

EVALUATION DEPARTMENT



REPORT 1/2019



Photo: Ken Opprann

Evaluation of Norway's Multilateral Partnerships Portfolio The World Bank and UN Inter-Agency Trust Funds

ANNEXES 1-11

Contents

- 1 Terms of Reference 3
- 2 Total Norwegian Development Aid 2006-2018 and Shares Through Multilateral Organisations, UNDP and the World Bank 7
- 3 Norway’s Contributions to IBRD Trust Funds..... 8
 - 3.1 List of IBRD Trust Funds with Norwegian Contributions from MFA and Norad..... 8
 - 3.2 IBRD Trust Funds Accounting for Over 80 % of total Norwegian Contributions (million US dollars)..... 12
- 4 Norway’s Contributions to Financial Intermediary Funds in the World Bank..... 13
 - 4.1 Financial Intermediary Funds with Norwegian Participation (million US dollars) 13
 - 4.2 Financial Intermediary Funds Accounting for over 90 % of total Norwegian Contributions (million US dollars) 14
- 5 Overview of the World Bank’s Financial Intermediary Fund (FIF) Cost Recovery Procedure 15
 - 5.1 The Structure of the New Cost-Recovery Model 17
- 6 UN Inter-Agency Pooled Funds Accounting for over 80 % of Total Norwegian Funding Through MPTF Partnerships (US dollars)..... 18
- 7 Profiles of Norway’s World Bank Trust Fund Partnerships 19
- 8 Profiles of Norway’s Top 10 UN Inter-Agency Pooled Trust Funds partnerships..... 25
- 9 Staff Survey results..... 29
- 10 List of persons interviewed 72
- 11 Norad database and archive search 73

1 Terms of Reference

Note: TOR for evaluation undertaken in-house by the Evaluation Department. Project plans/background data/TOR for reference group, etc. specified in the inception report. Consultants to be recruited only for intermediary deliverables as needed

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Evaluation of Norwegian Multilateral Partnerships Portfolio

1. Introduction

Multilateral Partnerships (hereafter Partnerships) are financing arrangements whereby sovereign and non-sovereign donors share their resources with multilateral organizations to pursue their development policy objectives. Donor contributions through partnerships fund a wide range of projects and activities that may be free standing/programmatic, country-specific, regional or global in scope. Multilateral organizations play a variety of roles in such partnerships; ranging from a limited financial intermediary role, to complete responsibility for implementation of specific programs and activities.

There are a number of different terms used to describe multilateral partnerships. For example, the World Bank Group distinguishes between three types of partnership mechanisms- *Bank-executed trust funds (BETF)*, *Recipient-executed trust funds (RETF)* and *Financial Intermediary Funds (FIFs)*. BETF support the Bank's work program. RETF are funds that the Bank passes on to a third-party recipient; the Bank plays an operational role, such as appraising and supervising funded activities. FIFs are funds where the Bank acts as a financial trustee by providing a financial intermediary service, i.e. holding or transferring funds.

United Nations organizations such as United Nations Development Program UNDP distinguishes between four types of partnerships mechanisms- *Thematic Funds (TF)*, *UN pooled Funds (PF)*, *Earmarked Funds (EF)* and *Vertical Funds (VF)*. TF are funds used by UNDP to achieve the targets outlined in its strategic plan. PF are partnerships where donors pool contributions to support a particular project or program, with UNDP playing the role of designing, administering and the donor contributions. EF are funds designated for specific programs and projects - assigned at the global, regional although most commonly at country levels whereby the host country may also share in financing the program/ project through the so called Government Cost Sharing. Programs and projects supported through EF would typically be in line with host country's national development priorities and UNDPs strategic plan. VF are funds received by UNDP from other multilateral organizations supporting a high visibility specific development issues. Resources from partnership mechanisms collectively constitute the *non-core resources* of UNDP, as distinct from *core-resources* – the regular contributions from donors that helps UNDP to pursue its development mandate.

During the past decade, multilaterals have experienced strong growth in Partnerships which now constitute an important source of financing for the multilaterals pursuit of their development mandate. Donors view Partnerships as an important vehicle for engaging in multilateral effort and tapping on the capacities and systems of the multilaterals to pursue

their strategic developmental goals that may be difficult to accomplish through traditional bilateral channels or core-resources of the multilaterals. For recipient countries, Partnerships may provide additional source of development assistance to pursue their national priorities at lower transactions costs to the extent the Partnerships manage to facilitate donor coordination and harmonization.

Norway has a history of partnering with multilateral organizations. A preliminary analysis of the current information in public domain indicates that World Bank Group and UNDP have emerged as the most important trustees of Norwegian funding¹.

2. Purpose

The main purpose of this evaluation is to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of Norway's Multilateral Partnerships and how Norway in light of its strategic goals, can improve its engagement through such partnerships.

3. Objective

This evaluation shall assess how Norway engages with Multilateral Partnerships in light of its strategic goals, and how effectively and efficiently are these Partnerships mobilizing and delivering aid.

This is primarily a formative evaluation, and it shall contribute to learning. The assessment will inform the Ministry of Foreign Affairs MFA, Norwegian Embassies, Norad, Ministry of Climate and Environment KLD and their multilateral partners. Other users include non-governmental organizations and other likeminded donors with an interest in understanding the efficiency and effectiveness of trust fund mechanisms as a channel for aid delivery.

4. Scope

All the Norwegian Partnerships with the World Bank Group, UNDP and African Development Bank constitute a potential unit of analysis for this evaluation. The evaluation will cover the time-period 2007 to the present.

5. Evaluation questions

- What is the extent of procedural rationality, politics or heuristics in the decisions underlying Norwegian participation in Partnerships?
- What is the level of operational efficiency in the Norwegian Partnerships?
- To what extent have the Partnerships contributed to achievement of strategic goals motivating Norwegian participation?

¹ Sources <https://finances.worldbank.org/trust-funds> , <http://mptf.undp.org/> , <https://www.norad.no/om-bistand/norsk-bistand-i-tall/avansert-datauttrekk/>

- How and to what extent are Norwegian contributions linked to the performance of the Partnerships

6. Methodology

Evaluation shall be in accordance with the prevailing DAC OECD Evaluation Quality Standards and criteria, as well as relevant guidelines from the Evaluation Department. The evaluation team shall outline a well-formed research strategy and methodology to ensure a transparent and objective assessment of the relevant issues addressed in this evaluation based on the general approach outlined below. The analysis shall as far as possible be in a comparative mode. Comparisons across Partnerships, trustee organizations, implementing partners, allocating agencies, are of particular interest for this evaluation.

A mixed method (qualitative and quantitative) approach is envisaged for this evaluation. The evaluation team will make use of secondary and primary data that will be analysed using suitably defined qualitative and quantitative indicators. Primary data shall be collected using document reviews, interviews, focus groups and an on-line survey.

Portfolio review- Desk study

The evaluation team will undertake a desk study supplemented by interviews to map evolution of Norway's Partnerships portfolio. The desk study shall mainly rely on documents in public domain. The study may be supplemented by stakeholder interviews and archive search in MFA, Norad, KLD archives on need basis.

Documentation consulted during the desk study shall include the founding documents of the Partnership - MoU /Partnership Agreement, charter, governance, management, control function, results framework, minutes of the executive meetings, progress reports, financial reports, annual reports, monitoring and evaluation reports and decision documents supporting the contributions.

Case studies

The desk study shall inform selection of a sample of 8-10 Partnerships for detail analysis. The selection shall reflect differences in the type of Partnership, size and share of the Norwegian contribution, type of Norwegian engagement, granting agency (MFA, KLD), thematic focus, trustee organization. The sample shall primarily consist of currently active Partnerships, although the team may include an inactive Partnership if there are well-founded reasons to do so. The sample shall be finalized in consultation with EVAL based on the findings in the desk review and stakeholder comments.

The evaluation team shall draw on the desk study supplemented by stakeholder interviews to formulate working hypothesis for the evaluation questions. The information collected in the desk-study shall be supplemented by primary and secondary data collected through multiple sources and methods to test the working hypothesis. The case studies shall draw on information from all the stakeholders including donor, trustee and beneficiaries of the Partnerships in the sample. To facilitate collection of information from the beneficiary


countries, the evaluation shall include an on-line survey for the stakeholders in the countries in the sample selected for the case studies.

Evaluation management

The evaluation will be undertaken by the Evaluation Department at Norad. The project leader for the evaluation will contract consultants for intermediary deliverables on need basis. A Reference group to be constituted for the evaluation shall provide guidance, review reports and assist in resolving challenges.

2 Total Norwegian Development Aid 2006-2018 and Shares Through Multilateral Organisations, UNDP and the World Bank

Year	Total amount of Norwegian aid (NOK)	Shares through multilateral organisations	Share through UNDP	Share through the World Bank
2006	kr 18 826 914 209	kr 9 136 905 141	kr 1 435 922 421	kr 1 627 790 492
2007	kr 21 808 456 280	kr 10 274 794 122	kr 1 716 369 013	kr 1 806 057 233
2008	kr 22 862 065 804	kr 11 245 907 582	kr 1 685 526 696	kr 2 489 956 913
2009	kr 25 623 594 653	kr 12 068 491 125	kr 1 731 566 598	kr 2 301 158 627
2010	kr 26 423 931 556	kr 12 594 882 750	kr 1 944 290 834	kr 2 638 756 460
2011	kr 26 653 166 036	kr 12 452 628 384	kr 1 887 705 842	kr 2 398 185 082
2012	kr 27 638 175 183	kr 13 245 265 355	kr 1 596 581 229	kr 1 883 581 805
2013	kr 32 799 593 264	kr 14 310 578 418	kr 1 686 988 142	kr 2 636 188 722
2014	kr 32 045 710 563	kr 15 854 112 389	kr 1 672 584 877	kr 3 394 473 216
2015	kr 34 485 586 570	kr 15 674 957 758	kr 1 741 552 550	kr 2 470 812 621
2016	kr 36 790 954 038	kr 15 948 200 737	kr 1 735 220 917	kr 2 943 123 118
2017	kr 34 117 933 686	kr 18 386 158 895	kr 1 888 390 888	kr 3 143 509 415
2018	kr 34 631 640 638	kr 19 269 722 808	kr 1 985 735 284	kr 3 094 724 923



3 Norway's Contributions to IBRD Trust Funds

3.1 List of IBRD Trust Funds with Norwegian Contributions from MFA and Norad

Ministry of Foreign Affairs					
Trustee number	Trustee Name	Program	Program Name	Trustee GP	Contributions
TF023446	Prototype Carbon Fund	CARBON	Carbon Fund	GCC - Senior Director	18918593,00
TF050496	Global Environment Facility (GEF) Secretariat Budget Trust Fund	GEFSEC	GEF-Secretariat	GEF Front Office	170195,26
TF050576	Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund	ARTF	Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	465823485,81
TF052656	Norway Donor Funded Staffing Program	DFSP	Donor Funded Staffing Program	Development Finance	15690835,24
TF053676	Financing for the Consultative Group to Assist the Poor Multi Donor Trust Fund	CGAP	Consultative Group To Assist The Poorest	Fin, Comp & Innov - GP	5697638,90
TF070611	Multi Donor Trust Fund for Mainstreaming Disaster Reduction Initiative of the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery	GFDRR	Global facility for Disaster Reduction & Recovery	GCC - Senior Director	10013841,85
TF070859	Liberia Reconstruction Trust Fund	LRTF	Liberia Reconstruction Trust Fund	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	2532201,16
TF070948	Standby Recovery Financing Facility of the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery	GFDRR	Global facility for Disaster Reduction & Recovery	GCC - Senior Director	4132501,07
TF070955	Multi-Donor Trust Fund for the Global Financing Facility (GFF) in Support of Every Woman Every Child	GFF	Global Financing Facility	Health, Nutr & Population - GP	268795479,32
TF070962	Water and Sanitation Program Core Funding Multi Donor Trust Fund	WSP	Water And Sanitation Program(WSP)	Water - GP	2757145,19
TF071021	State- and Peace- Building Multi Donor Trust Fund	SPBF	State And Peace Building Fund	Global Theme Department - FCV	13977598,45
TF071076	Readiness Fund of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility	FCPFR	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility	GCC - Senior Director	30200000,00
TF071077	Carbon Fund of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility	FCPFR	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility	GCC - Senior Director	171310558,77
TF071149	Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative (StAR) Multi Donor Trust Fund	STAR	Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative	Fin, Comp & Innov - GP	4769437,23
TF071156	Carbon Asset Development Fund (CADF) Multi Donor Trust Fund	CRBF	Carbon Results Based Finance (Crbf)	GCC - Senior Director	2730630,49
TF071180	Multi Donor Nordic Trust Fund	NTF	Nordic Trust Fund	Governance - GP	10611861,58
TF071244	Trust Fund for Norway's Support to the Regional Power Infrastructure Projects in Southern Africa	AFRSD	AFR Sustainable Development	Energy & Extractives - GP	62960455,61
TF071295	Multi Donor Trust Fund for Forced Displacement	FDTF	Forced Displacement Trust Fund	Global Theme Department - FCV	2990126,40
TF071370	Rapid Social Response Multi Donor Trust Fund	RSR	Rapid Social Response Program	GP- Social Protection, Labor & Jobs	21621247,97
TF071379	Carbon Capture and Storage Trust Fund	CCS	Carbon Capture And Storage	Energy & Extractives - GP	18313355,91
TF071398	Energy Sector Management Assistance Program Multi Donor Trust Fund	ESMAP	Energy Sector Management Assistance Program	Energy & Extractives - GP	15884197,27
TF071424	Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province (KP)/Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA)/ Balochistan Multi Donor Trust Fund	PKNW	Pakistan: MDTF For NWFP/FATA	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	4414557,13

TF071479	Fragility and Conflict Partnership: United Nations-World Bank Multi Donor Trust Fund	FCP	Fragility & Conflict Partnership	Global Theme Department - FCV	5435605,25
TF071544	Multi Donor Trust Fund for Sustainable Urban Development	FS-SDN	Free-Standing Trust Funds For SDN	Urban, Rural & Soc Dev - GP	3029382,98
TF071597	Cooperation in International Waters in Africa (CIWA) Multi Donor Trust Fund	CIWA	Cooperation in International Waters in Africa	Water - GP	882746,31
TF071607	Palestinian Recovery and Development Plan Multi Donor Trust Fund	MNA-FS	MNA VPU Free-Standing Trust Fund Program	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	231486707,58
TF071617	Nepal Public Financial Management Support Multi Donor Trust Fund	NP-PFM	Nepal Public Financial Management Support	Governance - GP	2615314,36
TF071670	Partnership for Market Readiness Multi Donor Trust Fund	PMR	Partnership For Market Readiness	GCC - Senior Director	5829775,10
TF071796	Malawi Public Finance and Economic Management Reform Program	PFEMRP	Malawi Public Finance And Economic Management Reform Program	Governance - GP	2171249,31
TF071840	Middle East and North Africa (MNA) Region-wide Technical Assistance Multi Donor Trust Fund	MNXTA	Middle East and North Africa (MNA) Cross-Sector Technical Assistance Program	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	3369557,18
TF071860	Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services Multi Donor Trust Fund	WAVES	Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services	Envir & Nat. Res. - GP	3028440,54
TF071893	Umbrella Facility for Gender Equality (UFGE)	GENTF	Gender Trust Funds	Global Theme Department - Gender	5665562,93
TF071898	Partnership for Infrastructure Development in the West Bank and Gaza Multi Donor Trust Fund	PWUD	Partnership For Infrastructure Development	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	9772212,86
TF071929	South Asia Water Initiative II	SAWI	South Asia Water Initiative	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	2444917,86
TF071975	Competitive Industries and Innovation Program	CIIP	Competitive Industries And Innovation Program	EFI Strategy & Ops	1494463,69
TF072023	Malawi Agricultural Sector Wide Approach Support Project Multi Donor Trust Fund	ASWAP	Malawi Agricultural Sector Wide Approach Support Project - MDTF	Agriculture - GP	28645770,47
TF072090	Multi Donor Trust Fund for Ethiopia Sustainable Land Management Project Phase 2	AFRSD	AFR Sustainable Development	Envir & Nat. Res. - GP	41395728,09
TF072132	Debt Management Facility Phase II (DMF II)	DMF	Debt Management Facility for Low-Income Countries	Macro, Trade, and Investment	2483730,86
TF072143	Lebanon Syrian Crisis Multi Donor Trust Fund	LSCTF	Lebanon Syrian Crisis Trust Fund	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	6141453,41
TF072201	Zimbabwe Reconstruction Fund	ZIMREF	Zimbabwe Reconstruction Fund	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	4128163,01
TF072206	Ethiopia General Education Quality Improvement Project II	AFRHD	AFR Human Development	Education - GP	5692709,26
TF072213	Norway West Bank and Gaza Support Trust Fund	NWBG	Norway West Bank And Gaza Support TF	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	1545723,02
TF072236	Multi Donor Trust Fund for Mainstreaming Disaster and Climate Risk Management in Developing Countries	GFDRR	Global facility for Disaster Reduction & Recovery	GCC - Senior Director	6999791,07
TF072273	Consultative Group to Assist the Poor (CGAP V) Multi Donor Trust Fund	CGAP	Consultative Group To Assist The Poorest	Fin, Comp & Innov - GP	1558558,01

TF072283	Somalia Multi-Partner Fund	SOMPF	Somalia Multi-Partner Fund	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	19310378,66
TF072301	Sudan Multi-Partner Fund	SMPTF	Sudan Multi-Donor Programmatic TF	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	1849039,84
TF072304	Knowledge for Change Program III	KCPIII	Knowledge For Change Program III	Office of Sr. Vice President Devel	4535529,17
TF072305	Ebola Recovery and Reconstruction Trust Fund	ERR	Ebola Recovery And Reconstruction	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	10273796,68
TF072322	Jobs Umbrella Multi Donor Trust Fund	JOBS	Jobs Trust Fund	GP- Social Protection, Labor & Jobs	15309736,79
TF072335	Pollution Management and Environmental Health Multi Donor Trust Fund	PMEH	Pollution Management And Environmental Health	Envir & Nat. Res. - GP	9765946,08
TF072347	Extractives Global Programmatic Support (EGPS) Multi Donor Trust Fund	EGPS	Extractives Global Programmatic Support	Energy & Extractives - GP	2100000,00
TF072368	Results in Education for All Children (REACH) Multi Donor Trust Fund	REACH	Results In Education For All Children	Education - GP	7516512,53
TF072455	BioCFplus REDD+ Readiness Support Multi-Donor Trust Fund	BIOCFT	Biocarbon Technical Assistance Trust Fund	GCC - Senior Director	8856032,19
TF072490	Energy Sector Management Assistance Program Multi Donor Fund - Successor to TF071398	ESMAP	Energy Sector Management Assistance Program	Energy & Extractives - GP	4772965,48
TF072527	Global Gas Flaring Reduction Partnership	GGFR	Global Gas Flaring Reduction	Energy & Extractives - GP	1563325,54
TF072582	Nepal Public Financial Management Support Multi Donor Trust Fund (successor of TF071617)	NP-PFM	Nepal Public Financial Management Support	Governance - GP	4142473,17
TF072584	Multi Donor Trust Fund for Mainstreaming Disaster and Climate Risk Management in Developing Countries	GFDRR	Global facility for Disaster Reduction & Recovery	GCC - Senior Director	3098555,26
TF072593	Palestinian Recovery and Development Plan Multi Donor Trust Fund - Parallel Trust Fund	MNA-FS	MNA VPU Free-Standing Trust Fund Program	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	56340318,55
TF072600	Somalia Multi-Partner Fund	SOMPF	Somalia Multi-Partner Fund	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	6265031,27
TF072612	Ethiopia General Education Quality Improvement Project II -Parallel to TF072206	AFRHD	AFR Human Development	Education - GP	3852265,61
TF072635	Knowledge for Change Program III - Parallel to TF072304	KCPIII	Knowledge For Change Program III	Office of Sr. Vice President Devel	473440,02
TF072699	Extractives Global Programmatic Support (EGPS) Multi Donor Trust Fund	EGPS	Extractives Global Programmatic Support	Energy & Extractives - GP	1411002,43
TF072701	Global Water Security and Sanitation Partnership Multi-Donor Trust Fund	GWSP	Global Water Security And Sanitation Partnership	Water - GP	2368362,39
TF072722	State- and Peace- Building Multi Donor Trust Fund - Parallel to TF071021	SPBF	State And Peace Building Fund	Global Theme Department - FCV	2438218,03
TF072735	Indonesia Sustainable Landscape Management Multi-Donor Trust Fund	IDSLM	Sustainable Landscapes MDTF	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	28570562,42
TF072755	Middle East and North Africa (MNA) Region-wide Technical Assistance Multi Donor Trust Fund - Parallel to TF071840	MNXTA	Middle East and North Africa (MNA) Cross-Sector Technical Assistance Program	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	2467281,46

TF072764	Fragility and Conflict Partnership: United Nations-World Bank Multi Donor Trust Fund Parallel to TF071479	FCP	Fragility & Conflict Partnership	Global Theme Department - FCV	2012120,06
TF072778	Partnership for Infrastructure Development in the West Bank and Gaza Multi Donor Trust Fund	PWUD	Partnership For Infrastructure Development	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	8996413,92
TF072808	Umbrella Facility for Trade	TRTA	Trade And Development	EFI Strategy & Ops	6638381,85
TF072822	PEFA program phase 5	PEFA	Public Expenditure And Financial Accountability	Governance - GP	877537,86
TF072850	Multi Donor Nordic Trust Fund - Parallel Trust Fund of TF071180	NTF	Nordic Trust Fund	Governance - GP	1276813,07
TF072956	Indonesia Oceans, Marine Debris, and Coastal Resources Multi-Donor Trust Fund	ID-OMC	Indonesia Oceans, Marine Debris, and Coastal	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	1379889,61
TF072989	Norway West Bank and Gaza Support Trust Fund - Parallel Trust Fund of TF072213	NWBG	Norway West Bank And Gaza Support TF	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	53655,74
TF072991	General Education Quality Improvement Program for Equity Multi Donor Trust Fund	FS-HDN	Free-Standing Trust Funds For HDN	Education - GP	11770475,52
TFM20992	Water and Sanitation Programme (WSP) Global Program Management	WSP	Water And Sanitation Program(WSP)	Water - GP	2172226,14
TFM29008	Global Environment Facility (GEF) Voluntary Fund	GEFCO	GEF Cofinancing Trust Funds	GEF Front Office	4983,00
Ministry of Foreign Affairs Total					1 762 596 777,10
Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD)					
TF053980	Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund	ARTF	Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	42 894 450,62
TF071153	Public-Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility Multi Donor Trust Fund II	PPIAF	Public-Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility	Global Themes Dep - IPG - Sr.Dr	1 390 793,84
TF072133	Multi-Donor Trust Fund for the Global Financing Facility (GFF) in Support of Every Woman Every Child	GFF	Global Financing Facility	Health, Nutr & Population - GP	294 812 001,94
TF072591	Readiness Fund of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility	FCPFR	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility	GCC - Senior Director	83 575 407,14
TF072617	Public-Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility (PPIAF) Integrating Climate Change Agenda with Public Private Partnerships Program	PPIAF	Public-Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility	Global Themes Dep - IPG - Sr.Dr	2 028 006,01
TF072634	Information for Development Program (InfoDev)	INFOD	Information for Development	Fin, Comp & Innov - GP	5 089 370,02
TF072645	Ebola Recovery and Reconstruction Trust Fund	ERR	Ebola Recovery And Reconstruction	Office of the Regional Vice Presid	4 921 197,48
TF072859	Energy Sector Management Assistance Program Multi Donor Fund - Successor to TF071398	ESMAP	Energy Sector Management Assistance Program	Energy & Extractives - GP	2 980 874,71
TF072964	Special Initiative of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Evaluation Office - Parallel to TF070668	EOSIC	Evaluation Office Special Initiatives Co	GEF Evaluation Office	437 109,15
TFM52033	Multi-Donor Trust Fund for Impact Evaluation to Development Impact - Parallel to TF072161	IE2I	Impact Evaluation To Impact Development Umbrella Facility	Office of Sr. Vice President Devel	2 454 945,02
Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) Total					463 434 394,56
Grand Total					2 226 031 171,66

3.2 IBRD Trust Funds Accounting for Over 80 % of total Norwegian Contributions (million US dollars)

Trustee	Trustee Name	Contributions by MFA and NORAD	Contributions by all other Partners	Total Contributions to Trustee	Norway's share as percentage of total	Paid in MFA/ Norad %	Paid in all other donors
TF070955	Multi-Donor Trust Fund for the Global Financing Facility (GFF) in Support of Every Woman Every Child, including TF072645	563 607 481	420 260 102	983 867 583	57 %	71 %	78 %
TF050576	Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund	508 717 936	10 530 078 156	11 038 796 093	5 %	100 %	96 %
TF071607	Palestinian Recovery and Development Plan Multi Donor Trust Fund, including TF072593	231 486 708	231 486 708	231 486 708	100 %	100 %	100 %
TF071077	Carbon Fund of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility	171 310 559	519 693 922	691 004 481	25 %	100 %	56 %
TF071076	Readiness Fund of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility	113 775 407	250 101 999	363 877 406	31 %	89 %	100 %
TF071244	Trust Fund for Norway's Support to the Regional Power Infrastructure Projects in Southern Africa	62 960 456		62 960 456	100 %	13 %	
TF072090	Multi Donor Trust Fund for Ethiopia Sustainable Land Management Project Phase 2	41 395 728		41 395 728	100 %	100 %	
TF072023	Malawi Agricultural Sector Wide Approach Support Project Multi Donor Trust Fund	28 645 770	96 460 383	125 106 153	23 %		0 %
TF072283	Somalia Multi-Partner Fund, including TF072600	19 310 379	19 310 379	19 310 379	100 %	100 %	100 %
TF071398	Energy Sector Management Assistance Program Multi Donor Trust Fund, including TF072490	15 884 197	15 884 197	15 884 197	100 %	100 %	100 %
	Other funds	468 936 550	3 383 068 193	3 694 095 763	13 %	87 %	
	Total	2 226 031 172	15 466 344 038	17 267 784 946	13 %	86 %	97 %

4 Norway's Contributions to Financial Intermediary Funds in the World Bank

4.1 Financial Intermediary Funds with Norwegian Participation (million US dollars)

TF Number	Trustee name	Agency	Program Name	Norway's Contribution Paid in USD	Norway's Contribution Total in USD	All Partner Contribution Paid in USD	All Partner Contribution Total in USD
TF069001	The Global Fund to Fight AIDS Tuberculosis and Malaria	MFA	GFATM-Global Fund For Aids, Tuberculosis And Malaria	801 194 820	801 194 820	42 526 626 223	43 459 655 563
	Debt Relief Trust Fund	MFA	HIPC-Heavily Indebted Poor Countries	393 887 738	418 635 620	6 877 745 834	6 959 225 700
TF069020	Global Partnership for Education Fund	Norad+MFA	EFA-Education For All FIF	404 693 236	404 693 236	3 181 692 378	3 737 784 099
TF029840	Gef trust fund	MFA	GEF-Global Environment Facility	298 164 000	346 845 000	16 371 684 729	16 609 656 314
TF069012	Strategic climate fund	MFA+Norad	CSCF-Strategic Climate Fund	280 303 894	282 079 379	2 938 540 502	2 955 683 186
TFIFFIM1	International finance facility for immunization	MFA	IFFIM-International Finance Facility For Immunization	200 241 963	235 751 719	2 789 534 390	5 376 242 061
TF069022	Green climate fund	MFA+Norad	GCCTF-Green Climate Fund Trust Fund	205 366 335	205 366 335	6 739 207 882	7 065 060 907
TF069017	Guyana REDD+ investment fund	MFA	GRIF-Guyana Redd Plus Investment Fund Trustee	69 830 010	201 452 568	69 830 010	201 452 568
TFM21826	Support to Agricultural Research through the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) Centers	MFA	CGIAR-Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research	60 737 576	60 737 576	387 323 677	387 323 677
TF069016	Haiti reconstruction fund	MFA	HRTF-Haiti Reconstruction Fund	44 270 497	44 270 497	401 398 275	411 398 275
TF069002	Special climate change fund	MFA	SCCF-Special Climate Change Fund	34 592 632	34 592 632	346 247 377	351 247 377
TF069033	Cgiar trust fund	Norad	CGIAR-Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research	24 329 660	33 798 909	737 999 878	1 052 470 460
TF069004	Least developed countries fund	MFA	GEFCC-GEF - Climate Control	32 160 308	32 160 308	1 291 754 378	1 328 244 271
TF069029	Global concessional financing facility	MFA	MNACFF-Middle East and North Africa Concessional Financing Facility FIF	27 733 329	27 733 329	499 306 982	499 306 982
TF069035	Coalition for Epidemic	Norad	CEPI-Coalition Epidemic	11 899 237	11 899 237	156 999 946	283 572 707

	Preparedness Innovations		Preparedness Innovations				
TF069034	Women Entrepreneurs Finance Initiative	MFA	WEFI-Women's Entrepreneurship Financing Initiative	10 692 646	10 692 646	207 861 846	353 606 645
TF069013	Adaptation Fund	MFA	ADPTRS-Adaptation Fund Trustee	2 527 081	2 527 081	538 285 245	543 847 475
TF069019	Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund	MFA	NPIF-Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund	1 007 980	1 007 980	16 050 903	16 050 903
	Debt Relief Trust Fund	MFA	HIPC-Heavily Indebted Poor Countries	0	0	194 717 905	194 717 905
	Total			2 903 632 944	3 155 438 873	86 272 808 358	91 786 547 074

Notes:

MFA Agreements	17
Norad agreements	5
Total FIFs	18

4.2 Financial Intermediary Funds Accounting for over 90 % of total Norwegian Contributions (million US dollars)

TF Number	Trustee name	Percentage of total portfolio	N as percentage of total	Paid in MFA/Norad %	Paid in all donors	
TF069001	The Global Fund to Fight AIDS Tuberculosis and Malaria	0,25	2 %	100 %	98 %	Health
	Debt Relief Trust Fund	0,13	6 %	94 %	99 %	Poverty
TF069020	Global Partnership for Education Fund	0,13	11 %	100 %	85 %	Education
TF029840	Gef trust fund	0,11	2 %	86 %	99 %	Climate
TF069012	Strategic climate fund	0,09	10 %	99 %	99 %	Climate
TFIFFIM1	International finance facility for immunization	0,07	4 %	85 %	52 %	Health
TF069022	Green climate fund	0,07	3 %	100 %	95 %	Climate
TF069017	Guyana REDD+ investment fund	0,06	100 %	35 %	35 %	Climate

5 Overview of the World Bank’s Financial Intermediary Fund (FIF) Cost Recovery Procedure

August 2019

Overview

Financial Intermediary Funds (FIF) “revenues” received by the Bank as a trustee from FIF donors are based on the amounts billed to donors for FIF trustee services provided. Amounts billed are determined by the Trustee based on the anticipated time and resources required to perform the functions and responsibilities agreed with the respective governing bodies of each FIF. Typically prepared a year in advance and in some cases 3 years in advance, these budgets are presented to, and approved by, the respective governing bodies.

FIF “costs” include expenditures related to staff salary, benefits, travel and other indirect costs resulting from the World Bank’s role as trustee of the FIF. These costs are split into the following:

- i. Direct FIF-related Costs: These costs arise directly from the trustee activities of FIFs – e.g., staff time, travel and others (consultants, contractual services). The entire cost is billed to and recovered from individual FIFs using a well-established practice. In addition to the time billed, the indirect cost is billed to individual FIFs to cover the cost of IT and communications, etc. The Indirect cost is derived using the World Bank’s standard indirect rate of 17% and staff benefit rate of 70%.
- ii. FIF Supporting Costs: These represent shared costs that are not applicable to any specific FIF. These costs are attributed to the FIF portfolio as a whole on a proportionate basis (i.e. based on actual costs of each FIF). These costs include the following:
 - General operating expenses (for example, office space, printing, courier etc.);
 - Preparation of FIF-related documents (briefing notes and Board papers);
 - FIF IT systems and consultants;
 - Depreciation costs of IT systems;
 - ACS time (of those working on FIFs); and
 - Ad-hoc work across the FIF portfolio.

What is our current FIF budget estimation, cost recovery model, and billing methodology?

The administrative budget for each individual FIF includes five categories of expenses, which make up the administrative budget presented to each respective governing body for approval. The details of each of these components, including expenses covered and calculation methodology are listed in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Revenue Components of a FIF Trustee Administrative Budget

Administrative Fee Component	Expenses Covered	Calculation Methodology
Financial and Program Management	Procedures relating to all aspects of financial transactions; management and processing of contributions, including negotiation and execution with contributors, banking, foreign exchange, payment requests and acknowledgements; executing cash transfers to recipients; regular financial reporting and activities related to preparation of financial statements and external audit.	<p><u>Staff costs</u>: estimated based on number of staff weeks required, and costed by staff function and MRP of grade. Includes 70% staff benefit costs, and 17% for indirect costs.</p> <p><u>Travel costs</u>: estimated based on frequency and location of governing body meetings, or other travel as required.</p>

		<u>Consultant costs</u> : Estimated based on anticipated work program.
Legal	Preparation and negotiation of contribution agreements and other agreements as required; review of FIF governance documents as they impact the role of the Trustee.	<u>Staff costs</u> : estimated based on number of staff weeks required and costed by staff function and MRP of grade. Includes 70% staff benefit costs, and 17% for indirect costs.
Accounting and Reporting	Maintenance of appropriate records and accounts to identify contributions and other receipts and FIF liabilities.	<u>Staff costs</u> : estimated based on number of staff weeks required and costed by staff function and MRP of grade. Includes 70% staff benefit costs, and 17% for indirect costs.
Investment Management	Investment management of the liquid assets of a FIF.	4.5 basis points (0.045%) of the average annual undisbursed balance of a FIF and any customized services like Bond Issuances, Swap Fees and Custodian & Equity Management Fees.
Non-core costs	Any additional expenses that cannot be categorized in the above categories.	Typically, 10% of all administrative functions.

With the “bottom-up” methodologies used to calculate the budget for each FIF and the principle of full cost recovery for the services provided by the Trustee, the World Bank is currently recovering, in full, the costs related to the trustee services for all FIFs. If there is a difference in actual costs vis-a-vis the approved budget estimate for each individual FIF at the end of the budget cycle, the difference will be presented to the relevant FIF governing bodies and the differential amount will be settled based on the decision by the respective FIF governing body.

For each FIF, do we know Secretariat and the Implementing agency costs?

Secretariat Costs:

In general, the FIF secretariat costs includes two main components: 1) World Bank’s Administrative Support Services; and 2) Direct Costs, including staff salaries and benefits as per the Bank’s Trust Fund Cost Recovery Policy, which is based on the principle of full cost recovery. Any additional services provided by the secretariat as per the FIF governance documents and the committee decisions are reimbursed at actual cost.

In the event of any change in the Trust Fund Cost Recovery Policy, this will be automatically applied to the secretariat costs.

Implementing Entity (IE) Costs:

Implementing Entities (IEs) typically follow the World Bank Trust Fund Cost Recovery Policy in estimating Project Preparation, Supervision and the implementation Cost. However, in most cases, the cost recovery of the administration and support fees for the activities implemented by the IEs varies for each FIF based on the operating guidelines of the FIF and the amount for each activity as determined by the governing body.

5.1 The Structure of the New Cost-Recovery Model

	BETF	RETF	FIF ⁽⁵⁾
Rate to cover World Bank staff benefits (Rate on staff salaries applies to all sources of funds) ⁽¹⁾	70 %	70 %	70 %
Indirect rate on personnel costs including staff benefits ⁽²⁾	17 %	17 %	17 %
Fund fee		5-2 % ⁽³⁾	
Trustee budget ⁽⁴⁾ for management of fund (Treasury and DFI) total 15 mill.			⁽⁶⁾
Implementing agency fee for project cycle management of FIF projects			
<p><i>Notes</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Rate on salaries of locally recruited staff is 45% due to differences in benefits granted to local staff</i> <i>Total Personnel costs includes staff salaries plus benefits and expenditure on short-term consultants and temporaries. Interviews with staff indicate that full cost recovery of overhead costs requires an indirect rate between 28-30 %</i> <i>RETFs pay a fee that is calculated on a sliding scale at the time of signing the TF agreement. The rate applied depends on the size of the fund with highest on the first USD 50 million, then 4 percent of the next USD 450 million, 3 percent on the next \$500 million, and 2 percent on any further amounts committed. The Bank also charges project appraisal and supervision costs to a corresponding BETF. The Bank executed component in a RETF (consisting of project appraisal/ supervision by the Bank staff) is charged at BETF rates in addition to the administration fee.</i> <i>Trustee budget covers financial management and services of the Development Finance Unit. Interview with staff indicate that total revenue on this account was around 15 million USD.</i> <i>Rates vary significantly depending on the role played by the Bank in the FIF. Bank-executed component (Bank staff working in the secretariat or projects implemented by the Bank) is charged BETF rates; in addition to implementing agency fee where Bank is an implementing agency for the FIF.</i> <i>See also appendix 5 for overview of FIF cost-recovery procedures</i> 			

6 UN Inter-Agency Pooled Funds Accounting for over 80 % of Total Norwegian Funding Through MPTF Partnerships (US dollars)

Fund	No. of donors	Total Donor Deposit	Norway Deposit	Commitments	Norway % of total donor deposit	Norway's cumulative share of deposits	Norway's cumulative share of commitments
UN REDD Programme Fund	7	308 545 838	261 986 314	261 986 314	85 %	26 %	26 %
Sudan Humanitarian Fund	14	1 274 000 627	150 269 533	150 269 533	12 %	41 %	40 %
Central African Forest Init.	2	147 369 617	144 256 817	154 888 889	98 %	55 %	55 %
Peacebuilding Fund	60	950 999 573	80 823 221	80 823 221	8 %	63 %	63 %
South Sudan Humanitarian Fund	20	695 162 901	69 295 630	69 295 630	10 %	70 %	70 %
DRC Humanitarian Fund	16	1 128 772 313	52 213 749	52 213 749	5 %	75 %	75 %
Tanzania One UN Fund	11	256 357 723	45 246 776	45 246 776	18 %	79 %	79 %
Somalia Humanitarian Fund	24	472 434 395	30 561 907	30 561 907	6 %	82 %	82 %

7 Profiles of Norway's World Bank Trust Fund Partnerships

GEF - TRUST FUND (TF029840)

Total Norwegian Commitment in USD: 346.85 million

Total Fund Commitments in USD: million

Start Date / End Date: 1994/

The Global Environment Facility ("GEF"), was formally established on July 1, 1994. The GEF provides funding to eligible countries for incremental costs of measures to achieve global environmental benefits in the following focal areas specified in the Instrument, as amended: biological diversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation (primarily desertification and deforestation), and chemicals and waste. Incremental costs of such other activities under Agenda 21 (the action plan of the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development) as agreed by the GEF Council (the "Council") are eligible for funding if they achieve global environmental benefits in the focal areas.

The Trust Fund is administered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development ("IBRD") as Trustee. The responsibilities of the Trustee include the mobilisation of resources for the Trust Fund, financial management of the Trust Fund, investment of funds as well as disbursement of funds to the Implementing Agencies, Executing Agencies and GEF Project Agencies, in accordance with the fund's provisions and decisions made by its Council. –

There are three Implementing Agencies: IBRD, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (IAs). Specific responsibilities are assigned to each of the IAs, the GEF Secretariat the Trustee and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP). GEF resources are allocated to each of those parties pursuant to the terms of GEF. In addition, the GEF Council decided in 2003 that the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit shall operate functionally independent and report directly to the Council.

In addition to the three Implementing Agencies above, the following Executing/ GEF Project Agencies receive funding from the GEF:

- Asian Development Bank (ADB)
- African Development Bank/African Development Fund (collectively AfDB)
- Conservation International (CI)
- European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)
- Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO)
- Fundo Brasileiro para a Biodiversidade (FUNBIO)
- Inter-American Development Bank (IADB)
- International Fund for Agriculture and Development (IFAD)
- International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN)
- The Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA)
- United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO)
- World Wildlife Fund (WWF-US)
- West African Development Bank (BOAD)
- Development Bank of Latin America (CAF)
- Foreign Economic Cooperation Office, Ministry of Environmental Protection of China (FECO)

The Trust Fund receives its funding primarily from contributions, provided by the participants contributing to the Trust Fund. As of June 30, 2018, there have been six replenishment cycles under which the Trustee was authorised to accept contributions to the Trust Fund, as follows:

GEF-1: July 1, 1994 – June 30, 1998: \$2.01 billion

GEF-2: July 1, 1998 – June 30, 2002: \$2.67 billion

GEF-3: July 1, 2002 – June 30, 2006: \$2.93 billion

GEF-4: July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2010: \$3.34 billion
GEF-5: July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2014: \$4.34 billion
GEF-6: July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2018: \$4.43 billion

During 2017-2018, GEF received contribution from 30 countries.

STRATEGIC CLIMATE FUND (TF069012)
Instrument: Financial Intermediary Fund
Total Norwegian Commitment in USD: 201.51 million
Total Fund Commitments in USD: 1096.8 million
Start Date / End Date: 2008 /

The SCF finances targeted programs in developing countries to pilot new climate or sectoral approaches with scaling-up potential. Three programs have been established under the SCF: The Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR), the Forest Investment Program (FIP), and the Program on Scaling-Up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries (SREP).

The SCF is governed by the SCF Trust Fund Committee, which oversees the operations and activities of the SCF. The SCF Trust Fund Committee is composed of contributor and recipient representatives, together with representatives from the World Bank and the other MDBs. The World Bank and the other MDB representatives are non-decision making members. Decisions are made by consensus of the decision-making members of the SCF Trust Fund Committee. The World Bank also serves as an Implementing Entity (IE) for the SCF.

SCF Sub-Committees for each of the three programs have been established by the SCF Trust Fund Committee. Each SCF Sub-Committee is responsible for duties such as approving programming priorities, operational criteria and financing modalities for the SCF Programs, securing SCF Program financing for programs and projects, and preparing periodic reports to the SCF Trust Fund Committee on the operations of the SCF Programs.

SCF is one of the two Climate Investments Funds (CIF) established in 2008 by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and the International Development Association (IDA). The Funds are jointly implemented by the following multilateral development banks (MDBs): African Development Bank (AfDB); Asian Development Bank (ADB); European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD); Inter-American Development Bank (IADB); International Finance Corporation (IFC); and the World Bank.

Clean Technology Fund (CTF) is the other Climate Investments Fund CIF. The CTF finances scaled-up demonstration, deployment, and transfer of low-carbon technologies for significant greenhouse gas reductions. The focus is on piloting investment in countries or regions with opportunities for large greenhouse gas abatement

Guyana REDD-Plus Investment Fund (FIF)
Instrument: Financial Intermediary Fund
Total Norwegian Commitment in USD: 1.5 billion NOK
Total Fund Commitments in USD: 1.5 billion NOK
Start Date / End Date: 2011/2021

The GRIF is a fund for the financing of activities identified under the Government of Guyana's Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS). The fund will receive up to NOK 1.5 billion from Norway in performance-based payments for the period up until December 31, 2021, based on an independent verification of Guyana's deforestation and forest degradation rates and progress on REDD+ enabling activities. The World Bank's International Development Association (IDA) was invited by Guyana and Norway to act as Trustee and will be responsible for providing financial intermediary services to the GRIF.

TF069002-Special Climate Change Fund
Instrument: Financial Intermediary Fund
Total Norwegian Commitment: 34.59 million USD
Total Norwegian Contribution: 34.59 million USD
Total Fund Commitments: 352.31 USD
Total Fund Contributions: 347.31 USD
Start Date / End Date: 2002 /

The Special Climate Change Fund SCCF was established following the decision of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (the "UNFCCC") at its Seventh Session ("COP 7") in November 2001 to invite the **Global Environment Facility ("GEF")** to operate such a fund (Decision 7/CP.7 of the UNFCCC). At its May 15-17, 2002 biannual meeting, the GEF Council (the "Council") approved the arrangements proposed for the establishment of such a fund and invited IBRD to act as its Trustee (GEF/C.19/6).

Under the SCCF Trust Fund are the **Program for Adaptation** and **Program for Technology Transfer**, both of which have been established under the SCCF following the endorsement by the Council of such Programs on the basis of document GEF/C.24/12, Programming to Implement the Guidance for the Special Climate Change Fund adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change at its Ninth Session.

The report is produced by the Trustee in accordance with the Trustee's role as set forth in the paper entitled Arrangements for the Establishment of the New Climate Change Funds (GEF/C.19/6) which states:

"[...] the World Bank would be responsible for the financial management of each fund, including: [...] (iv) the preparation of financial reports regarding the investment and use of the funds' resources; and (v) regular reporting to the Council on the status of the funds' resources."

Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPFR)

Total Norwegian Commitment in USD: 201.51 million

Total Fund Commitments in USD: 1096.8 million

Start Date / End Date:

The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) is a global partnership of governments, businesses, civil society, and Indigenous Peoples focused on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, forest carbon stock conservation, the sustainable management of forests, and the enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries (activities commonly referred to as REDD+). The FCPF assists countries in their REDD+ efforts by (i) providing them with financial and technical assistance in building their capacity to benefit from possible future systems of positive incentives for REDD+, (ii) piloting a performance-based payment system for REDD+ activities, with a view to ensuring equitable benefit sharing and promoting future large-scale positive incentives for REDD+; Within the approach to REDD+, (iii) testing ways to sustain or enhance livelihoods of local communities and to conserve biodiversity; (iv) disseminating broadly the knowledge gained in the development of the Facility and the implementation of Readiness Preparation Proposals (RPPs) and Emission Reductions Programs (ERPs).

Trustee Accounts (2)

1. TF 071076 The FCPF Readiness Fund

Total Norwegian Commitment in USD: 171.3 million

Total Fund Commitments in USD: 400 million

The FCPF Readiness Fund supports 47 forest countries in establishing the building blocks for REDD+ initiatives. The Readiness Fund will provide grants to support a specific technical assistance (TA) program (the Readiness Mechanism) for about 20 interested developing countries (together referred to as REDD Participant Countries), with the goal of arriving at estimates of their respective national forest carbon stocks and sources of forest emissions, as well as likely national reference scenarios for future emissions, and monitoring systems for measuring progress against the reference scenarios. Since the Readiness Mechanism will help reate new policies and methodologies for REDD that can be used broadly, it will have a substantial research, development and global knowledge sharing function.

At the country level, it will assist countries in developing monitoring plans for REDD and build capacity for monitoring and verification as needed. TA would be available to help countries to calculate the opportunity costs of possible REDD interventions and design a strategy for reducing emissions, taking into account their respective priorities and constraints. In support of these activities, the Readiness Mechanism can also provide countries with resources for communications and stakeholder consultations, to ensure that the reference scenario, monitoring plans and REDD strategies are realistic and country-owned

Total contributions and commitments to the Readiness Fund are US\$400 million.

2. TF 071077 The FCPF Carbon Fund

Total Norwegian Commitment in USD: 30.2 million

Total Fund Commitments in USD: 900 million

The FCPF Carbon Fund supports 19 countries in developing jurisdictional scale emission reductions programs. Total contributions and commitments to the Carbon Fund are US\$900 million

Multi Donor Trust Fund for Ethiopia Sustainable Land Management Project Phase 2 (TF072090)

Total Norwegian Commitment in USD: 41.4 million

Total Fund Commitments in USD: 41.4 million

Recipient-executed in USD: 38.45 million

Bank-executed in USD: 2.4 million

The Project Development Objective of SLMP-2 is to reduce land degradation and improve land productivity in selected watersheds in six regions in Ethiopia. The objective would be achieved through the provision of

capital investments, technical assistance and capacity building for small holder farmers and government institutions at national and sub-national levels.

Indonesia Sustainable Landscape Management Multi-Donor Trust Fund (TF072735)

Total Norwegian Commitment in USD: 28.5 million
Total Fund Commitments in USD: 32.43 million

Recipient-executed Commitment: 0
Bank-executed Commitment: USD 1,48 million

The overall development objective of the SLM-MDTF is to improve the integration and coordination of landscapes management across multi-sector stakeholders and demonstrate sustainable landscape management approaches in selected areas of Indonesia

Multi Donor Trust Fund for Ethiopia Sustainable Land Management Project Phase 2 (TF072090)

Total Norwegian Commitment in USD: 41.4 million
Total Fund Commitments in USD: 41.4 million

Recipient-executed in USD: 38.45 million
Bank-executed in USD: 2.4 million

The Project Development Objective of SLMP-2 is to reduce land degradation and improve land productivity in selected watersheds in six regions in Ethiopia. The objective would be achieved through the provision of capital investments, technical assistance and capacity building for small holder farmers and government institutions at national and sub-national levels.

Indonesia Sustainable Landscape Management Multi-Donor Trust Fund (TF072735)

Total Norwegian Commitment in USD: 28.5 million
Total Fund Commitments in USD: 32.43 million

Recipient-executed Commitment in USD:
Bank-executed Commitment in USD: 5,28 million

The overall development objective of the SLM-MDTF is to improve the integration and coordination of landscapes management across multi-sector stakeholders and demonstrate sustainable landscape management approaches in selected areas of Indonesia

Somalia Multi-Partner Fund (TF072283)

Total Norwegian Contribution: USD
Total Fund contributions: USD:

Recipient-executed (active grants) in USD: 207.94 million
Bank-executed (active grants) in USD: 42.50million

The principal objective of the Trust Fund is to provide a platform for coordinated financing for the sustainable reconstruction and development of Somalia, as outlined in the Somali Compact covering 2014-2016 that was endorsed at the multi-stakeholder Brussels Conference in September 2013 (the "Somali Compact"), with a focus on core state functions and socio-economic recovery, including to:

(a) Foster socio-economic recovery and stabilisation by (i) supporting the payment of civil service salaries and the running costs of government institutions, and (ii) by financing technical assistance and supporting the building blocks of larger public investment programs across a range of sectors;

- (b) Strengthen core government functions by focusing on the budget framework and public financial management systems;
- (c) Facilitate policy dialogue between international and national actors and promoting mutual accountability by positioning the Trust Fund as part of the governance of the Somali Development and Reconstruction Facility (the “SDRF”); and
- (d) Increase the coordination of international financial support and its alignment with Peace and Statebuilding Goals of the Somali Compact and any successor document.

Global Partnership for Education Fund (TF069020)

Total Norwegian Contribution: USD

Total Fund contributions: USD:

Recipient-executed (active grants) USD:

Bank-executed (active grants) USD:

The Global Partnership for Education Fund (GPEF) was established as a Financial Intermediary Fund in 2011 as part of the rebranding process of the Education for All Fast Track Initiative (EFA FTI), which started in 2002. The Global Partnership for Education Fund finances the development and implementation of education plans in developing countries and the dissemination of knowledge and best practices in education at the global and regional levels.

Energy Sector Management Assistance Program Multi Donor Trust Fund (TF071398)

Total Norwegian Contribution: USD

Total Fund Contributions: USD:

Recipient-executed (all grants) USD: 1.44 million

Bank-executed (all grants) USD: 191.67

Established in 1983, ESMAP assists to client countries to increase know-how and institutional capacity to achieve environmentally sustainable energy solutions for poverty reduction and economic growth. The objective of this ESMAP Programmatic Multi-Donor Trust Fund is to provide multi-year funding support to implement the new ESMAP 2008-2013 Strategic Business Plan (SBP), endorsed by the ESMAP governing body (the Consultative Group for the Energy Trust Funded Programs) in April 2009. Under the SBP, ESMAP supports demand-driven AA and TA activities that address three interlinked global thematic challenges - energy security, poverty reduction and climate change. The intended outcomes for ESMAP client countries are (i) better informed policy decisions, (ii) adoption of cutting-edge solutions for scaling up deployment of clean energy technologies, and (iii) enhanced institutional capacity to plan, manage, and regulate energy sector strategies. ESMAP's core functions - think tank, operational leveraging and knowledge clearinghouse - provide the essential links that clients need to translate high quality advice received into concrete results-on-the-ground, the intended outcomes.

Trust Fund for Norway's Support to the Regional Power Infrastructure Projects in Southern Africa (TF071244)

Total Norwegian Contribution: USD

Total Fund Contributions: USD:

Recipient-executed (all grants) USD: 1.44 million

Bank-executed (all grants) USD: 191.67

Development Objectives

- to strengthen regional integration through cross border trading of electrical energy
- to improve the state of regional capacity deficit and to meet an anticipated growth in demand through the development of the extensive natural energy resources in Mozambique
- to extend the basis for the SAPP electrical energy market
- to allow for Malawi to benefit from bilateral and regional trade through SAPP
- to enable the development of least cost and low environmental impact generation capacity

8 Profiles of Norway's Top 10 UN Inter-Agency Pooled Trust Funds partnerships

<p>UN REDD Programme Fund</p> <p>Total Commitment in USD: 271,773,403</p> <p>Start Date / End Date: 20 Jun 08 / 31 Dec 20</p> <p>Brief Description: The UN-REDD Programme is the United Nations Collaborative Initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD+) in developing countries. The Programme was launched in 2008 and builds on the convening role and technical expertise of the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The UN-REDD Programme supports nationally led REDD+ processes and promotes the informed and meaningful involvement of all stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities, in national and international REDD+ implementation. More information on the Programme can also be found at the following links:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UN-REDD Programme governance • UN-REDD Programme partner countries • UN-REDD Programme support mechanisms and technical work areas
<p>Central African Forest Initiative</p> <p>Total Commitment in USD: 252,525,477</p> <p>Start Date / End Date: 29 Sep 15 / 31 Dec 22</p> <p>Brief Description: A coalition of willing donors (<i>European Union, Federal Republic of Germany, Kingdom of Norway, Republic of France and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</i>) together with the Central Africa partner Countries (<i>Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Cameroon, Republic of Congo, Republic of Equatorial Guinea and Republic of Gabon</i>) has entered into collaborative partnership to establish the Central African Forest Initiative (CAFI). The objective of this initiative is to slow down and halt deforestation and forest degradation in the region through the implementation of country-led, national scale, holistic REDD+ and Low Emissions Development investment frameworks that include policy reforms and measures addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. The CAFI Multi-Partner Trust Fund is administered by the UNDP MPTF-Office and intends to reduce aid fragmentation and increase predictability through multi-year country based financing strategies.</p>
<p>Sudan Humanitarian Fund</p> <p>Total Commitment in USD: 150,269,533</p> <p>Start Date / End Date: Jan 06 / N/A</p> <p>Brief Description: The Sudan Humanitarian Fund (SHF) is a pooled funding mechanism established in 2005 for humanitarian activities in Sudan. Under the overall authority of the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC), the Sudan HF is intended to give the HC greater ability to target funds to the most critical humanitarian needs, encourage early donor contributions and enable a rapid response to unforeseen circumstances. A similar mechanism exists in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Only those humanitarian projects included in the UN and Partners Work Plan for Sudan (the Work Plan) are eligible for SHF funding. The Work Plan outlines the annual strategic and operational plan for the UN and partners' assistance in Sudan and is developed in consultation with national, regional and local authorities. It is divided into seven planning regions and one national programme, each covering up to twelve sectors with four cross cutting issues that all sectors are expected to integrate into their programming. The Sudan CHF is administered by the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in accordance with its financial regulations and rules.</p>
<p>Peacebuilding Fund</p> <p>Total Commitment in USD: 72,125,552</p>

<p>Start Date / End Date: 2006 / N/A</p> <p>Brief Description: The United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) is supports more than two hundred projects in 27 countries by delivering fast, flexible and relevant funding. Countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) receive funding. Countries that are not on the PBC agenda may also receive funding, following a declaration of eligibility by the Secretary-General.</p> <p>The PBF allocates money through two funding facilities -- the Immediate Response Facility (IRF) and the Peacebuilding Recovery Facility (PRF). Both facilities fund initiatives that respond to one or more of the following four criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respond to imminent threats to the peace process and initiatives that support peace agreements and political dialogue • Build or strengthen national capacities to promote coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflict • Stimulate economic revitalisation to general peace dividends • Re-establish essential administrative services <p>The PBF is managed on behalf of the United Nations Secretary-General by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support, supported by the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO). The UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office) is the PBF fund administrator.</p>
<p>Expanded DaO Funding Window</p> <p>Total Commitment in USD: 68,647,128</p> <p>Start Date / End Date: Sep 08 / N/A</p> <p>Brief Description: The Expanded Delivering as One Funding Window for Achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (EFW) was launched by the Chair of the UN Development Group and the Governments of Spain, Norway and the United Kingdom in September 2008 as a multi-donor funding mechanism that provides resources to support nationally-led and owned programming processes to help UN Country Teams to Deliver as One. Specifically, the EFW is designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respond to the need for additional, un-earmarked, more predictable funding; • Provide a channel for additional resources to fill funding gaps for UN country programmes; • Allow donors to support integrated UN Programmes in countries where they may not have a bilateral presence or country-level funding mechanisms; and • Reduce the transaction costs associated with the separate and multiple financing agreements required to manage earmarked resources. <p>The United Nations Development Programme's Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office) is the designated the EFW Fund Manager with responsibilities for receipt and management of contributions from donors, and transfers of such funds to DaO/One UN Fund Administrative Agents in accordance with the approved EFW Steering Committee allocations.</p>
<p>South Sudan Humanitarian Fund</p> <p>Total Commitment in USD: 63,982,133</p> <p>Start Date / End Date: 21 Feb 12 / N/A</p> <p>Brief Description: The South Sudan Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) was established in February 2012 by the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) for South Sudan, UN Agencies and donors to support the timely allocation and disbursement of donor resources to the most critical humanitarian needs in South Sudan under the direction of the HC. The CHF is a pooled funding mechanism intended to support national and international NGOs and UN agencies providing humanitarian assistance to people in need in a strategic and timely manner.</p> <p>The South Sudan CHF aims to give the HC, in consultation with the CHF Advisory Board, the ability to allocate funds to priority humanitarian needs, encourage early donor contributions and allow rapid response to unforeseen needs. CHF priority clusters are: Common Services and Coordination, Education, Emergency Telecommunications, Food Security and Livelihoods, Health, Logistics, Non-Food Items and Emergency Shelter, Nutrition, Protection, Mine Action, WASH, Multi-sector (Emergency Returns and Refugees), and Camp Coordination and Management.</p> <p>The UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office) serves as Administrative Agent of the South Sudan CHF, on behalf of the Participating UN Organisations and IOM. Each Participating UN Organisation and IOM assumes full financial and programmatic accountability for the funds received.</p>

DRC Humanitarian Fund

Total Commitment in USD: 52,213,749
Start Date / End Date: Jan 06 / N/A

Brief Description:

The multi-donor humanitarian fund in the Democratic Republic of Congo, DRC, (the [DRC Pooled Fund](#)) aims to channel resources to projects within the Humanitarian Action Plan (HAP), to strengthen coordination and increase the extent to which funding is allocated to priority humanitarian needs. The Pooled Fund was established upon signing of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Humanitarian Coordinator, OCHA, Participating UN Organisations and [UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office \(MPTF Office\)](#) as the Administrative Agent. The main purpose of the Pooled Fund is to improve humanitarian response in the DRC as part of the wider reforms of humanitarian architecture.

The DRC Pooled Fund allocates funds to projects under different clusters. The clusters, based on the HAP, are Coordination, Early Recovery, Education, Food Security, Health, Logistics, Multisectoral (refugees), Nutrition, Protection, Shelter and Non-Food Items, and Water Sanitation and Hygiene.

The Administrative Agent of the Pooled Fund administers the DRC Pooled Fund in accordance with UNDP financial regulations and rules. The Administrative Agent disburses the funds upon the decision of the Humanitarian Coordinator to the respective Participating UN Organisations and the International Organisation for Migration (IOM).

Somalia Multi Window Trust Fund

Total Commitment in USD: 39,182,558
Start Date / End Date: 01 Jan 14 / 31 Dec 24

Brief Description:

The Somali Compact, endorsed in September 2012, is a joint partnership between the Somali people and the international community intended to be the only and overarching framework for all international donor and partner engagement with the country. It identifies a set of key priorities for the reconstruction of Somalia over the next three years under five Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Priorities (PSG).

As part of the Compact, the Federal Government of Somalia (FGS) and development partners established the Somalia Development and Reconstruction Facility (SDRF) as a centerpiece of the New Deal partnership to enhance the delivery of effective assistance to all Somalis. Closely aligned with the Somalia Compact principles, the SDRF serves as a mechanism for the FGS to oversee and guide the diverse activities of its development partners.

The SDRF brings together several funds (“windows”) under common governance arrangements (the UN, the World Bank and the African Development Bank and the Special Financing Facility). The Somalia UN MPTF will be complementary to and aligned with the other windows. Its governance structure will be aligned with the governance structure proposed for the SDRF.

Somalia UN Multi Partner Trust Fund MPTF

The **New Deal Compact** of 2012, between Somalia and the international community, established an overarching framework for all international donor and partner engagement with the country. It identified a set of key priorities for the reconstruction of Somalia over the next three years under five Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Priorities (PSG) -- Inclusive Politics, Security, Justice, Economic Foundations, and Services and Revenues.

As part of the Compact, the Federal Government of Somalia and its development partners agreed to establish the **Somalia Development and Reconstruction Facility** SDRF to enhance the delivery of effective assistance. The SDRF brought together several funds (“windows”) under common governance arrangements (the UN, the World Bank and the African Development Bank and the Special Financing Facility).

The **Somalia UN Multi Partner Trust Fund MPTF** was, established under the overall leadership of the Federal Government of Somalia. The MPTF organises its programmatic and operational work according to the priorities identified under each Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals of the Somali Compact.

The Fund is governed by the same Steering Committee as the SDRF. The **Steering Committee** reviews and approves proposals submitted keeping in view the requirements of the Fund’s Terms of Reference and is

responsible for providing oversight and exercising overall accountability of the Fund. The Federal Government of Somalia and Development Partners Groups provide a **Technical Forum** for sectoral policy formulation, planning and programmatic co-ordination and serve as a common governance and coordination function for the Somalia UN MPTF. This platform ensures joint oversight (donor and government) of the strategic direction, implementation and results of Somalia UN MPTF, the MPFs, and other financing instruments. The Steering Committee is co-chaired by the UN Resident Coordinator with the participation of two representatives of participating UN Agencies (on rotational basis), the World Bank, and two donor representatives contributing to the Somalia UN MPTF. A **Secretariat** with dedicated staff supports day-to-day functioning of the SDRF Steering Committee, the Partnership Forum, and financing, aid effectiveness and co-ordination, monitoring and reporting of the Fund.

The Somalia UN MPTF is administered by UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office), as its **Administrative Agent**. The Administrative Agent concludes a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the **Participating UN Organisations** (UN Agencies, The United Nations Support Office for the African Union Mission in Somalia UNSOA 2009-2015 and its replacement The United Nations Support Office in Somalia UNSOM since 2015) and a non- UN identity International Organisation for Migration IOM. Financing may be provided to national and sub-national institutions and international NGOs through one of the UN Agencies.

Use of funds, reporting obligations, liability, audit and other matters relating to the management of the funds provided and the activities are implemented by each participating organisation in accordance with its own regulations and procedures. Participating UN organisations and IOM assume full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds disbursed to them by the Administrative Agent.

Tanzania One UN Fund

Total Commitment in USD: 38,182,557
 Start Date / End Date: 26 Oct 07 / 30 Jun 21

Brief Description:

UN Tanzania has been operating a One Fund since 2007 when the Government of Tanzania requested to be a pilot country for Delivering as One (DaO) reform. The fund has contributed to achievement of results under the programmes of cooperation as well as strengthened joint work planning and reporting, formal and informal collaboration in implementation of delivering results together. The Tanzania One Fund supports coherent resource mobilisation as well as transparent allocation and disbursement of partner resources to facilitate delivery of common outcomes outlined in UNDAP II (2016-2021), channelling funds towards the highest priority needs based on agreed criteria, under the direction of the UN Resident Coordinator.

The Tanzania One UN Fund is administered by the [Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office \(MPTF Office\)](#) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in accordance with its financial regulations and rules.

Somalia Humanitarian Fund

Total Commitment in USD: 29,640,832
 Start Date / End Date: 20 May 10 / N/A

Brief Description:

The Somalia Humanitarian Fund (SHF) is a multi-donor country-based pooled fund established in 2010 to support the timely allocation and disbursement of donor resources to the address the most urgent humanitarian needs in Somalia.

The SHF has several distinct comparative advantages – the unearmarked nature of the Fund; the established and functioning accountability systems; integration within the existing coordination systems; and flexibility. The SHF has two allocation modalities – the standard allocation modality for large and medium-size strategic allocation rounds, typically once or twice a year, and the reserve allocation modality primarily intended for the rapid and flexible allocation of funds for individual allocations in the event of sudden emergencies or rapidly deteriorating situations, or to address the quickly emerging strategic needs.


The Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) for Somalia oversees the fund and decides on SHF funding allocations. In his role, the HC is supported by the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), which manages the Fund on a day-to-day basis, the SHF Advisory Board and the Somalia cluster coordination structure.

9 Staff Survey results

PART 1. THE PARTNERSHIPS

This part of the questionnaire asks about trust fund based partnerships that you have administered/managed during the last 10 years.

1. Have you administered/managed any of Norway’s trust fund based partnerships with the World Bank Group or the UNDP?




Have you administered/managed any of Norway’s trust fund based partnerships with the World Bank Group or the UNDP?

	Count
Yes	55
No	18
Total	73


2. How many trust funds based partnerships have you administered/managed?

Row Labels	Number of responses
1	21
2	12
3	5
4	3
5	1
8	1
9	2
10	1
Several in various positions at Embassies	1
Grand Total	47




In case you have participated in more than one partnership, please choose the partnership most representative of your experience and answer this questionnaire with that partnership in mind.

3. Where was this partnership located?




Where was this partnership located?	Count
The World Bank Group	35
UNDP	20
Total	55

4. What was the target sector for the partnership?



What was the target sector for the partnership?	Count	Other:
Climate	6	Government functions
Environment	3	Trade development
Health	1	Ocean, Digitization, Jobs creation / Private sector, Private sector in Conflict Affected states
Education	2	Other (please specify):
Energy	1	Employment
Multisector	15	Humanitarian and conflict
Other (please specify):	26	Sustainable fisheries
Total	54	Climate Smart Agriculture
		Infrastructure (energy, climate etc)
		JPO programme (if this can be considered a Trust Fund)
		Governance/Democracy Assistance
		Humanitarian pooled fund
		Debt management
		Public Finance Management
		Peace
		Stabilisation/peace building
		governance
		Public finance management
		entertainment education
		Private sector development
		PFM
		Stabilisation
		Maritime security
		Stabilization Funds
		Privat sektorutvikling, hav, sårbare stater, digitalisering
		Human rights


5. What was the geographic focus of the partnership?



What was the geographic focus of the partnership?

	Count
Global	15
Regional	5
Country	24
All of the above	11
Total	55


6. If the geographic focus was a country, was it a fragile state?



If the geographic focus was a country, was it a fragile state?

	Count
Yes	17
No	7
Total	24

7. Did your partnership have more than one donor partner?



Did your partnership have more than one donor partner?

	Count
Yes	51
No	3
total	54


8. What was the approximate % share of Norway’s financial contribution to the partnership?

	Percentage	Count
2-5 %	0-10%	13
3%	11-20%	16
3	21-50%	10
3.7	51-100%	7
5%	Not sure/difficult to estimate	8
5-10 percent		
10%		
10%		
10%		
10		
10		
10		
10		
11 % (but Norway is the third largest donor behind Sweden and EU)		
11-12%		
12		
15		
15%		
15%		
Approx. 15%		
16%		
19%		
20%		
20%		
20%		
20%		
20		
20		
20		
22		
25		
28		
30		
about 20%		
33%		
initially about 45%, but the other donor increased its contribution, so NOR contribution became app. 35%		
46%		
Lately 50%, before less		
50%		
60		

70
80
100
100
100%
20-100 %
From 20 to 100%
Cannot recall
Difficult to estimate
I don't know
N/A
Not one answer to this - range from substantial (+20) to single digit for larger initiatives
This varies a lot
Very high


For answers considering The World Bank

9. What type of trust fund was the partnership based on?



What type of trust fund was the partnership based on?	Count
Bank Executed	15
Recipient Executed	2
Bank and Recipient Executed	14
Financial Intermediary Fund	1
Don't know	3
Total	35

10. What type of trust fund was the partnership based on?




What type of trust fund was the partnership based on?	Count
Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF)	15
Thematic Fund	3
Vertical Fund	0
Don't know	2
Total	20

PART 2. YOUR ROLE

This part of the questionnaire asks about your position and location at the time of your participation in the partnership.


11. What was your position?



What was your position?	Count
Desk officer / Project Manager / Senior Adviser	44
Senior Manager / Section Head / Department Head	6
Other (please specify):	4
Total	54


Other:
 counsellor
 Project officer
 Adviser
 Programme Officer

12. In which unit were you located?



In which unit were you located?	Count
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	19
Norad	12
Embassy	24
Delegation	0
Total	55

13. Which tasks in the trust fund project cycle were you involved with?



Which tasks in the trust fund project cycle were you involved with?

Task	Count
Needs analysis	14
Fund architecture design	14
Fund establishment	10
Governance	28
Technical advice	17
Oversight function	40
Other (please specify):	6
Total	54


Other:

Member of the advisory board
 Grant management
 We funded a dedicated window in an already existing MDTF
 First donor to the fund
 All cycles
 My responsibility goes back a few years. I managed Norway's support, and influence how that was used. That was it.

PART 3. QUALITY OF PARTNERSHIP


This part of the questionnaire asks you to rate quality of your partnership in terms of following statements.

14. Please choose the most appropriate answer




	Percent					Total
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly agree	
There was sufficient realism and clarity of purpose in the partnership	0,0%	5,5%	9,1%	67,3%	18,2%	55
Expectations about how the partnership would operate were clear at the outset	1,8%	14,5%	25,5%	47,3%	10,9%	55
Your unit had sufficient staff resources to participate in the partnership	3,6%	18,2%	29,1%	45,5%	3,6%	55
Your unit had access to sufficient technical capacity to participate in the partnership	1,9%	16,7%	25,9%	46,3%	9,3%	54
The multilateral trust fund partner had sufficient capacity to coordinate with bilateral donors at country level	1,8%	10,9%	34,5%	47,3%	5,5%	55
The partnership had the active support of senior management of the multilateral trust fund partner	0,0%	10,9%	16,4%	56,4%	16,4%	55
The partnership had the active support of senior management of donor partners	0,0%	5,5%	16,4%	61,8%	16,4%	55
The partnership had the active support of senior officials of the recipient partner	1,8%	7,3%	36,4%	50,9%	3,6%	55

15. There was sufficient realism and clarity of purpose in the partnership




	Percent
Strongly disagree	0,0%
Disagree	5,5%
Neither disagree or agree	9,1%
Agree	67,3%
Strongly agree	18,2%
Total answers	55

16. Expectations about how the partnership would operate were clear at the outset




	Percent
Strongly disagree	1,8%
Disagree	14,5%
Neither disagree or agree	25,5%
Agree	47,3%
Strongly agree	10,9%
Total answers	55

17. Your unit had sufficient staff resources to participate in the partnership




	Percent
Strongly disagree	3,6%
Disagree	18,2%
Neither disagree or agree	29,1%
Agree	45,5%
Strongly agree	3,6%
Total answers	55

18. Your unit had access to sufficient technical capacity to participate in the partnership




	Percent
Strongly disagree	1,9%
Disagree	16,7%
Neither disagree or agree	25,9%
Agree	46,3%
Strongly agree	9,3%
Total answers	54

19. The multilateral trust fund partner had sufficient capacity to coordinate with bilateral donors at country level




	Percent
Strongly disagree	1,8%
Disagree	10,9%
Neither disagree or agree	34,5%
Agree	47,3%
Strongly agree	5,5%
Total answers	55

20. The partnership had the active support of senior management of the multilateral trust fund partner




	Percent
Strongly disagree	0,0%
Disagree	10,9%
Neither disagree or agree	16,4%
Agree	56,4%
Strongly agree	16,4%
Total answers	55

21. The partnership had the active support of senior management of donor partners



	Percent
Strongly disagree	0,0%
Disagree	5,5%
Neither disagree or agree	16,4%
Agree	61,8%
Strongly agree	16,4%
Total answers	55

22. The partnership had the active support of senior officials of the recipient partner




	Percent
Strongly disagree	1,8%
Disagree	7,3%
Neither disagree or agree	36,4%
Agree	50,9%
Strongly agree	3,6%
Total answers	55

PART 4. MOTIVATION

This part of the questionnaire asks about Norway's motivations to participate in the partnership.


23. Which of the following motivations would you say have been the most important for Norway's decision to partner with the multilateral organisation? (Please do not select more than three motivations.)



PART 5. EFFECTIVENESS


This part of the questionnaire asks you to rate the performance of the partnership.

33. Please choose the most appropriate answer




	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree or agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Total answers
The results of the partnership are relevant for Norway's development policy priorities	1,9%	0,0%	9,3%	50,0%	38,9%	54
The partnership has contributed to better targeting of Norwegian assistance	1,9%	3,8%	18,9%	62,3%	13,2%	53
The partnership has been complementary with Norwegian bilateral engagement at the country level	0,0%	1,8%	25,5%	54,5%	18,2%	55
The partnership has developed new knowledge about what works or does not work	0,0%	7,3%	21,8%	54,5%	16,4%	55
Norwegian support has had a catalytic effect and contributed to leveraging support from other ODA sources	1,9%	11,1%	33,3%	38,9%	14,8%	54
The partnership has leveraged support from non-ODA sources	17,0%	26,4%	39,6%	13,2%	3,8%	53
Norway's own priorities have been visible in the partnership	1,8%	3,6%	14,5%	54,5%	25,5%	55
Norway has received sufficient public acknowledgement for its participation	3,6%	16,4%	29,1%	41,8%	9,1%	55
The comparative advantages of the partners have been utilised	0,0%	10,9%	34,5%	49,1%	5,5%	55
The Norwegian contribution has influenced the multilateral organisation and other donors	0,0%	1,8%	16,4%	63,6%	18,2%	55
Norway's own capacity and bilateral presence has been strengthened by drawing on the multilateral organisation in this partnership	3,6%	9,1%	32,7%	45,5%	9,1%	55

34. The results of the partnership are relevant for Norway's development policy priorities




	Percent
Strongly disagree	1,9%
Disagree	0,0%
Neither disagree or agree	9,3%
Agree	50,0%
Strongly agree	38,9%
Total answers	54

35. The partnership has contributed to better targeting of Norwegian assistance




	Percent
Strongly disagree	1,9%
Disagree	3,8%
Neither disagree or agree	18,9%
Agree	62,3%
Strongly agree	13,2%
Total answers	53

36. The partnership has been complementary with Norwegian bilateral engagement at the country level




	Percent
Strongly disagree	0,0%
Disagree	1,8%
Neither disagree or agree	25,5%
Agree	54,5%
Strongly agree	18,2%
Total answers	55

37. The partnership has developed new knowledge about what works or does not work




	Percent
Strongly disagree	0,0%
Disagree	7,3%
Neither disagree or agree	21,8%
Agree	54,5%
Strongly agree	16,4%
Total answers	55

38. Norwegian support has had a catalytic effect and contributed to leveraging support from other ODA sources




	Percent
Strongly disagree	1,9%
Disagree	11,1%
Neither disagree or agree	33,3%
Agree	38,9%
Strongly agree	14,8%
Total answers	54

39. The partnership has leveraged support from non-ODA sources




	Percent
Strongly disagree	17,0%
Disagree	26,4%
Neither disagree or agree	39,6%
Agree	13,2%
Strongly agree	3,8%
Total answers	53

40. Norway's own priorities have been visible in the partnership




	Percent
Strongly disagree	1,8%
Disagree	3,6%
Neither disagree or agree	14,5%
Agree	54,5%
Strongly agree	25,5%
Total answers	55

41. Norway has received sufficient public acknowledgement for its participation




	Percent
Strongly disagree	3,6%
Disagree	16,4%
Neither disagree or agree	29,1%
Agree	41,8%
Strongly agree	9,1%
Total answers	55

42. The comparative advantages of the partners have been utilised




	Percent
Strongly disagree	0,0%
Disagree	10,9%
Neither disagree or agree	34,5%
Agree	49,1%
Strongly agree	5,5%
Total answers	55

43. The Norwegian contribution has influenced the multilateral organisation and other donors



	Percent
Strongly disagree	0,0%
Disagree	1,8%
Neither disagree or agree	16,4%
Agree	63,6%
Strongly agree	18,2%
Total answers	55

44. Norway's own capacity and bilateral presence has been strengthened by drawing on the multilateral organisation in this partnership




	Percent
Strongly disagree	3,6%
Disagree	9,1%
Neither disagree or agree	32,7%
Agree	45,5%
Strongly agree	9,1%
Total answers	55

PART 6. OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY


This part of the questionnaire asks you to rate operational efficiency in governance and management arrangements of the trust fund partnerships.

45. In your view, do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the partnership you have been involved with:

	Percent					Total answers
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	
The length of time between agreement signing and the initial transfer of funds to the final implementing partner was not long	11,1%	14,8%	29,6%	37,0%	7,4%	54
The pace of commitments/allocations of funds for planned activities corresponded with disbursement of Norway's contribution to the partnership	3,7%	14,8%	27,8%	50,0%	3,7%	54
The pace of disbursements to the responsible implementing partner was acceptable	5,5%	5,5%	41,8%	45,5%	1,8%	55
The trust fund partnership's overhead costs were reasonable	3,6%	1,8%	34,5%	60,0%	0,0%	55
There was a clearly-defined exit strategy for the partnership	10,9%	25,5%	40,0%	23,6%	0,0%	55
The partnership was an efficient instrument for pursuing its development objective	3,6%	5,5%	16,4%	54,5%	20,0%	55
The partnership represented value for money	3,6%	14,5%	25,5%	43,6%	12,7%	55




46. The length of time between agreement signing and the initial transfer of funds to the final implementing partner was not long




Percent	
Strongly disagree	11,1%
Disagree	14,8%
Neither agree nor disagree	29,6%
Agree	37,0%
Strongly agree	7,4%
Total answers	54

47. The pace of commitments/allocations of funds for planned activities corresponded with disbursement of Norway's contribution to the partnership




Percent	
Strongly disagree	3,7%
Disagree	14,8%
Neither agree nor disagree	27,8%
Agree	50,0%
Strongly agree	3,7%
Total answers	54

48. The pace of disbursements to the responsible implementing partner was acceptable




Percent	
Strongly disagree	5,5%
Disagree	5,5%
Neither agree nor disagree	41,8%
Agree	45,5%
Strongly agree	1,8%
Total answers	55

49. The trust fund partnership's overhead costs were reasonable




	Percent
Strongly disagree	3,6%
Disagree	1,8%
Neither agree nor disagree	34,5%
Agree	60,0%
Strongly agree	0,0%
Total answers	55

50. There was a clearly-defined exit strategy for the partnership




	Percent
Strongly disagree	10,9%
Disagree	25,5%
Neither agree nor disagree	40,0%
Agree	23,6%
Strongly agree	0,0%
Total answers	55

51. The partnership was an efficient instrument for pursuing its development objective




	Percent
Strongly disagree	3,6%
Disagree	5,5%
Neither agree nor disagree	16,4%
Agree	54,5%
Strongly agree	20,0%
Total answers	55

52. The partnership represented value for money



	Percent
Strongly disagree	3,6%
Disagree	14,5%
Neither agree nor disagree	25,5%
Agree	43,6%
Strongly agree	12,7%
Total answers	55

53. What was the percentage of overhead mark-up in the partnership?



What was the percentage of overhead mark-up in the partnership? Percent


Higher than agreed	15,4%
Lower than agreed	11,5%
Don't know	73,1%

Total answers 52

PART 7. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

This part of the questionnaire explores the quality of the monitoring and evaluation function in the partnership

What were your main sources of information to monitor progress in the partnership?




Count
Source of information


Partnership meetings	41
Project reports	40
Board meetings	28
Fund website	25
World Bank DPC connection	12
UNDP MPTF Gateway	7
Recipient organizations	6
Other sources	6

63. How satisfied were you with the information?

	Percent					Total answers
	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	
Partnership meetings	20,8%	60,4%	12,5%	6,3%	0,0%	48
Project reports	18,8%	60,4%	12,5%	8,3%	0,0%	48
Board meetings	17,1%	60,0%	11,4%	11,4%	0,0%	35
Fund website	17,1%	42,9%	25,7%	14,3%	0,0%	35
World Bank DPC connection	4,3%	17,4%	52,2%	26,1%	0,0%	23
Recipient organizations	0,0%	23,5%	70,6%	5,9%	0,0%	17
UNDP MPTF Gateway	13,3%	33,3%	40,0%	13,3%	0,0%	15
Other sources	0,0%	26,7%	73,3%	0,0%	0,0%	15




64. Partnership meetings




Partnership meetings	Percent
Very satisfied	20,8%
Satisfied	60,4%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	12,5%
Dissatisfied	6,3%
Very dissatisfied	0,0%
Total answers	48

65. Board meetings




Board meetings	Percent
Very satisfied	17,1%
Satisfied	60,0%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	11,4%
Dissatisfied	11,4%
Very dissatisfied	0,0%
Total answers	35

66. Fund website




Fund website	Percent
Very satisfied	17,1%
Satisfied	42,9%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	25,7%
Dissatisfied	14,3%
Very dissatisfied	0,0%
Total answers	35

67. Project reports




Project reports	Percent
Very satisfied	18,8%
Satisfied	60,4%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	12,5%
Dissatisfied	8,3%
Very dissatisfied	0,0%
Total answers	48

68. World Bank DPC connection




World Bank DPC connection	Percent
Very satisfied	4,3%
Satisfied	17,4%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	52,2%
Dissatisfied	26,1%
Very dissatisfied	0,0%
Total answers	23

69. UNDP MPTF Gateway




UNDP MPTF Gateway	Percent
Very satisfied	13,3%
Satisfied	33,3%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	40,0%
Dissatisfied	13,3%
Very dissatisfied	0,0%
Total answers	15

70. Recipient organizations



Recipient organizations	Percent
Very satisfied	0,0%
Satisfied	23,5%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	70,6%
Dissatisfied	5,9%
Very dissatisfied	0,0%
Total answers	17


71. Other sources




Other sources	Percent
Very satisfied	0,0%
Satisfied	26,7%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	73,3%
Dissatisfied	0,0%
Very dissatisfied	0,0%
Total answers	15

72. This question asks you to rate the quality of the Monitoring and Evaluation function in the partnership. Please choose the most appropriate answer

	Percent					Total answers
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	
The partnership had clear success criteria in terms of its development objective	0,0%	12,7%	27,3%	52,7%	7,3%	55
The partnership had clear arrangements to monitor and evaluate the achievement of outputs and outcomes	0,0%	12,7%	16,4%	63,6%	7,3%	55
There were effective arrangements for dissemination of monitoring and evaluation findings to all partners	0,0%	16,4%	23,6%	56,4%	3,6%	55
There were effective arrangements for public dissemination of monitoring and evaluation findings	7,3%	12,7%	50,9%	27,3%	1,8%	55
There were clear arrangements to ensure use of monitoring and evaluation findings	3,7%	14,8%	38,9%	35,2%	7,4%	54
There was clear evidence that monitoring and evaluation findings led to improved working of the partnership	1,9%	17,0%	35,8%	41,5%	3,8%	53
There was clear evidence that the monitoring and evaluation findings influenced donor contributions to the partnership	3,7%	14,8%	33,3%	42,6%	5,6%	54
Payment of contributions from Norway were in line with activity levels	5,6%	1,9%	18,5%	68,5%	5,6%	54
Payment of contributions from Norway were related to achievement of partnership results	7,5%	7,5%	34,0%	47,2%	3,8%	53




73. The partnership had clear success criteria in terms of its development objective




	Percent
Strongly disagree	0,0%
Disagree	12,7%
Neither agree nor disagree	27,3%
Agree	52,7%
Strongly agree	7,3%
Total answers	55

74. The partnership had clear arrangements to monitor and evaluate the achievement of outputs and outcomes




	Percent
Strongly disagree	0,0%
Disagree	12,7%
Neither agree nor disagree	16,4%
Agree	63,6%
Strongly agree	7,3%
Total answers	55

75. There were effective arrangements for dissemination of monitoring and evaluation findings to all partners



	Percent
Strongly disagree	0,0%
Disagree	16,4%
Neither agree nor disagree	23,6%
Agree	56,4%
Strongly agree	3,6%
Total answers	55


76. There were effective arrangements for public dissemination of monitoring and evaluation findings



	Percent
Strongly disagree	7,3%
Disagree	12,7%
Neither agree nor disagree	50,9%
Agree	27,3%
Strongly agree	1,8%

Total answers 55


77. There were clear arrangements to ensure use of monitoring and evaluation findings



	Percent
Strongly disagree	3,7%
Disagree	14,8%
Neither agree nor disagree	38,9%
Agree	35,2%
Strongly agree	7,4%

Total answers 54


78. There was clear evidence that monitoring and evaluation findings led to improved working of the partnership



	Percent
Strongly disagree	1,9%
Disagree	17,0%
Neither agree nor disagree	35,8%
Agree	41,5%
Strongly agree	3,8%


Total answers 53

79. There was clear evidence that the monitoring and evaluation findings influenced donor contributions to the partnership




	Percent
Strongly disagree	3,7%
Disagree	14,8%
Neither agree nor disagree	33,3%
Agree	42,6%
Strongly agree	5,6%
Total answers	54

80. Payment of contributions from Norway were in line with activity levels



	Percent
Strongly disagree	5,6%
Disagree	1,9%
Neither agree nor disagree	18,5%
Agree	68,5%
Strongly agree	5,6%
Total answers	54

81. Payment of contributions from Norway were related to achievement of partnership results



	Percent
Strongly disagree	7,5%
Disagree	7,5%
Neither agree nor disagree	34,0%
Agree	47,2%
Strongly agree	3,8%
Total answers	53

10 List of persons interviewed

The World Bank	
Augustina Nikolova - Sr. Operations Officer	Global Financing Facility (GFF)
Stephanie Lyn Saulsbury - Analyst	Global Financing Facility (GFF)
Merly M. Khouw - Lead Investigator	The Integrity Vice Presidency (INT)
Bhuvan Bhatnagar - Manager, DFTPR	The Integrity Vice Presidency (INT)
Arjun Suraj Ponnambalam, Sr. Investigator	The Integrity Vice Presidency (INT)
Steven Charles Burgess - Sr. Operations Officer	The Integrity Vice Presidency (INT)
Irina Shmeliova - Sr. Operations Officer, OPCS	The Integrity Vice Presidency (INT)
Santa Aguti - Operations Analyst, DFTPR	The Integrity Vice Presidency (INT)
Hazel M. Embuscado - Sr. Program Assistant	The Integrity Vice Presidency (INT)
Simon Whitehouse - Sr. Financial Officer	Carbon Fund of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
Chie Ingvoldstad - Operations Officer	Carbon Fund of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
Mafalda Duarte - Practice Manager	Strategic Climate Fund
Hugh Searight - Operations Officer	Strategic Climate Fund
Jonathan Caldicott - Sr. Financial Officer	Strategic Climate Fund
Charles E. North - Manager	Global Partnership for Education (GPE)
Charles Tapp - Manager	Global Partnership for Education (GPE)
Robert Krech - Strategy Officer	Global Partnership for Education (GPE)
Nidhi Khattri - Lead Evaluations Officer	Global Partnership for Education (GPE)
Sabine Bettina Terlecki - Sr. Partnership Specialist	Global Partnership for Education (GPE)
David Bridges - Sr. Partnership Specialist	Global Partnership for Education (GPE)
Angela Williamson - Sr. Financial Officer	Global Partnership for Education (GPE)
Oliver James Knight- Sr. Energy Specialist	Energy Sector Management Assistance Program (ESMAP)
Brenda Manual - Sr. Operations Officer	Energy Sector Management Assistance Program (ESMAP)
Anna Aghababyan - Operations Officer	Energy Sector Management Assistance Program (ESMAP)
Mei Leng Chang - Manager	Development Partner Center
Praveen Desabatla - Sr. Financial Officer	Development Partner Center
Ravikumar Reddy Podduturi - Business Analysis Officer	Development Partner Center
Brice Quesnel - Lead Operations Officer	Development Partner Center
Dirk Reinermann, Director	Development Finance Trust Funds and Partner Relations (DFTPR) Department

11 Norad database and archive search

11.1 Preliminary analysis using Norwegian Aid Statistics database

The sample set presented in appendix 2 is a sub-set drawn from Norad's ODA statistics database using the schematic in figure A.1. A text analysis of the agreement titles using key words – fund, facility and partnership was undertaken to identify the sub-set. The final sample given in appendix 2 represents a cut of the sub-set of trust funds, facilities and partnerships with total contribution exceeding NOK 40 million during the period 2007-2016.

Note: The sample will be updated for any missing partnerships that may have been omitted in the above selection process.

Figure A.1 Schematic diagram for identification of the sample set



11.2 Overview of Norwegian multilateral partnerships

Type of Flow	Initiatives > NOK 40 million, 2007-2016													
Sum of Disbursed (mill NOK)		Year												
Agreement partner	Agreement title	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total	Notes (Budget Chapter)	
"Trust Fund" in Agreement Title														
IBRD - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Jobs Umbrella Multi-Donor Trust Fund								70			70	Ch.. 171	
IBRD - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Multi Donor Trust Fund, Southern-Sudan, phase II (2008-2011)		150							-11		139		
IBRD - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Multidonor Trust Fund for Health Results Innovation, Total all	11	220	228				168	260	360		1 247		
IBRD - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Nile Basin Initiative, Trust Fund		23	20	12							55		
IBRD - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Nordic Trust Fund								20	10	10	40	Ch.. 171	
IBRD - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Trust Fund for Environment and Social Sustainable Development	68	67	45	50	30	30					290	Ch.. 171	

IBRD - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Trust Fund for Post Primary Education in Africa	20	20	13		6	6					65	Ch.. 171
IBRD - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Trust Fund for Private Sector and Infrastructure, Total 2007-11	95	69	59	20	15						258	Ch.. 171
IDA – HIPC	HIPC Debt Initiative Trust Fund - IFAD and AfDB compensation	65	58									123	
IDA - International Development Association	Trust Fund for North Sudan (MDTF-NS)	79		23						-31		71	
World Bank	CCS Trust Fund for Capacity Building in Developing Countries			35	18		15	15	14			97	
World Bank	Multi-Donor Trust Fund for Southern Sudan (MDTF-SS)	146	0									146	
World Bank	REACH Multi Donor Trust Fund RBF Education World Bank									60	40	100	
World Bank	Support through the World Bank for Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund										110	110	
World Bank	UN-WB Trust Fund with addendum							13	10		17	40	
World Bank	WBG. Trade Facilitation Support Program Trust Fund 2014 - 2015								20	20		40	

UNDP - UN Development Programme	Dem. Governance Them Trust Fund UNDP	60										60	Ch.. 170
UNDP - UN Development Programme	Enegy/Environ m. Them. Trus Fund 2007	50										50	
UNDP - UN Development Programme — MPTFO	UN Multi Partner Trust Fund Somalia								37	45		82	
UNDP - UN Development Programme — MPTFO	UN Post-conflict Multi-Partner Trust Fund for Colombia									50		50	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	UNDP - PCA - Crisis Prevention and Recovery Thematic Trust Fund		0	30	44	44						118	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	UNDP - PCA - Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund		0	60								60	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	UNDP Crisis Prevention and Recovery Thematic Trust Fund, 2012-15						20	20	20	20		80	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	UNDP Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund, 2012-16						45	25	31	25		126	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	UNDP Energy and Environment Thematic Trust Fund				11	11	10	10				42	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	UNDP: Law and Order Trust Fund (LOTFA) (Successor phase)									90	90	180	
AFDB - African Development Bank	AfDB Zimbabwe Multi-Donor Trust Fund				41		25	16		9		91	

"Fund" in Agreement Title but not Trust Fund													
IBRD - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	BioCarbon Fund Plus - Technical Assistance Fund								58			58	
IDA - International Development Association	Guyana REDD-Plus Investment Fund				175	213						388	
IFC - International Finance Corporation	Catalyst fund/IFC Private Secotr								100			100	
UNDP - UN Development Programme — MPTFO	Common Humanitarian Fund South Sudan, Total all						69	50	70	73	67	329	
UNDP - UN Development Programme — MPTFO	Common Humanitarian Fund Sudan, Total all			105	120	128	60	60	60	50	20	603	
UNDP - UN Development Programme — MPTFO	Darfur Community Peace and Stability Fund (DCPSF). Phase II					12		9	12	5	13	52	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	DOCO UN Coordination Fund, Total all				20	20	20	30				90	Ch.. 170
UNDP - UN Development Programme	Iraqi Stabilization Fund									41	58	99	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	One Plan Fund 2012 with addendums						21	2	8	10		40	
UNDP - UN Development Programme — MPTFO	SDN/Common Humanitarian Fund	105	90									195	
UNDP - UN Development Programme — MPTFO	Support for Delivering Results Together Fund (DRT-F)							84	79	16	5	184	Ch.. 170

UNDP - UN Development Programme -- MPTFO	Support to the One Plan Fund for Vietnam, Total all	35	15		10	8						68	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	UNDP Basketfund - Referendum 2011				45		-3				0	42	
UNDP - UN Development Programme -- MPTFO	UNDP Democratic Republic of the Congo. Pooled Fund			20	20	40	50	40	30	10		210	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	UNDP: Law and Order Trust Fund (LOTFA) (Successor phase)									90	90	180	
UNDP - UN Development Programme -- MPTFO	UN-Reform "Delivering as One Expanded Funding Window" 2					70	74					143	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	ZAR/DRC Pooled Fund	20	35									55	
World Bank	Haiti Reconstruction Fund - 2010-11				200	74						274	
World Bank	WB Multi Partner Fund 2015-2017									40	50	90	
AFDB - African Development Bank	Congo Basin Forest Fund		80	105	160		155					500	
ASDF - Asian Development Fund	Asian Development Fund - ADF X - Total 4 promissory notes		0	60	60	60	60					240	Ch.. 171
CERF - Central Emergency Response Fund	CERF - Central Emergency Response Fund			300	375	387	414	439	350	392	389	3 046	
CFC - Common Fund for Commodities	Common Fund for Commodities, Total all	14	6	8	7	7	8					51	Ch.. 170
Council of Europe	CoE Norwegian fund for extrabudgetary					0	4	11	15	5	37	72	

	project support Eurasia												
Council of Europe	Norwegian fund for extrabudgetary project support					8	7	15	17	12		59	
EBRD - ETC - Early Transition Countries Initiative	EBRD ETC Fund , Total all	4	8	9	8	8	8	4				49	
EBRD - European Western Balkans Joint Trust Fund	European Western Balkans Joint Fund, Total all		9	8		30	8	11			57	122	
FAO - Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations	ITPGRFA - Voluntary contribution to the Benefit-sharing Fund							40				40	
FCPF - Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Total	FCPF Carbon Fund									510		510	
GEF - LDCF - Least Developed Countries Trust Fund	Least developed Countries' Fund , Total all	24	0	10	25	53	20	22	22			176	Ch.. 170
GEF - SCCF - Special Climate Change Fund	GEF. Special Climate Change Fund, Total all	15	40	30	15	15	17	15	15			162	Ch.. 170
GFATM - Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria	The Global Fund to Fight Aids, Malaria and Tuberculosis, Total all	301		375	375	450	450	450	500	600	600	4 101	2007 only Ch.. 170
IDEA - International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance	IDEA - Core funding, Total all incl. WANA basket fund			8	13	14	13	18	20	22	8	115	Ch.. 163, 164
IFAD - International Fund for Agricultural Development	IFAD - International Fund for Agricultural Development, Total all	70	70	70	80	80	80					450	Ch.. 171

Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol	Multilateral Fund for the Montreal Protocol, Total		0	7	7	7	8	8	8	10	10	73	Ch.. 170
UN Peacebuilding Fund (Window Two) — MPTFO	Peacebuilding Fund PBF – Norwegian support					30	30	30	30	30	18	168	
UNDG - United Nations Development Group — MPTFO	UN-Reform - "Delivering as One Expanded Funding Window"			65	135	60						260	
UNFCCC - United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change	UNFCCC - Supplementary Fund, Total							19	13	9		41	
UNFPA - UN Population Fund	UNFPA - Maternal health thematic fund, Total				15	15	40					70	
UNHCR - UN Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees	UNHCR. Annual core funding			290	325	290	290	300	300	300	350	2 445	
UNICEF- United Nations Children's Fund	Education Transitional Fund and addendum			41								41	
UNICEF- United Nations Children's Fund	Funds towards global humanitarian thematic, Total				8	15	30					53	
UNICEF- United Nations Children's Fund	UNICEF - Health Transition Fund (multi-year)					10	15	28	15	5		73	
UNOCHA - UN Office of Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs	Humanitarian Pooled Fund Irak										37	37	
UNOCHA - UN Office of Co-ordination of	OCHA Core funding agreement 2010-2015			0	75	90	85	65				455	

Humanitarian Affairs													
UN-REDD - United Nations Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation	Support to UN's Donor Fund for REDD		65									65	
UNRWA - UN Relief and Works Agency	UNRWA Core funding and general funding, Total			215	150	150	150	150	150	150	113	1 228	
WFP - World Food Programme	WFP Unearmarked funds for humanitarian operations 2010-2011				40	43						83	
WFP - World Food Programme	WFP. Core funding 2016-2019										237	237	Ch.. 170
"Partnership" in Agreement Title													
IBRD - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Partnership for Infrastructure Development in Gaza & West Bank PID-MDTF								54		5	58	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	Strategic Partnership UNDP	8	10	32								50	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	Strategic partnership, UNDP- Somalia		25		18					-1		42	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	UNDP Somalia Support to Strategic Partnership Programmes 2011					42						42	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	UNDP. Partnership on Governance and Rule of Law - Phase II			20	15							35	
UNDP - UN Development Programme	UNDP: Support to Norway India							32	10	20	-3	58	

	Partnership Initiative												
World Bank	World Bank – Governance Partnership Facility		13	13	13	13						50	
EAC - East African Community	EAC Partnership Fund, Total all	3	3	2	2	1	10	10	10	5	5	50	
EBRD - technical co-operation and special funds	Eastern Europe Energy Efficiency and Environm. Partnership Fund 2011-13					14	16	16				45	
GPE - Global Partnership for Education	Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Fund					200	190	240	290	390	480	1 790	Ch.. 171
IDEA - International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance	Strategic Partnership Agreement IDEA-MFA 2014-17							0	20	20	22	62	
UNICEF- United Nations Children's Fund	Norwegian Pakistan Partnership Initiative		15	30	30	30		20	12			137	
"GAVI" in Agreement Title													
GAVI - Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization Total	GAVI, Total all (470	472	463	491	429	606	749	1 089	1 190	1 348	7 307	2007 Ch. 170
"TF" in Agreement Title but not "Fund"													
IBRD - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Budget support World Bank TF 2011-12					240	298					538	
IBRD - International Bank for Reconstruction	LOTFA			60	25	89			60			234	

and Development													
UNDP - UN Development Programme	UNDP TTF Democratic Governance		60									60	
World Bank	Support to Justice National Priority Programme (ARTF), incl. sep. equip., Total all	180	135	165	365	285	330	315	241	216	17	2 249	
World Bank	Budget support PRDP TF 208-2010, Total all		313	319	60							692	
World Bank	Ebola Reconstruction and Recovery MDTF								70			70	
World Bank	World Bank MDTF Land Use Management										230	230	
WTO - Doha Development Agenda Global Trust Fund	Norwegian contribution to the WTO DDAGTF 2009-16	10	10	10	10	10	15			10	10	85	
GEF as Agreement Partner in addition to GEF Agreements above													
GEF - Global Environment Facility	GEF 4, 5 and 6	44	44	44	55	106	106	106	108	108	108	829	2007-14 Ch. 170
IFC as Agreement Partner in addition to IFC Agreements above													
IFC - International Finance Corporation	SEDF 2		15		14	7	12	2				50	
											Total	41 388	

11.3 Scope of the evaluation using Norwegian Aid Statistics database

SECTOR	DAC Code	n
Education sector funds (DAC main sector codes 111, 112 and 113)	111;112;113	3
Health sector funds (DAC main sector codes 121 and 130)	121,13	4
Water/sanitation sector fund (DAC main sector code 140)	140	1
Government/civil society funds (DAC main sector code 151)	151	7
Conflict prevention and peace and security funds (DAC main sector code 152)	152	3
Business/trade-related funds (DAC main sector code 250 and 331)	250; 331	4
General environment funds (DAC main sector code 410)	410	5
Other multisector funds (DAC main sector code 430)	430	5
Total sample size, N		32

Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPFR)

Development Objective

The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) is a global partnership of governments, businesses, civil society, and Indigenous Peoples focused on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, forest carbon stock conservation, the sustainable management of forests, and the enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries (activities commonly referred to as REDD+). The FCPE assists countries in their REDD+ efforts by (i) providing them with financial and technical assistance in building their capacity to benefit from possible future systems of positive incentives for REDD+, (ii) piloting a performance-based payment system for REDD+ activities, with a view to ensuring equitable benefit sharing and promoting future large-scale positive incentives for REDD+; Within the approach to REDD+, (iii) testing ways to sustain or enhance livelihoods of local communities and to conserve biodiversity; (iv) disseminating broadly the knowledge gained in the development of the Facility and the implementation of Readiness Preparation Proposals (RPPs) and Emission Reductions Programs (ERPs).