

Annex 7: Results of the online survey

1 Introduction

The survey on M&E requirements of extending agencies focused on reporting requirements along the project life cycle, monitoring and evaluation practices, and communication between the organizations/institutions and the project implementing partners. An on-line survey questionnaire was sent to the five extending agencies Norad, MFA, Embassies, Peacekorps and Norfund. In the case of the embassies, only those embassies were included, of which projects had been reviewed as case studies, i.e. Zambia, Malawi, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Guatemala and Nepal. Within Norad, different departments were included, namely Norad Department for Civil Society (Dep CS) and Department for Climate, Energy and Environment (Dep CEE). Out of the 20 persons who received the questionnaire, 16 responded. The MFA did not reply.

The respondents were asked to take into account the overall evaluation period in their responses. However, as the period under review goes back to 2005, it involved several generations of staff, and most respondents were only able to indicate the situation for the most recent years.

It should also be noted that the answers from Norfund have to be interpreted carefully, as Norfund's way of funding (investments vs. grant funding) is highly different from the other agencies. Thus, requirements and procedures are different from the more conventional way of development cooperation financing.

2 Funding requirements and application procedures

All extending agencies requested from their contracting partner a **proposal which included a budget**. It appeared that most embassies did not use specific templates, or only for projects with specific requirements (e.g. the FISP programme in Malawi which is multi-donor funded). An exception seemed to be the embassy in Ethiopia where templates were used for most projects. The embassy in Guatemala did not use specific templates; however it embassy had specific requirements in relation to the budget that had to be provided by the contracting partner. The embassy in Malawi pointed out that they had to spend time on asking for additional information as a result of not using templates.

The Dep CS of Norad, Peacekorps and Norfund stated that templates and standard documents had been used. No templates were used by the Department ECC of Norad. It is interesting to note, that rules within a same extending agency were varying (in these cases Norad and the embassies).

All agencies required a logframe. Norfund followed standard investment which followed the structure of a logical framework, without explicitly asking for a logframe. In the case of the ICIMOD core funding in Nepal, the logframe had been adapted to the ICIMOD strategy.

Norad, Dep CS, Peacekorps, the embassies of Malawi, Ethiopia and Guatemala, all reported to use templates being based on e.g. the Norad LFA handbook or the Manual of Development Cooperation¹. The embassy of Tanzania, Norad, Dep ECC did not use specific templates. Here again, basic requirements were requested from the contracting partner, but without imposing them a specific format.

¹ Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Norad (2005) Development Cooperation Manual.

Agencies **using guidelines for preparing project proposals** were: Norad, Dep ECC; Peacekorps and the embassy of Guatemala. The embassies of Zambia, Malawi, Tanzania, Ethiopia and Nepal did not use guidelines. An inconsistency in the answers appeared for Norad, Dep CS and Norfund, where one of two respondents answered “yes”, and the other “no”. This might point to the fact that guidelines were not universally known and applied within one institution.

In the case of Norad (both departments), Norfund and Peacekorps, guidelines were produced by the agencies themselves. The embassy of Guatemala used guidelines produced by Norad, including the Cooperation Manual. The embassy in Malawi highlighted that guidelines for project appraisals had been used as guidance for project proposal preparation.

3 Reporting and monitoring requirements

All agencies requested **progress reports**, with the exception of the Peace Corps. Most of the projects were requested to report on an annual or semi-annual basis. Norfund requested quarterly reports; the FISP in Malawi was monitored weekly.

All agencies stated that **specific requirements to progress reports** existed, with the exception of the embassy of Nepal. Both departments of Norad, Norfund, Peacekorps, the embassies of Malawi, Tanzania and Guatemala specified their requirements already in the proposal document and/or in the contract/agreement. Even though answering “no” to this question, the embassy of Nepal stated that the reporting requirements were defined at the contracting stage.

In the case of Norad, Dep CS, reporting had to be done against the logframe and the budget. Also in Malawi and Ethiopia reporting was done according to the planned activities. The embassy of Malawi furthermore requested gender-segregated data in their progress reports.

The following table reveals that only a part of the extending agencies requested **baseline and end-of programme surveys**, namely Norad (both departments), the embassies of Zambia, Malawi, Tanzania and Ethiopia.

Table 1 Answer to question related to baseline and end of programme survey

Extending Agency	Baseline and end of programme surveys required?	Specific requirements to the surveys?
Norad	Yes	
Dep. of CivSoc	No	
----- Dep. of Climate, Envi&Energy	Yes	To what extent are results/goals met
Norfund	No	
Peace Corps	No	
Embassy: Zambia	Yes	End reviews financed by embassy
Embassy: Malawi	Yes	This varies. The obvious one is that there needs to be a connection between the baseline and the target formulation.
Embassy: Tanzania	Yes	Not any specific requirements, only the usual used for development cooperation
Embassy: Ethiopia	Yes	the current situation has to be specified, for example, productivity per unit area today has to be estimated so that at the end of the project period it will be evaluated whether or not productivity is increased/decreased as a result of the

Extending Agency	Baseline and end of programme surveys required?	Specific requirements to the surveys?
		programme.
Embassy: Guatemala	No	
Embassy: Nepal	No	In the last annual meeting the issue of baseline came up and ICIMOD has been requested to make this available to enable accreditation for results

For those agencies requesting a baseline survey, detailed requirements on how to implement survey seemed not to be fixed, but were specific to the projects' needs (Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Malawi). No baseline or end of programme survey was requested by Norfund and Peacekorps and by the embassies of Guatemala and Nepal.

The majority of extending agencies used **M&E guidelines**. Agencies using guidelines for M&E were: Norad (both departments), Norfund, the embassies of Malawi, Tanzania, Nepal and, to some extent, Ethiopia. The Development Cooperation Manual was used as a guideline by the embassies of Malawi and Guatemala. As in previous questions, respondents within the same institution answered differently (cases of Norad Dep CS, Norfund and the Embassy of Guatemala).

The embassies of Malawi and Ethiopia (although the latter did not answer the yes/no question) stated that M&E issues were the responsibility of the implementing partner. Peacekorps and the embassy of Zambia did not use guidelines.

All extending agencies carried out **appraisals**.² Only Peacekorps and Norfund did not foresee a mid-term review in their project cycle. **Mid-term evaluations/reviews and final evaluations** were done by all agencies with the exception of Peace Corps. Norfund, as well as the embassy in Guatemala, gave different answers to this question, depending on the respondent.

4 Manpower in the extending agency and communication with the implementing partner

The embassies of Zambia, Malawi, Ethiopia and Guatemala had each approximately two staff allocated to the agricultural/environmental portfolio, dedicating between 20-30% (Guatemala) up to 75% (Malawi) of their time to this portfolio. In Tanzania, only one person dedicate 50% of his/her time to this type of portfolio, while the embassy in Nepal had no person directly and mainly in charge of agriculture, but two environment/energy advisors spent around 10% of their time on this topic. For Peacekorps, two programme advisors spent 10% of their time on the agricultural portfolio.

According to information from the survey respondents, all agencies **visited the projects** during their implementation, with the exception of the embassy in Nepal, where Norad was in charge of the annual visit to the partners. The other agencies' frequency of project visits was reported as follows:

² According to the Development Cooperation manual (MFA/NORAD, 2005) appraisals are mandatory for a Norwegian contribution exceeding NOK 15 million. Projects over NOK 50 million have to do a "full-scale appraisal", following a format given in the Manual.

- At least annually during the implementation period: Norfund, Norad, Dep ECC and the embassies of Malawi and Tanzania
- At least semi-annually: Peacekorps, the embassies of Ethiopia and Guatemala
- On a quarterly basis: Embassy of Zambia.

The range of answers regarding communication with project partners is equally very broad:

- On an monthly basis: Norad Dep ECC, Peacekorps, Malawi and Nepal
- On a weekly basis: Embassies of Zambia and Guatemala and Norfund
- Depending on needs: Embassies of Ethiopia, Zambia and Malawi. Ethiopia also stated that the annual meeting was a must, while the Malawi embassy reported to communicate with the implanting partners on a daily base for one (in this case FISP) or on semi-annually basis for others.