

**Discussion Paper on Evaluation**

**Local Monitoring and Evaluation  
Systems and Capacities:**

**A contribution to the debate on the alignment  
and harmonisation of development aid**



The opinions presented in this report are those of independent consultants and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development. This report was prepared by: Azra Jafferjee and Valéria Salles



# TABLE OF CONTENT

## PART ONE: OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS

### MAJOR ABBREVIATIONS

- 0. SUMMARY ..... i
- 1. INTRODUCTION..... 1
- 2. UNLOCKING EVALUATION – A WORD ON THE MEANING OF EVALUATION ..... 5
- 3. CURRENT PRACTICES AND TRENDS IN EVALUATION ..... 10
- 4. LOCAL M&E SYSTEMS AND CAPACITIES: COUNTRY CASE STUDIES ..... 15
  - 4.1 Brazil ..... 15
  - 4.2 Mozambique..... 19
  - 4.3 South Africa..... 23
  - 4.4 Tanzania ..... 27
  - 4.5 Indonesia..... 31
  - 4.6 India ..... 35
  - 4.7 Bangladesh ..... 37
  - 4.8 Cambodia..... 39
  - 4.9 Nepal..... 41
  - 4.10 Sri Lanka ..... 43
- 5. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS ..... 45
- 6. RECOMMENDATIONS ON NEXT STEPS ..... 51
- REFERENCES..... 55

**PART TWO: INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES FROM CASE STUDY COUNTRIES**

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES 59

A: BRAZIL 59

B: MOZAMBIQUE 67

C: SOUTH AFRICA 75

D: TANZANIA 85

E: INDIA 97

E: INDONESIA 107

F: BANGLADESH 113

G: CAMBODIA 119

H: NEPAL 123

I: SRI LANKA 127

EVALUATION ASSOCIATIONS 133

**ANNEXES 132**

The authors:

**Azra Jafferjee**, born in Sri Lanka, works as an independent consultant in the fields of development economics, poverty research and monitoring and evaluation. At present she is based in Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

**Valéria Salles**, born in Brazil, works as an independent participatory development facilitator, specialised in monitoring and evaluation of developmental processes. She presently lives in Bonn and Maputo.

## MAJOR ABBREVIATIONS

AfDB	African Development Bank
AfrEA	African Evaluation Association
AsDB	Asian Development Bank
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BMZ*	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
BGS	Budget Support
BoPS	Balance of Payments Support
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
DC	Development Cooperation
DED*	German Voluntary Service
DFID	UK Department for International Development
DWHH*	German Agro-Action
EC	European Community
EED*	Protestant Churches Development Service
ERP	Economic Recovery Programmes
FYP	Five Year Plan
GO	Government Organisation
GoB	Government of Bangladesh
GoM	Government of Mozambique
GoSA	Government of South Africa
GoSL	Government of Sri Lanka
GoT	Government of Tanzania
GTZ*	German Technical Cooperation
HIPC	Heavily Indebted Poor Countries
IADB	The Inter-American Development Bank
IDC	International Development Cooperation
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFI	International Financial Institution
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMG	Independent Monitoring Group
InWEnt*	Capacity Building International, Germany
JAS	Joint Assistance Strategy
KfW	German Development Bank
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTEF	Medium-Term Expenditure Framework
NGO	Non-Government Organisation

ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PAF	Performance Assessment Framework
PAPs	Programme Aid Partners
PER	Public Expenditure Review
PHDR	Poverty and Human Development Reports
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RBM	Results Based Monitoring
RGC	Royal Government of Cambodia
RGN	Royal Government of Nepal
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SAMEA	South Africa Monitoring and Evaluation Association
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programme
SLEVA	Sri Lanka Evaluation Association
SWAp	Sector-wide approach
TA	Technical Assistance
TEC	Tsunami Evaluation Coalition
TGNP	Tanzania Gender Networking Programme
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	UN Environment Programme
UNESCO	UN Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNFPA	UN Population Fund
UNHCR	UN High Commission for Refugees
UNICEF	UN Children's Fund
UNIDO	UN Industrial Development Organisation
UNODC	UN Office on Drugs and Crime
USAID	US Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank
WFP	World Food Programme

*\* Denotes acronym in original language.*

## 0. SUMMARY

### Background

Since the signing of the Rome and Paris Declarations on Aid Effectiveness in 2003 and 2005 respectively, pressure has been high on the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) members to put into place systems and procedures that conform to the declarations.

The declarations acknowledge that improving aid effectiveness rests a great deal on the strengthening of developing partner countries' own responsibility and capacity to act and on greater alignment and harmonisation in the delivery of aid.

Three principles are explicit from the declarations that are intended to form the red thread to improve aid effectiveness. They are: increasing partner countries' own responsibility (*ownership*), orienting aid with partner countries' priorities, systems and procedures and helping to strengthen their capacities (*alignment*) and coordinating the delivery of aid among donors within the development agendas of partner countries (*harmonisation*).

### Objectives of the study

Against this background, the BMZ has commissioned a study to provide a better understanding of local systems and capacities for development evaluation so that progress towards realising the DAC principles could be further supported and enhanced.

The study would contribute to "improve the deployment and capacity of local monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems and services commensurate with demands in the partner countries, on the part of other donors and in German development policy<sup>1</sup>".

In view of its wide scope, the study is commissioned in two phases. As per the TOR,

- Phase I shall collect and compile information on local M&E-systems and services as an input to the further process and the final study
- Phase II shall use this information for a broader perspective and a comprehensive study on "Orienting towards and the deployment of local monitoring and evaluation systems and capacities".

This report contains Phase I. It prepares the grounds for Phase II by collecting and compiling information on M&E services in partner countries (contained in Part Two of this report). It briefly analyses current evaluation practices and trends in donor and partner countries and seeks to assess the demand for M&E services (contained in Part One). On the basis of these assessments entry points into utilising and supporting development evaluation in developing partner countries are identified.

### Findings of the study

#### ***Capacity for partner country-led evaluation***

The indicator measuring 'ownership' in the Paris declaration specifies that "developing partner countries have operational development strategies (including PRSs) that have clear strategic priorities linked to a medium-term expenditure framework and reflected in annual

---

<sup>1</sup> Outline for the study, Maria Tekülve, BMZ Evaluierungsreferat, BMZ

budgets”<sup>2</sup>. All ten case studies have in place medium-term development plans with clear moves evident towards performance measurement in the public sector - away from traditional M&E systems that were geared to measure purely physical and financial progress of programmes. The adoption of PRSPs and MDGs in national plans, particularly in highly aid dependent countries, has considerably aided this process.

Nevertheless, much of the debate is still on indicator fulfilment, rather than on core issues such as the dynamics of poverty. Moreover, M&E, even of national plans, are not yet fully institutionalised or, at the most, are operationalised in a piecemeal way. Fragmentation, lack of linkages between M&E elements into M&E systems, lack of integration between sectoral and territorial processes are just some of the challenges ahead for developing countries that are moving towards a results-based-monitoring and evaluation system.

The role of civil society in this process is observed as crucial, not only to catalyse the move towards a national developmental consensus (or at the least national policies), but also to monitor and evaluate performance and results of public policies. The growth of M&E capacity in the parliament, among research institutions and within civil society organisations will help increase ownership of development processes by partner countries.

### ***Coordinating evaluation in German development cooperation***

Germany has undertaken a number of pilot steps to reform its aid delivery in keeping with the DAC vision. They include: a renewed attention to field-based German coordination (e.g. additional BMZ staff in embassies; use of country and sector teams, use of a one-country strategy for all agencies); and more flexible use of delivery modalities that go beyond a project-based system, to include programme-based approaches and budget support.

Steps towards coordinating evaluation procedures are also evident within German development cooperation. The past two years have seen the BMZ together with its official, bi-lateral implementing agencies (GTZ, KfW, InWEnt and DED), involved in a process of reforming internal evaluation procedures to bring them in line with the DAC evaluation criteria as well as with one another. Among the non-government development organisations (NGOs), however, the trend is less clear. The variations in size, outreach, thematic focus and degrees of professionalism of the many NGOs dotting the German development landscape, result in widely differing evaluation practices and as yet there is no evidence of meaningful interaction and exchange on evaluating their development initiatives.

### ***Alignment towards partner country policies***

In policy terms, the recent years have seen clear progress to align German development cooperation with national development strategies. The formulation of PRSPs and MDG in partner countries, have led to more specific inclusion of partner country national priorities in German development policy papers and country strategies. There have been experiences of jointly developing policies (e.g. European Commission and South Africa) and programmes (e.g. Decentralization Programme in Mozambique).

In practice, however, alignment depends on the existence of “reliable country systems” (indicator 2 of the Paris Declaration), which are measured by the “Country Policy and Institutional Assessment” index, defined by the International Development Agency of the World Bank. To be considered ‘reliable’, a country has to reach the “good performance index

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/57/60/36080258.pdf>

threshold of 3.5". So far, only 15 African countries 'classify'<sup>3</sup>. The findings of this study suggest that alignment is welcomed albeit with some reservation. Moving towards budget support and untied aid creates a problem of lack of visibility for the donor-country, an important means to secure necessary resources for aid allocation.

NGOs seem to perform better on alignment, although alignment has a different meaning here. NGOs rely on institutional partners in the developing countries to implement projects. As such, NGOs tend to be much more oriented to the needs and objectives of their partners – although these might not necessarily be aligned with the development priorities and policies of the partner country.

### ***Harmonisation vs. Alignment: The dilemma***

One of the main findings of the study was the dilemma presented by the divergent trends between harmonisation and alignment: efforts to harmonise (and taking coordination as a first step) evaluation practices among donors have resulted in the standardisation of approaches, which have come at the cost of opening up to partner country approaches and practices. In other words, harmonisation invites uniform standards, while alignment calls for customisation and 'localisation' of evaluation approaches. Reconciling this dilemma will be a challenge to translating the DAC principles into German evaluation practice.

To this can be added a second dilemma; how to satisfy the regulatory demands of donors as well as of partners. The study highlights that the imperative to 'report' in evaluations calls for standards that satisfy Germany's legal requirements. At the same time, these might not be compatible with partner country regulatory systems. Hence, efforts to incorporate partner country approaches and contexts might pose a challenge to the different accountability systems in donor and partner countries. Since there is no 'either-or' answer, the challenge is rather to create the space for a critical mass of evaluation efforts that together will satisfy competing interests and at the same time provide the necessary information for effective decision making.

### ***Local capacities in development evaluation: a growing market***

While experiences among the ten case studies vary significantly, the trend towards operational research is evident, and indicates an institutional response to the demand for development evaluation. This comes from domestic institutions such as Government and Parliament as well as from donors. Increasingly, academic research institutes and universities respond to demand and offer advisory services for research and evaluation. This provides a space for the engagement of Government with civil society institutions as well as for donors to seek a 'national' or 'local' approach in development evaluation.

The profile of institutional service providers contained in Part Two of this study, shows that considerable M&E expertise comes from a growing private consultancy sector. The market for these consultancy providers is usually donor driven, although 'national' demand is growing (particularly as 'development' enters the realm of measurable public goods). 'Pure' commercially oriented players such as market research companies are also beginning to enter the development market, bringing in a much sought after expertise (in survey methods) and resources (network of data gatherers) to undertake large-scale development surveys.

---

<sup>3</sup> See classifications at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/2004CPIAweb1.pdf>

Although the expanding consultancy market makes available a pool of service providers in evaluation, these firms can be considered ‘development partners’ only if they have as vision or mandate a commitment to development objectives. In this respect, the research / academic community is well placed, through a substantial body of locally generated knowledge, to act as equal partners in evaluation at both the level of Government and donors.

A hitherto neglected, but increasingly important player in the evaluation field, are Evaluation Associations. While many are institutionally weak and based on voluntarism, the broad make-up of their membership (comprising representatives from the bureaucracy, professionals involved in research, civil society and the private sector) make Evaluation Associations a strategic player in defining national evaluation discourses in developing countries.

The institutional review points to the existence of a sound basis for piloting cooperative or joint evaluations with partner country service providers. The limitations might lie less with lack of sufficient providers or their quality, but rather the additional time and effort, and as pointed out but not verified in this report, the cost, of piloting such joint initiatives.

### ***Bridging the discourse gap: reinterpreting capacity building***

A major challenge to mainstreaming DAC processes is to bridge the gap in the discussions at the DAC/ OECD level and the realities of partner countries. In a number of the case study countries (notably in Asia and Latin America), awareness and interest in Paris and Rome agendas are scant. More important are national level discussions on how to influence policy processes within the countries, and how to influence donor strategies on the country. The problem is compounded by the glut of terminology invading ‘donor-speak’, often leading to misunderstanding (while it creates a discursive space of exclusivity among evaluators and experts).

This point is important in the context of capacity building in evaluation. Supporting national evaluation capacities is often equated with methodology development and training. Adopting this approach would once again turn the nature of the cooperation into a paternalistic relationship, undermining the essence of the very principles it professes to support. Supporting national evaluation processes goes beyond methodology development, and focuses instead on learning processes, understanding how policies are made and how to influence policy in national contexts. It also involves sustained partnerships with research bodies that are active in evaluation. It calls for investments in institutional learning on both donor and partner side, that go beyond a client-consultant relationship.

Moving towards DAC principles on aligning evaluation procedures is more than out-sourcing evaluations. It is about a new form of partnership, and one that takes time, patience, courage and learning from doing – often over and over again.

### **Recommendations on next steps**

Given that this first phase of the study is meant to prepare the grounds for Phase II, the recommendations summarised below revolve around potential approaches towards this.

Where this study took the form of a stock-taking on existing M&E services in partner countries, it is suggested that Phase II delve deeper into understanding local M&E systems

and services and actual international demand for such services. Understanding better the demand and supply of those services will also help to better plan capacity building measures that go beyond the delivery of training. The following are possible steps in Phase II.

- **Widen and deepen the scope:** It is proposed that the selection of case studies for Phase II be done on the basis of well-defined criteria to represent for example: different aid modalities; BMZ priority countries; aid-dependent countries with examples of joint assistance strategies; countries with innovative evaluation practices; and countries where the BMZ has upcoming evaluations. Given the partner-oriented nature of the study, it is further recommended that Phase II involves researchers from the case study countries. This would enable a deeper understanding of local systems and processes, including the role played by evaluation in influencing policy processes. This partnership approach will allow at the same time, a 'piloting' of joint cooperation in evaluation.
- **Bridge the gap:** Conventional approaches to bridging the gap through capacity building understand it as 'filling the gap' through the delivery of training. As the study tries to show, there is a gap in the approach to evaluation, that may not (which would be verified) be about good standards of social research and missing methodologies in partner countries. It might, instead be about 'independence', or about how to feed the results of evaluation into policy-making and political processes. Understanding the role played by evaluation in national policy formulation constitutes an important first step towards supporting these processes.
- **Identify alternatives for capacity development:** Working in partnership with 'local' organisations in Phase II of the study would improve the 'ownership' and legitimacy of evaluation capacity building proposals. Ideas would come out from a joint process and, more importantly, they would fit policy imperatives of partner countries, rather than helping efficient aid management by donors. This would involve the investigation of some other key questions, such as: what are the current concrete best practices in the field of evaluation within partner countries (for instance, led by evaluation associations or already supported by German Development Cooperation); in which ways is the BMZ best placed to support these processes; and what are the other capacity development activities already taking place, keeping in mind that BMZ wants to intervene in a complementary manner, and not overlap with similar initiatives.
- **Launch pilot initiatives:** Finally, a potential method of understanding the discourse gap is by initiating a number of pilot initiatives on joint evaluations. The value of pilot initiatives, especially if it involves regional teams, is that it will facilitate an exchange of evaluation experiences regionally, and support a 'regional approach to evaluation' (e.g. among the South Asian countries or in West Africa). In essence, it would facilitate the same 'moving together' that is emerging among the OECD/DAC members, among developing countries. At the same time it would be one step towards bridging the evaluation gap between OECD/DAC and partner countries.



# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

The study contained herewith has been commissioned by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) to assess and outline capacities and systems for development Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in developing partner countries (i.e., aid recipients).

The initiative comes against the background of the Rome (2003) and Paris (2005) Declarations of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC), which call for “the strengthening of partner countries’ own responsibility and capacity to act” and of the agreements on “ownership, alignment and harmonisation”. The debate centres on issues of aid effectiveness and contains an explicit demand for mutual accountability and greater transparency vis-à-vis the public in donor and partner countries<sup>4</sup>.

Three DAC principles are of specific importance in this context: the partner countries’ own responsibility (ownership), building on local<sup>5</sup> systems and policies (alignment of donor’s procedures to those of the partner’s) and harmonisation (coordination among donors).

The BMZ supports all three principles in the following ways<sup>6</sup>:

- *Ownership* and the inclusion of a "local perspective" are sought for through cooperation with local partners and through the subcontracting of local experts.
- *Alignment*, the utilisation of local systems and capacities, occurs through the use of local data, cooperation with universities and specialist research and consulting firms, some of them supported by German Development Cooperation (DC), e.g. in Sri Lanka.
- *Harmonisation* in evaluation occurs through the participation in international joint evaluations, particularly of joint donor financed measures (e.g. General Budget Support).

Nevertheless, in spite of the recent progress, the BMZ acknowledges that substantial scope for improvement in moving towards the DAC principles still exist. In particular, as the BMZ points out, “*there is an urgent need for greater understanding of the present systems and capacities of evaluation in partner countries*”<sup>7</sup>. According to experiences made by the BMZ Evaluation Division, “with regard to the range of consultancy services, qualified local experts and organisations [in M&E] are difficult to identify [and] cooperation proves to entail great expense, mainly for reasons of organisation”<sup>8</sup>.

## 1.2 Objectives

Against this background, the BMZ has commissioned a study to provide a better understanding of local systems and capacities for development evaluation so that progress towards realising the DAC principles could be further supported and enhanced.

---

<sup>4</sup> Throughout this report, ‘partner countries’ refers to developing partners / aid recipients.

<sup>5</sup> ‘Local’ refers to developing partner countries.

<sup>6</sup> “Outline for a study”, Tekülve, 2006.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

The study wants to contribute to:

“to improve the deployment and capacity of local monitoring and evaluation systems and services commensurate with demands in the partner countries, on the part of other donors and in German development policy<sup>9</sup>”.

The study will be conducted in two phases and has the following objectives (see Annex 1).

- **Phase I** shall collect and compile information on local M&E-systems and services as an input to the further process and the final study
- **Phase II** shall use this information for a broader perspective and a comprehensive study on “Orienting towards and the deployment of local monitoring and evaluation systems and capacities”.

The present study comprises **Phase I** and has the following objectives:

- i. Provide a brief overview of the current trends and debates on donor harmonisation and partner country led evaluations (subject of chapters 2 and 3).
- ii. Survey up to ten partner countries in order to provide an overview of current M&E practices, summarizing strengths and weaknesses of partner country M&E capacities and systems (subject of chapter 4).
- iii. Identify and provide institutional profiles of local service providers in M&E in the selected partner countries (subject of Part Two).
- iv. Draw preliminary findings on enhanced utilisation by German Development Cooperation of partner country capacities and systems and on potential M&E areas of support to partners (subject of chapter 5 and 6).

The major focus of the study is objective 3, which seeks to provide the BMZ with information, and therefore a better understanding, on partner country capacities in M&E. The results of this study are therefore intended to facilitate moves by the BMZ towards closer cooperation with partner countries in conducting future evaluations.

### 1.3 Methods

The study largely takes the form of a desk-study and uses the following methods.

- *Literature review* of current trends and debates on aid harmonisation and partner-country led evaluations.
- *Internet based research* to identify, screen, select and provide institutional profiles of research organisations/ consulting companies/ evaluation networks that could potentially serve as partners in evaluation for the BMZ.
- *Semi-structured interviews (email, telephone, face-to face)*,
  - With partner country institutions using a structured questionnaire in order to obtain institutional profiles
  - With representatives of BMZ and selected development organisations to obtain an overview of their evaluation practices and experiences with partner country M&E capacities.

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

## Case studies

The study adopts a case study approach in profiling capacities in partner countries. The following ten countries covering Latin America, Africa and Asia were chosen as case studies<sup>10</sup>.

- Brazil
- Mozambique
- South Africa
- Tanzania
- Bangladesh
- Cambodia
- India
- Indonesia
- Nepal
- Sri Lanka

Six of the case studies (Brazil, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, India and Indonesia) were selected on the basis of their strategic importance and relevance to the BMZ Evaluation Division. The country cases of Bangladesh, Cambodia, Nepal and Sri Lanka were added to widen the sample in Asia. A total of over 225 institutions in the ten countries were looked at by the two consultants for this study. About half were screened in detail via email/ internet/ telephone research to obtain a final selection of almost 90 institutions that are profiled in the report.

The process of identifying, screening and selecting institutions in partner countries was done using a combination of means:

- Personal knowledge of the local landscapes by the consultants
- Recommendations provided by German development organisations
- Recommendations by local actors in development and research
- Contacting local evaluation networks
- Internet research using databanks on research directories and development organisations.

A simple four step 'quality rating' was applied, as far as possible<sup>11</sup>, for selecting the institutions that are included in this report. The rating includes the following criteria:

- (1) proven experience in M&E;
- (2) staff strength (minimum of 5 professionals) and expertise;
- (3) experience with international organisations and;
- (4) a minimum of 3 years in existence

A rating of 1 (very weak) to 5 (very strong) was applied to criterion 1-3. All those scoring above 3 were included in the profiles. The profiles are provided in two variations. The first variant is presented in a more detailed format. This comprises institutions that were found to be the most suitable partners for evaluation in terms of thematic focus and evaluation experiences. The second variant contains shorter profiles and includes those institutions that have good research capacities, but insufficient M&E experience.

---

<sup>10</sup> Valéria Salles was responsible for Brazil and African countries, and Azra Jafferjee for Asian countries.

<sup>11</sup> In some cases some of the criteria, such as the minimum period of existence was overlooked due to recommendations by referees.

The profiles include the following information:

- Name and contact details
- Legal status and mandate
- Geographical scope
- Findings, with respect to M&E experience, staff capacities and reputation.

#### **1.4 Organisation of the report**

The report is divided into Part One and Part Two. Part One contains the overview and analysis of current evaluation practices and trends in donor and partner countries.

In Part One, *Chapter 1* introduces the study, including methods used and the approach taken. It also points out some of the limitations of the study. *Chapter 2* discusses the main concepts used in this study, in particular that of 'evaluation', providing an overview of its main current usages. *Chapter 3* contextualises the DAC declarations in terms of current trends in the German development cooperation landscape. It also seeks to provide a flavour of current M&E practices among the different development cooperation (DC) actors, including Government Organisations (GO) and Non-Government Organisations (NGO). Chapters 2 and 3 relate to the study objective (i). Chapter 4, together with the supporting Part Two, makes up the major focus and effort of the study, as required by the Terms of Reference (TOR). *Chapter 4* provides an overview of the development cooperation framework and a summary of M&E capacities in the ten case studies. Chapter 4 and Part Two satisfy the study objective (ii) and (iii). *Chapter 5* summarises the major findings and conclusions with respect to trends in the German DC landscape and capacities in the partner countries. Finally, *chapter 6* presents some recommendations to the BMZ on proceeding with Phase II of the study process. Chapters 5 and 6 address study objective (iv).

Part Two contains the institutional profiles of selected M&E service providers in partner countries, together with profiles of selected Evaluation Associations.

#### **1.5 Limitations of the study**

The major challenge of this study was the time required for the initial process of identifying, contacting and obtaining information. A substantial administrative and logistical effort was required to obtain responses from institutions in partner countries. The response rate to questionnaires was insufficient causing the authors to rely substantially on information gathered over the internet. The response rate of referees provided by institutions for verification of information and references was sub-optimal.

Time limitation combined with a small sample of German development organisations interviewed make the findings on the German demand for local M&E services only indicative and are not intended as a generalised representation.

## 2. UNLOCKING EVALUATION AND ITS MEANINGS

### **evaluate**

*verb* to form an opinion of the amount, value or quality of something after thinking about it carefully.

*Syn:* assess.

Oxford Dictionary of Current English, 2001. London. 3<sup>rd</sup>. Edition.

### **avaliar**

*verb* to determine the value, the price, the importance; appreciate the merit; estimate, calculate. Dicionário

Larousse de Língua Portuguesa, 2005. Rio de Janeiro.

### **makadirio**

*verb* to estimate, assess, measure the quantity or the quality of something.

Swahili Dictionary. <http://africanlanguages.com/swahili/>

The Development Assistance Committee – DAC is the donor countries' main body for consultations and cooperation on policies, methods and statistics in the field of development aid. Through cooperation between experts from OECD member states, DAC develops standards, principles and recommendations for making development cooperation more efficient and effective. The work done in DAC consists of studies, and negotiations between donor countries and, to an ever-increasing extent, with developing countries.

While donor countries have a body whose experts collaborate to *think* about development cooperation and for that matter aid evaluation, this is not the case with developing countries. The latter tend to operate loosely, without coordination, using organised forums and conferences for exchange of experiences, which are often provided by the donors themselves. Finding some consensus about important concepts such as 'aid evaluation' and 'aid effectiveness' is only possible if one looks at the donor countries and at the development agencies financed by them. There are, however, alternative discussions and meanings of *aid*, *effectiveness* and *evaluation*. In this report, we were able to capture some of the concepts and meanings of *development evaluation*.

### **The meanings of DAC**

In the 1998 *Review of DAC Principles for Evaluations*<sup>12</sup>, **evaluation** was defined as an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim of evaluations was to *determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability*. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors.

DAC defines the term **development intervention** as a general term to refer to an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, sector, operational area, institutional performance etc<sup>13</sup>. The aims of evaluations were refined in 1991 to emphasise *learning and accountability*. For example, the evaluation's purpose may be to contribute to improving an aid policy,

---

<sup>12</sup> OECD, 1998.

<sup>13</sup> OECD, 2006c.

procedure or technique; consider a continuation or discontinuation of a project/programme; or account for aid expenditures to stakeholders and taxpayers.

DAC applies five **criteria** for evaluating development assistance:

*Effectiveness:* The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

*Efficiency:* A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.

*Relevance:* The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.

*Impact:* Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

*Sustainability:* The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time<sup>14</sup>.

For DAC, the **focus** of evaluations in central evaluation offices has been moving away from traditional cycles of project monitoring and evaluation. This shift is more marked for some country members than for others. Generally, evaluators take on evaluations of the broader perspectives of sectors, themes, and country programmes, often involving cross-country studies. In the reorientation of development assistance work, more attention is being given to the overarching objectives of poverty reduction, governance issues, the cross-cutting themes of gender equity, the environment, major collaborative evaluations of international emergencies and multi-donor programmes and agencies, the expanded roles of NGOs, internal management and operating systems, and new instruments of assistance such as budget and sector support (investment, expenditure) programmes.

Regarding the **use of results** of evaluations by users, DAC found that:

- Users say that there is need for greater clarity on the purpose(s) of evaluations, starting with annual programming, through Terms of Reference and to the preparation of reports.
- Users are concerned that the selection of evaluators is not being open to a wider circle of expertise to provide fresh insights and minimize the effects of close client relationships.
- While users recognize the generally high quality of the evaluations, they have the familiar criticisms about voluminous reports, no time to read them, questions about relevance to their work, and ease of access to useful lessons.
- Users stress the importance of relating substance and form of the reports to different audiences inside and outside their agencies.<sup>15</sup>

In its efforts to promote **joint evaluations** as a tool for *increased participation and ownership, rationalization of the process of evaluation, reduced transaction costs for partner countries, improved quality of the work undertaken and increased weight and legitimacy of*

---

<sup>14</sup> OECD, 2002.

<sup>15</sup> OECD, 1998.

*the evaluation*<sup>16</sup>, DAC commissioned in 2004 a study on joint evaluations. As a consequence, a Working Paper was launched in 2006: *Guidance for Managing Joint Evaluations*, deemed by DAC as “vital at a time in which the international community is prioritizing more effective ways of managing aid and emphasizing the importance of mutual accountability in demonstrating results”<sup>17</sup>.

DAC recognizes that “it is difficult to define the term *joint evaluation* in one single, comprehensive definition that would satisfy all stakeholders. Conventional wisdom might suggest that joint evaluations are efforts undertaken by a group of donors, working together in a systematic and targeted manner, to obtain evidence of the achievements and failures of development cooperation activities and/or to assess the quality of - mostly multilateral - institutions. Although this kind of definition has, to date, prevailed in discussions, including those in the DAC and its Evaluation Network, it is a somewhat over-simplified definition, which is also challenged by partner countries”<sup>18</sup>. Definition of joint evaluations is then broadly given by DAC as *development evaluations conducted collaboratively by more than one agency*. Joint evaluations *with* “developing country partners” are said to be the only way to ensure that evaluation is aligned with national needs and that findings and recommendations are owned by the key partner country stakeholders.

### **The meanings of the BMZ**

BMZ commissions evaluations of development programmes in order to determine what progress has been made, but also in order to recognize undesirable developments in time. A specialized unit was created back in 1970 with the sole responsibility of carrying out this task. The evaluation unit primarily manages evaluations of a cross-cutting nature - thematic, sector, instrument, policy or country programme evaluations. The results enable the BMZ, parliament and the public to look at the past and verify what the people of developing partner countries have achieved in through the receipt of development assistance. They also help the BMZ and its partners to plan ahead and better design future collaboration.

For the BMZ, evaluations are comprehensive, systematic assessments of ongoing or completed aid activities, their design, implementation and results, including impacts. Evaluations are carried out by independent teams, usually with the participation of local experts as resource persons or as co-evaluators. The BMZ evaluation unit focuses on policy issues - sector, programme, thematic and instrument evaluations, - serving at the same time as a cross-check of the results of individual project evaluations. Increasingly, the BMZ evaluation division is undertaking joint evaluations with other donors and developing country partners. Performance assessments and evaluations of *projects* are mainly undertaken by the implementing organisations, which have independent evaluation units themselves: they conduct ex post, summative and mid-term evaluations, according to BMZ guidelines<sup>19</sup>.

### **Other institutional meanings**

The **European Commission** defines evaluation as a “judgment of interventions according to the results, impacts and needs they aim to satisfy”<sup>20</sup>. Therefore, it is a process that *culminates in a judgement* (or an assessment) of an intervention. Evaluation is considered to

---

<sup>16</sup> OECD, 2005b. DAC, 2005.

<sup>17</sup> OECD, 2006d.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> Info at <http://www.bmz.de/en/evaluation/index.html>

<sup>20</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/comm/europeaid/evaluation/intro\\_pages/introduction.htm#Definition](http://ec.europa.eu/comm/europeaid/evaluation/intro_pages/introduction.htm#Definition)

be one of the components in decision-making and is expected to inform whether the planned activity is justified in terms of *relevance, coherence, economy, efficiency, effectiveness, added value and sustainability*. For the **UN system**, evaluation aims at understanding why and the extent to which intended and un-intended results are achieved, and their impact on stakeholders. The UN adopts the DAC definition of evaluation and differentiates evaluation from other forms of assessment, such as *appraisal, monitoring, review, inspection, investigation, audit, research, internal management consulting*<sup>21</sup>.

The **African Development Bank** (AfDB) has an Operations Evaluation Department (OPEV), which carries out the independent evaluations of the bank. The bank has strongly moved from projects to Country Assistance Evaluations (CAE) in recent years. According to the bank, those aim at drawing lessons from previous interventions in a country to influence the design of future Country Strategy Papers (CSPs). The **Asian Development Bank** (AsDB) considers evaluation an integral part of its project cycle of planning, monitoring and evaluation. The Operations Evaluation Office (OEO) leads “independent” evaluations, whose results also provide input to the Evaluation Information System, which is AsDB’s online database for evaluation findings and lessons<sup>22</sup>.

**Danida** (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Denmark) adopted DAC’s definition of evaluation and makes a distinction between “evaluation” and “review”. The former is an inquiry that will be available to the public, while the latter is an internal, periodic assessment<sup>23</sup>. For the **Department for International Development** of the United Kingdom (DFID)<sup>24</sup>, evaluation of aid uses reliable and transparent methods of observation and analysis. The term “evaluation” is reserved for independent and in-depth studies, while “reviews” are internal evaluative activities taking place during the lifetime of the project or programme. For the Evaluation Division of the Economic Cooperation Bureau of the **Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan** (MOFA)<sup>25</sup> demand for evaluations expanded from individual projects to sector and country wide development assistance. For Japan, the main evaluation scopes are country-policy; priority-issue; sector programme; and type of aid evaluations.

The **Brazilian Government** defines evaluation as a systematic process of collecting and analysing data about characteristics, processes and impacts of a programme, on the bases of the criteria of efficiency, efficacy, effectiveness, in order to generate recommendations to improve the management and quality of public expenditure<sup>26</sup>. The **Brazilian Evaluation Network** (ReBraMA) defines it as the “learning moment”, which generates “sparks” that will initiate new processes. It can also be considered the focal point of knowledge management, the most important moment for learning organisations<sup>27</sup>.

**India’s** Planning Commission’s Development Evaluation Advisory Committee will start independent and in-depth evaluations, engaging civil society in the debate on the efficiency of the delivery mechanism. The existing monitoring and evaluation systems have neither been adequately used nor has there been any visible effort to improve and strengthen these mechanisms over time. The Planning Commission is setting a Programme Outcome and Response Monitoring Division (PO&RM Division). The Cabinet Secretary in his budget

---

<sup>21</sup> See definitions at UNEG, 2005a.

<sup>22</sup> See <http://www.adb.org/Evaluation/>

<sup>23</sup> See [www.um.dk/en/menu/DevelopmentPolicy/Evaluations/Guidelines/](http://www.um.dk/en/menu/DevelopmentPolicy/Evaluations/Guidelines/)

<sup>24</sup> See [www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/evaluation.asp](http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/evaluation.asp)

<sup>25</sup> See <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/evaluation/index.html>

<sup>26</sup> Government of Brazil, 2004.

<sup>27</sup> See <http://www.avaliabrasil.org.br/>

speech for the 2006-07 Annual Plan placed emphasis on the independent evaluation of all schemes/programmes by professional agencies.<sup>28</sup>

The **Government of South Africa** (GoSA) sees reviews as regular tools to assess policy or the implementation of development activity and evaluation as events that happen once in a development cycle<sup>29</sup>. The **African Evaluation Association** (AfrEA) adopted the following standards: utility, feasibility, propriety and accuracy. It finds evaluation and evaluators embedded in different cultures, each one with its own ways of rewarding positive behaviour and punishing bad one. *Evaluation* is an enterprise that involves thinking, increasing the potential to political and philosophical engagement in the world.

The **Government of Mozambique** (GoM) does not differentiate between monitoring and evaluation. Its' Monitoring and Evaluation System (PRSP II<sup>30</sup>) has the objective of creating conditions under which the government can maintain consistency in the poverty reduction strategy. The flow of information would also help to identify and capitalize on initiatives that, according to the data generated by the system, appear to have encouraging performance that might be multiplied.

The Joint Assistance Strategy (JAS)<sup>31</sup> in **Tanzania** affirms that M&E are to “assess progress towards achieving objectives and commitments”. There will be “regular and joint monitoring and evaluations” and a “mid-term and final assessment” by the Independent Monitoring Group (IMG). In addition, there will be a “comprehensive joint mid-term and final review of JAS implementation, undertaken in each five-year cycle”.

### **The meanings adopted in this report**

The above conceptualisation review is meant to be illustrative and not representative of the alternative meanings of (monitoring and) evaluation among different partners and organisations. It seems that there is more consensus than differences among them, although some do not distinguish between *evaluation* as part of an M&E cycle and *evaluation* as an independent and autonomous assessment.

The present report uses the concept of “M&E” whenever it refers to the “evaluation in the cycle” concept and it refers to “evaluation” when it wants to refer to the “independent” evaluations. Other meanings not explicit in this chapter are adopted from DAC’s definitions, which can be viewed in its development Glossary (DAC, 2002)<sup>32</sup>.

The authors hope that in the future there will be more room for recognizing different meanings and incorporating them in the exercises of *joint evaluation*, which has been promoted by DAC as a way for partners “to improve understanding of each others’ procedures and approaches”.

---

<sup>28</sup> [http://planningcommission.nic.in/plans/planrel/fiveyr/10th/volume1/v1\\_ch6.pdf](http://planningcommission.nic.in/plans/planrel/fiveyr/10th/volume1/v1_ch6.pdf)

<sup>29</sup> <http://www.dcis.gov.za/>

<sup>30</sup> Government of Mozambique, 2006.

<sup>31</sup> Government of Tanzania, 2006.

<sup>32</sup> An update of the Glossary can be viewed at

[http://www.oecd.org/glossary/0,2586,en\\_2649\\_33721\\_1965693\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html#35702048](http://www.oecd.org/glossary/0,2586,en_2649_33721_1965693_1_1_1_1,00.html#35702048)

### 3. CURRENT PRACTICES AND TRENDS IN EVALUATION

This chapter summarises findings regarding the discussions and trends in the implementation of the specific aspect of monitoring and evaluation within the framework of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. According to DAC, M&E should also move towards ownership, alignment and harmonisation. The major sources used are the desk literature review and discussions with German development agencies (see Annex 2 for list of interviewees). The chapter also assesses the 'demand' for locally implemented M&E expressed by development actors.

#### 2.1 The big picture

A recent publication<sup>33</sup> on the current practice of development cooperation evaluation describes the following approaches adopted by the aid community, which includes German DC institutions.

"Group one - DAC evaluation criteria approach": The members of this group accept the five DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability) as their main aid evaluation criteria. "This group is categorized into two sub-groups: (a) those agencies that use the original DAC five evaluation criteria (the group includes **BMZ**) and, (b) those agencies which significantly modified the DAC criteria (the group includes **KfW**)"<sup>34</sup>.

"Group two - Results-Based Management (RBM) approach": The members of this group accept the concept of monitoring and evaluation based on Results-Based Management (RBM). This concept requires an agency to formulate an organisation-wide (or sector- and country-wide, so called SWAp) strategic plan. Evaluation is seen as a special tool for answering questions from the management"<sup>35</sup>.

#### 2.2 The German development cooperation landscape

Germany's official development cooperation core is in the BMZ. The BMZ implements its official bi-lateral development cooperation through implementing agencies such as the GTZ, KfW, InWEnt and DED. A network of other agencies also provides technical and financial cooperation and capacity development. All in all, more than 30 German development institutions are included in this network. A number of other federal ministries (particularly the Foreign Office and Finance) and the federal states and municipalities also participate in development cooperation<sup>36</sup>.

The BMZ coordinates and leads bilateral European and Multilateral development cooperation. The BMZ evaluation division is responsible for the evaluation of German development cooperation. The division supports the harmonisation of German evaluation systems (government and non-government which receive funds from the Ministry).

---

<sup>33</sup> Sasaki, 2006.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>36</sup> OECD, 2006a.

## **Alignment on development policies**

In the Paris Declaration context, alignment is seen as aligning aid modalities and procedures with those of partner country policies and priorities, as expressed in national plans, such as Poverty Reduction Strategies

According to the BMZ<sup>37</sup>, in Germany the harmonisation agenda is an integral part of the goal of development cooperation. To implement its strategy of "DC with a single voice", the BMZ has made harmonisation and coordination with cooperation countries and other donors into an integral component of the work profiles of its operational units. In all DC countries, bilateral cooperation and the priority strategies for its implementation are aligned with the partner country's strategies for poverty reduction (where present). Where there are no such strategies, German development cooperation is aligned with the priorities set jointly with the partner in the government negotiations. Alignment also means donors using strengthened country systems to develop and implement evaluation of aid effectiveness.

Alignment in the context of the German Non-Government Organisation (NGO) landscape is another issue. Since the DAC principles are binding only at a Governmental level, this leaves a vast array of Non-Government Organisations outside its realm. Accordingly, there is no obligation for NGOs to conform to principles of alignment as envisaged in the Paris Declaration.

The sample of German NGOs interviewed for this study, operate on a high degree of alignment at the level of the cooperating partner institutions, which is where NGOs interact. In practice, NGOs' approach to development cooperation is quite partner-oriented, though not necessarily aligned with national policies. While most NGOs interviewed have some sort of country strategy that identifies priority areas for support, they tend to be applied with a broad brush, with considerable more scope for partner decision-making. This is also influenced by the high degree of trust that characterise relationships between NGOs and their partners, that evolve out of long-term partnerships often stretching into decades. This is especially the case in countries such as India, a popular operating ground for German NGOs, especially those that are supported by the Churches.

While the discourse and practice on alignment in the NGO context is not meant to be comparable with that on the governmental bi- and multilateral levels, it is nonetheless worth bearing in mind that on the practical level, NGO development cooperation could be assessed as being better aligned to partner priorities, thereby having a higher ownership by cooperating partners.

## **Harmonisation on evaluation**

Harmonisation in the Paris Declaration context applies primarily to the OECD/DAC member countries and calls for the implementation of common arrangements and simplified procedures with respect to aid commitment and aid evaluation.

In the context of aid evaluation, it entails streamlining and harmonising approaches to evaluation as well as reducing bilateral evaluations to give room to joint evaluations on common programmes.<sup>38</sup> In the context of the official development agencies, a Working

---

<sup>37</sup> BMZ, 2005.

<sup>38</sup> 'Joint' includes joint donor evaluations as well as joint evaluations between donors and developing partners. OECD, 2005b.

Group comprising BMZ together with GTZ, KFW, InWEnt and DED has been active over the past two years in translating the five DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability) into their evaluation contexts. In essence it seeks to coordinate the evaluation practices of this group on the basis of the DAC guidelines, for instance agreement on common evaluation criteria on the basis of the DAC criteria. What the working group discussions did not include was the partner country interpretations and definitions of the DAC's criteria as it applies to them. At present there is no link, or alignment, in the evaluation discourse (e.g., appropriate and context-specific frameworks, methodologies) between the German DC landscape and those of its partners.

In comparison to the official development agencies, German NGOs are less far on harmonisation efforts. The same autonomy that allows NGOs to be flexible and more adaptable to partner country contexts results in decision-making without or with minimal coordination with other development actors. The experience from the humanitarian aid following the Asian Tsunami - and the resulting NGO deluge, with little coordination, let alone harmonisation - only too well illustrates this point. Nevertheless, also as a result of the Tsunami experience, efforts are underway, especially by some of the larger NGOs such as the German Agro Action (DWHH), to coordinate activities, particularly in emergency situations. Initiatives such as *Alliance 2015*, a partnership of six European NGOs<sup>39</sup>, were reinvigorated after the Tsunami. According to DWHH, this 'partnership approach' is a step towards harmonisation and has attracted the attention of the wider NGO community.

On the methodological side, German NGOs differ widely. Larger NGOs such as DWHH have formal evaluation procedures and apply evaluation formats. Smaller NGOs such as EED and Misereor, work with open-ended formats, providing significant autonomy to partners to influence the evaluation process. Similarly, they vary in the use of evaluation results for planning. Many smaller NGOs have traditionally relied on non-formal feedback from implementing partners and information-gathering visits by Head Office missions, for their programming. This, however, is slowly changing with the introduction of M&E procedures and standards. The trend partly reflects the diffusion of the evaluation discourse among German DC, but it also reflects tighter regulatory requirements particularly when receiving BMZ funding.

On the practical aspects of organising evaluations, most organisations visited have databases on M&E service providers, with entries ranging from one hundred to several hundreds. The entries in most cases comprised information on individual consultants categorised under expertise. By some, this information was said to be included in the databases of cooperating partners in the partner country and would not be captured in the 'head office' databases<sup>40</sup>. The use of databases was difficult to assess – most of the interviewees estimated a ten to twenty percent use of the total database. In general, regular maintenance of the databases occurred less as a routine, and more by default, with the addition of new entries. Some interviewees pointed out that for reasons of transparency it was important to have the databases and use them. Nevertheless, when it came to actual selection of M&E services and consultants, most admitted that asking around through personal networks and experience with previous consultants were the main modes of selection.

---

<sup>39</sup> Cesvi (Italy), Concern (Ireland), Deutsche Welthungerhilfe (Germany), Hivos (Netherlands), Ibis (Denmark) and People in Need (the Czech Republic). See: <http://www.alliance2015.org/index.php>

<sup>40</sup> This applies to GTZ Country offices.

## **Alignment and ownership of evaluation efforts**

Alignment entails utilisation of partner country institutions and systems in planning, implementing and evaluating development cooperation. In the words of the OECD/DAC, “using a country’s own institutions and systems...increases aid effectiveness by strengthening the partner country’s sustainable capacity to develop, implement and account for its policies to its citizens and parliament”<sup>41</sup>. On this issue, the findings indicate slow progress in moving towards ownership or ‘buy-in’ of partner countries in evaluation efforts.

On the side of the Government development organisations, evaluation practice follows the traditional path of donor-led efforts. While these might vary in form and substance, the basic frameworks of evaluation, namely the Terms of Reference, are almost always drawn up by the funding agency. In several cases, TOR are presented to partner institutions and feedback invited, prior to an evaluation. According to interviewees, their usual experience is that proactive feedback or negotiation on TOR is rarely forthcoming from cooperating partners, demonstrating a low degree of interest and engagement.

The explanation for this apparent lack of ‘ownership’ appears to lie in the rationale for carrying out evaluations; that of providing information on performance of projects to the funding agencies, usually BMZ, and accountability to Parliament and the German tax payer. Evaluations for the most part are seen as management tools (to *control* or *prove*). Interestingly, the function of *improving*, which lies at the heart of evaluation, seems of lesser importance, at least in terms of the use of evaluation results. Given the dominance of the reporting function in evaluation, frameworks are determined using criteria defined by the funding agencies. Criteria are designed not only to meet regulatory standards in Germany, but also those at the OECD/DAC level. Through donor-only led evaluations, it is possible to miss altogether the “development” caused by the “cooperation”.

In contrast, the experience of the smaller NGOs looked at in this study suggests a higher ownership of evaluation by partners. This arises partly from the stronger ‘learning’ rationale that drives evaluations, that is attributed to more fluid systems of accountability to the funder (e.g., Churches and private donors).

## **Experiences with cooperating on evaluation**

The general experience of both government and non-government development organisations in utilising local capacities in evaluation suggests that positive experiences have been made in collaborative evaluations, especially in Asia and Latin America, which have stronger local research capacities. Most of those interviewed welcomed the trend towards closer collaboration, albeit with muted enthusiasm.

Some of the reticence arises from the need to distinguish between the control and the learning functions of evaluations, which were not always viewed as compatible. Many felt that qualities of critical reflection and objective analysis would be sacrificed, and pointed to cultural factors as potential impediments (for instance not losing face, fear of offending).

Most organisations interviewed were in favour of piloting joint donor and partner evaluations, but pointed to the substantial logistical and organisational effort involved, which would make such efforts more time consuming and costly<sup>42</sup>. The lack of information about the institutional

---

<sup>41</sup> OECD, 2005a.

<sup>42</sup> An assumption not substantiated by figures.

landscape and M&E capacity in partner countries was seen as a major obstacle – with many welcoming the present study as a potential source of reference.

In the final analysis, it appears that German demand for local M&E services would be driven by an approach to evaluation that is exploratory and open-ended. The main challenge would be to link accountability (compliance to donor-country's needs) with learning (the needs of the partner-countries). Or, as one of the interviewees observed, the challenge is how to create a new discourse of aid effectiveness to the German constituency that is less aid-oriented and more based on the concepts of long term development.

### **Capacity building to strengthen evaluation practices**

As part of the commitments to utilise partner capacities is the commitment to strengthen these very capacities. According to experiences by InWEnt, the leading capacity building institution in Germany, greater coordination and harmonisation of the various initiatives in this area is needed. This is further complicated by an unclear definition of “capacity building” in the institutional mandates of capacity building organisations. Although not the focus of this study, it seems that - as presently practiced - capacity building is synonymous with the delivery of training (see for instance capacity building projects of InWEnt in Annex 3). Moreover, these include the delivery of training on methodologies often defined by aid givers (e.g., OECD/DAC, World Bank), so that aid receivers can apply them in evaluating aid to their (the receivers') development. GTZ appears to have projects that base capacity building in different concepts (also in Annex 3). However, more analysis of the initiatives would be required before drawing conclusions.

The intention is not to dispute the value of addressing methodological gaps in evaluation capacity. The challenge to identifying supporting measures in the context of the aid effectiveness, would be to go beyond identifying challenges as those involving time and cost, inadequate report writing skills, insufficient critical review, or methodological know-how on how to assess impact.

True cooperation on evaluation might involve more than capacity building 'projects', but a more fundamental shift in the ideology of aid evaluation towards replacing control with compromise. It also calls for long-term and trusting institutional partnerships, which are not achieved overnight and require time and patience. This point will be further elaborated in chapter 5 and 6.

## 4. LOCAL M&E SYSTEMS AND CAPACITIES: COUNTRY CASE STUDIES

This chapter provides an overview of findings for each of the ten case-study countries. It summarises the findings from the institutional surveys, country research and discussions with German development organisations, including the BMZ.

The case studies are reviewed from the perspectives as far as possible:

- a) The current development cooperation framework, including progress on Poverty Reductions Strategies, Joint Assistance Strategies and joint evaluations
- b) Local capacity for M&E
- c) German development cooperation demand for locally led M&E

### 4.1 Brazil

#### Statistical overview (2004)

Population:	186.4 million
27.3% below the food security line <sup>43</sup>	
GNI total:	US\$645 billions (Atlas method)
GNI per capita:	US\$3,460 (Atlas method)
Total Net ODA:	US\$285 million
Net ODA of GNI:	0.04%
Bilateral share of gross ODA 68%	
Germany is the 2 <sup>nd</sup> largest donor with an average of US\$76 million in 2003-2004	

Source: OECD, UN Human Development Report, World Bank.

#### Background

The concern with monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of public policies and development projects and programmes in Brazil can be traced back to the re-democratisation of the country following the National Constitution of 1988. Firstly, participation became a widely accepted political concept. The Brazilian participatory budgeting, for instance, has already been institutionalised in several Brazilian municipalities and exported to other countries. Secondly, there has been an expanding practice of social corporate responsibility, which has promoted debate over the concepts of “development” and “partnership with the private sector”. Thirdly, civil society organisations entered a stage of professional intervention, relating more effectively their political action to an improved knowledge management.

The modern public management adopted by the Government implied the use of “rational” instruments to plan, budget and evaluate by outcomes and targets. The use of the logical framework and multi-stakeholder discussions and deliberation became a must in planning development. Discourses about the importance of planning and managing by results, however, do not go hand in hand with the fact that “Government structures give little

<sup>43</sup> 2002: extreme poverty 5.2 percent (Southeast); 25.2 percent. (Northeast). Medeiros, 2006.

incentive, if any, to learning and knowledge management"<sup>44</sup>. Evaluation results very rarely feed back into planning structures.

In 2006, the Brazilian Government launched an ambitious programme aiming at “public management evaluation”, with a series of evaluation criteria: leadership; strategy and planning; society’s participation; information management; personnel; processes and results. Institutional support of any kind would have to align with those criteria to guarantee good public management. All public institutions will have to comply with the standards set in the document. This *Programa Nacional de Gestão Pública e Desburocratização* (National Programme for Public Management and Reduction of Bureaucracy) takes responsibility for the M&E of public management through building capacity among civil society organisations which would volunteer to be the evaluators. Working on a parallel track, there is a Multi-annual Evaluation System (Federal Law 10.933/2004)<sup>45</sup>, under the responsibility of the Ministry of Planning, Budgeting and Management. The Brazilian Government’s M&E institutions include as well the *Instituto de Pesquisas Econômicas e Aplicadas* (Institute for Applied and Economic Research), the *Tribunal de Contas da União* (Federal Court of Accounts), the *Sub-chefia de Monitoramento e Articulação* (Cabinet for Monitoring and Coordination) and a *Núcleo de Assuntos Estratégicos* (Nucleus for Strategic Issues). The latter works closely with universities and research institutes on themes considered as strategic for the country, such as the ethanol programme, climate changes and political reform. An annual National Household Survey generates national statistic data.

The variety of M&E institutional instruments, as shown above, does not facilitate a rational decision-making process, evidencing the need for integration of the different loci where M&E takes place and the correspondent clarification on the relations among them. The M&E gap between sectors has been also mentioned as one of the problems still to be addressed: while the social sector has long M&E tradition, the infrastructure sector lacks studies and analysis to support public policy making, for example<sup>46</sup>.

In the private sector’s domain, associations, alliances and networks resulted in new foundations, institutes and an increasing direct funding of “civil society” organisations. The need to monitor the use of financial resources and to measure the outcome of the interventions became evident. In the face of those challenges and opportunities, civil society organisations employed managerial tools such as the logical planning, monitoring, evaluation and the systematisation of knowledge generated by practice. The role of evaluation expanded to become not only a learning instrument but also a way of politically projecting those organisations in terms of their power and creativity (in Brazil, civil society organisations are called *the third sector*).

### **Current development cooperation framework**

Development cooperation M&E activities are part of projects and programmes and the direct responsibility of the implementing agencies. ABC – *Agência Brasileira de Cooperação* (Brazilian Agency for International Cooperation) – is the national body responsible for overseeing ‘development cooperation’. Most interestingly, ABC does not have an M&E department, neither for the ‘received’ nor for the ‘given’ technical assistance<sup>47</sup>. The Paris

---

<sup>44</sup> Diewald and Pinto, 2006.

<sup>45</sup> Government of Brazil, 2004.

<sup>46</sup> For more about the M&E instruments of the Brazilian Government, see Gaetani, 2006.

<sup>47</sup> Brazil does not provide *financial assistance* to other countries, only for *humanitarian* cases

Declaration on Aid Effectiveness was unheard of in the department for 'given' cooperation. The other departments interviewed stated the unimportance of the instrument for Brazil. Probably because ODA has marginal relevance in the Brazilian political (and financial) scene, DAC concerns for ownership and alignment do not play a significant role. Some donors, however, are pursuing harmonisation around sectoral priorities and on financial management systems and expenditure eligibility, procurement procedures, and environmental safeguards. The Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) and the World Bank (WB) share information and audit tools on financial management, for instance.

Special cases for alignment and harmonisation are the so-called global interest programmes. The Pilot Programme for Conservation of the Brazilian Rainforest (PPG7) has particular significance here because of the German contribution (its largest in environmental programmes in the world). An initiative of the G-7 group of countries, with the participation of the World Bank, the European Union and the Netherlands, PPG7 is "unique in the world in that it is a one-country international partnership, in which the 'owning', recipient country, Brazil, works in a rather tight coordination and oversight arrangement with donor countries and the World Bank"<sup>48</sup>. PPG7 is in its final phase as a pilot project (as it ends in 2008) and will be followed by an institutionalised *Programa Amazônia* (Amazon Programme), as a sort of SWAp<sup>49</sup>. Harmonisation will be a challenge in that context, since it involves aligning national, international, bi- and multilateral partners around concepts, strategies and procedures.

### **Local capacity for M&E**

There is widespread capacity for public policy analysis in Brazil. The analytical capacity is concentrated in the hands of the academia and of civil society organisations. Although there are private consultancy firms providing such service, the field is generally seen as of 'public interest'. Several academic organisations involved in public policy analysis are affiliated to ANPOCS (*Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisas em Ciências Sociais*), an association that includes several social sciences foundations, institutes and research centres.

Besides the more academic social science research, NGOs are engaged in M&E of specific interventions that are implemented through time-limited projects and programmes. The need for exchange of experiences in evaluation practice led to the formation of a network whose goal is to strengthen the locally developed concepts and practice in development evaluation (ReBraMA). Moreover, PARTICIPE (an association of development facilitators) started addressing the lack of conceptualisation of 'participatory social development' in Portuguese language. Most evaluation theory and studies on participatory development are not produced or translated into Portuguese (very few Brazilians speak a second language). The development of a solid body of Brazilian M&E scholarship would help expand the space for exchange of experiences among practitioners.

Although there is an abundance of sectoral and sub-sectoral case studies in public policy, it seems that there is still a lack of systematic use of results produced by evaluations. Several consultancy service providers seem to use a 'participatory blue-print', an M&E tool-kit whose impacts could not be assessed by this desk study.

---

<sup>48</sup> Diewald and Pinto (2006).

<sup>49</sup> Sector Wide Approach.

### **German demand for locally led M&E**

Brazil ranks as a country of priority for German development cooperation. Financial cooperation activities concentrate on protection and management of natural resources (including renewable energies following the end of the nuclear agreement between the two countries in 2005) and integrated regional development in disadvantaged regions. Technical cooperation comprises the a) Pilot programme to preserve Brazil's tropical rainforests; b) Energy and urban-industrial environmental protection; c) Pro-poor development in Northeast Brazil; d) Promotion of cooperation between businesses in Northeast Brazil; e) Participation of German businesses in reducing poverty in Brazil; f) Sector project to strengthen the national AIDS/STD<sup>50</sup> prevention programme. Germany is Brazil's main economic partner in Europe.

The greatest need for improved partner ownership, alignment, harmonisation, and management by results concerns the future Amazon Programme that will follow PPG7, to which the German Cooperation has already committed support. The established Monitoring and Analysis Support Project (AMA), a dedicated unit within PPG7 to undertake M&E of its lessons learned during the pilot phase. AMA has had a role in building up monitoring and evaluation capacities and has published literature on types and practices in M&E. AMA will come to an end in 2008 and continuation is not yet decided upon. So far, PPG7 coordination and oversight mechanisms have included not only the Brazilian Government and international partners, but also representatives of the Brazilian civil society. Coordination mechanisms have gone through moments of friction among the partners in the past, and the future coordination and M&E mechanisms for the Amazon Programme are still undecided. Under PPG7, each project has its own implementation unit. The World Bank will fund the Brazilian coordination body until the end of the pilot phase, in 2008, despite criticism that this funding entails reduced ownership from the Brazilian side.

---

<sup>50</sup> STD: Sexually Transmitted Diseases.

## 4.2 Mozambique

### Statistical overview (2004)

Population:	19.8 million
49.1 % of population below the poverty line (HPI-1 measures)	
GNI total:	US\$6.1 billion (Atlas method)
GNI per capita:	US\$310 (Atlas method)
Net ODA of GNI:	23.6%
Bilateral share of gross ODA	58%
Germany is not among the top 10 donors (but the EC is the second largest)	

Source: OECD, UN Human Development Report, World Bank

### Background

Mozambique became independent in 1975. The new government, under president Samora Machel of the *Frente de Libertacao Nacional* (FRELIMO) gave shelter and support to South African (ANC) and Zimbabwean (ZANU) liberation movements while the governments of first Rhodesia and later apartheid South Africa fostered and financed an armed rebel movement in central Mozambique called the *Resistencia Nacional Mocambicana* (RENAMO). Hence, civil war, sabotage from neighbouring states, and economic collapse characterized the first decade of Mozambican independence. Talks were initiated between FRELIMO and RENAMO in 1986 and the new constitution enacted in 1990 provided for a multi-party political system, market-based economy, and free elections. The civil war ended in October 1992 with the Rome Peace Agreement.

In the years immediately following its independence, Mozambique benefited from considerable assistance from some western countries. The Soviet Union and its allies, however, became Mozambique's primary economic, military, and political supporters. This began to change when Mozambique joined the World Bank and International Monetary Fund in 1984. Western aid quickly replaced Soviet support. Mozambique's aid dependence peaked during the civil war period at 87 percent of gross national income (GNI) in 1992. By the late 1990s it had fallen to below 30 percent, but in 2001 donor support still accounted for more than half of total public spending and about two-thirds of public investment.

### Current development cooperation framework

The Government of Mozambique's (GoM) Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) is in its second phase (2006-2009) – it is called PARPA II in Portuguese - and forms the base for national M&E processes. Its joint monitoring – by GoM and development partners – is based on a Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) agreed and reviewed annually. The PAF contains about 50 indicators. In 2000, budget support donors formalized their coordination in the Joint Programme for Macro-Economic Support, which was superseded in 2004 by a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the GoM and its Programme Aid Partners (PAPs)<sup>51</sup>. The MoU commits both parties to a mutual accountability process by undertaking annual reviews of GoM's and PAPs' performance (each one has its own PAF).

The budget, planning and accounting systems on which donors align are weak. Mozambique has a high level of fiduciary risk owing to the weakness of its public finance management.

<sup>51</sup> Initially 14, the Programme Aid Partners are 18 in 2006.

There are concerns over the “effectiveness of un-earmarked aid flows entering a budget that is incremental in nature, is delinked from costed outcomes, exhibits little improvement in operational efficiency over time, depends on vulnerable and non-transparent procurement practices, and remains an ineffectual indicator of how money is spent and allocated”<sup>52</sup>.

Budget Support (BGS) and Balance of Payment Support (BoPS) represented 31 percent of aid flows to government in 2005. The Joint Review 2006 concluded that “at this rate the target set for 2006 (40%) will not be met”<sup>53</sup> particularly because “project aid is actually increasing faster than GBS”<sup>54</sup>. It means that the Annual Joint Review leaves out about 70 percent of aid flows that are in the form of project aid, indicating a limited capacity of evaluating aid effectiveness as a whole. Isolated and non-integrated instruments for “reviewing” project aid do exist, such as bilateral or sub-sector exercises, but so far a comprehensive evaluation mechanism to grasp the significance of project aid in the country is missing. The GoM has not given this an operational priority, despite having chosen to discursively align with donor countries’ demand for “drafting a National Cooperation Policy”, in order to “direct, systematically organise, and re-stabilize the flows of foreign aid into Mozambique”, as spelt out in the PRS II<sup>55</sup>.

The GoM’s guidelines for the 2007 Economic and Social Planning (PES) did not address at all the integration of project aid into the Government’s plan and budget but referred to the assumption that partnership between the Government and the partner countries will increasingly happen through Direct Budget Support. The positive results of an overall National Cooperation Policy that focuses on the generation of national revenues and a long-term budget support commitments would be to “reduce macroeconomic volatility caused by high aid dependence and the uncertainty about the effectiveness of the aid received”<sup>56</sup>.

### **Local capacity for M&E**

Joint and Mid-Year Reviews assess PRS implementation and progress. The Government has used these reviews as the main instruments to garner external partner support, replacing the traditional pledging approach of Consultative Group (CG) meetings. External partners have generally aligned their assistance strategies with the PRS. The five major external partners of the GoM accounted for approximately half of the gross ODA in 2003-04.<sup>57</sup>

The PRS II identifies the following aspects to improve M&E instruments and results: Improving the Annual Review of its Economic and Social Plan (BdPES) and starting an Impact Evaluation Report (*Relatório de Avaliação de Impacto-RAI*); improve relationships between planning and monitoring; strengthening the country’s analytical ability; aligning the decentralisation process with participatory requirements created under the Local Agencies Law (*Lei dos Órgãos Locais*); defining an organisational structure for M&E that ensures an effective flow of information. Preconditions identified include developing skills of integrated planning and M&E; and ensuring that the indicators selected reflect governmental priorities.

The role of Parliament has been so far to formally approve the State Budget and the Annual Economic and Social Plan (PES), without a visible presence in discussing national

---

<sup>52</sup> See Batley, 2006, p.6.

<sup>53</sup> Ernst & Young, 2006. p.6. The Joint Review of the year 2006 will take place in April 2007.

<sup>54</sup> Aide Memoire of the Joint Review 2006, p.5.

<sup>55</sup> Government of Mozambique, 2006, p.146.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

<sup>57</sup> World Bank, the EU, the USA, Denmark and the UK.

development policies. One M&E instrument that seems to have been strengthened in the PRS II is the Poverty Watch (*Observatorio da Pobreza*), an institution under Ministry of Planning that is supposed to guarantee public participation in M&E.

Since the end 1990s, the GoM and external partners have made efforts to tailor capacity building to country needs through SWAPs in agriculture, health and education, which have contributed to reducing fragmentation of capacity building efforts<sup>58</sup>. Capacity building in M&E systems, however, is still insufficiently defined and has been supported in a piecemeal way. While there are efforts to increase statistical quality in the Planning Ministry, there is little progress regarding the simplification and internal alignment between line ministries' M&E and the BdPES. Budget expenditure analysis is also made difficult by the lack of linkages between the State Budget and policy targets in line ministries with or without SWAPs.

NGOs and private consultancy companies' M&E capacity is weak developed, but steadily growing. Indicating this change, recent tenders for consultancy services specified preference or openness to local services. Several of the 'local' consultants are in fact expatriates who remained in the country after regular work.

### **German demand for locally led M&E**

The priority areas of development cooperation between Mozambique and Germany are decentralised rural development, education and economic development. Mozambique is one of four pilot countries involved in the German Programme of Action 2015. Germany provides Mozambique with direct budget support and is one of PAPs' countries. Germany committed funds of up to 68.5 million euros to Mozambique for 2005 and 2006, of which two thirds are to come in the form of financial cooperation and one-third in the form of technical cooperation. Mozambique is one of the first countries in the world to receive direct and untied budget support from German development cooperation. Of the financial cooperation Germany committed to Mozambique in 2005, twice 10 million euros were to be provided in this form for the budget years 2006 and 2007.

Supporting locally led M&E has been one of the impacts of the German technical assistance to the "Education Sector Strategic Plan" that started in 1999. Initiated in one of the three provinces receiving German support, the technical cooperation with the provincial government's staff helped them to improve coordination with other sectors, align the education planning and M&E cycles and increase the level of implementation. The experience has been disseminated to all provinces by the central level of the Ministry of Education and created demand for additional capacity building in the field of M&E.

Of the three 'decentralized planning and finance' programmes operating in Mozambique, one is supported by Germany and underwent a challenging and innovative joint evaluation (the other two are supported by the World Bank and the UN Development Programme - UNDP). A recent decision was made to formulate a 'sort of' SWAP of decentralisation from 2008 on, with German support. The implementation of an efficient system for M&E at decentralized level appears prominently in one of the 'strategic pillars' of the new joint programme. The experience of participating in such a complex exercise of alignment and harmonisation seems to have had positive impacts in terms of an enlarged dialogue among donors and the strengthened ownership by the GoM.

---

<sup>58</sup> A SWAP is also being finalized to strengthen coordinated support for the road sector.



### 4.3 South Africa

#### Statistical overview (2004)

Population:	45.2 million
40% of population below national poverty line <sup>59</sup>	
GNI total:	US\$224.2 billions (Atlas method)
GNI per capita:	US\$4,960 (Atlas method)
Net ODA of GNI:	0.3%
Bilateral share of gross ODA	76%
Germany is the 4 <sup>th</sup> largest donor with an average of US\$50 million in 2003-04	

Source: OECD, UN Human Development Report, World Bank

#### Background

Multi-racial elections held in April 1994 paved the way for the dismantling of the apartheid regime that for more than a century ruled the country. The African National Congress (ANC) won a majority in Parliament and its leader, Nelson Mandela, was elected President. Significant powers and responsibilities were transferred to nine newly created provinces, with elected local legislatures and executives. A new constitution entered into force in 1997. In 1999, Thabo Mbeki succeeded Nelson Mandela as President of South Africa and was re-elected in 2004. Since then, the ANC has been the only governing party, with a two-third majority in Parliament.

The Government of South Africa (GoSA) and its national partners formulated a Development Path in its South Africa 2015 Vision that combines all medium and long-term development strategies existing in the country. The major strategies are the Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP), the Growth, Employment and Redistribution Strategy (GEAR), the Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa (ASGISA), the latter launched recently in 2005. Medium-term priorities are given by the annual President's State of the Nation Address, the Government's Program of Action and the Medium-Term Budget Policy Statement. Provinces also prepare integrated development plans.

There are a number of sector strategies and government programs such as the Expanded Public Works Programme, the Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Programme, the Urban Renewal Programme, and the National Crime Prevention Strategy. Time-bound targets linked to a sequenced development strategy are yet to be clearly defined. Public expenditures have been managed through a Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), prepared on a three-year rolling basis since 1998, and have followed the strategic priorities identified in the RDP, the GEAR.

Civil society is regularly involved in policy formulation, implementation and monitoring. Since 2000, a People's Budget Campaign has monitored expenditure allocations and made policy proposals for the national budget. Parliament is involved in policy formulation, although there is no constitutional requirement for it to approve development plans.

---

<sup>59</sup> Although different definitions of poverty are used, quantitative analyses show that the poverty rate (percentage of individuals classified as poor) in South Africa generally varies between about 40 percent and 50 percent (May, 1998:45).

## **Current development cooperation framework**

The Government leads the coordination of development assistance, though the Directorate for International Development Cooperation (IDC) within the National Treasury. IDC has several mechanisms to officially interact with Development Partners, at different levels of Government. These mechanisms facilitate coordination, monitoring, and the strategic management of the relationship between Government and the donors.

Development partners' support to specific sectors normally integrates the sector strategic frameworks, and is usually captured in 3-5 year country strategy agreements between the parties. Some progressive examples are: the recently concluded UN-SA negotiations, where the UN adopted the Presidential Plan of Action to reflect the SA-UNDAF, including SA's indicators. Another progressive example would be the new SA-EC Country Strategy Framework based on the Presidential Plan of Action, being finalized not only between SA-EC, but also between SA and the EC plus 10 member states. The five major external partners are the EC, the UK, the USA, Germany and the Netherlands, accounting for approximately 80 percent of gross ODA in 2003-04.

External assistance accounts for approximately one percent of the Government budget and focuses more on development of skills and capacity and less on transfer of financial resources. A recent study<sup>60</sup> found that only 30 percent of aid is untied. This is partially because most external partners rely on their own procedures and reporting requirements, including evaluation procedures, for implementation of externally financed projects. The study also indicated that only between 4 to 6 percent of external missions are coordinated.

## **Local capacity for M&E**

The GoSA is on the way to establish a country-level monitoring and evaluation system. Progress on implementation of the annual Government Program of Action is monitored through process and quantitative indicators with annual targets. This is the responsibility of the Presidency. Progress against the targets set in the Presidential Plan of Action is reported regularly to the President, and published in the media. The Government is introducing a system of regulatory impact analysis to reduce or eliminate the negative unintended consequences of laws and regulations, especially on job creation. With the support of UNDP, the Government is also developing a poverty M&E system known as South Africa Poverty Watch.

Local capacity for independent monitoring and evaluation of public policies and development interventions is well developed in South Africa. Although there are problems in M&E of development cooperation<sup>61</sup>, the national institutions are well equipped to do so. IDASA and the *Afrobarometer*<sup>62</sup> are two well-known institutions involved in quantitative surveys and analytical studies. There are consulting companies specialized in M&E, operating in the SADC region. Several organisations involved with M&E are associated in SAMEA – the South Africa Monitoring and Evaluation Association, which is also affiliated to AfrEA – the

---

<sup>60</sup> Government of South Africa, 2006. Co-funded by the International Development Cooperation section of the National Treasury and the EU. More information can be found at [www.dcis.gov.za](http://www.dcis.gov.za)

<sup>61</sup> Problems of definition and different fiscal year are two of the problems highlighted in collecting data for the High Level Forum on the Harmonisation for Aid Effectiveness in South Africa. Government of South Africa, 2006, *ibid*.

<sup>62</sup> "Afrobarometer is an independent research project that measures the social, political and economic atmosphere in Africa". [www.afrobarometer.org](http://www.afrobarometer.org)

African Evaluation Association. African guidelines for evaluation were developed and regular meetings take place, while interaction with other international evaluation associations is maintained.

### **German demand for locally led M&E**

Germany is currently supporting 63 projects in South Africa, one of Germany's approximately 40 priority partner countries. Development cooperation focuses on municipal development, vocational and technical education, private-sector development and policy and administrative advice for good governance. Moreover, combating AIDS has been defined as a cross-sectoral task for development cooperation with South Africa.

In the future, South African-German cooperation will move towards integrating into a European Commission Strategy for cooperation with South Africa. Programming work for such a Country Strategy for the period 2007-2013 is currently underway. The Commission and nine member states - including Germany - have jointly drafted a new Country Strategy and an indicative programme for development cooperation for the period 2007-2013. The areas of support were broadly defined as 'social sector', 'economic sector' and 'governance sector'.

It is not clear to what extent there is a *German demand* for M&E local services at this stage. Development cooperation 'implementing' agencies have their own pace and procedures of carrying out M&E activities, so far not aligned with national systems<sup>63</sup>. It seems that the concept of 'evaluation' for the German cooperation is intrinsically tied to the concept of 'independence'. It is difficult to see how evaluation results feed back into decision making at field level and how monitoring results (of GTZ's E-Val, for instance) are connected to an intended alignment of development cooperation's M&E.

---

<sup>63</sup> See Ficarelli, 2005.



## 4.4 Tanzania

### Statistical overview (2004)

Population:	38.3 million
36% of population below national poverty line (1999-2005)	
GNI total:	US\$12.6 billions (Atlas method)
GNI per capita:	US\$330 (Atlas method)
Net ODA of GNI:	16.2% (2004)
Bilateral share of gross ODA 58% (2004)	
Germany is the 8 <sup>th</sup> largest donor with average of US\$80 million in 2003-04	

Source: OECD, UN Human Development Report, World Bank

### Background

The United Republic of Tanzania was formed in April 1964 by the union of Tanganyika and the state of Zanzibar and Pemba. Despite Tanganyika's violent episodes of rebellion against domination and colonial rule (as the Sumbawa rebellion, the Hehe, and the Maji Maji war), the later struggle for national independence under the leadership of President Julius Nyerere was not marked by sharp confrontation and bloodshed<sup>64</sup>. Tanzania embraced socialism as a political philosophy after independence, translated into practice particularly through Ujamaa<sup>65</sup>, in 1967. Besides the war against Uganda in 1979 (to help Ugandans topple Idi Amin), Tanzania has remained relatively stable and peaceful to date.

The period between the mid-70's and the mid-80's saw several economic crises hit the country. Economic instability was addressed in the early 1980's by the first National Economic Strategy Plan (NESP), soon followed by the first World Bank and International Monetary Fund conditionality plans, the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), and the Economic Recovery Programmes (ERP) I and II (starting in 1986).

Under the presidency of Hassan Mwinyi (1985–1995), international pressure towards liberalization increased, while internally the debate polarized between the socialist and centralized model and the liberal and multiparty one<sup>66</sup>. The cooperation between the Government of Tanzania (GoT) and aid donors had nearly reached breaking point when an 'independent group' was commissioned with the task of investigating problems and possible solutions for the aid relationship (1994). The subsequent 'Helleiner report' (and others that followed in 1997, 1999 and 2000) constitutes the base of present development cooperation with the GoT. Since 2002, the process of investigating 'aid effectiveness' has been institutionalised with the establishment of an Independent Monitoring Group (IMG), under the leadership of the Tanzanian Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF).

### Current development cooperation framework

In 2002, a Tanzania Assistance Strategy (TAS) was put in place, aiming at promoting local leadership and ownership and providing mechanisms for dialogue, alignment and harmonisation of aid. Despite progress during the last years, parallel systems and procedures for delivering, managing, monitoring and evaluating development assistance as

<sup>64</sup> In Zanzibar, though, violence exploded during the 1964 overthrow of the Sultan's government.

<sup>65</sup> "Villagisation".

<sup>66</sup> The multiparty system was introduced in 1992.

well as multiple missions, meetings and analytical studies have remained burdensome for the GoT<sup>67</sup>.

A Joint Assistance Strategy (JAS) is on its final stages of formulation. JAS aims at further orientating cooperation efforts to the goals set in the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP) – also called *Mkukuta*, from the Kiswahili *Mkakati wa Kukuza Uchumi na Kuondoa Umaskini Taifa* - and in the Zanzibar Poverty Reduction Plan (ZPRP), searching for greater aid effectiveness. The key priorities are: adopting a unified country assistance strategy; harmonisation of development partners processes; alignment of development partners' support to Government's priorities, systems and mechanisms; management by results; and facilitating mutual accountability. JAS will contain furthermore an outline for a Technical Assistance (TA) policy.

JAS monitoring and evaluation mechanisms do not seem to be fully aligned with Mkukuta's M&E. JAS proposes an "annual implementation report", jointly carried out ("government, development partners and non-state actors"), using a matrix with indicators drawing from those of the Paris Declaration, and "mid-term and final assessments" by the Independent Monitoring Group. Mkukuta proposes as major instruments a) yearly internal assessments, such as the Public Expenditure Review (PER) and the Poverty and Human Development reports (PHDR); b) *ad hoc* participatory assessments, such as the Participatory Poverty Assessment and other qualitative assessments; c) a comprehensive review to take place at the end of the Mkukuta period (2010). It does not mention the JAS' M&E as one of the instruments to assess the achievement of development goals.

In addition, at the time of writing, a joint evaluation of the Tanzanian health sector SWAp is under preparation<sup>68</sup>. The BMZ is one of the partners supporting the process, which is planned to take place in early 2007.

### **Local capacity for M&E**

The role of Parliament in policy-making processes and evaluation of results is still unclear: "Parliament seems to be consigned to just approving the budget and the legal instruments for policies, if their legalisation is required"<sup>69</sup>. Recent exchanges between the Government and NGOs have reached a more trustworthy level. NGOs have begun to appreciate the Government's effort to widen the participative process while the Government recognises the positive attitude and contribution of the NGOs. NGOs are no longer automatically taken as hostile entities.

The level of internal organisation of NGOs to enhance their participation in the policy process has improved. About 70 national and international NGOs have gathered at an NGO Policy Forum (NPF), and have engaged in critical policy processes, such as in the planning of the poverty reduction strategy and the Public Expenditure Review. Some of the NGOs have become relevant development dialogue partners as well as acting as service providers of development evaluation in the country.

---

<sup>67</sup> Mkukuta, 2005.

<sup>68</sup> Terms of reference are available at [http://www.um.dk/NR/rdonlyres/44C415C4-F317-49FE-833B-A0A3D330FC0C/0/TOR\\_Health\\_Tanz.pdf](http://www.um.dk/NR/rdonlyres/44C415C4-F317-49FE-833B-A0A3D330FC0C/0/TOR_Health_Tanz.pdf)

<sup>69</sup> IMG, 2005.

Of special visibility among the NGOs is the Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF), which leads the IMG. On gender issues, the Tanzania Gender Networking Programme (TGNP) became a point of reference, as well as a resource organisation for gender oriented budget analysis. In the education sector, HakiElimu has been regularly mentioned as a reference organisation in policy analysis and investigation<sup>70</sup>. Hakikazi Catalyst, although not primarily working with M&E, has played a facilitating role, with its publications translating difficult topics into plain language (as for instance, the poverty reduction concepts and the pro-poor budget-making).

Individual local consultants for locally produced evaluations are often drawn from the University of Dar-es-Salaam's faculties, a fact that has generated some criticism. Consultancy work may reduce the time spent on teaching and course preparation, to the detriment of students; the university does not get its entitled overhead although university time and facilities are often used and the university is not able to exert quality control over the work undertaken. There has been a steady increase in the number of private owned consultancy service providers. In the first major joint evaluation of Tanzania's experience with General Budget Support, the Government of Tanzania along with 14 external agencies commissioned a team of researchers from Daima Associates, Tanzania and the Overseas Development Institute, UK.

### **German demand for locally led M&E**

Tanzania is a partner country of German development cooperation, with focus on the fields of water supply and sanitation, the health system, forest and wildlife conservation and on strengthening administration and governmental authorities. From the BMZ point of view, the leadership and ownership of Tanzania's development policies are indisputable, although alignment and harmonisation are a process yet to be consolidated. M&E processes will have to be more aligned with Tanzanian interests and priorities and more harmonized with other donors.

According to the BMZ, the role for development evaluation has changed and it needs a new discourse that can reach the German taxpayers, explaining the logic of partner country responsibility and ownership. While there must still be mechanisms to provide accountability to German constituencies, aid effectiveness can only be measured by the people who are to benefit from aid support.

Partner-country-led development cooperation policies and mechanisms are part of a new architecture of aid in Tanzania, which is supported by the German development cooperation policy. It is not clear however, to what extent the regular monitoring and internal evaluation mechanisms of those DC institutions (GTZ, KfW and others) are articulated with Tanzanian interests and processes.

---

<sup>70</sup> Although it has been "banned" by President Mkapa in 2005 for "unfair criticism" to the Government.



## 4.5 Indonesia

### Statistical overview (2004)

Population:	217.6 million
Population living below the national poverty line (1990-2004)	27 – 42 % (different sources)
GNI per capita:	US\$ 1,140 – 1,280 (Atlas method) (different sources)
Net ODA:	US\$84 million
Net ODA/GNI:	0.0% (the figure is abnormally low due to early loan repayments)
Bilateral share of gross ODA	83%
Germany is the 3 <sup>rd</sup> largest donor with an average of US\$163 million in 2003-04	

Source: OECD, UN Human Development Report, World Bank

### Background

Until 1997 Indonesia was considered as one of Asia's emerging tigers with steady economic growth and declining levels of poverty. The Asian Financial Crisis in 1997 resulted in a sharp economic contraction, rising poverty, currency devaluation, and bankruptcy of much of the banking and corporate sectors. Amidst these economic challenges, Indonesia embarked on a transition from an authoritarian to a democratic system. The democratic and decentralized decision-making system gave greater voice to civil society and exposed significant governance and corruption problems. Nevertheless, while decentralisation laws were approved, the necessary governance systems and local institutional capacity still require time to mature. The decision-making system has been subject to frequent change, with five presidents heading the Government between 1998 and 2004. After several difficult years, the country has regained some social, macroeconomic, and political stability with the election of the present government in 2004. In 2003, Indonesia graduated from the International Monetary Fund stabilization programme. In the recent years, the Government has focused on debt management and this has taken a toll on public investments. Nevertheless, "although many economic management and governance challenges remain, achieving macroeconomic stability after such severe economic shocks, current high energy prices, and political changes represents a considerable achievement"<sup>71</sup>.

### Current development cooperation framework

Indonesia (similar to India) falls into the International Development Association (IDA) category of a 'blend borrower'. Blend borrowers are eligible for IDA loans because of low per capita incomes but are also eligible for IBRD loans because they are financially creditworthy.<sup>72</sup>

Indonesia started formulating a PRSP in 2002 and finalised it in late 2004. During that process, the national government encouraged local governments to provide input in the process by piloting local PRSPs in partnership with district stakeholders. A major focus of the PRSP is local governance reform, thereby linking poverty alleviation with enhanced decentralisation.

---

<sup>71</sup> AsDB, 2006

<sup>72</sup> IDA lends to those countries that had an income in 2005 of less than US\$1,025 per capita and lack the financial ability to borrow from the World Bank.

The main agency responsible for coordinating foreign development cooperation and poverty reduction strategies is BAPPENAS (National Development Planning Agency), which comes under the State Ministry for Development Planning. Indonesia implements a medium term (5 years) development strategy, called *Propenas*, which sets out the basic framework for development cooperation strategies.

Indonesia has not undertaken a formalised joint evaluation arising from a Joint Assistance Strategy (JAS). However, a number of initiatives in the past two years go into that direction. One such initiative is the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition (TEC). The TEC was established in February 2005 in the wake of the December 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunamis. The main aims of the TEC are:

- To improve the quality of humanitarian action – including the linkages to longer term recovery and development – by learning lessons from the international response to the tsunami.
- To provide accountability to both donor and affected-country populations for the overall response.
- To test the TEC approach as a possible model for future joint collaborative evaluation

A Synthesis Report summarising the main findings of the TEC was launched in July 2006. It examines the successes and failures as well as the constraints within which the emergency response occurred. It does this by distilling the findings and learning not only from the TEC's thematic evaluations but from over 140 additional reports, including many TEC member agencies' real-time and ex-post evaluations as well as learning reviews.

### **Local capacity for M&E**

The research landscape in Indonesia is dominated by its universities. The University of Indonesia in Jakarta is the leading academic institution, followed by the University of Gadjah Mada in Yogyakarta. Both universities have a number of Centres that concentrate on a wide range of research, from bio-technology to national/ regional strategic issues.

The strength of the universities contributes to a good research base, particularly in quantitative methods. Similar to India, Indonesia has a sound statistical expertise. In terms of methodological know-how and experience on M&E, the research institutions focus on assessing impacts of national programmes and policies. The experience in M&E of development cooperation does not appear strong, in contrast to countries such as Bangladesh. This is easily explained by the relatively low relevance of aid for the Indonesian economy.

Another factor impeding service provision on development M&E is the perceived lack of a tradition of 'critical review', that is of particular importance for evaluation. This could be explained by so-called 'cultural factors' but could also be due to long years of authoritarian governments, which has curtailed independent and critical research. This factor was cited as a problem in the 2003 cross-country evaluation of Regional Rural Development programmes (RRD), undertaken by the BMZ, in which Indonesia was a case study country<sup>73</sup>.

Private sector consulting companies play a large role in the provision of donor related services, aided by their ability to produce research in English. The dominance of the national

---

<sup>73</sup> The other case studies came from Sri Lanka, Tanzania and Zambia. A synthesis of the reports can be viewed on: <http://www.bmz.de/en/service/infotehk/evaluation/BMZEvaluierungsberichte/index.html>

language, Bahasa, in all aspects of governance, research and private sector is evident, and stands in contrast to its counterparts in South Asia<sup>74</sup>. While the language issue could also be an impediment for donors seeking local research partners, the knowledge of local contexts and histories of Indonesian research institutions should balance, if not outweigh, language restrictions.

### **German demand for locally led M&E**

The perception of BMZ officials in charge of Indonesia is that the classic approach of project/ programme development cooperation and evaluation would continue for some time. A number of explanations are presented for this.

One is the relatively low significance of ODA in Indonesia's economy. At a current (2004) level of 0.0 percent of GNI, the enthusiasm to embark on a process of harmonisation on the part of the Government is assessed as being low. Observers on Indonesia also point to a reluctance to give up 'donor control', which they feel could be better ensured through bi-lateral dealings.

Another challenge is the complex decentralised structure of governance in Indonesia, which impedes the flow of information between district levels to the centre and other levels of government. Since 2001, Indonesia has decentralised many of its functions to over 400 districts, and capacities, especially in monitoring, are assessed as weak at the district level. Therefore, supporting capacities at the decentralised provincial and district levels are deemed to be of high importance.

In terms of experiences made through TEC and RRD exercises, the results do not indicate an overwhelming enthusiasm for joint (donor-partner) evaluations. The Tsunami evaluation was seen as encouraging and could hold potential lessons, although the RRD evaluation was assessed as not having met the standards of critical review required by the BMZ. 'Cultural factors', such as the reluctance to offend, were seen as possible explanations.

---

<sup>74</sup> The wide prevalence of *Bahasa* was also a constraint on the ability of this consultant to appraise websites of Indonesian research institutions.



## 4.6 India

### Statistical overview (2004)

Population:	1,079.7 million
Population living below the national poverty line (1990-2002)	28.6%
GNI per capita:	US\$720 (Atlas method)
Net ODA:	US\$691 million
Net ODA/GNI:	0.1%
Bilateral share of gross ODA	59%
Germany is the 5 <sup>th</sup> largest donor with average of US\$157 million in 2003-04	

Source: OECD, UN Human Development Report, World Bank

### Background

India, similar to Indonesia, is an IDA 'blend borrower' and qualifies for special treatment. Despite being the fifth largest borrower of the IDA in 2005 (after Ethiopia), India is not party to the PRSP process. India (similar to Brazil) is also not a signatory of the DAC 2005 Paris Declaration and therefore is not under obligation to conform to the agreement.

India is also part of the group of 'Anchor countries' (together with Brazil, China, Mexico, Nigeria, and South Africa), which due to their economic weight, political influence and regional importance, warrant a different form of development cooperation, one that is based on a strategic partnership. These many 'exceptions' makes India a difficult case to assess in terms of the prevailing discussion on harmonisation and alignment. The political influence it holds in the region, as well as on an international level, will ensure that the country will define its own terms in the present development cooperation discourse.

### Current development cooperation framework

India plans according to Five Year Plans (FYP) and will complete its tenth FYP in 2006. It is currently in the process of finalising its eleventh Five Year Plan<sup>75</sup>. Donors are invited to align concepts to the FYP and development cooperation takes place under the traditional project / programme approach. The FYPs are administered by the National Planning Commission whose Chairperson is also the country's Prime Minister. Mid-term appraisals of the FYPs are conducted by Planning Commission.

In recent years, India has rationalised the number of donors it cooperates with, with the result that a number of bi-lateral donors are no longer active in India. Germany remains in the pool of bi-laterals invited to continue. Due to the high involvement of donors in the Health sector, it is the obvious choice for the development of a SWAp, with the national government planning a sector programme that could potentially evolve into a SWAp.

### Local capacity for M&E

In keeping with its vast pool of qualified human resources, India has abundant capacities in research. To start with, there are over 225 Universities and Institutes of 'scholarly' training in India. This excludes Colleges (undergraduate degree awarding institutions) which are more

<sup>75</sup> The recommendations of the various sectoral Steering Committees can be viewed on the website of the Planning Commission: <http://www.planningcommission.nic.in>

than three times in number. Indian research has a strong quantitative tradition and the high degree of expertise in statistical methods means that data is abundantly available.

The research landscape also comprises NGOs which literally run into the thousands. Many of these carry out research and conduct M&E for local government and externally funded projects, and have a strong advocacy tradition. Finally, a large number of consulting firms also operate in the country, set up by professionals and/or academics who have worked in well known research institutes and universities.

Not surprisingly, in this vast array, quality is not always easy to discern. One such filter is accreditation with the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR). The ICSSR was established in 1969 by the Government of India to promote research in social sciences. It does this by sponsoring social science research programmes and projects and administering grants to institutions and individuals for research in social sciences. It also acts as a coordinating point for research and guide research into areas deemed of relevance for study.

What clearly distinguishes India from its South Asian counterparts is that given the relatively low penetration of aid, the research base is not one that is oriented or driven by donor needs and requirements. Hence, it is not surprising to find good research institutes that do not have a strong track record in development evaluation. Herein lie the challenges for cooperating on evaluation. The strong local context and sense of 'Indianness' will ensure that research is grounded in Indian realities, but it may require sustained cooperation and close interaction, for collaborative evaluations to create synergies and bear results that meet standards and expectations of both sides.

### **German demand for locally led M&E**

In volume terms, according to the OECD, Germany ranked 5<sup>th</sup> among donors, coming 4<sup>th</sup> amongst bi-lateral donors, after Japan, the UK and the USA. The BMZ identifies three priority sectors in India, namely, Energy, Economic Reform and Health. In addition to the official agencies, GTZ and KfW, India is the popular base of a plethora of German NGOs, both small and large, for which no clear understanding exists on how they are evaluated.

The approach to evaluating German development cooperation continues along the traditional project / programme lines. In general the evaluations are led by the German side, although teams are mixed with the involvement of local professionals either as consultants or resource persons. Given a perceived decreasing comparative advantage of technical cooperation, the thinking within BMZ appears to be in favour of budget support. This could pave the way for joint evaluations in the future. Nevertheless, according to those familiar with the evaluation scenery in India, the strong sense of autonomy among the Indian bureaucracy, as well as the tendency to do it the Indian way, would present some challenges for joint evaluations.

## 4.7 Bangladesh

### Statistical overview (2004)

Population:	140.5million
Population living below the national poverty line (1990-2002)	49.8%
GNI per capita:	US\$440
Net ODA:	US\$1,404million
Net ODA / GNI:	2.3%
Bilateral share of gross ODA	50%
Germany is not among the top 10 donors.	

Source: OECD, UN Human Development Report, World Bank

### Background

Around independence, Bangladesh was described as the “test case of development.” Despite many challenges, its development record thus far has been quite impressive. There have been substantial progress in indicators of social and economic well-being and the incidence of poverty has declined substantially between 1991/92 and 2000; although the extent and depth of poverty in Bangladesh remains high, with half of the population still living below the poverty line. Bangladesh embarked on its PRSP process in 2002 with the consultation process and prepared an I-PRSP in 2003. A full PRSP titled, “Unlocking the Potential – National Strategy for Accelerated Poverty Reduction” (NSAPR) was released in October 2005. A special secretariat called the National Poverty Focal Point within the Planning Commission was set up in 2003, to monitor and track the progress of anti-poverty programmes, including the PRSP.

### Current development cooperation framework

As could be expected of a country with a high aid dependence and consequent high donor presence, donor coordination is of high imperative. At the apex level this occurs during the periodic meetings of Bangladesh Development Forum (BDF), which usually take place in the World Bank’s European headquarters in Paris.

At the more operational level, the donor community since 1998 is organised under the umbrella of the Local Consultative Group (LCG). Its current (as of September 2006) membership comprises 24 bi-laterals<sup>76</sup> and nine multilaterals. Germany is represented by its Ambassador. The LCG has 21 Sub-Groups to facilitate more in-depth dialogue and collaboration in important development sectors and themes<sup>77</sup>.

The main scope of the LCG, in addition to facilitating regular coordination and information sharing meetings (which are chaired on rotation), is to combine forces either on research efforts or on “high-profile initiatives of common interest (e.g. the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper and the Aid Governance initiative)”<sup>78</sup>. The activities of the LCG are financed by a Multi-Donor Fund which operates as a shared funding window that is also accessible for the

<sup>76</sup> They include members from Embassies as well as development implementers, e.g. Canadian embassy and CIDA.

<sup>77</sup> LCG website: <http://www.lcgbangladesh.org/default.php>

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid*

Government of Bangladesh (GoB). The website of the LCG contains substantial and updated information on donor activities including progress on MDG, PRSP and Aid Effectiveness.

On Harmonisation, Bangladesh has much more to report on than its South Asian neighbours. In August 2006, the GoB released a Harmonisation Action Plan (HAP)<sup>79</sup>. The implementation and monitoring of the HAP is done by a Harmonisation Implementation Task Force, made up of Government and donor representatives. The document has been formulated on the three principles of ownership, alignment and harmonisation with reference to the PRS, and identifies the required action. In addition, Programme Based Approaches (i.e., SWAs) have been identified for health and primary education sectors. Under 'Managing for Results', joint evaluations are planned for 2005 onwards, although as of present, none have taken place.

On the donor side, the AsDB, DFID, Government of Japan and WB have partnered to work towards a joint strategy for Bangladesh. In addition, a new Procurement Regulation was introduced in 2003 which takes into account the harmonisation efforts of the Multilateral Development Banks.

### **Local capacity for M&E**

What is evident, also from the review above, is that the Bangladeshi Government and Non-Government landscape is quite responsive to demand from donors and external imperatives. Consequently, the NGO landscape is vibrant, thriving on donor funding of development initiatives that are not always on the same creative and innovative level as the Grameen Bank.

However, it would not be fair to attribute the well developed research and civil society base to donor demand. The Bengali intellectual tradition no doubt plays a role. Organisations such as the Grameen Bank are 'home grown' responses to Bangladesh's lagging status in development. This relatively well developed NGO base (estimated at over 20,000) however, poses a challenge to the outsider in terms of discerning quality and focus.

In the research landscape, well known organisations such as the Bangladesh Institute for Development Studies (BIDS) dominate the field. The donor market has, however, created room for the emergence of a number of independent institutes also undertaking research. A common tradition in the South Asian scene is the setting up of new institutes by well-known 'intellectuals' who have served with well-known institutes. Hence in the past 15 years or so, a number of new and in many cases more robust, organisations have entered the fray. M&E experience is also relatively well developed in Bangladesh in comparison to India or Sri Lanka, since client-oriented research services form a large part of the financial turnover of these institutions. Institutions such as the Centre for Policy Dialogue have sought to fill the vacuum on independent policy research and could prove interesting partners in development evaluation.

---

<sup>79</sup> The HAP is coordinated by the PRS-HAP Cell within the Economic Relations Division. See report on <http://www.lcgbangladesh.org/news/HAP-final%20doc%2023%20July-Formatted.pdf>

## 4.8 Cambodia

### Statistical overview (2004)

Population:	13.6 million
Population living below the national poverty line (1990-2002)	36.1%
GNI per capita:	US\$320
Net ODA:	US\$478 million
Net ODA of GNI:	11.2%
Bilateral share of gross ODA)	66%
Germany is the 7 <sup>th</sup> largest donor with an average of US\$22million in 2003-04	

Source: OECD, UN Human Development Report, World Bank

### Background

Cambodia has come a long way since 1979 when it emerged from “below ground zero”<sup>80</sup>. Since the mid 1990’s the pace of development and economic growth has picked up, thanks to robust garment exports and tourism, which has seen economic growth, averaging 10 percent in recent years and approached 13½ percent in 2005.

The picture on poverty and human development however remains weak. Poverty, while down from high levels of 56 percent of the population in 1993/94, to a current estimated 34.7 percent<sup>81</sup> is still high. The country also has the highest prevalence of HIV in Asia. According to the definition of aid dependence used in this study<sup>82</sup>, with a Net ODA/GNI 11.2 percent Cambodia can be regarded as aid dependent, making it the only country among the Asian case studies to fall into this group.

### Current development cooperation framework

Cambodia embarked on the PRSP process in 2000, preparing a PRSP in 2002 after a lengthy consultative process. Further, in 2003 the Cambodia Millennium Development Goals (CMDGs) were prepared and adopted, also involving an intensive consultative process. In 2005, the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) decided to focus on priority and strategic goals to be reached in the next five years. This led to a review of the 2002 PRSP and a new PRSP titled the National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) 2006-2010 was adopted by the Parliament in May 2006. The NSDP is single overarching document that synthesises and prioritises the goals of the 2002 PRSP, previous medium term strategies called the Socio-Economic Development Plan and the Socio-Economic and the Cambodian MDGs. The NSDP is intended “to align sector strategies and planning cycles to overall long term vision, as well as guide external development partners to align and harmonise their efforts towards better aid-effectiveness and higher 'net resources' transfer than hitherto”<sup>83</sup>. The NSDP did not go through yet another round of consultations, but instead is seen by some observers<sup>84</sup> to have been less donor-driven, with a far greater ownership by the RGC as compared with the previous documents.

---

<sup>80</sup> RGC, 2005.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>82</sup> Bräutigam, 2000.

<sup>83</sup> RGC, 2005.

<sup>84</sup> IDA/IMF, 2006.

On harmonisation and alignment, moves are underway to integrate the NSDP with the Consultative Group process that comprise donors and the RGC. However, “more effort is required among Cambodia’s donor partners to align their aid priorities to that of the NSDP. This would entail a further elaboration of Government priorities and a move by donors to multi-year aid commitments. Both processes are likely to take time”<sup>85</sup>.

At present there are about 18 bilateral donors, 16 UN agencies, the World Bank, the IMF, the Asian Development Bank (AsDB) and the European Commission, providing assistance to Cambodia. The Council for the Development of Cambodia was established to coordinate all external investment (ODA and FDI). In general, each donor operates individually, but in 2003, AsDB, IMF and the World Bank finalized a joint Integrated Fiduciary Assessment and Public Expenditure Review. Some improvements in donor coordination have been achieved since the Government has taken the lead with measures, such as the introduction of an Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee to Strengthen Development Partnerships, the establishment of a focal point within the Government for partnerships, and the strengthening and expansion of the ODA management information system<sup>86</sup>.

SWApS have been operational in the education and health sectors (the latter is completed), and in the decentralisation programme. Work was also underway to develop a SWAp for Land Management and Administration as well as one for Private Sector Development. Following a harmonisation workshop (jointly sponsored by the Government and the WB) in January 2004, the government began preparing a National Action Plan on Harmonisation in collaboration with donors. The Plan is not as yet complete.

### **Local capacity for M&E**

As could be expected for a country that lost its intellectual and professional elite during the Khmer Rouge years, building national capacities, will take several generations.

The high influx of aid to restore the ravaged country has also blunted local initiative, with the phenomena that until today, a number of research and other knowledge generating institutes are owned and run by expatriates.

Possibly also due to the urgency for capacity development, the Cambodian M&E landscape is abundant with training institutes, conducting project management trainings for the Cambodian as well as the regional market.

Local research quality remains a critical issue, with only a handful of organisations equipped to conduct good research. On the positive side, the sample of institutes profiled in Part Two, have a good M&E base of experience, which could be built on to develop an own Cambodian perspective to development evaluation in the future.

---

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>86</sup> Aid Harmonisation website: [http://www.aidharmonisation.org/ah-cla/ah-browser/index-abridged?rgn\\_cnt=in&master=master](http://www.aidharmonisation.org/ah-cla/ah-browser/index-abridged?rgn_cnt=in&master=master)

## 4.9 Nepal

### Statistical overview (2004)

Population:	25.2 million
Population living below the national poverty line (1990-2002)	42%
GNI per capita:	US\$260 – 322 (2004 – 2006)
Net ODA:	US\$427 million
Net ODA of GNI:	6.4%
Bilateral share of gross ODA	67%
Germany is about the 5 <sup>th</sup> largest donor with an average of US\$ 58 million around 2004	

Source: OECD, UN Human Development Report, World Bank, Nepal Central Bureau of Statistics

### Background

Nepal has been dogged by political strife led by the Maoist insurgency since the mid 1990s, which had overtaken much of the country, causing severe disruption to development activities. The situation escalated with the prorogation of Parliament by the King in early 2005. The picture has, however, changed dramatically in recent months, following a civil uprising against the Monarch, the restoration of Parliamentary democracy and a landmark truce between the Maoist rebels and the Royal Government of Nepal (RGN)<sup>87</sup>.

The slowdown in the implementation of development activities has affected the implementation of the PRSP. Although declining, poverty remains high, with 31percent of the population living below the poverty line in 2003/04.

### Current development cooperation framework

The RGN finalised its PRSP in 2002, which takes the form of its tenth Five Year Plan. The PRSP targets encompass many of the MDG targets that Nepal aims to attain over three FYP periods. In accordance with the PRSP, a number of reforms are underway, covering the financial sector, service delivery, governance, and donor harmonisation. Expenditure management reform, especially the deepening of the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), is one of many initiatives underway. The MTEF has aligned resources to PRS outputs.

In terms of aid effectiveness, according to a 2006 PRSP progress review<sup>88</sup>, there has been some progress in aid coordination and harmonisation at the overall programme, sectoral and financial management levels. The harmonisation is aided by a set of plans, management tools and action strategies (PRSP, MTEF, sectoral business plans, joint portfolio performance review, PRS monitoring, and Financial Management Information System).

There are several programmes in selected sectors that have common operational and financial modalities and are jointly funded by multiple donors. Two SWAps are underway in the education and health sectors and common financing and project operation modalities are being prepared in the water supply and local development sectors. Investments into the social sector (especially education, health and drinking water/sanitation) are urgently

<sup>87</sup> According to constitutional reforms underway at the time of writing, RGC would change to Government of Nepal.

<sup>88</sup> WB, 2006.

required in order to fulfil poverty reduction targets<sup>89</sup>. Two SWAps in the areas of education and the health sector have the budget allocation for the sectors. A sector-wide approach has been adopted in planning, programming, funding, monitoring (performance review) and delivering health care services.

On the side of M&E, a practice of joint biannual reviews – one for health sector performance and another on the outputs-based work programme and budgeting – has been initiated. Two donors have been pooling resources from 2004/05, following the adoption of the sector-wide approach and the Nepal Health Sector Programme, including UNFPA. On the side of the RGN, the tenth FYP Plan/PRSP has elaborate M&E provisions including annual poverty monitoring, process monitoring and reporting. The Nepalese National Planning Commission began putting in place a comprehensive Poverty Monitoring and Analysis System (PMAS) in 2004 which contains a set of intermediate and final indicators for reporting annual progress. In addition, the government has expanded *Nepal Info*, a database that includes both PRSP and MDG indicators and is updated annually. The most recent Nepal Info datasheet contains 197 PRSP and MDG indicators.

### **Local capacity for M&E**

The research scene in Nepal is small and concentrated among a few prominent social scientists, and research coming out from the University of Tribhuvan, Nepal's leading university. While Nepal is much researched by outsiders, a strong tradition of home grown research in the social sciences is weak.

In the area of development M&E, the high aid component of the government's development programmes, has nurtured a demand driven private consultancy market in M&E services. At the same time, given the limited supply of good professionals, the cost of service providers tends to be higher than its neighbours, especially for the small pool of well-known and better regarded consultants.

The location of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) headquarters in Kathmandu, the capital of Nepal, has also meant that Nepal is well placed to act as a focal point in development dialogue and discussions.

---

<sup>89</sup> Foreign assistance made up about 58 percent of the total allocation for development programmes in 2004/05.

## 4.10 Sri Lanka

### Statistical overview (2004)

Population:	19.4 million
Population living below the national poverty line (1990-2002)	25%
GNI per capita:	US\$1,010
Net ODA:	US\$519 million
Net ODA of GNI:	2.7%
Bilateral share of gross ODA	69%
Germany is the 4 <sup>th</sup> largest donor with an average US\$37 million in 2003-04	

Source: OECD, UN Human Development Report, World Bank

### Background

Sri Lanka has been in the grip of a long-standing conflict based on a separatist struggle. The conflict entered a new phase of hope in 2002, with the signing of a cease fire agreement. This saw a period of economic growth especially in 'non-conflict' southern and western parts of the country, with annual GDP growth climbing to 6.0 percent per annum in 2005. Since the start of 2006, however, renewed conflict has cast the cease-fire in doubt, and jeopardised development efforts, particularly in the conflict-affected parts of the country. In order to better respond to the persisting challenges the German development cooperation in 2006 has adjusted its strategy. The overall approach, according to the BMZ, is to ensure equality between all beneficiaries and the various ethnic groups. In addition, Germany continues to offer its support to the peace process and conflict transformation. The new strategy focuses on poverty reduction and reconstruction in the north and east of Sri Lanka, and on peace education and conflict transformation. Projects concentrating on the more prosperous south will be terminated as scheduled at the end of their current phase<sup>90</sup>.

An additional challenge to development cooperation, since 2001, has been the rapid changes in government and shifting national development priorities.

### Current development cooperation framework

The Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL) embarked on a PRS process as early as 1998, with a two-year consultation process leading to a Poverty Reduction Framework in 2000. The Framework was elaborated into a full-fledged Poverty Reduction Strategy in late 2001, only to be taken back to the drawing board due to a change of government later that same year. The document was revised and re-published in the form of the economic strategy of the new government in 2002. Similar to the experience in Cambodia, the 2001 PRS, while involving a long drawn out consultative process with civil society, was seen as donor driven with a low involvement of decision makers in the bureaucracy and in government. In contrast, the 2002 PRS saw minimal civil society input, but with a high government ownership, in particularly from the top.

The implementation of the PRS came to an abrupt halt in April 2004, with the election of a new government that questioned the neo-classical approach to poverty reduction contained in the 2003 PRS. Since then, a further change of political leadership in late 2005 has

<sup>90</sup> BMZ 2003, December 2006

effectively put the lid on renewed attempts by the donor community to place the PRS back on the agenda.

The current turmoil has insulated Sri Lanka from the DAC processes, although the country is a signatory to the declarations. Donor coordination takes the form of regular meeting by Donor Coordination Committees, organised along thematic issues such as conflict and the PRS (the latter has stopped meeting regularly). The committee on the PRS was chaired on a rotational basis while the conflict committee was led by the UN. The December 2004 Tsunami lent an added impetus on coordination, widening the net to include NGOs. However, these moves go more in the direction of coordinating implementation and less towards harmonisation as envisaged in the DAC declarations.

On that side, visible progress is yet to be seen, aside from some moves on environmental policy. The Asian Development Bank, the Japanese Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC) and the World Bank are working together to harmonise environmental and social safeguards with the GoSL. Harmonisation of funding for the Tsunami Emergency Recovery Programme is also underway, with World Bank, AsDB and JBIC pooling resources and taking over sectoral responsibilities.

On the macro side, having reached a per capita income of US\$1,188 in 2005, Sri Lanka is no longer a least income country, but a lower middle income country. This also means that Sri Lanka is no longer eligible for concessionary terms of the IDA. According to the IDA, Sri Lanka now receives IDA credit on “hardened terms”<sup>91</sup>.

### **Local capacity for M&E**

Sri Lanka has a strong tradition of social research helped by a highly literate population that makes it an outlier among developing nations. Somewhat similar to India, Sri Lanka has strong capacities in statistics and data collection, with the Central Bank of Sri Lanka and the Department of Census and Statistics, providing a large body of data for economic and social analysis.

The institutional landscape is also well developed, although a number of previous vanguards in social research such as the Marga Institute, the Agrarian Research and Training Institute are less active at present.

The recent years have seen a number of institutes adopting service oriented approaches, with more emphasis on applied research, and inputting into planning processes of donor supported development. Similar to some of its neighbours, Sri Lanka also has a vibrant consultancy market that responds to the market for development services, particularly in M&E.

Institutions such as the Centre for Poverty Analysis are leading the fray in combining applied research with advisory services on development evaluation, and are being joined by units in the Universities (such as SPARC) and the traditionally macro-economic policy focussed, Institute of Policy studies.

---

<sup>91</sup> IDA, 2006.

## 5. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

### 5.1 Findings

The study looked at trends and practices in evaluation in the context of the DAC principles of *ownership*, *alignment* and *harmonisation*. The philosophy behind the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness is that the developing world should lead its own development. Development partners (donors and providers of development cooperation, i.e., aid) committed themselves to align their support to the recipient countries' policies and procedures. To better align development aid, donors pledged to harmonize their approaches and mechanisms, searching for long-term sustainability and impacts.

The Declaration signatories recognize that “while the volumes of aid and other development resources must increase to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, aid effectiveness must increase significantly as well to support partner country efforts to strengthen governance and improve development performance”<sup>92</sup>.

#### **Ownership: capacity for country led development processes**

Of the 12 indicators used to assess progress towards a more significant impact of aid, one indicator refers to ownership: “at least 75 percent of developing partner countries have operational development strategies (including PRSs) that have clear strategic priorities linked to a medium-term expenditure framework and reflected in annual budgets”<sup>93</sup>.

All the countries reviewed have medium-term development plans, although the extent to which they are operational and linked to a clear medium-term expenditure framework is questionable, for reasons that also have to do with predictability of the aid flows and ownership of the national priorities. Nevertheless, the reviews of trends in the ten case study countries show clear moves towards **performance measurement in the public sector**, in line with OECD standards – albeit at varied paces. Most bureaucracies in partner countries appear to be moving away from the traditional M&E systems that were geared to measure purely physical and financial progress of programmes.

The major contributor to this trend in highly aid-dependent countries has been the discussion and formulation of steps to reach the MDGs through national plans and PRSPs. While much of the debate is still on indicator fulfilment, rather than on core issues like the dynamics of poverty, a conceptual shift to ‘managing for results’ when formulating national overall and sector development plans is evident.

Monitoring and evaluation by governments are, however, concepts not yet fully institutionalised or, at the most, are operationalised in a piecemeal way. Fragmentation, lack of linkages between M&E elements into M&E systems, lack of integration between sectoral and territorial processes are just some of the challenges ahead for developing countries that are moving towards a results-based-monitoring and evaluation system.

---

<sup>92</sup> OECD, 2005b, p.1.

<sup>93</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/57/60/36080258.pdf>

The role of civil society in this process is crucial, not only to catalyse the move towards a national developmental consensus (or at least national policies), but also to monitor and evaluate performance and results of public policies. The growth of M&E capacity in the parliament, among research institutions and within civil society organisations will help increase ownership of development processes by partner countries.

### **Evaluation in German development cooperation**

Germany is seen to be actively supporting the international vision of a more effective aid delivery. It has undertaken a number of pilot efforts to reform its aid delivery. They include: a renewed attention to field-based German coordination (e.g. additional BMZ staff in embassies; use of country and sector teams, use of a one-country strategy for all agencies); and more flexible use of delivery modalities that go beyond a project-based system, to include programme-based approaches and budget support. Suggestions contained in the 2005 DAC Peer Review report<sup>94</sup> include: further strengthening of the role of the Development Cooperation Officer under the leadership of BMZ; the secondment of additional BMZ staff to embassies; further integration of German implementation agency operations and programmes in the field; and the review of country sector strategies to better align them with partner country-led strategies.

Moves towards **harmonising** evaluation procedures are also clearly evident in German development cooperation. Seeking better internal coordination, the past two years have seen the German government agencies<sup>95</sup> involved in a process of reforming internal evaluation procedures to bring them in line, first with the DAC evaluation criteria and secondly, with one another. The outcome has been an agreement on a standardised format for evaluations applied by this group<sup>96</sup>. Moreover, German development organisations are increasingly becoming partners in joint evaluations, across sectors, themes or regional / international commitments. The picture is, however, mixed among the NGOs. As could be expected, given the substantial variation in size, outreach, thematic focus and degrees of professionalism, evaluation practices differ widely. DAC principles are not binding on NGOs and no discernable trend is evident in using the criterion of ownership, alignment and harmonisation to improve aid effectiveness. There is certainly a move towards standardising evaluations through the introduction of formats and guidelines for consultants and partner / cooperating agencies. Nevertheless, there is far more room for partner organisations to lead developmental processes, including M&E. Unlike the case of the government actors, there is so far not much interaction and exchange among the German NGOs as a way to learn from one another and exchange (coordinate) knowledge on evaluation practices.

On **alignment**, progress in policy and actual practice is varied. In policy terms, the recent years have seen clear progress to align German development cooperation with national development strategies. The formulation of PRSs and MDG in partner countries, have led to more specific inclusion of partner country national priorities in German development policy papers and country strategies. There have been experiences of jointly developing policies (e.g. European Commission and South Africa) and programmes (e.g. Decentralization Programme in Mozambique). In practice, however, alignment depends on the existence of

---

<sup>94</sup> OECD, 2006a.

<sup>95</sup> GTZ, KfW, InWent and DED.

<sup>96</sup> A distinction is made here between monitoring and evaluation. Harmonisation applies to the so-called "independent evaluations" led by independent evaluation units in donor countries. M&E that fall within the scope of implementing agencies continue along traditional project/ programme lines and utilise a number of instruments to assess performance and impact.

“reliable country systems” (indicator 2 of the Paris Declaration), which are measured by the “Country Policy and Institutional Assessment” index, defined by the World Bank (IDA). To be considered ‘reliable’, a country has to reach the “good performance index threshold of 3.5”<sup>97</sup>. So far, only 15 African countries ‘classify’<sup>98</sup>. The findings of the present study suggest that alignment is welcomed albeit with some reserve. Moving towards budget support and untied aid creates a problem of lack of visibility for the donor-country, an important means to secure necessary resources for aid allocation.

NGOs seem to perform better on alignment. Alignment has a different meaning here. NGOS are traditionally oriented to their implementing partners’ needs and objectives, particularly the medium and smaller NGOs that have leaner head office organisational set-ups. NGOs have also traditionally relied on their institutional partners to implement development activities. Evaluation modalities are much more supportive of their partners’ needs, concepts and interests, although these might not necessarily be aligned with the development priorities and policies of the partner country.

In the final analysis, the trends observed present a **dilemma**; harmonisation among donors results in a move away from alignment to partner’s systems and procedures. In other words, efforts to harmonise evaluation practices among the donors have resulted in the standardisation of approaches, which come at the cost of opening up to partner country approaches and practices. The political result may be that donor countries harmonise their interests in order to streamline (or to discipline, as some critics put it) partner countries’ systems, at the loss of concerted alignment approaches.

### **Local capacities in evaluation**

Three groups can be distinguished in evaluation landscapes in partner countries: academic/research organisations made up of universities and research institutions; NGOs that also engage in research and evaluation (usually advocacy oriented); and private sector consulting firms.

While experiences in the case studies vary significantly, the trend towards operational research is evident, and indicates an institutional response to the demand for evaluation. This comes from domestic institutions such as Government and Parliament as well as from donors. Increasingly, academic **research institutes** and Universities respond to demand and offer advisory services for research and evaluation. This provides a space for the engagement of Government with civil society institutions as well as for donors to seek a ‘national’ or ‘local’ approach in development evaluation.

Capacities in evaluation differ more significantly among the ten countries. Brazil and South Africa, for instance, have well-developed (even if still fragmented and often overlapping) government M&E systems, with an important role played by civil society groups, research institutes and also Parliament. However, aid dependent countries<sup>99</sup> such as Tanzania, Mozambique and Cambodia have much less political space to develop their own M&E

---

<sup>97</sup> CPIA is a World Bank tool to capture the quality of a country’s policies and institutional arrangements. CPIA was developed and first employed in the mid-1970s periodically updated. The ranking of countries started to be publicly disclosed only in 2000.

<sup>98</sup> See classifications at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/2004CPIAweb1.pdf>

<sup>99</sup> For a definition of “aid-dependent country”, see Bräutigam, 2000, p. 9 to 15. Aid intensity at levels of 10 percent of GNP and above is a marker of probable aid dependence.

concepts and practice, and parliaments act only to approve budgets. **Non-government organisations** are seen to be highly dependent on external funding and therefore lack the necessary independence to bring on a national approach. In Asia the picture is also mixed. India and Indonesia are not aid dependent and have a large body of NGO commissioned evaluation supporting own research/ policy imperatives. Cambodia, Bangladesh and Nepal stand in contrast, with high aid dependency and consequently a large market for evaluation services that serve an almost exclusive donor clientele.

M&E expertise also comes from a growing number of **private consultancy** service providers. The market for these consultancy providers is usually donor driven, although 'national' demand is growing (particularly as 'development' enters the realm of measurable public goods). 'Pure' commercially oriented players such as market research companies are also beginning to enter the development market, bringing in a much sought after expertise (in survey methods) and resources (network of data gatherers) to undertake large-scale development surveys.

While the expanding consultancy market makes available a pool of service providers in evaluation, these firms can be considered 'development partners' only if they have as vision or mandate a commitment to development objectives. In this respect, the research / academic community is well placed, through a substantial body of locally generated knowledge, to act as equal partners in evaluation at both the level of Government and donors.

Another noticeable trend in recent years is the increasing role in evaluation played by **Evaluation Associations**. Although many of these associations are based on voluntarism and institutionally quite weak, evaluation associations have a huge potential in taking a lead in defining national evaluation approaches. What is particularly valued is the wide representation of its membership, made up of representatives from the public sector bureaucracy to professionals involved in research, civil society and the private sector. The experience of associations such as SLEvA shows that despite professed objectives of creating a national evaluation culture, it focus much of their activities and discussions on trying to "catch up" with the international debate. While this is to be valued in terms of bringing the thinking in line with the international discourse, it can blunt fledgling efforts towards evolving a 'national approach' to evaluation. ReBraMA, SAMEA and AfrEA too have defined as objectives to create a locally centred conceptualisation and practice of development evaluation and are seen to be moving in this direction.

## 5.2 Conclusions

Going forward, one of the challenges in translating the DAC principles into German evaluation practice will be to deal with the **dilemma of reconciling harmonisation and alignment**. As discussed above, harmonisation invites uniform standards, while alignment calls for customisation and 'localisation' of evaluation approaches.

To this can be added a second dilemma; how to satisfy regulatory demands of donors as well as of partners. As discussed in chapter 2, the imperative to 'report' in evaluations calls for standards that satisfy Germany's legal requirements. At the same time, these might not be compatible with partner country regulatory systems. Hence, efforts to incorporate partner country approaches and contexts might pose a challenge to the different accountability systems in donor and partner countries. Since there is no 'either-or' answer, the challenge is rather to create the space for a critical mass of evaluation efforts that together will satisfy

competing interests and at the same time provide the necessary information for effective decision making.

Another challenge that lies ahead is to bridge the gap in the discussions at the DAC/OECD level and the realities of partner countries. In a number of the case study countries (notably in Asia and Latin America), awareness and interest in Paris and Rome agendas are scant. More important are national level discussions on how to influence policy processes within the countries, and how to influence donor strategies on the country. The problem is compounded by the glut of terminology invading 'donor-speak', often leading to misunderstanding (while it creates a discursive space of exclusivity among evaluators and experts).

This point is important in the context of **capacity building in evaluation**. Supporting national evaluation capacities, are often equated with methodology development and training. Adopting this approach would once again turn the nature of the cooperation into a paternalistic relationship, undermining the essence of the very principles it professes to support. Supporting national evaluation processes goes beyond methodology development, and focuses instead on learning processes, understanding how policies are made and how to influence policy in national contexts. It also involves sustained partnerships with research bodies that are active in evaluation. It calls for investments in institutional learning on both donor and partner side, that go beyond a client-consultant relationship.

Moving towards DAC principles on aligning evaluation procedures is more than out-sourcing evaluations. It is about a new form of partnership, and one that takes time, patience, courage and learning from doing – often over and over again.



## 6. RECOMMENDATIONS ON NEXT STEPS

In light of the findings and conclusions spelt out in previous chapters, this section presents some practical recommendations to BMZ on potential next steps for **Phase II** of the planned study on local monitoring and evaluation systems and capacities. To recap, the overall study wants to contribute to:

*“Improve the deployment and capacity of local monitoring and evaluation systems and services in partner countries, commensurate with demands from donors and from German development policy”.*

The study is to be conducted in two phases, each with the following aim:

- **Phase I** shall collect and compile information on local M&E-systems and services as an input to the further process and the final study;
- **Phase II** shall use this information for a broader perspective and a comprehensive study on “Orientation towards and deployment of local monitoring and evaluation systems and capacities”.

The present study comprises **Phase I** and addresses the following objectives:

- i. Provide a brief overview of the current trends and debates on donor harmonisation and partner country led evaluations.
- ii. Survey up to ten partner countries in order to provide an overview of current M&E practices, summarizing strengths and weaknesses of partner country M&E capacities and systems.
- iii. Identify and provide institutional profiles of local service providers in M&E in the selected partner countries.
- iv. Draw preliminary findings on enhanced utilisation by German Development Cooperation of partner country capacities and systems and on potential M&E areas of support to partners.

Where this study took the form of a **stock-taking on existing M&E** services in partner countries, the focus of Phase II could be to delve much deeper into understanding existing M&E systems and services and actual local and international demand for such services. Besides, only understanding well the existing demand and supply of those services will help plan any capacity building measure that goes beyond conventional capacity building conceived as training activities.

The following are possible steps to be taken during Phase II:

1. **Deepen the scope:** One limitation faced in this study was the lack of “local” research partners for in-country verification of the desk-study results. Given the developing-country-partner-oriented nature of the study, it is recommended that Phase II explicitly involve partner researchers from the case study countries. Those could be selected from institutions with experience in M&E or from evaluation associations (including those recommended in this study). This process of cooperation will also be a way of piloting different forms of cooperation in evaluation and contribute to study findings. Working together in exploratory studies is also a productive way to create local capacity in understanding the dynamics and politics of monitoring and evaluation systems.

2. **Widen the scope:** This study has concentrated on countries with which the consultants have a certain familiarity. It is suggested that the number of case study countries for Phase II be widened to include other relevant partner countries<sup>100</sup>. Some preliminary selection criteria for *relevance* could include: countries with upcoming BMZ (or joint) evaluations; other BMZ priority countries; countries where ODA represents more than 10 percent of GNI, therefore with more need for alignment and harmonisation of aid; countries which have innovative practice of evaluation processes; countries where development cooperation main modality is *projects*. The selection could also consider the suitability of including other so-called anchor countries, such as Mexico. These ‘anchor-countries’ might form a homogenous case to understand *country-led* evaluation processes.
  
3. **Understand the dynamics:** The above points still revolve around widening and deepening the stock-taking on monitoring and evaluation systems and services. It is recommended that in Phase II this process is taken a step further to better understand the dynamics of evaluation concepts and policies in partner countries. As pointed out in the previous chapter, supporting local capacities and systems is not just delivering training on evaluation methodologies. It is about understanding the evolution of and approach to evaluation in different countries, keeping in mind that the primary aim is to influence policy formulation be it at the developing country government or at the donor level.
  
4. **Bridge the gap**<sup>101</sup>: The above suggests a need to reduce the gap in the understanding of evaluation and its discursive practice between DAC members and developing countries institutions. The gap may not (which would be verified) be about good standards of social research and about missing methodologies in partner countries. It might be about different ‘cultures of evaluation’<sup>102</sup>, it might be about ‘independence’ and critical results<sup>103</sup>, or it might be about how to feed the results of evaluation into policy-making and political processes<sup>104</sup>. The OECD has a Civil Society Liaison Manager in the Public Affairs Division, looking after such gap, *from OECD’s point of view*. Bridges have to be built to facilitate a two way traffic stream; alignment of aid to partner country systems do not mean alignment of partner country systems to fit harmonized aid delivery.
  
5. **Launch pilot initiatives:** A potential method of understanding this gap is by initiating a number of pilot initiatives on joint evaluations. Here, the word ‘joint’ is defined as between donor and recipient – as recommended by latest DAC reports on joint evaluations – and between recipient countries themselves. The value of pilot initiatives, especially if it involves regional teams, is that it will facilitate an exchange of evaluation experiences regionally, and support a ‘regional approach to evaluation’ (e.g. among the SAARC countries or in West Africa). In essence, it would facilitate the same ‘moving together’ that is emerging among the OECD/DAC members, among developing countries. At the same

---

<sup>100</sup> Countries with French as operational language were excluded from this first study, for instance.

<sup>101</sup> See <http://www.cgdev.org/section/initiatives/active/evalgap>, an initiative from the Centre for Global Development claiming that there is need for closing the evaluation gap. That means to bring together evaluation practice and criteria that reflect cooperating partners’ interests, but particularly finding out what are the partner country’s perspectives to understand “impacts” coming from aid.

<sup>102</sup> The African culture could be different from the Asian culture and both might be different from OECD/DAC.

<sup>103</sup> For instance, in countries such as Indonesia with a tradition of authoritarianism.

<sup>104</sup> As seen for instance, in Indonesia and Sri Lanka, where political decision-making processes have been changing rapidly in recent years.

time it would be one step towards bridging the evaluation gap between OECD/DAC and partner countries.

- 6. Increase M&E capacity as part of development cooperation:** Several countries, as the study revealed, have started performance measurement in the public sector. Several German development interventions have also promoted local capacity in planning and monitoring. Evaluation in partner countries has so far been part of the M&E cycle as the German development cooperation moves out of the project approach<sup>105</sup>. Evaluation as part of a new overarching poverty reduction strategy or country development strategy is a new field to be supported by development cooperation measures and technical assistance. It is seen as a 'cross-sectoral' development intervention. DC could also support the partner country's internal re-alignment between the received 'sector support' (through SWAPs) and Budget Support. While sector support privileges improving M&E in line ministries, overall development policy's M&E has territorial and decentralized implications, which have not been taken care of as yet. Supporting M&E systems and independent evaluations could be on the table during upcoming bi- and multilateral development cooperation negotiations.
- 7. Identify alternatives for capacity development:** Working in partnership with 'local' organisations in Phase II of the study would improve the 'ownership' and legitimacy of evaluation capacity building proposals. Ideas would come out from a joint process and, more importantly, they would fit policy imperatives of partner countries, rather than helping efficient aid management by donors. This would involve investigation of some other key questions, such as: what are the current concrete best practices in the field of evaluation within partner countries (for instance, led by evaluation associations or already supported by German Development Cooperation); in which ways is the BMZ best placed to support these processes; and what are the other capacity development activities already taking place, keeping in mind that BMZ wants to intervene in a complementary manner, and not overlap with similar initiatives.
- 8. Revise the concept note:** The conclusions and recommendations presented in this study suggest a revisiting of the original concept note. Revision would also have to take into account time and budget frames. The overall framework of the concept note would have to include scenarios for Phase II that would take the form of a larger process. It is recommended that the revision of the concept is done early, so as to ensure a continuation of the commitment and momentum begun in this study, which constituted Phase I.

---

<sup>105</sup> Evaluations by 'independent evaluation units' have mostly done work without the direct involvement of local partners. Local institutions are usually source of information only (as it was with this study).



## REFERENCES

- AfDB (2006): Development Evaluation at AfDB. Operation Evaluation Department. [www.afdb.org/pls/portal/url/page/ADB\\_PageGroup/Topics/Operations\\_Evaluation](http://www.afdb.org/pls/portal/url/page/ADB_PageGroup/Topics/Operations_Evaluation). Retrieved 5 November 2006.
- AsDB (2006): Indonesia Country Assistance Programme Evaluation (CAPE). Asian Development Bank. <http://www.ADB.org/Documents/CAPES/INO/cap-ino-2005-16/default.asp>. Retrieved 15 October 2006
- BATLEY, R., Bjoernestad, L., Cumbi, A (2006): Mozambique Country Report. Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support 1994-2004. Burkina Faso, Malawi, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Rwanda, Uganda, Vietnam. Birmingham.
- BMZ (2005): The German Government 12<sup>th</sup> Development Policy Report, Paper 152
- BRÄUTIGAM, Deborah (2000): Aid Dependence and Governance. Expert Group on Development Issues. School of International Services, Washington
- CLEMENS, Michael et.al (2004): The Trouble with the MDGs: Confronting Expectations of Aid and Development Success, CGD Working Paper No. 40 May
- DIEWALD, Christoph & Pinto, Rogerio (2006): Alignment of Global Programs with Country Planning and Operational Frameworks, Brazil Country Survey. OECD-DAC/ UNDP/AfDB/ AsDB/ EBRD/ IDB/ WB/ GTZ
- ERNST & YOUNG (2006): Review of the PAP's Performance in 2005 and PAP's PAF Matrix Targets for 2006
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2006): Annual Evaluation Review 2005 - Conclusions and findings from evaluations in the Commission. Brussels. [http://europa.eu.int/comm/budget/evaluation/studies/study\\_2005\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/budget/evaluation/studies/study_2005_en.htm)
- FICARELLI, Pier P. (2005): Towards the Development of a Result-based Monitoring System for Programmes and Focal Areas in South Africa and Lesotho. GTZ, South Africa
- FÜHRER, Helmut (1996): A History of the Development Assistance Committee and the Development Cooperation Directorate in Dates, Names and Figures. OECD, Paris
- GAETANI, Francisco (2006): Avaliação, monitoramento e o exercício da Presidência. XI Congreso Internacional del CLAD sobre la Reforma del Estado y de la Administración Pública. Ciudad de Guatemala, 7 - 10 Novembro
- GOVERNMENT OF BRAZIL (2004): Decreto no. 5.233 de 6 de Outubro de 2004. Estabelece Normas para a Gestao do Plano Plurianual. Brasilia
- GOVERNMENT OF MOZAMBIQUE (2006): PARPA – Plano de Accao para a Reducao da Pobreza Absoluta II (2006-2010). PRS II
- GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA (2006): High Level Forum on the Harmonization for Aid Effectiveness in South Africa – Final report (Baseline Study)
- GOVERNMENT OF TANZANIA (2005): The National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (MKUKUTA - Mkakati wa Kukuza Uchumi na Kupunguza Umaskini Tanzania)

<http://www.bmz.de/en/service/infothek/fach/materialien/materialie152.pdf>. Retrieved 17 October 2006

GOVERNMENT OF TANZANIA (2006): Joint Assistance Strategy – JAS. Revised Third Draft, Dar es Salaam

IDA / IMF (2006) Joint Staff Advisory Note of the Cambodia National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP), 2006–2010, Washington

IDA (2006):

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/IDA/0..contentMDK:20054572~menuPK:115748~pagePK:51236175~piPK:437394~theSitePK:73154,00.html>

IDD and Associates (2006): Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support 1994-2004. Synthesis Report. International Development Department, Birmingham

IMG (2005): Enhancing Aid Relationships in Tanzania. Report by Independent Monitoring Group. Economic and Social Research Foundation, Dar es Salaam

MAY, J. (1998): Poverty and Inequality in South Africa. Office of the Executive Deputy President and the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Poverty and Inequality, summary report 13, Pretoria.

MEDEIROS, Marcelo (2006): Uma Introducao as Representacoes da Desigualdade de Renda. Texto para Discussao 1202. Instituto de Pesquisa Economica Aplicada (IPEA), Brasilia

OECD (1992): Development Assistance Manual. DAC Principles for Effective Aid. Paris

OECD (1998): Review of the DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance. Paris

OECD (2002): Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management. Series Evaluation and Aid Effectiveness Number 6. Paris

OECD (2005a): Harmonizing Donor Practices for Effective Aid Delivery. Vol. 2: Budget Support, Sector Wide Approaches and Capacity Development in Public Financial Management. DAC Guidelines and Reference Series. Preliminary edition.

OECD (2005b): Joint Evaluations: Recent Experiences, Lessons Learned and Options for the Future. DAC Evaluation Network Working Paper. Paris.

OECD (2005c): Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

[http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,2340,en\\_2649\\_3236398\\_35401554\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,2340,en_2649_3236398_35401554_1_1_1_1,00.html)  
Retrieved 10 October 2006.

OECD (2006a): DAC Peer Review - Germany.

[http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en\\_2649\\_3236398\\_34600534\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_3236398_34600534_1_1_1_1,00.html).  
Retrieved 10 October 2006

OECD (2006b): Aid Statistics.

[http://www.oecd.org/countrylist/0,2578,en\\_2649\\_34447\\_25602317\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/countrylist/0,2578,en_2649_34447_25602317_1_1_1_1,00.html).  
Retrieved: 12 October 2006

OECD (2006c): DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (for test phase application). DAC Evaluation Network, Paris

OECD (2006d): Guidance to Manage Joint Evaluations. DAC Evaluation Series. Paris

OECD (2006e): Evaluation Systems and Use: a Working Tool for Peer Reviews and Assessments. DAC Evaluation Network, Paris

ROYAL GOVERNMENT OF CAMBODIA (2005): National Strategic Development Plan 2006-2010

SASAKI, Ryoh (2006): "A Review of the History and the Current Practice of Aid Evaluation". Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Evaluation, Number 5, September.  
<http://evaluation.wmich.edu/jmde/Articles>. Retrieved 17 October 2006

TEKÜLVE, Maria. (2006): Alignment with and Deployment of Local Monitoring and Evaluation Systems and Capacities: Outline for a study. Evaluation Division, BMZ, Bonn.

UNEG (2005a): Norms for Evaluation in the UN System. United Nations Evaluation Group

UNEG (2005b): Standards for Evaluation in the UN System. United Nations Evaluation Group

UNDP (2005): [http://hdr.undp.org/statistics/data/country\\_fact\\_sheets/cty\\_fs MOZ.html](http://hdr.undp.org/statistics/data/country_fact_sheets/cty_fs MOZ.html). Retrieved 12 October 2006

UNICEF (2004): New Trends in Development Evaluation. Evaluation Working Papers.

UNICEF Regional Office for CEE/CIS and IPEN. With the International Programme Evaluation Network. Issue 5, Romania

WOOLARD, Ingrid (2002): An overview of poverty and inequality in South Africa. Working Paper, DFID, London

WORLD BANK (2006): [http://devdata.worldbank.org/AAG/bra\\_aag.pdf](http://devdata.worldbank.org/AAG/bra_aag.pdf). Retrieved 12 October 2006

WORLD BANK (2006): PRSP Review 2004/2005 – An Assessment of the Implementation of the Tenth Plan/PRSP (Nepal), Washington



**PART TWO:**  
**INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES FROM CASE STUDY COUNTRIES**

**INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES**

---

**A: BRAZIL**

---

**AMBIENTALIS**

Rua Porto Alegre 1570 E

89802-130 Chapeco, Santa Catarina

Tel: 55 49 3331 4291

Email: [assessoria@ambientalis.com.br](mailto:assessoria@ambientalis.com.br)

Web: [www.projetos@ambientalis.com.br](http://www.projetos@ambientalis.com.br); [www.ambientalis.com.br](http://www.ambientalis.com.br)

**Contact person:** Technical director: Silvia Valdez

**Legal status**

Private consultancy company.

**Mandate**

Formulate and implement projects; technical assistance; training; quality management.

**Geographical scope**

Brazil

**Thematic focus**

Environmental assessment; food security, social responsibility. Environmental standards monitoring. Mining, ceramics, electrical and chemical industries, banking and public sectors. Water and dams. Food industry.

**Findings**

The company specialises in environmental impact and control plans; vicinity impact studies; emergency plans; ISO 9000 and 14000.

It has five permanent staff and other associate technicians in the areas of agronomics, architecture, archaeology, biology, geography, civil and environmental engineering, geology, business administration, social services and pedagogy.

Ambientalis has been referred as a target group oriented company that can bring together technical expertise and popular knowledge in searching for solutions.

**BRAZILIAN ASSOCIATION FOR LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT (ABDL)**

Rua Professor Almeida Prado 532, predio 31

Cidade Universitaria

05508-901 Sao Paulo, SP

Tel: 55 11 37191532;

Email: [abdl@abdl.org.br](mailto:abdl@abdl.org.br)

Web: [www.abdl.org.br](http://www.abdl.org.br); [www.lead.org.br](http://www.lead.org.br);

**Contact person:** Executive coordinator: Andres Falconer

**Legal status**

Founded in 1991, as a result of a partnership between the Rockefeller Foundation and the University of Sao Paulo, ABDL is a non-government organisation. It is managed by a Board of Directors, its Executive Coordinator and the technical staff.

**Mandate**

Its mandate is to inspire leadership for a sustainable world. Build and nurture a network of leaders from different background. Promote sustainability and engage the network in action projects.

**Geographical scope**

Brazil and Latin America

**Thematic focus**

- Leadership training
- Environment and development
- Participation
- Managerial capacity building
- Network promotion
- NGO training
- Public policy analysis.

**Findings**

ABDL is a dialogue forum with more than 500 associates representing all 'walks of life' and 'leaders' in their areas of expertise. One of its programmes, in partnership with the AVINA Foundation, is the *Redesenvolvimento*, which trains network facilitators and strengthen social networks for public policy control. Throughout the year, the programme offers intensive face-to-face seminars and distance activities, in order to produce knowledge, build capacities and implement projects to institutionally strengthen the participating networks

The organisation has ten staff members for training, project design, fundraising, and mobilization.

ABDL is a member of LEAD – Leadership for Environment and Development, a worldwide fast growing leadership programme (currently with 600 associates in more than 80 countries, with offices in 14 regions around the world). It can mobilize expertise very quickly, in practically all areas of development.

**CENTRO BRASILEIRO DE ANALISE E PLANEJAMENTO (CEBRAP)**

Rua Morgado de Mateus 615

04015-090 Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo

Tel: 55 11 55740399

Email: [cebrap@cebrap.org.br](mailto:cebrap@cebrap.org.br)

Web: [www.cebrap.org.br](http://www.cebrap.org.br)

**Contact persons:** Country Convenor: Vera Schattan P. Coelho ([veraspc@uol.com.br](mailto:veraspc@uol.com.br))

Policy Coordinator: Paula Montero ([cultura@cebrap.org.br](mailto:cultura@cebrap.org.br))

**Legal status**

Non-profit multi-disciplinary research institution

**Mandate**

Founded in 1969, CEBRAP is dedicated to the study of Brazil's social reality and participation in political and institutional debates. It develops and implements studies on social, political, economical and cultural phenomena. It comprises the *Metropolitan Study Centre* (Centro de Estudos da Metropole – CEM), which specialized in studies on the city of Sao Paulo; and the *Commission for Citizenship and Reproduction* (Comissao de Cidadania e Reproducao – CCR), specialised in studies regarding health and sexual and reproductive rights.

**Geographical scope**

Brazil

**Thematic focus**

- Culture and politics
- Work force and work market policies
- History
- Society and politics
- Population
- Environmental conflicts.

**Findings**

CEBRAP has developed studies about several topics: cultural practices in specific settings; religious determinants of social phenomena; evaluation of efficiency and efficacy of public audiences in environmental impact assessments; evaluation of employment policies; impact of globalisation in specific work markets in Brazil. It has 34 permanent researchers; most of them hold PhD degree.

CEBRAP publishes the academic journal *Novos Estudos*, and maintains an academic post-graduation programme in various branches of the social sciences. Its studies have had impact on policy level, for instance the study on the experience of municipal and district health councils in the city of Sao Paulo created the basis for reforms.

**INSTITUTO DE ESTUDOS, FORMACAO E ASSESSORIA EM POLITICAS SOCIAIS (POLIS)**

Rua Araujo 124; 01220-020 Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo.

Tel: 55 11 21746800

Web: [www.polis.org.br](http://www.polis.org.br)

**Contact persons:** Coordinator: Silvio Caccia Brava

Executive coordinators: Ana Claudia Teixeira and Anna Luisa Salles Souto

**Legal status**

Founded in 1987, Polis is a research organisation

**Mandate**

Systematize, analyse, disseminate and promote debates around innovative and participatory social practices. Polis specialises in participation and urban governance, it works with civil society organisations, local governments, and academic institutions, and its partnerships are anchored on the principles of participation and the fight against social exclusion. Polis also manages a *School of Citizenship* in Sao Paulo.

**Geographical scope**

Brazil

**Thematic focus**

Urban environment, urban planning and food security. It is active in the promotion of participatory budgeting in local councils for social policy. It also produces two newsletters, one targeted at local governments, and the other for citizens involved in governance processes. It is an active member of various national and regional networks, including the National Network for Participation in Local Governance.

**Findings**

POLIS has developed studies on numerous social themes, among them: social budgeting control, empowerment of social networks in areas of extreme poverty; local economic development; new models of matricial organisation charts in public management.

POLIS has a horizontal coordinating council of 18 people, and 39 members of a technical team. It hosts an average of 10 interns at any given time.

POLIS' programme for public policy monitoring and evaluation aims has had an impact in several areas, having developed specific monitoring methods and instruments. They have partnerships with Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst (EED), Nederlands Organisatie voor Internationale Bijstand (NOVIB), Comite Catolique Contre la Faim et pour le Development (CCFD), Oxfam and Bread for the World among others.

**INSTITUTO DE ESTUDOS DA RELIGIAO (ISER)****Nucleo de Monitoramento e Avaliacao – M&E Unit**

Rua do Russel 76; 22210-010 Rio de Janeiro, RJ

Tel: 55 21 25553782

Email: [iser@iser.org.br](mailto:iser@iser.org.br)

Web: [www.lead.org.br](http://www.lead.org.br)

**Contact persons:** Executive secretary: Samyra Crespo;

M&E Unit Coordinator: Luis Eduardo Guedes ([leguedes@iser.org.br](mailto:leguedes@iser.org.br))

**Legal status**

ISER is a non-government organisation

**Mandate**

Founded in 1969, to promote development with social justice and environmental responsibility. It is based on democratic values, cultural, religious and political pluralism. It aims at producing tools and developing instruments for social intervention.

**Geographical scope**

Brazil and Latin America

**Thematic focus**

Civil society empowerment; urban violence; public security; human right; environment; societal and religions dialogue. It keeps a public interest databank and a monitoring and evaluation unit to serve other organisations.

**Findings**

The Monitoring and Evaluation Unit was created in 2001 and aims at designing and implementing M&E processes of social projects in various sectors. The group has a multi-disciplinary composition. Three main M&E areas have emerged: access to work and income; education; and citizenship and human rights.

M&E of social policy and interventions have been the general umbrella concern of ISER. It has evaluated, for instance (2005), the insertion of students in the labour market; quality of training in information technology by Brazilian NGOs; quality and efficacy of small scale business training; impact of communitarian education in Rio de Janeiro; impact of the project Balcao de Direitos; impact assessment of yearly motherhood care project; impact of the Brazilian disarmament project; credit analysis of low-income groups; feasibility studies for digital inclusion projects.

Its staff consists of 15 researchers, of which five are managerial staff members, including one for international relations (Henry Decoster).

ISER has developed an international reputation, particularly on studies of violence in Brazil. It is associated to the *International Action Network on Small Arms*. With only 2.8% of the world's population, Brazil accounts for 13% of the planet's deaths by firearms. ISER has established a successful network for M&E of arms use and production in Brazil, together with the Institute Viva Rio and Institute Sou da Paz.

**INSTITUTO FONTE PARA O DESENVOLVIMENTO SOCIAL**

Rua Itamirindiba 1 – Pinheiros; 05429-060

São Paulo –SP

Tel: 55 11 3032-1108, 3032 8373 and 3032 2575

Email: [fonte@fonte.org.br](mailto:fonte@fonte.org.br)

Web: [www.fonte.org.br](http://www.fonte.org.br)

**Contact person:** Rogerio Renato Silva and Daniel Braga Brandão

**Legal status**

Independent, not-for-profit institution.

**Mandate**

Promote organisational learning of development processes. To build organisational capacity to actively participate in development processes. Support authentic and coherent praxis geared by social transformation.

**Geographical scope**

Brazil and Latin America.

**Thematic focus**

Strategic planning; evaluation of social projects and programmes; institutional governance; initiatives development; financial administration; conflict management; sustainability, team building.

**Findings**

The objective of the M&E consultancy work is to empower social initiatives, aiming at intentionality and responsibility. Consultants are facilitators and work through generating questions according to organisational interests. Two experts dedicated to evaluation of development processes. The institute has provided services to national and international organisations and is partner of development consultant companies in other countries. Former secretariat for the Brazilian Evaluation Association (ReBraMA). It has published on evaluation, among other social sciences topics (Instituto Fonte has an associated Publishing House).

The institute has thirteen associates. They are highly qualified development practitioners and researchers with wide experience in social development ([www.fonte.org.br/associados.htm](http://www.fonte.org.br/associados.htm)).

Fonte's publications are often quoted in development publications. High quality workshops in partnership with strong social private partners, such as Philips do Brasil and HSBC. Their website offers an "evaluation package", a series of evaluation instruments for social development.

**ASSOCIACAO NACIONAL DE POS-GRADUACAO E PESQUISA EM CIENCIAS SOCIAIS**

Av. Prof. Luciano Gualberto 315 1º andar

05508-900 Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo

Tel: 55 11 30914664

Email: [anpocs@anpocs.org.br](mailto:anpocs@anpocs.org.br)

Web: [www.anpocs.org.br](http://www.anpocs.org.br)

**Contact persons:** President: Gabriel Cohn; Executive Secretary: Marcelo Siqueira Ridenti

**Profile**

A Not-for-profit organisation, with the status of an NGO. Founded in 1977 to bring together and represent research centres and post-graduation programmes in the Social Sciences. It has 61 affiliated organisations. It does not accept individual membership. Its thematic foci are sociology, anthropology and political science. It does not carry out evaluation research itself, but coordinate and mobilises its affiliates according to themes and expertise needed.

Executive staff comprises a president, a executive secretary, a deputy executive secretary, and three directors, all elected for a period of two years (2005-06).

It works through technical committees: academic committee, editorial committee, post-graduation committee, institutional advisory committee, international committee and others. ANPOCS has received growing acclamation for its mobilization power. It has developed a new concept of open databank, whereby one organisation contributes with a specialized database and can join the larger one. It promotes an annual national meeting where political and social themes and positions are discussed and consolidated.

**CENTRO JOSUE DE CASTRO DE ESTUDOS E PESQUISAS (CJC)**

Rua São Gonçalo, 118 - Boa Vista

50070-600 Recife, Pernambuco

Tel: 55 81 34232800 and 34235242

Email: [info@josuedecastro.org.br](mailto:info@josuedecastro.org.br)

Web: [www.josuedecastro.org.br](http://www.josuedecastro.org.br)

**Profile**

Founded in 1979, it is a not-for-profit organisation that has as its main activities social research and social intervention. It was born out of the realization that research in Brazil was elitist and not linked or use in the improvement of the status of disadvantaged people.

Its major geographic area is the Northeast of Brazil. Its services in the area of evaluation are related to the fields of poverty and hunger (food security).

It has partnerships with EED, GTZ, Oxfam, Terre des Hommes, ActionAid, DED and European Union.

**JOHN SNOW BRASIL CONSULTANCY**

SRTVN 701 Conj. C, sala 309 B. Centro Empresarial Norte.

70719-903 Brasilia, Distrito Federal

Tel: 255 6133281278

Email: [r.laro@johnsnow.com.br](mailto:r.laro@johnsnow.com.br)

Web: [www.johnsnow.com.br](http://www.johnsnow.com.br)

**Contact person:** Miguel Fontes (Director) and Rodrigo Laro (Coordinator)

**Profile**

In Brazil since 1995, the company acts in the social market in public health, finance for health and family planning. Associated to John Snow Incorporated (US), it has offices in the US, Dominican Republic, Brazil and Mozambique.

In Brazil, it has undertaken about 130 projects using social impact evaluation methods, such as social determinants evaluation, experimental and quasi-experimental evaluation, sustainability analysis and institutional evaluation.

**NUCLEO DE PESQUISA EM ANTROPOLOGIA DO CORPO E DA SAUDE (NUPACS)**

Rua Ramiro Barcelos 2600 sala 406

90035-003 Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul

Tel: 55 5132314336 and 91164130

Email: [dea.leal@gmail.com](mailto:dea.leal@gmail.com)

Web: [www.nupacs.ufrgs.br](http://www.nupacs.ufrgs.br)

**Contact person:** Andrea Leal (researcher) and Daniela Knauth (evaluator)

**Profile**

It has carried out research over the past 15 years on anthropological aspects of health, the body, sexuality, reproduction, gender and HIV/AIDS. It has led evaluation research and programme evaluations. It has wide experience in epidemiological surveys.

NUPACS employs two fulltime senior researchers and eight associate researchers. NUPACS has also a senior project manager and a secretary.

**B: MOZAMBIQUE**

---

**COWI MOZAMBIQUE** (a branch of COWI Denmark)

Avenida Zedequias Manganhela 267 5th floor

PO Box 4296 Maputo

Tel: 258 21 311160

Email: [cowimoz@tvcabo.co.mz](mailto:cowimoz@tvcabo.co.mz)

Web: [www.cowi.com](http://www.cowi.com)

**Contact person:** Country representative: Lars Christensen

**Legal status**

Danish private company with the COWI Foundation as major shareholder.

**Mandate**

Combines specialised knowledge with in-country expertise. It has 75 years of experience of independent multi-disciplinary consulting services. COWI Mozambique is a network of national and international development consultants and is linked to the Development and Planning Division in Denmark.

**Geographical scope**

Mozambique (within worldwide work of COWI Denmark)

**Thematic focus**

Governance, aid management and social development.

**Findings**

It offers evaluation services in the form of developing monitoring systems, indicators, and measuring instruments as well as surveys and evaluations. This work is done in collaboration with partner countries in order to align with their policies and procedures. In Mozambique, the core staff is composed of the country representative, 3 expatriate researchers and one national researcher. Major expertise of staff is institutional development, aid management and evaluation, participation, decentralisation.

COWI is a huge multinational corporation and a leading international consulting group, working worldwide with engineering, environmental science and economics. Since founded in 1930, it has been involved in more than 50,000 projects in 175 countries. It may not classify as a *local* service provider.

**DESMOND TUTU CENTER FOR LEADERSHIP – C4L**

Av. de Mocambique 255 Bairro da Liberdade, Matola

P.O.Box 2106 Maputo

Tel: 258 21 745505

Email: [mazive@C4L.org](mailto:mazive@C4L.org), [alfredomazive@teledata.mz](mailto:alfredomazive@teledata.mz)

Web: [www.c4L.org](http://www.c4L.org)

**Contact persons:** Executive coordinator: Alfredo Mazive (Mozambique)

**Legal status**

NGO based in South Africa (White River) with a branch in Mozambique

**Mandate**

Founded in 1994. It is a resource pool for adult learning in development. On its campus are various learning resources including a facility for residential courses, a resource centre, and on-campus residence for resource persons. Its members offer consultancy services on site.

**Geographical scope**

East and Southern Africa.

**Thematic focus**

Education, disaster mitigation and preparedness (AIDS is regarded as a slow-onset disaster) management & leadership development, enterprise skills for micro entrepreneurs, advocacy.

**Findings**

C4L has developed various training programmes and manuals on planning, monitoring and evaluation. It has the capacity to mobilize experts in the field.

It is directed by a voluntary Board of nine persons. The Board meets regularly (a minimum of four times a year), to provide corporate governance. Executive members are elected by the Board bi-annually. They are: chairperson - Chuck Stephens; vice chair - Alfredo Mazive; secretary - Petrus Dumisa; treasurer - Sidney Bliss. Ten employees work at the training facility and are supervised by operations team leader, Mavis Shongwe.

The scope of participants that have attended courses at C4L encompasses Madagascar, Ethiopia and Sierra Leone – although the focus is on southern Africa. C4L has a special mandate to serve lusophone Africa. Since 1999, it has held over 110 courses varying in length from 3 days to 3 weeks. Over 1300 participants have attended.

**IMPACTO - PROJECTOS E ESTUDOS AMBIENTAIS**

Av. Martires da Machava 968, Maputo

Tel: 258 21 499636, 2149963755 49 3331 4291

Email: [impacto@impacto.co.mz](mailto:impacto@impacto.co.mz)

**Contact person:** Director: Mia Couto ([miacouto@impacto.co.mz](mailto:miacouto@impacto.co.mz))

**Legal status**

Private consultancy company

**Mandate**

Founded in 1996, Impacto is an entirely Mozambican company. It was the first Mozambican company dedicated exclusively to the incorporation of sound environmental management principles into development plans, projects and programmes.

**Geographical scope**

East Africa and SADC.

**Thematic focus**

Environmental assessment; food security, social responsibility; environmental standards monitoring; Geographical Information System. It has a wide and systematically organized database about Mozambique and the region.

**Findings**

Environmental impact and control plans; vicinity impact studies; emergency plans. Preparation of geographically referred information; monitoring and auditing of physical and economic interventions; running of public consultations.

The company comprises 12 technical and administrative permanent staff with expertise in environmental impact assessment and related services.

Impacto has a good work record in Mozambique. Its work and products have had various quality standards, depending on the type of expertise required. It seems that it is highly reputable when M&E is directly linked to map generation and geographic data. It has generated creative and useful maps of socio-economic aspects in Mozambique. Its databank is considered a very well managed source of information.

**INSTITUTO DE INVESTIGACAO PARA O DESENVOLVIMENTO JOSE NEGRAO (IID)**

Rua 24 de Julho 285 2º. andar flat 3

P.O. Box 1023 - Maputo

Tel: 258 21 493561

Email: [cruzeirodosul.iid@tvcabo.co.mz](mailto:cruzeirodosul.iid@tvcabo.co.mz)

Web: [www.iid.org.mz](http://www.iid.org.mz)

**Contact person:** Luis Filipe Pereira (president of the Board of Directors)

**Legal status**

Also called *Cruzeiro do Sul*, the institute is a network think tank.

**Mandate**

Cruzeiro do Sul is a research organisation of Mozambique working on various development issues including research policy linkage through undertaking its own research work and ensuring this has policy influence. It is keen to maintain their independence and hence does not accept large grants from any single donor.

**Geographical scope**

Mozambique

**Thematic focus**

Interest includes rural development and poverty, land issues, social development: education, anthropology, participation, decentralisation, governance and accountability.

**Findings**

The members are all employed in research activities and work for the institute whenever needed and six senior academic staff plus an Academic Board and an Oversight Board.

It has a wide and long experience in quantitative surveys, rapid assessment methodologies, and focus groups.

The Institute has a strong reputation of independence. Its founder and anchor name Jose Negrao passed away in 2005, but the institute continues its work, and is presently engaged in feasibility studies, poverty surveys and impact evaluation of decentralisation of public management.

**KULA ESTUDOS E PESQUISAS APLICADAS LDA**

Av Lucas Elias Kumato 301; Maputo

Tel: 258 21 485383 and 82 5727846

Email: [kula.epa@kula.co.mz](mailto:kula.epa@kula.co.mz)

**Contact persons:** Executive director: Cristiano Matsinhe ([cmatsinhe@kula.co.mz](mailto:cmatsinhe@kula.co.mz))

Edite Cumbe ([ecumbe@kula.co.mz](mailto:ecumbe@kula.co.mz))

**Legal status**

Founded in 2005, Kula is a private consultancy company.

**Mandate**

Service provider of operational studies and research, technical assistance and programmatic assistance for governmental and non-governmental organisations.

**Geographical scope**

Mozambique

**Thematic focus**

Socio-economic studies and M&E of projects and programmes. Strategic planning. Major topic: health and HIV/AIDS. Gender policy analysis.

**Findings**

At least half of its professionals have more than 10 years of experience in the field, mostly in the health and HIV/AIDS domain, but also in food security and the design of operational research in related topics.

Kula has a permanent staff of 10 researchers (sociology, anthropology, medicine, disaster risk management and communication). Kula is a newcomer in the market but some of its professionals have an excellent and established reputation.

Most have experience with international organisations. During its short life, Kula has already done consultancy for FDC, SIDA, UNFPA, Save the Children, OCHA and Danida among others. They received good remarks on their baseline studies.

**PESQUISA E ASSISTENCIA TECNICA (IPAM)**

Av. Maguiguana 231 1o andar; Caixa Postal 137 Maputo

Tel: 258 21 315460 and 21 315461

Email: [ipam@tvcabo.co.mz](mailto:ipam@tvcabo.co.mz)

**Contact person:** Abdul Ilal (Managing Director)

**Legal status**

Private consultancy company

**Mandate**

Founded in January 2005, aims at strengthening public administration, in particular local governments. Provides consultancy services, training, studies and surveys.

**Geographical scope**

Mozambique

**Thematic focus**

Financial and budgetary administration and accountancy; fiscal and tax administration; local economic development; fiscal cadastre; urban planning and development; community participation and civic education; gender; monitoring and evaluation, project management and coaching.

**Findings**

Wide experience in evaluations for international organisations (Swiss Development Cooperation, GTZ, Danida, DfID, UNDP, World Bank, CIDA, SIDA, Ibis etc) and National organisations (Ministries, provincial and local governments). IPAM has three fulltime senior consultants (Abdul Ilal, Einar Braathen and Carolina Hunguana), one executive staff and three associates. Major area of expertise: local governance.

Abdul Ilal, the managing director, is Mozambican and was under an international contract with GTZ until recently, when he resumed his short-term consultancy assignments and joined other colleagues to form IPAM. The company is still consolidating its profile, but its members have already a strong reputation in the field of local governance in Mozambique.

**SAL CONSULTORIA EM DESENVOLVIMENTO SOCIAL LDA.**

Av. do Zimbabwe 1214; PO Box 2830 Maputo

Tel: 258 21 498746 and 21 494710

Email: [admin@salconsult.com](mailto:admin@salconsult.com)

Branch office: Av. do Poder Popular 264, POBox 7, Beira

Tel: 258 23 325997

Email: [salbeira@tdm.co.mz](mailto:salbeira@tdm.co.mz)

**Contact person:** Manager: Gaye Thompson ([gthompson@salconsult.com](mailto:gthompson@salconsult.com))

**Legal status**

Private consultancy company.

**Mandate**

Founded in 1999, by a group of lawyers and economists. In 2003, it expanded to include social and economic consultancy services, under the leadership of a social anthropologist.

**Geographical scope**

East and Southern Africa.

**Thematic focus**

Social development, gender and poverty reduction. Environmental and social impact assessment. Planning, monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes. Communication strategies. Institutional and organisational development.

**Findings**

Legal evaluations and assessments; legal sector reform; financial M&E and auditing systems and implementation for hundreds of national and international organisations.

The company has seven permanent staff. Their areas of expertise are in the legal sector, quantitative surveys, large sample inquiries, public consultation and operational research.

GTZ offices in Mozambique recommended SalConsult for its professional quality. SalConsult draws from a register of highly accepted and qualified Mozambicans and created a reputation of timely delivery of agreed products.

**DIDIDI MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS LDA.**

Av. 24 de Julho 3549, 5th Floor, Maputo

Tel: 258 21 302686 and 82 49007520

Email: [info@dididi.org](mailto:info@dididi.org)

Web: [www.dididi.org](http://www.dididi.org)

**Contact person:** David Harawa (dharawa@teledata.mz)

**Profile**

Dididi tries to understand the needs and requirements to offer a tailor made service. Its' team of professionals strive to deliver cost-effective enterprise solutions that promote growth and profitability, empowering organisations to be competitive.

Dididi offers support in project management, strategic planning and budgeting, M&E, proposal and report writing, financial auditing and internal auditing. Dididi acts as Local Support Services (LSS) for the German Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst (EED) in Mozambique.

**VERDE E AZUL CONSULT LDA.**

Rua do Castanheda 110, Sommerschield, Maputo

Tel: 258 21 486213/4 and 82 3056330

Email: [verdeazul@tvcabo.co.mz](mailto:verdeazul@tvcabo.co.mz)

**Contact person:** Alicia Calane (Manager) Alicia.verdeazul@tvcabo.co.mz

**Profile**

Formed in 1999, the private company has a comprehensive knowledge of international development organisations' requirements. In addition to seven permanent staff, Verde Azul can draw from its associate organisations in SADC countries.

Its key areas of expertise are enterprise development; applied socio-economic investigations; environment; participation and mobilization. It has already provided services for a variety of national and international organisations.

## C: SOUTH AFRICA

---

### **AFRICAN CENTRE FOR WATER RESEARCH (ACWR)**

47 On Strand, # 303; 8001 Cape Town.

Postal address: Suite 17, Pvt Bag X1, Vlaeberg,  
8018 South Africa.

Tel: 27 21 424 4738

Email: [poziswa@acwr.co.za](mailto:poziswa@acwr.co.za)

Web: [www.acwr.co.za](http://www.acwr.co.za)

**Contact persons:** Directors: Anton Earle and Daniel Malzbender

### **Legal status**

Independent research and capacity building, not for profit organisation.

### **Mandate**

To promote the cooperative and sustainable management and development of shared waters in Southern Africa through capacity-building and applied research initiatives.

### **Geographical scope**

SADC region

### **Thematic focus**

Environmental assessment; food security, social responsibility; environmental standards monitoring; Geographical Information System. It has a wide and systematically organized database about Mozambique and the region.

### **Findings**

Water capacity audits; economic and social impact of water related infra-structure; assessment for multi-stakeholder negotiation of use of water in river basins; water related programme evaluation.

The six staff members of the ACWR conduct capacity-building seminars and courses, applied research projects, and information dissemination. In addition, regional and international expertise is accessed through networks such as the Global Water Partnership (GWP - Southern Africa), WaterNet and the SADC Water Sector.

The Centre has had an innovative approach. It has studied the political implications of water related projects and the culture in the use of water in South Africa and the region.

**DESMOND TUTU CENTER FOR LEADERSHIP – C4L**

PO Box 2510 White River; 1240 Mpumalanga

Tel: 27 13 7501227 and 7512705

Email: [hospitality@C4L.org](mailto:hospitality@C4L.org)

Web: [www.c4L.org](http://www.c4L.org)

**Contact persons:** Executive director: Chuck Stephens (South Africa)

Executive coordinator: Alfredo Mazive (Mozambique)

**Legal status**

An NGO based in South Africa (White River) with a branch in Maputo, Mozambique and an operational arm in Tanzania

**Mandate**

Founded in 1994. On its campus are various learning resources including a facility for residential courses, a resource centre, and residential facilities for resource persons. Its members offer consultancy services on-site.

**Geographical scope**

East and Southern Africa

**Thematic focus**

Education, disaster mitigation and preparedness (AIDS is regarded as a slow-onset disaster), management & leadership development, skills for micro entrepreneurs, advocacy.

**Findings**

Various training and manuals on planning, monitoring and evaluation. C4L is directed by a voluntary board of nine women and men. These people provide corporate governance. Executive members are elected by the Board bi-annually.

Ten employees work at the training facility. C4L has a special mandate to serve lusophone Africa. Since 1999, it has held over 110 courses varying in length from 3 days to 3 weeks. Over 1300 participants have attended.

**ENGENDER**

PO Box 12992; Mowbray, 7705; Cape Town, South Africa

Tel: 27 21 448 2112; mobile: 27 83 345 0552.

Email: [info@engender.org.za](mailto:info@engender.org.za);

Web: [www.engender.org.za](http://www.engender.org.za)

**Contact person:** Director: Bernedette Muthien

**Legal status**

Established as an NGO in 2003

**Mandate**

To contribute to building equitable, just and non-violent societies of people in South Africa and elsewhere. To achieve its Vision through participatory research and capacity building of communities of people on genders and sexualities, human rights, justice and peace (including conflict resolution).

**Geographical scope**

South Africa

**Thematic focus**

Strategic interventions about the issues of genders and sexualities, human rights and conflict resolution. It acts through training programmes; research and publication; monitoring and evaluation; and strategic planning.

**Findings**

It has supported partner organisations in self-evaluation and putting together M&E systems and has carried out peer reviews of gender NGOs in South Africa.

Engender has eight senior members of staff. Expertise include research; human rights and gender activism; law; organisational development, management and human resources; as well as programme management. It has as well nine staff members in supporting areas.

Engender has won various awards in South Africa and has cooperated with a number of international organisations.

**EvalNET**

PO Box 41829; Craighall 2024 Johannesburg

Tel: 27 12 807 7861

Email: [info@evalnet.co.za](mailto:info@evalnet.co.za)

Web: [www.evalnet.co.za](http://www.evalnet.co.za)

**Contact person:** Core team: Zenda Ofir (zenda@evalnet.co.za)

**Legal status**

Established in 2000 as Scientech Evaluation (Pty) Ltd.

**Mandate**

To design M&E systems and conduct evaluations. To raise awareness of the important role that evaluation should play in sustainable development. To build African evaluation capacity.

**Geographical scope**

Southern Africa.

**Thematic focus**

Evalnet does not specialise in a particular field, but applies principles of evaluation and conceptual understanding of systems and issues across many programme areas. Past projects have focused, among others, on integrated rural development, natural resource management, health, HIV/Aids, small business development, policy analysis, teacher education, systems development in the higher education sector, and research capacity building.

**Findings**

Formative evaluations for several national and international organisations (e.g. USAID, Government of Netherlands, Kellogg Foundation, UNAIDS). Development of models or monitoring and evaluation systems. Conceptualisation, design, management and implementation of summative programme and project evaluations, using both qualitative and quantitative methods.

Evalnet consists of a small office of evaluation specialists linked to a network of subject specialists experienced in evaluation, organisational development, evaluation training and the development of IT tools. Two permanent staff members manage evaluation contracts. This is combined with the expertise of its associates, who are usually subject specialists with experience in evaluation and strategic planning.

The organisation is praised for using different types of evaluations, including impact, effectiveness, inputs, processes, context and systems - sometimes with a comparative focus. It specialises in the evaluation of programme implementation, institutional processes and management systems. The staff prefers to work on formative or mid-term evaluations, as these are found to be the most useful.

**IMBEWU ENVRO-LEGAL SPECIALISTA (PTY) LTD.**

1st Floor, Block 6, Albury Park; Dunkeld West, Sandton;

P.O. Box 411483, Craighall, 2024

Tel: 27 11 325 4928 Cell: 27 82 890 6459

Email: [catherine@imbewu.co.za](mailto:catherine@imbewu.co.za)

Web: [www.imbewu.co.za](http://www.imbewu.co.za); [www.imbewuregisters.co.za](http://www.imbewuregisters.co.za)

**Contact persons:** Directors: Andrew Gilder, Catherine Warburton (Managing)

**Legal status**

Private company specialising in legal consultancies, providing services to the South African and international markets.

**Mandate**

To facilitate the achievement of legal environmental compliance of an operation.

**Geographical scope**

Southern Africa.

**Thematic focus**

Development and Implementation of Environmental Management Systems; Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA); Environmental Risk Assessments; Environmental Management Plans (EMP); Environmental Legal Training; Environmental Management Programme Reports (EMPR) for the mining industry; and SHE Due Diligence Investigations.

**Findings**

The company works with a range of specialists, including environmental scientists, engineers, commercial lawyers, health and safety specialists or social anthropologists.

It employs four full-time lawyers specialising in environmental or health and safety law. It collaborates with law firm Warburton Attorneys in order to provide environmental specialist litigation services and to confer legal privilege where appropriate.

Imbewu is managing the environmental legal aspects of the EIA for the Gautrain Rapid Rail Link, a multi-billion rand government initiative to link Johannesburg and Pretoria with the Johannesburg International Airport by way of a state of the art high-speed rail system. Also contracted by DANIDA as a member of a team seeking to identify and develop Clean Development Mechanism projects in South Africa. The company is a team member of the BASIC Project (South Africa, Brazil, India and China), *Building and Strengthening Institutional Capacity on Climate Change* operated under the auspices of the European Union during 2005 and 2006.

**INSIDEOUT MONITORING & EVALUATION SPECIALISTS**

3<sup>rd</sup>. Floor New Market Junction, Dorset Road; 8001 Zonnenbloem, Cape Town

Tel: 27 21 4610989 / 95

Email: [kerstin@insideoutresearch.co.za](mailto:kerstin@insideoutresearch.co.za)

Web: [www.insideoutresearch.co.za](http://www.insideoutresearch.co.za)

**Contact person:** Kerstin Rausch (cell: 27 82 3702553)

**Legal status**

Privately women-owned research company.

**Mandate**

Founded in 2000. Provides evaluation and monitoring services to public and development sector organisations. The focus of its work is on programme evaluations – aimed at assessing a project's outcomes and strengths and weaknesses in achieving its goals. It also assists organisations with their own monitoring and evaluation frameworks.

**Geographical scope**

Southern Africa.

**Thematic focus**

Crime prevention and youth at risk; HIV/AIDS; gender issues; civic education; advocacy and lobbying; poverty alleviation; training programmes; local governance and M&E training.

**Findings**

Programme evaluations; development of M&E frameworks; conducting M&E training; evaluation research; facilitation; project management. It has worked for DFID, USAID, European Commission and a variety of NGOs, mostly South African, but also from other SADC countries.

The company has three fulltime senior consultants (Natasha Nel, Kerstin Rausch and Chantel le Fleur). Associate researchers and other staff are 80% and 70% black. Insideout is well known in the field and was recommended to us by staff at the University of Cape Town and Idasa (a Cape Town based political research institute). They seem to be very flexible and able to liaise with other service providers when needed.

**INSTITUTE FOR DEMOCRACY IN SOUTH AFRICA (IDASA)**

Cape Town: 6 Spin Street; Cape Town, 8001;

Tel: 27 21 467-5600

Pretoria : 357 Visagie Street (c/o Prinsloo);

PO Box 56950, Arcadia, 0007

Tel: 27 12) 392 0500

Email: [idsa@idasa.org.za](mailto:idsa@idasa.org.za)

Web: [www.idasa.org.za](http://www.idasa.org.za)

**Contact person:** Executive Director: Paul Graham

**Legal status**

Not for profit company.

**Mandate**

IDASA was established in 1987. Its mission is to promote sustainable democracy by building democratic institutions, educating citizens and advocating social justice. It maintains its independence and capacity through a range of diverse funding mechanisms. It has a fee-for-service component and a domestic fund-raising programme.

**Geographical scope**

Sub-Saharan Africa.

**Thematic focus**

Accountability, Active Citizenship, Constitutional Reform, Elections and Electoral Systems, Equality, Government Budgets, HIV/AIDS, Human Rights, Peace Building and Dialogue, Political Governance and Safety and Security.

**Findings**

It has conducted research, training and facilitation for various local governments, district councils, the national parliament, provinces and various line departments. Its programmes involve the monitoring of government behaviour.

IDASA employs permanent and contract staff in professional and administrative positions. Clients: CIDA, SIDA, DANIDA, SDC, Friedrich Naumann Stiftung, Ford Foundation, European Union and USAID. It has also worked for government and non-governmental organisations in South Africa and elsewhere in Africa. It has a high reputation for independence and quality.

**SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE CONSULTANTS (PTY) LTD.**

15th Floor Strand Towers; 66 Strand Street, 8001 Cape Town

PO Box 3260, 8000 Cape Town; Tel: 27 21 4210073/4.

Office in San Juan, Puerto Rico:

Bolivar #602, Santuree, 00909-1809; San Juan, 00907

Email: info@ southernhemisphere.co.za; [www.southernhemisphere.co.za](http://www.southernhemisphere.co.za)

**Contact persons:** Partners: Dena Lomofsky, Daniel Nina

**Legal status**

Private consulting company.

**Mandate**

Research, facilitation, training, planning, monitoring and evaluation, organisational development and training.

**Geographical scope**

South Africa, Southern Africa, Europe, the Americas.

**Thematic focus**

Training, facilitation, planning, monitoring and evaluation; applied research and organisational development. Economic development; law; public policy; conflict resolution; organisational development; conflict resolution; popular justice; international relations; project planning, evaluation, facilitation, organisational development.

**Findings**

The company has a wide experience in evaluation. Recent clients include the Shuttleworth Foundation, UNICEF and the European Commission. It designs and develops M&E framework, systems and tools, system development (coaching), and runs social and economic impact studies.

The company has two partners, 4 associates and 6 employees. Areas of specialisation include: Economic development; youth development and organisational development; law; public policy; conflict resolution; organisational development; conflict resolution; popular justice; international relations; project planning, evaluation, facilitation, organisational development. The organisation runs a internship programme to support young practitioners/ academics, from South Africa or from Southern countries, who are keen to gain experience in the development sector

In 2001, it launched a mandatory voluntary work for both directors. The vision behind the voluntary work component is that each director commits to performing free consultant services to any community, organisation, individual, government agency or NPO over a specified length of time, agreed upon by both parties. It uses affirmative procurement policy, hiring or sub-contracting previously disadvantaged individuals/ organisations.

**CDRA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT RESOURCE ASSOCIATION**

52 Francis Street, Woodstock ; PO Box 221 Woodstock 7915, Cape Town

Tel: 27 21 4623902

Email: [info@cdra.org.za](mailto:info@cdra.org.za)

Web: [www.cdra.org.za](http://www.cdra.org.za)

**Contact person:** Director: James Taylor

**Profile**

Founded in 1987, CDRA is a South African NGO operating as a “Centre for Development Practice”. It has worked with more than 800 organisations. It is committed to operational research and capacity building. It believes in collaborative sharing of ongoing learning, and it has placed collaborative action research as central to this purpose. For the next three years, it has committed itself to research the “practice behind developmental social change that works”. It has 16 permanent staff.

**GENDER AND ENERGY RESEARCH AND TRAINING**

The Green Building, 9a; Bell Crescent, Westlake Business Park, Tokai; 7945 Cape Town

Tel: 27 21 7023622

Email: [wendy@sustainable.org.za](mailto:wendy@sustainable.org.za)

Web: [www.sustainable.org.za](http://www.sustainable.org.za)

**Contact person:** Wendy Annecke

**Profile**

Established to bring a gendered perspective to research in the energy sector and linked fields of development. Offers socio-economic assessments of low-cost electrification, evaluating the impact of renewables – in particular Solar Home System installations, solar water pumps, solar cookers, hybrid systems, biomass use, transition to commercial fuels, small and micro-energy enterprises, energy efficiency and food security. It has done work in India, Brazil and Argentina, besides SADC countries. Member of the International Working Group on Monitoring and Evaluation of Energy for Development Projects (M&EED).

**KHULISA MANAGEMENT SERVICES**

26, 7th Avenue, Parktown North, Johannesburg 2193.

Tel: 27.11.447.6464/5/6/7

Web: [www.khulisa.com](http://www.khulisa.com)

**Contact persons:** Managing Director: Peter Capozza.

M&E Contact: Jennifer Robinson ([jrobinson@khulisa.com](mailto:jrobinson@khulisa.com))

**Profile**

Founded in 1993. Khulisa is a Project Management and Development consulting firm. It has a large network of personnel from both practical and academic backgrounds. It provides services to governments, donors and NGOs. Its services include: developing systems and structures to improve NGO management; governance and accountability; designing implementation plans; developing and implementing management information systems to make programmatic and operational data easy to access and analyse; developing impact indicators and set up monitoring and evaluation systems; advising NGOs on how to raise funds, improve sustainability and recover costs and; conducting evaluations that examine qualitative and quantitative impact, cost-effectiveness, and sustainability. Khulisa is at present the secretariat for SAMEA – South Africa Monitoring and evaluation Association.



**D: TANZANIA**

---

**COWI TANZANIA LTD.**

21 Ghana Avenue; PO Box 6983 Dar es Salaam

Tel: 255 22 2666161

Email: [cowi@cowi.co.tz](mailto:cowi@cowi.co.tz)

Web: [www.cowi.com](http://www.cowi.com)

**Contact persons:** Managing Director: Jens Christoffersen

**Legal status**

Private company

**Mandate**

COWI Tanzania is a wholly owned subsidiary of COWI Denmark and a private and fully independent foundation, established in 1965. The mandate is to improve the country's physical and social structure.

**Geographical scope**

Tanzania (within worldwide work of COWI Denmark)

**Thematic focus**

It comprises four independent departments: building and industry; development planning and natural resource management; transport and infrastructure; and energy and water.

**Findings**

COWI has experience in conducting baseline studies, programme identification and preparation; appraisal; financial assessment; programme implementation, monitoring and evaluation; impact assessment.

In Tanzania, its core staff is composed of 50 people.

COWI is a huge multinational corporation and a leading international consulting group, working worldwide with engineering, environmental science and economics. Since founded in 1930, it has been involved in more than 50,000 projects in 175 countries. It has 3,300 employees, including engineers, biologists, geologists, economists, surveyors, anthropologists, sociologists and architects. It may not classify as a *local* service provider.

**DAIMA ASSOCIATES LIMITED**

Daima House, Makumbusho Street, Kijitonyama

P.O.Box 75027, Dar es Salaam

Tel:255 22 277 1954

Email: [associates@daima.co.tz](mailto:associates@daima.co.tz)

Web: [www.daima.org](http://www.daima.org)

**Contact persons:** Chairperson: Prof. Samuel M. Wangwe (255-75 432 5487)

Executive Director: Dr. Samuel M. Nyantahe (255-75 427 8444)

**Legal status**

Private consulting firm established in early 2001.

**Mandate**

Offers professional services to the economic, industrial, agricultural and commercial sectors as well as policy makers and development agencies by providing management, financial, economic and public policy and consultancy services.

**Geographical scope**

East Africa

**Thematic focus**

Macro and micro-economic policy, fiscal and monetary policy, project and programme evaluations, business development services, public sector reforms, studies and market surveys in energy, environment, ICT, infrastructure development, trade policy and investment consultancies.

**Findings**

Daima has carried out a large number of commissioned studies on various social and economic policy aspects, for the government, donors, NGOs, business sector and international institutions.

It has ten professional staff employed on a full-time basis and a resource bank of short-term consultants who can be engaged at short notice. It has also formal working collaboration arrangements with other firms and institutions for constituting teams of experts.

Daima is well known to the international organisations: its chairperson is part of the Independent Monitoring Group of the Development Partners Group in charge of evaluation of the Tanzania Assistance Strategy. It has also carried out the progress review of the East African Business Council's project "Support of Regional Business Organisations in East Africa (SRBO-EA)" under German (GTZ) support to strengthen the East African Community integration process

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION (ESRF)**

51 Uporoto Street, Ursino States; PO Box 31226 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Tel: 255 22 2760260; 2760062

Email: [info@esrf.or.tz](mailto:info@esrf.or.tz)

Web: [www.esrftz.org](http://www.esrftz.org)

**Contact person:** Executive Director: Professor Dr. Samuel M. Wangwe

**Legal status**

Not-for-profit institution for research and policy analysis.

**Mandate**

Established in 1994. Aims at an improved understanding of policy options and development management issues. The objectives are to strengthen capabilities in policy analysis and development management and to enhance the understanding of policy options in the government, the public sector, civil society, the donor community and the growing private sector.

**Geographical scope**

East African Region

**Thematic focus**

Growth and Poverty; Globalisation and Regional Integration; Good Governance.

**Findings**

ESRF is a leading consulting organisation of the Independent Monitoring Group (IMG) of the Tanzania Assistance Strategy (TAS) and probable leading research institute to carry out mid-term and final review of the new Joint Assessment Strategy (JAS).

ESRF carries out research initiatives at grass-root level and at macroeconomic level to analyse the impact of growth on differing social groups, monitoring on governance issues and corruption, constraints on the development of national entrepreneurship in the global economy and legal implications of globalisation.

It has about seven highly qualified Tanzanian researchers and one expatriate senior advisor. Their areas of expertise include: socio-economic analysis, public policy analysis, private sector.

The company is regarded as reputable organisation, delivering good quality reports, analytical and experienced in working in multi-cultural environment. It is highly demanded for its services and usually under time pressure.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES LTD (EDI)**

157 Mgombani Street, Regent Estate  
P.O. Box 393 Bukoba, Kagera, Tanzania

Tel: 255 28 2220059

Email: [info@edi-africa.com](mailto:info@edi-africa.com)

Web: [www.edi-africa.com](http://www.edi-africa.com)

**Contact person:** Managing Director: Louise Broadbent

**Legal status**

Tanzanian registered private company.

**Mandate**

To offer expert consultancy, research and training services to the public, private and civil society sectors.

**Geographical scope**

East Africa

**Thematic focus**

M&E of donor-funded programmes; impact assessment; finance assessment; policy review and analysis; business process reengineering; organisational development.

**Findings**

It specializes in carrying out large surveys, studies and tailor-made monitoring and evaluation systems, implementation of evaluations for international and national organisations.

EDI has 51 fulltime employees (47 Tanzanians and 4 expatriates). It also draws from a register of about 150 national and international consultants.

The company is currently cooperating with the World Bank, the Government of Tanzania and the University of Dar es Salaam to design a National Panel Survey. One of the goals of such survey is to provide reliable nationally representative household data that can be used to evaluate on-going projects in sensible ways with pre and post intervention data.

**LEGAL AND HUMAN RIGHTS CENTER (LHRC)**

157 Mgombani Street, Regent Estate

P.O. Box 75254, Dar es Salaam

Tel: 255 22 2773038 / 2773048

Email: [lhrc@humanrights.or.tz](mailto:lhrc@humanrights.or.tz)

Web: [www.humanrights.or.tz](http://www.humanrights.or.tz)

**Contact person:** Executive Director: Helen Kijo-Bisimba

**Legal status**

Set up in early 1995 as a non-profit non-governmental organisation.

**Mandate**

To empower the public as well as promote, reinforce and safeguard human rights and good governance in Tanzania. The objective is to create legal and human rights awareness and empowerment among the general public, the authorities and, in particular, the underprivileged sections of the society. The headquarters are in Dar es Salaam, but the Centre also runs three legal aid clinics.

**Geographical scope**

Tanzania and SADC countries

**Thematic focus**

Human rights, reproductive rights, legal aid, civic education, immigration.

**Findings**

It has carried several studies and evaluations on human rights situations, besides programme evaluations.

LHRC has 60 staff. 34 permanent staff in several fields of expertise related to human rights, 26 volunteers (paralegals). 6 interns from different countries (at the moment, Canada, Germany, US, Denmark).

The organisation is regarded as highly reputable and has therefore been a reference for human rights in the country. It is part of several networks, some international and some embracing the region. It publishes a regular newsletter with its activities, including evaluations.

**MS – TRAINING CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION (MS - TCDC)**

P.O. Box 254 Arusha, Tanzania

Tel: 255 27 2553837 / 8 / 9

Email: [mstcdc@mstcdc.or.tz](mailto:mstcdc@mstcdc.or.tz)

Web: [www.mstcdc.or.tz](http://www.mstcdc.or.tz)

**Contact person:** Principal: Ulla Godtfredsen

**Legal status**

Part of the NGO MS, Danish Association for International Cooperation.

**Mandate**

Opened in 1976 to prepare Danish Volunteers for their assignments in different Eastern and Southern African Countries, but today, the majority of about 500 annual participants come for Swahili and Development courses from regional NGOs and others. Overarching goals are poverty reduction and intercultural cooperation.

**Geographical scope**

Primary focus: Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania.

**Thematic focus**

Civil society empowerment, management capacity building, impact monitoring.

**Findings**

MS-TCDC specialises in supporting development organisations with self-evaluation as a long-term learning process.

The organisation has 29 professional staff (15 female) and 55 support staff (21 female). Several regional languages. Managerial tools, M&E capacity building, advocacy and policy changes.

It has undertaken M&E consultancy work for a number of NGOs. In the future this type of services will be expanded, as spelt out in the Strategic Plan 2006-2010.

**RESEARCH ON POVERTY ALLEVIATION (REPOA)**

157 Mgombani Street, Regent Estate

P.O. Box 33223, Dar es Salaam

Tel: 255 22 2700083 / 2772556; mobile: 255 (0) 741 326064

Email: [repa@repa.or.tz](mailto:repa@repa.or.tz)

**Contact Persons:** Rehema Tukai (Research Coordinator) [rtukai@repa.or.tz](mailto:rtukai@repa.or.tz)

Consultancy Coordinator: Donald Mmari, [mmari@repa.or.tz](mailto:mmari@repa.or.tz)

**Legal status**

Non-profit non-governmental organisation, established in 1995.

**Mandate**

Plans and implements research, conducts and coordinates training, and promotes dialogue and development of policy for pro-poor growth and poverty reduction.

**Geographical scope**

Tanzania.

**Thematic focus**

Poverty reduction. Growth and Poverty. Gender. Environment and Agriculture. Technology. Social / Political /Cultural Issues. Governance. Vulnerability and Social Protection.

**Findings**

REPOA is one of the top independent non-profit research organisations in Tanzania. It has implemented large surveys, in depth studies and other forms of participatory evaluations.

REPOA specialises in economic and social research and has a core staff of 13 researchers. Research is conducted in mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar, with some research projects covering every district.

REPOA is the local implementing organisation for Afrobarometer projects (see [www.afrobarometer.org](http://www.afrobarometer.org)).

**TANZANIA GENDER NETWORKING PROGRAMME(TGNP)**

Mabibo Road

PO Box 8921 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Tel: 255 22 2443205; 2443244

Email: [mary.rusimbi@tgnp.org](mailto:mary.rusimbi@tgnp.org)

Web: [www.tgnp.org](http://www.tgnp.org);

**Contact persons:** Executive Director: Mary Rusimbi; Chairperson: Fenella Mukangara

**Legal status**

Established in 1993 as a non-governmental organisation.

**Mandate**

Promotion of gender equality and equity objectives. Policy advocacy and mainstreaming of gender and pro-poor perspectives in the Tanzanian society. Acts through activism, lobbying and advocacy; training, capacity building; networking and action oriented research.

**Geographical scope**

East African Region; SADC region.

**Thematic focus**

Gender, children, reproductive health, HIV/AIDS.

**Findings**

It does monitoring and evaluation of gender budgeting through the *Gender Budgeting Initiative* in cooperation with UNIFEM Southern Africa. Research about new gender roles in the region and its implications to economic development. Institutional analysis of gender NGOs capabilities. Gender analysis of HIV/AIDS impacts in various social groups.

Some of its' staff are well-known and respected researchers and activists in the field, such as Prof. Majorie Mbilinyi, Prof. Ruth Meena, Deus Kibamba, Gemma Akilimali, and Usu Mallya. As of 31st December 2005, the organisation retained 21 staff: 15 (71%) female and 6 (29%) male, both professional and administrative.

A Gender Advisory and Consulting Unit is under development to improve service delivery. Consultancy assignments contributed 45% of TGNP's 74.6 million (Tanzanian Shillings) program budget for 2005.

**UNIVERSITY OF DAR ES SALAAM CONSULTANCY BUREAU (UCB)**

PO Box 35125 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Tel: 255 22 2410410; 2410410

Email: [ucb@udsm.ac.tz](mailto:ucb@udsm.ac.tz);

**Contact person:** Executive Director: Prof. Shaaban Mlacha

**Legal status**

Academic institution. Part of the outreach programme of the University.

**Mandate**

Coordinate the service provision of consultancy work by University staff. Financial administration of service provision. Quality control of services rendered by staff.

**Geographical scope**

East African Region

**Thematic focus**

Any one theme related to one of the Faculties.

**Findings**

All of the Faculties contacted have carried out studies on their area of expertise, although only the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) has a direct link to developmental policy analysis.

The University Consultancy Bureau can draw from a 1200 strong body of experts. The IDS has 20 qualified staff, among them 16 holding a PhD degree.

The Faculty of Engineering established a Bureau for Industrial Cooperation (BICO) with support from Germany. BICO is quite successful in providing specialized consultancy and training services.

**UBUNIFU ASSOCIATES LTD.**

Tanzania Bureau of Standard (TBS) Compound, Ubungo, room 7

PO Box 32971, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Tel: 255 22 2771660; 255 744 571256

Email: [ubunifua@yahoo.com](mailto:ubunifua@yahoo.com); [makongo@yahoo.com](mailto:makongo@yahoo.com)

**Profile**

It is a multi-purpose development and learning organisation for promoting innovation, building confidence of people involved in development processes. Acts as facilitators for self-learning processes, such as participatory action monitoring and evaluation.

**HEDA**

PO Box 13129 Arusha, Tanzania

Tel: 255 57 8862 / 7596

**Contact person:** Dr. Katoranya Dauson (Programme Coordinator)

**Profile**

HEDA is a non-profit organisation created to enhance community based initiatives in environmental management and conservation, poverty reduction and education. It has carried out environmental impact assessments.

**TRACE (OD TRAINING AND FACILITATION TRAINING)**

PO Box 105110, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Tel: 255 22 2701840

Email: [trace@cats-net.com](mailto:trace@cats-net.com)

Web: [www.tracetz.com](http://www.tracetz.com)

**Contact person:** Mr. Djax Biria, Secretary to the Board, Executive Director

**Profile**

Dedicated to providing OD training and facilitation services to NGOs, CBOs, government institutions and other local and International organisations involved in development work.

TRACE works with organisations in poverty reduction, human rights promotion, and sustainable development. It has experiences with international organisations in programme evaluation, but it has not led one. It has worked in Zambia, Uganda and Ghana.

**K-REP ADVISORY SERVICES LTD. (KAS)**

JM Mall, Samora Avenue 2<sup>nd</sup>. floor  
 PO Box 77152, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania  
 Tel: 255 22 2136944/8  
 Email: [bmomanyi@k-repconsulting.com](mailto:bmomanyi@k-repconsulting.com);  
 Web: [www.k-repconsulting.com](http://www.k-repconsulting.com)

**Contact persons:** Mr. John Kashangaki (Managing Director, Kenya); Mr. Benson Momanyi (Country Manager Tanzania)

**Profile**

Begun as a project in 1984, KAS became a consultancy company to address the financial, management and technical needs of non-governmental organisations involved in the micro and small enterprises development sector. KAS Development Agency is one of its autonomous institutions. Its core activities as research, monitoring and evaluation of income pilot projects.

**DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT NETWORK LIMITED (DESUNE)**

POBox 1100 Mwanza  
 Tel: 255 28 2570246  
 Email: [desune@africaonline.co.tz](mailto:desune@africaonline.co.tz)

**Contact person:** Henry Mbuya

**Profile**

*Desune* offers support to NGOs, mainly church development organisations. The areas of support are: project conceptualisation and planning, community participation; project monitoring and report writing; enabling and supporting evaluation processes.

*Desune* acts as Local Support Services (LSS) for the German Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst (EED) and as a transfer-of-function office for Bread for the World.



**E: INDIA**

---

**CENTRE FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL STUDIES (CESS)**

Begumpet, Hyderabad - 500016,  
Andhra Pradesh, INDIA.

Tel: +9140 2340 2789, 2341 6780, 2341 6610-13

Fax: 91-40-2340 6808

Email: [postmaster@cess.ac.in](mailto:postmaster@cess.ac.in)

Web: <http://www.cess.ac.in/cesshome/cessmain.asp>

**Contact person:** S. Mahendra Dev, Director, Email: [smahendradev@cess.ac.in](mailto:smahendradev@cess.ac.in)

**Legal status**

CESS was established as an autonomous research Centre in 1980.

**Mandate**

To conduct interdisciplinary research in analytical and applied areas of social sciences, encompassing socio-economic and other aspects of development.

**Geographical scope**

India

**Thematic focus**

Rural Development & Poverty, Agriculture and Food Security, Irrigation and Water Management, Public Finance, Demography, Health, Environment, Governance And Policy Spaces (GAPS), Social Security, Employment and Unemployment, Rehabilitation and Resettlement, Welfare Policies.

**Findings**

CESS is a multidisciplinary research institute that undertakes research projects sponsored by the central and state governments, as well as international agencies. It also runs postgraduate training programmes in Development Studies. CESS receives grant-in-aid from the Government of Andhra Pradesh, where it is based, and the ICSSR.

CESS has undertaken a number of evaluation and impact assessment studies. They include,

- District Poverty Initiative Project: Monitoring and Evaluation. (World Bank)
- Longitudinal study on 2000 children for about 15 years.
- Poverty Alleviation Programs in Andhra Pradesh - An Assessment
- Livelihood Impact of Watershed development (DFID and University of Leeds)
- Social Sector Expenditures and Budgeting
- Health Insurance for the Poor in India (sponsored by Volkswagen, Germany)

The Institute has around 30 senior faculty members, eight Research staff, and 23 Administration staff. It has a strong quantitative research tradition.

CESS works with a number of national and international partners, particularly in running its research projects. They include State and central governments, as well as international agencies such as the World Bank, ADB, DFID, Ford Foundation and the EEC.

**CENTRE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH (CSR)**

2, Nelson Mandela Marg

Vasant Kunj, New Delhi - 110070

Tel: 91-11-26899998, 91-11-26125583

Fax: 91-11-26137823

Email: [info@csrindia.org](mailto:info@csrindia.org); [csr@nda.vsnl.net.in](mailto:csr@nda.vsnl.net.in)

Web: <http://www.csrindia.org/>

**Contact person:** Dr. Ranjana Kumari, Director CSR

**Legal status**

Founded in 1983 as a not-for-profit organisation by a group of concerned social scientists dedicated to promote the empowerment of women, deprived castes and groups.

**Mandate**

CSR aims to empower women and provide them with the resources to be self-reliant individuals. CSR works at the grassroots, regional and international levels to raise women's awareness of their rights, build inroads into decision-making institutions from *Panchayats* to Parliament and to eliminate violence against women.

**Geographical scope**

Primarily India.

**Thematic focus**

Women issues with a focus on :

- Women's Political Empowerment
- Gender and Governance
- Domestic violence
- Women and Economy
- Education
- Health
- Environment

**Findings**

CSR is one of the leading women's institutes India, undertaking Advocacy, Dialogue and Networking, Training, Research and Consultancy.

It has a large portfolio of studies in monitoring and evaluation, a number of them undertaken for international agencies. In particular, CSR works on linkages between health and women. It has also undertaken a number studies in the areas of land reclamation.

CSR includes among its international clients, the World Bank, the European Economic Commission, The Dutch Development Cooperation, DANIDA and ILO.

It has partnerships with a host of regional and global women's networks, including South Asia Network for Advocacy against Trafficking in Persons(SANAT), Beijing+10, The South Asia Coordination Committee on Political Empowerment of Women (SANWIP), Joint Action Front for Women (JAFW), The Feminist Majority Foundation, ICRW - The International Centre for Research and the Global 50/50 Gender Balance Campaign

**ETC CONSULTANTS INDIA PVT. LTD.**

'Srinivasa' C-2, second floor, site No. 2 & 3,  
Yadhava Farm, Near RBI Layout, Chunchagatta,  
Bangalore - 560062, India

Phone : +0091-(0)80-26638112/26638120

Email: [etcind@bgl.vsnl.net.in](mailto:etcind@bgl.vsnl.net.in)

Web: <http://www.etc-india.org>

**Contact person:** H. Lanting, CEO

**Legal status**

Private, not for profit company. ETC India is part of ETC India, headquartered in the Netherlands and established 30 years ago.

**Mandate**

ETC Consultants India envisages to provide quality consultancy services to those who wish to address these issues through participatory processes and paying due respect to sustainable resource management.

**Geographical scope**

ETC India focuses its work in India.

**Thematic focus**

- Participatory processes linking public and private sector with civil society
- Social development (poverty analysis and poverty alleviation strategies, gender analysis, organisation of civil society)
- Adult education in the field of sustainable resource management
- Sustainable agriculture, bio-diversity management
- Biomass production for organic matter production, feed, energy purposes and predator niche creation; Renewable energy in rural development (pumping, water heating, electricity supply), farm mechanisation and storage techniques.

**Findings**

ETC India specialises in the area of sustainable rural development. Its services include,

- inventory and appraisal studies
- programme formulation, budgeting and donor identification
- monitoring of programme implementation
- evaluation of programme implementation

It has a good track record in M&E, having undertaken a series of evaluations and impact assessments of Natural Resource Management projects in India. Consultancy teams have a mix of local and international experts. As part of the ETC International Group, ETC India draws on the parent group for expertise when local expertise is not available. ETC India has on its team nine Directors, 5 Consultants and 5 Associated Consultants.

The Government of the Netherlands is the major client of ETC, in particular to conduct evaluations of Dutch funded projects and programmes. It has partnerships with associated organisations and companies from the engineering and technical field such as ISA (international organisation of engineers) and ThinkSoft (global software group).

**PRIA - AN INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR LEARNING AND PROMOTION OF PARTICIPATION AND DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE**

New Delhi (Head Office)

PRIA 42, Tuglakabad Institutional Area New Delhi – 110062

Phone: 29956908, 29960931/32/33

Email: [info@pria.org](mailto:info@pria.org)

Web: <http://www.pria.org>

**Contact Person:** Dr. Rajesh Tandon, President

**Legal status**

Established in 1982 as a non-profit organisation

**Mandate**

To work towards promotion of policies, institutions and capacities that strengthen the voice and participation of the poor and the marginalized in improving their socio-economic status through democratic governance in society.

**Geographical scope**

India. PRIA has six state and district level offices in Andhra Pradesh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Rajasthan

**Thematic focus**

Gender, Social Exclusion, Environment, Human Rights

**Findings**

PRIA is one of the first points of contact for donors working in India due to its wide network and grassroots reach. It has 3 areas of intervention (services) namely,

- Knowledge Building,
- Capacity Building and,
- Advocacy.

Its Knowledge Building service includes Consultancy and offers an array of customised services that includes Evaluations, Needs Assessments, Impact Assessment and Policy Analysis. PRIA has substantial expertise in participatory methods, which is incorporated into its Monitoring and Evaluation consultancies and Community Based Monitoring activities.

The expertise of the staff is correspondingly strong in participatory based research and action research. The PRIA team at the Head Office comprises around 46 professionals (including consultants) and 15 administrative staff. This is further supported by the teams from its district offices.

PRIA receives funds (clients) from a number of international NGO's including Action Aid, CORDAID, DFID, The Ford Foundation, IIZ/DVV, Germany, SIDA, IDS Sussex, and SDC, Switzerland. It has partnerships with a number of Indian Research Foundations such as the Ratan Tata Trust and the Rajiv Gandhi Foundation.

**SOCIETY FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES (SDS)**

Society for Development Studies, Core 6A, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, India Habitat Centre, Lodhi Road, New Delhi – 110003, India.

Tel: (91-11) 24699368, 24656164

Fax: (91-11) 24699368, 24699369

Email: [sds@nda.vsnl.net.in](mailto:sds@nda.vsnl.net.in), [sds1@vsnl.net](mailto:sds1@vsnl.net), [sds2@vsnl.net](mailto:sds2@vsnl.net)

Web: [www.sdsindia.org](http://www.sdsindia.org)

**Contact person:** Dr. Vinay D. Lall, Director General / Chief Executive Officer

**Legal status**

Established in 1984 as a non-profit private institute.

**Mandate**

Policy-oriented research, programme evaluation, capacity building, institutional development, technical assistance and advisory services in areas central to the growth of local, national and regional economies, but often under-stressed or overlooked in the planning process.

**Geographical scope**

India, Asia-Pacific region, Arab region & parts of Anglophone Africa region. At the country level, work has been undertaken in India, Indonesia, Egypt, Yemen, Bangladesh, Mauritius, Nepal, Maldives, Sri Lanka

**Thematic focus**

Information-Based Policies, Strategies and Programs, relating to:

- Housing and Urban Infrastructure; slum upgrading
- Informal Sector
- Poverty Reduction (rural and urban)
- Health
- Rural Development; water & Sanitation
- Community Empowerment

**Findings**

SDS offers services in the areas of Policy Research, Action Projects, Technical Assistance/ Consultancy, Capacity Building Programs, Seminars/Conferences and Institutional Development. It has a wide experience in M&E, at the regional level and in the following areas: Social Development, Poverty Reduction, Urban Management, Urban Upgrading, Housing, Water and Sanitation.

It works with a range of research methods, depending on the assignment and ranges from Quantitative tools (e.g. census and stratified sample surveys) to Qualitative, PRA tools including Focus Group Discussion. SDS as a full time staff cadre of 15 Professionals and 6 Administrative at staff. The core staff is supported by a so-called 'Panel of Experts', who are inducted into designing and implementation of specific projects on a Consultancy basis, as per the requirements of the project.

Its' client outreach includes, UN HABITAT, World Bank, ILO, ADB, DFID, the Reserve Bank of India, National Housing Bank (India) and Ministries of the Government of India. The SDS has partnerships with UNDP, ESCAP, UNIDO, UNOPS, USAID, WB and WFP.

**CENTRE FOR BUDGET AND POLICY STUDIES (CBPS)**

S.V. Complex, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, 55, K.R. Road Basavanagudi,  
Bangalore- 560004

Karnataka, INDIA

Tel: 91-80-65907402, 91-80-26603836

Fax: 91-80-26671230

Email : [office@cbpsindia.org](mailto:office@cbpsindia.org), [cbpsmail@gmail.com](mailto:cbpsmail@gmail.com)

Web: [www.cbpsindia.org](http://www.cbpsindia.org)

**Contact Person:** Prof. Vinod Vyasulu, Director

**Profile**

Set up in 1998, CBPS works largely in the areas of decentralisation, Democratic governance, budget analysis, primary education, health, RCH and poverty studies. It provides research, training and consultancy and has undertaken studies for Government of Karnataka on health, education expenditure that focus on evaluation. In particular it looks at local level finances in the context of decentralisation and currently has an ongoing project to study the Municipal Finances of Karnataka, which is also a Ford Foundation grant to CBPS.

CBPS has a professional staff of 10 persons in addition to an administrative support staff. Among its clients are, the Central and State Governments of Karnataka, Kerala and Madhya Pradesh. International clients include, UNDP, UNICEF, WORLD BANK, Ford Foundation, MacArthur Foundation. The latter two also fund research programmes of CBPS.

**CENTRE FOR POLICY RESEARCH (CPR)**

Dharma Marg, Chanakyapuri

New Delhi - 110 021

Tel: 91-11-2611 5273-76 (4 Lines)

Email: [cprindia@vsnl.com](mailto:cprindia@vsnl.com)

Web: <http://www.cprindia.org>

**Contact Person:** Pratap Bhanu Mehta, President & Chief Executive.

Email: [president\\_cpr@vsnl.com](mailto:president_cpr@vsnl.com)

**Profile**

Established in 1973, CPR is one of India's leading policy research institutes. Its focus is in the areas of Strategic Issues, Governance and Economic Issues. Among its major objectives is to provide policy direction to the Government of India and to carry out policy studies on various sectors of the economy and society that concern national development. CPR does not focus on evaluation and impact studies but is an important resource centre for policy oriented development analysis.

The CPR staff faculty comprises Senior researchers numbering over 20.

**CONSUMER UNITY & TRUST SOCIETY (CUTS)**

D-217, Bhaskar Marg

Bani Park

Jaipur 302016, Rajasthan, India

Email: [cuts@cuts.org](mailto:cuts@cuts.org), [www.cuts-international.org](http://www.cuts-international.org)

**Contact Person:** Mr. Pradeep S. Mehta, Secretary General

**Profile**

CUTS is a Non-profit organisation established in 1984, that specialises in the areas of International Trade & Development, Competition, Investment & Economic Regulation, Human Development, Consumer Protection, Consumer Safety.

It provides research, training and consultancy within these areas, and conducts substantial advocacy programmes in partnership with leading international organisations such as UNCTAD, OXFAM and South Asia Watch. While it has a limited M&E track record, CUTS has undertaken substantial research on the impacts of WTO on developing countries.

**CENTRE FOR WOMEN'S DEVELOPMENT STUDIES (CWDS)**

25, Bhai Vir Singh Marg (Gole Market)

New Delhi - 110 001, India.

Phone: +91-11-23346044 /23365541 /23366930

Email: [cwds@vsnl.com](mailto:cwds@vsnl.com), [cwds@cwds.org](mailto:cwds@cwds.org), [cwdsorg@eth.net](mailto:cwdsorg@eth.net), [cwdslib@vsnl.net](mailto:cwdslib@vsnl.net)

Web: <http://www.cwds.org/>

**Contact Person** Dr. Mary E. John, Director, [mary@cwds.org](mailto:mary@cwds.org)

**Profile**

Set up in 1980 as an autonomous research and advocacy institute, CWDS works in the area of Women's Research. It provides Applied research, Training, Advisory services, Exchange and networking. While it does not specifically focus on M&E, CWDS has undertaken research on Impact of Globalisation on Women Workers in Delhi.

**INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGE (ISEC)**

Institute for Social and Economic Change, Nagarabhavi, Bangalore - 560072, India.  
Phone: 91-080-23215468, 23215519.

Email: [adm@isec.ac.in](mailto:adm@isec.ac.in), [registrar@isec.ac.in](mailto:registrar@isec.ac.in)

Web: <http://www.isec.ac.in/>

**Contact Person:** Prof. N. Jayaram, Director

**Profile**

ISEC was established in 1972 and is primarily a research that also offers fellowships for Phd programmes. ISEC also undertakes research and consultancy through affiliated Centres of Excellence.

It focuses on the themes of Decentralisation, Human Resource Development, and Natural Resources Management.

Relevant M&E related research include studies on Poverty and Economic Reforms, "Micro-Finance, Poverty Alleviation and Empowerment of Women, Monitoring Poverty and Human Development Indicators: A Framework and State Finances in India: A Critical Review

ISEC has a core faculty of 43 academics and six visiting fellows.

**INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT TECHNOLOGY (IDMAT)**

IDMAT, C8/8007,

Vasant Kunj, New Delhi, India

Tel: 91 11-26130242

email: [training@aidmat.com](mailto:training@aidmat.com)

Web: <http://www.aidmat.com/idmat>

**Profile**

Established in the 1990s, IDMAT specialises development management through training and consultancy provision. In particular, IDMAT has a strong record in Research and Development, HR Benchmarking, Monitoring & Evaluation, in particular of Social & Economic Development and Human Resource development.

Its services include: Training and Development, Research and Audit, Monitoring and evaluation, Social Auditing, Institutional Development and HR Benchmarking,

IDMAT has a resource pool of over 50 drawn including members from Asia and the USA. Its partners and clients include the World Bank, UN and the GTZ.

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (NIRD)– CENTRE FOR PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATION (CPME)**

National Institute of Rural Development,  
Rajendranagar, Hyderabad-500030  
Phone: 91-40-24008448/ 472/ 473/ 466/ 526  
Fax: 91-40-24015277, 24016500  
Web: <http://www.nird.org.in/CPME.htm>

**Contact Person:** Dr. S. K. Bhanja, Professor and Head  
Email: [sk\\_bhanja@yahoo.com](mailto:sk_bhanja@yahoo.com)

**Profile**

NIRD is the country's apex body for undertaking training, research, action research and consultancy functions in the rural development sector. It works as an autonomous organization supported by the Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India.

Affiliated to the NIRD is the CPME, which focuses mainly on sensitization and exposure to skills in the use of tools, methods and approaches for participatory micro planning monitoring and evaluation; which include developing indicators; the logical framework approach for programme formulation and management; formal surveys M&E designs; rapid rural appraisal and participatory method; impact evaluation; cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis; stakeholders' participation.

The CPME provides broad-based and comprehensive 'state-of-art' services and guide on all aspects of Planning Monitoring and Evaluation in Rural Development.

**RESEARCH AND INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (RIS)**

Zone IV-B Fourth Floor,  
India Habitat Centre Lodhi Road,  
New Delhi-100 003, India  
Phone: 91-11-24682177-80  
Email: [dgoffice@ris.org.in](mailto:dgoffice@ris.org.in);  
Web: [www.ris.org.in](http://www.ris.org.in), [www.newasiaforum.org](http://www.newasiaforum.org)

**Contact Person:** Dr. Nagesh Kumar, Director-General. Email: [nkumar@ris.org.in](mailto:nkumar@ris.org.in)

**Profile**

RIS was established by the Government of India as a 'Think-Tank' in the field of international economic relations and development cooperation. It provides policy oriented research, policy dialogue, outreach and networking in the areas of World trading and financial systems development (e.g. on WTO Negotiations), Regional economic integration in Asia, South-South cooperation, new technologies and development and Strategic responses to globalisation. While it does not specifically focus on M&E it researches the impact of trade policies in India, South Asia and South East Asia.

RIS has a faculty of 14 members supported by 5 external research advisors and 22 administrative staff members.



**AKATIGA CENTRE FOR SOCIAL ANALYSIS**

Jl. Tubagus Ismail II/2 Bandung

Tel: +62 22-2502302 Fax. 022-2535824

Email : [akatiga@akatiga.or.id](mailto:akatiga@akatiga.or.id)

Web: <http://www.akatiga.or.id>

**Contact Person:** Indrasari Tjandraningsih

**Profile**

Akatiga (Centre for Analysis and Dissemination of Data) is a well known NGO based in the Bandung province of Indonesia. It also has experience in research and conducting evaluations. Akatiga was created to bring a gender perspective to data on social issues. It focuses on social problems which affect women, producing data and analysis which are used to raise awareness in society, and to make policy recommendations to government and other agencies.

The main activities of the centre are research, social analysis, training, publications, and networking with other non-government agencies. These activities are often undertaken with, or on behalf of, other organisations.

Among its current activities is a research projects on the impact of the economic crisis on poor women, and in this context is highlighting non-physical types of violence against women. The centre is also working with the Women's Group for Labour Justice to develop a database on the health and safety of women labourers. Akatiga also works on labour and issues and industrial relations.

Other issues which Akatiga plans to address in the future include women and land; women labourers; women as small business owners; women migrant workers; and women in the law. Many of these projects will be planned to be undertaken in collaboration with organisations specializing in violence against women.

Unfortunately further organisational details on Akatiga could not be added as the English section of its website was inactive. However, due to its recommendation by Indonesia experts, it is included in the first list of organisations in Indonesia.

---

<sup>106</sup> Some of the First List organisations in Indonesia contain less detail due to many of the websites being available only in *Bahasa*.

**CENTER FOR ECONOMIC AND PUBLIC POLICY STUDY (CEPPS), GADJAH MADA UNIVERSITY, YOGYAKARTA**

Jl. Teknika Utara, Berek

Yogyakarta 55281

Phone/Fax:(0274)564926,520328,581827

Email: [humas@psekp.ugm.ac.id](mailto:humas@psekp.ugm.ac.id)

Web: <http://paue.ugm.ac.id/>

**Contact person:** Wihana Kirana Jaya, Director

**Legal status**

An independent Centre of the Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta

**Mandate**

- To provide support for researchers and research projects.
- To cooperate with stakeholders from internal and external of Gadjah Mada University, private, government and overseas institution

**Geographical scope**

Indonesia

**Thematic focus**

- Basic and Policy Oriented Research: Manufacturing Industries, Financial and Monetary, Economics, Banking, Environmental and Natural Resources, Agriculture)
- Applied Research: Public Policy Research (Fiscal Policy, Infrastructure Development, Decentralisation, Poverty, Banking and Finance, Local Government Finance); Economic Policy Research (Industry, Energy, Agriculture); Tax Policies

**Findings**

The establishment of CEPPS was initiated by the Government of Indonesia in 1986 with funding by the World Bank. Its major area of work is in the field of public policy analysis on trade, regulatory, tax and decentralisation issues. It has undertaken a substantial number of impact studies in these areas. The centre also undertakes poverty related research.

Some recent research outputs include;

- Pro-Poor Pricing policy: Health and Education Sectors in Indonesia Period
- Human Security and Regional Development, Case Study Report: Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- The Poor at Risk: Surviving the Economic Crisis in Southeast Asia.
- A Preliminary Review and Assessment of NGO's Role in the Delivery of Employment Creation Programmes in Indonesia.

CEPPS has a 30 member research body with a corresponding number of database / administrative personnel. Their major fields of expertise lie in economics, econometrics, and finance & business.

It collaborates with Indonesian Government and research institutions as well as international donors and researchers. These include; the National Development Planning Agency, Ministry of Internal Affairs, Directorate General of Taxation, Department of Finance, JICA, UNCRD and Monash University, Australia and the World Bank.

**INSTITUTE FOR POLICY AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT STUDIES (IPCOS)**

Jalan Ciomas V Nomor 4

Kebayoran Baru

Jakarta Selatan

Indonesia 12180

Phone: +62-21-7246871

Web: <http://www.ipcos.or.id/>

**Contact person:** Johan O Menajang, Executive Director, Phone: +62-21-7246871

**Legal status**

IPCOS is a Jakarta based Indonesian Non Government Organisation established in 1995.

**Mandate**

IPCOS was set up by a group of young scholars and intellectuals who share a common interest in policy studies, development and the civil society strengthening. The institute works together with other local and international organisations to build a democratic and humane society.

**Geographical scope**

Indonesia

**Thematic focus**

IPCOS currently focus our work on six programme clusters:

- Decentralisation & Local Government,
- Public services,
- Public Participation;
- Peace & Security;
- Institutionalization of Democracy;
- Marginalized Groups.

**Findings**

IPCOS is a well known NGO in Indonesia with also a record of conducting research and studies. Unfortunately at the time of this survey, the IPCOS website is under construction and further information is not available. Nevertheless, given its recommendation by referees familiar with the Indonesian landscape it is included in the organisational first list.

**LABSOSIO, CENTRE FOR SOCIOLOGICAL STUDIES, FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF INDONESIA**

Gedung C. Lt. 3., Faculty of Social & Political Sciences  
 University of Indonesia, Depok 16424, West Java, Indonesia  
 Phone : +62 21 786 3427, Fax : +62 21 787 0612  
 Email : [labsosio@indo.net.id](mailto:labsosio@indo.net.id)  
 Web: <http://www.labsosio.org>  
**Contact person:** Sulastri

**Legal status**

An independent Centre of the University of Indonesia

**Mandate**

A centre of studies that contributes significantly to the development of sociology as an empirical social science and the development of innovative social policies for the reformation and transformation toward a more equitable and democratic Indonesian society

**Geographical scope**

Indonesia

**Thematic focus** (Research Clusters)

- Democracy & Social Transformation
- Community Development
- Conflict Analysis and Peace Building
- Environment & Extractive Economy
- Labour and Industrial Relations
- Gender and family
- Health and Society

**Findings**

LabSosio as a centre for Sociological Studies at the University of Indonesia, is focused on the analysis and policy development of social problems and issues bearing the impact of inter-related societal changes (historical, economic, political and social cultural) of contemporary Indonesia. Among its mission objectives is to “To conduce assessment, monitoring and evaluation of projects design and implementation” and “Strengthened international cooperation an affiliation in social research and development (R & D) activities”.

As part of the prestigious University of Indonesia, LabSosio has high reputation for research and training. Among some of its ongoing research studies are,

- The making of civil society in Indonesia: historical and contemporary perspectives
- Social mapping of the community in and around West Java
- Performance review and discourse development of joint team for combating corruption

The centre has a 20 member research body and an Advisory Board of seven senior professionals.

LabSosio has a number of partnerships with Indonesian and foreign partners. They include the Regional Government of DKI Jakarta, Ministry of Social Affairs, Ministry of Population and Environment, Ministry of Health, the UNDP, UNICEF, WHO and European Union

**INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH (LPEM), FACULTY OF ECONOMICS,  
UNIVERSITY OF INDONESIA (FEUI)**

Jalan Salemba Raya 4,

Jakarta 10430, Indonesia.

Tel: (62-21) - 314-3177; 3983-0189

Email: [dede@lpem-feui.org](mailto:dede@lpem-feui.org)

Web: <http://www.lpem.org/>

**Profile**

LPEM, similarly to LabSosio is a part of the University of Indonesia and is among the country's oldest and leading economic research institutes. Its areas of focus are in the fields of Macroeconomics, trade policies and performance, industrial policy and development, poverty alleviation, environmental economics. It undertakes research and studies for the Government of Indonesia, such as the Ministry of Economic Affairs as well international agencies such as the World Bank. For instance in 2005 it undertook a two-year series of surveys to develop indicators for monitoring the investment climate in Indonesia.

Unfortunately detailed information on the organisational structure of LPEM could not be obtained as the website is largely in Bahasa. Most of its research outputs are also in Indonesia. LPEM has however been rated very positively by experts on Indonesia and warrants inclusion.



**F: BANGLADESH**

---

**BANGLADESH INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES (BIDS)**

E-17 Agargaon, Sher-e- Bangla Nagar,  
GPO Box # 3854, Dhaka-1207, Bangladesh

Email: [secy10bids@sdnbd.org](mailto:secy10bids@sdnbd.org)

Web: [www.bids-bd.org](http://www.bids-bd.org)

**Contact person:** Quazi Shahabuddin, Director General, dg\_bids@sdnbd.org

**Legal status**

BIDS evolved from the well known Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE). After the formation of Bangladesh, it moved to Dhaka and registered as an independent organisation in 1971.

**Mandate**

BIDS is a multi-disciplinary organisation which conducts policy oriented research on development issues mainly in the context of Bangladesh.

**Geographical scope**

Primarily Bangladesh and South Asia

**Thematic focus**

- Agriculture and Rural Development (natural resources management, rural development)
- General Economy (macroeconomic management, trade, monetary and fiscal policies)
- Human Resources Development (education, education, health, nutrition, poverty, gender)
- Industry and Physical Infrastructure (manufacturing and rural industry. Recent research includes regional trade regimes, industrialisation, role of technology and sick industries.)
- Population Studies (demography studies. Recent research includes women's empowerment, women's health status, women and migration and urbanisation)

**Findings**

BIDS is one of the oldest and leading research institutes in Bangladesh. Not surprisingly it is also one of the most sought after and is usually difficult to contract at short notice. It has a strong record in research as well as in M&E, having undertaken assessment of numerous poverty alleviation programmes as well as Government implemented, donor supported projects and programmes.

BIDS has a sizeable research staff, comprising 6 Research Directors, 11 Senior Research Fellows, 19 Research Fellows, and 11 Research Associates. Its partners / clients represent most of the international and bilateral agencies, as well as Government ministries.

BIDS has a wide partner outreach comprising international development agencies such as the ADB, Ford Foundation, Institute of Developing Economies, Japan, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Washington DC, ILO, JICA, ODA/DFID, Overseas Economic Development Fund (OECF), Japan, Royal Netherlands Government, Swiss Development Co-operation, SIDA, UNDP, UNICEF, UN-ESCAP, USAID, the World Bank and WHO.

**BANGLADESH UNNAYAN PARISHAD (BUP)**

H-50, Rd-8, Block-D, Niketon, Gulshan-1, Dhaka-1212, Bangladesh

Tel: 8853958-60, 8853962

Email: [bup2@citec-bd.com](mailto:bup2@citec-bd.com)

Web: <http://www.bup-bd.org/>

**Contact person:** Dr. Q. K. Ahmad, Chairman and Chief Executive

**Legal status**

Non-profit, non-government, multidisciplinary research organisation. Established in 1980

**Mandate**

The mission of BUP is to foster a people-centred culture of development. In pursuit of this mission, it seeks to generate ideas and policy directions through research on a continuing basis.

**Geographical scope**

National, Regional, International

**Thematic focus**

Poverty, economics, gender, education, environment, political analysis, infrastructure development, social advocacy, water management, sustainable development, rural development, regional cooperation.

**Findings**

BUP works in three core areas, namely,

1. Economic and Social Policy Research
2. Water and Environment and,
3. Social Weather Analysis.

Within these areas BUP has undertaken a number of evaluations and impact assessments, particularly in the fields of rural and urban electrification, product and sectoral development in private sector, socio-economic development of municipal towns and flood protection, corruption, social weather advocacy, democracy, PRSP/MDG, SME development, micro financing, research publication on recent issues.

BUP has a full time staff of 25 Professionals and 10 Administrative personnel. It also works with a network of consultants. The staff expertise involves Socio-economic analysis, entrepreneurship development, water and environment, monitoring and evaluation, advocacy, training and development, weather analysis, gender, education, poverty reduction.

Its major clients include the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, UNDP, the Government of Bangladesh, development organisations, local agencies and private organisations. In addition BUP has a large network of partners, in particular drawn from the areas of Water, Environment and Natural Resource Management networks and Social Weather Stations.

**CENTRE FOR POLICY DIALOGUE (CPD)**

House- 40/C, Road- 11 (New),  
 Dhanmondi R/A, Dhaka-1209 , Bangladesh  
 Phone: (+880 2) 8124770, 9141734, 9141703, 9145090  
 E-mail : [cpd@bdonline.com](mailto:cpd@bdonline.com)  
 Web: <http://www.cpd-bangladesh.org>

**Contact person:** Dr. Debapriya Bhattacharya, Executive Director, (+880 2) 9141655

**Legal status**

Civil Society Organisation established in 1993

**Mandate**

To serve the growing demands originating from the emerging civil society of Bangladesh for a more participatory and accountable development process. CPD endeavours to create a national environment conducive to open public discussion on important policy issues with a view to ensuring domestic ownership over the policy agenda and also building a broad-based support for such policies.

**Geographical scope**

National, Regional and Global Economic Issues

**Thematic focus**

Trade, Investment Promotion and Enterprise Development, Agriculture and Rural Development, Ecosystems and Environmental Studies, Human Resource Development, Gender Issues and Social Protection, Governance and Policy Reforms, Poverty, Energy.

**Findings**

The research focus of CPD is on macro-economic policy related issues. Some of its regular outputs are,

- Independent Review of Bangladesh Development (IRBD) which is an annual publication that monitors and traces major macro-economic performance indicators (poverty, aid, trade, revenue mobilisation) as an annual basis.
- Conduct Annual survey of business environment in Bangladesh for the World Economic Forum (Davos) Forum

Despite a limited focus on M&E, given its respected position in the Bangladesh research / policy landscape, CPD it is an important point of contact for development policy makers and evaluators.

The Centre has a substantial professional staff 39 persons, supported by an Administrative cadre of 8 persons.

Clients of the CPD include the Government of Bangladesh, Business and trade bodies such as UNCTAD, UNEP, ESCAP, ADB, WTO, CIDA and sia Foundation. It has partnerships with regional organisations such as the Institute of Policy Studies (Sri Lanka); RIS (India); WEF (Davos Forum); SANEI (GDN) and ARTNET (ESCAP).

**UNNAYAN SHAMANNAY / SHAMUNNAY**

2/E/1-B Mymensingh Road

Shahbagh

Dhaka 1000

Telephone: +880 2 861 0332

Email: [unnayan@citechco.net](mailto:unnayan@citechco.net), [shamunnay@sdnbd.org](mailto:shamunnay@sdnbd.org)Web: <http://www.shamunnay.org/index2.htm>**Contact person:** Dr. Atiur Rahman, Chair**Legal status**

A non-profit non-governmental research organisation incorporated in July 1994 under the Companies Act, 1913 (section 26) with the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies under the Ministry of Commerce, Government of Bangladesh.

**Mandate**

Building on the institutional capacity and proven track record, Shamunnay strives to innovate creativity in learning and to work at the frontiers of development. It makes a constant effort to equip itself with relevant knowledge and understanding and acquire state-of-the-art research skills

**Geographical scope**

Bangladesh

**Thematic focus**

- Aspects of macro and micro economy, particularly the socio-economic impact of developmental reforms
- Environmental conservation and preservation of bio-diversity
- Health, nutrition and social status of the most disadvantaged group
- Socio-cultural attitudes, norms and conventions and their manifestation in art forms
- Disaster management and coping strategies
- Education and promotion of society, gender, history, culture and economy
- Communication, advocacy and audio-visual materials on development and culture

**Findings**

Much of the reputation of the organisation rests on its Chair, Dr. Atiur Rahman. However, it is able to galvanise a critical pool of researchers and undertake a substantial number of projects and studies. It has significant experience in the area of M&E undertaken for multilateral and bilateral agencies.

Among some of the M&E related studies undertaken are:

- Socioeconomic Impact Evaluation of the Rural Electric Program in Bangladesh  
(Sponsoring Agency: USAID/NRECA/REB)
- An Assessment of Compartmentalization Pilot Project (FAP-20)  
Sponsoring Agency: KFW, Germany  
South Asia Poverty Monitoring, Bangladesh Country Report. Qualitative part  
Sponsoring Agency: UNDP, Dhaka

Information on the staff makeup of Shamunay is unfortunately not available.

**BANGLADESH CENTER FOR COMMUNICATION PROGRAMS (BCCP)**

House # 3A, Road # 74

Gulshan- 2, Dhaka- 1212

Tel. (880-2) 9893362, 9891354

Email: [info@bangladesh-ccp.org](mailto:info@bangladesh-ccp.org)

Web: [www.bangladesh-ccp.org](http://www.bangladesh-ccp.org)

**Contact Person:** Mr. Mohammad Shahjahan, Director & CEO

**Profile**

BCCP was set up in 1996, as a successor to the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health/Center for Communication Programs (JHU/CCP) in Bangladesh. It works in the area of Strategic Communication, and provides expertise in conceptualization, development, management, implementation, and evaluation of BCC programs.

In the area of research and evaluation, BCCP uses its communications expertise to manage large scale research studies, both qualitative and quantitative, including national surveys, to guide the design of BCC programs and evaluate their impact. BCCP has, in collaboration with UNICEF, JHU/CCP and the Social Marketing Company, conducted three national media surveys.

Information on the staff makeup of BCCP is unfortunately not available.

**RESOURCE PLANNING & MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS (PVT.) LIMITED (RPMC)**

House 92, Road 13/A, Block D

Banani, Dhaka-1213, Bangladesh

Phone: (8802) 9881708, 8812743, 8813853

Email: [rpmcl@bdonline.com](mailto:rpmcl@bdonline.com)

Web: <http://www.rpmcl.com/>

**Contact person:** Mr. A.Q. Siddiqui, Managing Director

**Profile**

RPMC is an independent, multi-disciplinary consultancy organisation incorporated as a limited company in 1994. The principals and key personnel of the company are those who have worked in the fields of development sectors including water resources development, rural and urban infrastructure, rural development and agriculture, etc. in-country and overseas.

The company offers services at all steps of development, including identification, planning, design, implementation supervision, management, exit strategy, monitoring and evaluation.

Among its clients are the World Bank, ADB, EU, UN organisations and bi-laterals such as GTZ, CIDA and the UN.

**SURVEY RESEARCH GROUP OF BANGLADESH LIMITED (SRGB)**

396 New Eskaton Road, P.O.Box 7092,  
Dhaka 1000, Bangladesh  
Tel: (880 2) 9353350-54, 9351102  
Email: [srgb@consultant.com](mailto:srgb@consultant.com), [srgb@bttb.net.bd](mailto:srgb@bttb.net.bd)  
Web: <http://www.srgb.org>

**Contact Person:** M Saidul Haq, President/CEO

**Profile**

SRGB was set up in 1987 as a Management and Industrial Consulting house. It has subsequently diversified to provide development consultancy among other areas.

SRG's expertise in conducting market research enables it to provide qualitative and quantitative research services ranging from broad based sectoral studies to micro level case studies for domestic and international clients.

It has undertaken M&E studies in the areas of project monitoring & evaluation, tracer studies, social impact and mitigation, trade & business promotion, social protection, and EIA/SIA.

Among its international clients are the World Bank, UN organisations, the ADB, and bi-laterals such as GTZ, CIDA, JICA and USAID.

**UNICONSULT INTERNATIONAL LTD. DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS**

Sena Kalyan Bhaban (7th Floor), 195, Motijheel Comercial Area,  
GPO Box 2608, Dhaka 1000, Bangladesh  
Phone: +880 2 9565122-5, 9565128  
Email: [ucil@bdonline.com](mailto:ucil@bdonline.com), [info@ucil-bd.com](mailto:info@ucil-bd.com)  
Web: <http://www.ucil-bd.com/>

**Profile**

Uniconsult International Limited (UCIL) is a consulting firm in Bangladesh established in 1980. The company focuses on the sectors of trade & commerce, agriculture, forestry, fisheries & livestock, education, and several other areas of social development.

UCIL specializes in agriculture and socio-economic development of Bangladesh through the provision of consultancy, management, and training services. UCIL draws its pool of consultants from management professionals who have served as international consultants and directors of international organisations as well as from teaching and research positions at universities and research institutions. UCI has international consulting experience in some Asian countries namely Bhutan, Cambodia, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh.

UCIL has undertaken a number of evaluation studies of projects and programmes in Bangladesh as well as the region. Its clients include IFAD, ADB, WB, EC, DGIS, SIDA, USAID, FAO, NORAD, UNDP, UNICEF, IDA, JICA, ODA, and DFID.

**G: CAMBODIA**

---

**CAMBODIA DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES INSTITUTE (CDRI)**

56 Street 315, Tuol Kork, Phnom Penh, Cambodia  
(Postal address: PO Box 622, Phnom Penh, Cambodia)  
Telephone: (855-23) 883-603 / 881-701 / 881-384 / 881-916  
Email: [cdri@camnet.com.kh](mailto:cdri@camnet.com.kh) / [pubs@cdri.forum.org.kh](mailto:pubs@cdri.forum.org.kh)  
Web: <http://www.cdri.org.kh>

**Contact person:** Mr Larry Strange, Executive Director

**Legal status**

Independent, private not for profit institute.

**Mandate**

To contribute to Cambodia's sustainable development and the well-being of its people through the generation of high quality policy-relevant development research, knowledge dissemination and capacity building.

**Geographical scope**

Cambodia

**Thematic focus**

- Economy, trade and regional cooperation;
- Poverty reduction, agricultural development and rural livelihoods;
- Democratic governance and public sector reform;
- Natural resources and the environment;
- Human security, peace building and conflict transformation.

**Findings**

CDRI is regarded as one of the most qualified research organisation in the development sector in Cambodia.

It has a total staff-strength of around 70 persons, of whom 64 are Cambodian. Its senior management is foreign led. In 2005, CDRI the first issue of its new *Annual Development Review* which aims to bring together the outcomes and lessons of CDRI's major research and policy work. In the same year it collaborated with the WB in its poverty assessment.

CDRI is also on the Technical Working Group on Poverty Reduction and Planning, which is overseeing the implementation of the government's 2006–10 National Strategic Development Plan and its associated poverty-reduction strategies. Its M&E experience lies in its Agriculture, Poverty, Rural Development and Natural Resources, Environment programmes.

It has a large client and partner outreach combining Cambodian government and non-government organisations and Ministries with international development agencies. The latter includes, ADB, World Bank, UNDP, bi-laterals such as GTZ, DANIDA, CIDA, SIDA and research foundations such as Rockefeller and IDRC Canada

**CAMBODIAN RESEARCHERS FOR DEVELOPMENT (CRD)**

Office # 77, Street 103, Sangkat Beong Trabek, Khan Chamcarmorn,  
Phnom Penh, Cambodia.

Phone/Fax: (855) 023 364 263

Mobile phone: 012 804 420

Email: [crdoffice@camshin.net](mailto:crdoffice@camshin.net)

Web: [www.crd.org.kh](http://www.crd.org.kh)

**Contact person:** Mr. LY Saroeun, Managing Director, Email: [lysaroeun@hotmail.com](mailto:lysaroeun@hotmail.com)

**Legal status**

CRD is a local, non-profit and NGO officially registered with RGC under the Mol as non-profit LINGO in 1994.

**Mandate**

The objectives of CRD is to fight poverty with four objectives:

- conduct socio-economic research,
- offer training community development and management
- carry community project interventions and,
- increase the capacity of its staff.

**Geographical scope**

Cambodia

**Thematic focus**

- Social and Poverty
- Economic, education and primary health care.
- Conflict resolution at community level.

**Findings**

CRD grew out of a research project commissioned by Save the Children Fund (UK) in 1994. It works largely at the levels of social research and capacity building of NGOs. Its' capacity building programmes are aimed at improving management and data collection of NGOs. Hence CRD has a large network that facilitates data generation for M&E.

CRD has undertaken a substantial number of evaluations of mainly donor supported projects, commissioned by donor agencies.

It has worked for international clients such as UNICEF, UNFPA, World Bank and the Asian Development Bank. In general CRD tends to implement evaluation according to TOR set out by the clients. CRD's staff expertise lies in field experience and ground level knowledge. Its ability to deliver high quality written outputs might be compensated by its knowledge of locally contexts.

**CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY (CAS)**

# 85, Street 141, Sangkat Veal Vong, Khan 7 Makara,  
Phnom Penh, Cambodia.

(Postal Address)

P.O Box 2030, Phnom Penh, Cambodia.

Tel. +855-23-214494

Email: [cas@forum.org.kh](mailto:cas@forum.org.kh)

Web: [http://www.cascambodia.org/overview\\_cas.htm](http://www.cascambodia.org/overview_cas.htm)

**Contact person:** Hean Sokhom, Managing Director. Email: [sokhom@forum.org.kh](mailto:sokhom@forum.org.kh)

**Profile**

CAS is an independent, non-political Cambodian institution devoted to research, education and public debate on issues affecting the development of the Cambodian society. It provides research services, develops research projects, supports research capacity building, and promotes the use of evidence-based policy. CAS was foreign managed until the end of 1999.

Its research focuses on the following areas: Ethnic Minorities, Trafficking, Sex workers, HIV/AIDS, Health seeking behaviour, domestic violence, mental health, children, election studies, socio-economic studies and decentralisation. Within these themes, it has undertaken some valuation studies, particularly in the latter three.

CAS has worked for international development agencies such as JICA, UNDP, DFID, IOM, ILO, OXFAM and WHO.



**H: NEPAL**

---

**HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT CENTRE (HURDEC) PVT. LTD.**

Nepal, GPO Box-158, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Tel: 5550759

Email: [hurdec@ntc.net.np](mailto:hurdec@ntc.net.np)

Web: <http://www.hurdec.org.np/>

**Contact person:** Parimal Jha - Executive Director

**Legal status**

HURDEC was established as management training and consulting organisation and registered in 1990 as a Private Limited Company.

**Mandate**

Its objective is to facilitate people-centred development by strengthening the human resource capabilities of donor supported projects, national and international NGOs, the private sector, local bodies and government agencies.

**Geographical scope**

In addition to Nepal, HURDEC has offices in India and South Africa. It also works in the South Asian region.

**Thematic focus**

HURDEC provides training, planning workshops and consultancy services for Project Cycle Management, Organisation Development, HRD, good governance, decentralisation and strengthening of community organisations, among others.

**Findings**

HURDEC is the most well-known and largest consultancy company providing development services in Nepal. Its services include: Strategic Planning and Review Workshops, Policy Study, Evaluation and Assessment and Program/Project Implementation Support. The latter service area includes analysis of sectoral & crosscutting policies project / programme evaluations, participatory and rapid appraisals, management assessment, management audits and other studies.

Assisting client organisations in improving their services and accountability, and designing effective programmes / projects often underlie such services. The approaches and tools selected depend on the context, situation and preference of the client and other ground realities. PRA, PLA and other participatory tools are very often used.

It has a team of 12 full-time professionals and a resource person pool of a dozen professionals.

HURDEC has provided more than 85 services to several national and international clients over the years. Its major international clients include GTZ, DFID, World Bank, UNDP, Swisscontact, SDC, IFC and the SAARC.

**SERVICE EXTENSION AND ACTION RESEARCH FOR COMMUNITIES IN THE HILLS (SEARCH-NEPAL)**

GPO Box 4277, 1064 Thir Bam Road, Maharajung,  
Kathmandu, Nepal.

Phone: 977 1 421 2539

Email: [search@wlink.com.np](mailto:search@wlink.com.np)

Web: [www.searchnepal.org](http://www.searchnepal.org)

**Contact person:** Deepak Tamang, Director, [deepak\\_tamang@hotmail.com](mailto:deepak_tamang@hotmail.com)

**Legal status**

Non Profit; Secular; Non Government Development Organisation established in 1988.

**Mandate**

- Vision: Ensure egalitarian, equitable and participatory human development in Nepal with a human rights based agenda.
- Mission: Facilitate a process where empowering human development is facilitated in CBOs, NGOs and Civic Society including local government.
- Goal: Reduce poverty and ensure sustainable livelihood

**Geographical scope**

Nepal; South and Central Asia

**Thematic focus**

*Action Research:* Sustainable Livelihood, Peace and Reconciliation, and Community Development, Natural Resources Management and Agro-business, Primary/Reproductive Health, Safe Motherhood, HIV/AIDS

*Process Consultancy:* Environment, Policy Research and Planning, Organisation and Institution Development, Change Management, Health, Education

*Training and Consultancy*

Training: Capacity Building, Peace, Reconciliation, and social Transformation, Gender, Peace and Sustainable Development, Sustainable Livelihood Approach

Consultancy: Survey/Market Research, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation(PME), Opinion Polling, Program Design, Baseline Study and Feasibility Study

**Findings**

SEARCH is a highly sought after service provider in the Nepalese donor-dominated landscape. Due to its outreach in far-flung areas in Nepal, SEARCH has the capacities to conduct research and M&E in most parts of the country. It is led by its dynamic Director, to whom SEARCH mostly owes its reputation.

SEARCH has a sound track record in M&E in Nepal as well as more recently in the region. It works on developing M&E methodologies and on designing M&E systems. Given the limited supply market, SEARCH is under high demand for service provision in Nepal. It has a staff of 10-12 Professionals and 6-10 Administrative support staff.

Its partners include the Asian Institute of Technology; School of Human Settlement, Bangkok), INTRAC, Oxford and PRIA, India. Its major clients include UNDP, Unicef, World Bank, ADB and GTZ.

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE (DMI)**

(Postal address)

GPO Box 12656, Kathmandu, Nepal

Tel: +977 1 4781394

Email: [dmingo@ntc.net.np](mailto:dmingo@ntc.net.np)

**Contact person:** Mr. Rajendra Giri, Director

**Profile:**

DMI is a private company aimed at developing management capacity in the development, public and private sector.

The main focus of DMI is in institutional and organisational assessments and capacity building in development management. DMI has undertaken a number of M&E assignment for donor supported projects. It has also conducted policy level studies such as on Decentralisation for GTZ Nepal and the preparation of a strategy paper on Micro Enterprise Development for UNDP Nepal.

At present, DMI has four professional directors and other professional associates working with. Each professional has drawn their rich experience in their respective field from 15 to 26 years. Most of the DMI's professional possess high level of skills in communication, facilitation and moderation.

Among its international clients are; UNDP, GTZ Nepal, JICA, ADB, WFP, SNV,

**NEW ERA NEPAL PVT. LTD.**

New ERA, Rudramati Marg, Kalo Pul,

P.O. Box 722, Kathmandu, NEPAL.

Phone: 977 (1) 4413603, 977 (1) 4423176

Email: [info@newera.wlink.com.np](mailto:info@newera.wlink.com.np)

Web: <http://www.newera.com.np/>

**Contact person:** Mr. M. Jaiswal

**Profile**

New ERA is a non-profit research organisation providing Research, Capacity building, Extension/ public awareness, Network development/ co-ordination, Project cycle management, and Consultancy services.

It specialises its service delivery in agriculture, livestock, horticulture, communication, drinking water and sanitation, forestry, education, environment, gender, human resources, migration and resettlement, population and family planning, health and nutrition, and rural development.

New Era has a full-time staff of 47, and draws on a pool of 24 retainer staff and consultants.

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY – CENTRE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION (CEDA)**

Tribhuvan University

CEDA Building; P.O.Box. 797,

Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Phone : (977-1) 4330-324, 4330851, 4331721

Web: <http://www.tribhuvan-university.edu.np>;

<http://www.tribhuvan-university.edu.np/research.php#CEDA>

**Contact person:** Dr. Ramesh Chandra Chitrakar, Executive Director. [ceda@wlink.com.np](mailto:ceda@wlink.com.np)

**Profile**

Although the University is largely academic and degree awarding, it has four Research Centres that function independently and undertake customised research and consultancy.

In particular, the Centre for Economic Development and Administration (CEDA) serves as a policy-research centre contributing towards the national development policies and strategies. The Centre's activities include research, consultancy and training programmes.

CEDA is a member of the following international institutions:

- ESCAP, Bangkok.
- Development Information Network for South Asia (DEVINSA), Colombo, Sri Lanka.
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).
- Asia and Pacific Development Centre, APDC, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Association of Development Research and Training Institutes of Asia and the Pacific (ADIPA), Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Association of Management Development Institutions in South

## I: SRI LANKA

---

### **CENTRE FOR POVERTY ANALYSIS**

29 Gregory's Road, Colombo 7, SRI LANKA

Tel: +94 112 676955

Email: [info@cepa.lk](mailto:info@cepa.lk)

Web: [www.cepa.lk](http://www.cepa.lk)

**Contact person:** Neranjana Gunetilleke, Research Coordinator. [Neranjana@cepa.lk](mailto:Neranjana@cepa.lk)

### **Legal status**

Established as a non-profit company in 2001, and registered under the Company's Act 17 of 1982, Section 21.

### **Mandate**

To be the leading organisation providing independent analysis of poverty, shaping policy in Sri Lanka

### **Geographical scope**

National

### **Thematic focus**

Poverty analysis, including impact monitoring / assessment.

### **Findings**

CEPA is undoubtedly one of the institutions with the most experience in M&E and impact assessment in Sri Lanka. This owes to its organisational history, having been established by the GTZ implemented Poverty Impact Monitoring Unit.

CEPA provides services in Applied Research, Advisory Services, Training and Dialogue and Exchange. These services are concentrated within four programme areas, which currently include; Poverty and Conflict, Poverty Assessment & Knowledge Management, Poverty Impact Monitoring. It has undertaken evaluations and impact assessments in all four programme areas as well as in previous areas such as Enterprise Development and Youth. CEPA has experience of conducting evaluations along typical project cycles, including ex-post evaluations as well as country portfolios, gender and budget auditing, public expenditure reviews and impact assessments of development projects. CEPA works with a combination of qualitative and quantitative methodologies, although most of its work involves qualitative methods.

At present CEPA has a full-time staff of 15 professionals and 14 Administrative personnel. It is supported by a pool of Associates and Consultants.

Its international clients include; WB, ADB, GTZ, SIDA, ODI. It has partnerships with DFID, ADB, DCS, GTZ, IDRC and Asia Foundation. CEPA's work is highly regarded for quality and innovative approaches. Due to high demand advanced planning is recommended.

**INSTITUTE OF POLICY STUDIES OF SRI LANKA**

99, St. Michale's Road,

Colombo 03, Sri Lanka

Phone: +94 112 431368

Email: [ips@ips.lk](mailto:ips@ips.lk)

Web: [www.ips.lk](http://www.ips.lk)

**Contact person:** Dr. Dushni Weerakoon, Deputy Director. [dushni@ips.lk](mailto:dushni@ips.lk)

**Legal status**

The Institute of Policy Studies (IPS) was established as an autonomous research institute, by an Act of Parliament in December 1988, and was formally gazetted in April 1990

**Mandate**

To contribute to the economic development of a democratic Sri Lanka and enhance the quality of life of its people by informing policy-makers and contributing to the public debate through timely, independent, and high quality research-based analysis of medium and long-term national policy issues.

**Geographical scope**

National and regional, especially South Asia.

**Thematic focus**

Economics, Labour and Human Resources, Poverty, Industry, Health.

**Findings**

The IPS was set up as a Government 'Think-Tank' on macro-economic policy issues and to provide research, training and consultancy. The establishment of the institute was supported by the Government of the Netherlands. In recent years it has broadened its focus to include meso level issues dealing with poverty.

In terms of M&E, IPS focuses on researching impacts of country policy programmes such as trade and agricultural policy. It has undertaken a number of industry level studies such as the plantation and garment sectors. It recently undertook a study on Livelihood strategies in post-Tsunami Sri Lanka that analysed the government, NGOs and development agencies to support livelihood recovery among tsunami affected households so that they may "build back better". While IPS does not have a strong M&E focus at the project / programme level, its' research base on macro issues makes it a strong counterpart for assessing country programmes.

The 26 member research staff of, is almost exclusively made up of economists. It has an administrative support staff of 23 as it plays lead roles in organizing local as well as international Workshops and Seminars.

IPS partners include the South Asia Centre for Policy Studies (SACEPS), SAARC Network on Global Financial and Economic Issues, The Indian Rim Association for Regional Cooperation (IOR-ARC), The Poverty and Economic Policy (PEP) Research Network, Asia-Pacific Research and Training Network on Trade (ARTNeT).

**CENTRE FOR POLICY ALTERNATIVES (CPA)**

24/2, 28th Lane, Off Flower Road,

Colombo 7, Sri Lanka.

Tel: 94-11-2301634 / 2565304-6, 94-11-5552746 /8.

Email: [cpa\\_sara@sri.lanka.net](mailto:cpa_sara@sri.lanka.net),

Web: <http://www.cpalanka.org/>

**Contact person:** Dr. Paikiasothy Saravanamuttu, Executive Director, [sara@cpalanka.org](mailto:sara@cpalanka.org)

**Profile**

The Centre for Policy Alternatives (CPA) was formed in 1996 and focuses primarily on issues of governance and conflict resolution. CPA is an independent, non-partisan organisation which receives funds from international and bilateral funding agencies and foundations.

CPA implements the following activities,

- Programmes of research and study of public policy.
- Dissemination of research and study
- Advocacy of constructive policy alternatives, lobbying of decision-makers and the shaping of public opinion.
- Monitoring of the executive, legislature, judiciary, media and other public institutions.
- Provision of consultancy services to political parties and other organisations involved in the field of public policy and engaging them in dialogue on the issues identified above.
- Forging linkages with local and foreign institutions with similar aims and objectives.

CPA programmes are implemented through 05 units - Legal and Constitutional, Media, Conflict and Peace, Polling and Translation. Monitoring of election related violence is conducted through the Centre for Monitoring Election Violence (CMEV), formed together with the Free Media Movement (FMM) and the Coalition Against Political Violence. CPA functions as its secretariat. CPA has a full time professional cadre of over 30 persons.

CPA has collaborated with a number of local and international civil society organisations including Article 19 and the Commonwealth Press Union, Conciliation Resources (UK), the Free Media Movement, the Ceylon Chamber of Commerce, UNHCR, ILO, Institute of Federalism, (Fribourg, Switzerland), Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, the International Telecommunications Union, Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, INFORM, the Forum of Federations (Canada), Berghof Foundation for Conflict Studies (Berlin, Germany) and the International Media Support (Copenhagen, Denmark).

**CENTER FOR WOMENS RESEARCH (CENWOR)**

225/4 Kirula Road, Colombo-5, Sri Lanka.

Tele/Fax : 94-11-236 9530 / 94-11-250 2153

Email: [cen\\_info@sltnet.lk](mailto:cen_info@sltnet.lk), [cenwor@slt.lk](mailto:cenwor@slt.lk)

Web: <http://www.cenwor.lk/>

**Contact persons:** Swarna Jayaweera or Thana Sanmugam

**Profile**

CENWOR is a non-governmental, non-profit organisation, was founded in 1984, focussing exclusively on Women's research.

It has four main programmes; Policy and Action Oriented Research, Information and Communication, Training, Advocacy, Lobbying and Networking. While not focusing on M&E, under its Policy and Action research, CENWOR has undertaken a number of studies that look at the impact on women from poverty alleviation programmes, macro economic policies and structural adjustment policies and programmes and employment and labour policies. It has also provided inputs to incorporate gender concerns in Environmental Impact Assessment studies.

CENWOR draws from a pool of highly experienced and qualified researchers on women's issues in Sri Lanka.

**ETC LANKA PRIVATE LIMITED**

No 04, Jayanthipura Main Road, Battaramulla, Sri Lanka.

Tel : +94- 011-2869778 / 4413749

E-Mail : [etclanka@sltnet.lk](mailto:etclanka@sltnet.lk)

Web: [www.etc-lanka.org](http://www.etc-lanka.org)

**Contact person:** Mr. Sumedha Karunathilake, Managing Director

**Profile**

ETC Lanka is a consulting private company established in 1997. It is part of the ETC International Group headquartered in the Netherlands.

ETC offers services in Project Cycle Services, Project Facilitation, Studies, Surveys, Documentation and Sector Analysis and Training among others. It undertakes evaluations and impact assessments for donor supported projects as part of its project services. Its sectoral focus is in the areas of Poverty, Economics, Gender, Education, Health and Environment. ETC has conducted a number of evaluations and impact assessments, particularly of community level projects.

It has a permanent full time staff of eight persons.

Its major clients include; World Vision, WUSC (World University Service of Canada) Sri Lanka, Fair Trade Labelling Organisation Germany, Fair Trade Original Netherlands, PLAN Sri Lanka, Care international and UNICEF.

**INSTITUTE FOR PARTICIPATORY INTERACTION IN DEVELOPMENT (IPID)**

591, Havelock Road, Colombo 06, Sri Lanka.

Tel: +94-011-2365521 Tel/Fax: +94-011-2587361

E-mail; [ipidc@panlanka.net](mailto:ipidc@panlanka.net)

Web: [www.ipidlk.org](http://www.ipidlk.org)

**Contact person:** S. W. K. J. Samaranayake, Executive Director

**Profile**

IPID has its roots in the Robert Chambers participatory school and hence has a strong record in conducting participatory studies and planning methods. In recent years it has gone into the field of M&E, and provides consultancy services in Planning, M&E, Impact Assessment and Institutional Development. It specialises in the fields of poverty, economics, conflict, gender, education and health.

IPID has 15 employs fulltime professional and administrative pool of researchers and consultants in specialised fields. They combine specialists in Participatory Rural Appraisal, Participatory Planning Methodology (LFA, ZOPP) and Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation.

IPIDs major clients include; World Bank, Asian Development Bank, JBIC, UNDP, FAO, ILO, UNICEF in Sri Lanka, USAID, WHO, Save the Children in Sri Lanka, Christian Children's Fund. It has partnerships with Resource Centres for Participatory Learning and Action (RCPLA), IIED and IDS, UK.

**THE MARGA INSTITUTE**

93/10 Dutugemunu St, Kirulapone, Colombo-06 Sri Lanka

Tel: 00 94 1 828 544 Fax: 00 94 1 828 597

Email: [marga@sri.lanka.net](mailto:marga@sri.lanka.net), [marga@sltnet.lk](mailto:marga@sltnet.lk)

Web: <http://www.margasrilanka.org/>

**Contact person:** Mr. Basil Ilangakoon, Chief Executive

**Profile**

The Marga Institute is a non-profit centre for development research established in 1972 with support from the Friedrich Naumann Foundation.

The principal activity of the Marga Institute is the study and critical evaluation of past and on-going development processes in Sri Lanka. Its programme of research covers three main areas of development-economic, social and political. Consequently, it draws on a wide range of social science disciplines and brings a multi-disciplinary approach to its work.

Marga has completed over 1400 research studies since its inception, a number of them being assessments of development policies and programmes.

Although at the forefront of research activity in Sri Lanka in the 70s and 80s, Marga is currently less active due to institutional restructuring. The institute nonetheless serves as an important resource point for development issues in Sri Lanka.

**MDF TRAINING & CONSULTANCY SOUTH ASIA**

137 Old Nawala Road, Nawala, Sri Lanka

Tel. 94 11 2808121 / 2805122 / 4404017

Email: [mdfsa@mdfsa.lk](mailto:mdfsa@mdfsa.lk)

Web: [www.mdfsa.lk](http://www.mdfsa.lk)

**Contact person:** Mike Zijderduijn, Director

**Profile**

Management for Development Foundation (MDF) Sri Lanka was established in 1997 as a private company and is a subsidiary of MDF Worldwide, headquarters in the Netherlands. The scope of MDF South Asia extends from Afghanistan up to Thailand. MDF provides Open-entry and Tailor-made Training, Consultancy and Facilitation services (both process facilitation and expert advice) in the areas of Project (Cycle) Management: Project Design & Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation among others.

Although its major focus is training, MDF has undertaken work in the design of monitoring systems for CORDAID (Dutch INGO), SEWALANKA Foundation in Sri Lanka, Dhaka Ahsania Mission, Bangladesh. It has also conducted a Participative Evaluation of ICCO funded Tsunami response programmes in India and Sri Lanka.

**SOCIAL POLICY ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH CENTRE (SPARC)**

Faculty of Arts University of Colombo

P.O. Box 1420, Colombo 03, Sri Lanka.

Tel.: +94 (011) 2589382

Email: [sparc@soc.cmb.ac.lk](mailto:sparc@soc.cmb.ac.lk)

Web: [http://www.cmb.ac.lk/academic/other\\_centers/sparc/](http://www.cmb.ac.lk/academic/other_centers/sparc/)

**Contact person:** Prof. S.T. Hettige, Director. Email: [sthetti@webmail.cmb.ac.lk](mailto:sthetti@webmail.cmb.ac.lk)

**Profile**

SPARC belongs to the Faculty of Arts at the University of Colombo. It was set up in 2005 to integrate research, teaching, training, policy analysis and advocacy on critical areas of social and economic development. It aims to support evidence-based social policy formation and programming to link academic research with critical development issues in Sri Lanka.

The Research and Survey Unit of SPARC undertakes research studies on Socio-Economic Security and Social Policy. The unit has conducted a number of socio-economic studies that involve evaluation and impact assessment. It currently conducts a Community-Based Impact Monitoring of Tsunami Affected Areas of Sri Lanka.

SPARC has a full-time staff of six persons and in addition draws on the expertise of its junior academic staff supervised by the senior faculty members, as well as a pool of Affiliated Fellows.

SPARC has ongoing projects for the ILO and the MIMAP network.

## EVALUATION ASSOCIATIONS

---

### **AVALIA BRASIL - REDE BRASILEIRA DE AVALIAÇÃO (FORMER REBRAMA)**

Web: [www.avaliabrasil.org.br](http://www.avaliabrasil.org.br)

**Contact persons:** Mariana Meirelles (mariana.guimaraes@planejamento.gov.br)

Divonzir Gusso (gusso@ipea.gov.br)

#### **Profile**

The Brazilian Evaluation Network (ReBraMA) is an informal group of monitoring and evaluation professionals. The global objective of the network is to support a national sustainable process of capacity building in monitoring and evaluation through the implementation of a forum that will contribute to the definition of norms, methodologies and professional practices. The members of the network have also adopted specific objectives and strategies. The creation of this network, in August 2002, is part of a global process to constitute a world community for monitoring and evaluation. Brazil engaged in this movement to benefit and contribute to the exchange of experiences and competency at an international scale.

The initiative was born out of an initial motivation by UNICEF's officer Marco Segone, who's known by its support to network formation. The initiative gathered interested members in various Brazilian States, namely Brasilia, Recife, Bahia, Rio de Janeiro, Minas Gerais and Sao Paulo. The network gained momentum in 2004, when it included about 200 members. 2004 saw the Network holding its Strategic Planning Conference, with the support of the organisation CARE Brazil, and the executive secretary in the Instituto Fonte. By that time, it was defined that the Network would refer only to "evaluation", considering "monitoring" as an intrinsic part of evaluation. ReBraMA had its name changed to **Avalia Brasil**.

The objectives of Avalia Brasil are to:

- facilitate an informal learning process through experience and skills sharing
- organize training sessions
- facilitate the exchange of M&E material and literature
- promote linkages and exchanges among practitioners and service users, envisaging a mutual understanding of needs and possibilities
- create and maintain an evaluators' databank
- facilitate the definition of standards for professional practice.

The network is not an association and intends to remain an informal gathering of interested parties. Its secretariat moved to the Rio de Janeiro's group in 2005, which seems to have caused activities to slow down. Its website hosts evaluation discussion lists and documents about monitoring and evaluation in Portuguese.

**SAMEA - SOUTH AFRICAN MONITORING AND EVALUATION ASSOCIATION**

c/o Khulisa Management Services,

P.O. Box 923, Parklands 2121, Johannesburg, South Africa

**Contact persons:** Chairperson: Jennifer Bisgard (chair@samea.org.za)

Deputy Chair and Media Liaison: Mark Abrahams (deputychair@samea.org.za)

Web: [www.samea.org.za](http://www.samea.org.za); Email: info@samea.org.za.

Tel: 27 12 807 7861 (Lise) or 11 447 6464 (Zanele)

**Profile**

SAMEA strives to cultivate a vibrant community that will support, guide and strengthen the development of monitoring and evaluation as an important discipline, profession and instrument for empowerment and accountability in South Africa. Through this it intends to promote the recognition of M&E as a profession and discipline essential to development, and practice and used in a manner that adds significant value to effective, sustainable development in South Africa.

SAMEA's objectives are to:

- provide a platform for interaction and information sharing among all those interested in M&E;
- promote high quality intellectual, ethical and professional standards in M&E;
- increase the use of M&E theory and practice;
- promote the development and adoption of M&E approaches and methods suitable to a South African and development context;
- promote post-graduate education and continuing professional development in the field of M&E;
- increase the profile of South African M&E at national and international level;
- help build understanding of international developments and trends in M&E;
- be a resource on M&E in South Africa.

SAMEA was founded in 2005 as a non-profit association. The organisation embodies the formalisation of the former South African Evaluation Network (SAENet). The Third AfrEA Conference, held in December 2004 in Cape Town, provided an opportunity for members to hold a special meeting with more than 70 South African participants to plan the way forward for the next two years. This led to the establishment of a Task Team of 16 volunteers, which was given a mandate to formalise the conceptualisation, governance, operations, and key priority tasks of SAENet. In the process of formulating a concept document, the organisation's vision, mission, and objectives, feedback was given by the South African community of evaluators through a public stakeholder workshop and an online needs survey. Informed by this input, the Task Team-work resulted in the launch of SAMEA.

SAMEA has been invited to participate in the revision process of AfrEA's African Evaluation Guidelines, which is taking place before the AfrEA Conference (January 2007 in Niger). SAMEA will hold its First Evaluation Conference in March 28-30, 2007, with the theme "Monitoring and Evaluation in Action", with the focus on M&E practices in development programmes; knowledge management; multi-sectoral, multi-partner and multi-tiered M&E systems, and evaluation capacity building.

SAMEA's website offers literature, links to useful sites, a directory of members (in its initial stages), opportunities for professional development and internships.

**AfrEA African Evaluation Association**

P.O.Box 41829, Craighall 2024, Johannesburg, South Africa

**Contact person:** Chairperson: Oumoul Khayri Ba Tall (oktconsult@yahoo.fr). She is the current Secretary General of AMSE, the national M&E association of Mauritania

Web: [www.afrea.org](http://www.afrea.org); Email: [admin@afrea.org](mailto:admin@afrea.org). Tel: 27 12 807 7861

**Profile**

AfrEA was founded in 1999 in response to a growing demand for information sharing, advocacy and advanced capacity building in evaluation in Africa. By that time, there were few opportunities in Africa to network and share evaluation experiences in a developmental context. AfrEA is an umbrella organisation for national M&E associations and networks in Africa, and a resource for individuals in countries where national bodies do not exist. AfrEA works with the national networks and donors to develop a stronger African evaluation community.

AfrEA's objectives are to:

- promote useful evaluations that support development in Africa.
- encourage the development and publication of high quality evaluation practice, research and theory development based on African experiences and expertise.
- advance the building of evaluation capacity on the continent.
- help establish, develop and support national African evaluation associations and regional evaluation interest groups.
- facilitate networking and information sharing on evaluation in Africa.
- be a reference point for evaluation information relevant to Africa.
- promote and share African evaluation expertise at relevant regional and international forums and events.

AfrEA has held three African evaluation conferences, with a fourth to take place in Niger in January 2007. The 4<sup>th</sup> Conference intends to broaden public debate on the practice of evaluation and its impact on human development in Africa, especially in poverty reduction and the fostering of good governance; to create awareness of the nature of monitoring and evaluation in public development policies and strategies; to run training sessions in monitoring and evaluation (concepts, methods, procedures, etc.); to help improve the management of evaluation missions, internally and vis-à-vis decision-makers, planners, heads of public and private enterprises and major development partners; to find out about international experiences in the area of monitoring and evaluation and lessons to be drawn in order to develop better evaluation practices in Africa.

AfrEA's website offers information on upcoming events, training opportunities, literature and other resources, links to other evaluation associations, discussion forums and Special Interest Groups (SIGs). AfrEA has also facilitated the development of African Evaluation Guidelines, which is being revised prior to the 2007 Conference. The guidelines are available in the website. These guidelines aim at enhancing the quality and utility of evaluation on the continent. AfrEA website also includes a database of evaluators. The Africa Gender and Development Evaluation Network is AfrEA's in partnership with UNIFEM, and has been enhancing African capacity in gender and rights-based evaluation since 2003.

**SRI LANKA EVALUATION ASSOCIATION**

591 Havelock Road, Colombo 6, Sri Lanka

Tel: 94 11 2365521

Email: [sleva@eureka.lk](mailto:sleva@eureka.lk)

Web: <http://www.nsf.ac.lk/sleva/index.htm>

**Contact person:** Mallika Samaranayake, President

**Profile**

The Sri-Lanka Evaluation Association (SLEVA) was founded in 1999, to address a long felt need for establishing an evaluation culture in the Sri Lanka Civil Society.

The SLEVA membership includes a wide cross-section of professionals from academia, international agencies, public, and private sectors. SLEVA was established with encouragement from the Ministry of Plan Implementation, the apex Monitoring and Evaluation Agency of the Government of Sri Lanka, and with active support from two UN Agencies, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). SLEVA has received support from GTZ for a project designed to evaluate the introduction of Quality Management Systems in Sri Lanka.

Currently SLEVA has a total membership of about 80. Some of SLEVA'S ongoing activities include,

- Preparation of database / directory of evaluation experts.
- Adoption of global evaluation standards to suit the Sri-Lankan situation.
- Promoting Quality Management Systems Evaluation
- National Conference on Evaluation
- Policy Advocacy - Drafting of an Evaluation Policy for Sri Lanka

SLEVA functions as an association based on voluntary contributions by its members. While being limited to undertake assignments for clients, it rather serves as a point of contact for facilitating evaluations.

## **ANNEXES**

TERMS OF REFERENCE

LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

PROJECTS SUPPORTING EVALUATION CAPACITY BUILDING



## Annex 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

BMZ Referat Evaluierung

RL: MR'in Zintl

Bearb.: ORR'in Dr. Tekülve, 21.8.06

### *Outline for a study* **Alignment with and deployment of Local Monitoring and Evaluation Systems and Capacities**

#### **0. Summary**

On the basis of international principles and objectives of German development policy, especially the **"strengthening of the partner countries' ownership and capacity to act"**, and of the agreements on **"ownership, alignment und harmonisation"** laid down in the Rome and Paris Declarations of the DAC, the BMZ Evaluation Division is pursuing the following objectives:

- Stronger alignment of evaluations with local systems and needs for monitoring and evaluation in particular
- Stronger deployment and, if appropriate, strengthening of local monitoring and, especially, evaluation capacities and services
- Better coordination with other donors in this respect.

To achieve this a desk study shall outline the current evaluation practise and service systems in the partner countries on the basis of the afore-mentioned aspects and current experience and starting points in German and international development cooperation. The work shall start in August 2006 with **Phase I** (see below) which is the substance of the contract at hand.

#### **1. Background and substantiation**

**The more recent debate on "Aid effectiveness" and harmonisation comprises the demand for mutual accountability and more transparency vis-à-vis the public, also in the partner countries.** Examples in this context are progress monitoring of PRSPs (e.g. Zambia), joint financing and sector programmes (e.g. SWAPs Tanzania) or locally initiated evaluations (cf. Chile, Mexico).

**The situation in many partner countries, which is turning more democratic, and the resulting greater public control play a role in this context, a development which requires a more in-depth clarification yet.** What will be the impact of emerging "multi-party-systems", the growing appreciation of parliaments, more freedom of speech and of the press, and the emergence in many places of a critical civil society on "transparency" and "evaluation" in such a public sphere?<sup>107</sup>.

**Three DAC principles are of specific importance in this context: the partner countries' own responsibility (ownership), building on local systems (alignment) and harmonisation (coordination with other donors and partners)** (cf. Annex 1). German development cooperation and evaluation explicitly support all three aspects and have acquired pertinent experience:

---

<sup>107</sup> In Germany, public "monitoring and development" of policies is done through a great and varied range of organisations, institutions and players, among them the German Parliament (Bundestag) research institutes, universities, statistics offices, NGOs, the press, demonstrations, citizens action groups, etc.

- Ownership and the "local perspective" play a role for BMZ evaluations in more than one respect, e.g. as evaluation issue in programmes, or, in the evaluation process, in the cooperation with local partners, and also in subcontracting local experts.
- The deployment and building up of local systems, too, is a well-known practise, directly or indirectly. This includes the application of locally established data, cooperation with universities and specialised consulting firms – supported by German development cooperation, e.g. in Sri Lanka.
- For several years the Evaluation Division of the BMZ has been participating successfully in international joint evaluations, especially, but not only, in evaluating multilateral organisations and measures financed (e.g. WFP, GBS, EU Triple C). Moreover, other donors play a role as important informants and discussion partners also in "traditional types of evaluation".

**Despite a great deal of, by and large, positive experience, the leeway for implementing the aforementioned principles seems not to have been fully exhausted (see above).**

Thus, the amount of information on, and the processing of, current evaluation practises, and a differentiating demand for services in the field of monitoring and evaluation is inadequate in the partner countries. With regard to the range of consultancy services, the experience made by the BMZ's Evaluation Division shows that qualified local experts and organisations are difficult to identify. Cooperation proves to entail great expense, mainly for reasons of organisation. In addition, information on what other donors do in gearing their respective work to local systems is inadequate or not properly analysed and processed.

## 2. Aims of the study

The study envisaged serves to achieve the aims of "strengthening the partner countries' own responsibility and capacity to act", and to pursue the agreements laid down in the Rome and Paris Declarations of the DAC on "ownership, alignment und harmonisation" with regard to monitoring and, especially, evaluation. If necessary, the study will also prepare further measures and contribute in the long run, as a **vision**, to improving the (development) policy monitoring in the partner countries and German development cooperation.

**The paramount aim** of the study is:

*To improve the deployment and capacity of local monitoring and evaluation systems and services commensurate with demands in the partner countries, on the part of other donors and in German development policy.*

Essentially, the study constitutes a stock-taking of the present situation, serving as a basis for establishing recommendations on the further procedure. **Immediate aims** are:

1. **Current evaluation practises and trends** are analysed and processed (response to more recent developments and discussions such as democratisation and Paris Declaration)

- in the partner countries
- in German development cooperation
- in international development cooperation / other donors.

2. The **demand for services** regarding accountability, monitoring and evaluation (especially services rendered locally) is known (in partner countries, German and international development cooperation).

3. **Existing local monitoring and evaluation systems and range of services** are known.

4. Points of linkage with **enhanced deployment of local** monitoring and evaluation know-how are identified.

5. Points of linkage with **strengthening local** monitoring and evaluation **know-how** are identified.

6. Points of linkage with **improved cooperation with other donors** (especially decentralised in the field) are identified.

Only **overviews, trends and, if applicable, case studies** will be feasible in this context. Selection criteria have to be developed yet.

A discrimination between the needs and capacities in terms of **monitoring** (e.g. recording and updating of PRSP indicators) and **evaluation** (e.g. review of impact of SWAPs) should be made, with the focus being placed on the latter.

### 3. Procedure, participants and methodology

The study will be done largely in the form of a **desk-study**. It will be carried out in two phases:

- **Phase I** shall collect and compile information on local M&E-systems and services as an input to the further process and the final study (see **annex 2**).
- **Phase II** shall use this information for a broader perspective and a comprehensive study on “Orientation towards and deployment of local monitoring and evaluation systems and capacities” (see **annex 3**).

The study should be carried out in **close coordination with the BMZ and the evaluation units of DED, GTZ, InWent and KfW**.

#### **Other organisations and players in Germany to be contacted are:**

- Evaluation units of NGOs, private executing agencies and the Churches
- Political foundations
- Specialised university institutions and research institutes
- Consulting firms and networks

Organisations within the **EU and at the international level** which might also be contacted are to be nominated yet and may include:

- Evaluation units of the EC/AIDCO in Brussels and other donors (e.g. DACH-Evaluation units<sup>108</sup>)
- Research networks (e.g. European Association of Development Institutes EADI)
- Specialised university institutions and research institutes (e.g. Nadel in Zurich).
- Bi- and multilateral donors.

The form of contact with relevant **organisations and players in the partner countries** has not been decided yet and will be settled iteratively, in the course of the study, on the basis of the information collected. Interesting links might be:

- Regional and national institutions (AU Economic and Social Research Centre, ADB, universities)
- Regional expert networks (Afreea, IDEAS)
- Special support measures under German/international development cooperation (e.g. GTZ Sri Lanka, Ethiopia).
- Experience with locally initiated evaluations in Chile, Mexico, Tanzania, Uganda, etc.

---

<sup>108</sup> DACH – National evaluation services for the development cooperation of Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium, Netherlands.

As mentioned earlier the study will be done in the form of a desk-study, including, where appropriate, visits to organisations in Germany (Phase I) and possibly Europe (Phase II). Methods and sources of information used include: literature and internet research, workshops, written and oral interviews, case studies. The study will be drawn up in the **English language**.

#### **4. Addressees**

Principal and primary beneficiary of the results is the **Evaluation Division of the BMZ**.

Second in line are the **evaluation units in German development cooperation**, especially of the DED, GTZ, InWEnt, KfW, for whom the study is also designed to provide a "service".

In addition, a **wide range** of potentially interested parties might be considered. These are, basically, all (international, national and German) organisations which commission studies on evaluation and monitoring and / or support processes to enhance transparency and accountability in the partner countries.

#### **5. Tasks, products and timing**

##### **Phase I:**

**Products:** (always draft and final version<sup>109</sup>):

- Inception report (3-4 pages will describe kick-off procedures, decisions, and process/methods to be used by the team to reach intended product)
- Guidelines for semi-structured interviews (BMZ, German implementing organisations) together with inception report
- Report according to preliminary report structure (see annex 2)

##### **Methods**

1. Literature review
2. Internet research
3. Semi-structured interviews (personal, telephone)

##### **Timeframe**

- Kick-off workshop 18.08.06 at BMZ
- Inception report by 22 September (cases selected)
- Implementation October
- Interview period: 16 to 20 October (both consultants in Germany)
- Draft report presentation 31 October
- Discussion with BMZ beginning of November
- Final report mid of November

##### **Quality assurance**

The BMZ expects high quality in terms of usefulness, validity and fairness (compare BMZ evaluation quality grid). The coordinator of the study is responsible for ensuring this high quality.

OECD/DAC evaluation network (2005): Joint evaluations: Recent experiences, lessons learned and options for the future

---

<sup>109</sup> Hard copy and electronic version (max 2 files)

## Report Phase I

### **Preliminary work structure Desk Study: Local Monitoring and Evaluation Systems and Capacities**

**A.** In the context of the abovementioned study, Phase I has the following objective:

Portray the existing monitoring and evaluation experiences, capacities, services and expertise in selected countries and regions.

**B.** The expected product of the study will be a report structured as follows:

- |       |  |        |
|-------|--|--------|
| 0.    | Summary  | 2 p.   |
| 1.    | Background of the study (aims, process, methods)   | 3 p.   |
| 2.    | Overview of currents trends and debates (on aid harmonization and partner country-led evaluations)                                 | 6-8 p. |
| 3.    | Local M&E systems and capacities: Selected country case studies  |        |
| 3.1   | Introduction (explain selection, country groups. overall presentation)   | 2 p.   |
| 3.2   | Country group 1: (classification to be decided) <sup>110</sup>   |        |
| 3.2.1 | Case 1: (introduction, donor harmonisation, PRS experience, demand M&E practices / examples, strengths & weaknesses)               | 1-2 p. |
| 3.2.2 | Case 2: same   |        |
| 3.3   | Country group 2: etc.  |        |
| 4.    | Findings and Recommendations (summary of overall findings incl. strengths and weaknesses and recommendations to BMZ for phase two) | 2-4 p. |

## Annexes

1. Annotated profiles of institutions potentially or actually providing M&E services and expertise (name, thematic and regional focus, size, main clients, reputation and references, addresses etc). The profile will cover organisations and networks in at least 20 countries or regions in Africa, Asia and South America (about 20 pages).
2. Recruitment procedures of German development organisations (incl. databanks)
3. Projects (German and international) supporting evaluation capacities (list to be provided by BMZ Evaluation Division)
4. TOR

---

<sup>110</sup> So far the following cases were defined: Brazil, Mozambique, South Africa, Burkina Faso, Tanzania, Indonesia and India. Up to two more Asian cases may be added. Max. 10 countries



## **Annex 2: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES**

### **Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)**

Dagmar Krenz, Desk Officer for Kenya & Tanzania, East Africa Division

Dorothea Groth, Head of Division Latin America

Franz-Birger Marré, Deputy Head, Regional Development Cooperation; Southeast Asia

Gottfried von Gemmingen, Desk Officer for India, South Asia Division

Heike Henn, Desk Officer, Regional Development Policy, Southern Africa

Karin Foljanty, Desk Officer, Brazil

Stefan Schmitz, Desk Officer for South Africa, Southern Africa

Wolfgang Schneider-Barthold, Desk Officer for Ethiopia, Eritria, IGAD & EAC, East Africa Division

### **German Development Agencies**

Dirk E. Günther, Head, Evaluation Unit, Deutsche Welthungerhilfe

Dorothee Mack, Evaluation and Quality Management, Misereor

Kirsten Vowerk, Torsten Schäfer, Detlef Leiner, Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst (EED)

Marianne Reuber, Senior Policy Advisor, Evaluation Department, German Technical Cooperation (GTZ)

Sonja Nelles, Quality and evaluation desk officer, InWEnt

Ulrich Jahn, Senior Project Manager, Evaluation Department, KfW



### Annex 3: PROJECTS SUPPORTING EVALUATION CAPACITY BUILDING

#### InWEnt's programme activities for local capacity building in the field of monitoring and evaluation

	Target Country/ Region	Programme (duration)	Activity (Modality)	Objectives	Target group	Partnership
1	Palestine	Development of Project Management competencies in order to a more effectively monitoring of development projects (2006-2006)	Online-Course: Results-Based Monitoring+Evaluation (M+E)	Enabling NGO to implement and to valuate development programmes of international donors according to international standards	NGO-staff and consultants being in charge of planning, implementation und documentation of development projects	Center for Continuing Education of Birzeit University, GTZ and DED
2	Central Amercia and Andean Region	Concepts and instruments to increase coherence and effectiveness of ecological programmes (2005 – 2007)	Training: „Impact monitoring“	Qualification of local evaluators for criteria and methods of DAC results based monitoring. Local evaluators are able to efficiently planning, monitoring and implementing evaluations.	Employees/ Executives of public administration and NGO being in charge of planning, monitoring and implementation of evaluations as well as freelance consultants or consultants of Universities	Universidad de Costa Rica, GTZ, CIM and CEVAL (= external expert)
3	Sub-Sahara Africa	Improvement of statistical capacity to support partner countries in development and implementation of adjusted development strategies (2005 – 2006)	Training courses on M+E techniques including e-Learning components and exchange of best practices	Enabling skilled and managerial staff from the sectors HIV/AIDS, Good Governance and Human Rights to generate and interpret significant (quantitative and qualitative) data in order to estimate development status and development progresses in selected sectors	Representatives of national statistical administration offices, governmental departments and other institutions of data acquisition and –utilisation	GTZ

	<b>Target Country/ Region</b>	<b>Programme (duration)</b>	<b>Activity (Modality)</b>	<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Target group</b>	<b>Partnership</b>
4	Westafrica (Benin, Burkina Faso; Mali; Niger)	Management for sustainable and impact-oriented planning and monitoring of decentralised rural development processes (2005 – 2008)	Training course: „Methods and instruments of outcome-monitoring”	Programme partners have profound skills in measuring the development project’s impact and are enabled to adjust impacts with national and global development goals	Stakeholders in international, national and regional development organisations and institutions as well as qualified employees and multipliers of local or regional institutions and decentralised territorial authorities	GTZ unit „ rural development in Africa“ DED
5	Ethiopia, Uganda	Reforms in the system and decentralised organisation of the Ethiopian vocational education (2005 – 2007)	Training course: „Quality Management, Monitoring and Evaluation for vocational trainings”	Enabling employees and executives of partner organisations to efficiently monitor and standardise vocational education	Executives and multipliers of private and public institutions in vocational education	Ministry of Education, Qualification institutions, Training Center for teachers in Nazareth
6	Middle East (Egypt, Yemen, Jordan, Lebanon, Palestine territories; Syria)	Human Resource Development in academic and vocational education (2005 – 2007)	Training „ Monitoring and Evaluation for vocational trainings“	Enabling partner organisations to monitor and standardise vocational education more efficiently and more goal-oriented	Executives of vocational trainings centres and stakeholders of national vocational education organisations	Ministry of Foreign Trade and Industry (Egypt), Technology Competency Centre for Automation Engineering and Electronics, Staff Training Institutes in Egypt

## Projects implemented by GTZ<sup>111</sup>

	Target Country /Region /Global	Objectives* (select numbers)	Target Group** (select numbers)	Modality*** (select numbers)	Partnership with other donors, if any
1	Sri Lanka	1 3,4,	4 via 6 (Centre for Poverty Analysis, CEPA)	1,3,4	DFID, ADB
2	Sri Lanka	2,3	1, 2 via 5 (Sri Lanka Evaluation Association, SLEVA)	2,4	UNDP

Source: DAC Survey, 08.2006

<p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Skills training for individuals</li> <li>2. Preparation of evaluation strategies or policy</li> <li>3. Development or improvement of evaluation system/organizational management</li> <li>4. Evaluation networking for information sharing</li> <li>5. Contribution to project/program performance</li> <li>6. Others (please specify)</li> </ol>	<p><b>Target Group</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Junior or middle level government officials involved in evaluation activities</li> <li>2. Senior officials in charge of evaluation policy/system</li> <li>3. Management level of the organization</li> <li>4. Project /program managers and staff</li> <li>5. Professional society/association</li> <li>6. Others (e.g., NGOs, beneficiaries/ please specify)</li> </ol>
<p><b>Modality</b></p> <p>Training/scholarships</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Workshop</li> <li>2. TA project/program</li> <li>3. Financial support</li> <li>4. Joint evaluation</li> <li>5. Dialogue with policy levels</li> <li>6. Others (please specify)</li> </ol>	

<sup>111</sup> The BMZ supported Poverty Impact Monitoring Unit (PIMU), operating between 1998-2005 in Sri Lanka, developed a service package for poverty impact monitoring and supported the institutionalisation of these services within the Sri Lankan organisational landscape by

- a) facilitating the establishment of the Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA), an independent professional service provider, now being involved in many evaluations of donor interventions,
- b) supporting SLEVA in its mandate to improve the evaluation culture in Sri Lanka