



Organisational Review of Norges Naturvernforbund/ Friends of the Earth Norway

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

P.O. Box 8034 Dep, NO-0030 OSLO
Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway
Phone: +47 23 98 00 00
Fax: +47 23 98 00 99

ISBN 978-82-7548-612-5
ISSN 1502-2528

Organisational Review of Norges Naturvernforbund / Friends of the Earth Norway

28 June 2011

Jan-Petter Høltedahl – team leader

Jørn Stave

Table of Contents

- Abbreviations 4
- Executive summary 5
- 1. Introduction 9
 - 1.1. General background 9
 - 1.2. Purpose and scope 9
 - 1.3. Norges Naturvernforbund / Friends of the Earth Norway 9
 - 1.4. Approach and methodology 10
- 2. The organisation 12
 - 2.1. Organisational structure 12
 - 2.2. Role in civil society; coordination with other actors 12
 - 2.3. International strategy 14
 - 2.4. Relations to Norwegian political priorities 15
 - 2.5. Professional competence and capacity 15
 - 2.6. Cross-cutting issues 16
- 3. Partnerships 18
 - 3.1. Partners and projects 18
 - 3.2. Partner selection 21
 - 3.3. FoE-N’s added value 22
 - 3.4. Scaling up 23
 - 3.5. Exit strategy 24
- 4. Results 26
 - 4.1. Planning for results 26
 - 4.2. Documenting and reporting results 27
 - 4.3. Case study: ERA’s results 28
- 5. Financial management 30
 - 5.1. FoE-N’s financial and administrative routines 30

| | |
|--|----|
| 5.2. Case study: ERA's finance and accounting system | 31 |
| 5.3. Anti-corruption..... | 32 |
| 6. Conclusions | 33 |
| 7. Recommendations | 35 |
| Annex 1: Terms of Reference | 37 |
| Annex 2: Documents consulted..... | 41 |
| Annex 3: Field itinerary | 46 |
| Annex 4: Persons interviewed..... | 47 |

Abbreviations

| | |
|--------|--|
| CAP | Common Agricultural Policy |
| CBD | United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity |
| EMIS | Environmental Movements in the South |
| ERA | Environmental Rights Action |
| FESMO | Forum for Sustainable Energy in Mozambique |
| FoE | Friends of the Earth |
| FoE-N | Friends of the Earth Norway (Norges Naturvernforbund) |
| JVE | Jeunes Volontaires pour l'Environnement |
| LFA | Logical framework analysis |
| M&E | Monitoring and evaluation |
| NEITI | Nigeria Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative |
| NGN | Nigerian Naira |
| NGO | Non-governmental organisation |
| NOK | Norwegian kroner |
| Norad | Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation |
| OVE | Danish Organisation for Renewable Energy |
| PIB | Petroleum Industry Bill |
| RBM | Results-based management |
| SPARE | School Programme for Application of Resources and Energy |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |
| USD | United States Dollar |

Executive summary

Background

Norges Naturvernforbund / Friends of the Earth Norway (FoE-N) is a non-governmental, nation-wide and membership-based organisation established in 1914. FoE-N's international projects constitute ca. 20 percent of the organisation's personnel resources (ca. eight full-time staff) and close to 40 percent of the budget (ca. NOK 18 mill. per year, out of a total of NOK 47 mill. per year).

This organisational review was conducted to assess the extent to which FoE-N is capable of achieving results in accordance with agreed goals, the guidelines for Norad's grant scheme and overall Norwegian policies and guiding principles for development cooperation. The review mainly deals with Norad-funded projects in Nigeria, Togo and Mozambique.

The methodology was based on qualitative data from semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and a systematic document review. In addition, one-week field work was carried out in Nigeria. The selection of Environmental Rights Action (ERA) in Nigeria as a case study implies that more evidence was collected to support the findings related to this partner, while findings related to FoE-N's partners in other countries should be treated with more caution.

The review findings were grouped in four categories: (1) The organisation (incl. organisational structure, role in civil society, international strategy, relations to Norwegian political priorities, professional competence and capacity, cross-cutting issues); (2) Partnerships (incl. partner selection, added value, exit strategy); (3) Results (incl. planning, documentation, reporting); and (4) Financial management (incl. financial and administrative routines, accounting system, anti-corruption).

Conclusions

The organisation

- FoE-N is a democratic, non-governmental organisation with about 19,500 members and 100 regional and local branches. It is a genuine civil society actor with an independent voice in policy debates and a watchdog function on environmental issues.
- FoE-N collaborates and co-ordinates with like-minded environmental actors in Norway and abroad on issues where they have a shared interest.
- FoE-N's mandate and international projects are well aligned with Norwegian policies and strategies as well as with existing guidelines for support to civil society.
- FoE-N's recently adopted international strategy (2011-2020) demonstrates a long-term approach and is likely to help increase attention to its international agenda and strengthen its international partners.
- FoE-N's professional competence and capacity provide sufficient support to the international work at present, but the organisation is highly dependent on a limited number of key staff. The follow up of partners may deteriorate if key personnel are lost or the portfolio is increased without recruiting more staff.
- FoE-N and its partners pay attention to gender equity and women's rights, partly by means of policies and guidelines, but there is a significant male bias in staff composition.

- Conflict sensitivity and Do No Harm-principles are not fully understood as concepts or systematically considered by FoE-N or its partners. Long-standing presence and implicit understanding of risks and vulnerabilities in the field might partly compensate for this.

Partnerships

- FoE-N has four main Norad-funded partners: Environmental Rights Action (ERA) in Nigeria, Jeunes Volontaires pour l'Environnement (JVE) in Togo, and ADEL Sofala and Forum for Sustainable Energy in Mozambique (FESMO) in Mozambique.
- ERA is a strong and capable FoE-N partner with long-standing experience and solid reputation and credibility. ERA plays a key role as a Nigerian human rights and environment advocate.
- ERA coordinates and collaborates with other NGOs and CBOs on relevant issues, and has established cordial relations with the Nigerian government at various levels.
- JVE in Togo and ADEL Sofala and FESMO in Mozambique work on issues of low-cost renewable energy solutions. While the team has not been able to visit these organisations, they appear to have lower capacity than ERA in terms of staff and funding levels. ADEL Sofala is a small, local NGO with limited outreach and scope compared to the other partners.
- FoE-N's added value can still improve, notably through a more systematic approach to the capacity-building of partners. Partnership development also requires an exit strategy.
- FoE-N aims to increase its impact by piloting best practices that can be 'scaled up' through information-sharing and policy advocacy. The reliance on localised, diverse interventions scattered across several countries and different contexts may help formulate relevant policy advice, but creates limited momentum and learning between projects.

Results

- The activities and results reported by FoE-N to Norad are in accordance with reports from partners. Moreover, the case study of ERA in Nigeria indicates that FoE-N's reports to Norad provide a true picture of the partners, the challenges on the ground, the activities and the achieved results.
- FoE-N and its partners have adopted results-based management (RBM), but the quality of planning and reporting varies considerably. The conceptual understanding and practical application of RBM seem limited, both in terms of linking goals and baselines with activities, indicators, outputs, outcomes and risks, and in terms of achieving coherence between project applications and reports.

Financial management

- In general, FoE-N's administrative and financial management system is in keeping with Norad's financial management guidelines and well suited to FoE-N's profile.
- Discrepancies between FoE-N's financial guidelines and observed practice were noted in some areas. These include over-utilisation on budget lines without prior approval, lack of separate bank accounts for FoE-N-funded projects and late reporting from partners and local auditors.
- The team's visit to ERA in Nigeria indicates that this partner has strengthened its administrative routines and financial management system during the last 2-3 years, including

improved financial guidelines and anti-corruption safeguards. There is regular contact between FoE-N and ERA on financial issues, but long time intervals between visits.

Recommendations

The organisation

- FoE-N should work towards diversifying its funding base, aiming to increase funding from sources other than the government. FoE-N should also apply for a multi-year co-operation (programme) agreement with Norad.
- In the event of improved funding, FoE-N should consider both increasing its staff and re-thinking the distribution of tasks, with a view to reducing vulnerabilities linked to personnel changes or fluctuating work loads.
- FoE-N should make a conscious effort to increase the number of women in the organisation, in particular in leading positions. The gender perspective should be strengthened in project and programme planning, including in dialogue with FoE-N's partners.
- FoE-N should initiate and sustain a training programme on conflict sensitivity throughout the organisation. FoE-N should ensure that conflict sensitivity is both theoretically understood and applied in projects and programmes, including through dialogue with FoE-N's partners.
- FoE-N's international strategy document should be translated into English and distributed to partners. FoE should make a focussed effort to involve its partners in understanding the strategy's rationale, contents and implications.
- As suggested in its international strategy, and in line with FoE-N's set-up in other thematic areas, FoE-N should appoint an international advisory committee to support and supervise the international department and to create stronger ownership to the international projects within the organisation.

Partnerships

- FoE-N should develop a more systematic approach towards the capacity-building of partners, including exit strategies.
- FoE-N should move from a project approach to a broader and more strategic programme approach that includes exploring opportunities for creating a better alignment between its geographical and thematic foci.
- FoE-N should aim at working with like-minded partners', i.e. policy-oriented NGOs with democratic structures and national (or international) outreach.

Results

- FoE-N and its partners should conduct a concerted, comprehensive effort to strengthen results-based management (RBM), including logical framework analysis, capacity across their organisations, and to ensure the consistent application of RBM principles and practice throughout all phases of the project cycle.
- FoE-N needs to consider the implications of moving from a project to a programme approach in terms of planning and results reporting.
- FoE-N should not always leave the responsibility to commission reviews and evaluations to their partners. FoE-N should sometimes, in particular for its most important partners and

projects, commission its own reviews and evaluations in order to have first-hand control over quality assurance and to ensure an independent, third-party view.

Financial management

- FoE-N should work to correct observed discrepancies between financial guidelines and financial management practice. FoE-N should also ensure that partners act promptly on auditors' recommendations.
- FoE-N should visit each of its partners annually. Each visit should include a thorough check of administrative routines and financial controls, as well as allow FoE-N to provide guidance and support to the partner on financial practices and requirements.

1. Introduction

1.1. General background

As part of its quality assurance of the support provided to civil society organisations, Norad conducts organisational reviews of its partners on a regular basis. Such reviews are a key tool for dialogue between Norad and its partners and inform Norad's consideration of approach and prospects for future funding to the organisations.

This review focusses on Norges Naturvernforbund / Friends of the Earth Norway (FoE-N)¹. FoE-N has been a Norad partner since the 1990s, and is currently funded through a three-year project grant covering 2009-2011. As Norad's first review of FoE-N, this review will form an important part of the basis for Norad's decision regarding whether to fund the organisation beyond 2011, as well as regarding the goal, funding level and scope of any future agreement.

1.2. Purpose and scope

The purpose of this organisational review is to assess the extent to which FoE-N is capable of achieving results in accordance with agreed goals, the guidelines for Norad's grant scheme and overall Norwegian policies and guiding principles for development cooperation.

According to the Terms of Reference (ToR), the review shall assess and make recommendations regarding FoE-N's professional, financial and administrative capacity to achieve its goals in an effective and efficient manner together with its partners.

The scope of the review includes the following areas:

- Mandate, strategy and relation to Norwegian political priorities
- Organisational structure
- FoE-N's cooperation with partners
- FoE-N's management and financial management capacity
- Professional competence and capacity
- FoE-N's management of results
- Coordination with other actors

1.3. Norges Naturvernforbund / Friends of the Earth Norway

FoE-N was established in 1914 and is a non-governmental, nation-wide and membership-based organisation. It has approximately 19,500 individual members and 100 regional and local branches. With its democratic structure, national scope and long historical record, FoE-N is a well-known and respected civil society actor in Norway. It is also the founder or co-founder of several other non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in Norway, e.g. Natur og Ungdom (Nature and Youth) and Regnskogfondet (Rainforest Foundation Norway).

¹ Norges Naturvernforbund is the Norwegian member of Friends of the Earth, an international network with 77 member-based/grassroots environmental NGOs.

FoE-N has for many years been active in global policy processes, most notably the UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) and the CBD (United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity). In parallel with its international policy engagement, FoE-N has also developed a portfolio of environmental projects that are being implemented by partner NGOs in the former Soviet republics, Eastern Europe and Africa.

FoE-N is financed by a combination of public funds, private and corporate donations, individual membership fees and occasional income-generating activities. While Norad is the only donor for the projects reviewed in this report (i.e., those in Africa), FoE-N also receives funding from the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. FoE-N's total income was approximately NOK 47 mill. in 2010, of which approximately NOK 18 mill. was allocated to international activities. Norad's support to FoE-N's projects in Africa amounted to NOK 5.3 mill. In addition, Norad provided NOK 100,000 in funding for information-related activities and NOK 1.1 mill. in support for climate and forest policy related activities (jointly with Rainforest Foundation Norway).²

1.4. Approach and methodology

Data and analysis

The review was based on qualitative methods. To the extent possible, data from different sources have been triangulated and cross-checked with key stakeholders before they were validated and analysed. The main data sources encompassed:

- *Systematic document review*, including:
 - FoE-N / Norad: contract agreements, multi-annual applications, annual plans, annual reports, audit reports, minutes from annual meetings, Norad's appropriation documents and correspondence;
 - FoE-N / partner: contract agreements, project proposals, annual (and semi-annual) reports, audit reports, policy documents, minutes from meetings, travel reports and correspondence;
 - FoE-N: international strategy, policies, guidelines, codes of conduct;
 - Reviews and evaluations of FoE-N and partners;
 - Scholarly literature on country contexts, civil society, renewable energy, climate change and the petroleum sector.
- *Semi-structured interviews* with key stakeholders. Checklists were developed prior to each interview. Norad's former and current desk officers for FoE-N were interviewed on 14 March 2011 and FoE-N's staff members were interviewed on 23-24 March and 31 May 2011. Two sessions of semi-structured interviews were held with the local partner Environmental Rights Action (ERA) in Nigeria on 9 and 10 June 2011, respectively.
- *Focus group discussions* with representatives of target groups in conjunction with a field visit to Nigeria (see below). The focus group discussions were deliberately made to be more open-ended than the semi-structured interviews in order to pursue issues emerging during the discussions.

² For updated figures for 2011, see section 3.1.

- *Briefing and debriefing sessions:* The team held briefing and debriefing meetings at the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Abuja on 8 and 14 June, respectively. The local partner ERA was debriefed on 12 June.

The triangulation and quality assurance checked for biased responses and tried to identify any vested interests and expectations of key stakeholders towards the review team.

The collection of data started in February/March 2011 and continued until the end of the review in late June. The relatively long period set aside for this review was found to strengthen the depth and breadth of the analysis, as it provided ample time for the team to compile and discuss the information before writing up the report.

Field work was carried out in Nigeria 7-14 June 2011. Nigeria was selected by Norad, with inputs from FoE-N, due to the latter's co-operation with the local partner Environmental Rights Action (ERA), including Oilwatch, together comprising the largest component of FoE's international programme. To ensure integrity and independence, the team travelled without being accompanied by FoE-N. The local partner ERA assisted the team in the field and allocated time and resources needed for interviews and data collection.

Methodological limitations

The limitations of the review include:

- The scope of the review includes only the Norad-funded projects. Hence the findings, conclusions and recommendations may have limited validity for the rest of FoE-N's international portfolio.
- The selection of Nigeria as a case study country implies that much evidence was collected to support the findings related to ERA, while findings related to FoE-N's partners in other countries should be treated with more caution.
- The cut-off date for the review was 31 May 2011. Apart from field data, documents from later dates have not been considered. Some of the findings, conclusions and recommendations have therefore not taken notice of the very latest developments.
- Despite checking for biased responses, the findings may have been influenced by the fact that most interviewees were fully aware that the review might influence further funding.

2. The organisation

2.1. Organisational structure

FoE-N is governed by a National Executive Committee and a Central Committee, both headed by the organisation's elected chair person (currently, Mr. Lars Haltbrekken). The supreme body is the General Assembly, which takes place every second year.

The General Assembly consists of FoE-N's members in the local and regional groups, as well as representatives from its affiliated organisations, viz. Natur og Ungdom (Nature and Youth), Miljøagentene (Children's Environmental Organisation) and Regnskogfondet (Rainforest Foundation Norway)³. The General Assembly approves a two-year work programme and elects members to the National Executive Committee and Central Committee.

The role of the *National Executive Committee* is to ensure that FoE-N is administered in accordance with the bylaws and the decisions taken by the General Assembly. It meets at least four times a year and consists of the Central Committee (see below) as well as one representative from each regional group, two representatives from Natur og Ungdom, one from Miljøagentene and one staff member.

The *Central Committee* consists of FoE-N's chair person, the deputy chair person and four members elected by the General Assembly. It is mandated to implement FoE-N's work plan within the approved budget and guides the day-to-day administration of the Secretariat.

FoE-N's grassroots level and membership base are the *local and regional groups*, corresponding to the municipality and county levels, respectively. There are currently about 100 local groups and 18 regional groups. These decentralised branches of FoE-N are governed by the central bylaws, but may also develop supplementary bylaws adapted to the local context and priorities. Each group is led by a Board elected by an annual General Assembly. The regional groups serve as the link between the local groups and FoE-N's national structures.

The Secretariat manages FoE-N's daily operations and is headed by a Secretary General (currently Mr. Jan Thomas Odegard). It consists of seven departments and currently 34 staff members. The Secretariat is supported by a number of advisory committees on issues such as climate change, energy and transport, biodiversity and forests.

The International Department (formerly called the International Project Department) is administering FoE-N's international programme. FoE-N supports a wide range of projects on energy efficiency, renewable energy, climate change and education in 20 countries in the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and Africa. The projects are implemented by FoE-N's partner organisations.

2.2. Role in civil society; coordination with other actors

FoE-N is one of Norway's largest membership-based organisations and a leading advocate for the environment. This strong anchoring in Norwegian civil society provides a unique source of legitimacy for FoE-N as a key actor in environment and development.

FoE-N maintains a reputation as an independent advocate for the environment, although the bulk of its funding comes from the Norwegian government, with occasional donations coming from the business

³ These organisations are 'off-spring' rather than 'sisters', as they were all established by FoE-N.

sector. FoE-N provides the following arguments why its independence is not curtailed by public funding:

- The overall justification for public funding to civil society organisations in Norway is that they shall represent an independent voice and provide checks and balances to the government.
- FoE-N would never apply for funding that required political loyalty to the donor.
- Public funding is preferred to private funding because the latter tends to impose more conditionality on how the funding is being used.
- FoE-N is a membership-based organisation, which serves as a guarantee against political influence from the outside.

The first of these points, while providing Norwegian NGOs with a rationale for and legitimisation of their existence and activities, does not in itself guarantee a given organisation's independence. However, FoE-N has frequently been critical of the Norwegian government's environment and development policies, which seems to underpin the two first argument above. As regards public vs. private funding, public authorities may be even more keen than private actors to impose a certain "world-view" on operations, and hence provide restrictions regarding the use of funding. Suffice to note that in several other country contexts, civil society actors view the public sector with at least as much suspicion as is accorded the private sector.

For FoE-N, however, certain private or corporate actors would be more damaging than others, notably as regards extractive and heavily polluting industries. Issues regarding the influence from corporate interests are controlled by FoE-N's sponsorship guidelines, which include a restrictive advertisement policy (e.g. FoE-N shall not promote specific companies or products) and a ban on receiving funding from companies that are, or have been, targeted in FoE campaigns.

Through its persistent campaigns against a range of government policies and actions at the local and national level, as well as its watchdog function toward the corporate sector, FoE-N has repeatedly demonstrated that it has an independent voice in policy debates and a unique position in Norway's civil society. FoE-N's broad membership base should act as a safeguard against serious deviations from the organisation's overall *raison d'être* and long-term goals.

Conversely, FoE-N collaborates with like-minded environmental actors in Norway and abroad on issues where they have a shared interest. For instance, FoE-N has co-operated with the Rainforest Foundation Norway and Statkraft. As a member of FoE International, FoE-N has also had some co-operation with other members. However, such co-operation has been limited, both due to the weakness of South partners and since European partners have been working with EU-related issues such as nuclear energy and Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) reform, in addition to energy efficiency. Moreover, FoE partners have often been either absent or marginal in many of FoE-N's project countries. On the other hand, FoE-N has had closer co-operation with other Nordic environmental organisations, notably regarding organisational development.

FoE-N took part in an umbrella organisation labeled Environmental Movements in the South (EMIS)⁴ towards the end of its three years of operation (2008-2010). According to FoE-N, the organisation did learn from this exercise, despite EMIS' short duration.

2.3. International strategy

FoE-N overall goal is to ensure an environmentally sustainable as well as equitable use of the world's resources, including generational equity. In turn, this leads to a need to preserve biodiversity, reduce carbon emissions to avoid dangerous climate change and reduce overall environmental pressures.

FoE-N's international strategy provides an overview of the organisation's vision, goals and priorities for its international work for the decade leading up to 2020. FoE-N's vision for its international work is to strengthen local environmental organisations in selected countries as well as advocacy efforts at the national and international level. In line with this, the strategy describes FoE-N's work within the thematic areas of energy efficiency, climate change and biodiversity, as well as organisational aspects. FoE-N has partners and projects in 20 countries, the majority of which are in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, although some are in African countries.

The strategy includes more detailed descriptions and analysis of FoE-N's programmes and projects in six areas: (1) Clean energy programmes in Africa; (2) Work on climate policy in key countries in Eastern Europe; (3) Clean energy in Central Asia and the Caucasus; (4) Sustainability and good governance in the Arctic; (5) International environmental politics; and (6) International education programme on the environment, climate and energy (School Programme for the Application of Resources and Energy (SPARE)). Finally, the strategy contains sections on co-operation among Nordic FoE members; on how to integrate the international work into FoE-N's overall organisation; and on fundraising. The strategy was endorsed by FoE-N's National Executive Committee in 2010.

While FoE-N's international work receives relatively scant attention in Norway compared with its domestic activities, international projects take up ca. 20 percent of the organisation's personnel resources (ca. eight full-time staff) and close to 40 percent of the budget (ca. NOK 18 mill. per year, out of a total of NOK 47 mill. per year). The strategy aims to increase attention to FoE-N's international work, as well as to intensify FoE-N's participation in the international debate on climate change and biodiversity. Besides arranging or participating in international environmental campaigns, working with students and pupils and conducting school exchange visits, FoE-N proposes establishing an international advisory committee in order to support the work of the International Department and ensure tighter integration with the organisation's members at large. Strengthening of FoE-N's partner organisations as well as of FoE-N's linkages with FoE International constitute key goals in the strategy.

The international strategy is timely and comprehensive, providing a solid foundation for FoE-N's international work in the coming years as well as a useful overview of the organisation's international activities and priorities. The priorities appear to correspond well with the organisation's overall goals.

⁴ EMIS was a pilot project following the Norwegian Action Plan for Environment in Development Cooperation of 2006. EMIS included seven Norwegian environment-related NGOs. It was terminated at the end of the three-year pilot phase, and the funds incorporated into Norad's overall funding from 1 January 2011 onwards.

FoE-N has prepared a separate document to ensure the smooth integration of the international strategy into the organisation's overall work. The strategy has not yet been translated into English. According to FoE-N, this will be done in the near future.

2.4. Relations to Norwegian political priorities

FoE-N's international strategy and the Norad-funded portfolio in Africa are well aligned with the key priorities for Norwegian development cooperation. FoE-N contributes mainly to the environmental agenda and to the strengthening of civil society.

The government's international development policy is described in White Paper No. 13 (2008-2009) entitled "Climate, Conflict and Capital – Norwegian development policy in a changed environment". It emphasises the role of civil society as a driving force for development as well as a watchdog. NGOs are therefore expected to strengthen their sister organisations in developing countries, especially in such areas as the environment. Within the environmental agenda, the government identifies the lack of access to energy as one of the most important obstacles to poverty reduction. Promoting renewable energy sources and energy efficiency is highlighted as a key priority.

FoE-N's alignment with the government's policy is further illustrated by the former's contribution to the Norwegian Action Plan for Environment in Development Cooperation. The action plan is a follow-up of White Paper No. 35 (2003-2004) entitled "Fighting Poverty Together: A coherent policy for development". One of the thematic priorities is climate change and access to clean energy, which closely resembles the profile of FoE-N's international programme.

FoE-N's contribution to the human rights agenda has not been explored in detail. However, the review team finds FoE-N's development approach pro-poor and rights-oriented, as evidenced by the organisation's promotion of low-cost energy technologies and of the 'environmental rights' of marginalised, oil-affected communities.

FoE-N's watchdog role occasionally involves a confrontational stand on government policies. Arguably, the most fundamental discrepancy between FoE-N's perspective and Norwegian government policy relates to the petroleum sector. While the government promotes oil exploration as a pro-poor energy service at home and abroad, FoE-N and some of its partners (e.g. ERA in Nigeria) are advocating for an oil moratorium as part of the "leave the oil in the soil" campaign. FoE-N has also been vocal and partly opposed to policies and actions related to Norway's Oil for Development programme, the Clean Energy for Development Initiative, Energy+ and Norway's International Climate and Forest Initiative. This opposition to government policy strengthens FoE-N's position as a credible and independent civil society actor.

2.5. Professional competence and capacity

FoE-N's international department consists of seven full-time staff, including its leader. Three of the remaining department staff are regional advisers (of whom one on Africa), three are thematic (two on energy, one on climate change). Several other members of the secretariat contribute to the organisation's international work, including the board leader, the secretary general, the financial director and several advisers. FoE-N also has a separate, two-member office dealing with Barents Sea issues.

FoE-N defines itself as a knowledge-based organisation, and aims to build a strong organisation capable of distributing research-based knowledge, experiences and solutions in order to influence Norwegian public opinion and policy-makers in an environmentally-friendly direction. In a separate

guiding document outlining the elements of FoE-N's policy to achieve these aims, the organisation underlines the need to both recruit staff with knowledge about relevant environmental issues and to engage in a steady process of knowledge development and renewal. This policy on knowledge development has been specified in several principles included in the noted document, and integrated into annual plans for knowledge-building. The document also specifies priorities and organisational responsibilities regarding FoE-N's knowledge development.

Staff turn-over in FoE-N is low and staff members are passionate and committed to the environmental agenda. However, the low staff number means that the organisation is highly dependent on a few key staff in most programme or project areas, making the organisation vulnerable to abrupt personnel changes, illness or unusually high workloads. This situation accentuates the issue of prioritisation between tasks, in particular during volatile or intense work periods. The limited staff number also represents a vulnerability in terms of taking care of seemingly less time-sensitive, yet important long-term tasks, such as regular follow-up and guidance of partners.

While having few FoE-N staff members to follow up the projects may increase the 'value for money' (efficiency), it risks reducing FoE-N's added value and potentially also the effectiveness of the projects. Great care should be taken to ensure that these risks are minimised, and the issue of staff increases and distribution of tasks should be carefully considered, notably if funding to FoE-N is increased in future.

2.6. Cross-cutting issues

Gender

According to FoE-N, the organisation as well as its partners are concerned with having a sensible gender balance. FoE-N underlines the importance of including women, not least since energy issues affect women in important ways in their daily lives. Still, there is a majority of men in the organisation, notably in leading positions. Apart from the Secretary-general (a man), nearly two-thirds (21 of 33) of the positions in the secretariat are filled by men, as are seven out of nine department/unit heads.

As for FoE-N's partners, the team draws chiefly on its visit to Nigeria. For ERA, gender considerations form an important part of ERA's manner of operating, and are included in several documents including ERA's gender justice policy, in its human resource manual and in the form of a separate welfare scheme. ERA has an HIV/aids workplace policy, and gender issues are included in ERA's constitution.

ERA's leadership underlined to the review team that women leadership is encouraged, and that women are leading some of ERA's projects. Moreover, ERA believes that women in influential positions do make a difference, and that they pay attention to issues (in the communities) that men might have overlooked. They are also seen to provide a softer working environment and to be able to "break the ice". In the Niger Delta, women can hardly move and meet alone, so they may end up not going to community meetings.

The team did note the presence of some strong and active female staff in key positions during its visit to Nigeria. Moreover, given its history as an all-male organisation at the outset, ERA has consciously worked to increase the number of female staff over the years. Still, the majority of leadership positions in ERA remains occupied by men, indicating that the efforts to strengthen women's influence and improving the overall gender balance in the organisation should continue.

Conflict sensitivity

FoE-N does not have a systematic approach to conflict sensitivity, and in the organisation's applications to Norad, the issue is rather cursorily treated. For instance, in the part of the 2011 application that pertains to ERA in Nigeria, no assessment is made of how the planned intervention in a given area will be received by neighbouring areas, how the intervention will be met by the oil companies or how the long-standing conflict between oil companies, local communities and central and regional authorities would be expected to influence the project's results.

On the other hand, ERA's long-standing experience of working in the area, including its well-established and strong relations with the local communities, augur well for the organisation's ability to operate relatively freely in the area, other elements notwithstanding. In any case, and quite apart from it being a Norad requirement, both FoE-N and ERA would stand to gain from a more thorough understanding of the concepts of Do No Harm and conflict sensitivity, including a more explicit and elaborate conflict sensitivity analysis in their applications to Norad.

3. Partnerships

3.1. Partners and projects

FoE-N has a diverse portfolio of projects in the former Soviet republics, Eastern Europe and Africa. The Norad-funded FoE-N partners are Environmental Rights Action (ERA) in Nigeria, Jeunes Volontaires pour l'Environnement (JVE) in Togo, and ADEL Sofala and Forum for Sustainable Energy in Mozambique (FESMO) in Mozambique. FoE-N's Norad-funded partners and projects in Africa are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. FoE-N's Norad-funded partners and projects in Africa.

| Partner | Project | Country | Norad support 2011 (NOK) |
|--|---|--|--------------------------|
| Environmental Rights Action (ERA) | Promoting public participation and tackling environmental concerns in the oil sector in the South | Nigeria | 1,420,000 |
| | Oilwatch Africa | Nigeria, Ghana, South Africa, Uganda | 1,000,000 |
| Jeunes Volontaires pour l'Environnement (JVE) | Resource centre for sustainable energy solutions | Togo | 500,000 |
| | JVE Africa | Togo, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire | 1,520,000 |
| | Clean energy | Togo | 487,000 |
| ADEL Sofala | Local sustainable energy centres in Sofala | Mozambique | 370,000 |
| Forum for Sustainable Energy in Mozambique (FESMO) | Clean energy | Mozambique | 972,000 |

In addition, FoE-N has from 2011 a four-year frame agreement with Norad on support to information-related work amounting to NOK 500,000 per year, as well as a three-year Norad agreement together with the Rainforest Foundation Norway on policy support to climate and forests worth NOK 1,100,000 in 2011 (Norway's International Climate and Forest Initiative).

Environmental Rights Action (ERA) / Friends of the Earth Nigeria

The founders of Environmental Rights Action (ERA), who sprang from the mainstream Nigerian human rights movement in the 1980s, soon realised the need to focus on environmental issues. ERA was started in 1993 as an environmental rights advocacy organisation by its current executive director, Nnimmo Bassey, and three others including the current programme manager (Godwin Uyi Ojo) and Orunto Douglas, currently strategic adviser to President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan. ERA's founders quickly realised the need to deal with environmental issues, including the serious breaches of environmental human rights on the part of the oil and gas industry in Nigeria. ERA today covers five programme areas: Forests and Biodiversity; Food Security; Democracy Outreach; Energy and Extractives; and Corporate Accountability and Environmental Health.

ERA (Friends of the Earth Nigeria) today has 25 full-time staff, with offices in Benin City (head office), Port Harcourt, Yenagoa and Lagos. Beyond the executive director and programme director, the staff includes three programme managers, several programme officers and support staff/administration. In addition to ERA staff, supporters are organised into so-called Host Communities Networks (HoCoN) consisting of volunteers from communities affected by environmental damage such as oil spills. Volunteer students are organised into a Student Environmental Assembly. Together, HoCoN and the Student Assembly provide crucial manpower in support of ERA's key tasks.

As ERA was established during the military dictatorship in Nigeria, membership registration and fees were not feasible. In practice, membership of ERA is based on participation, whereas HoCoN and the student assemblies do register members. ERA's members, HoCoN and Student Assembly members all have a right to participate, including speaking and voting, at ERA's annual General Assembly.

The Norad-supported project "Promoting public participation and tackling environmental concerns in the oil sector in the South" exemplifies some of ERA's core tasks. These include:

Mediation and support to communities affected by oil spills, including support for preparation and conduct of court cases in Nigeria and abroad. Examples of this include court cases in the Netherlands, where representatives of oil spill-affected local communities in the Niger Delta are suing Shell for negligence of safety measures, continued gas flaring despite a ban etc.

Coordination with other actors: Apart from establishing and maintaining close relations with affected local communities, ERA coordinates statements and policy stances with a host of local NGOs and community-based organisations (CBOs), notably with a view to exchanging and co-ordinating views and to mobilise support for ERA's policy initiatives. In fact, ERA appears to play a leading role in coordinating local policy and advocacy initiatives. ERA has also established cordial relations with government authorities at national, regional and local level.

Work on the Petroleum Industry Bill (PIB): Along with a host of other actors in Nigeria, ERA works for the adoption and implementation of legislation to regulate the activities of, hazards related to, and proceeds derived from the various oil companies operating in the Niger Delta. However, while some argue for the adoption of the current version of the PIB almost regardless of what many describe as serious flaws, ERA is demanding the inclusion of what it considers key environmental provisions and accountability measures as preconditions for supporting the bill. For ERA, some of the most flagrant omissions in the current PIB include the following issues: (1) A prohibition clause on gas flaring despite a 2005 High Court ban; (2) Text on environmental protection, such as on oil spills and gas flares; (3) Specifications regarding seismic survey drilling; (4) Regulations regarding Nigeria's refineries; (5) A provision on the establishment of an environmental tribunal in Nigeria; (6) A "defaulter pays" clause; (7) Sovereignty: the PIB vests sovereignty in the federal government, as opposed to in the federal republic; (8) Disclosure: the PIB does not reinforce the NEITI Act on disclosure; (9) Secret clauses should be removed; and (10) Community interest: ERA argues for 50 percent equity participation for communities, while the current share is 10 percent⁵; (11) In addition, the community should be granted membership of the board of joint venture oil and gas companies, in order to have a say in the management of the resource.

⁵ The community may need structural assistance or rather individual health or food assistance (i.e., they should decide what they need themselves). In practice, the community may end up getting less than half of those 10 percent.

Oilwatch Africa/International Secretariat: ERA hosts Oilwatch Africa's secretariat in ERA's office in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.⁶ Started in Quito in 1996, Oilwatch International was established to resist the negative impact of the oil and gas industry on the environment and people, notably through the provision of assistance to local initiatives to resist oil and gas projects. ERA and Oilwatch Africa are campaigning against continued oil spills, gas flaring and other environmentally harmful practices by oil and gas companies in the Niger Delta, and are leading a campaign called "Leave the Oil in the Soil", aimed at getting beyond oil and building a post-petroleum economy. Oilwatch Africa has recently taken on other issues related to the extractive industry in Nigeria. Beyond Nigeria, Oilwatch Africa today is a network of around 20 NGOs, community groups, environmental, religious and human rights organizations in 12 countries.

Jeunes Volontaires pour l'Environnement (JVE)

JVE is an NGO founded in November 2001 by some rural youths concerned about the rapid degradation of the environment in their community in Togo. One year later, the group grew and eventually accepted the first ever local branch. JVE Togo opened its headquarters in Lomé, Togo, where it started to build the network of JVE. Since then, it has grown continuously and now counts more than 30 local branches in cities and villages across Togo and national representations in several African countries (e.g. Cote d'Ivoire, Benin, Democratic Republic of Congo, Burkina Faso). These branches now constitute the JVE network. In Togo, JVE was officially registered as a non-profit organisation in Togo in July 2006 and as an NGO in September 2008. The goal of JVE is "to involve youth (and vulnerable groups) in the sustainable development process and promote social justice for all".

JVE Togo is a membership-based organisation with approximately 1200 members comprising mostly teachers, pupils and students. The number of members in the other countries is estimated at a few hundred in total. To become a member of JVE, one has to sign a confirmation form and pay a modest one-time membership fee ranging from USD 0.5 to USD 5 depending on the location (USD 10 for JVE Cote d'Ivoire).

JVE has around 20 full-time staff members and about 20 national and international volunteers/interns. FoE-N is the largest donor, but JVE also receives smaller project funding from a range of other foreign donors.

ADEL Sofala

ADEL Sofala is a local NGO in Sofala province of Mozambique. The organisation aims to develop projects that address poverty through access to economic opportunities for the poorest and most disadvantaged members of the society. Clean energy is a key issue for ADEL Sofala.

According to an organisational baseline of ADEL Sofala, the organisation has 19 staff/volunteers and 13 member organisations (representing rural and urban women, landless families, poor rural farmers, and organisations from the micro credit /credit sector, private sector and academia). In addition to the support from FoE-N, ADEL Sofala receives funding from the Danish Organisation for Renewable Energy (OVE).

⁶ ERA's secretariat function for Oilwatch Africa is covered by a separate contract between FoE-N and ERA.

Forum for Sustainable Energy in Mozambique (FESMO)

FESMO was started in 2009 by ADEL Sofala and OVE. The official launch occurred as late as June 2010. The goal of FESMO is to share information between local and national stakeholders working on sustainable energy and development and to translate the experience of these organisations into influence on the national energy policy.

FESMO has its headquarters in Beira, the capital of Sofala province, but its scope is nation-wide. FESMO has currently 16 members from NGOs, local authorities, academia and government institutions. The capacity is limited with only one part-time coordinator based at the Agricultural University in Beira.

3.2. Partner selection

Each of FoE-N's partnerships has a unique history. The partners may have been approached by FoE-N themselves or they have been recommended by others. In Mozambique, the partner ADEL Sofala was recommended by OVE, with which FoE-N had some informal relations, while in Togo, JVE was initially recommended by a Norwegian volunteer working for JVE before FoE-N started exploring the opportunities for a partnership. ERA in Nigeria was well-known to FoE-N long before the first project was initiated following a Norad-supported feasibility study in 2007.

FoE-N has not developed a rigorous list of eligibility criteria for partner selection. However, the following issues are the ones most frequently referred to:

- Democratic structures and grassroots support
- Thematic and ideological overlap with FoE-N's vision and mission
- Nation-wide scope, or potential to influence national policies and actions
- Membership of the FoE network: While it is certainly an advantage if the partner is an FoE member, few of FoE-N's partners are in fact members, either because there is no FoE chapter in that country or because other organisations are considered more suitable partners than the national FoE organisation.⁷
- Administrative capacity to handle FoE-N funding

FoE-N claims to support 'democratic' organisations, i.e. organisations that are governed by elected bodies. However, the majority of these organisations are not membership-based, although some of the partners refer to members in the sense that they have individual or collective supporters who are not registered and do not pay membership fees. In the local context, membership arrangements may not be feasible because of politics, tradition, etc.

The team's review of FoE-N's partnership with ERA in Nigeria confirmed that ERA has a democratic structure, yet it does not register individual members or collect membership fees. ERA refers to the concept of "membership by participation". The organisation is supported by a large number of volunteers through the Host Communities Network (HoCoN) and the Student Environmental Assembly, both of which nominate delegates to ERA's General Assembly.

⁷ Among FoE-N's partners in Africa, ERA is a member of FoE (known as FoE-Nigeria), while JVE is not a FoE member. In Mozambique, there was no national FoE organisation when FoE-N started working in the country (with ADEL Sofala). Later, JA! Justica Ambiental has become an FoE member, and also a member of FESMO.

As a member of the FoE network, ERA appears to be an ideal FoE-N partner. Both organisations are engaged in international policy campaigns on climate change and extractive industries, and there seems to be an equal and mutual exchange of ideas regarding substantive issues related to environment and development policy as well as on day-to-day administrative matters. Either organisation's scope reaches beyond the local constituency to cover national and international agendas as well.

Similarly, the document review and interviews with FoE-N staff indicate that JVE is a suitable FoE-N partner in Togo. The Togolese organisation comes across as a prominent grassroots-oriented organisation with a national scope in Togo and with an international representation in other African countries. JVE has also gained some reputation on the global policy arena through representing African youth at international meetings (e.g. UNFCCC).

The team is less convinced that ADEL Sofala is an ideal partner for FoE-N in Mozambique. In comparison to the partners in Nigeria and Togo, ADEL Sofala is a small, local NGO with limited outreach and capacity. Although Sofala is not a small province in Mozambique (population: ca 1.7 million), the geographical scope of ADEL Sofala does not match that of FoE-N, ERA and JVE. There may nevertheless be reasons for FoE-N to support ADEL Sofala. For example, FoE-N can add greater value to partners with limited capacity (see section 3.3) and FoE-N depends on experience from a diversity of contexts in order to scale up the practices and influence policy-making (see section 3.4). The team also notes that the recently established partnership with FESMO may assist ADEL-Sofala and FoE-N to disseminate their experience to policy-makers in government and at the national level.

3.3. FoE-N's added value

With an increasingly complex aid system, there is growing concern about what each actor contributes to the final outcome. Thus, FoE-N needs to document its 'added value' to its partners beyond the financial contribution.

One of the key contributions expected from FoE-N is the strengthening of civil society in the partner countries. As explained in section 2.2, FoE-N holds a prominent position in Norway's civil society. However, FoE-N's domestic experience may not necessarily be relevant or replicable in countries with political, social and economic contexts that differ vastly from the Norwegian one.

In the 2009 annual report to Norad, FoE-N made an attempt to summarise its contribution to the strengthening of civil society in the partner countries. FoE-N emphasised both its direct and indirect contribution:

- Strengthening of the partner organisations
- The partners' strengthening of local organisations, groups and individuals through the project activities
- The partners' strengthening of other organisations in the country and abroad through participation in networks, campaign meetings, and production and dissemination of written material.
- Strengthening of other organisations in civil society in the South through FoE-N's participation in networks, campaign meetings, and production and dissemination of written material.

Furthermore, FoE-N pointed to the following thematic areas where the organisation has added value to its partners:

- SPARE (School Programme for Application of Resources and Energy)
- Practical energy solutions
- Policy work
- Project management
- Partner visits
- Access to funding

In Norad applications and correspondence, FoE-N has also listed its specific contributions to the different projects. The main elements include:

- Providing technical and administrative support
- Training of project staff
- Sharing the Norwegian experience
- Disseminating the partners' experience to a wider audience
- Contributing to joint advocacy campaigns

Based on the document review and interviews with FoE-N and ERA, the team finds that FoE-N does add value to the partnerships, though the exact nature of the contribution is not always well documented. Indeed, the added value is likely to differ from partner to partner, especially related to its institutional capacity and the contribution from other donors. The stronger partners may need less non-financial support than the weaker partners. It is therefore reassuring that ERA, which is supported by many donors and is arguably among their strongest partners, seems to benefit from the partnership with FoE-N in terms of at least three aspects:

- Technical and administrative support
- Experience-sharing on climate change and oil policy
- Joint advocacy campaigns (e.g. "Keep the oil in the soil")

However, FoE-N's added value can still improve, notably through a more systematic approach to capacity-building of partners. FoE-N is in the process of developing a capacity-building package, which will be adapted to each partner. The package contains three pillars: (i) finance and administration capacity, (ii) planning and reporting capacity (log-frame analysis, results-based reporting), and (iii) policy and advocacy capacity. It remains to be seen when and how this capacity-building package will be implemented.

3.4. Scaling up

A key challenge for NGOs involved in international development work is to scale up the impacts beyond their discrete, localised interventions. FoE-N is currently supporting a portfolio of relatively small projects scattered across a wide geographical area, primarily in Nigeria, Togo and Mozambique. The thematic focus, apart from strengthening the environmental civil society movement, is energy efficient technologies in Togo and Mozambique and oil sector advocacy in Nigeria.

Until now, Norad has been supporting the FoE-N projects without much concern about thematic and geographical consistency across the portfolio. However, FoE-N's proposed transition from a project approach to a programme approach (i.e. Norad co-operation (frame) agreement) calls for a critical

assessment of how FoE-N aims to scale up their impact and how synergies can be created between projects.

The simplest way to scale up impact is to increase the size of projects, but because budgets are usually constrained it instead has to be achieved through some form of transfer to, or catalytic effect on, other organisations. Indeed, FoE-N argues that their projects on sustainable energy are intended to generate a set of best practices that can be used to influence and inform policy-makers. Provided that the projects are large enough to generate such best practices, the lack of geographical concentration and uniform thematic approach may therefore not be a reason for concern.

Interestingly, the views on the geographical fragmentation and the opportunities for scaling up seem to vary somewhat within the FoE-N secretariat. One view holds that drawing results from different geographical areas with varying contexts and challenges is necessary to obtain a wide range of experiences, and in turn for successful policy formulation at the international arena. This has to be balanced, however, against the need to concentrate activities in order to create momentum and synergies at the local or national level and achieve higher efficiency and effectiveness in project implementation.

The review team has observed that while all the FoE-N partners are involved in experience-sharing and policy advocacy at the local and national level, there seems to be less attention paid to creating cross-country synergies⁸ and to translating the ‘local reality’ into ‘global theory’.⁹ Indeed, the team is not convinced that the great geographical and cultural distance between the three key countries (Nigeria, Togo and Mozambique) and the multiple objectives pursued (different renewable energy technologies and oil advocacy) are conducive to increasing the total impact. A more strategic and targeted role of the FoE-N funded networking projects (Oilwatch Africa and JVE International) may help bridge the gap, but the thematic fragmentation is likely to remain.¹⁰

Taking note of the above, it should also be acknowledged that the available funding is limited compared to (i) what similar NGOs receive (e.g. Rainforest Foundation Norway, The Development Fund), (ii) the ambitious scope of FoE-N’s overall objectives, (iii) the strength of the counter-forces (e.g. the oil industry), and (iv) the total available funding for sustainable energy solutions and civil society development in Africa. This calls for modest and realistic expectations as to what FoE-N and the partners can be expected to achieve with Norad funding. Consequently, FoE-N needs to determine the overall goal and scope of its proposed Norad-funded programme, i.e. to what scale it aims to bring the policies and measures – and how this can be achieved using the available funding.

3.5. Exit strategy

FoE-N has not yet developed a strategy for how to exit or phase out partnerships and projects. This may be justified given the early stage of FoE-N’s partnerships in Africa, but the organisation will soon be required to have a more formalised approach to the different stages of the partnership cycle.

⁸ According to FoE-N, the project-based and country-centered funding from Norad has prevented cross-country exchanges.

⁹ For example, Norad has challenged FoE-N to document linkages between its partners in Mozambique and Togo and the Norwegian-funded Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves.

¹⁰ While there is certainly a connection in principle between anti-fossil fuel and pro-renewable energy advocacy, the nature and level of the two forms of intervention remain different and require different capacities.

FoE-N has some practical experience in phasing out partners and projects. Some of the partnerships in Eastern Europe were discontinued when the partner organisations got access to EU funding.

Partners with their own support or membership base, such as many of FoE-N's partners, may be in a better position to adjust to exit by donors, both because they may be able to raise their own funding and because the supporters can be expected to push them to continue pursuing their objectives.

Nonetheless, FoE-N's partners in Africa are likely to depend on donor support for years to come and any risk to continued funding needs to be mitigated by exploring alternative sources of income.

4. Results

4.1. Planning for results

FoE-N and its partners have adopted results-based management (RBM), although the quality of planning and reporting varies considerably. FoE-N's system for project cycle management, including guidelines for project planning, is outlined in the administrative routines for the international projects. Although this document does not contain detailed provisions for logical framework analysis (LFA) and RBM, a review of the project proposals and applications to Norad shows that FoE-N and its partners are attempting to design logically consistent projects with goals, activities, indicators, outputs, outcomes and risks. However, the team has not found LFA matrices in any of the reviewed documents.¹¹ More importantly, this appears to reflect more fundamental discrepancies and inconsistencies in the project design itself, as well as between project planning and implementation.

The design of projects is largely left to the partners, although FoE-N takes part in the initial formulation of the project concepts and provides quality assurance of the proposals before they are submitted to the donor. Based on the review of project applications to Norad, there seems to be a need for more involvement from FoE-N in order to build the overall capacity of partners in RBM and LFA and in checking the logical consistency within each project proposal. The team believes that the partners' reliance on Norad's application format is not conducive to developing the detailed project proposal, at least not without supplementing it with an LFA template. The observed weaknesses in project design include:

- The formulation of objectives (goal/impact, outcomes and outputs) is not always clear, specific and logically linked to the levels above and below.
- The indicators are often not SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely). Interestingly, outcome indicators sometimes resemble outputs instead of being parameters that represent the appropriate outcome level. The number of indicators is often too high to be included in an efficient monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system.
- The baseline descriptions are usually not project-specific and not related to the result indicators.
- The risk analysis is often generic and not specifically linked to each level of the objectives hierarchy. Hence, the assumptions underlying each logical step in the LFA are not identified and risk mitigation becomes increasingly difficult and is often not specified.

Planning for results is not a trivial exercise and the required time and resources should not be underestimated. In particular, FoE-N will find that the transition from a project approach to a programme approach, where the individual projects need to be designed and aggregated to deliver programme results, will require additional investments. The benefit is likely to be a shared understanding with the partners about the overall plans and underlying assumptions of the projects, as well as a more transparent and straightforward reporting system.

¹¹ While Norad does not require its agreement partners to use LFA in their applications, this does not preclude the use of LFA in the planning of projects and programmes. On the contrary, structured use of LFA will often be a precondition for good project and programme planning.

4.2. Documenting and reporting results

FoE-N receives semi-annual reports from partners on the activities that have been implemented and results achieved during the reporting period. The partners have until recently used their own reporting format for Norad-funded projects. However, FoE-N has now developed a standardised reporting format to be used this year. Based on a review of the latest reports from partners, the team finds that the format is well designed, but that some of the partners are not using it to its full potential.

The reports from partners serve as the main input to FoE-N's reporting to Norad (and other donors). Since the Norad funding is project-based, FoE-N does not need to aggregate the project reports. Thus, the reports to Norad are essentially a summary of the reports from partners supplemented with additional information from FoE-N.

The review team has conducted a detailed comparison between the partners' reports and FoE-N's reports for all Norad-funded projects in the period 2008-2010. Overall, the team finds that the reports to Norad are in accordance with reports from partners. The relatively short reports to Norad imply that certain details and nuances are lost in the reporting chain, but there is no apparent bias with respect to which activities and results are 'filtered away'. Indeed, the partners and FoE-N occasionally report on activities that were not implemented or results not achieved. The field visit to Nigeria also confirmed that the observed results of ERA's projects are in accordance with the picture painted in the reports to FoE-N and Norad.

While acknowledging the overall accuracy of the reports, the team found weaknesses in their quality and in the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system:

- Reports are largely activity-oriented and devote less attention to results, especially at the outcome and impact level.
- Reports do not always refer back to the planned activities and results, making it difficult to compare the reports with the proposals/applications. A detailed document review showed that there are repeated inconsistencies between the number of planned activities/results and the number of reported activities/results.
- Some of the reports from partners in Togo and Mozambique suffer from poor English and long narrative texts. The introduction of reporting formats, where partners need to be specific about their activities and results, may help mitigate the language barrier.
- Reporting of results appears to be primarily based on the experience and general knowledge of the partner organisations, rather than on a systematic monitoring and collection of data pertaining to the indicators listed in the proposal/application. Also, FoE-N and the partners have not developed a systematic approach towards evaluations and reviews, i.e. there is a lack of a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system.
- The contract agreements with partners contain a clause that the annual report shall include tables of accumulated results. However, none of the project reports from partners have yet complied with this requirement.

According to FoE-N, results reporting will be emphasised at the end of the three-year project period. This corresponds to Norad's reporting requirements, although preliminary results (outputs and outcomes) should also be reported every year. While FoE-N's partners try to document and report intermediary results during the course of the projects, it is unrealistic to expect achievement of outcomes (and impacts) on an annual basis.

The review team recognises that results cannot be expected within a few years, yet that does not give reason for delaying the design and implementation of an M&E system to document and report results. Evidence-based reporting on a few SMART indicators at the outcome and impact level would not only satisfy the donors, but also provide guidance to project implementation and help document best practices for policy formulation.¹² This is equally relevant for service-oriented activities (e.g. energy efficient technologies) as for policy-oriented activities (e.g. lobby campaigns), although it can be more difficult to capture (as well as achieve) the results of policy advocacy.

FoE-N is aware of the deficiencies in the M&E system and is actively working with the partners to improve the reporting skills. The team believes that the proposed capacity-building package (see section 3.3) and the use of reporting formats (including tables of accumulated results) will contribute to improving the documentation and reporting of results. However, strengthening the theoretical knowledge about as well as practical capacity for applying RBM will require a focussed effort on the part of FoE-N and its partners.

4.3. Case study: ERA's results

Given the nature of ERA's work – advocacy – it would be unrealistic to expect quick and easy results. Over time, however, the efforts should be able to yield significant changes for the better for communities affected by environmental damage such as oil spills, for instance through clean-up operations or material compensation.

When asked about the organisation's key successes, ERA's management emphasises that the organisation is trusted "by friends and enemies", i.e., its factual claims are taken seriously. ERA holds that the organisation is able to provide realistic solutions to the ongoing resource conflicts in Nigeria.

Furthermore, ERA underlines the value of having passionate, committed people across Africa who want to protect the environment and ensure that the oil production does not destroy vulnerable ecosystems. The Host Communities Network (HoCoN) in Nigeria is an example of a mechanism that promotes such environmental protection through monitoring and reporting. HoCoN has managed to get close to affected communities, and has been able to indicate to ERA several gaps in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, in turn allowing ERA to suggest provisions in the EIA Act that addresses any particular issue. Another example concerns HoCoN's role in the aftermath of an oil spill. Whereas ERA would mostly focus on human rights issues, communities (led by HoCoN) will often emphasise the need to obtain compensation for the environmental damage done.

A more concrete result ERA has contributed to, regards a case from 2005 where local communities sued Shell over its continued gas flaring, prior to FoE-N's involvement with ERA. The matter harks back to the 1979 Gas Rejection Law in Nigeria, which in 2004 was amended to allow gas flaring on a case-by-case basis. In 2005, after a five-month court case, the High Court imposed a ban on gas flaring in Nigeria. However, Shell and other oil companies¹³ have not adhered to the ban, defying the law as well as the affected communities. Initially, Shell stated it would stop gas flaring by 2009, later pushing the date out to 2011. No plan for stopping gas flaring has ever been put forward by either Shell or the

¹² FoE-N has recently developed a special reporting format for monitoring technical aspects in energy projects.

¹³ All the multinational oil companies in Nigeria operate in partnership with the Nigerian government, notably through joint ventures where the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) is the majority shareholder.

other oil companies in Nigeria. According to ERA, campaigning against the oil companies implies also campaigning against the government, as the latter is in practice allied with the oil companies.

It should be noted that many of the court cases in which ERA supports local communities having suffered the consequences of oil spills and other forms of environmental degradation, have not yet started or are in process. Such courts cases can be time-consuming, so quick results are unlikely to be achieved. However, should the plaintiffs win through in their court cases against Shell or other oil companies, this would constitute a significant victory for the local community as well as for ERA.

ERA has supported Nigerian forest communities against a French rubber plantations company. According to ERA, the communities obtained improved compensations for environmental losses after ERA's intervention.

ERA also helped start the Green Alliance of Nigeria, which focusses on issues of environmental governance. Finally, ERA works on issues of lead poisoning in north-western Nigeria; mines in Jos (the mines had simply been abandoned, not closed, thus posing a risk to the local community); or on solar power.

5. Financial management

5.1. FoE-N's financial and administrative routines

FoE-N has recently developed a document where all the administrative routines for the international projects are explained. The document contains sections on financial management and anti-corruption measures. The formal requirements are also stipulated in the contracts with donors and partners. The main steps in the project cycle are described below and accompanied by some observations made by the review team.

The initial version of the budget for the international department, including the Norad-funded projects, is prepared by 1 October each year. The project budgets will have been developed by the partners prior to this date. The proposed budget is then submitted to the donor on the agreed date. This budget contains the planned project costs of the partner organisations in addition to the FoE-N-related project costs and an administrative overhead (8 percent). It may also contain FoE-N's own contribution in case the project is not fully financed by the donor.

Once the budget has been approved (and often reduced) by the donor, a contract agreement is signed with the partner. If the approval is delayed and the project is a continuation of a multi-year project, a partner may request an advance disbursement to cover its expenses at the beginning of the year. Alternatively, the partner may request permission to use the remaining balance from the previous year. In any case, the partner needs to obtain a written approval by FoE-N and the amount is limited to 25 percent of the annual budget.

It was noted by the team that requests for advance instalments had been approved on a regular basis due to the late signing of FoE-N's contract agreement with Norad. While such a practice may prevent delays in project implementation, it involves a certain risk. However, since the risk is carried by FoE-N alone and the amount is significantly less than the FoE-N's contingency fund (approximately NOK 700,000), the team has no objection to this practice.

If an advance payment has not been requested, the first transfer to the partner is made after FoE-N has signed the contract with the donor and the partner, respectively. The next instalment is released upon receiving the semi-annual report from the partner, while the remaining amount is transferred when the exchange rate gain or loss has been calculated.

The partner's annual financial statement, including an external auditor's report and management letter, is submitted to FoE-N by 31 March each year. The project coordinator is expected to scrutinize the financial reports and ensure that the partners act on the auditor's recommendations. FoE-N's audited financial report to Norad is submitted by 31 May.

Based on an assessment of the financial statements and audit reports of all the Norad-funded FoE-N projects, as well as interviews with FoE-N, the team has noted the following examples of discrepancies between the financial management guidelines and the observed practice:

- Over-utilisation on budget lines without prior approval
- Significant under-utilisation of annual budget, indicating poor budgeting
- No separate bank accounts for FoE-N-funded projects despite such requirement in the contracts

- Late reporting from partners and from the local auditors

Overall, however, the opinion of the team is that FoE-N has a finance and administration system that is well suited to its current scope and budget. It is evident that FoE-N has improved its policies and routines by learning from the more experienced NGOs and by formalising procedures that were previously not well documented.

5.2. Case study: ERA's finance and accounting system

ERA has developed its own accounting and financial reporting system. The latest version was adopted by ERA's board in 2010. These guidelines are based on standard accounting principles and contain key provisions for oversight and control. The team was told that the revised guidelines represent a significant improvement compared to the previous version, including: (a) Specifications regarding advance payments to staff; (b) Prohibition against inducement (see also section 5.3 below); (c) Stricter authorisation policy; and (d) Per diem guidelines.

ERA's administration and finance officer has been with the organisation since 2008. He has previous experience from a bank and a private company, and has received training by Oxfam NOVIB in Germany as part of his specialisation for his current position. There is regular contact between FoE-N in Oslo and the finance officer, but the latter has received only one visit from FoE-N during his tenure. According to the finance officer, this has been sufficient, as there have not been any specific problems during this period. In the opposite event, more frequent visits would have been helpful.

ERA has not developed a procurement policy. For larger purchases, such as laptops (the organisation owns no vehicles), the organisation will obtain three to five quotations from different companies, and will select the provider based on an assessment of quality, price and freight conditions. For petty items, bids or proforma invoices are not collected.

There is strict separation of roles between the administration and finance officer and the cashier. The petty cash limit is maintained at NGN 40 000 (ca. NOK 1700).

The local auditor was replaced with a new one in 2010 (Michael Jones & Co., based in Abuja). The auditor comes to Benin City to conduct the annual revision of ERA's accounts. The auditor has only a limited period set off for this visit, which implies a high demand on the finance officer's time during this period. From this perspective, it would have been easier with an auditor from Benin City, who could pay shorter visits to ERA when needed. However, the current auditor is considered one of the best available for ERA's purposes, and the team was told that no auditor of a similar quality was available in Benin City.

Despite FoE-N's requirement, ERA does not have one bank account per project. Altogether, ERA currently has eight bank account for its 15 projects (one USD account, one EURO account, four NGN accounts etc.). Of these, three dormant NGN accounts will be closed, while only one will be kept open.

The team performed a spot check of ERA's finance and accounting system during the visit. The findings confirm that ERA maintains a satisfactory internal control system¹⁴ and that the organisation appears to comply with its own finance and accounting guidelines.

The team was told that ERA is in the process of implementing the recommendations from the auditor's management letter. Some of the auditor's recommendations have, however, been repeated in several successive management letters without having been acted upon by ERA.

The team noted that ERA is renting office facilities and that the rent for ERA's headquarters in Benin City has risen by ca. 54 percent from 2009 to 2011.

5.3. Anti-corruption

FoE-N has adopted a zero-tolerance policy towards corruption. There is no separate document that outlines the organisation's approach to corruption in detail, but one of the chapters in the administrative routines document (see above) lays out the key elements of FoE-N's anti-corruption approach, including such elements as transparency, control mechanisms and measures in the event of suspicion or actual cases of corruption. FoE-N's anti-corruption routines are to be finalised and endorsed by the National Executive Committee.

According to FoE-N, no instance of corruption has occurred with partners. However, in one instance an employee in a Kirgiz' partner organisation left the organisation (Biom) in 2007 and brought project funds of ca. USD 5000 with him to a new organisation he started. This was possible as the original organisation did not have its own account, so the funds had to be paid direct to the project leader (contrary to FoE-N's overall requirements). However, FoE-N pressed to ensure that the money was spent towards the original purpose (solar energy). As this indeed happened, FoE-N did not demand that the money be returned.

FoE-N is aware that corruption is rampant in some of the partner countries, and they admit that zero-tolerance in a strict sense may be unrealistic. FoE-N claims that anti-corruption issues are occasionally raised and discussed with the partners. The review team was told that FoE-N had performed a simple spot check of ERA's accounting and internal control system in 2009. However, the review team would emphasise the need to regularly conduct thorough checks of the partner's administrative routines and financial control systems.

The interviews with ERA revealed only one case where corruption had nearly occurred. The case involved attempted fraud by an employee. Action was taken before money was lost. ERA established an inspection panel and carried out an investigation. The suspected person was fired and several weaknesses in the internal control system were corrected. The case also motivated the revision of ERA's accounting and financial reporting guidelines (see section 5.2).

¹⁴ Note, however, that ERA requires only one signature on bank checks, i.e. by either the Executive Director or (in his absence) the Programme Director. FoE-N has no overall policy regarding the number of signatories, although this might change with the adoption of the Mango guidelines (Mango 2003).

6. Conclusions

The organisation

- FoE-N is a democratic, non-governmental organisation with about 19,500 members and 100 regional and local branches. It is a genuine civil society actor with an independent voice in policy debates and a watchdog function on environmental issues.
- FoE-N collaborates and co-ordinates with like-minded environmental actors in Norway and abroad on issues where they have a shared interest.
- FoE-N's mandate and international projects are well aligned with Norwegian policies and strategies as well as with existing guidelines for support to civil society.
- FoE-N's recently adopted international strategy (2011-2020) demonstrates a long-term approach and is likely to help increase attention to its international agenda and strengthen its international partners.
- FoE-N's professional competence and capacity provide sufficient support to the international work at present, but the organisation is highly dependent on a limited number of key staff. The follow-up of partners may deteriorate if key personnel are lost or the portfolio is increased without recruiting more staff.
- FoE-N and its partners pay attention to gender equity and women's rights, partly by means of policies and guidelines, but there is a significant male bias in staff composition.
- Conflict sensitivity and Do No Harm-principles are not fully understood as concepts or systematically applied by FoE-N or its partners. Long-standing presence and implicit understanding of risks and vulnerabilities in the field might partly compensate for this.

Partnerships

- FoE-N has four main Norad-funded partners: Environmental Rights Action (ERA) in Nigeria, Jeunes Volontaires pour l'Environnement (JVE) in Togo, and ADEL Sofala and Forum for Sustainable Energy in Mozambique (FESMO) in Mozambique.
- ERA is a strong and capable FoE-N partner with long-standing experience and solid reputation and credibility. ERA plays a key role as a Nigerian human rights and environment advocate.
- ERA coordinates and collaborates with other NGOs and CBOs on relevant issues, and has established cordial relations with the Nigerian government at various levels.
- JVE in Togo and ADEL Sofala and FESMO in Mozambique work on issues of low-cost renewable energy solutions. While the team has not been able to visit these organisations, they appear to have lower capacity than ERA in terms of staff and funding levels. ADEL Sofala is a small, local NGO with limited outreach and scope compared to the other partners.
- FoE-N's added value can still improve, notably through a more systematic approach to the capacity-building of partners. Partnership development also requires an exit strategy.
- FoE-N aims to increase its impact by piloting best practices that can be 'scaled up' through information-sharing and policy advocacy. The reliance on localised, diverse interventions scattered across several countries and different contexts may help formulate relevant policy advice, but creates limited momentum and learning between projects.

Results

- The activities and results reported by FoE-N to Norad are in accordance with reports from partners. Moreover, the case study of ERA in Nigeria indicates that FoE-N's reports to Norad provide a true picture of the partners, the challenges on the ground, the activities and the achieved results.
- FoE-N and its partners have adopted results-based management (RBM), but the quality of planning and reporting varies considerably. The conceptual understanding and practical application of RBM seem limited, both in terms of linking goals and baselines with activities, indicators, outputs, outcomes and risks, and in terms of achieving coherence between project applications and reports.

Financial management

- In general, FoE-N's administrative and financial management system is in keeping with Norad's financial management guidelines and well suited to FoE-N's profile.
- Discrepancies between FoE-N's financial guidelines and observed practice were noted in some areas. These include over-utilisation on budget lines without prior approval, lack of separate bank accounts for FoE-N-funded projects and late reporting from partners and local auditors.
- The team's visit to ERA in Nigeria indicates that this partner has strengthened its administrative routines and financial management system during the last 2-3 years, including improved financial guidelines and anti-corruption safeguards. There is regular contact between FoE-N and ERA on financial issues, but long time intervals between visits.

7. Recommendations

The organisation

- FoE-N should work towards diversifying its funding base, aiming to increase funding from sources other than the government. FoE-N should also apply for a multi-year co-operation (programme) agreement with Norad.
- In the event of improved funding, FoE-N should consider both increasing its staff and re-thinking the distribution of tasks, with a view to reducing vulnerabilities linked to personnel changes or fluctuating work loads.
- FoE-N should make a conscious effort to increase the number of women in the organisation, in particular in leading positions. The gender perspective should be strengthened in project and programme planning, including in dialogue with FoE-N's partners.
- FoE-N should initiate and sustain a training programme on conflict sensitivity throughout the organisation. FoE-N should ensure that conflict sensitivity is both theoretically understood and applied in projects and programmes, including through dialogue with FoE-N's partners.
- FoE-N's international strategy document should be translated into English and distributed to partners. FoE should make a focussed effort to involve its partners in understanding the strategy's rationale, contents and implications.
- As suggested in its international strategy, and in line with FoE-N's set-up in other thematic areas, FoE-N should appoint an international advisory committee to support and supervise the international department and to create stronger ownership to the international projects within the organisation.

Partnerships

- FoE-N should develop a more systematic approach towards the capacity-building of partners, including exit strategies.
- FoE-N should move from a project approach to a broader and more strategic programme approach that includes exploring opportunities for creating a better alignment between its geographical and thematic foci.
- FoE-N should aim at working with like-minded partners', i.e. policy-oriented NGOs with democratic structures and national (or even international) outreach.

Results

- FoE-N and its partners should conduct a concerted, comprehensive effort to strengthen results-based management (RBM), including logical framework analysis, capacity across their organisations, and to ensure the consistent application of RBM principles and practice throughout all phases of the project cycle.
- FoE-N needs to consider the implications of moving from a project to a programme approach in terms of planning and results reporting.
- FoE-N should not always leave the responsibility to commission reviews and evaluations to their partners. FoE-N should sometimes, in particular for its most important partners and projects, commission its own reviews and evaluations in order to have first-hand control over quality assurance and to ensure an independent, third-party view.

Financial management

- FoE-N should work to correct observed discrepancies between financial guidelines and financial management practice. FoE-N should also ensure that partners act promptly on auditors' recommendations.
- FoE-N should visit each of its partners annually. Each visit should include a thorough check of administrative routines and financial controls, as well as allow FoE-N to provide guidance and support to the partner on financial practices and requirements.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Revised version, 10 February 2011

Organisational review of Friends of the Earth Norway (Norges Naturvernforbund)

Terms of reference

1. Background

Organisational reviews of partners are conducted on a regular basis as part of Norad's quality assurance of the support scheme for civil society. It is an important tool for dialogue between Norad and the organisation, and constitutes a basis for deciding on approach and prospects of future funding to the organisation.

Friends of the Earth Norway is (FEN) is an independent non-governmental organization (NGO) founded in 1914, and is the oldest conservation- and environmental NGO in Norway. FEN work towards the protection of the environment within several areas, particularly related to conservation of areas, climate change, energy solutions and transport. FEN is based in Norway, but also supports development projects through local partners in Africa and Eastern Europe with a focus on capacity building and advocacy. FEN is a member of Friends of the Earth International.

FEN has received funding from Norad since the 90s to different projects and information work, and is currently funded through a three-year project contract covering 2009-2011 with Norad (NOK 2.2 million annually), two EMiS¹⁵ projects (NOK 3 million annually) and support to information activities (NOK 100.000 annually). The grants have been awarded to FEN's activities, as described in the project documents, in Togo, Nigeria, Mozambique and Tanzania. An additional amount of NOK 1.1 million was awarded in 2008, 2009 and 2010 through the Climate and Forest Initiative, to a joint advocacy project between FEN and the Rainforest Foundation Norway (RFN).

2. Purpose of the review

The purpose of the review is to assess to what extent FEN is capable of achieving results in accordance with agreed goals, in line with the guidelines for the grant scheme and in conformity with general Norwegian policy and guiding principles for development cooperation.

The review shall assess and make recommendations regarding FEN's professional, financial and administrative capacity to achieve its goals in an effective and efficient manner, together with its partners.

¹⁵ FEN is a member of *Environmental Movements in the South* joint initiative between the Development Fund, WWF and Rainforest Foundation.

3. Scope of the review

The team's assessment shall take account of Norad's experience of dialogue with the organisation, annual meetings, country visits, the organisation's follow-up of previous Grant letters, participation in various national and international fora etc.

The review shall analyse and make recommendations regarding the organisation's ability to achieve its goals, focussing on the following areas:

3.1 *Mandate, strategy and relation to Norwegian political priorities*

(i.e. contract with Norad, policy and strategy, reviews, annual reports, website and applications, applicable guidelines for grants to civil society (2001) White paper no. 35 (2003-2004) 1, Norad's strategy for the period 2006-2010, Principles for Norad's support to civil society in the South, Prop. 1S and other relevant documents.)

The analysis needs to address added value/comparative advantage of the Organisation.

3.2 *Organizational structure*

- decision making processes
- partners, members and constituencies
- budget

3.3 *FEN's cooperation with partners*

- strategy for selection of partners
- transparency
- competence and capacity development of partners
- South-South cooperation

3.4 *FEN's management and financial management capacity*

- anti-corruption measures
- systems for quality assurance and control
- monitoring of financial flow
- risk management

3.5 *Professional competence and capacity*

- FEN's thematic, geographical and organisational knowledge

3.6 *FEN's management of results*

- historic examples of results achieved (outcome level)
- system for monitoring and reporting results/relevance for end receivers (including indicators and information sources)
- system for learning and change management

Other aspects may also be included, but the analysis shall include an assessment of the extent to which the Organisation possesses the required systems for management and control of activities and funds (i.e. developing and applying methods, systems for documentation, etc.).

3.7 Coordination with other actors

- Coordination with other actors at country level, division of labour with other actors and relation to national/local government

4. Work methods

4.1 Team composition and qualifications

The study shall be undertaken by a team consisting of one team leader and one team member, both from Norad, with special knowledge and qualifications within the following areas:

- Relevant knowledge of civil society
- Good knowledge of financial and organisational management
- General knowledge of current Norwegian and international development policies
- Thematic knowledge of FEN's core activities
- Relevant country experience [generic]
- Documented experience with producing studies and reports of a similar nature

The team leader will have the overall responsibility for the assignment, including editorial responsibility.

4.2 Time schedule

1. *Preparation phase* [February/March/April 2011]
 - a. Background reading
 - b. Discussions and interviews
 - c. Plan field visit
2. *Present Inception Report* for comments to Norad [8 April 2011]
3. *Field visit* [May 2011 – ca. weeks 20-21] One week field visit is suggested to Nigeria.
 - a. Adjust review methodology if necessary
 - b. Interviews with stakeholders
4. *Process & verify information* [May/June 2011]
 - a. Analyse information
 - b. Conduct additional interviews (if needed)
 - c. Produce draft report by 8 June 2011 (week 23)
5. *Final report* [June 2011]
 - a. Receive input comments on draft two weeks after circulation (22 June – week 25)

- b. Produce final report by 29 June 2011 (week 26).

5. Reporting

Norad will call for an initial meeting with the consultants to clarify questions regarding ToR and other issues.

5.1 *Inception report*

The Team shall deliver an inception report to Norad no later than 8 April 2011 (Norad will distribute the report to the organisation) outlining its findings based on the document study, questionnaire(s) and interviews, as well as its plan for conduct of the country visits. This initial study shall propose (a) a hypothesis of the overall capacity of the organisation; b) an appropriate research design for the assignment (i.e., the use of surveys, selection of partners to visit, case study design, narrative analysis, etc.); and c) other relevant issues.

5.2 *Draft final report*

In order to allow an opportunity for comment and for correction of any factual errors and misunderstandings, the Team will present its draft final report to Norad (which will distribute to the Organisation) no later than 8 June 2011, with a deadline for responses to the Team two weeks later (22 June 2011).

5.3 *Final report*

The final report shall be submitted to Norad (and the Organisation) no later than 29 June 2011. It shall be written in English (word format), contain an executive summary and recommendations of approx. 3-4 pages and be maximum 20 pages long. Appendices may be added. The report shall utilise Norad's template for review reports (attached to ToR).

The report shall be presented by the Team leader (if possible by the whole team) for all stakeholders and other interested parties.

Annex 2: Documents consulted

- Aasen, B., Haug, M., Hellevik, S.B., Mosha, A. & Halvorsen, V., 2008. Organisational Performance Review of FOKUS. Norad Report 13/2008 Review.
- ADEL, undated. Local sustainable energy centre in Sofala. Project report 2009.
- ADEL Sofala, 2010. NNV/ADEL Sofala activity plan for 2010. May 2010.
- ADEL-Sofala, undated. Local sustainable energy centre in Sofala. Project report 2010.
- Amadi, S., Germiso, M. & Henriksen, A., 2006. Statoil in Nigeria. Transparency and local content. Report 1/2006. *Framtiden i våre hender*.
- Amundsen, I., 2010. Good Governance in Nigeria. A Study in Political Economy and Donor Support. Norad Report 17/2010 Discussion.
- ARSE & CONSULTANTS, 2010. Local Development Agency of Sofala. Locally energy center in Maringue (NORAD/NNV). Report and opinion of independent auditor. March 2010.
- Bassey, N & Lineikro, J., undated. Institutional assessment of Environmental Rights Action / Friends of the Earth, Nigeria (ERA/FoEN).
- Cabinet RABICO, 2010. ONG Jeunes Volontaires Pour l'Environnement. Audit report 2009. April 2010.
- Edwards, M. & Hulme, D., 1992. Scaling up NGO impact on development: learning from experience. *Development in Practice*, 2(2): 77-90.
- Eggen, Ø., Stave, S. & Moen, L.T., 2008. Conservation for Development. An organisational review of WWF-Norway. Norad Report 18/2008 Review.
- Emmanuel C. Uche Esq. & Andrew Mamedu, 2011. Evaluation Report of the Oil Revenue Management in Niger Delta Project & Organizational M&E Appraisal/Technical Support to ANEEJ. May 2011.
- Environmental Rights Action, 2011. Financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2010. Incorporating statement for NNV/EMiS Support Fund. Audit report attached. March 2011.
- Environmental Rights Action, 2010. Financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2009. Incorporating statement for NORAD/NNV support fund. Audit report attached. March 2010.
- Environmental Rights Action, 2010. Accounting and financial reporting system. February 2010.
- Environmental Rights Action, undated. New Steam, Great Results. 2009 Annual Report.
- Environmental Rights Action, undated. Gender Justice Policy.
- Environmental Rights Action, undated. HIV/AIDS Workplace Policy.
- Environmental Rights Action, undated. ERA Staff Welfare Scheme.
- Environmental Rights Action /Oilwatch, undated. Promoting public participation and environmental concerns when developing the oil sector in the South. Project report 2010.
- Environmental Rights Action /Oilwatch, 2010. Promoting public participation and environmental concerns when developing the oil sector in South – capacity building for the Oilwatch network. Final project report 2009. March 2010.
- Fjellgård, C.C., Furuseth, A.K., Hjeltnes, K.J., Nordgård, M., Svendsen, A. & Wangsness, P.B., 2010. ADRA Norge. Organisasjonsgjennomgang. Norad Rapport 06/2010.

Haarstad, J., Slenes, T. & Mosseby, N., 2009. Organisation Review of the Development Fund. Norad Report 31/2009 Review.

Hartmann, A. & Linn, J.F., 2007. Scaling up: A Path to Effective Development. 2020 Focus Brief on the World's Poor and Hungry People, Washington, DC. IFPRI.

Idehen, R. & Aghedo, M., 2011. Evaluation report on ERA/FoEN institutional capacity and project delivery. Project sponsored by Norges Naturvernforbund (NORAD) Norway. March 2011.

Jensen, O.B. & Whist, E., 2007. Organisational Performance Review of Rainforest Foundation Norway. Norad Report 9/2007 Review.

Jeunes Volontaires Pour l'Environnement, 2010. Resource development center on alternative energy. 2010 annual report. December 2010.

Jeunes Volontaires Pour l'Environnement, 2010. Strengthening the JVE network in West Africa. 2010 annual report. December 2010.

Jeunes Volontaires Pour l'Environnement, 2010. Resource centre for sustainable energy solutions. 2009 annual report. March 2010.

Karipo, M.K. & Lineikro, J., 2009. Institutional assessment of Oilwatch Africa. October 2009.

Kruse, S.-E. & Forss, K., 2007. Organisational Performance Review of Norwegian People's Aid. Synthesis Report. Norad Report 4/2007 Review.

Mango, 2009. Mango's Health Check. How healthy is financial management in your not-for-profit organisation? Version 3, 2009.

Norad, 2011. GLO-0634 Tilskuddsbrev –avtaleforhold 2011 – treårige prosjektavtale (2009-2011). 15. februar 2011.

Norad, 2011. GLO-0634 GLO 08/412-4 og GLO-08/412-5 Reviderte planer for 2011. Letter to Norges Naturvernforbund. April 2011.

Norad, 2010. OfUs faglige vurdering av søknader fra norske frivillige organisasjoner for 2011. Notat. 23. november 2010.

Norad, 2010. Energiavdelingens (ENAs) faglige vurdering av, og kommentarer til prosjektsøknad fra Norges Naturvernforbund. Notat. 30. november 2010.

Norad, 2010. Godkjent rapportering for 2009, andre utbetaling foretatt Norges Naturvernforbund GLO-0634 GLO-08/412. Letter from Norad to Norges Naturvernforbund. August 2010.

Norad, 2010. Beslutningsdokument for prosjektavtaler 2011. Appropriation document. November 2010.

Norad, 2009. Principles for Norad's Support to Civil Society in the South. May 2009.

Norad, 2009. Beslutningsdokument for enkeltavtaler og prosjektavtaler 2010. Appropriation document. November 2009.

Norad, 2008. Beslutningsdokument for nye 3-årige prosjektavtaler. Appropriation document. November 2008.

Norad, 2008. GLO-0634 GLO-08/412 Faglig vurdering av Norges Naturvernforbund. Notat. November 2008.

Norad, 2008. GLO-0634, GLO-08/412 Tilskuddsbrev –avtaleforhold 2009 – treårige prosjektavtale. April 2008.

Norad, 2008. Beslutningsdokument for prosjektavtaler. Appropriation document. January 2008.

Norad, 2008. BD 2008 – ny vurdering av Norges Naturvernforbunds søknader. Letter to Norges Naturvernforbund. April 2008.

Norad, 2006. Beslutningsdokument rammeavtale for informasjonsstøtte. November 2006.

Norad & Norges Naturvernforbund, 2009. Treårig prosjektavtale med norske organisasjoner. Contract agreement. April 2009.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2011. Strategi for Naturvernforbundets internasjonale arbeid. Utkast 6. februar 2011.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2011. GLO-064, GLO-08/412: Reviderte planer for 2011 fra Norges Naturvernforbund. Letter to Norad. March 2011.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2011. Administrative rurer for internasjonale prosjekter i Naturvernforbundet. Versjon av 17. mars 2011.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2011. Naturvernforbundets kompetansepolitikk. Versjon III, 21. februar 2011.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2011. Notat om status i utviklingen av Naturvernforbundets prosjektmetode. Oppdatert 22. mars 2011.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2011. Om integrering av det internasjonale arbeidet i Naturvernforbundets øvrige arbeid. Arbeidsdokument, sak til sentralstyremøte, 30. mars 2011.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2011. Internasjonal strategi – integrering i organisasjonen. Sak LAS 02-25-11 til Landsstyret, 21.-22. mai 2011.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2011. Naturvernforbundets strategi for inntektbringende arbeid 2011-2014. Versjon av 3. juni 2011.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2011. Resource centre for sustainable energy solutions. Report to Norad 2010. May 2011.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2011. Local sustainable energy centres in Sofala. Report to Norad 2010. May 2011.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2011. Strengthening the Oilwatch Africa network. Application to Norad 2011. March 2011.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2011. Promoting public participation and tackling environmental concerns in the oil sector in the South. Report to Norad 2009. May 2010. Report to Norad 2010. May 2011.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2010. Annual report 2009. International projects department. June 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2010. Styrets årsberetning 2009. Årsregnskap 2009. Revisjonsberetning 2009. May 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2010. GLO-0634, GLO-08/412: Årlig prosjektplan for 2011 fra Norges Naturvernforbund. Letter to Norad. November 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2010. Tillegg til årsrapport for 2009 for GLO-0634, GLO-08/412. Hvordan har innsatsen til Norges Naturvernforbund bidratt til styrking av sivilsamfunn i sør? May 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2010. FESMO, Forum for sustainable energy in Mozambique. Norad application for individual agreement 2011. November 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2010. Local sustainable energy centres in Sofala. Report to Norad 2009. May 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2010. Resource centre for sustainable energy solutions. Report to Norad 2009. May 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2010. Improved efficiency and reduced impact from charcoal production. Application to Norad 2011. November 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2010. Towards a stronger youth environmental movement in Africa.. Application to Norad 2011. November 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2010. Wood fuel stoves and ovens market development and entrepreneurship. Report to Norad 2009. May 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2010. Promoting public participation and tackling environmental concerns in the oil sector in the South. Report to Norad 2009. May 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2010. Skjema for årsrapport 2009 for organisasjoner med rammeavtale etter Norads informasjonsstøtteordning. Report to Norad 2009. May 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2009. GLO-0634, GLO-08/412: Årlig prosjektplan for 2010 fra Norges Naturvernforbund. Letter to Norad. September 2009.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2009. Skjema for årsrapport 2008 for organisasjoner med rammeavtale etter Norads informasjonsstøtteordning. Report to Norad 2008. May 2009.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2009. Ethiske retningslinjer for Norges Naturvernforbund pr. 1. september 2009.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2009. Annual report 2008. International projects. NNV Report 5/2009.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2009. Vedtekter gjeldende etter Landsmøtet 2009.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2009. Arbeidsprogram 2010-2011. Vedtatt på Landsmøtet i Bergen 21.-23. august 2009.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2009. Prinsippogram. Vedteke på Landsmøtet i Bergen 21.-23. august 2009.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2009. Promoting public participation and environmental concern when developing the oil sector in the South – capacity building for the Oilwatch network. Report to Norad. May 2009.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2008. Promoting public participation and tackling environmental concerns in the oil sector in the South. Norad application for individual agreement 2009. September 2008.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2008. Ensuring environmental concerns when developing oil sector in the South – a feasibility study in capacity building measures of the Oilwatch network. Report to Norad 2007. May 2008.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2008. Vedr: Endelig søknad til Olje for Utvikling fra Norges Naturvernforbund. Letter to Norad. December 2008.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2008. Vedr GLO 0634 Tilskuddsbrev 2008, enkeltavtale, deres ref. 0701483-6. Letter to Norad. March 2008.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2007. Vedr, Søknad 2007 fra Norges Naturvernforbund til Norad – Olje for Utvikling. Letter to Norad. July 2007.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2007. Feasibility study project report. Lagos-Oslo, December 2007.

Norges Naturvernforbund, 2006. Skjema for søknad om inngåelse av rammeavtale etter Norads informasjonsstøtteordning. March 2006.

Norges Naturvernforbund, undated. Skjema for årlig virksomhetsplan for organisasjoner med rammeavtale (2007-2010) over Norads informasjonsstøtteordning. Søknadsår 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, undated. Skjema for årlig virksomhetsplan for organisasjoner med rammeavtale (2007-2010) over Norads informasjonsstøtteordning. Søknadsår 2009.

Norges Naturvernforbund, undated. Local sustainable energy centre in Sofala, Mozambique. Norad application for individual agreement 2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, undated. Norges Naturvernforbunds strategi for informasjon om internasjonale klimaspørsmål 2007-2010.

Norges Naturvernforbund, undated. Guide to monitoring technical aspects in energy projects.

Oilwatch, undated. 2010 Oilwatch EMiS Report.

Romão, C., 2011. Mid term project evaluation report. ADEL Sofala/NNV.

Social Action, Environmental Rights Action & Civil Society Legislative Advocacy Centre, 2011. Joint Position Paper. The Petroleum Industry Bill: Issues of Concern to Communities and Civil Society. May 2011.

Studer, S., 2009. Institutional assessment of JVE International. A network of youth-oriented environmental organisations. September/October 2009.

Ukiwo, U., Allen, F. & Oji, A., 2009. Report of evaluation on ERA/FOEN, 2006-2009. September 2009.

Unknow, undated. Organizational baseline of Environmental Rights Action (ERA).

Utenriksdepartementet, 2010. Prop. 1 S (2010-2011). Proposisjon til Stortinget (forslag til stortingsvedtak) for budsjettåret 2011.

Utenriksdepartementet, 2008. Climate, Conflict and Capital – Norwegian development policy in a changed environment. White Paper No. 13 (2008-2009).

Utenriksdepartementet, 2006. Norwegian Action Plan for Environment in Development Cooperation.

Utenriksdepartementet, 2003. Fighting Poverty Together: A coherent policy for development. White Paper No. 35 (2003-2004).

Annex 3: Field itinerary

- 7 June 2011: Flight Oslo – Frankfurt - Abuja. Check-in at Protea Hotel, Abuja
- 8 June 2011: Abuja. Meeting at the Norwegian Embassy
Flight Abuja – Benin City. Received by ERA. Check-in at the Sage Hotel
Benin City: Meeting with ERA staff at the ERA Headquarters
- 9 June 2011: Benin City: Meeting with ERA leadership at ERA Headquarters
Benin City: Environmental Parliament at ERA Headquarters
- 10 June 2011: Flight Benin City – Abuja – Port Harcourt. Check-in at Protea Hotel, Port Harcourt
Dinner with ERA staff at the hotel
- 11 June 2011: Trip to Goi and Bodo communities, Rivers State
Meeting at ERA Office, Port Harcourt
- 12 June 2011: Travel Port Harcourt - Yenagoa. Check-in at Creek Motel, Yenagoa, Bayelsa State
Travel Yenagoa – Oruma. Town hall meeting at Oruma.
Travel Oruma – Yenagoa
- 13 June 2011: Flight Yenagoa – Abuja. Check-in at Protea Hotel
- 14 June 2011: Abuja. Debriefing at the Norwegian Embassy
Flight Abuja – Frankfurt – Oslo

Annex 4: Persons interviewed

| <i>Name</i> | <i>Position</i> | <i>Organisation</i> |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Alagoa, Morris | Field officer | Environmental Rights Action |
| Basse, Nnimmo | Director | Environmental Rights Action |
| Berg, Øystein E. | Finance and administration manager | Norges Naturvernforbund |
| Haltbrekken, Lars | Chairman | Norges Naturvernforbund |
| Høystad, Dag Arne | Project manager | Norges Naturvernforbund |
| Ogbebor, Eghosa | Finance officer | Environmental Rights Action |
| Karikpo, Michael | Programme manager | Environmental Rights Action |
| Kristjansdottir, Torhildur | Energy adviser | Norges Naturvernforbund |
| Lakså, Knut | Senior adviser | Norad |
| Lineikro, John | Project manager | Norges Naturvernforbund |
| Lorentzen, Yngvild | Head of international department | Norges Naturvernforbund |
| Odegard, Jan Thomas | Secretary general | Norges Naturvernforbund |
| Ojo, Godwin Uyi | Programme manager | Environmental Rights Action |
| Sandsnes, Anne Britt | Senior adviser | Norad |
| Sandvold, Reidun A. | Senior adviser | Norad |
| Williams, Chima | Project officer | Environmental Rights Action |
| Wæringsaasen, Kristin T. | Counsellor | Royal Norwegian Embassy |

Norad

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

Postal address:

P.O. Box 8034 Dep, NO-0030 OSLO

Office address:

Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway

Tel: +47 23 98 00 00

Fax: +47 23 98 00 99

postmottak@norad.no

www.norad.no