

**UNDEF**

The United Nations  
Democracy Fund



**FNUD**

Fonds des Nations Unies  
pour la démocratie

**POST PROJECT EVALUATION  
FOR THE  
UNITED NATIONS DEMOCRACY FUND**

**EVALUATION REPORT**

**UNDEF Funded Project / UDF-13-578-BOL**

**Strengthening Democratic Participation and Inclusive Local Development in  
Indigenous and Peasant Communities in Bolivia**

**Date: 2 August 2017**

# Table of Contents

## Table of Contents

<b>I. OVERALL ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. PROJECT CONTEXT</b>	<b>2</b>
Development Context	2
The Project Objective	3
Intervention Rationale	4
<b>III. METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>IV. EVALUATION FINDINGS</b>	<b>6</b>
(i) Relevance	6
(ii) Effectiveness	9
(iii) Efficiency	13
(iv) Impact	14
(v) Sustainability	15
(vi) UNDEF added value	16
<b>V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>VI. LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>VII. ANNEXES</b>	<b>20</b>
Annex 1: Evaluation Questions	21
Annex 2: Documents Reviewed	23
Annex 3: Persons Interviewed	24
Annex 4: Acronyms	26

**Acknowledgements**

The Evaluator would like to thank the Microjustice Bolivia Team, particularly Maria Choque, for the time and energy devoted to this process. Thanks are also due to all of the interviewees, including the project participants, government agency and civil society representatives, UN officials, and MJ Executive Director Patricia Van Nispen.

**Disclaimer**

The views expressed in this report are those of the Evaluator. They do not represent those of UNDEF or any of the institutions referred to in the report

**Authors**

This report was written by Kristen Sample

## I. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

From 1 December 2014 – 30 November 2016, the *Fundación MicroJusticia* Bolivia (MJB), a branch of Microjustice4All (MJ), implemented the project “Strengthening democratic participation and inclusive local development in indigenous and peasant communities in Bolivia.” The project objective was to legally and politically empower members and leaders of indigenous communities, women and men, in La Paz and Oruro to protect and exercise their civil and indigenous rights and participate in democratic decision-making processes. The project design was based on the model developed by MJ and implemented in its seven country organizations over the last 17 years. The project benefitted from an UNDEF grant of US\$ 200,000 (US\$ 10,000 retained by UNDEF for monitoring and evaluation).

The project objectives included:

- Increased number of people in the target groups holding basic legal documents;
- Increased awareness in the target groups of the importance of having their basic legal documents (identity, legal, personality) in order
- Strengthened capacity of members, leaders and organizations of traditionally excluded indigenous communities to participate in democratic processes and to exercise their civil and indigenous rights; and
- Improved access to basic legal documents through evidence-based inputs for institutional reforms through advocacy.

The project achieved significant results including:

- Legal registration of 233 collectives (communities, associations, producer organisations)
- Establishing legal identity of 151 individuals
- Strengthened community organization through participatory development of by-laws and internal regulation
- Individual-level empowerment of community leaders and rural facilitators
- Support for reform processes aimed at facilitating the individual and collective legal registration processes

The project was timely and relevant to participant needs and the political and cultural context in Bolivia. The potential impact could be extended beyond legal and political rights to also enhance socio-economic development once legalized communities are able to access government projects and resources. The project was cost-efficient and well managed. The project’s focus on community ownership contributed to sustainability of results, though Microjusticia’s own sustainability and ability to operate is dependent on additional external funding. The UNDEF brand and flexible approach has important value added in the Bolivian context.

The evaluation’s key recommendations include:

- Strengthen the project’s gender focus by facilitating “*personalidad jurídica*” (legal registration, hereafter referred to as PJ) for more women’s organisations and including articles in community PJ by-laws specific to women’s participation;
- Proactively seek opportunities to map and complement the efforts of other organisations in the target municipalities;
- Sharpen the monitoring and evaluation system through improved definition of the outcome-level indicators, instruments and sources;
- When working on advocacy, develop deliberate strategies including decision maker maps, media plans and coalition building;
- Strengthen sustainability through partnerships with other organizations—particularly international non-governmental organizations; a demand study to determine the feasibility of fee increases; and a cadre of local experts able and interested in offering legal services to communities at reasonable prices.

Lessons learned that could be applied to other projects in this context include:

- Legal services can produce benefits both in terms of the “ends” (legal recognition) as well as through the “means” (participatory processes that contribute to community organizations);
- Given proper design and careful implementation, legal services projects can be sensitive to traditional customs, while at the same time supporting human rights and gender equality principles;
- Alliances with law schools are a “win-win” by providing a pool of low-cost, highly motivated labour and supporting the development of a new generation of socially-conscious legal professionals;
- Engagement with State agencies must include both decision makers as well as lower-level officials interacting with communities and in case management on a daily basis;
- Project design should consider the challenges of sustainability and put in place measures from the start, while still permitting flexibility to respond to opportunities and partnerships that emerge.

## II. PROJECT CONTEXT

### *Development context*

The new State Political Constitution (CPE) of Bolivia, approved by a national referendum in January 2009, represents a complex and potentially transformative process of institutional reform that includes two particularly ambitious goals: a) the creation of a plurinational state with new forms of participation and inclusion; and b) a profound process of decentralization toward territorial autonomy.

Upon assuming power in 2006, President Evo Morales likened the Bolivian context to the apartheid-based system operating in South Africa until the mid-1990s. The movement that

brought him to power had indigenous roots and the intention underlying many of the CPE reforms was the inclusion of groups that had been traditionally marginalized from political and economic power, particularly the indigenous population.

It is important to note that Bolivia's inclusion challenges are not limited to ethnicity. While women have made progress in terms of their representation in the parliament, Bolivia continues to have one of the region's highest rates of gender-based violence. The inter-sectionality between gender and indigenous groups can present particular challenges. The tension between collective rights and individual rights can affect an indigenous woman's political participation if the needs of the community (as generally defined by male leadership) may take precedence over a woman's right to participate or exercise leadership.

*a. Personal Documentation (PD):* Access to legal identity has received increasing attention in recent years as a critical "enabler" for the exercise of political and economic rights as well as a fundamental ingredient of personal empowerment. Its relevance as a global challenge is underscored by Sustainable Development Goal 16.9, which calls on States to provide legal identity for all, including for birth registration.

Bolivia has faced long-standing challenges in the area of legal documentation. While some Bolivians lack their legal documents altogether—principally the birth certificate and "*cédula de identidad*" (identification card)—it is more common that the documents contain errors such as incorrect dates or spelling errors due to a system that depended for many years on handwritten registries filled out by officials with only basic levels of education.

The 2010 Law of the Electoral Authority created the Civil Service Registry (SERECI) and greatly simplified the PD process by channeling resolution through administrative, rather than judicial, means. Importantly, these reforms coincided with the creation of a series of new social programs aimed to assist the most vulnerable Bolivians. Thus, legal documentation became more important than ever—representing a necessary precondition in order to access the state pension (*Renta Dignidad*), health insurance, cash incentives for schooling (*Bono Juancito Pinto*), and a cash transfer for pregnant women or new mothers (*Bono Juana Azurduy*).

*b. Collective Registration:* At the same time, the decentralisation of power to new political structures based on traditional indigenous organisations gave birth to a series of new bureaucratic requirements for the PJ of community organisations. According to the new procedure, communities must submit a file including a series of requirements such as by-laws, internal regulation, community map, signatures from community members and neighboring communities— all of which must be reviewed and approved by the authorities at the state-level. The PJ of a collective body—which could be an association, women's/men's organization, community or "central" (conglomeration of communities) is a pre-condition for accessing resources from a Ministry, municipality, or Embassy cooperation agency.

### ***The project objective***

From 1 December 2014 – 30 November 2016, the *Fundación MicroJusticia* Bolivia (MJB) implemented the project “Strengthening democratic participation and inclusive local development in indigenous and peasant communities in Bolivia.” The project objective was “to legally and politically empower members and leaders of indigenous communities, women and men, in La Paz and Oruro to protect and exercise their civil and indigenous rights and participate in democratic decision-making processes.”

The project sought to achieve three outcomes:

- Increased awareness of target groups of the importance of having their basic legal documents (identity, legal, personality) in order and increased number holding basic legal documents;
- Members, leaders and organizations of traditionally excluded indigenous communities have strengthened capacity to participate in democratic processes and to exercise their civil and indigenous rights; and
- Improved access to basic legal documents through evidence-based inputs for institutional reforms (advocacy).

The project was originally proposed for six municipalities, but later expanded to 16 in the two target departments of La Paz and Oruro. The total UNDEF grant was US\$ 200,000 with US\$ 10,000 retained by UNDEF for monitoring and evaluation costs.

### *Intervention rationale*

Project design was based on the model developed by Microjustice4All (MJ) and implemented in its seven country organizations<sup>1</sup> over the last 17 years. MJ initiated its work in the former Yugoslavia in 1996, providing refugees and internally displaced persons with assistance in accessing legal documentation. Its approach centres on providing legal solutions to individuals at the local level, while raising their legal awareness and capacity. At the same time, MJ supports the capacity building of young lawyers—through its internship programme—and carries out advocacy to make the legal system more accessible.

MicroJustice Bolivia (MJB) initiated its work with a pilot programme in 2007. Once some key adaptations were made, the original MJ intervention rationale was appropriate to the local context. (See below Section on “relevance”). The UNDEF-funded project implemented during 2015-2016 included a number of actions:

- Baseline study;
- Recruitment and training of 18 rural facilitators through an alliance with the local law school;
- Establishment/functioning of nine (later changed to six) legal outlets

---

<sup>1</sup> Argentina, Bolivia, Croatia, Kenya, Peru, Rwanda, Serbia

- Conduct of 108 legal campaigns;
- Production and broadcast of six radio spots and programmes;
- Processing of 1200 legal cases on identity documents and 200 for syndicate formalization (later changed to 1000 legal cases for syndicate formalization and 200 on identity documents);
- Development of 90 legal and political capacity-building workshops;
- Realization of nine educational video training events for 2000 beneficiaries;
- Development of four evidence-based advocacy documents and a documentary film;
- Conduct of 20 advocacy and capacity building meetings with local/national governments; and
- Development of one large forum.

### III. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

An independent expert conducted the present evaluation, according to the guidelines of UNDEF's Operational Manual. After reading and analyzing the project documents and other relevant literature, the Evaluator prepared the Launch Note (UDF-13-578-BOL) describing the analytical methodology, techniques, and instruments used during the evaluation mission. The evaluation was conducted according to the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and UNDEF value added.

The Evaluator developed semi-structured interview and focus group protocols to guide questioning and discussions around the questions included in the Launch Note. Prior to each interview and focus group, the evaluator explained the purpose of the meeting and provided assurances of respondent anonymity. The report paraphrases all quotes, translates them into English and protects the anonymity of respondent institutions.

Prior to the field mission, the evaluator conducted skype interviews with MJ staff at the HQ and regional levels. The field visit took place from 19 – 23 June, 2017. The visit initiated with an in-depth interview of members of the MJB team. The evaluator also conducted interviews with beneficiaries, partners, external experts and UN agencies. Six focus groups were carried out in communities in the municipalities of Patacamaya, Viacha and Caracollo. Through these meetings, the evaluator collected a broad array of perspectives around the effectiveness and efficiency of the project. Annex 3 contains the complete list of interviews and focus groups.

In the interests of transparency and accountability, it is important to note several methodological limitations in this evaluation report:

- Although the UNDEF guidance includes “impact” as an evaluation criterion, the lack of a control group against which to measure outcomes in a counterfactual scenario precludes statements about programme “impact.” Rather, this report constitutes a “performance” evaluation in which actual MJB performance is measured against stated objectives and best practices. The sparse and disparate official data regarding personal

documentation and community registration in Bolivia further limited the degree to which the evaluator could assess the overall level of coverage and direct “impact” of UNDEF-funded efforts.

- The evaluator needed to rely upon MJB to facilitate contact with interviewees and focus group participants. Although the evaluator proposed a list of contacts for interviews, MJB managed access to interviewees and focus groups participants. This dynamic, while necessary to reach relevant stakeholders, may potentially have led to selection bias. It should be noted, however, that MJB did not prevent interviews with any particular organizations and, in fact, facilitated far better access than had the evaluator reached out to potential interviewees on her own.
- An additional limitation is courtesy bias, whereby interviewees or survey respondents who have benefitted from MJB assistance are hesitant to speak negatively of the assistance. The evaluator sought to overcome this bias by triangulation across multiple data sources, asking follow-up questions during interviews, and providing assurance at the start of meetings to indicate that findings would be confidential and without implications for the respondent. MJB staff was not present during the interviews and focus groups, with the exception of two meetings where a rural facilitator was needed for translation to Aymara.

## IV. EVALUATION FINDINGS

### (i) *Relevance*

1. *Project objectives were relevant to the needs of target communities, as well as the democratic context in terms of:*

a). Meeting a deeply felt need of the communities. PJ is a pre-condition for participation in any of the community-level social assistance programs created by the Government as well as for participation in municipal planning and projects. In the words of one project participant, “We weren’t able to knock on any door until we received our *personalidad jurídica*.” Another interviewee highlighted the importance of PJ by calling it the “community’s birth certificate.” The increase in the number of municipalities from six (proposed) to 16 (achieved) is testament to the project’s relevance. After the radio programmes aired, MJB received requests for assistance from community authorities from outside the target six municipalities. Following consultation with UNDEF, MJB agreed to provide support in the 16 municipalities.

b). Filling an unmet gap: The number, scope and influence of civil society organizations (CSOs) has decreased considerably in Bolivia over the last ten years. In part, this is due to decreasing levels of international cooperation in Bolivia. Additionally, civil society has faced pressure and even threats from the Government. Through interviews with communities and experts, the evaluator was able to confirm that MJB was the only CSO providing legal services in the target municipalities. Although municipal governments have “legal advice” offices, they do not provide support for PJ or personal documentation.

c). Shifting away from personal documentation: Though the original project included a focus on legal services for PD, the MJB staff quickly ascertained that this need was lower priority than the PJ processes. Reliable official statistics are lacking, but the MJB staff determined that the number of individuals lacking valid PD was lower than originally estimated. Additionally, the 2010 PD reform meant that individuals could obtain their identify documents with only minimal counsel from MJB. Based on the revised analysis, MJB requested authorization from UNDEF to place greater emphasis on the PJ component and de-prioritize PD.

2. *Though the original MJ model was developed in another region, the national team was able to make necessary adjustments to the local context.*

The essential elements of the model remain the same as in other countries, in terms of legal services, combined with empowerment and advocacy for legal reform. However, adjustments were made as needed, particularly to ensure that the project was appropriate to the rural context. At the start of the UNDEF project, MJB contracted two anthropologists to ensure that project design was culturally appropriate and to assist with community outreach. Their report informed a number of key adjustments including: a). working through the central/sub-central authorities; b). carrying out formal introductions; c). providing refreshments at meetings; and d). adapting the project timeline to the agricultural calendar. Additionally, while MJB may build on training content and materials from other MJ countries, all documents are tailored per the specifics of the Bolivian legal context.

3. *The project's geographic targeting strategy was appropriate*

Though MJB had previously worked in urban areas—such as El Alto—the UNDEF-funded project focused on rural communities in the “*altiplano*” (highlands). This targeting strategy is appropriate for a number of reasons. First, the number of service suppliers from either CSOs or private lawyers is limited. Additionally, rural areas are poorer and less empowered to interact with government offices. At the same time, Bolivia’s *altiplano* communities are highly organized with leadership structures at the community, sub-central and central levels as well as numerous associations and federations focused on productive activities. Finally, basing the project in La Paz, rather than in an eastern or valley department facilitated MJB engagement in policy or reform discussions with political decision makers.

4. *The project's objectives and methods were respectful of community -generally indigenous-traditions*

MJB’s support for the participatory development of by-laws and internal regulations gave communities an opportunity to re-examine, reaffirm and/or adapt their own long-standing traditions. PJ documents included sections on the communities’ values such as solidarity and respect for the environment as well as the symbolic meaning of traditional dress. During interviews and focus groups, community members were unanimous in asserting that MJB staff demonstrated sensitivity to local customs. Community members were particularly appreciative that many MJB staff—particularly the rural facilitators—came from the target municipalities, had deep knowledge of local needs and customs, and spoke Aymara. Participants in focus

groups and interviews used terms such as “kind”, “responsive”, “respectful” and “knowledgeable” to describe the MJB staff.

5. *While showing sensitivity to community traditions, MJB staff also facilitated reflection and adaptation in accordance with the human rights principles enshrined in the 2009 Constitution:*

Based on training and advisory support from MJB, PJ documents would include references to constitutional principles and legal frameworks. Sections regarding “punishment” provide one example of the introduction of human rights principles. Whereas community traditions often associate justice with physical punishment (whipping is particularly common), MJB staff worked with communities to raise awareness regarding non-physical forms of community justice and the need to move away from “vigilante justice” towards mechanisms based on due process and the presumption of innocence.

6. *While respecting community traditions, the project’s objectives and methods promoted gender equality through the following:*

a.) The MJB team—which itself was majority women—worked to promote the active participation of women community members in the PJ processes. Although men led most of the PJ processes (83% versus. 17%), MJB required that women make up half of all training participants.<sup>2</sup> Trainings also highlighted gender equality as a key theme. Staff encouraged women’s participation by offering “prizes” to the most active woman in the each workshop. Project materials—such as brochures and manuals—also featured women prominently in the drawings or case studies. The radio campaign included male and female voices.

b.) Of the 233 PJ cases completed<sup>3</sup>, 5% of them were focused on women’s associations, including handicraft groups or chapters of the national *Bartolina Sisa* organization.<sup>4</sup> By securing PJ that could lead to project support from the government or municipalities, these women’s organizations could potentially gain some financial autonomy as well as enhanced experience in project management and exposure to a broader network of institutional contacts.

c.) In the PJ files reviewed by the evaluator, by-laws and internal regulations make reference to gender equality legislation in the sections on principles and legal framework. However, not all PJ files include gender beyond the level of general rhetoric or include references to women’s participation in the leadership structures.

d.) Due to greater need and through the project’s concerted gender focus, the PD component helped slightly more women than men (53% versus. 47% of the 151 cases).

---

<sup>2</sup> The MJ Case Management System registers the name and sex of the client for each PJ process. The number of people registered (1266) as PJ promoters is greater than the number of PJ cases completed (233) because multiple individuals might be listed as promoters on a single PJ case if they split work between the different stages.

<sup>3</sup> In this case, “completed” means PJ received by the community or in *Gobernación* awaiting final approval

<sup>4</sup> Bartolina Sisa is the primary union movement of “*campesina*” (peasant) women and the largest mass-membership women’s organization in Bolivia. The group is linked to the *Movimiento al Socialismo* (Movement to Socialism, MAS) ruling party.

Due to an error in his birth certificate, Francisco Choque Laura's identity document was registered as invalid and he was unable to access his retirement pension. He learned about MJB support through the radio. MJB staff explained the process to him—importantly in his native Aymara—assisted him in obtaining the necessary paperwork and accompanied him to the government offices in La Paz. With MJB support he was able to access a corrected birth certificate and obtain his identity document. He has since been able to receive his pension payments and participate in community projects related to land and water rights.



## (ii) Effectiveness

1. The project achieved important results on four key important measures:

a) Registration: Through the project, 233 collectives (communities, associations, producer organisations) were able to obtain their PJ. Additionally, 151 individuals were able to obtain their personal documentation.

b) Community empowerment: Beyond measuring the legal registration as a concrete product, it is also important to consider the quality and effect of the *process*. Project participants consistently highlighted the benefits for empowerment and consolidation of community organizations that resulted from the project training as well as the opportunity to engage in participatory reflection and development of the by-laws and internal regulation.

c) Rural facilitator empowerment: The project forged an important alliance with the *Universidad Mayor San Andres* (San Andres Major University, UMSA) such that 18 recent graduates or law students in the Community Justice programme were able to work as interns (known in the project as “rural facilitators”) on the project. These students/alumni who were from local communities gained valuable experience in PJ and PD processes that will facilitate their future career opportunities and, perhaps, contribute to the creation of a critical mass of legally-trained experts working in the rural area.

d) Gender sensitivity: As highlighted in the Section on “Relevance,” the project was effective in addressing the needs of women in the community, evidenced by the high percentage

of women receiving PD, inclusion of gender equality principles and mechanisms in PJ provisions, and PJ support for women’s organizations.

The project also included an advocacy objective aimed at “improving access to basic legal documents through evidence-based inputs for institutional reforms.” To this end, MJB informed representatives of relevant agencies of the obstacles that communities faced during the PJ process. While it is true that the government did take some measures to facilitate the process, it is not possible to attribute these reforms to MJB efforts.

The project achieved its proposed results as detailed in the following table with outcome-level targets, baselines (BL) and results for the two-year period. Notwithstanding reservations regarding indicators and instruments (see findings on “efficiency”), the below demonstrates that targets were met.

<i>Outcome: Increased awareness of target groups of the importance of having their basic legal documents in order and increased number holding basic legal documents</i>		
Target 1.1: 90% of the NPIOC members/leaders in target municipalities have a valid identity document	BL: 60-80%	Result 1.1: 91%
Target 1.2: 70% of indigenous organisations in the target municipalities are formalized with legal personality	BL: 10%	Result 1.2: 70%
Target 1.3: 120,000 in/direct beneficiaries have increased awareness of the need to hold correct legal documents	BL: not specified	Result 1.3: 184,663
<i>Outcome 2: Members, leaders and organisations of traditionally excluded indigenous communities have strengthened capacity to participate in democratic processes and to exercise their civil and indigenous rights</i>		
Target 2.1: 750 NPIOC leaders (50% women) in targeted communities know their basic rights and 80% of these leaders feel empowered to exercise these, including through democratic participation	BL: not specified	Result 2.1: 1495 (incl. 707 women) participated in workshops and “most of them” feel empowered
Target 2.2: 85% of NPIOC women and men in target communities have an understanding of their basic rights and how to achieve these	BL: not specified	Result 2.2: 90% based on survey
Target 2.3: 80% of trained leaders should feel empowered to participate in democratic processes and 40% should be participating actively in one way or another	BL: not specified	Result 2.3: 84% of leaders feel empowered to participate actively + 50% participate in and outside community
<i>Outcome 3: Improved access to basic legal documents through evidence-based inputs for institutional reform (advocacy)</i>		

Target 3.1: Institutional changes achieved that improve access to basic legal documents for members and leaders	BL: 0	Result 3.1: Obstacles were solved in Year 1 by interceding with officials; in Year 2, remaining obstacles were recorded in advocacy document + video
Target 3.2: 3 new or improved channels of communication between NPIOC leaders and government agencies	BL: largely absent	2 improved channels of communication with LP/Oruro and 1 new channel with SERECI/Oruro

*2. The project fulfilled its intended outputs*

The project proposal included ten outputs across the three outcomes. By the close of project, nine of these output targets had been met or surpassed. The only output that was not met was the original target number (nine) of legal services outlets, which was decreased to six. However MJB provided UNDEF with justification for the change, explaining that outlets could not be open in three of the target areas due to a lack of community engagement.



*MJB facilitated PJ processes in Churillanka, La Paz. According to one interviewee, receiving legalization was like “getting a birth certificate for the whole community.” The majority of the villages in their area do not have PJ, and participants are recommending to neighbouring communities that they complete the process- if possible with MJB support.*

*3. Project training appeared to be effective in terms of content delivery and use of materials*

a) Most of the participating PJ communities received three training sessions. Interviewees and focus group participants assessed these trainings as highly informative, easy to understand and clearly focused on the steps necessary for obtaining a PJ.

b) The training materials — including brochures and manuals—received positive reviews from the communities. When trainees returned to their communities they would use the materials to develop their by-laws and internal regulation. The communities also appreciated receiving “models” or boilerplate examples of the PJ components such that they could work off and adapt these to their particular needs.

c) One challenge to training effectiveness was the high turnover of community leaders, based on a long-standing and widespread tradition of annual elections. Frequently, MJB would work with one set of leaders, but then need to bring up to speed new authorities midway into the process. In some cases, MJB was able to work with a specially appointed PJ “commission” that would lead the process for the duration or engage incoming leaders prior to the start of their tenure.

*4. The project established and leveraged key partnerships with non-State actors:*

a). MJB’s decision to partner with *Banco Fondo Iniciativas Económicas* (Bank for Economic Initiative Fund, FIE) in five operation centers (four in El Alto and one in La Paz) was useful for cost-saving and to facilitate outreach to FIE clients.

b) The partnership with UMSA was particularly critical. On the one hand, it provided MJB with a pool of low-cost labor with roots in the target municipalities and high motivation to contribute. On the other hand, the creation of a mass of experienced PJ facilitators has the potential to contribute to project sustainability in the long-term. (See findings on “sustainability”).

c) MJB partnered with Radio San Gabriel – and other radio media to a lesser extent—for information campaigns. This proved particularly useful for outreach to new communities. Indeed a number of the community interviewees stated that they first learned of MJB support through Radio San Gabriel announcements.

*5. MJB’s efforts to cooperate effectively with State actors were genuine and perseverant, but not always reciprocated.*

As part of its model, MJB accompanies communities to “*Gobernacion*” (state-level offices) for the submission of the PJ file. As explained by MJB and confirmed by others, coordination with these authorities depended on the goodwill (or often lack thereof) of the government officials. While MJB was able to work smoothly with *Gobernación* in Oruro—often receiving feedback on PJ drafts within a few days—work with *Gobernación* in La Paz was complicated by frequent staff turnover and varying levels of interest and commitment to these processes. In the area of personal documentation, MJB was also able to work quite effectively with Patacamaya whose Director showed particular commitment to prompt and high-quality service. MJB reportedly sought to coordinate with municipal offices at the start of the project, though the response was not positive.

### *(iii) Efficiency*

#### *1. The project was cost efficient*

For the overall cost of \$190,000, project participants were able to secure 233 PJ's and 151 PD's. Wherever possible, MJB staff sought cost savings, including through the use of UMSA students, sharing office space with FIE bringing communities together for joint training, and also through travel exclusively through public transport. Since the same staff worked on both individual and collective registrations, it is not possible to disaggregate the cost of each separate process. However, a simple calculation based on the sum of PJ and PD cases would yield a per case cost of approximately \$500. As a comparison point, communities mentioned that private lawyers in the area charge communities between \$735 - \$1030 (5000-7000 Bs). It should be noted however that private lawyers do not provide the ancillary benefits provided by MJB such as community organization strengthening, gender sensitivity, rural facilitator empowerment, and policy advocacy. Furthermore, communities indicated that the support provided by private lawyers, in addition to being more limited in scope, was also less reliable and prone to frequent fraud.



*Through the UMSA-MJB partnership, Liduvina Laura (right side in photo) worked with the project from 2015-16 as a rural facilitator. Her role was to liaison with communities, in terms of promoting their participation, informing them of the process, accompanying their progress and supporting women's active engagement. Liduvina appreciated the opportunity to help communities like her own and gain professional experience and self-confidence at the same time. She hopes to study law and continue to work with rural communities.*

#### *2. The MJ Case Management System (CMS) is useful for case tracking and decision making*

The CMS was piloted in Bolivia and has been in use for four years. MJ countries share the software with slight adaptations to reflect the specific procedures and timelines of relevant government agencies. The CMS allows tracking and analysis of each (individual or collective) client's case. Disaggregation categories include client's motivation for accessing the service, sex, disability, and donor among others. The CMS also registers events and includes a client satisfaction form with ten questions. The CMS is user-friendly and MJ developed a training video for new users. One MJB staff member said that the CMS' most useful feature was the case tracking: "Thanks to the CMS, no case can slip through the tracks. We know the status of a process at any given moment." According to MJB staff, the CMS is used to generate reports for donors as well as for internal analysis and learning, for instance, to identify the most common PJ bottlenecks. Two potential areas for improvement would be: a). include a question on whether other service providers are already working in the area; and b). generate reports based on client

satisfaction, for instance, identifying the percentage of respondents who believe the service is reasonably priced.

*3. Coordination within MJB at the national, regional and global level contributed to enhanced project management*

MJB project staff asserted that information exchange between MJ staff in Latin America provided useful insights for project design and innovation. The MJ structure also facilitated economies of scale through the CMS and shared technical staffing. Additionally, MJ/HQ provided overall strategic vision, guidance and facilitation of lessons learned with other regions where MJ works. Coordination between the MJ teams enhanced management of the project, in terms of the timely delivery of project reports and efficient management of the budget.

*4. Project implementation included deviations from the original budget, but all were clearly justified*

The project's final report details seven budget deviations, all of which are clearly explained and justified given some unanticipated developments including cost-savings, community contributions, increased participant numbers and the reduced number of legal outlets. Overall project spending (\$189,940) was in line with the total approved project cost (\$190,000).

*5. The project's monitoring and evaluation system allowed for reporting, decision making and accountability at the output level, while outcome-level indicators and instruments could be improved*

The output measures included in the project were sufficiently concrete, quantifiable and linked to project outcomes. At the outcome level however, democracy projects are notoriously difficult to measure. In the case of the MJB project, the objective related to advocacy work presented attribution challenges. While it may be possible to demonstrate that the law has changed, it is not possible to determine MJB's level of influence. Objectives related to enhanced knowledge, empowerment, and participation face the attribution challenge, as well as the added burden of "tangibility" and appropriate instruments. For instance, the project aimed for "increased awareness" of 120,000 direct and indirect beneficiaries. The majority of these individuals were counted based on estimates of radio listeners. However there is no certainty that awareness was enhanced simply because someone listens to the radio. Also, since this indicator also includes market day attendees, website views and workshop participants, there is a risk of double counting; the same individual may have been reached through multiple entry points.

***(iv) Impact***

*1. The project has the potential to improve communities' socio-economic development*

Though the project concluded too recently to assess long-term impact, key informants were optimistic that the PJ's would improve their economic and social development in future years. About half of the communities consulted had already leveraged their PJ's to prepare projects for ministries or municipalities and one of the communities had already received preliminary funding approval.

*2. The project has catalytic potential beyond the direct beneficiary group, though MJB did not make this an explicit part of its strategy*

Participants in interviews and focus groups said they have referred neighboring communities to MJB for PJ support. Given funding limitations however, it is unlikely that MJB will be able meet the needs of all the interested communities. It does not appear that MJB built the capacity of participating leaders such that they would be able to counsel or orient interested neighbors beyond the level of referrals. An additional opportunity for catalytic growth would be through public dissemination of the results and lessons learned of the project such that other CSOs or State agencies are encouraged to provide PJ services. This does not seem to have been a focus of the project however. This issue will be discussed more at length in the findings on “sustainability.”

### *(v) Sustainability*

*1. MJB’s focus on community ownership contributes to long-term capacity development*

As a condition for support, communities were required to sign “Commitment Acts” that clearly outlined their responsibilities, including payment of a service fee of \$35 (250 Bs). Initially, MJB had not planned to charge for their services, but early experience demonstrated that communities would take the process more seriously if they were required to pay even a nominal amount. Although MJB provided a boilerplate format for by-laws and internal regulation, community leaders were expected to develop their own documents through a series of participatory consultations. MJB staff followed up on progress through frequent phone contact, but real progress hinged on community leader initiative.

*2. Since the end of UNDEF funding, MJB has been forced to reduce the scope of its activities*

Without UNDEF funding, MJB’s 2017 budget is significantly reduced. MJB continues to engage in PJ processes thanks to a smaller-scale donation and has satisfactorily finalised the majority of the cases that were still open as of December 2016. However, due to budget cuts, MJB is working with fewer communities and rural facilitators. The legal outlets in the participating municipalities were closed.

*3. Participation of the rural facilitators generated a pool of local capacity for critical legal services.* The project empowered 18 rural facilitators (law students or recent graduates) by developing their legal knowledge, understanding of local customs and professional experience. As will be discussed below, these individuals represent a potential source of legal support for communities in the future.

*4. Sustainability is the project’s principal challenge*

Even if MJB were able to secure new project funding, it would not be able to meet the vast need for PJ facilitation. Some of the potential strategies that MJB could consider for enhanced sustainability include:

a.) Approaching development agencies— particularly international non-governmental organisations such as Plan International, *Ayuda en Acción* (Action Aid), CARE, Save the Children

and World Vision— to propose a partnership whereby MJB provides PJ support (for a fee) to the communities where they work;

b) Conduct a study of local demand to determine up to what amount communities are willing to pay for PJ support. MJB charged \$35, while lawyers charge up to \$1,030. MJB estimates that to cover operational costs, they would need to charge approximately \$250 for each PJ process (contingent on certain economies of scale). Depending on the results of a demand study, communities may be willing to accept higher costs, particularly if there were flexibility regarding the scheduling of payments.

c) Support a critical mass of qualified— and trusted— PJ facilitators. MJB has developed a “professionals’ network” that currently consists of three lawyers who are qualified, seemingly honest and willing to charge communities lower rates for PJ services. This network could be broadened considerably, particularly if MJB expands the group to include former rural facilitators (law students and recent graduates). The former rural facilitators in are highly experienced in PJ processes and often in need of reliable employment. With this in mind, MJB could consider providing initial orientation and/or “certification” such that lawyers and facilitators are able to provide legal services support to communities.

d) Support training of trainers. Particularly engaged and qualified leaders who successfully complete the PJ process in their communities could be encouraged to provide a certain level orientation or counsel in neighboring areas or to other associations within their own communities.

*(vi) UNDEF added value*

*1. UNDEF’s flexible and practical approach is highly appropriate given the complexity of Bolivia’s political and culture context.*

MJB staff was appreciative of UNDEF’s willingness to approve changes in the budget and project targets as long as they were clearly explained. The requested adjustments were justifiable in order to take advantage of emerging opportunities as well as ensure responsiveness to conditions in the communities.

*2. The UNDEF brand— identified with democracy promotion and impartiality— has particular value in Bolivia*

While the Government has made progress in ensuring greater social inclusion, the country’s democratic institutions and processes have suffered a number of setbacks in recent years. Separation of powers, for instance, is at risk given the Executive’s strong influence over the Parliament and the weakened independence of the judiciary. In addition, the government has frequently attacked journalists who uncover corruption or publish otherwise unflattering portrayals of government functioning. At the same time, the number of international donors and agencies supporting democracy programming in Bolivia has decreased. Under a recent restructuring, UNDP, for instance, is eliminating its “Governance” programme. In this context,

the type of support offered by UNDEF to Bolivia’s civil society organizations is more critical than ever.

## V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion	Recommendation
<i>Design:</i> The project’s intervention was timely, well targeted, and culturally appropriate to the local context	n/a
<i>Community organization:</i> The project contributed to strengthened community organisations and improved local capacity	n/a
<i>Gender:</i> The project supported women’s empowerment, though a gender focus was not always apparent in the final PJ documents	While recognising that MJB cannot “impose” concepts or language on communities, the project could share examples/models of PJ articles that support women’s participation (beyond the sections on “principles”) and work with communities to consider alternative equity mechanisms. The project could also seek to increase the number of women’s organisations assisted beyond the current 5%.
<i>Civil society partnerships:</i> The project established partnerships with key civil society actors, particularly in the cases of the UMSA and FIE	Given the vast need and limited resources, MJB should conduct a mapping in each municipality of the CSOs and INGOs operating and seek to complement/integrate services as feasible.
<i>Advocacy and State partnerships:</i> The project built constructive relationships with State actors, as feasible. It is not evident that the project’s advocacy activities influenced policies.	If MJB is going to focus on advocacy in the future, efforts should include the development of a specific and deliberate strategy with decision maker mapping, media plans and the creation of broad coalitions, involving communities and other CSOs.
<i>Monitoring and Evaluation:</i> The Case Management System (CMS) is a useful tool for project tracking and reporting. Monitoring and evaluation indicators and instruments could be improved, particularly at the outcome-level in that baseline figures were estimates of PJ/PD coverage and “awareness” is based on the number of radio listeners	While already quite useful and efficient, the CMS could be further leveraged to capture the presence of other CSOs in the target areas and generate/analyse client satisfaction factors. To the extent possible, MJB should try to carry out a more rigorous baseline estimate of PJ and PD coverage, perhaps in alliance with another CSO or a university. If a full census approach is not feasible, the project could consider sampling and extrapolation for more precise estimates of PJ/PD coverage. Additionally, MJB can use estimates on radio listeners to gauge the number of people with access to information, but not the

	number of people with greater awareness. Impact of the services—in terms of awareness, knowledge and empowerment—could be better measured through periodic random sampling of participants and tracking through a database.
<i>Internal coordination:</i> Project quality is enhanced by coordination within MicroJustice at the global (The Hague), regional (Lima) and national levels (La Paz).	n/a
<i>Impact:</i> The project is catalytic in that legal documentation will lead to broader socio-economic impacts. The catalytic impact in terms of direct beneficiaries reaching indirect beneficiaries is not evident.	As part of a broader sustainability strategy (see below), MJB could identify/support some of the most interested and capable community members to provide basic orientation and outreach to other communities.
<i>Sustainability:</i> As is often the case of democracy projects, sustainability is difficult to achieve. The project’s incipient attempt to create a “professionals’ network” is a good start.	There are a number of measures MJB could consider for greater sustainability including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnerships with INGOs to provide legal services to their target communities;</li> <li>• Conducting a demand study in order to increase fees charged;</li> <li>• Developing a pool of trained, trusted and relatively inexpensive PJ experts- including from the UMSA graduates- who can support communities and make a living off the fees charged</li> </ul>
<i>UNDEF value added:</i> The agency’s flexibility and responsive were much appreciative and appropriate. UNDEF’s unique brand – focused on impartial democracy support—is greatly needed in the current Bolivian context.	Continue to support CSOs in challenging democratic contexts. Facilitate contacts between UNDEF-funded CSOs and relevant UN agencies, which would include in this case, UNDP, UN Women, UNICEF, and possibly FAO.

## VI. LESSONS LEARNED

The project presents a number of useful lessons learned, including:

- a) Legal services projects can produce benefits both in terms of the “ends” (securing legal recognition) as well as through the “means” (process developed). On the former, obtaining (collective and individual) legal identity is fundamental for human rights and democratic participation. At the same time, the process of applying for collective identity—through

reflection and drafting of by-laws and internal regulation— can strengthen community organization, empower community leaders and open opportunities for socio-economic development.

b) When properly designed and carefully implemented, legal services projects can combine sensitivity to traditional customs (in this case of indigenous groups) with principles such as human rights and gender equality. To a great extent, achieving this delicate balance hinges on the service provider's local knowledge, respect for traditions, ability to build trust, and use of appropriate language and communication channels.

c) Alliances with law schools provide a number of win-win benefits. On the one hand, the CSO can lower costs, expand reach and improve service quality through recruitment of students who are motivated and familiar with the target communities. Additionally, the students are given the opportunity to test their theoretical knowledge in a practical setting as well as gain experience that can benefit their career prospects.

d) Relationship building with State agencies must take place at different levels. While MJ focused its advocacy activities on the high-level officials responsible for making policy decisions, it is equally important to work with staff of lower hierarchy given the important role they play in implementing policy. That is, enhanced trust and coordination with the lower level staff who work on PJ processes on a daily basis helped facilitate the review process and improve the overall treatment of the community members.

e) Sustainability is the Achilles' heel of democracy projects. To ensure the continuation of services beyond the end of project funding, projects need to plan for sustainability from the start, as design and implementation will require: creative partnerships with civil society and State organizations; careful analysis of the level of demand and willingness to pay; the creation of a cadre of competent professionals able to provide continuous service; and empowerment of community members to provide orientation or counsel, as feasible.

## VII. ANNEXES

## *Annex 1: Evaluation Questions*

The evaluation focused on the following questions:

### *Relevance:*

- Whether the objectives of the project were in line with the needs and priorities for democratic development given the context?
- Should another project strategy have been preferred rather than the one implemented in order to better reflect the needs, priorities and contexts?

### *Effectiveness:*

- To what extent were project objectives achieved?
- To what extent was the project implemented as envisaged? If there were deviations, what was the reason and result?
- Were the project activities adequate to make progress toward the project objectives? Were any outputs not achieved and if so, why?

### *Efficiency:*

- Was there a reasonable relationship between project inputs and project outputs?
- Did institutional arrangements promote cost-effectiveness and accountability?
- Was the monitoring and evaluation system conducive to accountability, decision-making and learning?
- Did budget design and implementation facilitate achievement of objectives?

### *Impact:*

- To what extent has/have the realization of the project objective(s) and project outcomes had an impact on the specific problem the project aimed to address?
- Have the targeted beneficiaries experienced tangible impacts? Which were positive; which were negative?
- To what extent has the project caused changes and effects, positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen, on democratization? Is the project likely to have a catalytic effect? How? Why? Examples?

### *Sustainability:*

- To what extent has the project established processes and systems that are likely to support continued impact?
- Are the involved parties willing and able to continue the project activities on their own (where applicable)?

### *UNDEF's value added:*

- To what extent did UNDEF funding provide value added (in terms of best practices or areas of improvement) to work that was already up and running since 2008?
- How distinct were the UNDEF-funded activities from the other activities undertaken by Microjusticia Bolivia?

- How was the UNDEF brand used to develop new partnerships and negotiate with stakeholders?

***Annex 2: Documents Reviewed:***

O. Della Costa Steunkel, 2017, "Bolivia's Democracy at Risk: What Role for External Actors?"  
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

S. Fagernas, 2017, "The benefits of low fee legal services on documentation: Lessons from the clients of Microjusticia Bolivia" Study funded by Research Development Grant from School of Business, Management and Economics, University of Sussex

M. Harbitz and M.C. Tamargo, 2009, "The Significance of Legal Identity in Situations of Poverty and Social Exclusion" Inter-American Development Bank

MicroJusticia Bolivia, 2015, "Linea Base: Proyecto Fortalecimiento de la Participación Democrática y el Desarrollo Local Inclusivo en las Comunidades Indigenas y Campesinas de Bolivia"

MicroJusticia Bolivia, 2015, "Modulo 1: Derecho a la Identidad: Certificados de Nacimiento, Matrimonio, Defunción, y Cédula de Identidad"

MicroJusticia Bolivia, 2016, "Modulo 2: Personalidad Jurídica y Derechos Indigena Originario Campesinos"

MicroJusticia Bolivia, 2016, "Modulo 3: Gobernanza y Democracia Interna"

K. Ouillette, 2015, "An Impact Assessment of Microjustice4All's Legal Service Provision in Peru and Bolivia" Microjustice4All

UDF-13-BOL-578: Project Document, Project Budget and Results Framework

UDF-13-BOL-578: Milestone Verification Report 2

UDF-13-BOL-578: Mid-term Progress Report

UDF-13-BOL-578: Final Financial Utilization Report.

UDF-13-BOL-578: Milestone Verification Report 3

UDF-13-BOL-578: Final Narrative Report

United Nations Democracy Fund, 2017, "Post Project Evaluations for the United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF): Operational Manual"

### *Annex 3: Persons Interviewed*

19 June 2017	
Arrival, international consultant	5:00 am
Kick-off and Coordination meeting	MJB Team, led by Maria Choque (Director), Jacqueline Quispe Lima (Social Area), Miriam Colque Flores (Legal Area), Monica Chavez (Gestor Legal Senior) and Filiberto Hualpa (Campaign Coordinator)
Interview, Efrain Tinta Guachalla	Director Regional Altiplano of Fundacion Tierra (e.tinta@ftierra.org)
20 June 2017	
Travel	7:00 am- drive to Patacamaya
Fermin Choque	Director, Oficina Regional de Registro Civil
20 people	Subcentral Agraria Churillanka
30-40 people	Communities Villa Concepcion Belen, Belen de Quiaca, Phinaya Pampa y Chairumani
Jose Luis Torrez and Liduvina Laura	Rural Facilitators
Francisco Choque Laura and Marcelina Plata	2 beneficiaries of personal documentation
Celia Martinez	Gobernacion de Oruro, Legal Dept
21 June 2017	
Travel	8:30 am drive to Caracollo
Zulema Condori	Rural Facilitator
Authorities	4 Caracollo communities
Authorities	4 Patacamaya communities of Huayllaroco, Cahuanata y Asoci Amproacota
22 June 2017	
Olivia Santander	Ex Staff of Gobernacion de La Paz
Travel	8:30 am drive to Viacha
4 Community leaders	Communities of Viacha

4 Community leaders	Villa Jupi, Asoc Sartawiwi, Yanarani, Khoputa, Aroma (in La Paz)
Petrona Condori	Community Leader (in La Paz)
23 June 2017	
Karen Valverde, Alberto Garcia, Rosali Ledesma	UNDP – Departments of Justice + Governance
Toribia Lero	UN Women Civil Society Advisory Committee
Maria Choque	Debriefing

#### ***Annex 4: Acronyms***

CMS	Case Management System
CPE	<i>Constitución política del estado</i> (State Political Constitution)
CSO	Civil society organization
FIE	<i>Banco Fondo Iniciativas Económicas</i> (Bank for Economic Initiative Fund)
MJ	Microjustice4All
MJB	Microjustice Bolivia
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PD	Personal documentation (individual identity cards)
PJ	<i>Personalidad jurídica</i> (legal personality)
SERECI	<i>Servicios de registro civil</i> (Civil registration services)
UNDEF	United Nations Democracy Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UMSA	<i>Universidad Mayor San Andrés</i> (San Andrés Major University)