

## **Annex 2: Survey instruments (evaluation matrix, including project fiche and M&E online survey questionnaire)**

### **Table of content**

Evaluation Matrix & Data collection grid.....	2
Project Fiche - template.....	19
Online Survey questionnaire.....	20

## Evaluation Matrix & Data collection grid

In line with the TOR, each Evaluation Question (EQ) included Judgment Criteria (JC) and Indicators (I) required to answer it, as well as indication of information sources as presented in the Evaluation Matrix below. The ten EQs outlined in the TOR have been grouped under four headlines:

- 1) Contribution to Food Security
- 2) M&E and Documentation
- 3) Sustainability and Scaling up
- 4) Financial Analysis

### Cluster 1: Contribution to Food Security

The TOR included three questions related to food security: 1) EQ 1 focuses on whether the Norwegian supported programmes have been relevant for achieving food security, thereby focusing on alignment with policies and coherence/coordination with other programmes. 2) EQ 2 focuses on whether the programmes theories (explicitly or implicitly) related to food security have been based on evidence and are realistic. This EQ thus focuses on existence of adequate analysis and analysis of programme intervention logic and likely impact pathways. 3) EQ 3 focuses on whether enhanced food security has actually been achieved (whether the projects/programmes have achieved their goals with regard to food security – keeping in mind that this might not be an explicit goal of all projects), applying indicators for the four aspects of food security: food availability, food accessibility, food stability and food utilization.

<b>EQ1</b>	<b>To what extent have supported programmes been relevant for achieving food security, regardless of whether they have food security as an explicit objective or not?</b>	
DAC criteria	Relevance	
<b><i>Judgement criteria, indicators and information sources</i></b>		
<b>JC11</b>	<b><i>Alignment with partner country food security policies/strategies if available</i></b>	
I-111	Objectives and activities of Norwegian funded agricultural projects are aligned with relevant/updated national food security policies/strategies	Norwegian project/programme documentation (e.g. proposals); national food security policies/strategies
I-112	In the absence of relevant/updated policies/strategies: project/programme is aligned with adequate/recognized analysis of the national/regional/subnational food security situation	Donor/government analysis of food security, Food Security Information System
<b><i>Judgement criteria, indicators and sources</i></b>		

<b>JC12</b>		
<b>Coherence with national food security programmes (action plans) and programmes of other donors</b>		
I-121	Norwegian funded agricultural projects have been coordinated with national/other donor-funded food security programmes/food security platforms (if available)	Interviews with national stakeholders, including staffs of ministries and coordinating units (if available) Norwegian project/programme documents
I-122	Planning documents of Norwegian supported agricultural projects identify gaps, discuss means of filling them, and identify action to minimise overlaps	Norwegian project/programme documents (e.g. proposals, annual reports)
I-123	Evidence and quality of joint and harmonised agricultural/food security strategies, of joint field missions and of shared analytical work	Food security strategies/action plans, joint field mission reports, food security analysis reports
<b>Relevance of project intervention according to final beneficiaries</b>		
<b>JC 13</b>		
<b>Relevance of project intervention according to final beneficiaries</b>		
I-131	Project intervention reflect priorities and needs of final beneficiaries	<i>Interviews/Focus group discussions with national beneficiaries</i>

<b>EQ2</b>	<b>To what extent have programme theories (rationale) of supported activities – explicitly or implicitly related to food security – been based on evidence and realistic?</b>
DAC criteria	Relevance

<b>Judgement criteria, indicators and information sources</b>		
<b>JC21</b>	<b>Norwegian supported activities likely to lead to increased food availability (local/national level)</b>	
I-211	Existence of and reference to adequate analyses of food production and its projection at national and sub-national levels (targeted areas)	Norwegian programme/project documentation, National food security data/analysis regarding availability of food
I-212	Norwegian funded agricultural projects are likely to contribute to increased food production at local/national level (targeted areas)	Norwegian programme/project documentation, National food security data/analysis regarding availability of food Analysis of intervention logic
<b>Judgement criteria, indicators and sources</b>		
<b>JC22</b>	<b>Norwegian supported activities likely to lead to increased food accessibility</b>	
I-221	Existence of and reference to adequate analysis of food access at household/individual level and its projection at national/sub-national levels (targeted areas)	Norwegian programme/project documentation, National/sub-national food security reports/analysis regarding accessibility of food (locally/household)
I-222	Norwegian funded agricultural projects are likely to contribute to increased level of food accessible (e.g. increased number of meals per day) at households/individual levels in targeted areas	Norwegian project/programme documentation; analysis of programme intervention logic Assessment and mapping of likely impact pathways
I-223	Norwegian funded	Norwegian project/programme documentation; analysis of programme

	agricultural projects are likely to contribute to enhanced purchasing power (based on high value crop production/livestock production, cash crop production) at household/individual levels in targeted areas	intervention logic Assessment and mapping of likely impact pathways
<b>Judgement criteria, indicators and sources</b>		
JC23	<b>Norwegian supported activities likely to lead to increased food stability over time</b>	
I-231	Existence of and reference to adequate analysis of food shortages caused by crisis (financial or climate) or cyclical events (seasonal food insecurity), and its projection at national/subnational levels (targeted areas)	Norwegian programme/project documentation, National/regional food security reports/analysis regarding food stability (locally/household level), Food Security Information Systems
I-232	Norwegian funded agricultural projects are likely to contribute to reduced periods of food shortages at household/individual level in targeted areas	Norwegian project/programme documentation; analysis of the intervention logic Assessment and mapping of likely impact pathways
<b>Judgement criteria, indicators and sources</b>		
JC24	<b>Norwegian supported activities likely to lead to enhanced food utilization resulting in a good nutrition status</b>	
I-241	Existence of and reference to adequate analysis of food utilization and nutritional situation at	Norwegian programme/project documentation, National/regional food security reports/analysis regarding utilization of food (household/individual)

	household/individual level, and its projection at national/sub-national levels (targeted areas)	Food Security Information Systems
I-242	Norwegian funded agricultural projects are likely to contribute to improved nutritional status (e.g. reduced level of stunting, wasting, etc.) of beneficiaries in targeted areas	Norwegian project/programme documentation, analysis of the intervention logic Assessment and mapping of likely impact pathways

<b>EQ3</b>	<b>To what extent have programmes reached or are likely to reach their goals with respect to food security?</b>	
DAC criteria	Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact	
<b><i>Judgement criteria, indicators and sources</i></b>		
<b>JC31</b>	<b><i>Food availability: increased (achieved or expected) availability of food due to the Norwegian support</i></b>	
I-311	Increased (achieved or expected) food production in targeted areas	Project baseline and end of programme surveys National statistics (sub-national level), Food Security Information Systems Interviews with beneficiaries
<b><i>Judgement criteria, indicators and sources</i></b>		
<b>JC32</b>	<b><i>Food accessibility: increased (achieved or expected) accessibility of food at household/individual level due to the Norwegian support</i></b>	
I-321	Evidence of increased number of meals per day (meal of same size) or improved diet at household/individual levels in targeted areas	Household surveys, national statistics, project documents, Food Security Information Systems Assessment and mapping of impact paths (programme theories) Interviews with beneficiaries
<b><i>Judgement criteria, indicators and sources</i></b>		

<b>JC33</b>	<b><i>Food stability: availability and accessibility of food is stable due to the Norwegian support</i></b>	
I-331	Evidence of decreased length of periods of food insecurity at household/individual levels in targeted areas	Baseline and end of programme surveys National statistics (sub-national level), project documents, Food Security Information Systems
I-332	Evidence of decreasing use of coping strategies in targeted areas	Norwegian project/programme documentation (surveys) Interviews with project staff Interviews with beneficiaries
I-333	Livelihood systems in the targeted areas have become more resilient and sustainable due to the Norwegian support (livelihood diversification, non-farm/off-farm income, asset creation, etc.)	Norwegian project/programme documentation (surveys) Interviews with project staff Interviews with beneficiaries
<b><i>Judgement criteria, indicators and sources</i></b>		
<b>JC34</b>	<b><i>Food utilization: achieved or expected improved food utilization leading to enhanced nutritional well-being</i></b>	
I-341	Evidence of decreased number of underweight/stunted/wasted children; and/or increased adult Body Mass Index in the targeted areas,	National statistics (sub-national level) Norwegian project/programme documentation (Surveys), Food Security Information Systems Interviews with beneficiaries



## Cluster 2: M&E and Documentation

Three EQs focusing on M&E and documentation were included in the TOR. One EQ focused on the extent the programmes had been revised according to internal and external factors. Since this is related to the EQ on M&E, the two questions were merged (EQ4). EQ 4 thus focuses on the appropriateness and quality of the M&E design, strategy and implementation as well as the evidence of adjustment of plans due to M&E results. EQ 5 focuses on the extent of documentation and dissemination of programme results.

<b>EQ4</b>	<b>To what extent have programmes been designed to allow monitoring and evaluation (including breakdown on gender in order to know the inclusion of female farmers) and to what extent have they been revised according to evidence emerging from within or outside the programmes during their execution?</b>	
DAC criteria	Relevance, Efficiency, Cross-cutting	
<b>Judgement criteria, indicators and information sources</b>		
<b>JC41</b>	<b>Appropriateness of programme M&amp;E design</b>	
I-411	Quality of objectives and indicators at all levels to allow for M&E (including availability of gender disaggregated indicators)	Norwegian project/programme documentation (Logical frameworks, other planning documents)
I-412	Evidence in planning, of a monitoring and evaluation strategy, including (human) resources required, feedback mechanisms foreseen, etc.	Norwegian project/programme documentation (baseline surveys, end of programme survey) Interviews with project staff
<b>Judgement criteria, indicators and information sources</b>		
<b>JC42</b>	<b>Appropriateness of internal M&amp;E strategy and implementation</b>	
I-421	Evidence of required resources made available for M&E (human and financial)	Norwegian project/programme documentation (including budget analysis) Interviews with project staff
I-422	Relevance, frequency and	Norwegian project/programme documentation (baseline surveys, follow up)

	timeliness of data collection (including gender disaggregated data) at all levels (output, outcome and impact)	surveys) Interviews with project staff
<b>Judgement criteria, indicators and information sources</b>		
<b>JC43</b>	<b>Adjustment of programme design and/or implementation modality</b>	
I-431	Evidence and quality of adjustments of plans as a consequence of M&E results	Interviews with project staff Norwegian project/programme documentation (evaluation reports, progress/annual reports)

<b>EQ5</b>	<b>To what extent have programme results been documented?</b>	
DAC criteria	(Effectiveness), Efficiency	
<b>Judgement criteria, indicators and information sources</b>		
<b>JC51</b>	<b>Availability of documentation of results</b>	
I-511	Existence and appropriateness of monitoring/progress reports and databases	Monitoring reports (progress reports/annual reports) Databases
I-512	Existence and quality of evaluation reports	Norwegian programme/project documentation (evaluation reports)
I-513	Existence and quality of other types of documentation of results	Other types of documentation: best practices, surveys, cases studies, scientific articles, etc.
<b>JC52</b>	<b>Extent to which intervention results have been disseminated</b>	
I-521	Evidence and quality of dissemination strategies	Norwegian project/programme documentation (dissemination strategy if available)
I-522	Appropriateness of dissemination tools and	Norwegian project/programme documentation

	channels in relation to subjects to be disseminated	Interviews with programme stakeholders
I-523	Evidence of articles published, presentations in workshops, conferences	Norwegian project/programme documentation Interviews with programme staff
I-524	Awareness, by relevant stakeholders, of results and lessons learnt from Norwegian funded agricultural projects	Stakeholders' interviews (national stakeholders for instance other donors, ministry staff, embassy staff, etc.)

### Cluster 3: Sustainability and Scaling Up

The TOR included two questions related to sustainability and scaling up of activities. EQ 6 focuses on various aspects of sustainability (financial, economic, institutional and technical). EQ 7 focuses on the appropriateness of the programme design for scaling up and the existence of required elements for scaling up (potentially or achieved).

<b>EQ6</b>	<b>To what extent have programmes been sustainable?</b>	
DAC criteria	Impact, Sustainability	
<i>Judgement criteria, indicators and information sources</i>		
<b>JC61</b>	<b>Financial sustainability/economic sustainability</b>	
I-611	Funds of relevant stakeholder/ institutions are available for supporting the programme activities after phase out	Interviews with stakeholders, Norwegian programme/project documentation (budgets, if available)
I-612	Services/results are affordable for the intended beneficiaries succeeding phase out	Interviews with beneficiaries, project staff Norwegian programme/project documentation (evaluation reports)
I-613	Likelihood that results can be maintained if economic factors change (commodity prices, exchange rates, etc.)	Interviews with project staff, national economic analysis, Norwegian programme/project documentation (evaluation reports)
I-614	Beneficiaries/authorities are capable of affording replacement and maintenance	Stakeholder interviews (including beneficiaries, etc.) Norwegian programme/project documentation (evaluation reports)
I-615	Policy changes are not likely to affect programme activities	Stakeholder interviews, Norwegian programme/project documentation
<i>Judgement criteria, indicators and sources</i>		

<b>JC62</b>	<b><i>Institutional and technical sustainability</i></b>	
I-621	Institutional structures involved in implementation have the required capacity (managerial and technical) to continue activities succeeding phase out	Stakeholder interviews, capacity analysis (if available), Norwegian programme/project documentation (evaluation reports)
I-622	Beneficiaries have the required technical and managerial capacity to continue activities succeeding phase out	Beneficiary interviews Norwegian programme/project documentation (evaluation reports)
<b><i>Judgement criteria, indicators and sources</i></b>		
<b>JC63</b>	<b><i>Environmental sustainability</i></b>	
I-631	The achievement of project results and objectives are not likely to generate damage on environment or increased pressure on scarce natural resources	Norwegian programme/project documentation (including evaluation reports) Interviews with national stakeholders
I-632	Good environmental practices are followed in project implementation (use of land, water, energy, etc.)	Norwegian project/programme documentation Interviews with project staff Interviews with beneficiaries
<b><i>Judgement criteria, indicators and sources</i></b>		
<b>JC64</b>	<b><i>Quality of exit strategy</i></b>	
I-641	An appropriate exit strategy/phase out strategy has been prepared, approved and implemented by relevant partners/authorities	Interviews with project staff and stakeholders, exit strategy

<b>EQ7</b>	<b>To what extent have programmes lent themselves to scaling-up?</b>	
DAC criteria	Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact (Sustainability)	
<b>Judgement criteria, indicators and information sources</b>		
<b>JC71</b>	<b>Appropriateness of programme design for scaling up</b>	
I-711	Evidence of potentially scaling up programme activities in the form of innovative processes and methods with an added value over existing methods, etc.	Norwegian project/programme documentation Interviews with project staff interviews Interviews with stakeholders National agricultural analysis
<b>Judgement criteria, indicators and sources</b>		
<b>JC72</b>	<b>Extent of scaling up of programme activities (potentially/achieved)</b>	
I-721	Evidence of success stories which can easily be scaled up	Norwegian project/programme documentation Interviews with programme staff Interviews with beneficiaries
I-722	Evidence of an effective learning process with a high adoption rate	Interviews with programme staff Interviews with beneficiaries
I-723	Evidence of overall (political) agreement among institutional stakeholders (Government, donor, private sector) to scale up activities/results of intervention	Interviews with institutional stakeholders

### Cluster 4: Financial Analysis

EQ 8 will cover the totality of Government expenditure on Agriculture, as well as the totality of international aid funds spent on support to agriculture, with the possible exception of funds spent by USAID as this data may be difficult to obtain. The data collected will cover the years 2004 (a year before the review commences) to 2011. It is not feasible to attempt to determine whether external funds for agriculture have been used to finance other sectors, as there would be numerous variables involved, making attribution difficult and contentious, with dubious results. This part of EQ will therefore not be covered by the evaluation. EQ 8 covers the countries Malawi, Zambia and Tanzania as outlined in the TOR.

EQ 9 covers the single largest project in the three pre-selected countries Malawi, Zambia and Tanzania (as per the TOR). The main issue under consideration is what percentage of the total programme funds are targeted at, and are reaching the disadvantaged groups mentioned above, as opposed to being applied to administrative and support functions of the programme. This question then leads into a series of associated issues concerning programme activities, outputs, productivity, efficiency, costs and cost control. If and where the data is available, the question of emerging impacts will be included.

Area	Issues	Data / evidence required	Source of data	Means of verification
<b>QUESTION 8 To what extent have Norwegian and international aid funds for agriculture been additional to national funds, i.e. to which extent have external funds been used to replace national funds</b>				
A. AGRICULTURAL SPENDING BY GOVERNMENT, AND BY DONORS	Is there evidence to suggest that increased funding support by Donors (for Agriculture), is offset by declining Government expenditure in this Sector	For 5 years 2005 - 2011 1. The actual amount of the budget expenditure for Agriculture, noting the annual increase or decrease, 2. The percentage of the total National Expenditure outturn allocated to Agriculture 3. The annual level of support to Agriculture funded by Norwegian and other International Aid Donors	1. Government Budgets, showing the outturn of the previous years . 2. Own computation (supported by Government Statistics) 3. Possibly disclosed in Annual Budgets , or otherwise from Donor Coordination Units in MOF, (discuss other sources ?)	Not Applicable (NA)- Official data
<b>QUESTION 9 To what extent have the funds reached income-poor farmers, women and other grassroots target groups?</b>				
A. TRANSFER / RECEIPT OF	Have all the funds transferred by	1. List of Fund transfers made by Norad	1. Norad – (Embassy or Oslo ?) 2. (a) Programme Accounting	1. NA Official Data 2. Agree the total on list of

Area	Issues	Data / evidence required	Source of data	Means of verification
NORAD FUNDS	NORAD, been received and accounted for by the Programme	2. List of Fund Transfers received by the programme	Office 2. (b) Audited Financial Statements Annual (AFS) – Provided by Accounting Office	Fund transfers, to the amount disclosed in the AFS
B. SERVICE DELIVERY EXPENDITURE Front Office vs Back Office	What %age of total expenditure is spent on the 'front office' expenditure (services /support directly to, or benefitting citizens / society), and 'back office' expenditure (administrative overheads and support costs).	1. Detailed Accounts showing the coding / classification of all expenditure (by cost nature), - and possibly also by Activity 2. Reorganise the expenditure classifications to derive 'front office, back office' split	1. Accounting Office 2. Own Computations	1. Totals of the detailed data, to be agreed back to the AFS. 2. Confirm the result with the Accounting Office
C. BUDGETING, COST CONTROL	1. Within the budgeting process, is there an explicit awareness of the need to minimise back office and maximise front office expenditure. 2. Do procedures exist to stringently budget for, manage and control costs.	1. Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) exist for Budgeting and Cost Control 2. Auditors reports re (a) The AFS (b) System weaknesses. 3. Annual Operations Report to NORAD / Donors	1. Accounting Office 2. Accounting Office 3. Programme Operations Office	1-3 Obtain & Review the data provided
D. PROJECT STRUCTURE & STAFFING & STAFFING LEVELS	1. Does the Structure, and Staffing Levels of the Programme seem appropriate to execute the objectives, workplans, and activities of the programme, (with a focus on the front / back office issue) 2. Are staffing levels (especially new recruits), stringently controlled	1. (a) Program Organogram , showing staff numbers in each position (b) Complete listing of staff showing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Position / Title</li> <li>• Department / Unit</li> <li>• Date commenced, date left</li> <li>• Salary</li> </ul> 2. Official Procedures (SOP) exist for approval and hiring of new staff, with emphasis on 'open competition' in selection	1. Administrative / HR Office 2. Administrative / HR Office	1. Select every 5 <sup>th</sup> employee on the list (b) , locate related staff file and verify the data (4 bullets) 2. Review the SOP



Area	Issues	Data / evidence required	Source of data	Means of verification
E. OUTPUTS PRODUCED	<p>Are Outputs produced ...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. through a formalised set of processes designed to convert inputs into outputs efficiently</li> <li>2. commensurate with programme objectives, workplans</li> <li>3. produced in a timely manner, according to schedule</li> <li>4. 'Fit for purpose' (meet specifications, good quality , durable, sustainable)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Standard Operating Procedures governing the methods by which Inputs are converted into Outputs</li> <li>2. Quarterly / Annual workplans, specifying objectives, outputs and output volume</li> <li>3. Management procedures which proactively monitor the timely production of outputs</li> <li>4. Quarterly / Annual Report disclosing outputs produced, compared to plans</li> <li>5. Standard Quality Assurance procedures covering the four requirements</li> <li>6. Quality Assurance Reports, meeting the requirement in 5.</li> </ol>	1-6 Programme Office	<p>1-6 Obtain and review the data provided</p> <p><i>[Compute Data on Cost per Unit of Output, and review for reasonableness]</i></p>
F. PROCUREMENT and ASSET MAINTENANCE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is procurement carried out in accordance with a formal set of procurement procedures, leading to good value for money being obtained.</li> <li>2. Are assets and facilities maintained in a satisfactory operational condition</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. (a) Procurement Procedures Manual (b) Compliance with Procedure – file for each significant procurement , demonstrating compliance</li> <li>2. (a) SOPs contain a maintenance Policy (b) Budget provides for reasonable maintenance &amp; money is spent</li> </ol>	1 and 2 - Programme / Procurement Office.	<p>1 and 2 - Obtain and review the documentation provided</p> <p><i>(Select the five largest procurements for compliance review )</i></p>
G. IMPACT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are the desired / expected impacts explicitly stated in the design document</li> <li>2. Do mid term / final reports (or other M&amp;E mechanisms)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project Design Documentation</li> <li>2. Midterm and Final Reports</li> </ol>	1 and 2 - Programme Office.	1 and 2 - Obtain and review the documentation provided

Area	Issues	Data / evidence required	Source of data	Means of verification
	explicitly deal with the question of impact, and measure them where appropriate			
H. SUSTAINABILITY and RISK	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are Sustainability and Programme Risks explicitly dealt with in the design document</li> <li>2. Do mid term / final reports (or other M&amp;E mechanisms) explicitly deal with the question of Sustainability, and Risk Management .</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project Design Documentation</li> <li>2. Midterm and Final Reports</li> </ol>	1 and 2 - Programme Office.	1 and 2 - Obtain and review the documentation provided

## Project Fiche - template

### General Data

Intervention title	
Agreement partner (name)	
Type of agreement partner	
Agreement nr.(s)	
Country / region	
Implementing institution	
Implementing partner	
Programme officer:	
Extending agency	
Donor Cooperation	
DAC Sector	
Intervention start & end dates	
Budget Approved amount Agreed amount Disbursed amount	
Main stakeholders	
Number of beneficiaries targeted	
Intervention description	
Programme background & history	

### Project objectives and activities & expected results

Overall objectives	
Specific objectives	
Expected results	
Main activities specify agri. Activities for envir. Interventions)	•
Process on track? Main difficulties/challenges	
List of available documentation for the intervention	

## Online Survey questionnaire

### Introduction

#### Evaluation of Norwegian agriculture & environment support to food security Questionnaire to extending agencies

The Evaluation Department of the Norwegian Development Agency (Norad) has commissioned an evaluation of Norwegian agricultural support to food security. The evaluation covers the years 2005 to 2011 and is assessing a selection of agricultural and environmental projects/ programmes worldwide and the contribution to food security.

In accordance with the Terms of Reference, the evaluation focuses on 3 main issues, which are:

- 1) Design, relevance and impact of food security
- 2) Monitoring, evaluation and reporting
- 3) Sustainability and scaling up

This questionnaire is part of the evaluation and targets the **principal organisations and institutions managing Norwegian agricultural projects and programmes** (later referred to as extending agencies) namely: Norad, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), Embassies, Norfund, Peace Corps.

The purpose of the questionnaire is to gather information on reporting and monitoring requirements and practices within the five organisations/institutions mentioned above. The questions will focus on reporting requirements along the project life cycle, monitoring and evaluation practices, and communication between the organizations/institutions and the project implementing partners.

The questionnaire is composed of 5 blocks of questions and will take no more than 15 minutes. Your contribution is extremely valuable. We would kindly ask you to fill in the survey by no later than **16<sup>th</sup> December 2012**.

*Please note that this message may have been sent to several persons within your organisation/institution. However, it is sufficient to submit only 1 answer per institution (except for Norad, for which we would need an answer from both the departments of Civil Society and Environment/Climate Change).*

If you have further questions regarding this evaluation in general, or have any comments or technical problems in relation to the online survey, your **contact persons** are:

Sarah Seus, survey manager : sarah.seus@particip.de, 0049 761 79074-0

Pernille Soerensen, team leader: pernille@psadvize.dk

**Thanking you in advance for your kind co-operation.**

*The Evaluation Team*

**Note:** Please note that the evaluation focuses on the period 2005-2011. If you do not have information regarding the entire period, please state which year(s) you are referring to.

## General Data

Your personal identification details in this questionnaire will be kept confidential, and will not be reported with the results of the survey.

1. Please state your extending agency: \*

- Embassy
- Norad
- Norfund
- MFA
- Peace Corps

Please indicate your position within the organisation

Please indicate the year your employment started

Your email address

Phone number

### Managing data entry

- Fields marked with a \* , are mandatory. You cannot access the next page without having filled them out.
- Click **'Next'** at the end of each page to save the current page and to get to the next set of questions.
- It is possible to use the **'Back'** button at the end of each page to refer to earlier pages and/or edit earlier answers if you wish. However, the data you entered on any page is only saved by clicking **'Next'** on that page. Do not go back before saving the current page by clicking Next first, to avoid losing data you entered.
- A **'Save and continue later'** button can be found at the very bottom of each page of the survey. By clicking the button, a link will be sent to your email address, which allows you to continue the questionnaire at the point where you have interrupted it.
- After completion of the survey, if you wish to obtain an overview of all the replies you have provided, a file can be generated and sent to you upon request. In this case, please directly contact the survey manager (contact details are provided on the previous page).

## 1. Funding requirements and procedures

1. Please indicate the requirements and procedures for applying for project funding:

---

### Project Proposal & Budget funding

Was a Project Proposal, including a budget requested?

Yes

No

If yes, were there specific requirements (e.g. in the form of templates)

---

### Logical Framework

Was a Logical Framework requested?

Yes

No

If yes, were there specific requirements (e.g. in the form of templates)

---

### Guidelines for preparation of Project Proposals

Did guidelines for preparation of Project Proposals exist?

Yes

No

If yes, please state whether these were developed by your institution or by others?

---

Please state if other specific requirements for funding projects existed.

---

## 2. Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting Requirements

---

2. Please indicate the M&E requirements and procedures:

### Progress Reports

Were progress reports requested?

Yes

If yes, annual, semi-annual or quarterly?

No

### Reporting requirements

Were there any specific requirements to the reports?

Yes

No

If yes, what were the requirements? (Please describe the requirements)

### Baseline and end of programme surveys

Were implementing partners requested to conduct baseline and end of programme surveys?

Yes

No

If yes, were there specific requirements to the surveys?

### Guidelines for M&E

Did guidelines for M&E exist during the period 2005-2011?

Yes

No

If yes, please state whether they had been developed by your organization/institution or by others?

### 3. Project Cycle & Relation with Implementing Partner

3. Please indicate whether a project cycle normally included the following:

Appraisal      Mid-term Evaluation      Final Evaluation

Yes       Yes       Yes

No       No       No

4. Please indicate the manpower allocated to the agricultural portfolio during the period.

*(Please state number of staff, position and their time allocated for the management in % of full time employee).*

If data are not available for the entire period, please indicate the year (s) referred to.

5. Relation with the implementing partner

Did your organisation/institution visit projects during implementation?

Yes

No

If yes, on an average how often? (quarterly, semi-annually, annually, etc.)

Please indicate the frequency of communication (mail/phone/meetings) between your organisation and the implementing partner. *(Weekly basis, monthly basis, quarterly basis, semi-annual basis, annual basis)*

If this cannot be stated for the entire period, please indicate the year(s) referred to.

Please provide a list of agricultural and food security projects implemented during the period 2005-2011.

(Either upload a document here or use the next textbox to list the projects).

Choose File

No file selected

Upload



List of projects

---

Thank you for answering our questions. Do you have any further comments or remarks?

---

**Thank You!**

Again, thank you for answering our questions. Your response is very important to us.

---