
THE AFRICAN UNION MEDIATION SUPPORT CAPACITY PROJECT

Evaluation Report of Phase II

Final Report
January 26th 2015

Raisa Venäläinen
Oury Traore

Table of Content

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS & ACRONYMS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1. CONTEXTUAL FRAMEWORK	7
1.1. AU and the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA).....	7
1.2. Project Description	8
1.3. Previous Evaluation.....	9
2. EVALUATION.....	10
2.1. Objectives of the Evaluation	10
2.2. Methodology.....	10
3. FINDINGS	11
3.1. Relevance	11
3.2. Effectiveness	13
3.2.1. Operational Support to Mediation.....	13
3.2.2. Lessons Learned and Sharing of Good Practises (AU, CMI).....	15
3.2.3. Capacity Building, Training and Development	16
3.3. Efficiency.....	19
3.4. Impact.....	21
3.5. Sustainability	22
3.6. Coordination and Coherence.....	23
4. CONCLUSIONS	24
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	25

ANNEXES:

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Annex 2: Persons and Organizations Consulted

Annex 3: Documents Reviewed

Annex 4: Performance Matrix

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS & ACRONYMS

ACCORD	African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes
AGA	African Governance Architecture
AU	African Union
AUC	African Union Commission
AUPG	African Union Partners Group
APSA	African Peace and Security Architecture
AULO	African Union Liaison Office
ASF	African Standby Force
CAR	Central African Republic
CEWS	Continental Early Warning System
CMD	Conflict Management Division
CMI	Crisis Management Initiative
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EASF	East African Standby Force
ECCAS	Economic Community of Central African States
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EU	European Union
FOMAC	Economic Community of Central African States
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
HD	Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue
HR	Human Resources
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
JFA	Joint Funding Agreement
JSC	Joint Steering Committee
KMF	Knowledge Management Framework
LOs	Liaison Offices
MARAC	Early Warning Mechanism of Central Africa
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NARC	North Africa Regional Capability
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations

OAU	Organizations of African Unity
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation
PAD	Political Affairs Department
PD	Project Document
PMC	Project Management Committee
PoW	Panel of the Wise
PSD	Peace and Security Department
PSC	Peace and Security Council
PSO	Peace Support Operation
PSOD	Peace Support Operations Division
ToR	Terms of Reference
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SSR	Security Sector Reform
RBM	Results-Based Management
RECs	Regional Economic Communities
RMs	Regional Mechanisms
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The African Union (AU) Mediation Support Capacity Project Phase II was implemented by three partners during the period of 2012 – 2014 - the African Union Conflict Management Division (AU CMD), the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD), and the Crisis Management Initiative (CMI).

The aim of the project was to strengthen the operational capacity of the African Union (AU) in mediation and to consolidate the gains made during Phase I of the project. The project focused on Operational Support to Mediation; Lessons Learned and Sharing of Good Practise as well as Training, Capacity Building and Development.

The purpose of this End-Term Evaluation was to assess the performance of the project and make recommendations on its possible continuation. The evaluation was carried-out from November to December 2014. Field work was undertaken in Helsinki, Addis Ababa, Pretoria, and Durban.

The Evaluation Team considers that the AU Mediation Capacity Support Project is relevant because the contemporary African peace and security landscape is characterized by conflict in its various configurations, and this environment requires that the AU and the RECs/RMs develop a dedicated architecture towards strengthening conflict prevention and mediation. Peace and security have an impact on poverty reduction and realization of human rights, which are key objectives of the Finnish development cooperation policy. The project enjoys high level of political support both in the AU and in the MFA. However, its visibility has been low. There is limited awareness about its activities and achievements among the development partners and even within other AU departments.

This project has delivered most of its planned deliverables, and has achieved its objectives. Activities have been carried-out with several AU Liaison Offices and RECs in more than ten (10) African countries to broaden awareness on mediation. The demands on the Project for mediation support have steadily increased and taken different shapes, which in turn have put some pressure on the implementation plans of Phase II. As a response to these increased demands, the project has provided flexibility to introduce new activities and operational preventive measures emerging from the needs and conflict situations in the Central African Republic (CAR) and in Mali.

There are concerns about the sustainability of the project activities and outcomes. Currently the project is fully financed by the MFA and it is evident that the AU is not yet ready to contribute financially. An AU Mediation Unit with a full staff capacity should be the nucleus of sustainability of mediation capacity within the institution, but currently there is no permanent staff. Therefore, AU should ensure that qualified and permanent staff is recruited and capacitated. Although gender issues are tackled by the project activities, a more systematic approach in all activities undertaken by the project would support full mainstreaming. The Project Management could also seek for synergy benefits and enhance horizontal learning between the partners.

In response to the evaluation findings, the evaluation team made the following recommendations:

- It is recommended to the MFA to continue financing the Mediation Capacity Development Project. In 2015 MFA should explore the Joint Funding Arrangements targeted to AU Capacity Development as an alternative or complementary funding modality. This would support the integration of the project into the broader AU capacity development activities and programmes.

- The AU should ensure sufficient permanent staffing in the AU's Mediation Unit with the right expertise and resources.
- The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of the project should be improved. It should be built in a Results-based manner with clearly defined objectives which indicate whose mediation capacities will be developed. The M&E framework should include measurable output and outcome (and impact) indicators disaggregated by gender. The reporting should focus on the achievement of the objectives and not only to the implementation of the activities.
- The project should develop a comprehensive sustainability strategy. It should improve its visibility and dissemination.
- ACCORD should carry on with the training activities. The training packages should be more strategic and results-oriented. Trainings should be informed by a need analysis, and appropriate sequencing of measures which should focus not only on enhancing individual capacity, but also on organizational change and transformation.
- The CMI should ensure that operational mediation support activities contribute in a sustainable way to the AU Capacity Development objective.

The vision of this project is to create a critical mass of individuals and institutions on standby to support peace mediation processes being undertaken by the AU, or the RECs in Africa. This will require strengthening the capacity of mediation thematic experts in core areas such as power and wealth sharing, elections, constitutionalism, transitional justice, Security Sector Reform (SSR), gender issues, etc. These individuals and institutions can be deployed to support the AU mediation processes or to provide analytical, technical and operational supports. There is a need to develop skills in those thematic areas.

The African Union Mediation Support Capacity Project, Phase II

1. CONTEXTUAL FRAMEWORK

1.1. AU and the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA)

When establishing the African Union (AU) in 2002, its Member States entrusted the organization with a broad political mandate in the area of conflict prevention, management, resolution and peace building. The AU and the African Economic Communities or Regional Mechanisms (REC/RMs) have since made a commitment to take practical steps to address the peace and security challenges in Africa through African-owned and African-led initiatives.

Today, the AU is recognized as an integral partner in the promotion of peace and stability on the continent, and among the repertoire of approaches that are adopted, mediation is a critical component of its strategies towards promoting peace, security and stability. However, the AU has delivered mixed results in executing its mandate in mediation in Africa. Success stories of the AU's efforts in mediation include the mediations in Mozambique, Namibia and to some extent in Burundi, and Kenya which resulted in the signing of important peace agreements. Despite these successes, there are also cases which reflect the AU's continuing challenges in mediation, and these include South Sudan, Cote d'Ivoire, Libya, DRC and Somalia, among others. The considerable number of failed peace agreements on the continent is also a testimony that mediation approaches need to be strengthened in the African peace and security institutions such as the AU, the RECs/RMs, and even further decentralized at national levels to involve Civil Society organizations (CSOs).

As a structural and long-term response to the African peace and security challenges, a comprehensive and dynamic African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) were drafted. The APSA consists of several components, structures and themes, in particular an AU Peace and Security Council (PSC), which is its central decision-making body; a Continental Early Warning System (CEWS); a 'Panel of the Wise' (PoW), with a mandate in conflict prevention and resolution, and an African Standby Force (ASF) to be deployed in peace support operations. The restructuring of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to the African Union (AU) in 2002 was an important milestone towards the development of the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) and the facilitation of collaboration between the continental body and its Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and Regional Mechanisms (RMs).

APSA includes the AU Peace and Security Council (PSC) with most of its supporting mechanisms in mediation including the African Union Commission (AUC), the AU Special Envoys, the AU Panel of the Wise (PoW) and similar mechanisms at the level of the RECs. Towards ensuring that these mechanisms fulfil their mandate in mediation, the AU adopted several policies and frameworks including the African Governance Architecture (AGA), the *AU Constitutive Act* and the *Protocol leading to the establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union (2002)*. Article 4(e), of the Constitutive Act calls for the "peaceful resolution of conflicts among Member States of the Union through such appropriate means as may be decided upon by the Assembly." Similarly, Article 3 of the *Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union* stipulates the importance of conflict prevention as a core value of the AU.

A key element of the APSA and the RECs/RMs are their mandates to engage in mediation. Some of the RECs/RMs have adopted similar normative frameworks. For example, the *Economic Community of West African States* (ECOWAS) has adopted the Protocol Relating to the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management, Resolution, Peace-making, Peacekeeping and Security (1999) and the *Southern African Development Community* (SADC) the Protocol on Politics, Defence and Security (2001).

1.2. Project Description

The African Union Mediation Support Capacity Project aims at strengthening and enhancing the mediation support capacity of the African Union (AU). The project is a joint intervention, implemented by three partners, namely the African Union Conflict Management Division (AU CMD), the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD), and the Crisis Management Initiative (CMI). It supports a larger AU initiative which involves the UN Mediation Support Unit and several other partners through the AU – United National (UN) Programme of Cooperation in Mediation, including the *AU Mediation Framework for 2012 – 2014*. This project is funded by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.

African Union Mediation Support Capacity Project was first launched in 2009. The *overall goal* of the Phase II, which commenced in August 2012, is to strengthen the mediation support capacity of the AU to resolve conflicts through more gender sensitive, efficient, and effective AU mediation interventions.


The specific *Project Objectives* are:

- 1) To enhance the AU's mediation support capacity to plan, deploy, manage and monitor mediation interventions;
- 2) To enhance the AU's capacity to identify lessons and best practises on conflict prevention and peace mediation efforts; and
- 3) To strengthen internal systems and procedures in support of AU mediation interventions.

The above objectives are realized through the implementation of activities under three focus areas (also referred as Components) which are in line with the overall AU 2012 – 2014 Mediation Framework: Operational Support in Mediation; Lessons Learned and Sharing of Good Practise and Capacity Building, Training, and Development.

The primary beneficiary of the Project is the African Union (AU). The project partners share the overall responsibility of Focus Area One while the AU and CMI share the responsibility of Focus Area Two. ACCORD has the overall responsibility for Focus Area Three. Responsibilities of each party are defined on the Project Document (PD). The hierarchy of the objectives of the project, key deliverables and responsibilities are illustrated in the picture below.

The total MFA funding for the AU Mediation Project is 3.0 million Euro for the project period 2012-2014. The MFA has two separate funding agreements for the Project, one with the AU CMD and another with ACCORD. ACCORD is the contracting party with the CMI. The share of funding is defined on contracts and project budget as follows: 1,965,690 Euro for ACCORD and CMI, and 1,034,309 Euro for the AU CMD.



1.3. Previous Evaluation

A Mid-Term-Evaluation (MTE) of Phase I was carried-out in 2011. This evaluation revealed that the AU Mediation Support Capacity Project was relevant and timely because of the pressing needs for sustainable peace and stability. MTE also revealed that the AU was in need of expertise to provide services and support in mediation on regular and sustainable basis. The report encouraged the continued support of Finland as a way to strengthen the building blocks of a robust and professional mediation unit within the AU. The evaluation also stated that the training courses organized by the project have contributed significantly to the existing capacity of the AU in mediation.

The MTE recommended to continue supporting the wider UN-AU capacity building programme and to further improving the cooperation and information sharing between all relevant parties. It suggested that the development of guidelines for cooperation between the AU and the UN as well as with the RECs was found very critical for the overall success of the Project. The MTE also proposed strengthening the cooperation between the AU and RECs and to continue the training of thematic experts and AU staff. Recommendations were made to improve the monitoring and reporting framework and to ensure that women's integration into the process remains a high priority and it that training activities should be developed to ensure their active participation in mediation.

2. EVALUATION

2.1. Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation is commissioned by the partners as a valuable tool for management to enhance programme implementation. It is also expected to inform the Government of Finland and the partners of progress made and lessons learned to date, and towards necessary adjustments required in discussions for a third phase of the project. Thus, the evaluation is expected to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, management and coordination of the project. The objectives of the End-Term Evaluation were to:

1. Assess the efficient and effective use of funds by the project in relation to the work plans;
2. Assess the expected and unexpected outcomes achieved in terms of needs, relevance and appropriateness, and the contribution the project has made towards strengthening the mediation capacity of the AU;
3. Assess the sustainability of the project and determine if the benefits produced can be maintained after the termination of external support;
4. Provide concrete proposals to enhance the relevance, outcome and impact of project initiatives; and
5. Make justified and well founded recommendations on the possible continuation of the project after 2014 and the necessary refinements to ensure maximum impact.¹

2.2. Methodology

The Evaluation Team was comprised of two experts contracted by the MFA and ACCORD. The evaluation process was participatory and involved a great number of key stakeholders from the three implementing organizations, RECs/RMs, and relevant development partners. The following methodologies were used for data collection: document review; interviews; focus group meetings; and questionnaire.

Inception and Document Review: An orientation session was undertaken with the MFA to clarify the expectations of the client, agree on the objectives of the evaluation and to identify key stakeholders who should participate in the evaluation process. After an initial document review, an inception report was prepared in accordance with the MFA Evaluation Guidelines. A thorough document review was carried-out to help the consultants understand the context of the project and the activities implemented.

¹ The specific evaluation questions are presented in the ToR in Annex 1.

This document review included project reports, project documents, operational procedures, manuals, budgets, working papers, proposals, strategy documents, publications, audit report, etc.

Data Collection: Various stakeholders and beneficiaries were engaged in the evaluation process including key stakeholders from MFA, the AU PSD, ACCORD, CMI, some of the RECs/RMs and some of the participants from the various training carried-out during the cycle of the project. *Semi-structured interviews* were carried-out with AU CMD and PSD, CMI, MFA and ACCORD. Interviews were also carried-out with the Finland Embassies in Pretoria and Addis Ababa, participants from the various training, a board member of ACCORD, CMI Regional Representative and other development partners. Group discussions were held at both ACCORD and CMI to examine the evaluation questions including issues such as the effectiveness, efficiency and impacts of the Mediation Support Capacity Project. A questionnaire with 12 items was designed and administered to fifty four (54) participants of the training via email. The consultants received feedback from 17 participants.²

Report writing: A draft report was submitted to the MFA. A Debriefing meeting was held in the MFA on 14th January 2015. Based on the feedback, the report was finalized.

Limitations: The consultants' Team couldn't meet as planned because of the delay with visa of the African Consultant, but the Team worked via email and Skype. The Team did not have an opportunity to interview all intended Officials in the MFA and AU, for instance the Team did not meet the AU resource person El Ghassim Wane.

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Relevance

This section presents the policy relevance of the Mediation Capacity Development Project both from the Finnish and AU's perspectives and needs. Also the relevance of the selected strategies will be discussed.

The 2012 Finnish Government underscored mediation as a central issue in its development policy. Finland is very much committed to mediation and together with Turkey has established a *Group of Friends of Mediation* to intensify cooperation in peace mediation among nations, international bodies and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). The aim of the Finnish Development Cooperation Programme (2012) is to promote human rights, democracy and accountable society by:

- Participating in the international community's efforts to help fragile states towards peace and development and by supporting their state-building.
- Involving women in conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peace-building, in accordance with UN Resolution 1325.
- Supporting peace mediation, in accordance with the approach outlined in the Action Plan for Mediation and exploring the possibilities for flexible use of resources, for example through the establishment of a stabilisation mechanism.

The contemporary African peace and security landscape is characterized by conflict in its various configurations, including election disputes, unconstitutional changes of government, insurgencies, terrorism and violent extremism, maritime security as well as civil wars. In such volatile environment,

² List of persons consulted is in Annex 2

there is an increased appreciation and appetite for mediation, negotiation and dialogue, especially in light of the upcoming presidential and parliamentary elections across the continent in countries such as Burundi (2015), DRC (2016), Uganda (2016) and Rwanda (2016), etc. Past experiences have demonstrated that these elections can be triggered of conflicts as were the case of Kenya in 2011; Zimbabwe in 2008, etc. The understanding of mediation processes and application of its capacity are required to resolving these conflicts. So mediation has become a central tenant of conflict management in Africa as seen through the many on-going peace processes.

The complex conflict landscape described above also requires for the AU and the RECs/RMs to develop a dedicated peace and security architecture towards strengthening conflict prevention and mediation. Thus, the Project is in line with the AU Plans and priorities, including the AU Work Programme (2009-2012) and (2013-2016) which underscore the need for a more proactive approach to conflict.

Furthermore, the debate during the 4th High-Level Retreat of Special Envoys and Representatives of the African Union on the promotion of peace, security and stability in Africa, held in October 2013, focused on strengthening the AU's mediation capacity and conflict resolution mechanisms. An outcome of this Retreat was the Declaration on the AU's Golden Jubilee which called on the AU to take a more proactive approach to conflict by focusing on the development and implementation of prevention and mediation strategies.

One of the key recommendations of the APSA assessment which was conducted in 2010³ was to strengthen cooperation within AU and between the AU and RECs. Also strengthening collaboration with NGOs is also one of the priority areas for the APSA. The project is well aligned in these priorities. This project has contributed to enhancing collaboration between the AU and NGOs such as ACCORD and CMI. Second, the Project has also improved its reach by directly supporting the RECs. This aspect has helped in trying to streamline mediation approaches continentally.

The project is relevant because the process towards professionalising mediation in the AU and RECs is only beginning to materialise. The peace mediation initiatives undertaken by the AU and RECs have been affected by limited skills, insufficient expertise, limited capacity and institutional memory in mediation. Mediators from the AU and RECs have also met several challenges in the field, including the complexity of the context, the proliferation of actors and issues as well as limited institutional arrangements to support their work. Against this background, the need for ensuring that mediation becomes mainstreamed in the AU's promotion of peace and stability is still very crucial and relevant. Therefore, mediation structures and processes need to be embedded in the AU and APSA. While cooperation with the Liaison Offices has increased there is still work to be done to enhancing the cooperation within the APSA structure and the RECs.

Another aspect of the relevance is that the peace and security platform has attracted more than 30 donors and EU being the biggest donor. Some donors implement stand-alone projects, some target their support to the Regional Organizations but also a Joint Funding Agreement (JFA) is established by the Nordic Countries to support the capacity development of the AU.

There has also been a clear evolution of the Project towards supporting more operational initiatives on the continent which is directly responding to, not only the aspiration of the AU, but also to the security threats on the continent (i.e. the work in CAR, Mali, etc.). The project has been able to adapt its

³ African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) Assessment Study. 2010. <http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/RO%20African%20Peace%20and%20Security%20Architecture.pdf>

initiatives according to the dynamics on the continent and this flexibility has allowed the project to continuously focus on key mediation trends on the continent. Mediation has also gained a greater visibility and importance in the peace and security field and greater capacities remain to be imparted through this type of project.

3.2. Effectiveness

As indicated earlier in this report, the project activities fall under three focus areas (components) namely (i) Operational Support to Mediation, (ii) Lessons Learned and Sharing of Good Practises, (ii) Training, Capacity Building and Development. The document analysis showed that each implementing organization reports about their activities separately under each component which –makes it difficult to construct an understanding of the cumulative achievements. It was also observed that while a Results Framework is developed, it does not contain indicators which could be used to track the progress and achievements of the project.

3.2.1. Operational Support to Mediation

The objective of this Focus Area is to *“provide updated and analytical information to support the AU in its prioritization to intervene in conflict or potential conflict situations”*. This focus area is largest in terms of funding as it covers 20% of the activity costs. This objective is relatively well achieved as can be verified from the facts below:

Conflict tracking, mapping and analysis include political analysis and mapping of conflict areas and hotspots and national actors for the AU to engage with, and it serves as support tool to address the conflicts. During the project period, ACCORD focused its efforts in supporting conflict prevention through the *Continental Peace and Security Assessments* in Mali (2013) and in Central African Republic (CAR 2014). Conflict assessments are done through desktop research and sometimes interviews in a country selected by the AU. The focus of the assessment is on conflict prevention and national dialogue. The information is then used in different formats: (i) adapted into training material for specific case such as for the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) and CAR; (ii) to develop case studies (AU Mediation Handbook); and (iii) in briefing for a conflict prevention mission such as the Joint UN-AU-ECCAS women solidarity mission in CAR.

CMI, in turn has carried-out *Mapping of National Stakeholders* in Togo (2012), in Guinea Bissau (2013), and in Swaziland (2013)⁴. The countries are identified with the AU and Department of Political Affairs and Continental Early Warning System (CEWS). The reports are submitted to AU and shared internally with the Union’s early warning system, Peace and Security Council (PSC) secretariat, the Director of the Peace and Security Department (PSD), and the Political Affairs Department (PAD). The reports are expected to support the AU to make informed decisions to engage in a timely manner in these countries in the framework of early-response and conflict prevention. For instance, the mapping in Bissau-Guinean focused specifically on the upcoming electoral process. Also, the Togo report was used to obtain the Peace and Security Commissioner’s approval for an AU Panel of the Wise. The mapping exercises take advantage of CMI’s discreet profile, which enables the organization to consult diverse stakeholders in politically sensitive and potentially explosive contexts.

⁴ In 2014, Burundi and South Sudan were identified as key priorities and it was agreed that CMI would also look into the possibility of conducting mappings in Burkina Faso and Nigeria.

The Team reviewed some Mapping Documents provided by the CMI. It was observed that the work has been done in broad consultation with local actors, including local NGOs. The reports highlighted the general political situation, potential risks and key actors. Though gender issues were present in the documents, it seems that there is still a space to approach gender issues in a more systematic manner. This would be a concrete action to mainstream gender in accordance with AU policies and recommendations of the APSA assessment of 2010. Further, the production of documents and their dissemination should be accompanied by a monitoring system to track the use of these documents and for collecting feedback from the users.

In addition, during Phase II the CMI has more actively been engaged in operational support and it has held needs-based consultations with the AU Liaison Offices for instance in the Central African Republic (CAR), Cote d'Ivoire, Libya and Madagascar. ACCORD participated in April 2014 at a CAR Women technical meeting in Libreville (with ECCAS) which resulted in the development of Terms of References (ToRs) for a High Level joint mission in CAR. As a result, a Joint High Level Delegation composed of UN Women, AU, ECCAS was mandated to carry-on a solidarity and fact finding mission in CAR. ACCORD was called upon as technical partner to this mission, with the specific role of engaging the CAR civil society in this initiative. The background information and research done on CAR was used to inform ACCORD's support to the mission (i.e. identification of participants, methodology to engage with civil society, reporting on and analysing identified challenges for women in CAR). ACCORD was also part of the technical team hosting preparatory meetings with civil society groups in anticipation to the visit by High Level Officials.

The project has provided *assistance to the AU liaison offices and mediation initiatives* in accordance with the Plans. The AU has launched a series of consultations with the RECs to strengthen their mediation capacities and to build national infrastructure for peace (August 2013 ECCAS in Gabon; ECOWAS September 2013 in Ghana; SADC September 2013). Also, in 2013 the Secretariat supported the African Union Liaison Office in Guinea Bissau and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in the design and implementation of the long-term strategy to help the country manage high-risk elections with the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue (HD) and worked with the AU Office in Libya on constitutional arrangements. Preventive dialogue and diplomacy mission was carried-out to Burundi and stock taking exercises convened at the request of the AU Liaison Office in Mali. Overall, it is noted that cooperation with the Liaison Offices has increased and they have also been active in asking for assistance in building their mediation capacity.

The AU also requested CMI to provide technical assistance to the ECCAS in establishing a mediation support team for the mediation efforts in the CAR. In addition, following the consultations with the AU CMD, ACCORD also started tracking the peace and security developments of Central African Republic (CAR). The results have been shared with the ECCAS in the spirit of complementarity of efforts and in order to support regional Interventions. ACCORD has also supported the ECCAS by co-developing an actions plan for the development of mediation capacity of ECCAS.

According to the information available for the evaluators the objectives of this component have been achieved (see also ANNEX 4). The component has delivered most of the planned outputs and there are also indications that the deliverables have contributed to the AU's readiness to mobilize conflict prevention efforts in a timely manner. Worth of mentioning is that the project activities are planned and implemented in close collaboration with the AU Political Affairs Department (PAD) and AU Liaison Offices (AULOs) and to some extent with RECs which is a way to strengthen the AU capacity. However, it remains unclear whether the project activities of producing and dissemination of information is a sustainable and efficient way for building the AU capacities and how the models being developed for information sharing could be institutionalized and sustained. Alternative approaches on how the

activities could be sustained and embedded in the AUs work should be explored. Development of sustainability strategies is of priority for the next phase.

3.2.2. Lessons Learned and Sharing of Good Practises (AU, CMI)

The evaluation team considers that the concept and objective of this component "Lessons Learned and Sharing Good Practises" is vague. Compared to the previous phase, the objective of this component was "up streamed" to "deepening the understanding of reflective practise and transmission of good practice in peace mediation and to increasing the awareness and knowledge of the AU on the concrete expertise that African non-state actors possess in the field of mediation and to contributing to a creation of approaches linking non-state efforts in mediation with those of the AU". While majority of activities have been implemented and the project has provided platforms for sharing lessons learned and good practises, such an ambitious objective would also require robust monitoring and evaluation systems to demonstrate the link between the outputs and expected change produced by the project interventions. Presumably this has also been recognized by the project implementers as in the new proposal this component is eliminated and activities integrated under other objectives.

Main activities under this area include AU High level Retreat on the promotion of Peace, Security and Stability in Africa (AU, ACCORD); Annual AU Special Envoys/ mediators Meeting AU UN-AU Consultative meeting on Prevention and management of Conflicts (AU), Mapping of non-state actors (CMI) and Implementation of Debriefing Frameworks for AU mediation Initiatives (Organizational learning CMI).

ACCORD has organized the Annual High Level Retreat on behave of AU. The implementation of the Retreat is in line with ACCORD's role in providing mediation support for the AU. In this case, mediation support involves the provision of political, technical, logistical support and expertise towards ensuring that the African Union has opportunities to discuss with partners on issues relating to peace and security on the continent. Additionally, this is an important dimension of the project wherein there is an emphasis on provision of a reflective space for the stakeholders that engage in peace mediation in Africa. So far three reports have been published and the report of the Arusha High Level Retreat is underway. They can be useful as training and educational materials for other stakeholders who are critical in enhancing and strengthening the peace and security landscape in Africa. So, efficient dissemination channels should be developed and the project could also consider of making the documents available in the Internet.

The Fourth High Level Retreat of Special Envoys and Representatives on the Promotion of Peace, Security and Stability in Africa, took place in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, from 29 - 30 October 2013. The Retreat was held under the theme "The AU 2013 Golden Jubilee Retreat: 50 Years of Peace-making in Africa – A Critical Retrospective of OAU/AU Peace-making." AU mediators (AU Special Envoys, Special Representatives of the Chairperson, Heads of Field Offices and the members of the Panel of the Wise) were able to exchange views with other international peacemakers on the peace and security landscape of Africa in the future and consolidate its conflict prevention approach based on the deliberations. *An Annual AU Special Envoys/Mediators meeting was held on 28 October 2013, one day before the AU Retreat of Special Envoys.*

According to the outcome of the questionnaire, many participants found the 2014 Retreat to be useful and relevant to mediation in Africa. The Retreat involves the provision of political, technical, logistical support and expertise towards ensuring that the African Union has opportunities to discuss with partners on issues relating to peace and security on the continent. Additionally, the Retreat is an

important dimension of the project wherein there is an emphasis on provision of a reflective space for the stakeholders that engage in peace mediation in Africa.

While the Annual High Level Retreat of the AU Special Envoys and Special Representatives is regarded as a key event for the AU and its partners. However, what might be needed is to ensure that this High Level Retreat becomes more than an annual ritual for the AU, RECs and UN, but provides a platform to make core decisions on revolutionizing the mediation landscape in Africa. As mentioned earlier, the conflict landscape keeps evolving so are the drivers of conflicts. The retreat could be used as a platform to discuss emerging security issues in Africa, innovative methods in mediation, networking in mediation case studies, lessons that emerge from those cases, etc.

3.2.3. Capacity Building, Training and Development

Capacity Building, Training and Development – component of the AU Mediation Project aims at strengthening the capacity and skills of AU and RECs/RMs to support mediation missions and to promoting the link between training, rostering and deployment. ACCORD is responsible for this component and its key activities include AU Mediation Training and Revision and Translation of AU Mediation Handbook.

As part of the mediation tools to support the AU and the RECs, ACCORD has developed the Second Edition of the AU mediation Handbook. The Handbook covers five thematic areas: Understanding and Analysis of Conflict; Responding to Conflict; Designing Strategies for Interventions; the Mediation Process; and Monitoring and Evaluating of the Mediation Process. The Handbook is unique in its focus on real case studies in Africa, and its emphasis on the AU Mediation processes. It also analyses the lessons learned in mediation from the perspective of generating insights on the complexities, intricacies and nuances of mediation. It looks at many case studies on the continent such as Burundi, Uganda, DRC, Mali, etc. to analyse what works, what didn't work and why it didn't work. In terms of the gender content, the document includes several full chapters on gender considerations such as engaging with women's groups, the role of thematic expertise, specifically gender advisors, conflict mapping and actors analysis looking at women's involvement. Included also in the Handbook are case studies on women's groups in Liberia, women lead mediator in Uganda, specific ceasefire agreements and women involvement in Burundi.

The Handbook was printed in 1500 copies and officially launched during the Annual Retreat of AU Representatives and AU Special Envoys where copies were disseminated to all AU LOs and Desks on the continent and a stock is still available for dissemination at the AU HQ. According to an ACCORD Progress Report (June 2013) under the project, "the Handbook serves as a general reference and field study guide for those deployed on AU mediation missions in a support role, and as a training tool for the AU mediation support courses. It is a hands-on tool that is based on the premise that mediation is a critical and complex skill that ideally requires time, practice and continuing education." The Handbook is used during all the trainings, which ensures that it has a wider outreach. All the participants who had the opportunity to work with the handbook testified that it is very useful, practical and very focused on real African cases. It is available in English only and there is a need to translate it in French to ensure that Francophone stakeholders could also experience the benefits of it. The Handbook could be published on-line to make it available for a wider audience.

Training Courses

During the implementation of Phase II of the AU Mediation project, ACCORD had carried-out several training programs. The training were divided into three categories: The basic mediation training held in Libreville and carried-out in three days; the Advanced Training which covered 5 days and focused mainly on simulation and the contextual training which was informed by on-going conflicts such as the conflicts in the Central African Republic (CAR), the case in Mali and election related violence. These training sessions built on the knowledge of the participants and focused on the reality on the ground. ECCAS and COMESA were the last clusters to go through the contextualized training. Furthermore, some of the key training organized by ACCORD were the Seminar on the "Role of African Women Mediators" was in collaboration with the AU Conflict Management Division (CMD) and the AU Peace and Security Department (PSD) in Johannesburg, South Africa in May 2012; and the "Advanced Mediation Training for the African Union, the Regional Economic Communities (RECs/RMs) and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in Libreville in July 2013.

During Phase II of the project, 45 people were trained and 35% of the trainees were women. Key institutions participated in the training such as the AU PSD staff, AU LOs, AU Special Representatives and Ambassadors as well RECs/RMs including FOMAC, ECCAS, MARAC, etc. Nearly all the post-conflict and in-conflict countries have participated in the training. Countries such as Cote d'Ivoire, CAR, Somalia, Nigeria, and South Africa were also represented. The four (4) trainings also included high level participants from various Ministers across the continent.

The sustainability of these trainings relies a lot on the target audience which was chosen based on their potential to be deployed in mediation initiatives: i.e.: Amb. Ki-Doulaye, the former AU Representative of AULOs in Chad, was a participant in the basic and advanced trainings. After these trainings he supported the Brazaville Talks on CAR. Mr. Kwaku Asante was also a participant in all trainings and supported several missions of the Panel of the Wise. In the absence of a standalone AU mediation roster (although the AU is developing a roster for the PSD), ACCORD database of trainees contains a reliable list of qualified mediation experts that can be deployed in the future (note that this database also incorporates participants from Phase I).

According to the feedback from the participants, the trainings were highly relevant and allowed the participants to have deeper perspectives on the Mediation processes and further enhanced their skills in mediation. The participants also affirmed that these trainings allow them to share knowledge; to have important resources on the topic such as the AU Mediation Handbook and they were highly impressive with the participatory and practical nature of the training.

The Mission had an opportunity to interview an AU staff member who had participated the Confidence Building Workshop, which was held in November 2014. The participants of this workshop were the representatives and focal persons of the Joint Boundary Commissions (South Sudan) and two respective ministers. According to the interviewees, the workshop was successful. It brought two sides together and it was conducted in a professional way. The content was tailored to address the particular issues of Boundary Commission. As a concrete outcome of that training, a report was prepared for the Ministers and the participants also prepared an action plan to be presented to the Joint Demarcation Committee. This training is a testimony that "tailored" specialized, technical trainings are crucial and can produce feasible outputs.

Training has a pivotal role for the development of continental and regional mediation capacity. As such ACCORD, through Phase II of the project, seeks to equip the AU with the required knowledge and skills to enhance their mediation capacity and thus promote the use of dialogue for conflict management.

ACCORD, in collaboration with the AU, designed and developed mediation simulation material for a French Advanced Mediation Training for the AU that took place from 29 - 31 July 2013. It is noted that in the context of mediation training is not seen as only means of capacity building but it can also be used as an intervention as well a platform for exchange, sharing and transfer of knowledge.

While training should continue in phase III, more focus should be on the Panel of the Wise (PoW), the RECs, and actual mediators. Efforts should be made to help design actual mediation processes; to regularly coach the RECs and actual mediators; and to help RECs transfer their mediation knowledge and skills at national levels. During Phase II of the AU Mediation Support Capacity more engagements were noted with ECCAS, COMESA and IGAD. Phase III should be focused on capacity building and coaching of the RECs/RMs in mediation especially ECOWAS and possibly North Africa Regional Capability (NARC) which are currently dealing with many security challenges. Training efforts should also focus on thorough conflict analysis. Failure of past peace agreements is a corroboration that mediators often failed to understand the conflict, thus failed to undertake a thorough conflict analysis.

Conducting training in Mediation for the AU, and RECs is very important because it will produce a critical mass of mediation capacity and actors in Africa. Additionally, the training in mediation is also imperative because it acknowledges the reality that mediation is a specialized field, which requires that the key actors get both the substantive and conceptual elements together. Additionally, by conducting the mediation training in French, ACCORD has done well to expand the coverage of the project to include Africa's French speaking nations where conflicts are actually more prominent. What is therefore needed is to ensure that the French Mediation training is supported by training materials that are also in French including the AU Mediation Handbook, curriculum and course materials. Otherwise it will sideline and undermine the capacity of a significant linguistic group.

The mediation training being conducted by ACCORD at different levels helps to deepen the understanding of the theory and practice of mediation, and building core team of mediation experts that can guide and advise mediation process experts. Additionally, the training initiatives have led to the creation of an African network of mediation practitioners. The trained alumni will also form part of a core team of rapid deployment associates who can be deployed in peace making interventions.

The evaluation team concludes that AU Mediation Capacity Support Project Phase II has achieved its objectives and has been aligned with the expected outcomes that were underscored in the Project Document. The capacity building activities have aimed at and succeeded in building general capacities on mediation which is a sound basis for future work. However, it is also recognized that core focus should be on specialized "tailored" trainings such as Confidence Building Training, elections, etc. In this context a rigorous training needs assessments might not be feasible but ACCORD should try to project the future training needs and present the training packages in a more strategic manner which would also include appropriate sequencing of measures aimed at organizational change and transformation, not only individual skill building.

Otherwise it seems that capacity development may remain fragmented, making it difficult to capture sustainable impacts in the AU. What is needed is a more comprehensive and sustained approach, one that builds an enduring capacity. Again with no doubt the objective of this Component has been achieved, but if looked through the lens of RBM we realize that we should look beyond the attainment of the training objective to explore the results and impacts of the training had on AU, the RECs/RMs and those who received skills.

In summary, this project has contributed to the professionalization of mediation within the AU and RECs/RMs. The AU has developed frameworks for mediation and mediation support, referred to as the

AU Action Plan, which was adopted by AU Principals in late 2009, following the High Level Mediation Seminar, in Addis Ababa, in October 2009 and has led to the development of multi-track work programmes focusing on various aspects of mediation. Additionally, during the project period (specifically in 2012), the AU developed a Knowledge Management Framework (KMF), which is intended to enable the AU to have an institutional memory of its mediation efforts, by providing guidelines for collecting and sharing important information among AU headquarter, field offices and teams, and mediation partners in AU mediation processes. Finally, this project contributed to the strengthening of the AU's collaboration with partners, more specifically with the UN (which led to the production of UN-AU Mediation Guidelines). Such closer collaborations have led to the holding of regular High level and Desk level UN-AU consultations and strategic discussions on on-going mediation and peace processes. It also enabled both organizations to develop a set of Guidelines on joint collaboration, and process which has stalled for political reasons.

3.3. Efficiency

Financial Performance

The total MFA funding for the AU Mediation Project is 3.0 million Euros for the project period 2012-2014. The MFA has two separate funding agreements for the Project, one with the AU CMD and another with ACCORD. CMI has a contract directly with ACCORD and thus the MFA funding is channeled to CMI through ACCORD. The funding from the MFA is divided between the contracts as follows:

TABLE 1 PROJECT BUDGET FOR 2012-2014	
PARTNER	AMOUNT EURO
<i>AU CMD</i>	1,034,309
<i>ACCORD</i>	1,156,597
<i>CMI (Through ACCORD)</i>	809,094
Total	3,000,000 EURO

At the time of the last audit performed by the KPMG in 2014 the costs had been reported until the end of financial year 2013. For the first two years of the Phase II, the budget utilization rates of ACCORD have been 88 per cent for 2012 and 97 per cent for 2013 in comparison to the original budget of the Project. Utilization rates for the CMI's share of budget have been 47 per cent for 2012 and 96 per cent for 2013 respectively.

According to the Audit performed by the KPMG in 2014, the overall financial administration and management of ACCORD is on a good and qualitative level and there is sufficient capacity in the finance, administration and Human Resources (HR) functions. Currently a main part of the funding comes from the Nordic countries. Self-financing is being discussed and the structural changes under discussion include steps towards building a separate private entity structure around the organization. The companies would operate on commercial basis and will contribute to the sustainability of ACCORD by diversifying its sources of funding. This option was also discussed in the course of this evaluation. The issue should be thoroughly discussed to address that such arrangement is in accordance with complex procurement procedures and exclusivity policies.

Project Management

The project management has been efficient, special credit was given to the flexibility of the Finnish support. It has been possible to re-allocate for some dynamic processes (e.g. CAR), and it is claimed that using other mechanisms this process would have taken weeks. Rights and duties of ACCORD and the CMI are further specified on the agreement between the parties. The agreement defines ACCORD to have an overall project coordination role between ACCORD and CMI. CMI is responsible for supporting other project partners in the implementation of the project objectives, and is the coordinating partner for the focus area on Lessons Learned and Sharing of Good Practice.

Joint Steering Committee (JSC) and a Project Management Committee (PMC) have been established involving representatives of each organization (AU CMD, ACCORD and the CMI). The JSC involves the Director of each organization and it meets at least annually to review project progress and to approve the plan for the following year. Also a representative from the MFA participates in the JSC meetings. The Review of the SC minutes suggested that participation rate is high. The JSC is a good platform to share information. However, it remained unclear to what extent the JSC discusses the substance issues and how does it actually steer the intervention. The project document does not contain a Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Steering Committee or for the Project Management Committee.

All respondents confirmed that the tripartite approach of bringing AU, ACCORD and CMI together is a unique approach for strengthening the capacity of AU. However, the role of the AU as the leading organization and owner of this project should be strengthened. There should be a clear strategy defining how the AU mediation capacities will be developed and how the achievements will be measured. Currently, the CMI works quite independently from ACCORD with more focus on the work with the AU and ACCORD is focused on training. (See also KPMG 2014 Performance Audit). While the partnership approach is seen as a good model for cooperation and complementarity, there might also be unused opportunities for promoting the “added value of the tripartite approach to capacity development”.

Closer cooperation and more frequent meetings of the Project Management Team would bring synergy benefits. However, it was noted by the partners that the ACCORD and CMI are also “competitors” in the mediation field and thus open sharing of experiences and lessons learned may not be feasible from a business perspective. While this issue hasn’t negatively affected the partnership, it is an issue to be taken into account. Furthermore, since the launching of the project, the CMI status has changed and currently it receives funding from the MFA in form of multiannual Partner Organization framework. This, as it was noted in the KPMG Audit, is a second source of funding. The implications of this change should be further explored.

There are some concerns about the cost efficiency of the project. For instance, concerns were expressed regarding the high costs of travel, meeting venues and consultants. These issues were addressed in the KPMG Performance Audit which concluded that personnel costs and consultancy costs of ACCORD are in line with the approved activity plans and budgets and that the travel costs are remunerated according to ACCORD and AU travel policy in economy class with minor exceptions. The spending can be also justified because some of the events and seminars are organized in high-class locations due to the high profile of the participants.

Human Resources

The current staffing of the Mediation Unit is not sufficient and sustainable as there is only full-time staff employed within the AU. Recruitment process is underway to hire additional permanent staff (one

person). However, the AU must first secure funding from Member States. A scenario has been developed that the AU Mediation Unit should have five employees which would have key expertise on emerging thematic issues in mediation: Expertise in Knowledge Management in mediation; power sharing; someone who can work with CSOs and women's group; someone who can also facilitate the work with the RECs/RMs.

The analysis of the project 2014 budget 2014 shows that half (49%) of the annual budget is allocated to salaries (CMI 48%, ACCORD 49%). According to the budget, in CMI a total number of seven persons are engaged (part-time⁵) in the project implementation and in ACCORD, two Project Officers are remunerated by the project in addition to AUCMD Project Manager. Activities (Components 1-3) accumulate third of the project expenses (Operational Support 19%; Lessons Learned and sharing of Good Practices 2% and Capacity Building 10%).

Whereas the project has managed to develop regional level capacities in mediation, in the future the priority is to set up a standby-professional mediation team which would have special technical expertise on crucial areas such as power sharing and ready for rapid deployment. After Phase I and now Phase II of the project, AU should be capable to deploy a Rapid Mediation Standby Team. However it is important to note that the work of the Mediation Standby Team will be more credible when RECs play central role because they have a better understanding of their regions, its conflicts and complexities. Furthermore involving the RECs will diffuse the "tension" and "competition" between some of the RECs/RMs and AU. It will enhance a much needed collaboration.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

Monitoring and reporting of the project should be improved. Firstly, as indicated above, separate reporting by the implementing institutions does not provide a comprehensive picture about the achievements of the project. Secondly, though efforts have been made to develop a Results Framework, this Framework lacks indicators, which could be used to track the outputs and outcomes of the project. As a matter of fact, it is only CMI which presents numeric indicators which are also disaggregated by gender in their activity reports. Such numerical output indicators (e.g. numbers of beneficiaries) are needed to assess the cost-efficiency and particularly, in development of sustainability strategies (to define what resources are needed to continue with the activity after the project is ended). In addition to outputs, the project should also track the outcomes and impacts on AU, the RECs/RMs and on peace and security issues in Africa. It would be useful to introduce certain capacity development related indicators both for the development activities (e.g. training) and to operational support (e.g. Operational Mediation support, Conflict Assessment) to demonstrate their relation with the project objective. In addition, the evaluation team suggests that while the AU is moving towards the results-based approach it should also be applied in the project. The project should ensure that all the partners have sufficient capacity in RBM and that M&E is used as a management tool to ensure that the set objectives will be achieved.

3.4. Impact

The AU Mediation Capacity Support Project contributes towards the AU's long-term objectives in peace and security because it is in line with the AU normative frameworks and programme initiatives. The Protocol leading to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council underscores the centrality of peace mediation and conflict prevention in the AU's work. The establishment of mechanisms such as

⁵ Project Manager, Advisor Mediation Capacity, Project Direction, Project Assistant, CMI Security and Field Implementation Advisor CMI Communications Personnel. CMI Internal Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation personnel. The budget does not indicate the total man months / weeks allocated to the project.

the AU Panel of the Wise (PoW), and the existence of AU institutions that have mediation mandate including the AU Special Envoys and Special Representatives, provides evidence to how much peace mediation is becoming highly regarded in the APSA. Similarly, at the levels of the RECs, mediation is also becoming central towards advancing peace and security.

This project is creating awareness and appreciation for mediation as a preferred way to prevent conflicts in Africa. Additionally, the Project has contributed to a shift towards more operational support of mediation initiatives by the AU and the RECs which are the main organs of the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA). Greater engagement was noted with ECCAS, COMESA, and IGAD. The effort to decentralize mediation by focusing more on the Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and relevant national-level actors will certainly help to effectively address emerging crises on the continent. The project has also contributed to a number of paradigm shifts to how mediation and conflict prevention can be addressed on the continent. It has also contributed to the development of key mediation tools that have been crucial in strengthening technical and procedural processes of mediation within the AU, and the RECs: for example, the AU Mediation Handbook, the AU Mediation Knowledge Management Framework, and the various publications on mediation.

3.5. Sustainability

Sustainability could be explored through several lenses. As a starting point, the foundation for sustainability is that there will be a demand for Mediation. As indicated above, and in case of this project, it is evident that the need for mediation will sustain. The Projects reports also suggest that there is an increasing demand for instance in the AU Liaison Offices for mediation support and capacity development and also work with RECs has evolved new demands and opportunities.

Regarding the *institutional sustainability*, the basic conditions exist: Mediation is recognized as part of the AU's Peace and Security functions. Mediation is also embedded in the AU institutional functions as the organigram of the AU contains a Mediation Unit to manage these actions. On the other hand, as noted above, the Unit suffers from limited human capacity. There is only one project-based personnel coordinating the Mediation activities and this inevitably raises questions on sustainability. However, the mission was informed that plans are underway to increase the staff at the AU's Mediation Unit with the availability of funding. Efforts should be made to fully staff the unit to its full capacity that can effectively navigate the increasing demand of mediation in Africa. Institutional sustainability in the partner organizations is already a core function within ACCORD and CMI - both organizations are known worldwide for their niche in this field. The project of ACCORD to launch a consultancy branch is its attempt to reduce its vulnerability on external funding and diversify its funding sources.

At this stage, all funding for the project activities is project-based and thus the *financial sustainability* project outcomes and activities are questionable. However, to assess the financial sustainability it would be necessary to conduct cost analysis to see what financial resources would be needed to maintain the *basic functions of mediation* and what would be needed to *further develop and disseminate them*. Only after this is done, a financial sustainability strategy can be developed. This analysis should also be accompanied with an analysis of the programmatic sustainability of mediation and how it is embedded in the AUs operations and in APSA in general. For instance, the development of ECCAS action plan for mediation support for a period of five (5) years should be accompanied with budget estimates.

Therefore, it is recommended to the partners to conduct in a collaborative manner a "sustainability assessment" to address the following questions: What do we want to sustain and/ or further develop? What are the desired outcomes of sustainability? What does sustainability mean to the project? What is

required to keep the desired outcomes/ activities sustainable? What the project, partners, stakeholders can or should do to ensure sustainability? It is also important to develop mechanisms which will keep the mediation on the Peace and Conflict and Political agenda of the AU. Participation in the donor coordination platforms and promoting the visibility of the project/ Mediation Unit could be the first concrete step.

Beyond the focus on financial sustainability, the project is sustainable considering the knowledge building that has taken place since the project was implemented. Important to note is the creation of the AU Mediation Pool of the PSD Civilian Standby Roster, which will provide a rapid-response mechanism that is intended to strengthen AU mediation efforts on the Continent while increasing the quality of its mediation processes. The Mediation Pool of the PSD Civilian Standby Roster will benefit of the deployment of a rapid deployment mediation, transparency, homogeneity, and accessibility to enhance its effectiveness in peace making and preventive diplomacy. Several RECs are also working on their Civilian Standby Roster such as ECOWAS, East Africa Standby Force (EASF), SADC, etc. These rosters will be integrated in the ASF Civilian Roster.

Though the Evaluation Mission did not have an opportunity to interview the AU resource person, the information gathered from the other interviews suggest that the AU has a strong sense of ownership of building the mediation capacities. This ownership can also be seen through its determination to transfer mediation skills to the RECs and enhance their collaboration. While the AU takes concrete ownership in terms of project focus and core activities, it is evident that in the short-term, it will be not able to meaningfully contribute to the project materially and financially. This vision might be a reverie considering that more than 96% of the AU's operational budget in peace and security is funded by external partners.

However, there are factors promoting sustainability such as: The general training and expert meetings approach of the project will leave a certain level of installed capacity and knowledge that will remain with the individuals and possibly beyond, depending on the individual's institutional framework. The trainings are targeting AU and RECs staff that are already working in the field (Liaison offices) and doing mediation support. Also, the development of the RECs mediation capacity is done based on their long-term needs. In addition, an emphasis on supporting national peace infrastructures would increase the sustainability of the Project. In accordance with the recommendations of APSA assessment, engaging civil society is indicated as one of the sustainability measures. This would develop a stronger link between national, regional and continental efforts for mediation.

3.6. Coordination and Coherence

European Union is the Lead Donor in Peace and Security. There is an AU Partners' Group Non-operations (AUPG Non OPS) which is primarily focused on exchanging information about AU plans and activities, but there are also partners presenting their action though less systematically. This group meets once a month. There are also specific groups which meet in the framework of Joint Financing Agreements, and high level AU partners group lead by China. However, it was noted by all partners that sectorial discussions have not taken place. This was communicated to the Ambassador of the Finnish Embassy who took an initiative to invite the donors in a meeting to discuss the coordination mechanisms and needs. This initiative was welcomed by all development partners who were consulted in the course of this evaluation.

This period is an interesting period and many developments are taking place at the same time: A New AU Mediation Framework 2015 – 2017 is being developed and it will be ready during the first quarter of 2015. An APSA Capacity Assessment is being finalized and its results will be presented for validation in January 2015. This assessment will produce information on APSA implementation and assess the capacity-building needs of different stakeholders (AU and RECs/RMs) and assess coherence, coordination, effectiveness and sustainability of APSA as a whole. The EU will use this assessment to develop its new programme. Also Results-Based Management will be introduced in the AU. Nordic Countries (e.g. Norway, Denmark) have established a joint Funding Arrangement to support AU Capacity Development. The mission did not study the procedures of this arrangement in detail but considers, that moving from bi-lateral project towards a more programmatic approach could be a feasible option and in line with the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and Harmonization (2005). However, it is noted that it is equally important to maintain then long-standing partnership between the ACCORD and CMI, as they are civil society organizations that work towards African solutions to the conflicts.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The AU Mediation Capacity Support Project is highly relevant because the contemporary African peace and security landscape is complex and requires integrated interventions. Furthermore, dialogue is becoming the preferred method of preventing and responding to crisis. According to one of the respondents, *"Investing in AU is investment in the future"*. AU has the capacity and mandate to mitigate conflicts and together with its regional organizations, forms a sound structure of mediation in Africa. The collaboration between three partners, AU, ACCORD and CMI is quite impressive, coherent and necessary. However, while the project enjoys the presence of three "powerful well-recognized organizations", closer cooperation at Project Management level in planning, implementation and monitoring of the activities would produce synergy benefits and promote results-based approach. The added value of the tripartite approach should be clearly spelled out by the partners from the results based perspective.

This project has delivered most of planned deliverables, and its objectives have been achieved. Significant achievements have been made, for example, when the project was launched in 2009, the AU has not yet established frameworks and mechanisms to support its mediation effort. Now, in 2014, the project exists alongside a well-established Panel of the Wise (PoW), as well as the AU's growing emphasis on mediation as a strategy for conflict resolution. In addition, the AU now has a Handbook for Mediation, a Mediation Curriculum and a course for Mediation which can be utilized in posterity. Another concrete example of the achievements of the project was the engagement in CAR where a full fledged mediation support was provided to the Government by ACCORD and while CMI also contributed by providing support to ECCAS, which was the lead mediator. Thus each partner brought comparative advantages to the mediation process.

However, the establishment of a fully operational Mediation Unit within the PSD is a prerequisite for the sustainability and institutionalization of the activities in the AU. This Unit requires permanent staffing. It is also important to note that the work of the Mediation Standby Team will be more credible when RECs play central role in that framework.

One of the most noted added-values of this project is that it is an African initiative. The project enjoys high level of political support both in the AU and in the MFA. However, the visibility of the project has been low and there was limited awareness about the project and its achievements among the development partners and AU. MFA and the implementing partners should take a more proactive role to amplify the visibility of the project especially in donor coordination platforms. The Embassy of Finland

has already noted this and is planning to organize a coordination meeting with actors engaged in Peace and Security.

Sustainability of the project activities and outcomes is of great concern. Currently the project is fully financed by the MFA and it is anticipated that the partners are not yet ready to make additional financial contributions. Therefore, sustainability measures should be developed taking into account that the heavy focus on personnel costs does not promote sustainability, thus the implementing partners could explore cost-saving alternatives. Having a double administration first in the ACCORD and then in the CMI accumulates the resources needed in project administration. A Mediation Unit with a full staff capacity is the nucleus of sustainability of mediation capacity development in the AU. It is essential that it is "rooted" in the organizational structure on permanent basis. Therefore, one of the key actions is to ensure that qualified and permanent staff is recruited and capacitated. In the future, the project could pay more attention to ensuring the sustainability of the capacities developed.

The evaluation Team noted that gender issues are not as prominent as would have been expected in project implementation and reporting. Though during the project period, the AU and ACCORD have jointly implemented activities that focus on gender in mediation, such as organizing an *African Women Mediators Seminar in 2012*, by specifically focusing on the role of women in resolving conflict and that gender issues are addressed in the conflict assessments. A more systematic analysis for instance in the conflict mapping would be needed. It is important to quantitatively and qualitatively highlight key gender issues in the project reports, including the number of female participants, the involvement of women in mediation and the representation of gender issues in the project materials such as the AU Mediation curriculum, course and handbook. There is a greater need to produce a critical mass of women mediators in Africa and to encourage the RECs/RMs to do the same. Not only some of the training must solely focus on women, there should be a publication to address that complex issue on the importance of gender mainstreaming in mediation processes. But again based on RBM, the results should be more than training a critical mass of women mediators to focus on what those women trained are doing or have done with their skills.

Similarly, in accordance with the AU's development needs and Finnish Development Cooperation Programme priorities, the mapping has engaged local NGOs and significant achievements have been reported. For instance in Guinea Bissau, the local NGO "Voz di Paz" has already started in collaboration with CMI a high-level women's dialogue, which discusses the key issues critical for the future of Guinea-Bissau and feeds the results into political discussion.

Whereas it would be important to maintain the tripartite approach, it is also important to consider in accordance with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) opportunities to simplify procedures for instance through Joint Financing Mechanisms developed by Nordic Countries to support the Capacity Building of the AU. This evaluation considers that this might not be the right time to fully change the funding modality and approach as the project still has to complete the pending activities and phase out. The MFA should, however, explore the feasibility of using parallel funding for the project and joint financing agreement as a transitional step. Project-based approach has always its limitations particularly regarding sustainability and impact.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Financing Mediation Capacity Development

Based on the findings and conclusions of this evaluation, it is recommended to the MFA to continue financing the Mediation Capacity Development Project to ensure that the mediation capacities and

expertise of the AU is streamlined and transferred to the RECs/RMs and possibly to Member States where there are greater needs. Project-based funding is feasible at this time but during 2015 the MFA should also explore the other funding modalities such as Joint Financing Agreement (JFA) for AU Capacity Development.⁶ This would be in accordance with the Paris Declaration (2005) and harmonization principles and would also pave way for better integration of the project into the broader AU capacity development activities and programmes. Also a mixture of funding modalities (sharing funds between the Mediation Capacity Development project and joint funding modality) could be an option in long term.

- It is recommended to the MFA to continue financing the Mediation Capacity Development Project. During 2015 the MFA should explore other funding modalities such as Joint Financing Agreement for AU Capacity Building.

Establishment of a Mediation Unit/ Division

In line with the objective of making mediation central to the APSA, it is important for the AU to ensure that the Mediation Unit is well-staffed. This would also demonstrate the ownership of the AU. This Unit would be responsible for keeping a roster of African mediators, conducting rapid deployment of mediation teams and thematic experts.

- AU should ensure that there is sufficient *permanent* staff in the Mediation Unit.

Collaboration with RECs and UN

It is important for the project to continue underscoring the need for joint initiatives and collaboration between the AU and partners. Examples of such collaborations would entail supporting the PanWise, which is a network of the Panels of the Wise and similar mechanisms in RECs, which engage in conflict prevention and peace mediation. Therefore, it is important to invite representatives from RECs and UN to participate in AU conferences, meetings, seminars, workshops and trainings and other events organised under the auspices of the Project.

It is recommended that:

- Collaboration with the partners such as RECs and UN should be enhanced. Specific activities should be organised between the AU and RECs to facilitate exchange of information, sharing of experiences and lessons learned to promote synergies and address coherence and duplications in mediation processes.

Mediation Capacity Development

An added value for this project is the creation of a critical mass of individuals and institutions that will stand ready to support peace mediation processes undertaken by the AU, RECs in Africa. It will require strengthening the capacity of mediation thematic experts in core areas such as power and wealth

⁶ The mission met with representative of Norad and Denmark who are part of this JFA.

sharing, elections, constitutionalism, transitional justice, security sector reform and gender issues. These individuals and institutions can be deployed to support the AU mediation processes or to provide analytical, technical and operational support. Thus becoming a good mediator requires a broad range of skills and expertise.

It is recommended:

- Thematic expertise should be promoted. ACCORD training packages should be more strategic and results-oriented. Trainings should be informed by a need analysis, and appropriate sequencing of measures which should focus not only on enhancing individual capacity, but also on organizational change and transformation.

Project Design, Monitoring and Evaluation

The current plan is activity-based with a limited focus on vision of the AUs mediation capacity. Therefore, measures should be explored on how the project could be better anchored with existing capacity development interventions of AU. The Project Documentation should also clearly demonstrate how it is linked with the AU initiative which involves the UN Mediation Support Unit and several other partners through the AU – United National (UN) Programme of Cooperation in Mediation.

The planning should be based on a thorough situation and needs analysis. The project might also benefit from the recent APSA assessment (which will be validated in the beginning of 2015). It will provide information about the AU's capacity development needs. In addition, the Comprehensive Mediation Framework is being developed by the AU CMD. They should be used to guide the planning of the new phase.

If there will be continuation for the project, the Project design should be improved. This would include at least the following:

- The project plan should be based on a thorough situation and needs analysis. The beneficiaries of the project should be defined in the project design. The Project plan should present measures how the project is linked with existing capacity development interventions.
- The project must be based on a vision and clearly determined objectives. A programmatic approach should be applied showing achievement of the objectives rather than activities of each individual partner.
- There should be a sound monitoring framework, including relevant output and outcome (and impact) indicators disaggregated by gender. The project should ensure that sufficient capacities to develop good quality monitoring system exist.
- In addition to Risk Assessment, the plan should identify and assess assumptions (see. e.g. Logical Framework Approach) that are factors which influence the project implementation and achievement of the objectives. The realization of such external factors should be also monitored.

- Reporting should reflect the achievements of the project, not only the activities carried out by the Partners.
- The Project Document for the possible next phase should be subjected to an external appraisal which will check that all the measurers for good results-based proposal are in place. This will ensure the good quality project implementation and M&E.

Gender

Gender should be systematically addressed in all the project activities. It would be a minimum requirement for the three partners to report on female representation in the training, documentation processes and conflict analyses and assessments. Additionally, there is a need to underscore the role of women in mediation, and to specifically implement activities that are targeted at female mediators, mediation team members, thematic experts and civil society organizations. A gender situational analysis should be carried-out to set benchmarks; and support training of personnel and RECs/RMs. There is also the need to document good practices and innovative responsive interventions of women in Mediation. The project should explore mechanisms on how technical support on gender issues could be provided to the RECs/RMs and AULOs. The Team also notes that calling the journal on mediation "*Le Mediateur*" as proposed in the last management meeting will not be a clear show of commitment of AU to women's integration in mediation processes.

- Gender should be systematically addressed in all the project activities and M&E.

Knowledge Generation and Dissemination

In line with the objective of professionalizing mediation and creating a repository of information on what works and what does not, the role of knowledge production and dissemination cannot be under-stated. The sustainability of the project is therefore hinged on the continued availability of information for the AU, mediation and other structures that support peace processes, to help them in making informed and effective decisions and to design responsive strategies towards addressing peace and security challenges. For instance a web-page could be created to give update on the evolution of the project, but also to serve as forum for mediation experts to discuss pertinent issues and network. It would also improve the visibility of the project.

- The project should proactively promote the mediation approach among the development partners.

Cooperation

In order to strengthen the added value of the tripartite approach and synergy benefits, project coordination could be strengthened. For instance, more frequent meetings of the Project Management Committee (PMS) and joint activities would promote horizontal learning and information sharing between the project partners and thus promote a coherent and coordinated approach.

- Horizontal learning between the partners should be promoted through frequent meetings of PMC and joint activities.

Sustainability

Project-based funding is not the most sustainable way to build and maintain the AU's mediation capacity. Therefore, in order to ensure sustainability of the activities and achievements of the project, it is advised for the project partners to develop a *sustainability strategy*, which would identify means to sustain the necessary activities and achievements of the project, and which would include an analysis on how the mediation could be better institutionalised within the AU and APSA operations. The CMI should ensure that operational mediation support activities contribute in a sustainable way to the AU Capacity Development objective.

- During 2015, the partners need to develop a sustainability strategy which demonstrates measures how and on what conditions the key activities could continue and achievements would sustain. Similarly, a phasing-out plan should be developed.

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

END-TERM EVALUATION OF THE AFRICAN UNION MEDIATION SUPPORT CAPACITY PROJECT PHASE II 2014

1. BACKGROUND TO THE END-TERM EVALUATION

The African Union Mediation Support Capacity Project, referred hereafter as 'the project,' is guided by an overarching objective of strengthening and enhancing the mediation support capacity of the African Union (AU). The project is jointly implemented by three partners, namely the African Union Conflict Management Division (AU CMD), the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD), and the Crisis Management Initiative (CMI). Phase II of the project commenced in August 2012, and its focus is to consolidate the work done in Phase I by increasing efforts that contribute to strengthening the operations and processes relating to AU on-going mediation initiatives. Phase II continues to support efforts by the AU to undertake mediation and good offices initiatives based on early warning data. This project is funded by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.

The specific objectives of Phase II of the project are to:

- Enhance the AU's mediation support capacity to plan, deploy, manage and monitor mediation interventions;
- Enhance the AU's capacity to identify lessons and best practices on conflict prevention and peace mediation efforts; and
- Strengthen internal systems and procedures in support of AU mediation interventions.

In order to achieve these objectives, the project partners are implementing the following three focus areas:

- Focus area one: Operational Support in Mediation
- Focus area two: Lessons Learned and Sharing of Good Practise
- Focus area three: Capacity Building, Training, and Development

The project partners share the overall responsibility of focus area one while the AU and CMI share the responsibility of focus area two. ACCORD has the overall responsibility for focus area three. Nonetheless, where needed and deemed appropriate, assistance is provided across the focus areas by the partners in support of the broader project objectives.

2. RATIONALE, PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The need for and benefit of an evaluation was reflected upon and outlined during the planning phase of the project. It is viewed as a valuable tool for management to enhance programme implementation and is expected to inform the Government of Finland and the partners of progress made and lessons learned to date, and towards necessary adjustments required in discussions for a third phase of the project. The evaluation will look at the project as a whole, but in addition will pay attention to each focus areas in lieu of its objectives and context, as implemented by the different partners. Given that the roles and activities vary between the organisations, each organisation should therefore also be looked at separately.

The approach of the evaluation should be to benefit the project in the future design and implementation of its work. Consequently, the assessment will determine if current activities carried out by the project are appropriate in meeting the needs of the AU, examine and assess if annual outputs and initiatives were achieved, and analyse the initiatives and project activities to determine if it is inclusive, participatory, engaging and consultative. The evaluation process shall both review the implementation of the project as well as engage directly with stakeholders, including the project partners and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland, as well as those who have worked with, and/or participated in project activities.

The specific objectives of the evaluation will be the following:

Assess the implementation of project activities and initiatives in relation to the inputs, outputs and core deliverables as outlined for each focus areas in the Project Agreement and annual work plans, as well as this project's role in relation to others and in relation to the overall strategy, as well as changes that were agreed upon subsequently;

1. Assess the efficient and effective use of funds by the project in relation to the work plans;
2. Assess the expected and unexpected outcomes achieved in terms of needs, relevance and appropriateness, and the contribution the project has made towards strengthening the mediation capacity of the AU;
3. Assess the sustainability of the project and determine if the benefits produced can be maintained after the termination of external support;
4. Provide concrete proposals to enhance the relevance, outcome and impact of project initiatives; and
5. Make justified and well founded recommendations on the possible continuation of the project after 2014 and the necessary refinements to ensure maximum impact.

3. SCOPE OF THE END-TERM EVALUATION

The duration of this evaluation will be from 15 September to 6 November 2014, and will include the planning, implementation of the activities, and delivery of the final report. Below is a draft implementation plan for the evaluation, to be finalized in consultation with the evaluators:

Proposed Evaluation Phases:**Phase I**

- Appoint two evaluators and provide them with the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the evaluation;
- The evaluators develop and submit a proposal based on the ToR, describing the course of action for carrying out the evaluation. This proposal shall be presented to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland, ACCORD, the AU CMD and CMI within one week after entering into the agreement;
- Convene a “kick-off” meeting with both evaluators in Helsinki to clarify any queries and discuss the phases;
- Review, assess and analyse relevant project documentation;
- Prepare an inception report that summarises the review of documentation and specifies the evaluation methodology to be submitted by 25 September.

Phase II:

- Conduct interviews (during visits to the head office of each partner institution, telephone consultations or via email correspondence) with (1) relevant representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland; (2) the project partners including the AU CMD, ACCORD and CMI; (3) other stakeholders including the Regional Economic Communities (RECs); and (4) an appropriate sample of participants in project initiatives such as trainings and meetings;
- Participate in existing planned activities of all partners during the evaluation period, which will provide for an opportunity of interacting with project beneficiaries;
- Participate in activity to be organised by the AU CMD (AU High Level Retreat).

Phase III

- Prepare a maximum twenty page first draft evaluation report covering the areas outlined above to be submitted by xx.xx. 2014;
- Circulate by email the preliminary report to representatives of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, the AU CMD, ACCORD and CMI and receive comments by xx.xx.

4. ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Relevance

Policy relevance / needs relevance:

- Is the project based on proper situation analysis, and is it development policy-based in respect of both the donor and partners concerned?
- Are the stated project goals relevant to the central issues of the partner's development plans and priorities?
- Is the Finnish aid relevant and feasible in the current format and in the context of the African Union's needs and policies?
- Is the delivery modality and the selection of interventions relevant and valid? Is there in-built flexibility to comply with some changing needs?

Effectiveness

- Has the project achieved its stated purpose and objectives?
- Are the development interventions expected to result in measurable improvement in situations they are addressing?

Efficiency

- Are the material, human and financial inputs comparable with the observed outputs/results (results *versus* costs)?
- Is the management and administration of the aid programme cost-effective? Does it include proper aid management and steering systems, and aid governance with defined procedures? Are the joint project and programmes managed and administered in an efficient and coherent manner?
- Are roles of the relevant stakeholders clear?

Sustainability

The evaluation is requested to make judgment on the dimension of sustainability of results. Issues relevant to sustainability include:

- Adequacy of funding from local sources in the future?
- Steps which have been taken to enhance and ensure sustainability of results through the AU's capacity to plan, manage and improve its governance and administrative systems
- Ownership of the development interventions? What steps have been taken to ensure building-up of ownership and handing over of tasks and responsibilities to the AU and RECs?
- Any gradual handing over or phasing-out plans included in the initial programmes?

Impact

- Does the programme contribute to the African Union's long-term development objectives?

- In terms of policy compliance? Compliance with the international development agenda pertinent to African Union with special relevance to security and development issues?

Coordination & Coherence

- Coordination and joint-planning mechanisms among Project Partners? Finland's role in these?
- Have the coordination mechanisms been included in the initial plans and budgeted for?
- Is coordination an explicit output?
- Resources spent (time, human, and money) on coordination and information sharing?
- Coherence in terms of continuity (past-present-future)?

Value added

- In the current aid delivery mix of Finnish aid, does it make specific contribution, which otherwise would not be achieved?

(Quality standards: The evaluation report shall respect the EU evaluation report quality standards, obtainable in the web-site of the EU AidCO Evaluation Unit

And observe the OECD/DAC development evaluation quality criteria, which can be reached in the web-page of the organization (<http://www.oecd.org>).

5. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation team shall base their observations and recommendations on relevant project documentation; comparison with projects of a similar nature, where relevant and appropriate; and best practice as it applies to the implementation of projects of this nature. Importantly the evaluators should carry out interviews and consultations with stakeholders to guide assessments. The evaluation team should in the inception report provide their methodological plan for implementing the task.

The evaluation team shall produce a common report of approximately twenty (20) pages which should cover the following areas:

Executive summary: The task, brief description of the methodology, main findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.

Introduction: Evaluation purpose, objective, scope and main questions, the methodology used, data collection and analysis including indicators.

Key findings: Overall progress of the implementation of the project; impact, effectiveness, sustainability of results achieved, efficiency, relevance and compatibility; utilisation of project funds in the implementation of planned and unplanned activities; impact (anticipated and spin-off) of the work of the project during the period under review.

Conclusions: Overall performance, achieved results compared with given evaluation criteria, policy issues, etc.

Recommendations: Key areas of modifications; recommendations for improving policy/implementation and management; recommendations to maximise the impact of the work of the project throughout the remainder of the project cycle; recommendations with regard to the possible extension and future continuation of the project.

Lessons learned: General conclusions that are likely to have potential for wider application and use.

Annexes: Terms of Reference, stakeholders interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

6. MANAGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

6.1 Selection and Appointment of Evaluators

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland together with CMI will propose one European evaluator, whilst ACCORD and the AU will propose one African evaluator. The evaluators should be independent and neutral entities to the process and to project partners. The two evaluators will work together as an evaluation team. The evaluation team will be formally appointed at by all partners. A team leader will be appointed on the basis of the assessment of experiences and qualifications of the two evaluators that have been identified. The following expertise shall be required by the evaluators for the successful conduct of the evaluation:

- Significant expertise (minimum ten years) in the African or developing country context in areas of mediation and mediation support, peacemaking, peace and security, conflict, comparative politics, and international relations;
- Working knowledge of English, with knowledge in French being a desirable additional consideration;
- Experience with and knowledge of programmatic conceptualisation, planning, implementation, management, monitoring and evaluation;
- Experience and methodological expertise in evaluating interventions in the field of peacebuilding and conflict resolution;
- Previous experience with undertaking evaluations of this nature and demonstrated ability to work well in a team and produce professional reports.

6.2 Evaluation Management

The project partners will assist the evaluators in organising meetings with relevant stakeholders and will provide them with the necessary project documentation. Also, ACCORD and CMI will assist the evaluators in making travel arrangements, such as booking tickets and hotels.

The evaluators, whilst appointed individually, will work jointly as a team to review the terms of reference, to plan the overall assessment process and to draft the inception report, to conduct the assessment, to participate in the activities listed above, and to draft the preliminary and final reports. It is expected that the assessment team will work together in the planning and conduct of the evaluation, will share information, and will provide mutual accountability throughout the duration of the evaluation period. Possible differences in opinion between the team members will need to be clearly articulated in the final report.

Annex 2: Persons and Organizations Consulted

<i>African Union</i>
Bowers Grant H. Geographic Information System Officer, AU Border Programme, workshop participant
Barugahare Jeseplat A. Senior Programme Officer, Project Management Team, Peace and Security Department, AU
Janha Abdul, PCM Unit African Union
Kapinga-Yvette Ngandu, Coordinator, Mediation Capacity Building Programme and Secretariat of the Panel of the Wise, Peace and Security Department, AU
<i>Donor Community</i>
Lassen Peter, Counselor, Royal Danish Embassy, Addis Ababa
Mai Gerhard, GIZ
Odumuyiwa, Julia GIZ ET
Poullaouec Carole, EU-EEAS
Stiansen Endre, Counselor, Royal Norwegian Embassy
<i>ACCORD</i>
Ahere John, Senior Officer, Peacemaking Unit
Fleetwood, Mari
Gounden Gounden, Executive Director
Kunama Natacha, Head of Peacemaking Unit
Ngubane Senzo, General Manager, Operations
Pravina Makan-Lakha, General Manager, Operations and Business Development
Sachane Jerome, Deputy Director
Sunitha Singh, General Manager, Finance & Administration
<i>CMI</i>
Isoaho Eemeli,
Col. Baye Faye, Senior Security Advisor, CMI
Huhtanen Heidi, Programme Manager, CMI
Kakoma Itonde, CMI
Talvitie Tuija, Director CMI
Tuuli Suvi, Programme Manager (former), CMI
<i>Ministry for Foreign Affairs</i>
af Hällstöm Erik, Regional manager – Pan-African issues
Ms. Saxen, First Counsellor, Finland Embassy, Pretoria
Mäenpää Sirpa, Ambassador, Embassy of Finland,
Oksanen Janne, Embassy of Finland, Addis Ababa
Rantanen Tapio, Counsellor, Peace mediation, Ministry for Foreign Affairs
<i>Questionnaire Respondents</i>
Hon. Catherine Mabobori, Senior Advisor: Communications, First Vice-President. Burundi
Hon. Betty Bigombe, Minister of State for Water Resources, Uganda.
Mrs. Chinwe Odigboegwu, Senior Associate; Banalghodalo. Nigeria.
Amb. Corentin Ki-Doulaye, Special Rep. Of AULO, Chad.
Mr. Deprose Muchena, Deputy Director, OSISA
Ms. Duniyo Mohammed, Coordinator Godir Center, Km5, IIDA Women Development Organization. South Africa.
Ms. Emile Beatrice Epaye, Former Deputy Minister for Trade and Industries; Current Member of Parliament, CAR.

Ms. Hamza Sheikh Hussein, Women Desk Officer, INTERSOM Relief Development Organization, Somalia.
Amb. Hawa Ahmed Youssouf, Special Representative of the AU LO, Bangui, CAR
Dr. Heshina Rukato, Tana High Level Forum (THLF) Coordinator, THLF on Security in Africa. Ethiopia.
Mr. Liban Sidow Hassan, Office Assistance. Somalia
Hon. Lindiwe Zulu, International Relations Advisor, Presidency, South Africa.
Mrs. Litha Musyimi-Ogna, Director Director, Women, Gender and Development Directorate (WGDD), African Union
Hon. Mariam Aweis Jama, Minister for Women's Development and Family Care, Somali Transitional Federal Government (TFG). Somalia
Mr. Nthanga Oyougou Athanase, CEEAC/EMR
Mr. Emvono Alexis Symphorien, CEEAC/MARAC
Mr. Savihemba Daniel, CEMR/CEEAC/FOMAC
1. Mrs. Achere Ibifuro Cole. Independent Consultant ADR, Nigeria

Annex 3: Documents Reviewed

<i>African Union Mediation Support Handbook. 2014. Accord.</i>
African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA). <i>Assessment Study. 2010.</i>
Cammack , Diana et al. 2006. <i>Donors and the 'Fragile States' Agenda: A Survey of Current Thinking and Practice.</i> March 2006. Overseas Development Institute. UK
CMI. 2013. <i>From Pre-Talks to Implementation. Lessons Learned from Mediation Processes.</i>
<i>Finland's Development Policy Programme Government Decision-in-Principle</i> 16 February 2012
Lutmar Carmela and Bercovitch Jacob. 2011. <i>Fragile States and Civil Wars: Is Mediation the Answer?</i> CRPD Working Paper No. 7 December 2011. Centre for Research on Peace and Development (CRPD). KU Leuven.
KPMG. 2014. <i>ACCORD Performance Audit Report. 2014</i>
Kääriä Tauno & Traore Oury. 2011. <i>Mid-Term-Review. The African Union Mediation Support Capacity Project.</i>
Managing Peace Process. Thematic Questions. A handbook for AU practitioners. Make Peace Happen
Ministry for Foreign Affairs. 2010. <i>Peace Mediation – Finland's Guidelines. 2010.</i> Helsinki.
Ministry For Foreign Affairs. <i>Finland's Development Policy and Development Cooperation in Fragile States. – Guidelines for Strengthening Implementation of Development Cooperation 2012.</i>
Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. <i>Africa in Finnish Foreign Policy.</i>
Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. 2011. <i>Action Plan for Mediation.</i>
Mottiar Shayna and Jaarsveld Salome. 2009. <i>Mediating Peace in Africa. Securing Conflict Prevention.</i> Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. Accord.
<i>The African Union Mediation Support capacity Project. A Joint Project by AU CMD/ ACOORD/ CMI. Progress Report 1 January – 30 June 2013.</i>
<i>The African Union Mediation Support capacity Project. A Joint Project by AU CMD/ ACOORD/ CMI. Progress Report 1 January – 30 June 2014.</i>
<i>The African Union Mediation Support capacity Project. A Joint Project by AU CMD/ ACOORD/ CMI. Progress Report 1 July – 31 December 2013.</i>
<i>The African Union Mediation Support capacity Project. A Joint Project by AU CMD/ ACOORD/ CMI. Phase II Project Proposal. 2012 – 2014.</i>
<i>Towards Enhancing the Capacity of the African Union in Mediation. 2009. A Report based on a seminar organized by the African Union (AU) Commission. Addis Ababa. Ethiopia. 15-16 October 2009.</i>
World Bank. 2009. <i>The Capacity Development Results Framework. A strategic and results-oriented approach to learning for capacity development.</i>
Ulkoasiainministeriö. 2011. <i>Rauhanvälityksen toimintaohjelma.</i>

Annex 4: Performance Matrix and Key Deliverables

ANNEX 4 Key Deliverables		
Component and Objective	Planned Key Deliverables as stated in the Project Document	Status
<p>Component 1: Operational Support to Mediation</p> <p>1. To provide updated and analytical information to support the AU in its prioritization to intervene in conflict or potential conflict situations;</p> <p>2. To support AU in identifying and developing strategic responses and interventions;</p> <p>3. To generate new knowledge to inform capacity building and mediation interventions.</p>	<p>a. Continental Peace and Security Assessment Reports (three in total)</p> <p>b. Conflict Mapping and Analyses Reports</p> <p>c. Mapping of National Stakeholders (three countries in total)</p> <p>d. One Dialogue Workshop Per Year (three in total)</p> <p>e. Operationalization of Mediation Tools (Mediation Pool of the AU PSD Civilian Standby Roster, Mediation Handbook, UN-AU Guidelines in Mediation, establishment of Standard Operating Procedures in Mediation as well as Knowledge Management Framework)</p> <p>f. Support provided to AU Mediation Initiatives, and Knowledge Generated</p>	<p><i>Achieved, key deliverables delivered:</i> Peace and Security Assessments produced (Mali 2013, CAR 2014); Mapping of National Stakeholders Togo (2012), in Guinea Bissau (2013), and in Swaziland (2013). In 2014, Burundi and South Sudan were identified as key priorities and it was agreed that CMI would also look into the possibility of conducting mappings in Burkina Faso and Nigeria; Operationalization of Mediation Tools (Mediation Pool of the AU PSD Civilian Standby Roster, Mediation Handbook, UN-AU Guidelines in Mediation, establishment of Standard Operating Procedures in Mediation as well as Knowledge Management Framework) were in a very advanced stages of production and the Phase II has focused on disseminating those; The AU has launched a series of consultations with the RECs to strengthen their mediation capacities and to build national infrastructure to peace (August 2013 ECCAS in Gabon; ECOWAS September 2013 in Ghana; SADC September 2013).</p>
<p>Component 2: Lessons Learned and sharing of Good Practices</p> <p>4. To deepen the understanding of reflective practice and transmission of good practices in peace mediation</p> <p>5. To increase the awareness and knowledge of the AU on the concrete expertise that African non-state actors possessed in the field of mediation and to contribute to a creating of approaches in linking non-state efforts in mediation with those of the AU.</p>	<p>b) AU Annual High Level Retreat (three in total)</p> <p>c) Research Report based on the AU Annual High Level Retreat (three in total)</p> <p>d) Annual AU Special Envoys/Mediators Meeting (three in total)</p> <p>e) One UN-AU Consultative Meetings on Prevention and Management of Conflicts Per Year (three in total)</p> <p>f) Mapping of Regional Non-State Actors (one region)</p> <p>g) One Networking and Experience Sharing Workshop</p> <p>h) Debriefing of AU Mediation Teams (six in total)</p>	<p><i>Key deliverables delivered:</i> The Fourth High Level Retreat of Special Envoys and Representatives on the Promotion of Peace, Security and Stability in Africa, took place in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, from 29 - 30 October 2013. The Retreat was held under the theme "The AU 2013 Golden Jubilee Retreat: 50 Years of Peace-making in Africa – A Critical Retrospective of OAU/AU Peace-making." Research Report is being prepared.</p>
<p>Component 3: Capacity Building, Training and Development</p> <p>6. To strengthen the capacity and skill of AU and RM personnel to support mediation missions.</p> <p>7. To promote the link between training, roistering and deployment.</p>	<p>i) Mediation Trainings (four in total)</p> <p>j) African Women Mediators Seminar</p> <p>k) African union mediation training (French)</p> <p>l) African union mediation training (French)</p> <p>m) ECCAS Mediation Training (French): Strengthening Mediation and Dialogue Processes</p> <p>n) Revision and Translation of AU Mediation Support Handbook</p>	<p><i>Key deliverables delivered:</i> Mediation Trainings (four in total) conducted; people were trained and 35% of those trained were women. Trainings in basic, advanced and contextualized mediation have provided AU and RECs staff wide knowledge and skills in conflict analysis and mediation process design; Database of trained AU and RECs staff that can be chosen for deployment; Revision and Translation of AU Mediation Support Handbook completed.</p>