expected outputs. For example, the WWS pilot's expected output that citizens would have acquired "the knowledge, competencies and confidence necessary for engaging in a positive dialogue with local authorities," was met. The evaluation clearly shows that citizens engaging with WWS have acquired knowledge and competencies.

The evaluation, however, shows that **there is no effective, direct and regular interaction between the citizens and the authorities**. This lack of engagement limits citizens from capitalizing on the knowledge and competencies they have acquired. Similarly, the project expected that authorities would become "more receptive and committed" in their citizen engagement; however, the evaluation finds that while authorities are better aware of citizen

rights and the state's obligations, citizen engagement is not effective. On the one hand, this could be the result of turnover of some authorities who participated in the project. It could also be caused by citizens' lack of confidence in the effectiveness of dialogue with authorities, both with existing authorities and new ones replacing those who participated in the project.

The evaluation shows that the project probably contributed to a change in attitudes about women's rights and their potential for participation in public life. However, there is no clear evidence that this has led to a change in norms and practices.

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

PILOT PROJECT CONTEXT AND IMPLEMENTATION

Oxfam implemented the WWS pilot project in the province of Équateur from September 2015 to June 2017. The project was implemented in four communities: Wendji Secli, Bikoro centre, Ingende and Bokatola. The project was initially conceived within the framework of Oxfam's global program Within and Without the State (WWS) with financing from the U.K. Department for International Development (DFID). It was twice extended through contributions from Oxfam Great Britain.

The pilot aimed to contribute to an improvement of state-citizen relationships through dialogue, believing that this improvement would also promote citizen rights and improve government accountability.

The pilot's approach was based on the program of Community Protection that Oxfam has implemented in conflict zones in eastern Democratic Republic of Congo since 2009. This program supports communities in establishing relations with local authorities, enabling citizens and authorities to negotiate solutions to issues such as rights violations, violence and the abuse of citizens by authorities. The program raises awareness among community residents as well as authorities about their rights and obligations. It also helps them establish a regular consultation process.

The principal goal of the WWS pilot project in Équateur was to test the efficacy of the protection program methodology in a province not affected by the conflict. The pilot helped citizens create a local committee structure for their representation in negotiations with authorities. It identified and supported citizen change agents in raising awareness in neighboring villages. It also enabled the creation of a Women's Forum to provide women with a space to discuss priority issues. Additionally, Oxfam installed a community facilitator in each community to train, support, and guide citizens. The pilot trained citizens and local authorities in laws and universal rights applicable to everyday life, as well as in the processes of negotiation and petitions. The pilot sought to reinforce citizen capacity and ease in approaching the authorities, submitting a specific concern and engaging the authorities effectively through negotiation and petitions. The pilot theorized that reinforcing these areas would lead or contribute to more agreed and shared solutions between citizens and government. With the support of the facilitator, the citizens committee identified pressing governance problems and formulated a plan of action to propose solutions, in consultation with the authorities. The committee and the authorities established a process of regular dialogue through monthly meetings, which allowed them to raise problems and collaborate on solutions.

According to the Theory of Change underlying the pilot project, if the citizens have “the knowledge, the competencies and the confidence” to identify protection and governance problems and an understanding of pertinent laws; if the local authorities received the same training; and if they have a neutral space to discuss these problems; then, a regular dialogue would be established that would permit the two parties to identify and implement actions to resolve these problems. The theory maintains that if change agents raise awareness in communities, citizens' knowledge of their rights will increase and the citizen-state relationship

would improve. The theory also follows that if change agents raise community awareness about discrimination against women and negative female stereotypes, and the Women's Forum challenges attitudes and social stereotypes on gender, social norms would change (refer to Annex 5, Theory of Change).

In four communities in Équateur, the pilot helped citizens establish a regular process of consultation with local authorities to identify and resolve problems of governance. The participants from community structures and authorities were trained on human and civic rights, and on norms of equality and non-discrimination based on factors such as gender, age and ethnic appearance. The project emphasized the strengthening of trust between the communities and local authorities, so that they are capable of finding solutions to problems by applying principles of good governance.

At the end of the project, Oxfam collected a lot of testimony from participants and anecdotal evidence about the efficacy of the project. Due to a lack of resources, Oxfam did not carry out a final evaluation at the conclusion of the project. The lasting impact of the project was not measured and the theory of change that guided the project was not tested. Furthermore, the follow-up and evaluation system of Oxfam projects is principally based on quantitative methods in order to provide measurement data for different indicators. These studies thus lack the richness and the depth that is gained through qualitative methods.

Therefore, in order to conduct this evaluation of the learning process, the Oxfam team in DRC responded to the call by **Oxfam America on Oxfam America's Country-led Evaluation Fund** for the financial year 2019 and obtained financing.

EVALUATION AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The aim of the evaluation is to understand the lasting effects of a pilot project on governance implemented in one of the poorest and most neglected zones of the DRC, characterized by an extremely fragile state.

Specifically, this evaluation pursues the following learning objectives:

1. Improve understanding of governance programming at the local level, as well as the program approach, to promote active citizenship and responsible government in the context of fragile states, which will clarify future programming.
2. Increase the capability of personnel in qualitative research methods and data analysis.
3. Increase the comprehension (of stakeholders) regarding the possible advantages of a citizen-state consultation process, as could be indicated by the results of the evaluation.

The evaluation could help Oxfam International understand ways of promoting relationships between citizens and the state, the responsibility of the government, and resilience in the context of fragile states. The design and the results of the evaluation will be distributed by means of Oxfam's Center of Knowledge on Governance and Citizenship, a webinar will be

organized on the results, and a document will be published to present conclusions and lessons.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This evaluation is centered on the following questions:

1. In what measure do citizens and local authorities feel capable of efficiently resolving problems of local governance?
 - a. How do citizens and local authorities react when they encounter problems related to governance?
 - b. How efficient are the systems in place in resolving these kinds of problems?
2. How do citizens and local authorities perceive each other and interact with each other?
 - a. How often, and for what reasons, do citizens interact with local authorities?
 - b. How do citizens and authorities understand their own roles and respective responsibilities in matters of community governance?
 - c. In what measure do citizens and authorities respect and trust each other and feel respected by the other?
3. In what measure are women perceived as real or potential participants in taking public decisions and in public activities?
 - a. In what measure, and to what end, do women play a leadership role?
 - b. What do men and women see as obstacles preventing public participation of women?

SECTION II: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Oxfam seeks to understand the effect of the project on several aspects of governance: knowledge and understanding of concepts of governance and the social contract at the level of community members and at the level of authorities; the practices and processes of governance that are regularly used to resolve social and political problems; and attitudes on the rights, capacity, and role of women in public life.

The evaluation carried out a comparative analysis of these aspects between beneficiary communities and communities that were not beneficiaries of the project. To do this, for each community that participated in the pilot project, Oxfam chose a community that was similar in size, composition and economic status in order to judge if there is a difference in knowledge and practices related to processes of governance between the communities. While the evaluation does not intend to determine causal links (because the communities were not selected through random sampling), the study of comparison communities will provide a richer perspective on perceptions and practices of governance in the province. The evaluation will be conducted in the same manner in all the eight communities.

The evaluation resorted to a mixed methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative techniques.

A normal recruitment process (publication of offer, interview, selection) was carried out. Eight researchers were selected and trained to conduct general surveys through the use of electronic methods (tablets). In addition, four research assistants were recruited and trained to conduct individual interviews and focus groups, and carry out data transcription.

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

To gather data necessary for the evaluation, we resorted to the following techniques for data collection:

1. Qualitative Methods

Analysis of project documents: It refers to analyzing the different documents produced in the frame of project implementation, in particular, the project document, narrative reports, etc. The goal of this technique was to understand the questions to ask in the course of the evaluation.

Individual interviews: This technique allowed us to collect data from local authorities in the concerned communities. We felt that the authorities would be more comfortable replying frankly

to questions in individual interviews rather than in the focus-group format. An interview guide (see Annex) was used for this purpose. The average length of an interview was 30 minutes. Around 13 local authorities were interviewed in the eight communities (the posts were not the same; there were village chiefs, city chiefs, territory administrators, customary chiefs, etc.). All the 13 authorities interviewed were men, seven were new (they had not participated in the project, and had since replaced those who had participated), and six had participated in the project.

The group discussions (focus group): The group discussions were organized with the members of community structures to collect data on comprehension and governance practices. We chose the focus group format, expecting that the group could generate a discussion that would provide us with a richer assessment of their collective experience than individual interviews.

Two focus groups were organized in each community: a **mixed-gender** focus group (five men and five women) and a focus group with **women** alone (10 women). We decided on this configuration to provide a space for women to express themselves, judging that they would be more at ease in a group with other women than in a group with women and men.

In the beneficiary communities, the focus groups brought together members of the community structures created with project support and members of the project-supported women's forums.

In the comparison communities, the focus groups assembled community leaders and those who were or had been members of existing community structures (e.g., local development community, water management community, members of civil society organizations) and women leaders and members of women's structures that are, or had been, members of local women's groups, OSCs (e.g., local association of women, women's group cooperatives, etc.).

Each focus group brought together 10 participants. A discussion guide (see Annex) was used for this purpose. The average duration of these discussions was 90 minutes. In all, 120 women and 40 men participated in the two series of group discussions.

With regard to individual interviews and group discussions, the questions were open. Depending on the answers given, other questions that did not figure on the guides were asked to better understand the situation and the context.

Four facilitators were recruited and trained for collecting and transcribing qualitative data.

2. Quantitative Methods

Survey (quantitative poll): A general poll was conducted among the members of the eight communities evaluated.

We used the following formula to determine the sample: $N = t^2 \cdot p \cdot (1-p) / m^2$, with:

n = Size of the sample

t = Level of confidence (95% whose value type is 1.96)

m = Margin of error (5% or 0.05)

p = estimated proportion of the population that presents the characteristic studied (0.5 if no value is known)

By applying the formula ($n = t^2 \times p(1-p) / m^2$), the minimum size of the required sample is around 384 valid questionnaires. To this sample, we added 17% of 384 to cover errors occurring because of responses being incorrectly selected due to the use of tablets. In all, 448 questionnaires were completed. However, since one questionnaire was not completed until the end, we had 447 filled and valid questionnaires. A quota system was defined based on communities, sex and age. The statistical units were composed of individuals. In the beneficiary communities, 111 women and 112 men were polled against 98 women and 126 men in the comparison communities. That makes a total of 209 women and 238 men for the eight communities.

A quantitative questionnaire was used. The data from the general poll were collected with the help of tablets. Eight pollsters were recruited and trained for this purpose.

A comparative analysis of the pilot communities and neighboring communities will give an indication of the knowledge, confidence and practices of local governance that predominate in the participating communities.

3. Limitations and Dangers

The project that was the object of this evaluation has been closed since June 2017. There is, therefore, a gap of about two years between ending the project activities and this evaluation. This gap could influence the results of this evaluation insofar as certain gains of the project existing when the project closed may not be there during this evaluation. In that case, the disappearance of these gains could be due either to the absence of a durability-and-exit strategy in the implementation of the project or due to the situation and local context in each community. However, this gap constitutes, at the same time, an important element in measuring the durability of project gains. In that case, the project gains that were found at the time of evaluation were there either because the durability-and-exit strategy of the project was effective, or because of the situation and the local context of the project. In addition, a certain number of authorities who participated in the project were not there at the time of evaluation (of the 13 authorities interviewed, seven authorities were new and had not participated in the project). There is also the possibility that some of the respondents think and say things that they believe would be considered correct by the questioner so that the organization (Oxfam) brings in a project or offers support to their communities. Finally, there is also the possibility of change in meaning to the extent that the questions were asked, and responses were given, in Lingala, and the discussions were then transcribed into French. These translations could also alter the data.

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES

Analysis of qualitative data: Due to their nature (qualitative), the technique used for analysis is *content analysis*. The first stage was the re-transcription of interviews and discussions recorded in audio format. This involved transcribing into text what had been said. The second stage was manual codification, followed by actual analysis. NVIVO software was initially used. But given the difficulty of not being able to take into account the context in which a word was said, we codified the data through a manual method (search function in Microsoft Word). Depending on the questions, we used two processes: the *open coding* process and the *predefined coding* process.

Analysis of quantitative data: Quantitative analysis was based on descriptive statistical methods to produce **proportions, percentages** and links between several variables. The software package SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) was used to achieve this. The analysis of all the variables was crossed with the gender variable to see if there were differences between men and women.

The evaluation was conducted in eight communities of which four had participated in the project (Wendji Secli, Bikoro Centre, Ingende and Bokatola) and four had not participated and served as the comparison communities (Itipo, Boteka, Buya and Mpaha).

The results of this evaluation are thus valid and present the situation in the eight communities evaluated.

As the analysis is comparative, the data is presented in two groups: the communities that participated and those that did not participate. However, the analysis will bring out the particularities of each community, regardless of the group.

SECTION II: PRESENTATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS

This section of the report presents the results of the evaluation. These results are presented in two large blocks: 1. communities that participated in the project, and 2. communities that did not participate in the project. The results of the qualitative and quantitative data are presented in such a way that they can confirm, nuance or disprove the aspects raised by the quantitative or qualitative results.

According to the framework of the original results of the pilot project (refer to Logframe Annex 6), shown as Expected Outcomes and Outputs, the project aimed to achieve the following:

Outcome: The local authorities, as well as the female and male members of the community, are more and more committed to positive actions aimed at resolving the problems of protection and governance through formal and informal spaces.

Outputs:

1. 135 change agents have the knowledge, competencies and confidence necessary to engage in a positive dialog with local authorities on questions of protection and governance.
2. The local authorities are increasingly receptive and involved in discussions on problems and concerns of the local population.
3. The members of the community are better informed about their human and legal rights, the roles and responsibilities of local authorities, and the existence of local reference services.
4. The attitudes and social norms relative to the participation of women in community decision-making and in different forms of sexist violence are challenged.

1. Knowledge pertinent to Protection Governance

Towards the expected output, "The members of the community are better informed about their human and legal rights, the roles and responsibilities of local authorities, and of the existence of local referral services," the evaluation finds that the pilot project achieved the results below.

a) Results of quantitative data

Within the communities that participated in the project ("the beneficiaries"), as well as in those that did not participate ("comparisons"), a focal point was knowledge, inclusion/ transparency/ participation/ trust and engagement with the authorities, women's inclusion/ participation and leadership.

With regard to knowledge, the evaluation analyzed the knowledge of community members about: fundamental rights and liberties; the legal basis that guarantees these rights and liberties; the

duties and the responsibilities of the citizens towards the state; the duties and the responsibilities of the community members to contribute to the welfare of, and respect towards, the rights of other members, as well as the rights and obligations of the government (public authority) vis-à-vis the citizens.

Knowledge of fundamental rights and liberties

Table 1: Known legal bases that guarantee rights and liberties

	Beneficiaries			Comparisons		
	Men N=112	Women F=111	Total N=223	Men N=126	Women N=98	Total N=224
Existence and recognition of human rights and individual liberties	53%	33%	43%	69%	53%	62%
Existence of civil and political rights	40%	32%	36%	17%	10%	14%
Gender equality	62%	51%	57%	17%	21%	19%
Equality of rights	52%	38%	45%	6%	4%	5%
Other	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Don't know	6%	23%	15%	21%	42%	30%

With regard to rights and liberties themselves, the proportion of respondents in the beneficiary communities who recognize gender equality is a lot higher (57%) than those in the comparison communities (19%). Their recognition of equal rights is similarly a lot higher (45%) than in the comparison communities (5%). Nevertheless, the proportion of people who are conscious of the existence of civic and political rights in the participating communities is (43%) is less significant than in the comparison communities (62%). Besides, the proportion of people who answer "don't know" is higher in the comparison (30%) than in the beneficiary communities (15%).

Knowledge of legal bases that guarantee these rights and liberties

Table 2: Known legal bases that guarantee rights and liberties

	Beneficiaries			Comparisons		
	Men N=112	Women F=111	Total N=223	Men N=126	Women N=98	Total N=224
The Constitution	74%	52%	63%	67%	50%	59%
The Penal Code	33%	8%	21%	4%	0%	2%
The Universal Declaration of Human Rights	11%	5%	8%	2%	5%	3%
Law on Parity	30%	29%	30%	10%	9%	10%
Law on Torture	22%	7%	15%	1%	0%	0%
Code of Penal Procedure	8%	3%	5%	0%	0%	0%

Code of Civil Procedure	26%	19%	22%	0%	0%	0%
Other universal conventions on human rights and individual liberties	6%	1%	4%	3%	0%	2%
Other	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Don't know	9%	27%	18%	29%	46%	37%

With regard to legal bases, the proportion of people who know the different legal bases that guarantee individual rights and liberties is higher for all the legal bases in the beneficiary communities, compared to those in the comparison communities. In addition, the proportion of people who say, "don't know," in the comparison communities is double (37%) of those in the corresponding beneficiary communities (18%).

Knowledge of duties and responsibilities of citizens towards the State

The charts below present the results of the survey with regard to the knowledge of legal bases that guarantee these rights and liberties.

Table 3: Rights and responsibilities of citizens towards the State

	Beneficiaries			Comparisons		
	Men N=112	Women F=111	Total N=223	Men N=126	Women N=98	Total N=224
Respecting the Law	96%	94%	95%	79%	67%	74%
Participating in financing the state's expenses by paying taxes	48%	32%	40%	10%	7%	9%
Participating in decision making on questions of general interest through different mechanisms	21%	14%	17%	5%	7%	6%
Ensuring that the execution of decisions and measures of general interest are monitored through different mechanisms	22%	15%	19%	6%	3%	4%
Other	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Don't know	2%	5%	4%	13%	21%	17%

As for the duties and responsibilities themselves, a more significant proportion of respondents from beneficiary communities recognize a larger variety of citizen's duties than those in the comparison communities, where very few recognize duties other than respecting the law. In addition, the number of people who answer, "don't know," is higher in the comparison communities (17%), than in the beneficiary communities (4%).

Table 4: Duties and responsibilities as community members to contribute to the welfare and to the respect of other members' rights

	Beneficiaries			Comparisons		
	Men N=112	Women F=111	Total N=223	Men N=126	Women N=98	Total N=224
No duty/responsibility	4%	3%	4%	14%	27%	20%
Promoting others' welfare	61%	54%	57%	49%	22%	38%
Respecting others' liberties	59%	44%	52%	29%	32%	30%
Avoiding criminal acts	88%	75%	82%	14%	14%	14%
Other	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Don't know	1%	7%	4%	12%	16%	14%

Regarding duties and responsibilities in the beneficiary communities, "avoiding criminal acts," was a frequent response (82%); in the comparison communities it was low (14%). In the beneficiary communities, more than 50% of the respondents acknowledged their duty toward other members of the society, whether the duty of promoting the welfare of others, or of respecting the rights of others, but less than 40% did so in the comparison communities. On the other hand, the proportion of people who answer, "don't know," is higher in the comparison communities (14%) than in the beneficiary communities (4%). It is significant that the proportion of people who say, "no duty/responsibility," is higher in the comparison communities (20%), compared to those in the beneficiary communities (4%).

Table 5: Duties and Obligations of the Government

	Beneficiaries			Comparisons		
	Men N=112	Women F=111	Total N=223	Men N=126	Women N=98	Total N=224
Protecting citizens	94%	95%	94%	69%	65%	67%
Respecting and enforcing respect of human rights	47%	29%	38%	14%	16%	15%
Applying and enforcing application of laws	45%	33%	39%	5%	2%	4%
Respecting and enforcing respect of civic and political rights of citizens	29%	19%	24%	6%	7%	7%
Providing solutions to the concerns and problems of citizens	28%	28%	28%	46%	44%	45%
Other	1%	0%	0%	2%	1%	2%
Don't know	3%	3%	3%	5%	8%	6%

The data above reveal that "protecting the citizens" is the government duty that is at the top in the beneficiary communities (94%) and in the control communities (67%). On the other hand, in the control communities, the proportion of people who answer, "don't know," (6%) is double that of the beneficiary communities.

b) Results of qualitative data with regard to citizens' knowledge

General knowledge of citizens' rights and obligations

In order to complete and broaden the results of the poll, the evaluation team posed several questions within the focus groups about knowledge pertinent to governance and protection.

In response to questions concerning the role and the function of non-state structures in public life, the respondents of the beneficiary communities show a much higher level of basic knowledge than those in the comparison communities. Among the types of responses to the question, they cite, for example, that the non-state structures should train, inform, and supervise the population just as they educate them. The comparison communities cite very few functions, more often saying, "helping the population." The beneficiary communities specified that informing the citizens and making them participate was a role and a responsibility of the authorities charged with the decision-making process. On the other hand, the comparison communities responded that the authorities are responsible for taking decisions, without mentioning the citizens at all. While the beneficiary communities cite several points as responsibilities of the civil society in public decision making, such as collaborating and informing people, the comparison communities do not mention a single one.

General knowledge regarding the state's obligations

Few respondents correctly listed the rights of citizens in the comparison communities, but those in the beneficiary communities identified a larger variety of rights, such as right to protection and right to security. A single, clear response, the right to vote, emanated from the comparison communities. As rights of citizens, the respondents in the beneficiary communities, as well as in the comparison communities, gave the same responses: Respect the law and pay taxes. But the number of beneficiaries who gave a clear response is twice as high than those in the comparison communities. All the respondents in the communities who participated in the project said, "yes," in response to the question about knowing that the authorities have obligations vis-à-vis citizens, and they could list a variety of obligations, such as protection, security and imparting justice. However, in the comparison communities, the respondents answered, "no," almost in the same proportion as those who said, "yes," to authorities having obligations, and they identified only protection as an example. Most of the respondents in the beneficiary communities answered, "the Oxfam project," when asked about the source of their knowledge (14 out of the 16 who answered). In the comparison communities, they quoted a non-governmental organization or an association (19 of the 27 who answered this question).

General knowledge on problems facing the public

The respondents from the beneficiary communities seem to be more conscious of social problems tied to governance and protection. They identified injustice, petty annoyances and proliferation of taxes as social problems, while in the comparison communities, the majority of the responses are linked to material difficulties, such as lack of infrastructure.

c) Summary of Citizens' Knowledge of Governance and Protection

As for knowledge pertaining to governance and protection, the quantitative data shows a clear difference between the beneficiary communities and comparison communities. The respondents of the beneficiary communities could list a greater number of universal rights. They also have a better knowledge of the different legal bases for these rights. The beneficiary communities could also identify the duties of citizens vis-à-vis the state as well as the duties of the citizens towards their community. However, the level of knowledge about the duties of citizens is a lot lower than knowledge about their rights. The participating communities listed a greater variety of citizens' duties than the comparison communities, but other than "respecting the law," which was also mentioned by a large majority in the comparison communities (four of six people who answered this question), there are not too many who give other examples of duties. These respondents also list a greater variety of obligations of the state towards its citizens.

The greater knowledge shown by the poll results is confirmed and reinforced by the qualitative data produced by the focus groups in both communities.

2. Public Participation and Relationship between Citizens and Local Authorities

Given these two expected outputs:

1. *135 change agents have the knowledge, competencies, and confidence necessary to engage in a positive dialog with local authorities on questions of protection;" and*
2. *The local authorities are increasingly receptive and committed in discussions regarding the problems and concerns of the local population,*

the evaluation finds that the project has achieved the following results:

a) Quantitative Data Results

With regard to the above aspects, the evaluation analyzed:

- the frequency of participation in the decision-making process
- the frequency of representation in the decision process
- satisfaction with decisions taken
- the capacity to engage with authorities
- the right to participate in the decision process
- knowledge of the decision process
- relationship with the authorities
- the level of confidence
- the sources of learning about rights and liberties
- the equality of rights and obligations between men and women
- the equality of opportunity between men and women
- the equality of opportunities for men and women to occupy leadership positions
- the perspective on women's ability to lead, and
- the sources influencing perspectives regarding women's roles.

Table 6: Frequency of participation in the decision-making process

	Beneficiary N=223				Comparison N=224				
	Never	Don't know	Sometimes	Always	Never	Don't know	Sometimes	Refusal	Always
Women	67%	1%	30%	3%	45%	0%	36%	0%	19%
Men	52%	0%	30%	18%	45%	1%	33%	1%	20%
Total	59%	0%	30%	10%	45%	0%	34%	0%	20%

Table 7: Frequency of participation, from their perspective, in the decision-making process

	Beneficiary N=223				Comparison N=224				
	Never	Don't know	Sometimes	Always	Never	Don't know	Sometimes	Refusal	Always
Women	51%	5%	30%	14%	59%	0%	32%	0%	9%
Men	42%	4%	36%	18%	58%	1%	26%	2%	13%
Total	47%	4%	33%	16%	58%	0%	29%	1%	12%

Regarding the frequency of participation (Table 6) in the decision-making process within the community, the above tables reveal that the assertion "never" is at the head in the beneficiary communities (59%) and in the comparison communities (45%). As for the beneficiary communities, the proportion of women who say, "never," is higher (67%), than men (52%). Similarly, the proportion of women who say, "always," is lower (3%) than men (18%). Finally, and surprisingly, the proportion of people in the comparison communities who say, "always," is double that of the beneficiary communities.

On the subject of frequency of representation (Table 7), the above table shows that the assertion "never" is at the head in the beneficiary communities (47%) and in the comparison communities (58%), with the proportion being higher in the comparison communities than the beneficiary communities. In addition, the proportion of people who say, "always," in the comparison communities is lower (12%) than in the beneficiary communities (16%). There is no significant difference based on gender. However, in the beneficiary communities, there are more women who say "never" (51%) than men (42%).

Table 8: Satisfaction with decisions taken

	Beneficiary N=223				Comparison N=224			
	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree
Women	56%	14%	10%	20%	48%	26%	19%	7%
Men	53%	15%	11%	21%	56%	28%	12%	5%
Total	54%	15%	10%	21%	52%	27%	15%	6%

With regard to satisfaction with decisions taken, the following differences appear in the above tables: In the comparison communities, the proportion of people who say, "do not agree," is higher (27%) than in the beneficiary communities (15%). In the same manner, the proportion of people who say, "strongly disagree," is lower (6%) than in the beneficiary communities (21%). The differences based on gender are not significant.

Table 9: Capacity¹ to engage with the authorities to solve problems

	Beneficiary N=223		Comparison N=224	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
Women	14%	86%	24%	76%
Men	10%	90%	13%	87%
Total	12%	88%	18%	82%

Regarding the capacity to engage with the authorities in order to find solutions to problems of governance, we see that the proportion of people who say, "yes," (capable) in the beneficiary communities (88%) is slightly higher than in the comparison communities (82%). With regard to gender, it appears that in the beneficiary communities, as in the control communities, the proportion of men who feel themselves capable (answering, "yes") is clearly higher than that of women. Besides, in the comparison communities, the proportion of women who do not feel capable of engaging with the authorities (answering, "no") is almost double (24%) that of the corresponding women in beneficiary communities (14%).

Table 10: Right to participate in the decision-making process

	Beneficiary N=223				Comparison N=223			
	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree
Women	62%	7%	30%	1%	67%	6%	26%	1%
Men	48%	7%	40%	4%	69%	6%	25%	1%
Total	55%	7%	35%	3%	68%	6%	25%	1%

Regarding the right to participate, and the possibility of all members of the community participating in decision making, it appears from the table above that the majority of respondents in the beneficiary communities, as in the control communities, either "agree" or "strongly agree" with this statement (90% in the beneficiary communities and 93% in the comparison communities). This implies that in terms of rights, the members of both these types of communities recognize and are aware of their right to participate in the decision-making process in their communities. However, the proportion of people who recognize this right in the comparison communities is

¹ In the framework of this evaluation, "capacity" signifies the possession of knowledge and competencies and the confidence that this gives to interact with authorities.

slightly superior (93%) to that of the beneficiary communities (90%). It is important to emphasize that the proportion of people who "strongly agree" with this statement in the beneficiary communities (35%) is higher than that of the comparison communities (25%). This can perhaps be explained by the fact that the project has reinforced the confidence of members of the beneficiary communities in their knowledge of their rights. Finally, in the beneficiary communities, the proportion of men who "strongly agree" with this statement (40%) is higher than that of women (30%). This is perhaps in line with the general trend in the evaluation results that show that in terms of knowledge, the level of men's knowledge is higher than that of the women.

Table 11: Knowledge of the decision-making process

	Beneficiary N=223				Comparison N=224			
	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree
Women	32%	39%	2%	28%	51%	21%	22%	5%
Men	24%	42%	1%	33%	45%	27%	20%	8%
Total	28%	40%	1%	30%	48%	25%	21%	7%

Regarding the statement "the decision-making process and the resolution of social problems is known to everyone and decisions are communicated to everyone" it appears from the above table that the proportion of people who "do not agree" or "strongly disagree" with this statement in the beneficiary communities (70%) is more than double that of comparison communities (32%). This would signify that there is no decision-making process that is clearly known in the beneficiary communities. In the comparison communities, the proportion of people who "agree" or "strongly agree" (69%) is double that of the beneficiary communities (29%). This can be explained by the fact that in the comparison communities, the members have knowledge of the traditional systems that the leaders have recourse to, and use, these when there is a problem to be solved. Similarly, the proportion of people who "strongly disagree" (30%) with this statement in the beneficiary communities is significantly higher to that of the control communities (7%). Gender-based differences are not significant.

Table 12: Relationship with Authorities

Relationship with the authorities	Beneficiaries			Comparison		
	Women N=111	Men N=112	Total N= 223	Women N=98	Men N=126	Total N= 224
They do not consider us	36%	36%	36%	32%	36%	34%
They listen to us, but are not always interested in what we tell them	39%	34%	36%	19%	11%	15%

They listen to us, but rarely find solutions to the problems we bring to their notice	17%	23%	20%	18%	17%	17%
They listen to us and find solutions to problems	8%	7%	8%	31%	37%	34%

With regard to relationships with authorities, it appears that a considerable proportion of respondents think that the authorities do not take them into consideration in the beneficiary communities (36%) and in the comparison communities (34%) without much difference based on gender. On the other hand, it is surprising that the proportion of people who think that the authorities listen to them and find solutions to their problems is higher in the comparison communities (34%) than in the beneficiary communities (8%). Finally, the proportion of respondents who think that the authorities listen to them but are not always interested by what they tell them is high in the beneficiary communities (36%) compared to the comparison communities (15%) without much difference based on gender.

Table 13: Level of confidence in the authorities

Level of trust in community authorities	Beneficiary communities			Comparison Communities		
	Men N=112	Women N=111	Total N=223	Men F=98	Women N=126	Total N=224
Very High	8%	5%	6%	6%	3%	5%
High	13%	11%	12%	34%	36%	35%
Medium	40%	46%	43%	26%	36%	30%
Low	13%	9%	11%	23%	19%	21%
Very Low	26%	30%	28%	10%	6%	8%

As for the level of confidence in the authorities, in the beneficiary communities, a low proportion of respondents (12%) have a high level of confidence compared to those in comparison communities (35%). In the same way, there are more respondents who have a very low level of confidence in the beneficiary communities (28%) compared to their counterparts in the comparison communities (8%). Gender-based differences are not significant.

Table 14: Sources of learning for knowledge and perspectives regarding authorities, citizens, rights, duties, etc.

		At School	At Church	From Friends, Family, Acquaintances	Oxfam Project	Other NGO project	Other	Don't know
Beneficiaries	Women N=111	67%	40%	36%	11%	18%	2%	1%

	Men N=112	88%	24%	27%	11%	23%	4%	2%
	Total N=223	77%	32%	31%	11%	21%	3%	1%
Comparison	Women N=98	33%	14%	49%	11%	10%	8%	9%
	Men N=126	48%	5%	45%	11%	12%	6%	7%
	Total N=224	42%	9%	47%	11%	11%	7%	8%

Regarding sources who have influenced the learning and composition of knowledge of rights, liberties, duties and obligations, the above charts show that school is at the top (77%) in the beneficiary communities, followed by church (32%), while in the comparison communities, it is friends, family and acquaintances who lead, with 47%, followed by the school, with 42%.

In the beneficiary communities, as well as comparison communities, the Oxfam project is cited by 11% of the respondents. This effect could be linked to the fact that in many of the comparison communities, Oxfam has implemented other types of programs or projects in the recent past. Since the question does not ask the respondents to specify which project or type of project they are referring to, it is possible that respondents are referring to a project implemented by Oxfam in domains other than governance. In fact, in three of the four comparison communities, Oxfam in the past two years has implemented projects in the fields of education, water, hygiene and sanitation, as well as means of subsistence. In addition, it must be noted that for the two groups, with regard to the source of knowledge or influence, the statement, "*Other NGO Project*," gets a score higher or equal to the statement, "*Oxfam Project*." In the beneficiary communities, 21% gave this response, and in the comparison communities, 11% have replied in this fashion.

b) *Results of qualitative data*

Ability to engage with the authorities

The results of the focus groups indicate that the respondents of the comparison communities lack the knowledge and the tools to engage with the authorities, while the respondents in the beneficiary communities have expressed confidence, but they say that their ability to engage is low. The beneficiaries recognize in a larger proportion that the modalities, such as meetings or petitions, are in place to resolve public problems and that it is the members of local structures as well as the women who participate. But, curiously, the number of people who say that the manner of resolving problems is efficient is higher in the comparison communities than in the beneficiary communities. In addition, in the beneficiary groups as in the comparison ones, the respondents say that they do not meet with the authorities unless there is a problem, and that the frequency of this interaction is irregular, taking place only when there is a problem. When asked how they have put the problem resolution process in place, the majority of respondents of comparison communities mention their ancestors, those in the beneficiary communities mention Oxfam.

Satisfaction with the process and the result of engagement with the authorities

The answers to questions about the satisfaction of communities regarding their interaction with the authorities show a clear difference between the communities. Almost all those who responded in the beneficiary groups feel very satisfied with their interactions, while the majority in the comparison groups say that they are not satisfied. Among the beneficiaries, all say that the authorities respect them and have their respect, as well. However, in the comparison communities, those who say that the authorities do not respect them are almost the same in number as those who say the contrary, and the great majority say that the authorities do not have their respect. These results are a little contradictory with the result that the number who say that their process of resolving problems is efficient is higher in the comparison communities, just as in the beneficiary communities. It is possible that this impression among the beneficiary communities is because of the higher expectations of results from their interactions with the authorities or because they engage more often with the authorities for the resolution of problems than in the comparison communities.

c) Summary of results on the relationship between the citizens and the local authorities

The results of the survey do not clearly indicate that the communities who participated in the Oxfam project have necessarily established closer relationships with the local authorities or a higher level of confidence. On the other hand, the comparison communities are more likely to say that they have confidence in the authorities and that the authorities listen to the citizens and find satisfactory solutions.

In addition, the responses do not show a significant difference in the confidence of men in their capacity to engage with the authorities to find a solution. The large majority say that they are confident. The big difference in both the types of communities is between the confidence of men, which is high, and the confidence of women that is relatively very low in both the groups. At the same time, the responses of the focus groups indicate that the comparison groups do not think that they have the knowledge and the tools necessary to take on the authorities, and among the beneficiaries, they think that their ability is weak.

The responses of the focus groups differ clearly in the survey responses regarding the satisfaction expressed with regard to interactions with the authorities and mutual respect between respondents and authorities. It is possible that this difference is because of the closer and more frequent interaction that the participants in the focus groups in the beneficiary communities had with the authorities during the life of the project. In fact, all the participants in the focus groups are members of governance structures put in place by the project and had interaction with the authorities during the project, while the poll reached out to all the community members including those who were not direct beneficiaries of the project. In these communities, the participants in the mixed focus group were members of the governance committee within the pilot project. It is important to mention that in each community, there were governance structures: 1. change agents (25 members), 2. Women's Forum (15 members) and 3. Committee for Local Development (12 members). The role of these structures was to identify problems, establish priorities, and organize

a mixed meeting each month to which they invited the authorities to bring up a problem specific to the community.

In this role, they would have regularly participated in the meetings and exchanges with the authorities during the life of the project. This experience would probably have affected their opinion on the authorities' commitment. This discovery also tells us that this positive impression among the members of governance structures was not effectively transmitted or diffused by the committee to the community at large.

3. Public Participation of Women and Other Marginalized Groups

Towards the expected output, "the attitudes and social norms relative to the participation of women in making community decisions and in different forms of sexist violence are challenged," the evaluation found that the pilot project produced the following results:

a. Results of Quantitative Data

Table 15: Number of rights and fundamental liberties known by the women compared to the men

		0	1	2	3	4
Beneficiaries	Women N=111	0%	20%	33%	5%	42%
	Men N=112	0%	14%	34%	10%	42%
	Total N=223	0%	17%	33%	8%	42%
Comparison	Women N=98	0%	42%	27%	31%	0%
	Men N=126	0%	56%	18%	18%	9%
	Total= 224	0%	50%	21%	23%	5%

Table 16: Number of legal bases that guarantee rights and fundamental liberties known by the women, as compared to the men

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Beneficiaries	Women N=111	29%	41%	18%	9%	4%	0%	0%	0%
	Men N=112	19%	21%	20%	7%	15%	3%	6%	10%
	Total N=223	22%	28%	19%	7%	11%	2%	4%	6%
Comparison	Women N=98	70%	25%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Men N=126	69%	26%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

	Total=224	69%	26%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
--	------------------	-----	-----	----	----	----	----	----	----

Table 17: Number of duties and responsibilities of citizens known by the women, as compared to the men

		0	1	2	3	4	5
Beneficiaries	Women N=111	0%	40%	21%	5%	34%	0%
	Men N=112	0%	25%	30%	4%	38%	2%
	Total N=223	0%	32%	26%	5%	36%	1%
Comparison	Women N=98	0%	86%	7%	7%	0%	0%
	Men N=126	0%	76%	17%	7%	0%	0%
	Total=224	0%	80%	13%	7%	0%	0%

Table 18: Number of rights and obligations of the government known by the women, as compared to the men

		0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Beneficiaries	Women N=111	0%	24%	23%	12%	4%	38%	0%
	Men N=112	0%	12%	26%	15%	7%	37%	2%
	Total N=223	0%	17%	25%	14%	6%	37%	1%
Comparison	Women N=98	0%	44%	38%	9%	6%	4%	0%
	Men N=126	0%	41%	40%	10%	9%	0%	0%
	Total=224	0%	42%	39%	10%	8%	2%	0%

The responses to a series of questions on their knowledge of rights and duties of citizens and the state shows that the respondents of beneficiary communities are clearly better informed on the subject. For each question, the participants of beneficiary communities give a larger number of correct responses than those of comparison communities. The women in the beneficiary communities show a stronger knowledge relative to the men and women in the comparison communities. But in a comparison between the responses of men and women in the beneficiary communities, the correct responses by women are fewer than the correct responses of men. It is possible that the activities to raise awareness in these communities were not as effective in communicating with the women, or that the women were not in the same position or circumstances as the men (time, traditions and cultures, prejudices, project participation, level of

education, etc.) to grasp, understand and internalize concepts regarding duties and obligations of the government.

This is true to the extent that the familial and social burdens of the women in the rural areas of DRC do not give them enough time to participate actively in the same way that men did in the developmental activities of raising awareness and training. Besides, the often limited level of women's education in the rural areas of the DRC could also limit the acquisition of new knowledge when compared to the men.

Table 19: Opinion on the equality of rights and obligations between men and women

	Beneficiary N=223				Comparison N=224			
	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree
Women	37%	4%	54%	5%	53%	10%	37%	0%
Men	39%	5%	54%	2%	56%	10%	28%	6%
Total	38%	4%	54%	4%	55%	10%	32%	4%

With regard to the affirmation "in our community, the women should have the same rights and obligations as the men," the charts above show that 92% of the respondents either agree or strongly agree with this statement in the beneficiary communities, against 88% in the control communities. There is no significant difference based on gender.

Table 20: Opinion on the equality of opportunities for men and women to participate in the decision-making process

	Beneficiary N=223				Comparison N=224			
	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree
Women	44%	1%	54%	1%	49%	12%	38%	1%
Men	41%	5%	54%	0%	56%	10%	25%	9%
Total	43%	3%	54%	0%	53%	11%	30%	5%

With regard to the affirmation, "The women should have the same opportunities as the men to participate in decision-making within the community," the charts above show that the proportion of persons who agree or strongly agree in the beneficiary communities is high (97%), compared to the control communities, with 83%. Here as well, there is no significant gender-based difference.

Table 21: Opinion on the equality of opportunities for men and women in occupying positions of leadership in the community

	Beneficiary N=223				Comparison N=224			
	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree
Women	40%	0%	59%	1%	49%	11%	40%	0%

Men	39%	1%	58%	2%	60%	10%	25%	6%
Total	39%	0%	59%	1%	55%	10%	32%	3%

As for the affirmation, "The women should have the same chances as the men to occupy leadership positions within the community," the charts show that in the beneficiary communities almost all the respondents (98%) agree or strongly agree with this statement, against 87% in the control communities. With regard to gender, quite an important difference is seen in the control communities in the gender variable, with 40% of women who strongly agree with this affirmation, against 25% of men.

Table 22: Opinion on the equality of men and women in being good leaders

Row Labels	Beneficiary N=223				Comparison N=224			
	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Do Not Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree
Women	29%	3%	68%	1%	50%	7%	41%	2%
Men	37%	1%	62%	1%	59%	9%	28%	5%
Grand Total	33%	2%	65%	1%	55%	8%	33%	4%

As for the statement, "The women can be as good leaders as men are," the data shows that almost all the respondents (98%) either agree or strongly agree with this statement in the beneficiary communities, as opposed to 88% in the control communities. With regard to the gender variable, the proportion of women who strongly agree with this affirmation is higher than the men who responded in both the beneficiary and control communities.

Table 23: Frequency of participation in the decision-making process

Frequency of participation in the decision-making process	Beneficiary communities			Comparison Communities		
	Men N= 112	Women N=111	Total N=223	Men N=126	Women N=98	Total N=224
Never	59%	67%	52%	45%	45%	45%
Sometimes	30%	30%	30%	33%	36%	34%
Always	18%	3%	10%	20%	19%	20%

At the same time, the proportion of women who say that they "always" participate in the decision-making process is notably lower in the beneficiary communities at 3%, than in the control communities, at 19%. Among the beneficiaries, 67% of the women say that they "never" participate, against 45% in the comparison communities.

Table 24: The most important source influencing the learning/composition of knowledge and perspectives on women's role and leadership

		At the School	At the Church	From Friends, Family, Acquaintances	Oxfam Project	Other NGO project	Other	Don't know
Beneficiaries	Women N=111	62%	47%	36%	13%	27%	4%	0%
	Men N=112	79%	34%	30%	18%	26%	8%	0%
	Total N=223	71%	40%	33%	15%	26%	6%	0%
Comparison	Women N=98	59%	3%	29%	14%	9%	8%	7%
	Men N=126	58%	9%	33%	17%	12%	6%	4%
	Total= 224	58%	6%	31%	16%	11%	7%	5%

With regard to the sources that have influenced the learning and composition of knowledge about women's roles and leadership, school comes at the top in both groups of communities (71%). It is interesting to note that the Oxfam project gets almost the same level of responses (15%) in the beneficiary communities as in the comparison communities (16%). It is possible that in the comparison communities, the respondents allude to projects implemented by Oxfam in fields other than governance. The assertion "Other NGO Project" obtains 26% in the beneficiary communities, against 11% in the control communities.

b) Results of qualitative data

Generally, the responses of the focus groups to the questions linked to public participation by women and other marginalized groups indicates a significant difference in the perception of rights and the ability of members from these groups to play a role in public life and in governance. In the beneficiary groups, a significant number of people recognize that these groups have the same role as others in public participation, which is missing among the comparison groups. The number of people who cite women, disabled people and "everyone" as people involved in public decision-making is much higher in the beneficiary communities than among the comparison communities.

While the large majority in the comparison communities recognizes the role of women to be "cultivating the fields," many in the beneficiary groups say that it is to participate in decision making, except for a single person who said, "The same as the men."

The qualitative data indicates that in the two types of communities, the respondents have expressed that their perception of women's roles has recently changed. The difference is that this change is expressed in a unanimous fashion in the beneficiary groups, but almost half the

respondents in the comparison groups have not perceived this change. Another difference is that, for the beneficiary communities, this perception changed three or fewer years ago, but for the respondents in the comparison groups, it is more than three years.

c. Summary of results of quantitative and qualitative data

The poll respondents and the focus groups show that there is a clear difference between the beneficiary communities and the comparison communities. While responding to a series of survey questions on the rights and capacities of women, the men and women said they strongly agree with the notion that women have the right to the same opportunities as the men, and, as leaders, could be as effective. In fact, when answering the last question, a larger percentage of men (65%) said that they strongly agree, compared to the women (62%).

One response inconsistent with the others is that a clear majority of beneficiary community respondents said that the rights and duties of women are not the same as those of the men, while the responses by the comparison communities do not show such a clear take on the question.

Local Authorities

The evaluation also tried to understand the perspective of local authorities responsible for the beneficiary communities and their counterparts in the comparison communities. According to the methodology used, the evaluation collected only qualitative data through individual interviews with the formal authorities, which means that all the data is qualitative. In the eight communities, 13 authorities were interviewed. All of these were men. Among them, seven were new authorities who did not participate in the project.

1. Knowledge Pertaining to Protection Governance

The majority of respondents among the authorities responsible (five of the seven who answered this question) for the comparison communities recognize that there is a civil society committee active in the village, in addition to the non-government associations and organization. The fact that the authorities are aware that there is an active structure responsible for issues of governance indicates that the authorities pay attention to this committee and its activities. Curiously, none of the authorities in the beneficiary communities mentions such a committee. Rather, they mention the church and the NGOs as active civil society structures. This tells us that the governance committee established with the support of the project is not very active or is not very visible to the authorities.

The authorities in both types of communities recognize that they have obligations toward the citizens. They express this in larger number among the beneficiary groups and list a greater variety of these obligations, with the primary one being, "protect the citizens." No authorities among the comparison communities gives this response as one of their obligations. Regarding the rights and duties of citizens, there is a clear difference between responses. The authorities of beneficiary communities identify a variety of rights, especially "to life" and "to information," while there are only two responses in the comparison communities, including one authority who

responded that "citizens have no rights." But there is no comparable difference in the identification of duties of citizens—both groups concluded that they were "respect the law" and "pay taxes."

When asked who has the responsibility to solve social problems, many authorities in the beneficiary communities answered that it is the state that is responsible. Not a single authority in the comparison communities gave this answer. The other responses were the same in the two groups: "the population" or "the entire community," "partners" and "NGOs." When asked what they do to resolve problems, the authorities of comparison communities say they meet together, but also say that there is no specific mechanism for this process. The authorities of the beneficiary communities are less clear on what they do to resolve problems, despite their acknowledgment that they have this responsibility.

When asked how their community put a process in place to find a solution to social problems, there is a clear difference in the responses: The respondents of beneficiary communities all mention the Oxfam project; those in the comparison communities say that this process is in place since the time of their ancestors. This discovery is what was expected following the implementation of the pilot project. One of the main results of the project was the establishment of a governance committee that meets and has regular exchanges with the authorities. It is notable that, as explained above, the authorities in these communities do not recognize a "specific community," but rather a "process," which reinforces the impression that the problem solving process has lasted, but the structure is no longer regularly active or very visible to the authorities.

2. Public Participation and Relationship between Citizens and Local Authorities

The authorities' responses to questions about their interaction with citizens do not show a clear difference between the groups. The respondents of both groups mention a consultation process as the means of interaction, and neither one nor the other group responds clearly on the frequency of this interaction. Similarly, both groups unanimously say, "yes," to trusting the citizens and the majority says that the citizens trust the authorities.

3. Public Participation of Women and Other Marginalized Groups

When asked, "Who participates in the process for resolving public problems?" the respondents among the authorities of beneficiary communities, as well the comparison communities, say in larger numbers that it is the whole community. Both also mention women, old people and the authorities. It is only those among the beneficiaries who mention the youth.

Respondents from both groups say, in the same number, that women are in leadership positions in their community, and that they take part in the decision-making process. Both groups say, unanimously or in majority, that their perspective on the role of women has changed recently. But the respondents of beneficiary communities say that this change happened two or three years ago, while the respondents in the comparison communities say that it has been more than three years.

SECTION III: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

In this section, we will analyze, discuss, interpret and explain the results of the evaluation presented in the preceding section.

Knowledge

It is clearly visible from the results of the evaluation that there is a difference in knowledge of citizens who responded from beneficiary communities as compared to those from comparison communities. This difference appears in the responses to the poll and in the focus groups. In the communities that participated in the Oxfam project, the citizens who participated in the evaluation are a lot more inclined to talk about the role of citizens in the governing process, such as participating, being informed and organizing themselves. They have much clearer understanding of the rights and duties of citizens and the obligations of the authorities towards the citizens.

Citizen-State Relationship

The respondents of beneficiary communities more often express satisfaction with their relationship with authorities and express having confidence in the authorities. The results of the evaluation do not clearly indicate that the Oxfam project helped the beneficiary communities to establish and maintain a regular process of consultation between a governing structure and the local authorities. Neither the responses to the surveys nor the citizens' focus groups clearly indicate that the communities have a structure in place that meets regularly with local authorities to consult and collaborate for resolving problems of governance. This impression is confirmed by the responses of the authorities, which indicates that in the two groups, there is no systematic interaction with citizens to identify and resolve problems.

In addition, the respondents of beneficiary communities do not show that the citizens have any more confidence in their capacity to effectively interact with the authorities than those in the comparison communities. Even if the respondents in the focus groups of the beneficiary communities recognize that they have the knowledge and the tools to do so—while no one in the comparison communities does—all the respondents in the beneficiary communities say that their capacity is weak. The women say that they have less confidence in their capacity than the men.

Based on their responses, it looks like the local authorities in the beneficiary communities had perhaps improved their knowledge of citizens' rights and their obligations towards the citizens, including the responsibility of resolving social problems. But the Oxfam project does not seem to have had a notable impact on their interaction with the citizens or on their perception of the role and capacity of women in public life. The turnover of more than half the authorities who responded could have contributed to his effect, but it does not explain it fully. Actually, the authorities who participated in the project in the beneficiary communities at least admit the existence of a governance structure and know about the modalities of engagement, even if these modalities are not effectively implemented; the authorities who did not participate in the project are not aware of the existence of the governance structures in their communities. In both cases, the interaction between these structures and the authorities is not effective, even if this aggravates the situation in the communities where the authorities have not participated in the project, as they are unaware

that these structures exist. It is also possible that the project was effective in raising awareness and transmitting new information and ideas, but not so in changing the behavior or the habitual relationship between the authorities and the citizens and in their engagement.

With regard to participation and engagement, it must be underlined that the project strategy had planned that, after identifying problems and establishing priorities, the governance structures should organize a meeting each month where they invite the authorities to take up a specific problem in the community and put a plan of action in place that lays out responsibilities. Besides, during a learning workshop organized at the end of the project, it was also proposed that the authorities have the responsibility of organizing social dialog days every trimester and inviting all the stakeholders. However, the results of the evaluation do not indicate that the different stakeholders (authorities and governance structures) took up this responsibility at the end of the project. During the implementation of the project, the project had, in fact, facilitated engagement and participation; in context, this could have been linked to the fragile state in which the project was implemented.

Women's Participation

The survey responses also show that the respondents in the beneficiary communities are more inclined to recognize women's rights and their public role. But the negative response of the majority in the focus groups to the question, "Are the rights and duties of the men equal to that of women?" which is not compatible with the other answers, raises the question of how deep and coherent this attitude is. The results show that the women in the beneficiary communities have a better knowledge of these than in the comparison communities, but lesser knowledge than the men in the beneficiary communities and in the comparison communities (see Tables 15 to 23). The women in the beneficiary communities systematically give more correct answers to questions testing knowledge, such as those related to rights, duties and legal bases of rights, than the women in comparison communities, and often more than men in the comparison communities. However, they give fewer correct answers than the men in the beneficiary villages. But the results do not clearly show the real role that the women play in public life. The responses in the focus groups in beneficiary communities indicate that the women participate in the process of governance, and that women and other often-marginalized people have the same role as the others in the process. However, the survey answers indicate that very few women say that they always participate in decisions and they are far fewer in the beneficiary communities than in the comparison communities.

SECTION IV: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions

This evaluation was conducted by combining qualitative and quantitative techniques. This allowed the collection of valuable data measuring the effects of the project and their durability.

The evaluation does not definitively indicate that the WWS pilot project achieved its desired result of increasing both citizen-state engagement and positive actions that resolve public problems. Nevertheless, at the expected output level, the evaluation shows us several lasting effects of the project.

The comparative approach of the evaluation shows that the pilot project achieved, in a certain measure, the output expected that the communities become better informed of their rights and the obligations of the authorities because of the project. The results of the evaluation show that a clear difference between the beneficiary communities and the comparison communities exists when it comes to knowledge. However, the evaluation does not disclose a difference between beneficiary communities and comparison communities regarding citizen participation and engagement.

On the other hand, with regard to the project expectation that citizens would have acquired "the knowledge, competencies, and the confidence necessary to engage in a positive dialog with local authorities," the evaluation shows mixed results. The beneficiaries acknowledge having better knowledge and competencies, but they seem to lack the confidence to use these regularly. Similarly, for the expected output that the authorities become "more receptive and committed" in engaging with the citizens because of the project, the evaluation shows that the authorities are better aware of the rights of citizens and the obligations of the state, which could render them "more receptive" to interacting with citizens. It is, however, not clear from the results that they are "more committed." There is no significant difference between the two groups when it comes to the systematic functioning of governance mechanisms. The authorities do not recognize a specific structure or a regular process for citizen-state dialog. In the two groups, these mechanisms for interaction exist in some way or the other, but they are not regularly scheduled. Their functioning is linked to the existence of a problem to be solved.

Regarding the change in attitudes and norms relative to women's participation in public life that the project intended as an output, the evaluation shows that the project probably contributed to a change in attitudes on women's rights and their potential to participate more actively. But the results do not clearly show that it has led to a change in norms and practices. It does not appear as if the women exercise their rights and potential more, or more visibly, due to the project.

Implications

The results of the evaluation suggest that some of the important hypotheses of the program's theory of change do not necessarily hold true in implementation on the ground. The theory is based on the supposition that if the citizens and the authorities have the capability to identify public problems and have a space to meet and discuss, a regular dialog between them would occur. But the evaluation shows that although they have the capacity, even if it is weak, and they have established a regular consultation process, this practice does not last. This discovery indicates that it is possible that changing knowledge and introducing a space are not sufficient. Something is missing: greater capacity, especially with regard to the level of confidence, a stronger motivation that pushes the two sides to maintain a regular dialog, or something else.

The results show that the better opinion that the members of the governance committee have of the authorities, perhaps due to their more regular and more positive interaction through monthly dialogs, does not extend to the general population. It is not clear that the population of beneficiary communities is aware of the work of the committee and the positive contribution of the authorities, which is appreciated by the committee but not by the community.

The evaluation shows us that the project's approach to strengthen capabilities was effective in improving knowledge and competencies, but it seems to be less effective in increasing confidence.

As for its approach in promoting public participation of women, the evaluation indicates that the project had an effect on both men's and women's attitudes, but not necessarily on the norms and practices which result in real participation of women in public life. To change norms and practices, it seems necessary to go beyond the project's efforts. For example, to support a more active and visible public participation by women, it will be necessary to put more of an accent on demonstrating women's capabilities and the exercise of their rights, as "rights in action," than to stay at the level of theoretical knowledge.

Data from this evaluation should allow Oxfam (including all affiliates) and other actors who work in the community governance domain to understand the successes, challenges and limits of interventions in this domain, with a view to developing strategies for improvement.

LESSONS LEARNED

Through this evaluation, the following lessons have been identified:

- In terms of costs of the addition, the quantitative approach cost about \$5,361, while the qualitative approach cost \$3,760. But from the beginning to the end of the project, including data analysis, Oxfam staff nearly twice as much time on the qualitative part as the quantitative component; Oxfam principally uses the quantitative approach to measure the level of project indicators. Adding the qualitative approach to the quantitative approach requires an increase of approximately 70% of the cost of quantitative research, and, in addition, more than twice the staff time. This is new information that Oxfam can use while budgeting evaluations and studies that require the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, given that currently Oxfam mainly uses quantitative methods in the DRC.
- The replacement of local authorities by new ones in the beneficiary communities has had a perceptibly negative effect on the functioning of the governance mechanisms put in place by the project. In fact, because they had not participated in the project, the new authorities did not have the same dynamism, interest and understanding to keep the governance mechanisms they found functioning.
- Even though the project had included women in all the awareness and training activities, the women did not reach the same level of knowledge as the men.
- The project strategy (bringing the citizens to demand accounts from authorities) and the echoes it created in the beneficiary and comparison communities fostered mistrust between citizens and authorities. In fact, this strategy gave the impression that the Oxfam governance project was a "policing" project. Several authorities (civil, military and police) were subjected to disciplinary measures or dismissal because of protest actions and petitions by the citizens. Such a situation would create a climate of mistrust between citizens and authorities and this could be considered as a negative impact of the project.

As for engagement and participation, the different stakeholders of the project (governance structures and authorities) did not assume their responsibilities in a systematic manner with regard to putting in place engagement, consultation and participation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

At the end of this evaluation, and considering the lessons learned, these are the recommendations formulated:

Knowledge

- Conduct more research to better understand the messages and influences of the other sources cited, such as the origin of information, and the norms and practices pertaining to community governance, such as traditions, ancestors, school, church and local associations. The governance programs could benefit from these influencing sources to make sure that they are complementary and that they utilize these sources to reinforce attitudes and practices of good governance and positive social change.
- Examine the reasons that women have not reached the same level of knowledge on governance and protection issues as the men. Try to revise the methodology or training and awareness techniques to ensure that the women can learn up to the same level as the men.

Citizen-State Relationship

- Help communities to establish and maintain a regular and systematic citizen-state consultation process. Research the beneficiary communities in depth to better understand why they do not continue to meet regularly once a month with the authorities, identify the obstacles that hinder this habitual practice. Seek to better understand what is necessary to motivate citizens on one side, and authorities on the other to push them to maintain continuous and open dialog between them.
- Do not limit the consultation process uniquely to identifying problems and resolving them. Help citizens and authorities understand that these regular consultations also help them maintain trust. This process gives the opportunity and the mechanism for citizens to participate in public dialog, transparency and accountability of authorities; to help exchange information and avoid problems and conflicts; furnishes a mechanism to encourage and organize civic engagement, etc. All these opportunities are lost if they think of meeting and consulting with each other only when a specific problem is identified.
- Help citizens and authorities evaluate and improve the efficacy of their consultation process to make sure that the process is effective and is worth the effort invested. If it loses its effectiveness, it loses its value, and the members would stop coming.
- Increase attention and encouragement given to authorities to help them appreciate the advantages of inviting and facilitating political and civic participation, and help them develop the confidence and the tools to do so. As far as possible, encourage a better appreciation, among authorities at the local level and higher in the hierarchy at the territorial and provincial level, for the advantages of improved trust and collaboration with citizens.
- Support the governance/protection committee in having more effective communication and accountability with the community to keep the general population updated on their role, their activities, the relationships established with the authorities and the efforts they make together.
- Recognize that frequent turnover of authorities is a fact in the DRC, and that it endangers the durability of the effects of local governance improvement efforts. Seek to better institutionalize

the capacity and the assimilation of authorities for the process of engagement with citizens, so as not to depend entirely on individuals.

- Reinforce the process of rendering the stakeholders (governance structures and authorities) autonomous and responsible, and strengthen their assimilation of project gains to ensure durability.
- Improve communication about the project, its strategy, its objectives and its validity for the beneficiary communities to avoid the type of disinformation that made certain people (among the authorities) think that the WWS project was a "police project."

Women's Participation

- Create opportunities for women to show their leadership and their competence in public life and to make their potential for participation and active contribution visible in order to promote a change in norms as well as attitudes.
- Engage men more actively in challenging stereotypes and discriminatory attitudes towards women.
- Follow up more with women and men of participating communities to better understand the weaknesses that they perceive in the knowledge, tools and confidence necessary to interact with the authorities. Help them to find the means to reinforce the capacity or confidence that they think they lack.
- Pay more deliberate attention to the participation by young people, young women, ethnic minorities and disabled persons.

Follow-up, Evaluation, Learning

- When possible, use a mixed methods approach for project impact evaluations and important programs to have a better estimation of the participants' experience and the effects of the project/program. Make sure that the cost estimation and budgeting in terms of necessary staff time are correct and that the deadlines are realistic.