



PROGRAM FOR YOUNG POLITICIANS IN AFRICA

Annual Evaluation Report

2017-05-04

PYPA 2016

Elin Ekström, Monica Johansson, Eccola

Contents

1. BACKGROUND	7
1.1 Theoretical framework.....	9
1.2 Methodological cornerstones.....	10
1.3 Sources of information, and how we collect, organise and analyse data.....	12
2. BASELINE.....	13
3. RESULTS AND OUTCOMES	14
3.1 Programme objective	16
3.2 Outcome 1: increased participation and/or influence in political parties	16
3.3 Outcome 2: participants have worked for democracy and rights	20
3.4 Outcome 3: cooperation with other parties outside the PYPA training.....	27
4. MINI-PROJECTS	31
5. ALUMNI ACTIVITIES	34
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	37
6.1 Increased participation and influence in politics	37
6.2 Participants' work for democracy and human rights	38
6.3 Collaboration with other parties.....	40
References.....	44

Appendices

Appendix I PYPA programme matrix; expected outcomes and outputs

Appendix II PYPA programme matrix; outcomes and outputs 2016

Appendix III Participants and parties in PYPA 2016

Acronyms

CIS	Centre Party International Foundation
Eccola	The external evaluators commissioned for carrying out on-going research on the PYPA programme
ETU	Education Training Unit (South Africa)
IGD	Institut Général Tiémoko Marc Garango pour la Gouvernance et le Développement
KIC	Christian Democratic International Center
GF	Green Forum
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
OPC	Olof Palme International Center
PAO	Party Affiliated Organisations (<i>Sw: Partianknutna organisationer</i>)
PYPA	Program for Young Politicians in Africa
Sida	Swedish international development cooperation agency
SC	Steering Committee - the KIC coordinator and representatives from the PAOs

Summary of the Annual Evaluation Report 2016

This is the 5th Annual Evaluation Report (AER) since 2012. The report builds on a wide range of material retrieved and analysed by us, a team of two evaluators: semi-structured interviews with participants and mother party representatives, small workshops with participants, observations and field-notes, interaction and learning dialogues with PAOs and implementers, annual visits in the PYPA regions, questionnaires, PAOs' regional activity reports, etc.

Our participatory oriented evaluation aims at contributing to learning, in terms of durable and increased capacity of PYPA actors and participants. Capacity strengthening activities are expected to support actors and participants to fulfil and practice their duties and rights according to the aims of the programme. However, not only prescribed objectives, but also unexpected, yet highly relevant results have been taken into consideration in our analysis.

Three party affiliated organisations (PAO) - the Christian Democratic International Center (KIC), the Olof Palme International Center (OPC) and the Centre Party International Foundation (CIS) in collaboration with Green Forum, (GF) - developed the capacity-strengthening 'Program for Young Politicians in Africa - PYPA.' The Swedish PAOs and their local partners implemented the programme in eleven countries in East, West and Southern Africa between 2012 and 2014.¹ Approximately 400 young politicians participated in the programme during those three years, and all attended four weeks of regional training, over a one-year period, as well as national mini-projects and alumni activities. PYPA 2012-2014 is referred to by PAOs as "PYPA first phase".

In 2015, PYPA went on, but no new participants were accepted to the programme, and the year was devoted to capacity strengthening of alumni from 2012-2014.

In 2015, the four PAO that founded PYPA, applied for and were granted funding for a new PYPA phase (2016-2018) from the "Special Democracy Support through Political Party Affiliated Organisations". This report is, hence, the first Annual Evaluation Report (AER) for this "second phase" of three years.

One new region, Malawi-Zambia (Southeast Africa, abbreviated SEA) was added to PYPA in 2016. The opening session was held in November of 2016. Graduations will take place in October 2017.²

In PYPA WA, Senegal, Togo and the Ivory Coast entered the programme for 2016-2018. No new participants were recruited from the four countries making up PYPA WA during 2012-2014: Mali, Niger, Benin and Burkina Faso. Alumni-activities were, however, arranged in 2016, inviting all graduated students from WA PYPA 2012, 2013 and 2014.

Outcomes and outputs 2016

PYPA has done well with the expected outcomes and the overall programme-objective is partly being achieved already, although this is a long-term objective for the entire period 2016-2018. This is a general result for participants in WA, SA and EA.

¹ WA: Niger, Burkina Faso, Mali and Benin, SA: Mozambique, South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe, EA: Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania.

² This is the reason why this report will not include the full results from SEA 2016.

As participants assess their own action, influence and participation on a 1-4 scale³ in our questionnaires,⁴ the percentage of respondents checking the “quite a lot” or “yes, a lot”, are generally in majority, hence showing a good result for PYPA’s overall adequacy and capability to empower young politicians in their social-political contexts. Learning, experiences and skills from PYPA are used as a “toolbox” to apply, so that strategies and approaches best fit the political and societal context and the target group(s). Plenty of examples from questionnaires and interviews can be found on how the most important contents of the PYPA training are being implemented.

Below, the objectives for Outcome 1-3 are presented, followed by the summarised total percentage of answers rated 3 or 4 on the 1-4 scale. The percentage for women/men is also provided.

1. Objective: 55 % of participants have increased their participation and/or influence in political parties. Results from participants’ self-assessment questionnaires: A total of **90%** of the participants who have answered this question (85% f/96% m) report to have increased their participation in their political party. The total percentage reporting to have increased their influence in their political party thanks to their participation in PYPA is: 86% (79%f/93%m).

2. Objective: 70 % of participants have worked for democracy and rights within youth wings and/or political parties and/or other organisations. Result from the questionnaire: 73%, (71%f/75%m).

3. Objective: 50 % of participants have cooperated with other political parties and/or youth wings outside the PYPA training. Result from the questionnaire: **85%** (82% f/88% m).

However, it is possible to make improvements in the programme and how it is implemented. Some reflections and recommendations for the future are summarised below.

The Human Rights Based Approach

Implementers should safeguard that knowledge and skills acquired through PYPA on human rights can be used by participants to bear their duties by combatting discrimination and inequalities, and actively attempting to make an impact on policy, rather than just carrying out charity. Implementers can make a difference by preparing participants prior to study-visits, as well as by stimulating reflection on human rights and duty bearing, and how this is linked to policy.

Furthermore, the conceptualisation of discrimination ought to be widened, so that it embraces not only youth and women but also, for instance, inhabitants in rural areas, LGBTI-persons and disabled.

³ 1= No, not at all, 2= A little, 3= Quite a lot, 4= Yes, a lot

⁴ The self-assessment questionnaire was filled out by participants at the last training-session 2016.

Participants' relation to mother parties

It is crucial, but difficult for young politicians to be accepted and included, as they get back to their mother parties after having attended PYPA. It is especially difficult to get seniors to entrust the young for taking on responsibilities. Furthermore, seniors do not consult young people to the extent that would be desirable. One approach that can be applied by PAOs and implementers is to continue working with mother party activities to promote PYPA as a programme, as well as to render PYPA participants and alumni more visible as resources for mother parties.

Corruption

Corruption has been indicated as a difficult challenge by participants since PYPA first started in 2012, and the accounts of PYPA 2016 participants do not mark any change on this note. Corruption make young politicians vulnerable and dependent on donors. Also, it hampers democratic processes, and undermines confidence and interest in politics in society in general. Examples of measures that can be taken, so as to facilitate participants' training, and providing tools for fighting corruption are; exchanging and spreading good examples on anti-corruption from PYPA 2012-2015 across the regions and paying attention to that that as many opportunities as possible are given to practical training about anti-corruption (minor alumni projects are good fora for practice). Furthermore, the concept of *integrity* has been used successfully in the training in anti-corruption in EA 2016, and might be one feasible tool for other regions to consider.

Activities across party lines and networks outside of PYPA

PYPA participants of 2016 report to have few contacts with other political organisations outside of PYPA. This is of no surprise to us, not least since participants generally have very negative views of other political parties as they enter PYPA, and fill out the "baseline questionnaire". PYPA builds tolerance and improved appreciation of other parties, but in most cases the expected outcome that "participants have **cooperated with other political parties and/or youth wings outside** the PYPA training" may be unrealistic, at least if we expect it to be achieved during one year. However, we know, from PYPA first phase, and from the alumni-narratives and self-assessments, that collaboration with other political parties does increase after graduation. Nevertheless, we should remember not to set expectations too high, when aiming at facilitating collaboration between ruling and opposition parties. As participants narrate, collaboration may be troublesome or even risky in some of the contexts. We can conclude that the objective of the outcome is set high, but that we can expect it to be achieved in a longer term perspective. As for collaboration between ruling and opposition parties, PAOs and implementers are already doing a great effort, generally achieving good results in terms of improved tolerance and appreciation among youth from different poles of the political panorama.

Alumni activities

We do want to emphasise the importance of keeping up and developing the work with alumni activities. "Maintaining and building networks" is mentioned by participants themselves as the most important means for PYPA to sustain the empowerment processes in and among participants after graduation. It may take some time before graduated participants can implement and practise what they learned in PYPA, for various reasons PAOs, implementers and evaluators have witnessed how alumni use experiences, skills and networks from PYPA even up to three years after graduating.

We have also observed how some of the objectives of PYPA, that are difficult to achieve during the one year of training, can be assessed by alumni.⁵ The alumni networks, together with mother party activities are the most important tools that PYPA holds, for safeguarding *long-term sustainable empowerment* of participants.

Collaboration and exchange among PAOs and implementers

During 2016, we have seen how the collaboration and exchange of experiences has deepened and improved among PAOs and regional implementers. There had already been good progress on this note in PYPA 2012-2015, but 2016 marked a good start for PYPA second phase 2016-2018, and the cooperation and open learning dialogue bodes good for the future.

Long-term sustainability and continuous learning

Again, on this account we would like to emphasise the importance of constant exchange of experience and learning among PAOs and implementers. We also encourage continuous support for long-term sustainability through alumni networks, close communication with mother parties and other possible activities or measures.

We would like to thank the PAOs, implementers and facilitators, mother party representatives and, of course, the most important; the young participants and alumni themselves for granting us unlimited access to PYPA during 2016. We now look forward to following the PYPA-journey on new exciting endeavours!

May 3, 2017

Monica Johansson and Elin Ekström

⁵ AER 2015

1. BACKGROUND

Three party affiliated organisations (PAO) - the Christian Democratic International Center (KIC), the Olof Palme International Center (OPC) and the Centre Party International Foundation (CIS) in collaboration with Green Forum, (GF) - developed the capacity-strengthening 'Program for Young Politicians in Africa - PYPA.' The Swedish PAOs and their local partners implemented the programme in eleven countries in East, West and Southern Africa between 2012 and 2014.⁶ Approximately 400 young politicians participated in the programme during those three years, and all attended four weeks of regional training, over a one-year period, as well as national mini-projects and alumni activities.

The programme was elaborated according to the multi-party system support strategy applied by the Swedish government, with the overall aim to contribute to rendering political systems more representative and less discriminative.

PYPA received funding from the strategy “Special Democracy Support through Political Party Affiliated Organisations ” under the multi-party support component (VO2), and went on throughout 2015 thanks to continued funding from the same strategy. The 2015 programme was designed to build on the achievements of the 2012-2014 programme (generally called PYPA first phase) and to consolidate the objectives of PYPA.

In 2015, the four PAO that founded PYPA, applied for and were granted funding for a new PYPA phase (2016-2018) from the “Special Democracy Support through Political Party Affiliated Organisations”. This report is, hence the first Annual Evaluation Report (AER) for this second phase of three years.

In 2016, one new region was added to PYPA. The region Malawi-Zambia (Southeast Africa, abbreviated SEA) held their opening session in November 2016. Graduations will take place in October 2017.⁷

In PYPA WA, Senegal, Togo and the Ivory Coast entered the programme for 2016-2018. No new participants were recruited from the four countries making up PYPA WA during 2012-2014: Mali, Niger, Benin and Burkina Faso. Alumni-activities were, however, arranged in 2016, inviting all graduated students from WA PYPA 2012, 2013 and 2014.

The Youth perspective – the core of PYPA

The ‘youth perspective’ permeates all aspects of PYPA. The approach acknowledges young people as important social actors in their own right. They should not only be considered tomorrow's leaders, but also the leaders of today. The youth perspective is founded on youth’s democratic right to participate in, and influence social and political processes.

The core challenge on which PYPA builds, is that young people have limited opportunities to participate in decision-making processes and their interests are not adequately represented in policies. Power structures neglecting youth, have become normalised in society. Young people are discriminated simply because they are young.

⁶ WA: Niger, Burkina Faso, Mali and Benin, SA: Mozambique, South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe, EA: Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania.

⁷ This is the reason why this report will not include the full results from SEA 2016.

To work towards increasing youth's participation and influence by merely adopting a youth perspective, and by emphasising youth's capacity in programmes like PYPA are not sufficient measures for dealing with the considerable challenges faced by youth in society in general as well as in political life.

For this reason, KIC, OPC, CIS and GF aim at reaching beyond the objective of providing a “traditional” education or training, by putting particular emphasis on long-term-sustainable capacity strengthening and empowerment among participants. This approach reveals, addresses and challenges the power structures based on age that prevent youth from getting access to participation and influence.

Long-term collaboration for continuous improvement and learning

During the second phase of PYPA 2016-2018, KIC continues to have the overall programme responsibility as well as the responsibility for the programme component in East Africa (EA). OPC remains responsible for the programme component in Southern Africa (SA), CIS for West Africa (WA) and Green Forum (GF) for the new PYPA region, South Eastern Africa (SEA).⁸ Each PAO also kept one or more local partner in the regions to share the responsibility of implementation and to strengthen the grass-root support of the programme. This collaboration has been a major key to the overall success of the programme during PYPA 2012-2015, as all three regions have had highly qualified, competent partners with extended contextual knowledge.

Representatives for the four PAOs and the coordinator from KIC make up the Steering Committee for PYPA. KIC is the commissioning body for the on-going learning evaluation and, hence, also for this AER.

The 2016-2018 PYPA programme continues to build on the human rights-based approach (HRBA) and applies youth and gender perspectives. The marginalisation of youth in society is not necessarily due to lack of knowledge and experience on part of the youth, but also due to existing, and normalised, power structures that discriminate youth solely based upon age. The HRBA elucidates the fact that youth politicians are both ‘right-holders’ (belonging to a discriminated group) and ‘duty-bearers’ (belonging to organisations - political parties - that govern, or try to govern, the state).

To this end, the programme objective is: *“programme participants have increased their participation within politics and work for democracy and rights”*. The programme objective has two significant aspects. One refers to the intrinsic aim of increased participation of youth in all spheres of politics (right holders). The other aspect refers to the importance of participants serving as democratic leaders promoting human rights (duty bearers).

It is acknowledged that this type of change process relates to behaviour, attitudes and values. Increasing the participation of marginalised groups entails questioning and challenging traditional power structures. The conventional result management methods, such as LFA and RBM, are rather unsuitable for capturing the dynamics of these processes.⁹

⁸ SEA encompasses Zambia and Malawi.

⁹ Klingebiel, 2012. “Result-based aid (RBA): new aid approaches, limitations and the application to promote good governance”. http://www.die-gdi.de/uploads/media/DP_14.2012.pdf/ International IDEA, 2014. “Democracy assistance and results: debates and constructive reflections (roundtable report)” Vähämäki/Schmidt/Molander, 2011. “Results Based Management in Development Cooperation”.

PYPA is, hence, an attempt to explore, develop and put into practice a less positivistic management method, which endorses open ended and process oriented objectives and indicators. The programme relies upon and uses different tools of result management instead of one single result matrix or model.

PYPA 2016 has three main components:

- 1) PYPA training sessions in the four regions with approximately 40 participants in each region.¹⁰ Training sessions were held in all regions as according to the PYPA programme. The so-called mini-projects through which participants get a chance to practise what they have learned during PYPA are an integrated part of the training. In addition to the “regular” mini-projects, alumni from Benin, Niger, Mali and Burkina Faso were given the opportunity to carry out alumni projects funded through and supported by PYPA.
- 2) Alumni activities: Alumni activities were arranged in all countries of WA (PYPA first phase) and in EA. In SA alumni-seminars were arranged in Mozambique, Namibia and Zimbabwe.
- 3) Mother party activities: Mother party activities have been carried out in WA, SEA and EA. In SA one short mother party workshop was held, in order to settle conflicts between the ruling and the major opposition party of Mozambique.

Expected outcomes, objectives and outputs PYPA 2016-2018

The programme objective for PYPA’s first phase 2012-2014, “Participants have increased their participation within politics and work for democracy and rights”, is kept also for PYPA 2016-2018.

In addition to the programme objective, there are three main expected outcomes:

1. 55 % of participants have **increased their participation and/or influence** in political parties.
2. 70 % of participants have **worked for democracy and rights** within youth wings and/or political parties and/or other organisations.
3. 50 % of participants have **cooperated with other political parties and/or youth wings outside** the PYPA training.

Each of the three expected outcomes is complemented by three outputs, so as to permit for monitoring gradual changes throughout the entire programme period.¹¹

1.1 Theoretical framework

The programme, and the learning evaluation in PYPA is theory driven. PYPA’s Theory of Change (ToC) was elaborated and further developed during 2013. The ToC is based on earlier research on empowerment and power in theory and practice and focuses on the participants’ (the ‘for whoms’/ target groups) progressive movements in relation to their own starting points.

Rather than expecting the participants/target groups to end up at the highest end of the "ladder of participation" or a high political position, the core in the ToC is about facilitating the participants’ (the right holders) use of their own capacity, knowledge, power and agency to act (power to).

¹⁰ Appendix 3 is a summary of the number of female/male participants and the parties represented in PYPA 2016.

¹¹ See Appendix 1 for the PYPA result matrix 2016-2018.

Although there is a focus on the participants' acting and positions within their respective parties and national/regional/local governmental bodies, the political participation is interpreted in a broader sense, including interactions with groups of citizens, organisations, universities and other institutions with social and political connotations in society.

Within the achieved changes/results, the participants can be analysed as claiming/exercising their right to (their own) participation as well as contributing to fulfilment of the rights of others; in other words, they act as both right-holders and duty-bearers.

The Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) and methods have been used in training sessions, mini-projects and alumni activities. This is not only about learning from new theoretical knowledge in the academies. It is also about empowerment, capacity strengthening participatory actions and explorative research on how to meet the challenges faced in the political leadership with attitudes and changed behaviour in relation to good governance and human rights. PYPA provides relevant constructive multi-party relations and opportunities for participants to practice the newly acquired knowledge and skills through concrete projects in local/regional/national practices and benefit from networking during and beyond PYPA.

1.2 Methodological cornerstones

Participatory action approach

The methodological framework – a participatory action approach and its rights- and gender integrated youth perspective - permeates the programme and its implementation. The construction of social networks is strongly encouraged. The PAOs responsible for the PYPA programme also emphasise the quality of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), by defining performance indicators - criteria for success – and using ongoing learning evaluation and implementation research. The 'PYPA-platforms' in the four regions offer a space for interactive participation and open reflection among participants and facilitators (and others) who provide entries into further reflections, learning and actions during, in-between and after PYPA.

Learning evaluation

The design and different methods in the learning evaluation have been systematically developed and implemented during 2012-2014. This Evaluation Report builds on information gathered during 2016. As in previous years, we use various sources and methods for the exploration of the questions of adherence to the learning evaluation purposes in PYPA. The purpose of the learning evaluation, issues to explore, sources and methods will be briefly described in the following.

Our participative approach stems from, and is closely related to what the international community of researchers would refer to as “PAR” (Participatory Action Research). This approach is characterised by the responsible actors and participants' active participation in generation and recycling of knowledge in democratic processes, carried out with the actors' common objective that the process will lead to finding solutions to the shared problems for which PYPA is organised.

Our participatory oriented evaluation aims at contributing to learning, in terms of the PYPA actors and participants' durable and increased capacity to fulfil and practice their duties and rights according to the aims of PYPA.

One important prerequisite for learning to take place is perceptiveness and compliance in relation to the individual and social demands, the needs and capacities of the participants. Another point-of-reference in our explorative approach is the programme objective and the specific objectives presented above. The full Result Matrix with prescribed indicators and sources of verification is one of our principal points-of-reference as we carry out the ongoing evaluation. This Matrix is attached in Appendix 1. The evaluators have had access to a rich empirical material, and although the prescribed indicators are central parameters, as results were to be presented, we found that the Matrix needed to be extended, and that results needed to be presented in numerical as well as in qualitative terms.

We also identify and add non-prescribed values to the prescribed results, indicators, baseline values and benchmarks.

The points-of-departure, experience-based as well as theoretical knowledge and values are taken seriously, are recognised and taken into account. The meeting between the participants' various experiences, the implementers and the evaluators' critical analysis is expected to enhance the understanding and give voice to the target groups and identities that generally have no voice and/or are being discriminated. The process is progress-oriented. It actively searches for means that may give support to young, politically active and/or discriminated individuals/groups.

The aim is to give these groups access to structures, processes, social networks and other resources that empower them to represent their interests, enjoy rights and fulfil duties in their political leadership and in their role as expected change agents in democratisation processes.

The aim of the learning evaluation is that we (the evaluators), together with the groups for whom we are evaluating PYPA, get access to, communicate and re-use knowledge that, during the programme, can: confirm, safeguard and improve design, content, methods and implementation of PYPA's processes. Another aim of the evaluation is to shed light upon target groups and the possibilities to change structures related to age, gender and power, and, finally, to contribute to change directed towards solutions and results during and after PYPA.

Learning and critical reflection are central features of the organising of PYPA, as well as the collaborative process of organising the evaluation activities, which, in turn is connected to the shared responsibility and focus on the prospects for continuous development.

The strategy adopted involves evaluation of social interaction and learning among and between actors (target groups) throughout the whole programme. The objective is to contribute to (de)learning and participants' use of newly acquired knowledge. Various research and evaluation perspectives, objectives, methods and approaches that complement each other are used in the evaluation for the aims at reaching an enhanced understanding and knowledge about the following six aspects:

(I) Characteristics of the participants (individual as well as target groups): sex, age, political position, experiences, educational background) and driving forces (motivation) for learning in PYPA. (II) Main challenges, (III) Alternatives for facing challenges and finding solutions, facilitated by the implementers, (IV) Participants' self-assessment of their own acquired knowledge, experience and learning: resources, understanding, knowledge and capacities,

(V) Participants' implementation of knowledge acquired through PYPA, in their political leadership and activities and (VI) Participants' social (political) networks and interaction, degree of interaction, for what reasons, why and with whom.

We use various methodological tools in our study as we follow the participants and other actors involved in the implementation of PYPA. We look for indicators regarding whether and how the training in PYPA has effectively delivered results in terms of: (I) participants' (increased/deepened knowledge, (II) objectives and modes of using knowledge and skills in PYPA participants' own contexts of political leadership, (III) social and political interactions in which our young politicians engage with the objective to increase young people's involvement and influence in political processes and organising policy.

1.3 Sources of information, and how we collect, organise and analyse data

This report builds on information gathered from various sources, which will be briefly described in the following.

Baseline questionnaires

At the beginning of the first training session in each region, we carried out a Baseline study, to map out challenges, needs and experiences of newly enrolled PYPA participants.

Participants' self-assessment

At the end of PYPA 2016 individual questionnaires have been answered by participants (119 answers, 56 women/63 men) out of 125 participants (59 w/66 m)¹² 2016.¹³

The questionnaire contained questions that respondents were asked to answer by checking a box, using a 1-4 scale where 1 corresponded to "not at all" and 4 corresponded to "a lot". Each section of questions in the questionnaire that related to the objectives of PYPA 2016, also contained a "semi-structured" section, where the participants are asked to clarify and provide concrete examples of their statements on practical use of gained skills. The last section contained open questions regarding participants' perception of which themes and which content they considered most useful and empowering, what they were missing in PYPA and what could be improved to make their learning and empowerment more long-term sustainable.

Dialogue with PAOs and implementers in the regions

Also the implementers/main facilitators in the three regions were asked to answer a questionnaire regarding their own experiences and views, as well as on participants' learning and interaction during PYPA. They were also asked to report on the number of female and male participants (Appendix 3).

¹² The number does not include SEA 42 participants (22w/20m), since the closing session will be held in October 2017.

¹³ Our analysis of the quantitative and qualitative indicators in the Result Matrix (Appendix 2) related to the programme objective and the 3 outcomes build on these answers.

Two “learning seminars” were held. The first was held in August 2016, and focused on “internal monitoring/external evaluation”. The second was on “Long-term sustainability in PYPA”.

A lengthy learning dialogue was held during the partnership days in February 2017 with PAOs and implementers from the four regions.

Semi-structured interviews

The evaluators have been given numerous additional opportunities to gather information regarding the programme and its implementation throughout PYPA 2016. An important tool has been semi-structured individual and/or group interviews.

We have been granted access to the Steering Committee and its representatives, the coordinator, participants, alumni-representatives, implementers in the regions and other key-persons.

We have continuously monitored, studied, analysed and reflected on what we have seen, and provided feed-back in discussions with PYPA key-actors. In addition, we have studied a number of documents, such as the implementers’ regional reports. A total of 25 semi structured interviews (13 women/12 men) have been carried out with participants from: EA (4 w/4 m), SA (5 w/4 m) and WA (4 w/4 m). The interviewees represent the ruling and the opposition parties, and were selected by the evaluators from the list of participants. Interviews were carried out at the last training session in three regions.

Five mother party representatives (two from SA and three from EA) have also been interviewed. Also these interviewees represent ruling as well as opposition parties in the two regions.

Visits and workshops in all of the four regions

The evaluators did not attend any of the opening sessions of PYPA during the first phase of the programme (2012-2015), but in 2016, as a new region, South-East Africa, was added, we decided together with the regional manager, Green Forum, to pay a visit, to hand out the baseline questionnaire and to carry out an opening workshop on the needs and expectations of participants.

Both of the evaluators attended the final training sessions in EA, SA and WA. We handed out and collected the participants’ self-assessment questionnaires, and carried out interviews. We also organised a workshop on long-term sustainability of learning and skills from PYPA. After the small workshop, we also shared examples of overall outcomes from earlier PYPA years and from all regions.

Furthermore, we have collected approximately 30 pages of field-notes, carried out observations and engaged in dialogue with implementers and facilitators.

2. BASELINE

Baseline studies have been carried out annually since 2012, the first PYPA-year. At the first day of training, all participants are asked to fill out a questionnaire. Questionnaires are then sent off to the external evaluators for analysis. An extensive baseline report, as well as a reduced mini-report of the baseline was published in 2013. After the first year, the questionnaire was revised, and the number of questions was reduced.

The main objective for carrying out the study is to provide information about experiences, main challenges and expectations before the start of PYPA among the participants. Furthermore, the questions serve as a tool for preparing and opening up the minds of participants, and relate the topics of the PYPA training to their own political and societal context, before the training begins. PAOs, regional managers and facilitators also get an idea of the challenges and expectations that will need to be faced during the training, in order to assist and continuously evaluate the progress of the individuals as well as the group. Last but not least, all PYPA actors get the possibility to confirm annually, whether the content of the programme is relevant.

We have read and analysed all of the questionnaires, and delivered a written summary to PAOs and implementers of the four regions. Since space is limited, our account here will be extremely short, while we will integrate findings and reflections on some of the challenges and expectations among participants in other sections in this chapter.

The written summary delivered to the Steering Committee and the implementers in the regions, was concluded with a small quality check of the correlation between the findings of Baseline 2016 and the PYPA application to Sida for PYPA 2016-2018.

What we are trying to verify is whether PAOs and implementers have been capable of identifying the challenges, opportunities and measures for meeting the needs and demands of the target-group(s).

The main challenges, as stated by participants in PYPA 2012-2015 (and presented in the Baseline Report of 2012, as well as in the Annual Evaluation Reports of 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015) are cited in the PYPA programme (application to Sida) as follows:

- lack of influence and marginalisation of youth in society and political life in general, as well as in mother parties
- lack of influence and marginalisation of women in society and political life in general, as well as in mother parties and in the families of young female politicians
- corruption
- lack of knowledge and political training among (young) politicians and the electorate in general
- discrimination of ethnic groups, tribalism,
- unequal distribution of wealth (i.e. poverty)

We can conclude that the challenges faced by newly recruited participants of PYPA 2016 and their fellow young men and women are roughly the same as they were in 2012-2014. We believe that some of the needs and expectations of participants will be slightly changed and some “themes” will emerge clearer and stronger than others during 2016-2018.

3. RESULTS AND OUTCOMES

Expected results, outcomes and indicators are specified in the Result Matrix for PYPA second phase 2016-2018 (see Annex 1). Annex 2 is the same matrix, filled out with the quantitative outcomes 1-3.

PYPA has done well with the expected outcomes and the overall programme-objective partly is being achieved already, although this is a long-term objective for the entire period 2016-2018. This is a general result for participants in WA, SA and EA.

As participants assess their own action, influence and participation on a 1-4 scale¹⁴ in our questionnaires, the percentage of respondents checking the “quite a lot” or “yes, a lot”, are generally very high, and the numbers are also confirmed by good examples of applied knowledge.

This is, hence a good result for PYPA’s overall adequacy and capability to empower young politicians in their social-political contexts. Learning, experiences and skills from PYPA are used as a “toolbox” to apply, so that strategies and approaches best fit the political and societal context and the target group(s). Plenty of examples from questionnaires and interviews can be found on how the cornerstone content of the PYPA training is implemented.

Below, the objectives for Outcome 1-3 are presented, followed by the summarised total percentage of answers rated 3 or 4 on the 1-4 scale. The percentage for women/men is also provided.

1. Objective: 55 % of participants have increased their participation and/or influence in political parties. Results from participants’ self-assessment questionnaires: A total of **90%** of the participants who have answered this question (85% f/96% m) report to have increased their participation in their political party. The total percentage reporting to have increased their influence in their political party thanks to their participation in PYPA is: **86%** (79%f/93%m).

2. Objective: 70 % of participants have worked for democracy and rights within youth wings and/or political parties and/or other organisations. Result from the questionnaire: **73%**, (71%f/75%m).

3. Objective: 50 % of participants have cooperated with other political parties and/or youth wings outside the PYPA training. Result from the questionnaire: **85%** (82% f/88% m).

Challenges do, however, remain. For instance, participants from EA, SA and WA generally provide few concrete examples of applied knowledge in their self-assessment regarding:

...being given responsibilities and being consulted by seniors. This tendency of not being consulted, or being given responsibilities by seniors is stronger among women. (This output relates to outcome 1.)

...having practised anti-corruption in their work. (This output relates to outcome 2.)

...having organised activities with peers from other political parties. (This output relates to outcome 3.)

These outputs, implying challenges that still need to be dealt with, will be discussed in the respective outcome sections 1-3 below as well as in the section “Conclusions and recommendations”.

¹⁴ 1= No, not at all, 2= A little, 3= Quite a lot, 4= Yes, a lot

3.1 Programme objective

The programme objective for PYPA phase II 2016-2018 is stated in the application to Sida as follows: **During the programme period, 60% of participants have increased their participation and influence within politics and work for democracy and rights.** Outcomes are measured each programme year during 2016-2018, and the achievement of the overall programme objective is traced and reflected upon from 2016. This is, however, a long-term-objective, that is expected to be achieved gradually through the fulfilment of outcomes 1-3 (below).

In the alumni report of 2015 (AER 2015), we found rich evidence the programme objective having been achieved for the first phase of PYPA. It is clear that for this objective to be approached over time, the participants need to get back to their parties, to start implementing their toolbox of skills and experiences from PYPA. Many use their mother party as a greenhouse where they can slowly cultivate their political skills, and start reaching out toward the larger society and other groups in civil society after some time.¹⁵

The qualitative indicators of the programme objective refer to participants’:

... increased participation and/or influence in political parties and/or in politics.
... actions taken to promote democracy and rights.

Let us first take a closer look at what has been achieved by PYPA participants during 2016, related to outcome 1-3.

3.2 Outcome 1: increased participation and/or influence in political parties

55 % of participants have increased their participation and/or influence in political parties.

Examples of indicators:

... increased participation and/or influence in political parties.
... actions initiated and led by participants within youth wings or mother parties.
... participants being given responsibilities within youth wings or mother parties by seniors.
... participants being consulted by seniors within mother parties.

Increased involvement and acceptance in mother parties’ activities

During the first phase of PYPA, 2012-2015, in the first two years in particular, many participants (especially young women, but also young male politicians) shared their experiences of hitting the glass-ceiling as well as having more practical difficulties as they got back to the mother parties after the PYPA training. Senior members would try to block young members from achieving influence within and outside of the party, and from developing their leadership capacities. PYPA alumni used to narrate, especially in the beginning of the PYPA training, that they would have to “shout” in order to get other party members to listen to them.

During the alumni year 2015, we collected clear examples of positive change on this note. PYPA youth stated that they had found ways to talk to senior members. Several alumni told that they had learned advocacy through PYPA. They reported to have noticed a positive gradual change and a more respectful attitude of seniors and/or the party management.

¹⁵ AER 2015, p. 15-16

When looking at the results from 2016, a few cases of palpable discrimination and domination in relation to young leaders in the mother parties do come to our knowledge. However, it is clear that the overall tendency speaks in favour of more influence to the young.¹⁶ Below we will refer to some representative quotes collected through semi-structured interviews and questionnaires at the end of PYPA 2016.

“Since the PYPA training, I have more critical positions. The youth leader of my party said that after the PYPA training, I became more dynamic. I conduct training sessions in the sections of my party, which gathers various groups of divisions within the party. I have been chosen by a candidate of the past legislative elections to develop the campaign strategy. Sometimes, the leader of my party youth section asks me to give my opinion when he wants some strategic opinions.” /Man WA

“While organising yearly party region conference my party had to consult me on which topic can benefit the youth and also asked me to recommend some facilitators. This has helped me to share what I learned in PYPA with my party.” /Man EA

“other members from my mother party are calling me, asking what topics should be done or suggested due to the experience that I have now.” /Woman EA

“I’m in the middle of the decision making. Senior members of the party ask for my opinion. I’m even allowed to represent the president of my party if he’s not available, speak in his name if needed. We have a lot of young people believing that that party has forgot about them, and they are angry for it and there was manifestations and some destruction. I was in the commission that was tasked with dialoguing with them and calm the situation.” /Woman WA

“I was consulted by the senior members inside my party, if I would like to be member of the central committee and if I will represent them correctly in their sessions of the central committee.” /Man SA

“At several occasions, I was entrusted by my senior members in the party as well as in the City Council. The senior members normally ask my opinion for future decisions” /Woman SA

“Thanks to PYPA and some training modules that I put into practice, a leader of my party proposed me to become his communication manager.” /Woman WA

“I go with my party’s leaders during their travels and I am involved in decision-making.” /Woman WA

“The NP’s, the chief executives, the ministers, some leaders of our party asked me to give them information on the program content, to advise them or to provide them my services.” /Man WA

Improved mutual respect between youth and the mother party

One of the explanations to this positive change might, as suggested by the young themselves, be that they have learned to speak to power in a different way. They are less aggressive and more tactic than before the PYPA training. Another plausible explanation is that in the eleven Phase 1 countries (seven of which are evaluated here), a small critical core of alumni has built up within the parties since 2012 in most of the parties that send participants to PYPA. The youth wing can therefore continue to fuel empowerment even in the post-PYPA period, not least through the networks that our young politicians continue to nurture and strengthen also after graduating from PYPA, often with youth from similar parties in neighbouring countries.

¹⁶ Phase 2 includes 5 new countries: Zambia, Malawi (in SEA), Ivory Coast, Togo and Senegal (in WA). The 3 countries in WA have been fully evaluated in 2016. Here there are, however, no alumni yet, and no previous experience of PYPA.

We know, from interviews carried out with mother party representatives, that PYPA is a well-known and highly regarded programme, seen as training a new generation of leaders, who can promote politics in community and among other young people. Also, several PYPA alumni have reached important influential positions at regional and/or national levels, hence serving as credible models among youth themselves, and building trust and respect in mother parties.

A quote from one of the interviewees representing the mother parties:

“I serve as the president for the youth wing. I am sitting where the decisions are made, and actively advocate for the rights of the young in my party.... As you know, politics in Africa focuses a lot on financial resources, and if you are short of means and young it is easy to despair. Since many of us are in the same situation, we can assist each other also in fundraising. The young will give opportunities and try to support other young in promoting themselves, and - as I told you earlier - many PYPA alumni now hold important offices. The network of young who can help each other is growing strong.”

A number of examples have been provided by interviewees and respondents on activities carried out within the party. The most common activity is training of other (young) members (sometimes specifically female members) within the party, but also in communities as well as among university students outside of PYPA to promote interest in politics in general. The mini-projects have, however, been the most significant activity of this kind for many of the participants.

The majority of participants claim to have increased their participation and influence in their mother parties, and most have organised or assisted in the organisation of activities for the youth wing members.

A few interviewees and respondents also report to have been consulted by the senior members or the leadership of the party. For instance, youth have been given the task to develop policies for political communication and/or campaigning.

Participants from EA, SA and WA generally provide few concrete examples of applied knowledge when assessing whether they have been given responsibilities and/or have been consulted by seniors.

In earlier AERs (2012-2015), we have observed that youth from WA face more significant challenges related to getting the chance to implement and practise what has been learned in PYPA, as compared to participants in SA and EA. Youth from Burkina Faso, Benin and Mali generally referred to the mini-project as *the* forum for implementation. This changed somewhat during PYPA 2012-2014, and alumni reported on improved possibilities of acceptance and responsibilities in the mother parties.¹⁷

Also in 2016, WA participants report low implementation related to the above mentioned themes and, in addition, “initiating and leading actions within youth wings or mother parties”, “working for democracy and rights” and “conflict prevention”. This tendency is particularly strong among the Togolese. One difference, as compared to earlier years in WA (in Mali, Burkina Faso, Benin and Niger) is that especially the Ivorian participants (and also

¹⁷ See, for instance AER 2015

some of the Senegalese) report to have well-developed relations with the mother bodies of their parties which should bode good for WA participants in PYPA 2016-2018.¹⁸

Mother party activities

However, youth will be able to take on responsibilities and carry out activities on behalf of their parties only if they are given the space. We recognise mother parties being important gatekeepers, and potential facilitators for PYPA participants' prospects for actually using the knowledge and skills from PYPA. The relationship between the PYPA management and the mother parties is also crucial for long term sustainability. We have carried out telephone interviews with 5 mother party representatives in 2016, and plan to do more in 2017. Our objectives for following up with the mother party representatives are mainly to give mother parties feedback about the long term impact of PYPA, and to let them give us feedback and share reflections on PYPA and what it means to participants and their parties. Below is a short account on mother party activities carried out during 2016, as reported by the regional managers.

WA: Mother parties were invited to opening and closing ceremonies during the first and third training sessions, as well as to all the mini-projects. After the third and final session, a meeting was organised a meeting of all the mother parties in each of the participating countries in order to sum up the experiences. The aim of these meetings are threefold: i) to present the 2016 activities to mother parties, ii) to get their feedback as to how to improve the programme, and iii) to inform them how they can assist the programme. Thus, the meetings were used as an opportunity to advocate for parties to give more space for the youth, and also to draw their attention about the need to respect the procedures during selection process.

EA: An advanced training on conflict management and mediation was organised in collaboration with International Idea in Kenya. It was a joint alumni and mother party activity. Kenyan alumni with positions in the parties were invited, as well as other youth working in the parties.

KIC held one-on-one meetings with participating political parties in Kenya to update them on the year's program activities, selection criteria, content of the trainings and the mini and alumni projects. KIC does this every year because of the high leadership turnover in many of the Kenya Political Party headquarters. KIC always strive to make sure the new leaders understand the PYPA program and what is in it for the party. It was an opportunity to encourage the party headquarters to utilise the alumni and deploy them to practice the skills and knowledge acquired from the academies.

SEA: By February 2016, physical follow-up meetings have been held with all mother parties in Malawi and the same will be done in Zambia. In Malawi, the parties were represented by their Secretary Generals (or Deputy) in all but one party and National Youth Directors were also present in some meetings. These meetings were also used as an opportunity to facilitate for the participants to officially interact with the party leaders regarding PYPA. Hence selected participants took part in the meetings and provided feedback on what they had learned. However, it was clear that there is a strong hierarchy within the party structures and that some participants felt uncomfortable to speak in front of the senior party officials.

¹⁸ This tendency has been checked and confirmed also by facilitators from WA.

A meeting is also planned with all Secretary Generals in Malawi in the first half of 2017, potentially in a workshop format. This may also be an option for Zambia. During the start-up phase of the programme meetings with mother parties were organised in both countries to explain and promote PYPA.

SA: No mother party activities were organised 2016. Given the importance of mother parties as gatekeepers for the young and for the long term sustainability of the empowerment processes taking place during and after PYPA, ETU is planning for mother party activities in 2017.

Mother party representatives confirm growth in PYPA youth

Three out of our five interviewees representing the mother parties are PYPA-graduates themselves, and report on the role played by PYPA in training young members of the party.

Two comments from mother party representatives interviewed:

“I can see a big change in young party members who come back from the PYPA training. One of the most important skills that they learn in PYPA is communication tools, how to use media platforms and how link with the party members. We can also see a clear improvement in political strategic work. This is a big contribution. Any political party wants and needs this!”

“I can see two things. They [PYPA participants] are more active and vibrant. Even intellectually, they begin to question so many things. They look at things differently, and they look at the party differently and that’s a real indicator that some learning has happened. I’ve also noticed the idea that they have the same challenges as other young leaders from other countries and that they want to do things together. Also, the appreciation of social media, they want to bring that to the party. Clearly PYPA does leave a person changed!”

3.3 Outcome 2: participants have worked for democracy and rights

70% of participants have worked within youth wings and/or political parties and/or other organisations.

Examples of indicators:

...participants working for democracy and rights within youth wings, political parties or other organisations.

...increased interaction with participants’ constituency.

...participants applying an HRBA/youth/gender approach within youth wings, political parties or other organisations.

...participants applying knowledge of democratic processes and leadership within youth wings, political parties or other organisations.

... participants doing anti-corruption work within youth wings, political parties, or other organisations.

Implementing the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA)

In interviews carried out with participants during the final session in WA, EA and SA 2016, we pose the questions: *“What does human rights mean to you?”* and *“How do you (plan to) work with/integrate human rights in your work as a politician, what are the biggest challenges?”*

The first question is mainly there to open up the minds of the interviewees, while the second has been put in the interviews in order to find out what the interviewee plans to actually do with the knowledge and experiences gained.

There is also a third question linked to human rights: *“In your opinion or experience, who are the people/what groups of people are most likely to face violation of their rights in your country?”*

Some of the answers to question number two indicate that the participants see gender and youth issues as the two most important. In most of the cases, “youth and women” is the straight answer to question number three, that regards what groups of people are more likely to face violation of their rights. Participants from Southern Africa tend, however, to show broader perspectives on discrimination and human rights. Respondents mention migrants, “street kids”, and LGBTI persons when talking about groups who are more likely to face human rights violations.

Many of the participants also either leave us “empty” answers, or answers indicating they have not fully understood the question. Some seem to have difficulties in thinking freely about, or operationalising concepts such as human rights, democracy, and gender equality. For instance: *“There are two main forms of democracy, representative and participatory.”* Another example from one of our interviews: *“In my country discrimination is very rare. None of my country people is being discriminated at all or not using their human rights. Even the people who are claiming to be discriminated are having more power than us.”/Woman S.A. “My party is democratic, so there is democracy within my party, we also implement this principle in the election of our leaders, this party always follow this principle” Man S A*

Also the answers related to how the training in human rights can be implemented in the practical work suggest that participants have registered the meaning and importance of the concept, but does neither show that they have implemented it, nor does it indicate how this will be done.

Examples: *“I can pay attention to the importance of safeguarding everybody’s equal rights...”* or *“I can work for setting up policies for improved inclusion of youth or women in party activities...”* or *“I can train other youth in human rights...”*

Based on experiences from PYPA 2012-2014, it is not a surprise to us not to find as many signs of implementation as we would have wished. This is an objective that requires changes in attitudes, which is a long-term and slow process.

There is continuous dialogue between evaluators and implementers/facilitators about how to improve the PYPA training, in order to facilitate the understanding of Human Rights and relate them to tools and actions for implementation in the socio-political contexts of participants. This year, the discussion focused much on widening the rights perspective from “youth and women”, so that it also encompasses other discriminated groups, as well as on concepts as charity and policymaking. We will return to these perspectives later in this report.

Good examples of implementation, human rights

The last time we evaluated implementation was at the end of 2015, the “alumni year” in PYPA. In the Annual Evaluation Report of 2015, we found several examples of successful implementation. We could also clearly see how participants had “matured” in terms of reflection and practice.

Good examples of implementation do exist also in 2016. The mini-projects as well as the work in the mother parties and/or the local community have served for implementing what has been learned during PYP A, and although examples collected during the interviews are few, several examples of how PYP A participants have worked for democracy and rights are provided in the answers in questionnaires. Most of them focus on the rights of women and youth. Some examples follow below:

“I have initiated a political training for young girls of the civil society, to allow them to have a political vision.”/ManWA

“I took into account the gender /youth approach in the creation of my campaign teams at the local level, and even in the setting up of my committee.” /ManWA

“The national committee in which I am a member is composed of 35 members including 6 girls. After the PYP A training, I advocated to the leader, so that we increase the number of girls.” /Man/WA

“In the composition of the federal bureau, I convinced the elders to vote for a dynamic lady who had no chance to be in the office.” /ManWA

“I have hosted two platforms at the University of Nairobi, aimed at increasing the democratic space of youth within the political structures and governance. I also coordinate two women’s/girls’ projects within the area. I try to promote adolescents’ and women’s rights.” /Man WA

“I have worked to increase the participation of young women in my party and I have fought against gender segregation. This helped me get a position in the interparty youth platform to represent my party until 2020 as a Steering Committee member.” /Woman EA

“During our interparty youth elections, I taught about democracy and rights and shared experiences. This helped us carry out peaceful elections.” /Woman EA

“I organised a feedback and an awareness session on human rights in rural areas and suburbs.” /Man WA

“Thanks to PYP A I am working to promote democracy and human rights. I work with the feminist commission. We have organised seminars and exchange of experience about this module. Finally, we gather people to do the general feedback.” /Woman SA

“I carry out different tasks within the youth section related to human rights. For instance; transparency of opportunities, criticism and self-criticism of the organisation and freedom of expression.” /Man SA

“I made efforts to ensure that all members feel comfortable to express their feelings, through the creation of discussion platforms.” /Man SA

“I try to raise [issues on human rights] in our political party gatherings so what I learned in PYP A just helped me to gather my thought and be eloquent in my expression and deepened my understanding.” /Woman SA

“In the movement of students and pupils in which I am the secretary general, I noticed that men are more numerous than women. That is why I set up a female youth commission. I train them and encourage them to be more influential.” /Woman WA

Participants have started to reflect on their own situation, and what respect for everybody's equal rights really means:

"The concept of human rights is very wide – it is respect of everyone's rights – even if you don't agree with it. For instance this means being tolerant when it comes to religion. I happen to be a Muslim – a Christian may be conservative about Islam and say 'they are not even worshipping God'. It is a process, and it is about defending people however. I still need more time on the human rights perspective, for instance it might be difficult for me to accept the concept of homosexuality, but you must as a human rights defender." /Man EA

Linking duty bearing to policy making

In all regions PYPA includes "field trips" where the participants get to meet people who have been exposed to human rights violations, such as orphans, LGBTI- persons, abused women and migrant workers. One example is the visit to "la Maison Rose" in Dakar, Senegal, a home for women who have gone through violence and discrimination, and their children. Several of the participants were clearly moved by the visit and the stories told by the women living at la Maison Rose. After the visit, participants announced that they had raised money that was going to be handed over to the manager of la Maison Rose, along with some medicine. There was, however, little discussion on how these women ended up in such an exposed situation in the first place. Also, we could not hear any reflections in the group on how PYPA participants, as politicians, could work towards securing human rights for those facing similar discrimination.

We brought up the question with the interviewees, and asked whether it would be possible for them to take action for better policies. A very brief summary of the four answers we got, is that *"politicians work at another level – with policy"* and *"politicians are busy working with issues that can bring back votes as soon as possible, therefore it is very difficult for me as a young politician to prioritise this issue in discussions with senior representatives in my party"*. *"We look for programmes that we can use to be elected – like economic visions, where of course basic needs are the problems. If we want to find a solution to the problem – we have to start by knowing more about the problem... If you can put it into the national programme in our party, it will be the beginning of our solution."*

Reflections led to dialogue at the PYPA partnership meeting in February 2017 between implementers, facilitators and evaluators. Some of the issues brought up were human rights, charity, duty bearing and participation in policy making for human rights. We will return to these issues later, as we provide some recommendations.

Gender

Gender has, through the years, been particularly appreciated as a topic by the female participants. 2016 follows the same pattern. Most female participants describe gender or gender equality as one of the most appreciated topics in the training. A slight difference from previous years is the increase of male participants who also express an interest in gender issues and women's rights. Several young men report working for gender equality. Some examples of quotes from male participants follow below.

"I have helped our men understand why and how women should be included in decisions just like men." /Man SA

“In our region I have helped our men understand how and why women should be included in decision making, and why women’s votes should count just as that of men, which was not something they were used to do”/Man WA

“I also coordinate two women’s & girls’ projects within the area I am trying to bring adolescents and women’s rights into political work” /Man WA

“I have worked for youth and women’s participation and leadership at the University. The result was an increase of 42% girls joining the guild union.” Man EA

“I am a male feminist and have contributed to the gender fairness policy” /Man SA

Several interviewees mention women (together with youth) as the most discriminated groups. One of the interviewees mention the training in gender particularly useful, since it offered practical suggestions on how to actually go about to improve gender equality, and ensure rights for women.

Another interviewee, when asked how he is going to work for increased participation in party work by women says: *“One very practical thing that might seem simple, could be to organise meetings at hours when it would be easier for them to take some time off from the family. It is probably easier in the evening than during the day, for instance.” /Man WA*

Altogether, the answers we get from the participants suggest that participants are reflecting on structures of discrimination as well as practical tools or strategies to overcome these discriminating structures. Some of the participants, like the example above, mention simple adjustments in how political work can be conducted. Several participants mention “zebra rules” to promote equal participation in political decision making, or simply in order to develop society as a whole.

One participant writes; *“Together with fellow youth leaders in the party we now run a campaign in tertiary institutions to educate young people and students about the need for gender balance in order to enhance development.”* A female participant describes how she *“...applied gender approach by always sending equal numbers of both sexes to any trainings or workshop. At the moment I am in the process of lobbying for key strategic positions for women, not only affirmative position of a woman leader in the party”*. Another participant simply states that *“...in gender we have enough number of women in our party/youth wing.”*

In previous reports we have discouraged overreliance among facilitators and implementers on “zebra rules”, as well as on organisational changes aiming at facilitating women’s entry into decision making forums. Women being invited to decision making is an important first step, hence we welcome the employment of such strategies. However, it is important to realise that discrimination goes deeper than numbers. For women to participate on equal terms it is also necessary to work with attitudes and perceptions on gender.

Answers in questionnaires and interviews have indicated that participants believe zebra rules are sufficient means for achieving gender equality in politics. In previous evaluation reports,¹⁹ we have described how female PYPA participants from previous years have recognised the difference between having a seat at the decision making table and truly and actively representing.

¹⁹ See AER 2015 and AER 2014.

We also want to raise the issue of equal representation and opportunities during the training sessions. Participants have pointed to the importance of upholding the PYP A spirit in the sessions as well as working with it outside, in their respective political field.

Equal time in the spotlight, equal attention when speaking in front of the group or in group discussion, equal amount of responsibility in group work etc. are all important aspects to take into consideration. One female participant reflects upon male colleagues not paying attention when women speak; *“If they can’t respect us in here, and listen to what we have to say, how are they going to respect us in the parliament?”* Another participant writes; *“What I disliked in PYP A activities is that girls are not motivated during sessions”*, suggesting that equal participation and representation is the responsibility of both male and female participants. The issue of equal opportunities during PYP A trainings session was discussed at the Partnership days, and the guidelines on gender, with practical suggestions on how to monitor and handle gender issues²⁰ elaborated by one of the PYP A colleagues at KIC can be used as a tool by facilitators.

There has been some criticism against the training on gender. Some participants, almost exclusively male, question how the training on gender relates to what is described as African values and traditions. Especially when talking about LGBTI-rights and gender roles in the private sphere, participants have expressed discontent with how these issues are approached by the facilitators. In all three regional contexts, one or a few of the participants have indicated that having an open attitude to everybody’s equal rights, regardless of sex, ethnicity, sexual orientation, regard mainly “Western style ideas”, that are not compatible with “African values”.

Here is one such note:

“I want the facilitators to somewhat respect African traditions and norms. For example, on lessons to do with gender and equality. We must remember that Africa is Africa. Yes, we appreciate foreign efforts but our culture and traditional norms and beliefs make us who we are as Africans. I’m talking of same-sex-marriages, gay relationships, roles for women and the like.”

“We would like to learn more about Pan Africanism – and what is specific about Africa – its challenges and opportunities. In one of the sessions, we were discussing same sex marriage – somebody said «that is not African». We didn’t quite finish off that discussion.” Man/SA

The regional manager of SA comments on this discourse in the Regional report 2016:²¹
“Political - mother parties often object to us dealing with LGBTI issues, but we tell them even if they do not agree with a non-discrimination position, they should do it from an informed basis.”

“We have to avoid making PYP A a “foreign influence” or overly critical of African governance as this immediately builds resistance to the learning. Our facilitators are 95% African (which allows them to criticise African governance without any problems) and we only use conscientised outsiders who come through PYP A partners or the Palme Center.”

²⁰ One simple tool suggested in the guidelines is observing the number of women, and the number of men who talk during sessions, and for how long they talk. Guidelines for Gender Mainstreaming PYP A, Elisabeth Kring, KIC 2013

²¹ Regional report SA, ETU p.8

Lacking knowledge and failing trust in politics

Participants still struggle to reach out to other youth and voters in order to promote democracy and human rights and to gather support for their campaigns and candidacies. A seemingly widespread problem that has represented a challenge since the very beginning of PYP is the general public mistrust for politics and politicians as described by the quote below.

“We had some problem with awareness rising because it’s hard to make young people understand. They don’t believe that politics has anything to say or give to them. Politics is frowned upon. If you talk to young people, they will say that it’s not their business. Not many will engage in politics. We have already started with the mini-projects but we must continue with awareness raising and broaden the good understanding of politics, make them see that it’s not only for elders, for government or ministers.”

Another quote about lacking knowledge:

One of the reasons why my area and my country is in a difficult situation, is that we have left the local to the uneducated... The population is suffering a trauma— they fear to lead and are afraid of leaders — people left leadership to whoever they thought were good leaders. I work with young people and try to influence them — we need to organise ourselves — we have oil development in my region, and there have been conflicts about land. We help people apply for land at the local level, and then you have to fight authority and even the army, because government claims that the land belongs to them. Leaders have collaborated with people in authority. People in my area are convinced that these leaders are going to sell us and our land to the government. The leaders and the government claim that everything belongs to the government, and they are not compensating for whatever they take. We need to refer to laws, and authority and local representatives need to collaborate in implementing the laws.... The biggest challenge is engaging different stakeholders and giving information to people who are stakeholders, but have no information. We, the young must be the first to advocate human rights — I must be a role model, the example of what I am preaching: you cannot say one thing and then do another.”

Corruption

It is clear that corruption is a concept to which participants can relate closely. It has been particularly emphasised as a principal challenge by PYP youth, already in the baseline. Many examples are given of what corruption is, as well as of its negative impacts on society. A few out of many examples are: buying votes, using political power for one’s own gain, taking party funds for private purposes and giving positions and jobs to persons who don’t have the required education or skills.

Participants provide good definitions of how corruption affects people’s opportunities to exercise their rights, and receive their fair share of services and welfare. Challenges that participants see, related to corruption are also directly linked to what some of the participants report that they would like to change in politics in the future. *“There is a lot of corruption in my party. To them only their relatives should be in higher posts. “Even when these people can’t lead and are not serious.” “Corruption creates a gap between the rich and the poor. It hampers development and equity...” “The worst thing is that corrupt practices get institutionalised over time...”*

Corruption, bribery and the commercialisation of politics are clearly strong underlying causes to the disinterest and mistrust in politics.

Another aspect that hampers the development of the young in politics, is the nomination fees a candidate must pay for getting on the list when vying for a position. High nomination fees tend to exclude young leaders who lack the financial income to pay the fees themselves. This, in turn, make young leaders more vulnerable both to the temptation of taking bribes to gather the funds and paying bribes to cut corners.

Below is a quote from a senior party member about the commercialisation of politics:

“[The people] are so poor they [the politicians] take advantage by literally buying the vote. People who are in power are giving salt, sugar, or even money to get the votes. This has changed the mind of the people, who expect to get their share now because they know they will not get anything from the leaders once they are elected. And – sadly- this is spilling over to the opposition because they believe they have to do the same to even be relevant in politics [...] The danger is that the young person is going to be involved in bribery or that their values are going to be corrupt, because they have to become part of the way that things work, and then he or she is no different from the older people. Even those young leaders we are growing are going to get lost in this system.”

PYPA participants are aware of this problem as well, and they are reflecting upon it. Several of the participants can describe how they work against corruption and some have given us example of situation where they have been the whistle-blowers in their own parties. However, observing participants self-assessment in the questionnaire, respondents from EA, SA and WA generally provide few concrete examples of applied knowledge as they are asked if they have practised anti-corruption in their work.

In 2016, the training on anti-corruption was linked to the concept of integrity. We found it interesting to hear how participants related to integrity as a “shield” against corruption in the interviews. Several interviewees linked corruption to the integrity of politicians in general as well as to their own personal integrity. Participants talked about integrity in terms of standing up for political ethics and democratic values in the face of corruption. Women also talked about integrity in terms of protecting themselves from bad reputation or blackmailing by not putting themselves in difficult situations, dressing or behaving in a certain way, or associating with certain groups or persons.

3.4 Outcome 3: cooperation with other parties outside the PYPA training

50% of participants have cooperated with other political parties and/or youth wings outside the PYPA training.

Examples of indicators:

- ...cooperation across parties outside the PYPA training.
- ...multi-party experience exchanges outside the PYPA training.
- ...multi-party activities outside the PYPA training.
- ...participants practicing conflict prevention and/or management outside the PYPA training.

Negative views of other parties initially

It is clear that PYPA has come a long way, only by bringing young politicians from different parties together. The majority of the answers from the interviews and questionnaires indicate that the international and cross-party content is conceived of as the most important aspect of PYPA. Many of the participants narrate that PYPA represented the first occasion for them to meet other young politicians from other countries, and several also confirm that this was their first transnational experience. As a matter of fact, as newly recruited participants answered questions in the Baseline questionnaire 2016 about what they knew about other parties from their own country, most respondents were critical and suspicious to other political parties.

A few examples from the Baseline:²²

“Many parties mobilise only before the elections, to attract voters. Politics are based on personal interest, tribalism, MPs elected outside of their constituencies, personal interests rule, etc.”

“I know a little of other parties through media, but not deeply I know about their appearance and why they appear. Many parties in my country find their origin in conflicts (wars).”

“xx is a corrupt party full of elders who want to enrich themselves, yy is a ‘sensational party’ that exaggerates things” – generally parties in my country need to come together if they have people at heart.... “

“Other” parties are accused of being “...corrupted and violent. Youth are excluded and candidates are given positions to which they should not be entitled... then their power is imposed upon the people.... “

“The other parties are not mindful of people. All they look forward to is to be in government and to enrich themselves. “Other political parties are a mess – there is violence and youth are used as tools for violence...”

“The heart and passion for their people lacks. They have selfish ambitions, and the words and the actions of many of the leaders do not match.”

Despite strongly suspicious attitudes towards other parties, there are some participants who, from the time of the baseline, recognise multiparty ideological richness and define other parties as important for democracy. Some participants express a wish to meet other parties through PYPA in order to form alliances. The importance of improved collaboration between the ruling party and the opposition was mentioned by a few of the respondents, who called for dialogue and unity.

Prospects for building tolerance and multiparty networks

As the narratives of participants are analysed at the end of the PYPA training 2016, there are clear signals of change. The collaboration has brought improved understanding and tolerance among participants:

“I now understand that we all have different levels of tolerance. The fact that we come from different backgrounds and different ethnic groups. We must learn how to coexist as one. It is also important to know that we are all unique in our own way. The diversity of this programme has helped me interact with different people from all walks of life.” /Woman WA

Another example: *“I am now closer to see other people and parties as competitors, and not enemies...” /Man EA*

“The collaboration with peers from other parties in the PYPA training has taught me how to use other youth to help me understand where I do good and where I go wrong, and that will lead me to improve my experiences in the future” /Man SA

²² With respect to respondents’ integrity, we have not specified gender or region after the quotes. The tendency is, however, general, and there are similar answers from all four PYPA regions; SA, EA, SEA and WA.

“In other parties like [party], they have many human right defending strategies and organisations. I now appreciate the work they have done for the masses. They have fought a good fight.” /Woman SA

“Appreciation is one thing I learned. Now I know how to appreciate whether the help come from another comrade from a different party as long as it’s good work.” /Man EA

“I think my introduction with youth wings from other countries has taught me appreciate the contribution of other parties in making Africa better.” /Woman WA

“Through PYP A, I have learned conflict resolution and advocacy – tolerance! I need to be tolerant because we are always going to disagree on something. I have learned that I can use tactics, and see that we have a win-win situation, and make others see it too. We cannot afford to be divided by different political colours... society deserves better. In my country, there is always a big risk that we slide into turmoil. One of my tasks as a young political leader, as I come back to my party is to convince the rest of the young people in my party to use peaceful methods, instead of taking to arms. I have already done this, because the young in my area are very frustrated and angry, and can easily resort into armed conflicts.” Man/EA

Collaboration sometimes troublesome

However, some interviewees indicate that the collaboration and sharing of ideas among young politicians from various parties (not least among ruling and opposition parties from the same country) may be troublesome. A narrative from an interview:

“Sometimes the young of our party meet with young colleagues of the ruling party. We have been in the national assembly to discuss the youth challenges. Sometimes the invitation comes from the ruling party when they want to justify something, and try to use us as hostage. Once after we left the meeting, they started to discuss behind our back, and tried to create conflict among us, by pointing out one of our members as a traitor, accusing that member of being corrupt with our money.

It is always useful to participate at this kind of meetings, but sometimes they will see to that there are less persons present from the opposition than from the ruling party, in order for them to be more powerful in decision making on common proposals. We go there only to pick the point. PYP A has helped getting over some of these problems though. Some of the participants can even admit that there is corruption in their own party, and share critics with the rest of us. Some of the participants are not mature enough to carry forth a dialogue, and there will be conflicts. What we do when conflicts break out in PYP A is to stand together as a group and ban misbehaviour and immaturity, no matter who is to blame. This is to avoid conflicts among us, but also in the national assembly.”

Other, similar comments:

“All are friends of mine in PYP A, but we cannot be together out in the street. People would beat me up, if they saw me with people from the ruling party, they would think that I am a betrayer”.

“I have not exchanged experiences with peers from other parties, because of the state of politics in our country, and because our senior leaders don’t like that...”

“My party will consider me a traitor and this is a fact. As our politics are based, we don’t associate.”

Some participants, mainly from opposition parties, felt that even during the training sessions the presence of certain other parties, in particular ruling parties, could be problematic. In an interview, one participant said; *“It’s difficult for us who are in opposition. It [PYP A] should focus on the opposition also. If you see all the countries here, it’s parties that have been in power for 30 years. They have to allow the other opposition parties to come. The ruling parties do everything to stay in power, even*

killing others. I think we can't learn together with them because they are not going to [step back from] power. [We] could come in different times and separately. It would be good for everyone and the subjects could be different. We [opposition] need strategies. The ruling parties get to know things they are not supposed to learn. Our strategies and ideas. They know what we are going to do next. It is not a challenge for them because they are in power and they are going to get an advantage when they learn the strategies of the opposition."

The same participant continues; *"In some moments I need to keep quiet to protect myself and my party. We have things to say but we can't speak, we need to avoid clashes. There were things that we wanted to talk about [corruption], call things with the right names, but we can't speak because they are present here."*

The challenges described above, have been discussed with PAOs, implementers and facilitators at the Partnership days in February 2017, and especially representatives from EA and SA as well as the Togolese in WA report to face similar challenges. Participants from SA generally report lower implementation than peers from other regions in relation to *"having exchanged experiences and organised activities together with peers from other parties outside of PYPA"*. This output can possibly be explained by the fact that SA has a somewhat different strategy than the rest of the PYPA regions regarding the multi-party approach as well as the alumni-structures. Regional implementers take care not to build new (alumni) structures outside of the strong youth wings, in order to avoid competition with mother bodies, as well as to prevent the aggravation of fierce conflicts, going on in some of the countries. Cross-party activities are arranged in SA, but may need attentive facilitation.

In SA, small conflicts often arise at the training sessions, and facilitators are well experienced "pacifiers" by now.

In the dialogue at the Partnership days in February 2017, the implementers commented that it is important to recognise the situation of some of the participants, but that it is difficult for PYPA implementers and facilitators to intervene outside of PYPA, to protect them. Furthermore, strategies of single parties are usually not discussed in the training sessions. None of the participants should therefore, according to implementers and facilitators, have to feel that they must reveal any "party secrets" during PYPA.

Examples of collaboration outside of the PYPA training 2016

Participants from EA, SA and WA generally provide few concrete examples of applied knowledge when assessing whether they have organised activities with peers from other political parties outside the PYPA training.

Examples provided describe, for instance, how youth from different parties have gathered to challenge new rules for nominations fees in East Africa. The reason for the protest was that fees were raised for members of parliament, which – in turn - discriminates against youth. Others describe how they have come together across party borders to condemn unfair arrest or brutality of opposition leaders. One participant writes: *"I was part of the people who demanded justice after one female youth was tortured by the police but she was not from my party."*

Other examples from three of the four PYPA regions²³ follow:

“The other parties’ youth supported me to be appointed youth chairwoman in my village.” /Woman EA

“Thanks to PYPA, I work together with and I consult youth from opposition parties. Now, I value youth from other political parties.” /Man WA

“For me, this was the real purpose of the training. The youth of our political parties are now in contact with the focal points. Visits for experience sharing are being conducted.” /Woman WA

“I collaborated with some youth from the opposition party for the development of our village. This has been officially announced before our local authorities.” /Woman SA

4. MINI-PROJECTS

Mini-projects have become an integrated part of PYPA training in all regions and are important tools for implementing tools and skills from PYPA in a “real life context”. Many of the projects in the first phase of PYPA, 2012-2015, focused on capacity building through training, mainly youth within the parties, women and students, and several replicated the PYPA curriculum. We consider mini-projects as a very important component of the training.

In the Annual Evaluation Report of 2015, one of our recommendations was that PYPA participants should have the opportunity to carry out mini and/or alumni projects also in the future, so that they would get a chance to implement what they have learned.

In the Alumni study (AER 2015), we found several good examples of (alumni) projects that fulfilled the objectives of operative and targeted implementation well in line with the objectives of PYPA. Alumni projects were generally beyond the “miniPYPA”, hence, the mere replication of a training session from PYPA, that we are getting used to seeing during the regular training, in the sense that they handled topics more at depth than what was the case during the mini-projects. Approaches and contents were more mature.

Mini-projects have been carried out in all of the countries in EA, WA and SA also in 2016. In the new PYPA region SEA, mini-projects will be carried out in 2017, therefore we cannot report on them yet. In EA and WA, multiparty national groups are formed, while – in Southern Africa – the youth from each party runs a project.

Accounts on mini-project activities from the Regions

SA: In 2014 participants from the ANC Youth League did a mini-project to raise awareness among girls in informal settlements on menstruation. They also collected sanitary packs for girls. The Youth League started a campaign in 2016 to get free sanitary packs to girls in the poorest schools in the country. In the biggest province, KwaZulu-Natal, the education minister was from the Youth League Provincial exec and he has become the first minister to introduce free sanitary packs in the poorest schools (66% of schools). The ANC mother body is now considering making it a national policy and will discuss the issue at its conference at the end of 2017.

²³ Answers from the fourth region, SEA (Malawi-Zambia) are not included in the analysis, since the PYPA-group from 2016 will graduate in October 2017.

Mini-projects took place in the other ten parties and in 2016, all parties were asked to focus on capacity building within their party. They had to use some of the material and skills they learned at PYPA and take it to a group of leaders or members in their own party. Most of the parties held one or two day workshops added onto other party activities like national executive meetings of the youth wing. Popular choices for topics they trained in were ideology, leadership skills, political communication skills, development and youth challenges and organising and conflict management skills.

WA: Mini-projects were carried out on a multiparty basis in all countries. The Senegalese team held a training on gender, good governance and leadership for around hundred young members of political parties. The Togolese participants also focused on training, but the target group was young people not engaged yet in politics. The objective was to encourage political participation and to introduce topics such as democracy and youth perspective. The participants from Cote d'Ivoire initiated a charter for the promotion of young people in political parties. The charter was drafted with the participation of all main political parties. At a formal ceremony it was signed by representatives of the major parties who announced their commitment to implement it.

The regional manager concludes that experiences have been quite positive. In none of the three countries, it is common for young people from different parties to work together at all. Despite some slight contradictions, the three groups succeeded in achieving their projects. Mother parties were invited to all mini-projects, and attended several of the activities. This multiparty collaboration among politically committed young people also has an important effect at national level, not least because the mini-projects raised the awareness and improved the knowledge about PYPA and its objectives among mother party representatives and other political actors.

EA: The **Tanzanian** mini-project, “Youth empowerment in politics” was a two day training targeting youth politicians from the “PYPA- parties” in Dodoma. The subjects taught were democracy, public speaking and campaigning reaching 48 participants. In **Kenya** “Chukua Kura U’vote, Kesbo Ishafik” The group organised two events, one mobilisation campaign in Narok in collaboration with the Registration Bureau to get youth to acquire identification cards. This was done in order for them to be eligible to participate in the electoral process by registering as voters. The second event was peace talks in Nairobi.

In **Uganda**, the group chose to go to Kasese, a district that had experienced intense violence after the elections in February 2016. Over 70 youth were killed and mass graves related to the violence and its aftermath is still being uncovered. The violence stems from the conflicting jurisdictions of the regions traditional kingdoms and political affiliations.

The PYPA group trained youth leaders in Kasese in conflict resolution, advocacy, communication skills and political consensus, to boost peaceful coexistence regardless of political affiliation or tribes. The initiative was very well received by the youth that attended the training, since they felt that the youth had been neglected in prior attempts to mitigate the conflict.

An important training experience

Many of the participants mention the mini-project as an example, when they are asked whether they have exchanged experiences with peers from other parties outside the PYPA training: *“Youth leaders from around the country were taken through a peace building process. The PYPA curriculum was replicated”*.

Another example: *“I was afraid when we were supposed to carry out the project in (the name of the region), The region has a violent history. However, I gathered and employed my skills, and we worked together with the local youth, and the project went on smoothly.”*

Other narratives from experiences and knowledge gained in the mini-projects:

“We have been networking with associations – 23 political parties, senior politicians were very impressed to see this kind of initiative from youth. Many youth from the political parties were on the activities. We have also carried out debates at the universities.”

“The mini-project made me reflect on the importance of training for young leaders to be. The project was about empowering young people who want to become political leaders. Not even politically active youth have knowledge about what they work with. They say they work with democracy and strategic planning, but the truth is that they are only used by the seniors as machinery. Twenty of them told us that they are going to run for positions in the next election. They have no education and training for leadership. At the grass root level there is no knowledge about decision making in the party – that is also why they are used as a machinery. On the other hand party leaders do not know about what happens at lower level.”

One of the participants from SA, narrates about the mini-project experience, which aimed at easing up a conflict in a mining region, where young workers were on strike. The PYPA participants brought the different interest groups together for discussions in order to understand and manage the conflict. *“People are striking for the mines, we had a session to unite them and give them a platform to express why they are on strike. It turned out young people are unable to register their businesses, they lack funds etc. The youth in the mining communities who own mining companies, small companies. We helped them meet with the mayor and assisted them in getting info, the right papers etc. We learned a lot from this as well.”*

Safeguarding correct administration and financial management

We understand from the narratives, that the mini-projects represent the very first experience for many, in managing funds, planning, organising, implementing and reporting on the process and the outcomes. The management tasks of mini-projects rendered PYPA participants responsible to the PYPA managers and facilitators, to the rest of the team members as well as to the target groups. Participants have mainly enthusiastically shared experiences on all of the advantages and new experiences the work has brought.

In 2016, however, our attention was also drawn to some questions of conflicts in a few of the mini-project groups. Conflicts seem to have incurred mainly related to how the project was organised and steered, and how money was spent. Participants turned to us, in one of our interviews, while visiting the regions and through two questionnaires, asking us to make sure that their projects had been implemented, reported and administered correctly. There had been discussions about whether unused funds for the mini-project should be returned to the PYPA management, or shared among the participants themselves.²⁴ The two respondents mentioned that they wanted to make sure that the project had been administered and managed correctly in the eyes of facilitators, and called for a more thorough supervision and closer guidance of the mini projects, on behalf of the implementers. The objective, according to these respondents, should be to ensure the desirable quality and transparency regarding roles and use of resources in the implementation of mini-projects.

²⁴ One of the respondents does not clarify whether the money was returned to PYPA or not, while the second respondent refer to discussions that led to the respondent convincing the rest of the group to return the funds to PYPA.

This is, of course, a very small sample, considering that a total of 125 participant self assessment questionnaires have been collected and analysed by evaluators. There is, hence, no reason for alarm or considering this as an institutionalised or widespread concern for PYPA. It did, however, open for learning dialogue between implementers and evaluators, and made us pose important questions on monitoring, management and coaching of the mini projects.

The issue was brought to discussion during the partnership days in February 2016. We deliberated on what measures of security against embezzling are already in place. Routines have been set for ensuring that the groups responsible for the mini projects account for the funding they get. The PAOs and regional managers assured that mini-projects go through thorough financial monitoring. It would, hence, be difficult for participants to embezzle funds in PYPA.

CIS, one of the PAO, brings up difficulties with mini-projects in their Regional report 2016. Three out of the seven mini-projects and alumni-projects were so late with reporting and accounting for their expenses, that money was still outstanding at the time of auditing. One of the reasons is presumably the lack of accountancy skills in the leadership of the alumni-networks. The measure taken to improve financial management, and to minimise risks is that IGD, the West African partner, will take more responsibility in the financial management of mini-projects.

We feel safe with the routines put in place to impede fraud, and it is wise of the PAOs to have integrated the accountancy of mini-projects in the risk analysis. There ought to be a good preparation in case there should be instances of embezzlement or even suspicions of misconduct. Another important aspect of monitoring of processes in PYPA is, however related to what we do to protect “whistle blowers” who want to report misconduct, while ensuring that they will not suffer repercussions from their peers.

5. ALUMNI ACTIVITIES

Alumni activities, together with activities targeted towards mother parties, are important cornerstones in the strategy for safeguarding long-term sustainability in PYPA. The opportunities related to becoming an “alumni” are now well known among PYPA graduates, who are indeed keen on keeping up their networks with other alumni as well as with implementers and facilitators of PYPA.

Most of the answers to our question *“Is there any support that you would need now and over the next few years to make your experience from PYPA sustainable over time?”* regard participants’ possibility to keep up and develop the networks with other PYPA alumni.

The respondents state that they need continuous support from fellow young politicians as well as from PYPA staff and facilitators, to keep developing and learning, exchanging experiences, knowledge and advice as well as support in campaigning or running for offices. Many participants mention that they would like continuous training in order to have enough knowledge as politicians and good leaders. Training in all topics that are already part of the PYPA curriculum are requested, communication and campaigning as well as public speaking being particularly appreciated topics. Training in economy and economic development in different countries are also requested, and very appreciated, especially by participants from SA.

Some alumni have implied that the continued contact with PYPAs, colleagues and facilitators is empowering them in their relations with the mother party. One need that is recurring (since 2013) is knowledge on and training in self-sufficiency (entrepreneurship) and fundraising.

From narratives provided by respondents of the alumni-questionnaires collected at the end of 2016, and at the beginning of 2017, we learn that not only the personal networks live on beyond PYPAs. There are also several examples of concrete collaboration. As respondents are asked whether they “*have cooperated with different (other than their own) political parties and/or youth wings in 2016*”, we get the following (and yet other) narratives:

“I personally contributed financially to a colleague who was running for Youth MP in my region, but on a different party ticket. Reason: our party did not have a candidate there.” /Man EA

“We always collaborate and share ideas with other youth leaders after PYPAs. PYPAs alumni always work as a team and put aside the political differences.” /Woman EA

“I have a big collaboration with some youth leaders in other political parties. We have opened up a consultancy firm, which handles political management, research, advocacy for policy, etc.” /Man EA

“I have worked closely with members of two other parties in the past general elections on advisory roles and helping with campaign resources. This has been due to the tolerance that we were taught in PYPAs.” /Woman EA

“I have cooperated with other political parties through a platform called interparty youth platform which has a combination of seven different political party youth wings.” (Several answers from EA refer to this platform.) /Woman EA

“I am a member of the main opposition party in my country, and we often organise meetings with other opposition parties to plan action. We also carry out national projects together.” /Woman WA

“We have organised meetings to promote young during elections, and to put their names on top of the electoral lists.” /Man WA

“Some fellow young politicians have invited me to take part in congresses and press conferences. I could have refused to go, since we are not from the same party, but I was glad to participate.” /Woman WA

“I’m going to run next year, which I also did 2015, for a position as member of parliament.... I have a mentor from another party, who supports me.” /Woman EA

Alumni activities during 2016

Since we carried out a thorough study of alumni activities and outcomes from PYPAs 2012-2015 in the AER 2015, we decided, together with the PAOs not to focus particularly on analysis of alumni in our AER 2016. We have, however, decided to distribute and collect alumni questionnaires from WA (Benin, Mali, Burkina Faso and Niger), SA and EA.

We have collected 6 questionnaires from SA (2w/4m), 56 from EA (25 w/31 m) and 56 from WA (26 w/30 m), since we wanted to offer alumni the opportunity to keep us informed on any changes that occurred from 2015.²⁵

There are some changes, and most PYPA alumni report to have increased their participation and influence, especially in their party, but also in general, in political life during 2016. Some of the respondents narrate that they have been running for higher positions in their party. Some of them have been successful, others keep on trying.

There are also examples, among the answers, of training activities in public speaking, communication and campaigning, human rights and gender for other youth (mainly within the parties, but also among university students), support for women's increased participation in politics. Alumni also work actively within their party in developing policies and strategies for campaigning, communication, etc.

Some alumni report to have carried out anti-corruption work within parties. They are consulted for helping out in the improvement of auditing routines and transparency within the mother parties.

The ambition and strategy of the PAOs and the regional managers has been to keep up and develop the networks and to continue to offer alumni activities to youth who have graduated from PYPA.

... a short account

Below is a short account on the alumni activities, as reported by the regional managers in SA, EA and WA in March 2017:²⁶

SA: Three alumni workshops were held in Mozambique, Namibia and Zimbabwe. The country workshops focused on the African Union's vision of African economic and social development that we should aim to achieve by 2063 - a hundred years after the first African countries gained independence.

It is a progressive agenda for change and development and improving basic living conditions, economic activity and development, social development, greater equality especially for women and youth, and an end to discrimination against all marginalised groups. It is a useful starting point to push for a progressive agenda that is indigenous to Africa and to move away from the accusation that the LGBTI and progressive ideas are Western imports. The workshops were well received and attended by 49 alumni.

In South Africa, ETU continued work to support the South African Youth Council in popularising and monitoring implementation of the Youth Policy for development and economic inclusion of young people adopted by Parliament at the end of 2015. Workshops were organised in collaboration with SAYC for 286 young leaders from civil society (most of the costs paid by SAYC). SAYC is a multiparty plus civil society formation that tries to mobilise youth on common programmes for youth advancement. In the 2015 consolidation year we worked extensively with them as part of our PYPA

²⁵ Very few of the questionnaires have been filled out with care, and the information that we can get from reading the short answers on activities are, in most cases, inadequate. This does, however, not worry us. We will keep on following alumni along with the ordinary PYPA training until 2018, and are taking measures together with the implementers, to improve internal monitoring as well as external evaluation.

²⁶ Quotes from Regional reports 2016.

programme to strengthen youth formations in countries. Since then they have asked us to assist them and many of our alumni are involved in their activities.

EA: Alumni workshops were held in Uganda and Tanzania bringing together all alumni from 2012, 2013 and 2014 (as well as those that graduated from 2016)

An advanced training on conflict management and mediation was organised in collaboration with International Idea²⁷ in Kenya. It was a joint alumni and mother party activity. Kenyan alumni with positions in the parties as well as other youth working in the parties were invited. The training focused on setting up, handling and managing cross party dialogues as a tool for conflict mitigation and management.

WA: Two-day workshops were organised in each of the four countries from phase 1: Niger, Burkina Faso, Mali, and Benin, to which all alumni 2012-2014 were invited, and 83% of all alumni attended. Among other things, this gave the opportunity to discuss the lessons learned from the 2015 alumni projects and to decide on the national alumni projects for 2016.

In addition, each of the four countries from phase 1 carried out a mini-project in 2016. In both Mali and Benin, the alumni projects consisted of “Foire des partis politiques”, a space where all political parties were invited to present their political programmes with a view to sensitise the population about party politics.

It was the second edition in Benin and the first one in Mali. This project is motivated by the need to create a space for debate between politicians and citizens about democracy, development and politics. In West Africa, many people vote without a basic understanding about the party programmes.

In Niger the alumni project consisted of two major activities promoting youth participation in politics, a public conference and a television debate. They associated the presidents of the youth leagues of the main political parties in Niger. In Burkina Faso, the alumni organised a training session on gender and political ideologies for fifty young politicians from political parties.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Increased participation and influence in politics

As shown earlier in this report, the majority of participants report to have increased their influence and participation in politics and in their mother parties. There are, however, aspects in need of extra attention from the side of implementers and facilitators. One such aspect relates to participants’ effective access to implementation of skills and experiences acquired during the training as they come back after the PYPA training. Implementers and facilitators do have a role in supporting participants during and after the PYPA training, and participants’ relations with mother parties can be facilitated.

Participants’ influence and activities in mother parties

As we have seen, improvements are manifest in terms of participants’ influence and participation, due to the fact that PYPA is now more well-known, and that parties understand what benefits they can get from PYPA participants and alumni.

The increased space given to the young can also be explained by the fact that some of the countries already have strong youth-wings, hence, collaboration was established also before PYPA between the youth-wings and the mother bodies.

Mini projects appreciated and useful

The mini-project activities are, indeed, appreciated by participants, and many mention that the mini-project offered a most useful possibility for participants to apply experiences and skills that they have learned in PYPA. Most of the mini-projects also involves cross-party collaboration, which entails other important challenges and experiences for participants. We know, from implementers' and participants' own narratives, that decision-making, management, administration and economic responsibility in mini-and alumni projects has not always been easy for the teams. A few of the participants from 2016 with whom we have been in contact want to make sure that their mini-project was carried out in a proper way, and call for closer monitoring and feedback from facilitators. In WA, measures have been taken to improve financial management, and to minimise risks related to mini-project activities. IGD, the West African partner, will take more responsibility in the financial management of mini-projects.

Recommendations

It is important that implementers and facilitators continue to support PYPA participants and alumni in their relation with the **mother parties**. As we have seen, the implementers are working with specific mother party activities already.

We would, however like to suggest that the PAOs and the implementers work out a clearer common strategy for how mother parties can be approached successfully. Exchange of experience should increase between the PYPA regions. One example of such a shared experience is that implementers in EA approach mother parties by mentioning party members who have attended PYPA. This is a way of promoting PYPA, and show how empowered youth can take on new roles and responsibilities in parties. PAOs and implementers should continue the dialogue on *why* and *how* mother party activities are carried out, and what outcomes can be expected/is desired from the activities. The evaluators also promise to collaborate in making the monitoring and evaluation of feedback from and to the mother parties more systematic.

We suggest that the **mini-projects** continue to be regarded as a crucial component of PYPA, and that implementers guarantee a close monitoring and coaching, as well as a transparent management from the side of implementers. Implementers should ensure that all of the prerequisites are in place for the mini-project to become an empowering experience, allowing for participants (and alumni) to get more confident in applying their PYPA "toolbox" in an authentic context.

6.2 Participants' work for democracy and human rights

Many good examples have been provided by participants, on how they work for democracy and human rights, although we know that human rights perspectives are complex and that some aspects are difficult to grasp in a short-term perspective. We know that the concepts *per se* have been understood theoretically, but that it is sometimes difficult to transform the understanding into adequate tools that can work for participants or alumni in their concrete work. Implementers and facilitators are also well aware of this challenge, and we are all continuously engaged in learning dialogue on how to improve the HRBA of the programme.

Reflections on charity, rights and duty bearing

Some of the evaluators' observations and reflections during 2016 regard the approach taken by implementers when carrying out study-visits during the "human rights session" in the PYPA training, and how these study visits are prepared and followed up on. Our experience at the "Maison Rose" is only an example, but it made us reflect on possible ways of developing and improving the PYPA training. Of course it is an excellent thing that participants become aware of the challenges of minorities and discriminated groups in the society. We do commend the eagerness to assist and help.

There is, however, a risk that concrete political action (policy making) to safeguard rights of marginalised groups might be partly forgotten, if participants focus entirely on charity. Providing medicine or donating money as a private initiative might meet the immediate need of marginalised people. Nevertheless, it does not secure their rights or encourage participants to further reflect on what they can effectively do as young politicians (and duty bearers) to prevent marginalisation, and secure rights.

Gender

Several female participants describe improving gender equality in politics and in society in general as one of their main challenges. Though the training session of gender is much appreciated, gender discrimination is an obstacle when it comes to women advancing in politics and women participating in democracy. Some of the female participants mention that they do not feel completely respected, and taken into account.

Corruption

The challenge of corruption prevails, and implies difficult challenges in society in general, and participants mention that they conceive of it as a problem in their everyday (political) life. They also provide several examples on how it may pose difficulties to them in their political career. Corruption scandals in participants' own parties, and in politics in general, makes it difficult for young politicians to promote politics.

Furthermore, the strong focus on financial resources in political campaigning, impedes young politicians from building their future independently, since most of them will rely on donors or co-funders. This is a big risk, also for PYPA-participants. There are a few examples among the narratives from 2016, about how youth have prevented corruption in their own parties. Concrete examples are, however, few and the majority of participants state not to have practised anti-corruption in 2016.

Funding is still one of the main challenges described by the participants. Funding is needed to finance political projects, awareness raising campaigns, exchange meetings, research etc. Many young describe that the difficulties related to funding and self-sufficiency puts them in a situation of inferiority and dependency in relation to more politically influential persons, including their own senior party members. In AER 2015, we have also described how some of the alumni feel that they lack credibility in front of youth as well as other potential supporters, since they cannot even sustain themselves.

Recommendations

It is still possible to **improve on the HRBA** in the training sessions. For instance, implementers and facilitators can work on the preparation and following up on study-visits related to discrimination and human rights.

Participants themselves represent the duty bearers, and should actually work for more continuous interventions that would safeguard action against marginalisation and discrimination. Aspects that regard charity, duty-bearing and the link between political participation and policy should be emphasised in PYPA-training.

The **gender equality component** can also be improved. Implementers and facilitators are already doing a good job on this aspect, although more attention can be paid on making sure that female participants get as much space as their male colleagues during trainings. Dialogue for development on rights discussions should be taken beyond “zebra rules”.

The **human rights perspective can be widened**, to not only embrace “women and youth” as discriminated groups in society. The rights of other groups such as inhabitants in rural areas, LGBTI persons and disabled should also be included in the HRBA.

It is good that implementers and facilitators are aware of the challenges related to what is referred to as “**African values**”, by some participants (generally male), in all regions. These arguments tend to hamper constructive discussions on possible action for progress. At the same time, it is important to avoid making PYPA a “foreign influence”, since this will build immediate resistance to learning among participants.

In SA, older male feminist facilitators are used to deal with the culturally sensitive issues around gender and sexuality to avoid accusations that they are Western imports or foreign to “African culture”.

As for the challenges related to **corruption**, we encourage implementers and facilitators to continue exchanging good examples on anti-corruption actions taken by young politicians, and to use them during trainings.

We would also like to suggest that implementers consider if the anti-corruption aspects and examples of preventing corruption could be used more effectively in mini- and alumni-projects, since these projects may be one of the first and, hence, a very important “practical case” for participants and alumni, for carrying out a concrete project.

We have discussed with PAOs at an SC-meeting in April 2017, whether they could consider carrying out some training in **economic planning, fund raising** and possibly giving some suggestions on where to find more information on how to start an own business activity. The SC members answered that they understand the difficulties, as well as the risks involved, as young politicians find themselves short of funding for campaigning or other political activities, but that this goes beyond the mission of the PAOs and the implementers. Unfortunately, at the time being, PAOs and implementers see no possibilities for accommodating this request.

6.3 Collaboration with other parties

It is clear that PYPA has come a long way, only by bringing young politicians from different parties together. As we analyse answers and narratives from interviews and questionnaires from PYPA 2016, we find that the international and cross-party content is conceived of as the most important aspect of PYPA during, as well as after the training. Many of the participants narrate that PYPA represented the first occasion for them to meet (young) politicians from other parties, and several also confirm that this was their first transnational experience. It is therefore not surprising, to find very few examples among the answers from PYPA 2016 of participants’ collaboration with other parties *outside of* PYPA.

We do, however know that alumni carry on and deepen their collaboration with other PYPA alumni, but also with other political groups/associations after graduation (see examples in section 5. Alumni activities).

Cross-party, international exchange and alumni

As participants are asked to give suggestions on how to render their experiences and what they learned through their participation in PYPA sustainable in a long-term perspective, one of the most common answers is that they need support to **keep up their networks with other participants as well as with the facilitators**. It is also clear that the alumni do keep up, and develop their cross-party and/or international networks after graduation. There are good reasons to believe that for PYPA to achieve Outcome 3 in a long-term-sustainable perspective, one adequate tool can be found in providing fora for participants to meet and exchange experiences and, possibly, working together in concrete activities and/or projects.

Long-term sustainability

A challenge, that at the same time, holds excellent prospects that we, as evaluators have emphasised ever since the start of PYPA is the long-term sustainability aspect. It has also been an issue for continuous learning dialogue with PAOs and implementers since 2012, when PYPA started. Mother party- and alumni activities have been identified as two crucial components for the long-term sustainability of PYPA.

During 2016 we carried out a “mini-workshop” on long term sustainability with the participants when visiting EA, SA and WA. The participants were given the task to discuss how to make their political work, as well as their learning processes and experiences from PYPA sustainable over time. Networking, mainly conceived of as “alumni” or post-PYPA activities with youth from other countries and/or parties was a common point-of-reference in the discussions.

One of the groups said: *“We will form a network and we will need PYP A for training and to raise the credibility of politics. We would like to keep on working together in projects – it is a platform for change and exchange”*.

Moreover, several participants call for a clearer understanding of economic planning and how to make do with little funding. Some ask for training in entrepreneurship to ensure self-employment and economic independence in their future career. Others call for training in fund-raising and/or improved knowledge regarding public funding. Multi-party cooperation is also mentioned as a way of working sustainable as well as cooperation over party borders as a way of ensuring long-term sustainability in political projects and reforms. In 2012-2016 we saw how PYPA alumni supported each other by helping out during campaigning, also by helping fellow emerging politicians in raising funds.

Participants also mention the importance of having the possibility to integrate learnings and knowledge from PYPA in their respective political structures. This aspect has already been discussed above under the heading “Participants’ influence and activities in mother parties”.

Recommendations

We have seen that the **alumni activities** are considered useful and relevant by participants and alumni, and we do encourage that this component is kept and developed within the programme. We do, however, recommend that PAOs and implementers discuss a common strategy for the alumni activities. Some of the questions that should be posed are: Why are alumni activities carried out? What is the content of the activities? What is the expected and desired scope? What general outcomes can be expected and desired? How do we monitor

and evaluate progress among alumni? We would like to monitor progress in terms of acquired political offices and “making career”, but - just as well - evaluate progress in terms of personal growth and duty bearing among alumni as politicians in general.

These recommendations were discussed at a PYPA SC-meeting in April 2017, and implementers are already at work with establishing tools for the monitoring part.

Learning dialogue among PAOs and implementers

Another aspect that we would like to emphasize, and that is important for aiming at long-term sustainability, is learning. Through the years, the PYPA actors (PAOs, implementers and facilitators) have learned many things, and there are now several examples of “good practice” in the overall structures. The evaluators have had the privilege to observe, analyse and encourage recycling and institutionalisation of “what works”. One of the examples of learning acquired by the PYPA actors is the enhanced understanding among members of PYPA actors of how the understanding of theoretical concepts related to “human rights” can be facilitated and transformed into tools and concrete political action for PYPA participants. Other examples of how “what works” has been institutionalised in PYPA processes is the exchange of knowledge between implementers and facilitators of the regions and the improved structure for internal monitoring. The confidence in the programme and what it can do, has increased among PAOs, implementers and facilitators.

In 2016, we noticed a positive shift in the learning dialogue between us evaluators, the PAOs and the implementers, and felt an improved openness to share examples of good practice, and what does not work so well in the respective regions. We truly feel now that there is trust among the actors, and that PAOs and implementers are more apt to share experiences with us as evaluators, as well as among themselves, although it might imply stepping out of one’s comfort zone. Several explanations could be given to this finding, but the fact that SEA was added as a new region definitely nurtured reflection, and understanding on how good practice and tools that we know work well, can easily be slightly adjusted and used in a new context.

Through 2012-2015, PAOs and implementers often discussed how to keep the overall “programme umbrella”, yet permitting and even encouraging diversity concerning regional and national contexts. Questions raised regarded, for instance, whether the same training manual had to be used in all PYPA regions, how internal monitoring should be done, and whether the components of the training should be the same in all regions. PYPA and its actors grew stronger as a united programme, yet respecting and allowing regional differences. The dialogue among PAOs and implementers on the minimum limit for streamlining, and the possibility for regional deviation continues however. During 2016, the discussion touched, among other things, upon alumni and mother party activities and whether there could be a “minimum level” of mother party activities.

Recommendations

Again, on this account we would like to emphasise the importance of constant exchange of experience and learning among PAOs and implementers. We also encourage continuous support for long-term sustainability through alumni networks, close communication with mother parties and other possible activities or measures.

We would like to thank the PAOs, implementers and facilitators, mother party representatives and, of course, the most important; the young participants and alumni themselves for granting us unlimited access to PYPA during 2016. We now look forward to following the PYPA-journey on new exciting endeavours!

May 4, 2017

Monica Johansson and Elin Ekström

References

- Ekström, E., Karlsson A B. & Johansson M. 2015 *Programme Evaluation Report (AER)* 2016-05-08. Con Trust.
- Ekström, E., Karlsson A B. & Johansson M. 2015 *Programme Evaluation Report (PER)* 2015-04-30. Con Trust.
- International IDEA, 2014. *“Democracy assistance and results: debates and constructive reflections (roundtable report)”*
- Karlsson, A B. & Johansson, M. 2013. *Baseline Study 2012, PYP A in East, West and Southern Africa 2013-03-07*. Con Trust
- Karlsson, A B. 2013. *Lärande utvärdering genom följeforskning i PYP A*. (Eng. Learning evaluation by ongoing research). PM to the meeting with the Steering Group and the Learning dialogue 2013-08-20. Con Trust.
- Karlsson, A B., Johansson, M. & Ekström, E. 2014 *Alumni report 2014. Changes and results from the perspectives of the target group. PYP A 2014 in East, West and Southern Africa*. Con Trust.
- Klingebiel, 2012. *“Result-based aid (RBA): new aid approaches, limitations and the application to promote good governance”*. http://www.die-gdi.de/uploads/media/DP_14.2012.pdf/
- Kring, E “Guidelines for Gender Mainstreaming PYP A”, working material Elisabeth Kring, KIC 2013
- Vähämäki/Schmidt/Molander, 2011. *“Results Based Management in Development Cooperation”*. http://www.seachangecop.org/sites/default/files/documents/2011_11_RBM_in_development_cooperation.pdf/
- OECD. 1991/2008. DAC, Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance
- ### Reports and working documents
- EA, 7 Project reports from endowment projects, WA, 15 Project reports from endowment projects
ETU Report on Youth Councils
- KIC, CIS, OPC Programming document: Program for Young Politicians in Africa – PYP A. Application to Sida 2011-10-31
- KIC, CIS, OPC PYP A activity lists 2016
- KIC, CIS, OPC, GF PYP A Activity reports, April 2017
- KIC, CIS, OPC, GF Ansökan till Sida 2016. (Eng. Programming Document, Program for Young Politicians in Africa – PYP A 2015, application to SIDA) Ver. Rev. 160219
- KIC, CIS, OPC, Theory of Change (ToC) PYP A 2013-12-13, revised for the application 2014-10-17.
- KIC, Terms of Reference (ToR) for Baseline design and ongoing evaluation of PYP A; Agreement, Consultancy Agreement, KIC-Eccola, 2016-05-26

Earlier PYPA reports by Con Trust

Con Trust, *Baseline study PYPA 2012*
Con Trust, *Annual Evaluation Report 2012*
Con Trust, *Annual Evaluation Report, Short Version 2012*
Con Trust, *Annual Evaluation Report, 2013*
Con Trust, *Alumni Report PYPA, 2014*
Con Trust, *Annual Evaluation Report, 2014*
Con Trust, *Program Evaluation Report 2012-2014, 2015*
Con Trust, *Annual Evaluation Report, 2015 (Alumni year)*