

Evaluation of Norwegian aid engagement in the Sahel

Organisational Management



FINAL REPORT

ANNEX 3: EVALUATION MATRIX AND RUBRICS

#	Sub-Questions	Indicators	Data Collection Methods	Main Sources of Data/ Information	Data Analysis Methods/ Triangulation
1.1	To what extent do the organisational and management set-up and strategic planning enable optimal use of all available workforce and expertise to facilitate efficient and effective Norwegian assistance to the Sahel?				
1.1.1	Were the roles and functions of the workforce appropriate and aligned to Norwegian assistance to the Sahel?	<p>Stakeholder perceptions regarding the degree to which the roles and functions of the workforce are aligned (what is needed to support Norwegian assistance in the Sahel).</p> <p>Whether all positions in the different relevant organigrammes are filled.</p>	<p>Qualitative desk review using a structured framework</p> <p>Quantitative data extraction using a structure framework</p> <p>Existence of key documents such as conflict analysis, gender analysis, etc (cross cutting issues)</p> <p>Existence of key documents to support the use of baseline documents (listed directly above), such as tool boxes and guidelines</p>	<p>Norad disbursement/interventions with identification of responsible management units</p> <p>Tools and systems (the documents) used to monitor activities</p> <p>Data on monitoring of Sahel engagement by MFA’s Section for the Horn of Africa and West Africa</p> <p>Data on the role and functions of MFA’s staff engaged in the Sahel</p> <p>Data on staffing and administrative costs from Norad statistics and relevant reports</p>	<p>Norad statistics with identification of responsible management units</p> <p>Primary data: analysis in MaxQDA - creation of code to classify information extracted from KIIs and discussions</p> <p>Qualitative secondary data: classification of information extracted from documents receive by Norad, the MFA and publicly available.</p> <p>Quantitative secondary data: statistical analysis in Excel or Tableau of data received by Norad, the MFA and publicly available.</p>

FINAL REPORT

<p>1.1.2</p>	<p>Does the monitoring mechanism used enable optimal use of available workforce?</p>	<p>A monitoring system exists and is accompanied by support material (guidelines, tolls). Clear guidelines on its use are available. Stakeholders (who could use/have access to) The monitoring system use the system. Stakeholders perceive the system as useful. There is documented evidence on the utility of the system (references of use).</p>	<p>Key Informant Interviews Online Survey Group discussions</p>	<p>and studies (including annual aid budget and spending review of MFA) Data on number of staff with specific competence relative to total number of staff (ex: number of staff who have received gender sensitivity training vs total number of staff) Review of documents that demonstrate the inclusion of cross cutting issues. These can include: guidelines on how to conduct gender sensitivity assessments, conflict sensitivity assessments, risk assessments*, context analysis*, political economy analysis*. Those with * need to be reviewed to assess the degree to which they capture/support improved response to cross cutting issues. In addition, documents (minutes, correspondence, contracts, demonstrating use of available documentation will also be a critical mechanism to substantiate the use/utility of tools developed.</p>	
<p>1.1.3</p>	<p>Does the staff have the knowledge needed to ensure the adequate inclusion of cross cutting issues?</p>	<p>Stakeholder perception of adequate ability to ensure inclusion of cross-cutting issues. Staff with documented knowledge on cross cutting issues (is their area of expertise, have received trainings, have access to guidelines). Note the number of staff per unit with any specific level of competence will be</p>		<p>MFA's directives, delegation and guidelines to Norad (including review of appropriation letters) Bamako-Embassy's annual work plans (virksomhetsplaner) Interview data with MFA staff engaged in the Sahel, grant managers at MFA and Norad and with Bamako embassy</p>	

FINAL REPORT

		<p>documented (ex: has all staff received training, have all staff received refresher training)</p> <p>Documented availability and use of key documentation to ensure the effective inclusion of cross cutting issues and themes by available staff.</p>			
<p>1.1.4</p>	<p>Were the organisational and management set-up and strategic planning approaches efficient and effective to enable the optimal use of workforce to Norwegian assistance to the Sahel?</p>	<p>Stakeholder perception that the management set up was efficient.</p> <p>Stakeholder perception that the management set up was effective.</p> <p>Does the organigram clearly note complementarity vs possible duplication.</p> <p>Documented tools and approaches used to ensure the effective inclusion of cross cutting issues and themes. For example: Gender analysis, conflict analysis, respective tool boxes.</p> <p>Documented evidence of efforts to optimise resource use. This could include shifts in staffing,</p>			

FINAL REPORT

		opening of additional roles.			
1.2 To what extent is Norwegian assistance to the Sahel relevant, and shows flexibility and ability to adapt to the continuously changing contexts and challenges in a conflict-sensitive manner? How does the organizational and management set-up affect flexibility and adaptability, if at all?					
1.2.1	Was the Norwegian assistance to the Sahel able to adapt and be flexible when faced with dilemmas, challenges and changing context?	<p>Stakeholder perception of adaptability and flexibility.</p> <p>Stakeholder description of the experience in line with the scales found in tables 3 and 4 in the main document.</p> <p>Documented attention paid to cross cutting issues in the form of</p>	<p>Qualitative desk review using a structured framework</p> <p>Existence of conflict sensitivity assessments, which include risk analysis, context analysis, political economy analysis. Documentation demonstrating the type of engagement Norway is involved in (e.g. avoid negative effects, build positive effects, contribute to peace).</p>	<p>Sahel Strategy and other relevant strategies and actions plans (including country strategies and the Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security, where Mali is identified as a priority country)</p> <p>Decision documents from main interventions and departments and/or sections (sample)</p> <p>Review of cross cutting related assessments and documents demonstrating their use (e.g. conflict</p>	<p>Primary data: analysis in MaxQDA - creation of code to classify information extracted from KIIs and discussions</p> <p>Qualitative secondary data: classification of information extracted from documents receive by Norad, the MFA and available publicly.</p>

FINAL REPORT

		<p>studies, guidelines or more informal communication.</p>	<p>Existence of documented evidence (re: gender analysis, climate change analysis, etc) demonstrating the systematic inclusion of cross cutting issues in the assessment of the changing context.</p> <p>Existence of documentary evidence that baseline documents (listed directly above) have been used. For example: agenda for meetings, minutes, correspondence, etc.</p>	<p>sensitivity analysis, gender analysis etc), and relevant guidelines for use, and/or correspondence/minutes/ agendas that demonstrate use.</p> <p>Interviews with grant managers from a sample and with the Sahel workforce</p> <p>Interviews with Norwegian stakeholders in Sahel Forum (NGOs and academics/resource persons)</p>	
<p>1.2.2</p>	<p>Was the Norwegian assistance to the Sahel able to respond to changing context and dilemmas in a conflict-sensitive manner?</p>	<p>Stakeholder perception of responsiveness to conflict and conflict sensitivity.</p> <p>Documented evidence that conflict sensitivity have been considered in the response to changing context.</p> <p>Documented evidence that cross cutting issues have been considered in the response to changing context.</p> <p>Stakeholder description of the experience in line with the scales found in tables 3 and 4 in the main document.</p>	<p>Key Informant Interviews</p> <p>Online survey</p> <p>Group discussions</p>	<p>Interview with agreement partners in Bamako, including Norwegian NGOs based in Bamako)</p>	

FINAL REPORT

1.2.3	Were the organisational and management set-ups able to respond to dilemmas, challenges and changing context?	Stakeholder perceptions of how change is prompted. Responses will be aligned with table 3 in the main text.			
1.2.4	Was the communication and dialogue between agreement partners (recipients) and Norway (donor) appropriate to a changing-context?	Stakeholder perception of appropriateness of dialogue between partners. Responses aligned with factors in table 3 in the main text			
1.3 To what extent is the Norwegian engagement coordinated, both internally and externally?					

FINAL REPORT

<p>1.3.1</p>	<p>How were the interventions managed and coordinated by the MFA (Oslo), Norad and the Embassy?</p>	<p>Stakeholder description of the coordination mechanism.</p> <p>Documentation of stakeholder coordination protocols.</p> <p>Documentation of stakeholder coordination protocol adherence.</p> <p>Alignment between description of protocols and documents.</p>	<p>Qualitative desk review using a structured framework</p> <p>Quantitative data extraction using a structure framework</p> <p>Key Informant Interviews</p> <p>Online Survey</p> <p>Group discussions</p>	<p>Data on monitoring and assessments collected by MFA staff working on the Sahel, including relations with other internal and coordinating mechanisms (such as the monitoring of Mali engagement in relation to women, peace and security)</p> <p>Mapping of the Norwegian contribution to joint donor initiatives, including earmarked and core funding to multilateral institutions and funds (from Norad statistics) and participation in donor coordinating forum (from work plans of Embassy)</p> <p>Documents that demonstrate adherence with a coordination protocol (emails, other correspondence, minutes of meetings)</p> <p>Documentary evidence that coordination changed actions (emails, other correspondence, minutes of meetings) (improved effectiveness)</p>	<p>Primary data: analysis in MaxQDA - creation of code to classify information extracted from KIIs and discussions</p> <p>Qualitative secondary data: classification of information extracted from documents receive by Norad, the MFA and publicly available.</p> <p>Quantitative secondary data: statistical analysis in Excel or Tableau of data received by Norad, the MFA and publicly available.</p>
<p>1.3.2</p>	<p>How effective are the MFA (Oslo), Norad and the Embassy at internal and external coordination?</p>	<p>Stakeholder perception of the of the effectiveness of coordination mechanism.</p> <p>Documentary evidence that coordination led to improved effectiveness</p>		<p>Interviews with those responsible for the above (Staff working on issues related to the Sahel at MFA, Embassy, grant managers).</p>	

FINAL REPORT

<p>1.3.3</p>	<p>Was the core funding provided to multilateral institutions and funds implemented and monitored appropriately?</p>	<p>Stakeholder perception of the appropriateness of monitoring mechanism.</p> <p>Documentation demonstrating clear parameters for monitoring.</p> <p>Documentation demonstrating clear use of aforementioned parameters.</p>		<p>Interviews selected donor - representatives/co-ordinating bodies in Bamako (to be identified following a review of Embassy work plans and review of documents)</p>	
<p>1.3.4</p>	<p>Did the monitoring of core funding provided to multilateral institutions and funds impact the implementation of Norwegian assistance to the Sahel?</p>	<p>Stakeholder perception of the impact (value and use) of monitoring tools.</p> <p>Documented evidence that can show that monitoring information was used to impact decision making about partners.</p>			

FINAL REPORT

1.3.5	Was the engagement with projects funded through earmarked contributions to multilateral institutions and delegated to other bilateral agencies implemented relevant and monitored appropriately?	<p>Stakeholder perception on the appropriateness of the appropriateness of earmarked funding and delegation to different agencies.</p> <p>Documentary evidence that monitoring data influenced decision making.</p>			
1.3.6	What was the extent of the MFA's (Oslo), Norad's and the Embassy's engagement in donor-coordinating forums, and what was its impact on Norwegian assistance to the Sahel?	<p>Stakeholder perception of the use of donor coordination.</p> <p>Documentary evidence that donor coordination takes place.</p> <p>Documentary evidence that donor coordination efforts lead to tangible results beyond information exchange.</p>			
<p>1.4 To what extent do the different Norwegian strategies affecting the Sahel engagement facilitate a coherent and conflict-sensitive approach? To what extent are these strategies helpful for prioritising the support?</p>					

FINAL REPORT

<p>1.4.1</p>	<p>Are the elements within the Sahel Strategy and other relevant country strategies (Mali, Niger, Mali WPS) and thematic strategies relevant, and coherent, to ensuring a conflict-sensitive approach?</p>	<p>Stakeholder perception of the relevance of the strategies. Alignment between key elements in the strategy and key priorities identified in national strategies of the countries included. Evidence of alignment between the Norwegian Strategy and key strategies from multilateral organisations or other main donors.</p>	<p>Qualitative desk review using a structured framework Quantitative data extraction using a structure framework Documentary evidence demonstrating that conflict sensitivity assessments, gender assessments, climate change assessments... were conducted and used Key Informant Interviews</p>	<p>Review of cross cutting related assessments and documents demonstrating their use (e.g. conflict sensitivity analysis, gender analysis etc), and relevant guidelines for use, and/or correspondence/minutes/ agendas that demonstrate use. Interviews with MFA staff engaged in the Sahel, Embassy and grant managers Interview main recipients and stakeholders. In Norway, this will include the Sahel Forum</p>	<p>Primary data: analysis in MaxQDA - creation of code to classify information extracted from KIIs and discussions Qualitative secondary data: classification of information extracted from documents receive by Norad, the MFA and publicly available. Quantitative secondary data: statistical analysis in Excel or Tableau of data received by Norad, the MFA and publicly available.</p>
<p>1.4.2</p>	<p>Did these strategies influence the level of priority Norway has given to the assistance to the Sahel?</p>	<p>Stakeholder perception of what factors have affected/influenced Norwegian assistance in the Sahel. Documentary evidence that cross cutting issues and themes were considered in priority setting.</p>	<p>Online Survey Group discussions</p>	<p>Mapping of Sahel Strategy, country strategies and thematic strategies Data on Norwegian assistance to the Sahel</p>	
<p>1.5 What is the rationale behind the choice of partners? What assessments are done when selecting partners by Norway? (Including in relation to conflict sensitivity and coordinating with other donors in selecting partners)</p>					

FINAL REPORT

1.5.1	Were the selection of partners (disbursement channels, agreement partners) appropriate and relevant for the Norwegian assistance to the Sahel?	<p>Stakeholder perception of the relevance of partners.</p> <p>Documentary evidence that partners focus on areas of work that are Norwegian priorities (key areas of competence).</p>			
1.5.2	How were partners selected by Norway?	<p>Stakeholder perception of the process of selection.</p> <p>Documentary evidence of calls for proposals and review guidelines.</p> <p>Documentary evidence that partners were assessed on their ability to effectively include all cross cutting issues and themes (staff capacity, knowledge, guidelines, programmatic experience).</p>	<p>Qualitative desk review using a structured framework</p> <p>Quantitative data extraction using a structure framework</p> <p>Inclusion of clear cross cutting requirements in invitation/review of potential partners</p> <p>Key Informant Interviews</p> <p>Online Survey</p> <p>Group discussions</p>	<p>Proposal documents/TOR documents</p> <p>Decision documents</p> <p>Interviews with MFA staff engaged in the Sahel and grant managers in main sections and at Embassy level</p> <p>Interview with major partners and donors</p> <p>Mapping of partners</p> <p>Mapping of funds used by partners</p>	<p>Primary data: analysis in MaxQDA - creation of code to classify information extracted from KIIs and discussions</p> <p>Qualitative secondary data: classification of information extracted from documents receive by Norad, the MFA and publicly available.</p> <p>Quantitative secondary data: statistical analysis in Excel or Tableau of data received by Norad, the MFA and publicly available.</p>
1.5.3	Was the assessment done by Norway when selecting its partners relevant and appropriate in relation to conflict sensitivity?	<p>Stakeholder perception of the relevance of the approach taken to select partners.</p> <p>Documentary evidence that partners were assessed on their ability to effectively include conflict sensitivity into</p>			

FINAL REPORT

	their work (staff capacity, knowledge, guidelines, programmatic experience).		
--	--	--	--

Rubric 1- Prompting adaptation – triggers and response

Trigger of change	Degree of change
Level 1: Ad hoc	Issues requiring flexible responses are reported to the Norwegian funding representative in an ad hoc manner as they arise, or Norway informs the implementing partner that a change will be made.
Level 2: Periodical (known time interval)	Annual meetings or reports are used as an opportunity to highlight changes in context and discuss the needs for change.
Level 3: Responsive	There is a reporting system that takes stock of contextual changes as they arise and depending on their level of gravity, they demand a response. This means that Norway counts on a system to determine the level of gravity and trigger responses.

Source: Evaluation Team

Rubric 2 – Matrix - Context changes and adaptations made

Contextual change experienced		Type of response		
Change in context reduces the possibility of supporting all pre-identified beneficiaries	Beneficiaries initially covered by the intervention are excluded	Beneficiaries are excluded, but others are included in order to use the available funds	A programming change is made to include all beneficiaries so long as there are no cost implications	Additional resources are made available to enable coverage of all beneficiaries and address the contextual challenges
Change in context reduces the possibility of supporting some beneficiaries	Beneficiaries initially covered by the intervention are excluded	Beneficiaries are excluded, but others are included in order to use the available funds	A programming change is made to include all beneficiaries so long as there are no cost implications	Additional resources are made available to enable coverage of all beneficiaries
Change in context reduces the possibility of delivering on time	The intervention is unable to meet its objective, and funds are returned	A no-cost extension is granted		
No change in context	No change in activity required			

Source: Evaluation Team

ANNEX 4: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Interview Guide: The guide below was used as a foundation for the document, but interviews were adapted depending on area of focus of respondents.

Objective 1	Ability to Organise
Interview Descriptors (only those relevant will be applied)	
Name	
Gender	<input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer to not disclose
Age	<input type="checkbox"/> > 30 years old; <input type="checkbox"/> between 30 – 50 years old; <input type="checkbox"/> over 50 years old
Position	
Description of role	
Category/level (TBD)	
Organisation	
Specific project-country(ies)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Burkina Faso <input type="checkbox"/> Chad <input type="checkbox"/> Mali <input type="checkbox"/> Mauritania <input type="checkbox"/> Niger <input type="checkbox"/> Lake Chad area of Cameroon <input type="checkbox"/> Lake Chad area of Nigeria
Specific projects worked on⁶¹	
Location	
Date (DD/MM/YYYY)	
Language	<input type="checkbox"/> English <input type="checkbox"/> French <input type="checkbox"/> Norwegian <input type="checkbox"/> Other:
Interviewer	<input type="checkbox"/> Ananda <input type="checkbox"/> Elling
General Observations	
<p>[This is a guide, not a questionnaire. It indicates the areas to be covered and provides a guideline for the expected order in which the topics will be addressed. The questions may not be asked in this exact format, and interviewers may change the order and emphasis as the interview progresses. However, all relevant topics will be covered in each interview. Instances where a topic was not covered will noted and the reason for their exclusion documented to ensure consistent analysis. Note: Most interviews, especially with grant managers in Oslo, are expected to be conducted remotely].</p> <p>The interviewer will:</p>	

⁶¹ This question will only be asked of staff engaged in project activities.

Introduce him/herself. If a team is in attendance, the whole team will be introduced, and the roles played during the interview will be described. If a representative from the donor organisation is in attendance, he/she/they will introduce themselves and his/her/they role in the interview will be explained as well.

Explain the purpose of the interview (and evaluation), including the relevance of the assignment and the importance (expected value) of the interview. Following is an example of standard introduction to be used for interview under objective 1: ability to organise.

The purpose of this interview is to collect data to inform the evaluation on Norway’s Support to the Sahel between 2016-2022. The evaluation is expected to provide information that may assist Norway to, adapt its engagement in fragile and unstable contexts, such as the Sahel. More specifically, this evaluation focuses on three distinct objectives (organisational aspects related the support to the Sahel, the results of the support to the food security sector and how Norwegian government bodies have made use of lessons that have emerged from the experience of supporting the Sahel. Specifically, this interview will provide valuable information relating to objective 1, which will assess whether the organisational set-up, strategic planning, partner selection and overall management of the Norwegian aid to the Sahel is enabling effective assistance to the region. Critically this evaluation covers the 2016-2022 time period. Therefore, throughout you will be asked to note any changes that may have occurred during that time frame. Specifically, if there are more than one answer to your question depending on the year in question.

We would like to inform you that all information collected today is confidential and will not be shared, in its raw format, with anyone outside the evaluation team. In the event that evaluation team wish to quote something you have said today a written permission will be sought. Otherwise, the information collected today will be anonymised and triangulated with other data collected and used only in aggregate format. Still, if you have been very open about your views, it may be that a reader attribute some of the findings partially to you, the evaluation team is not in a position to fully prevent this.

Please note that as an interviewee, you have a right to withdraw at any stage of the evaluation process. Furthermore, you also have the right to stop the interview process at any point and/or to refrain from answering any questions asked. If any information you share should not be used, please advise the team of this and the team will ensure that no written record of the ‘off the record data’ is kept. [The information above will be included in the requests for an interview].

Describe the interview process and the roles that will be played by each team member in attendance;

Obtain consent to record/transcribe the interview and/or engage in detailed note-taking (the chosen process will be agreed upon prior to the start of the interview process). Recorded interviews can be shared, if requested, with the interviewee.

Allow flexibility in the approach to account for emerging themes or topics of interest to the fulfilment of the assignment.

1.1	To what extent do the organisational and management set-up and strategic planning enable optimal use of all available workforce and expertise to facilitate efficient and effective Norwegian assistance to the Sahel?	
1.1.1	Were the roles and functions of the workforce appropriate and aligned to Norwegian assistance to the Sahel?	
1.1.1.1	Explain your title, role and function in xxx department/section/unit.	
1.1.1.2	Explain the role and function of xxx department/section/unit.	
1.1.1.3	Explain if/how your role is aligned or not to the needs and requirements of xxx department/section/unit to support	

	Norwegian assistance to the Sahel. Explain if/how this may have changed over the period under review.	
1.1.1.4	Explain if/how xxx department/section/unit (you are part of) is aligned or not to the needs and requirements for the support of Norwegian assistance to the Sahel. Explain if/how this may have changed over the period under review.	
1.1.1.5	Explain if/how the present workforce sufficient in xxx department/section/unit to support Norwegian assistance to the Sahel. Explain if/how this may have changed over the period under review.	
1.1.2	Does the monitoring mechanism used enable optimal use of available workforce?	
1.1.2.1	Describe the monitoring system/mechanism used by xxx department/section/unit.	
1.1.2.1	Describe which tools (if any exist) are used to guide the monitoring process (ex: guidelines, trainings, specialised staff)	
1.1.2.3	Describe the extent to which the workforce of xxx department/section/unit systematically monitors activities (note: reference to clear protocols/guidelines trainings on how to do this).	
1.1.2.4	Describe the utility of monitoring activities in xxx department/section/unit (note: seek examples of utility)	
1.1.3	Does the staff have the knowledge needed to ensure the adequate inclusion of cross cutting issues?	
1.1.3.1	Explain the degree to which staff available are able to effectively include cross cutting issues (by issue)?	
1.1.3.2	Describe how said knowledge has been secured (training, guidelines, protocols)	
1.1.3.4	Describe key lessons that have been learned which are relevant to the inclusion of cross cutting issues.	
1.1.4	Were the organisational and management set-up and strategic planning approaches efficient and effective to enable the optimal use of workforce to Norwegian assistance to the Sahel?	
1.1.4.1	<p>Explain the extent to which/how the efficiency of the management set up of xxx department/section/unit was ensured (i.e., the ability to accomplish something with the least amount of wasted time, money, and effort or competency in performance).</p> <p><i>Note: ensure that efficiently addressing cross cutting issues and themes (see previous sub section of questions) are included in the discussion (i.e., how was efficient inclusion of cross cutting issues ensured).</i></p>	

1.1.4.2	<p>Explain the extent to which/how the effectiveness of the management set up of xxx department/section/unit was secured (i.e., the degree to which something is successful in producing a desired result; success).</p> <p><i>Note: ensure that effective addressing cross cutting issues and themes (see previous sub section of questions) are included in the discussion (i.e., how was effective inclusion of cross cutting issues ensured).</i></p>	
1.1.4.1	<p>Describe (and explain the genesis of) any work duplications between xxx department/section/unit work and other department/section/unit work regarding Norwegian assistance to the Sahel.</p>	
1.2	<p>To what extent is Norwegian assistance to the Sahel relevant, and shows flexibility and ability to adapt to the continuously changing contexts and challenges in a conflict-sensitive manner? How does the organisational and management set-up affect flexibility and adaptability, if at all?</p>	
1.2.1	<p>Was the Norwegian assistance to the Sahel able to adapt and be flexible when faced with dilemmas, challenges and changing context?</p>	
1.2.1.1	<p>Explain the extent to which Norwegian assistance is (has been) relevant (is/has been needed) to the Sahel context/needs. Please elaborate if this has been more/less true in relation to specific subjects/themes and the degree to which the support has been particularly relevant in relation to cross cutting issues (specifically: human rights, gender and environment).</p> <p><i>Note: Conflict sensitivity can be highlighted here, but is also addressed later on).</i></p>	
1.2.1.2	<p>Explain if/how xxx department/section/unit is able to adapt (i.e., anticipating and planning ahead) to dilemmas/challenges (e.g., coup-d'état, political insecurity, insecurity, climate change, etc.) in the Sahel-context.</p> <p><i>Use table 3 "prompting adaptation – trigger and response" and matrix in table 4 "Context changes and adaptations made" to guide informant answers</i></p>	
1.2.1.3	<p>Explain if/how xxx department/section/unit is flexible (i.e., immediate and situational) to dilemmas/challenges (e.g., coup-d'état, political insecurity, insecurity, climate change, gender demands, etc.) in the Sahel-context.</p>	
1.2.2	<p>Was the Norwegian assistance to the Sahel able to respond to changing context and dilemmas in a conflict-sensitive manner?</p>	
1.2.2.1	<p>Describe and explain the extent to which xxx department/section/unit has been able to respond to dilemmas/challenges/changing contexts in the Sahel in a conflict-sensitive manner. Please provide examples.</p>	

	<i>Use table 3 “prompting adaptation – trigger and response” and matrix in table 4 “Context changes and adaptations made” to guide informant answers</i>	
1.2.3	Were the organisational and management set-ups able to respond to dilemmas, challenges and changing context?	
1.2.3.1	Explain the extent to which the management set-up of xxx department/section/unit appropriate and able to answer dilemmas/challenges/changing contexts in the Sahel. Please provide examples.	
1.2.3.2	Explain how change is prompted or not to answer to these dilemmas/challenges/changing contexts in the Sahel. <i>Use table 3 “prompting adaptation – trigger and response” to guide informant answers</i>	
1.2.4	Was the communication and dialogue between agreement partners (recipients) and Norway (donor) appropriate to a changing-context?	
1.2.4.1	Describe the type of partners you working with in xxx department/section/unit to support Norwegian assistance to the Sahel.	
1.2.4.2	Describe the extent to which the dialogue and communication between the types of partners and xxx department/section/unit appropriate in the Sahel changing context. <i>Note: place specific attention on how cross cutting issues have been included in the dialogue. For example: has gender, human rights, climate change, anti-corruption figured consistently in the dialogue as context has changed?</i> <i>Use table 3 “prompting adaptation – trigger and response” to guide informant answers</i>	
1.2.4.3	Describe changes and/or improvements that can be made to increase the appropriateness of the dialogue between partners and in xxx department/section/unit in the Sahel changing context. <i>Note: same as for 1.2.4.2.</i>	
1.3	To what extent is the Norwegian engagement coordinated, both internally and externally?	
1.3.1	How were the interventions managed and coordinated by the MFA (Oslo), Norad and the Embassy?	
1.3.1.1	Describe the intervention and coordination mechanism between xxx department/section/unit and the MFA (Oslo), Norad and the Embassy.	
1.3.2	How effective are the MFA (Oslo), Norad and the Embassy at internal and external coordination?	
1.3.2.1	Describe the degree of effectiveness (i.e., the degree to which something is successful in producing a desired	

	<p>result; success) of the internal coordination within xxx department/section/unit.</p> <p><i>Note: ensure that information on how the inclusion of cross cutting issues is effectively coordinated -i.e., who is responsible for ensuring different cross cutting issues are included.</i></p>	
1.3.2.3	<p>Describe the degree of effectiveness (i.e., the degree to which something is successful in producing a desired result; success) of the external coordination of xxx department/section/unit with others department/section/unit.</p> <p><i>Note: same as above for 1.3.2.1.</i></p>	
1.3.3	Was the core funding provided to multilateral institutions and funds implemented and monitored appropriately?	
1.3.3.1	Describe the extent to which core funding to multilateral institutions and funds were monitored by xxx department/section/unit.	
1.3.3.2	Explain the degree to which the level of monitoring (described above) was appropriate.	
1.3.3.3	<p>Explain how the monitoring of core funding to multilateral institutions and funds ensured effective integration of cross cutting issues and themes.</p> <p><i>Note: specific tools used should be documented and reviewed.</i></p>	
1.3.4	Did the monitoring of core funding provided to multilateral institutions and funds impact the implementation of Norwegian assistance to the Sahel?	
1.3.4.1	Describe the value/purpose of the monitoring of core funding to multilateral institutions and fund for the implementation of Norwegian assistance to the Sahel in xxx department/section/unit.	
1.3.4.2	Describe if/how the monitoring of core funding to multilateral institutions and fund for the implementation of Norwegian assistance to the Sahel influence the way Norway has provided assistance to the Sahel.	
1.3.4.3	Describe if/how the monitoring of core funding to multilateral institutions and fund for the implementation of Norwegian assistance to the Sahel influence the focus of Norwegian assistance to the Sahel.	
1.3.5	Was the engagement with projects funded through earmarked contributions to multilateral institutions and delegated to other bilateral agencies implemented relevant and monitored appropriately?	
1.3.5.1	Explain the extent to which projects funded through earmarked contributions to multilateral institutions and delegated to bilateral agencies was relevant.	

1.3.5.2	<p>Explain the extent to which projects funded through earmarked contributions to multilateral institutions and delegated to bilateral agencies was effectively monitored.</p> <p><i>Note: describe tools and processes used for monitoring.</i></p>	
1.3.6	What was the extent of the MFA's (Oslo), Norad's and the Embassy's engagement in donor-coordinating forums, and what was its impact on Norwegian assistance to the Sahel?	
1.3.6.1	Describe the extent to which xxx department/section/unit of MFA, Norad and/or the Embassy's engaged in donor-coordinating forums.	
1.3.6.2	Explain the impact and use of this donor-coordination.	
1.3.6.3	Describe if/how cross cutting issues were addressed in donor-coordination meetings. For example: was gender/climate change/corruption, etc. on the agenda? Were there staff at the meeting with the adequate competence to address these issues?	
1.4	To what extent do the different Norwegian strategies affecting the Sahel engagement facilitate a coherent and conflict-sensitive approach? To what extent are these strategies helpful for prioritising the support?	
1.4.1	Are the elements within the Sahel Strategy and other relevant country strategies (Mali, Niger, Mali WPS) and thematic strategies relevant, and coherent, to ensuring a conflict-sensitive approach?	
1.4.1.1	Explain the extent to which these strategies (e.g., Sahel Strategy and country strategies) are relevant and useful to xxx department/section/unit work in the Sahel.	
1.4.1.2	Explain the extent to which these strategies (e.g., Sahel Strategy and country strategies) aligned to ensure a conflict-sensitive approach.	
1.4.2	Did these strategies influence the level of priority Norway has given to the assistance to the Sahel?	
1.4.2.1	Explain what factors have affected and/or influenced the Norwegian assistance to the Sahel.	
1.4.2.2	<p>Explain the extent to which and how cross-cutting issues were taken in consideration in relation to conflict-sensitivity (e.g., gender, environments, etc.).</p> <p><i>Note: this includes perception of inclusion of cross cutting issues, but also tangible examples and references to tools, trainings, assessments that have been used.</i></p>	
1.5	What is the rationale behind the choice of partners? What assessments are done when selecting partners by Norway? (Including in relation to conflict sensitivity and coordinating with other donors in selecting partners)	
1.5.1	Were the selection of partners (disbursement channels, agreement partners) appropriate and relevant for the Norwegian assistance to the Sahel?	

1.5.1.1	Explain the degree of appropriateness of the disbursement channels used for the Norwegian assistance to the Sahel.	
1.5.1.2	Explain the degree of appropriateness of the agreement partners engaged in the Norwegian assistance to the Sahel.	
1.5.2 How were partners selected by Norway?		
1.5.2.1	Describe how partners were selected by xxx department/section/unit.	
1.5.2.2	Describe the level of coordination between the responsible management unit and xxx department/section/unit regarding partner selection.	
1.5.2.3	Describe the level of coordination between the responsible management unit and other donors.	
1.5.2.4	Describe the extent to which the selection process has been appropriate to address the objectives of the strategy.	
1.5.2.5	Describe the extent to which the selection process has considered the degree to which the selected partner could effectively address cross cutting issues. Specifically what mechanism (systems, tools, adequate staff) was available to the partner to ensure that gender, climate change, human rights and anti-corruption were effectively addressed. <i>Note: each cross-cutting issue will be addressed individually.</i>	
1.5.3 Was the assessment done by Norway when selecting its partners relevant and appropriate in relation to conflict sensitivity?		
1.5.2.1	Describe the extent to which the selection process has considered the degree to which the selected partner could effectively address conflict sensitivity. Specifically what mechanism (systems, tools, adequate staff) was available to the partner to ensure that conflict sensitivity was effectively addressed. <i>Note: each cross-cutting issue will be addressed individually.</i>	

Survey (online)

Objective 1	Survey tool
<p><i>This survey will contribute to the evaluation on Norway's Support to the Sahel between 2016-2022. The evaluation is expected to provide information that may assist Norway to adapt its engagement in fragile and unstable contexts, such as the Sahel.</i></p> <p><i>Specifically, this survey will provide valuable information relating to one of the objective of the evaluation, which will assess whether the organisational set-up, strategic planning, partner selection and overall management of the Norwegian aid to the Sahel is enabling effective assistance to the region.</i></p>	

The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Please note you may skip any question that you feel like not responding. While providing additional comments in the open text boxes is not mandatory, it would greatly assist our evaluation. You are welcome to write your comments in English, Norwegian or French. You may use these boxes to clarify your responses, particularly for questions with multiple answers.

All information collected is anonymous, confidential and will not be shared, in its raw format, with anyone outside the evaluation team.

We thank you for taking the time to answer this survey.

Sincerely,

The Evaluation Team

1	Have you worked on issues related to any of these countries: Burkina Faso, Niger, Chad, Mauritania, Mali, Lake Chad region of Cameroon, Lake Chad region of Nigeria, during the any of the following years: 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021 or 2022?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2	What is your gender?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer to not disclose
3	How old are you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Under 30 years old <input type="checkbox"/> Between 30 and 50 years old <input type="checkbox"/> Over 50 years old
4	Please select all that apply to the statement: "I have worked on issues or themes relating to these countries during these years" (multiple responses are possible). If none apply, please select "none of the above".	(Matrix: the participant will be able to selected the years worked in the Sahel countries)
5	How long have you been working on the Sahel?	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year <input type="checkbox"/> 1 to 3 years <input type="checkbox"/> 4 to 6 years <input type="checkbox"/> 7 to 9 years <input type="checkbox"/> 10 years and more
6	Which institution are you currently working for?	<input type="checkbox"/> Ministry of Foreign Affairs Oslo <input type="checkbox"/> Norad <input type="checkbox"/> Norwegian Embassy in Mali <input type="checkbox"/> Norwegian Embassy in Accra <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)
7	Please select your current position/role	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Department <input type="checkbox"/> Head of Section <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Advisor <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Director Department <input type="checkbox"/> Chief/Deputy Chief Mission (Embassy) <input type="checkbox"/> Minister Counsellor (Embassy)

		<input type="checkbox"/> First Secretary (Embassy) <input type="checkbox"/> Counsellor (Embassy) <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Officer (Embassy) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)
7	Do you think that the management set up (e.g., how you relate to the embassy, MFA, Norad, the special envoy and/or any other coordination mechanism or group within the government structure) allows/allowed you to effectively oversee the projects in the Sahel you work/worked on?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I am not sure
8	Please identify the cross-cutting issues that you feel are effectively integrated into the work you oversee/oversaw in the Sahel (you can choose several).	<input type="checkbox"/> Human rights <input type="checkbox"/> Gender <input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Corruption <input type="checkbox"/> Conflict sensitivity <input type="checkbox"/> None of the above
9	Please select all categories/elements that apply: Which areas have you received training in?	<input type="checkbox"/> Human rights <input type="checkbox"/> Gender <input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Corruption <input type="checkbox"/> Conflict sensitivity <input type="checkbox"/> None of the above
10	Do you have access to documents or tools which you use to support the inclusion of cross-cutting issues? Please mark all for which documents or tools are available. If possible, please include the name of relevant material in the comment box.	<input type="checkbox"/> Human rights <input type="checkbox"/> Gender <input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Corruption <input type="checkbox"/> Conflict sensitivity <input type="checkbox"/> None of the above
11	List all actors with whom you actively engage/engaged in coordination to ensure effective and efficient delivery of support in the Sahel (you can choose several):	(List of all the actors)
12	In your view, what makes Norwegian assistance particularly relevant to the Sahel context?	
13	Has Norway support to the Sahel been able to adapt to changes in the context? If you wish, please explain in more detail why you have answered “yes” or “no” and/or provide examples.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I am not sure
14	Are/were you engaged in donor coordination forum in the context of interventions in the Sahel?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> I am not sure

	If you wish to explain in more details your answer, please do so in the comment box. Please note how (if at all) cross-cutting issues are addressed (or not) in donor coordination forum.	
15	<p>During the time you have worked on issues related to the Sahel, have any of the following been useful to you?</p> <p>If you wish to elaborate on how these strategies have been useful to you, or list strategies not mentioned above, please do so here.</p>	(Matrix: the participant will be able to rate the usefulness of policies/strategies on a liker scale)
16	Please provide any additional information you feel would be valuable for the evaluation team.	

ANNEX 5: SURVEY RESPONSE OVERVIEW

The survey was sent to 39 MFA and Norad staff. 2 invitations remained unopened and 1 bounced back. 38.4% (15) of those who received the invitation completed the survey entirely. Question 1 acted as a ‘triage’ question for those qualified to answer the survey (i.e., “Have you worked on issues related to any of these countries: Burkina Faso, Niger, Chad, Mauritania, Mali, Lake Chad region of Cameroon, Lake Chad region of Nigeria, during the any of the following years: 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021 or 2022?”). Of the 15 who completed the survey, 11 qualified and out of the 11 qualified, 9 provided a complete answer against 2 for a partial answer. Of the 11 qualified, 4.55% and 45.45% were respectively men and women.

ANNEX 6: CASE STUDIES

A case study approach was adopted to address the requirements of the evaluation. In the inception phase, a preliminary set of interventions was selected. Following a more in-depth review of documentation, a final selection of cases was made and used in the evaluation. The cases identified, which are described below, capture the work of the principal departments and sections at the MFA in Oslo and Norad, as well as the main interventions administered by the embassy in Bamako.⁶² Relevant documentation was collected and reviewed for each case. In most cases – although not all – this had to be supplemented by interviews with grant managers and other staff.

EU AND THE EU TRUST FUND FOR THE SAHEL

Since 2016, Norway has provided over NOK 122.5 million to the EU Trust Fund for the Sahel. The Fund has now come to an end (in 2021). The initiative intended to replace it, the [Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation instrument – Global Europe](#), does not receive financial support from Norway.

The EU Trust Fund was the first instance in which Norwegian aid was channelled through an EU mechanism. The decision to support the Fund was political and followed the participation of the Norwegian prime minister at the EU-initiated high-level Summit held in Valletta in November 2015. The Fund was intended as a response to the 2014–2015 influx of asylum-seekers and refugees into Europe and the political concerns that this caused in several EU member-states. During the summit, agreement was reached on the Joint Valletta Action Plan, which led to the establishment of the *EU Emergency Trust Fund for Stability and Addressing Root Causes of Irregular Migration and Displaced Persons in Africa* (EUTF). The EU Trust Fund component on the Sahel was one of three geographical focus areas, the other two being North Africa and the Horn of Africa.

The now-dissolved Section for Migration at MFA was originally responsible for managing the Fund. When the section was dissolved, the original grant managers, who became part of the MFA's European Department, continued to manage the fund. Grant management has been carried out in close cooperation and consultation with the MFA's Section for West Africa and the Horn of Africa in the Regional Department. Funding was provided from the budget chapter on peace, security and global cooperation and its budget item on stabilisation of fragile states. No decision document was considered necessary to provide the support, but a decision memo was prepared and approved ahead of each disbursement.⁶³

Politically and diplomatically, relations with the EU have become increasingly important to Norway's Sahel engagement. This is also illustrated by Norwegian support to the EU's civilian crisis management teams (EUCAP) in the Sahel, especially in Mali, and the EU's efforts to promote security sector reform and to restore and maintain a constitutional and democratic order and the conditions for lasting peace.

⁶² Food security is a main area of focus of Norwegian engagement in the Sahel. This area is addressed as part of a separate report part of this evaluation.

⁶³ Information on the EU Trust Fund and the Norwegian support is derived from interview notes, the website of the EU Trust Fund (https://trust-fund-for-africa.europa.eu/index_en), a policy exchange seminar related to the Fund with the MFA and Norad, held on 3 February 2023 (<https://www.cmi.no/news/3087-the-eu-trust-fund-for-africa-and-implications-for-norwegian-aid>), and European Commission. 2020. Mid-Term Evaluation of the European Union Emergency Trust Fund for Stability and Addressing Root Causes of Irregular Migration and Displaced Persons in Africa 2015–2019.

SECURITY AND STABILIZATION

Following the 2015 Algiers Peace Agreement, support to security and stabilisation has been a key pillar in the Norwegian engagement in the Sahel.⁶⁴ A main component of Norwegian support has been contributions to the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), which was established in 2013. The Section for Security Policy at MFA has been responsible for managing this support. Norwegian support to MINUSMA has included the mandatory core contributions (about NOK 52 million from the aid budget in the 2016–2021 period),⁶⁵ as well as military support (managed by the Ministry of Defence and not funded from the aid budget) and the deployment of Norwegian police officers. Deployment of Norwegian military troops ended in 2022 (except for a few military staff officers at MINUSMA HQ). Norwegian police deployment ended in 2022.⁶⁶

Nearly NOK 119 million has been disbursed to the MINUSMA Trust Fund for Peace and Security in Mali. This UN Trust Fund is managed by MINUSMA's stabilisation unit and seeks, through the implementation of quick-impact projects, to bring stability and a peace dividend to areas controlled by the government and MINUSMA and to support the peace process. Funding from donors is heavily earmarked. Norway's main support via the Fund has gone to a Norwegian Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) (NIS – the Nordic International Support Foundation) and its project for electrification; to the US Carter Center for observation of the peace agreement (since 2017, the Carter Center has been the official independent observer of the implementation of the agreement); to projects related to women's participation in the peace process (for more on gender, see below); and to the preservation of the Timbuktu manuscripts.⁶⁷ Funding for these efforts has been sourced from the Africa regional chapter post and from the peace, security and global cooperation budget chapter post. Additionally, the embassy also provides funding to UN Women, partly implemented by the MINUSMA Trust Fund (NOK 12 million).

In addition to the core funding and deployment allocated to MINUSMA, there are a number of stability interventions of varying sizes that are primarily managed by the embassy in Bamako and different sections in the MFA. The embassy in Bamako manages two major stabilisation projects in the Sahel. NOK 67 million has been disbursed to the Danish–Norwegian Stabilisation Fund for the Sahel, which

⁶⁴ The Agreement for Peace and Reconciliation in Mali was signed by the government and northern armed groups, the Coordination of Azawad Movements, and the Platform of the Movement of June 14, 2014. The terms of the agreement called for the decentralization of state institutions, greater representation of peripheral areas in national institutions, the integration of combatants from the signatory armed groups into the national army, and the creation of a Northern Region Development Zone to support economic growth in northern Mali. An overview and assessment of the evolving Norwegian support to security and stabilisation in Mali and the Sahel is provided in PRIO. 2022. Review of the Strategy for Norway's Efforts in the Sahel Region 2018–2020.

⁶⁵ Up to 15% of support for the UN peacekeeping mission can be funded from the aid budget and reported as ODA. The remaining amount is from the MFA's non-aid budget. Military support is allocated from the budget of the Ministry of Defence.

⁶⁶ Norad statistics does not allow for quantification of the funding to the police deployment, which is part of a global agreement between the MFA and the Norwegian police/Ministry of Justice covering all police deployment, but the figure is estimated at NOK 20 million. For more on the MFA's management of the police deployment, see Norad Department for Evaluation. 2022. What, Why and How? A Mapping and Analysis of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' and Norad's Use of Other Norwegian Public Sector Institutions in Development Assistance.

⁶⁷ See Royal Norwegian Embassy in Bamako. 2018. Beslutningsdokument; Royal Norwegian Embassy in Bamako. 2018. Decision document, UN Trust Fund in Support of Peace and Security in Mali; and Royal Norwegian Embassy in Bamako. 2021. Decision Document, UN Trust Fund in Support of Peace and Security in Mali. See also the website of MINUSMA and the Trust Fund: [United Nations Trust Fund for Peace and Security in Mali | MINUSMA \(unmissions.org\)](https://unmissions.org)

is managed by the Danish embassy through delegated authority (a de facto core funding).⁶⁸ The Norwegian contributions amount to nearly 40% of the Fund. The Fund provides funding – through a call for proposals – to several international NGOs, as well as to UN agencies (the UN Office for Drugs and Crime, the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights). The Danish embassy previously managed the fund through a separate support office in Bamako, but from 2022 the fund has been managed from the premises of the Danish embassy in Bamako.

From the MFA in Oslo, the Section for UN Policy in the Multilateral Department manages the Norwegian core funding to the UN Peacebuilding Fund (about NOK 468 million in the period under review). This fund has a large focus on the Sahel and West Africa. The Section for Human Rights, Democracy and Gender Equality in the same department manages funding to the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, which includes a component for the human rights training of the Joint G5 force in Sahel.⁶⁹

The Section for Global Security in the MFA's Security Department supports the Geneva-based Global Community and Resilience Engagement Fund (GCREF), which – in consultation with host-country authorities – provides funding for Malian NGOs to work with local communities to prevent violent extremism (NOK 34.3 million).⁷⁰ GCREF was created by the Global Counterterrorism Forum in 2014 to serve as the first global effort to support local, community-level initiatives aimed at strengthening resilience against violent extremism. The Section for Global Security in the MFA's Security Department also funds the UN Office on Drugs and Crime for its regional Sahel programme (NOK 23.2 million) and Interpol for fighting organized crime (the latter was not examined by the evaluation team).⁷¹

The Section for Peace and Reconciliation in the MFA's Regional Department provides funding for several Sahel projects related to stabilisation and mediation (with a focus on Track Two initiatives). These efforts are mainly conducted by NGOs identified through the Section's country, regional or global partnership arrangements. The main funding has been to the French NGO Promediation. Promediation engages in independent mediation in the Sahel, with a focus on supporting the Mali peace agreement and mitigating violence through dialogue. NOK 27.5 million were disbursed to Promediation during the 2016–2021 period. This NGO was set up in 2014 with Norway as sole donor. Today, it also receives funding from other donors, including the EU.

Earlier direct funding was also provided to the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue. Currently, Norwegian funding to the Centre's Mali programme is provided through the Danish–Norwegian Sahel programme (see above).

The New York-based NGO Independent Diplomat is also a long-time recipient of Norwegian funding. The support to the Independent Diplomat's Mali programme focuses on the peace agreement and specifically on providing professional diplomatic advice and services to the Coordination of Movements of the Azawad. A multi-country Humanitarian Mediation Initiative implemented by the Norwegian Refugee Council in three countries, one of which was Mali, has also been funded. The grant

⁶⁸ For a current list of agreement partners and recipients of funds see: Royal Danish Embassy in Bamako. 2018. Final Results Report: Danish Regional Sahel Peace and Stabilisation Programme, Phase I.

⁶⁹ These projects have not been examined by the evaluation team. For more about them, see PRIO. 2022. Review of the Strategy for Norway's Efforts in the Sahel Region 2018–2020.

Note: decision documents for these interventions were not available to the evaluation team.

⁷⁰ See GCERF. 2017. Preventing Violent Extremism in Mali and Nigeria; GCERF. 2022. Annual Narrative Report Mali.

⁷¹ See United Nations Office on Drugs and Crimes & Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2019. Agreement Between the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the United Nations, Represented by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime Regarding Support to RAF-18/0059, Trust-Building in the Sahel.

agreement for the two-year project period amounted to NOK 6 million in 2021–2022 (the actual disbursements are not included in the dataset).⁷²

Importantly, Norad's Civil Society Section also manages support to Norwegian Church Aid's peacebuilding programme in Mali. The support to the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the African Union (AU) for their Sahel engagement includes funding for the recruitment and payment of staff through Norwegian Refugee Council's (NRC) NORCAP facility; for the training of police and civilians in MINUSMA through the Training for Peace in Africa Programme (managed from the embassy in Addis Ababa); and for the Kofi Annan Peacekeeping Training Centre in Ghana (managed from the embassy in Accra).

A major component in the Norwegian support to the Mali peace process involves the promotion of the involvement of women. This has been mainly managed by the embassy in Bamako and had pursued different forms of engagement, including efforts to include women as participants in the follow-up committee of the peace agreement (through the MINUSMA Trust Fund) and the establishment of the Women Observatories at the regional level (*inter alia*, through the Norad/embassy support to the Norwegian Church Aid (NCA); see below).⁷³

Parallel to support for the inclusion of women in the peace process, there has been a related effort to strengthen local ownership and implementation of Mali's National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security. This has included support to UN Women (NOK 12 million from 2019, managed from the embassy in Bamako). From 2021, the embassy has also supported the Ecole de Maintien de la Paix (EMP) for this type of activity. The grant agreement confirms an allocation of NOK 30 million over four years, of which NOK 2.4 million were disbursed in 2021. The funding to EMP is for training and capacity-building of women and men linked to the peace process and community development.⁷⁴

Additionally, this sector has also seen the use of several short-term projects responding to needs and changes in contexts. These include a 2022–2023 funding via NORCAP to help get the UN High-Level Panel on Security and Development in the Sahel, led by former president of Niger Mahamadou Issoufou, up and running.

SUPPORT THROUGH NORWEGIAN NGOS

The channelling of development aid through Norwegian NGOs has been a key feature of Norwegian aid, also in the Sahel. The main sources for this funding are the civil society budget chapter post managed by Norad and the humanitarian budget chapter post managed by the MFA in Oslo. The evaluation team examined the funding from the civil society budget post to three main recipients – Norwegian Church Aid, CARE Norway and the Atlas Alliance (a fourth, the Strømme Foundation, is examined in the education section below). Norad's Department for Civil Society managed the Norad grants to these organisations for most of the evaluation period. With the reorganisation of Norad in the latter part of the period under review – which was completed in 2021 – management responsibilities shifted to thematic sections.

The Section for Civil Society in the Department for Partnerships is responsible for grants to large NGOs such as NCA. Management responsibility for the grant to CARE Norway lies with the Section for Gender

⁷² Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2023. Final Report for Grants from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) for Humanitarian Mediation Initiative from the Norwegian Refugee Council.

⁷³ See also the presentation and discussion of this in PRIO. 2022. Review of the Strategy for Norway's Efforts in the Sahel Region 2018–2020.

⁷⁴ See Royal Norwegian Embassy in Bamako. 2021. Decision document. Support to Ecole de Maintien de la Paix for capacity building and training of main actors on peace and security in Mali.

Equality in the Department for Human Development. Grants to the Atlas Alliance are managed by the Section for Human Rights in the same department.

The Section for Civil Society is responsible for allocating funds to other Norad sections managing grants to recipients from this chapter post for civil society. About NOK 1 billion from this post is disbursed to projects and activities in the Sahel. This represents more than 40% of Norway's earmarked funding to the Sahel in the period under review. Importantly, the funding for these projects is not based on Norwegian priorities related to the Sahel, but determined by the NGOs applying for funding themselves. The applying NGO defines the project they will implement and identify the country where the project will be implemented. Norad will approve or reject individual projects on the basis of an assessment of the projects.

Disbursements to Norwegian Church Aid (mainly to Mali) from Norad during the period under evaluation equalled NOK 136 million. This amount includes some grants made directly from the embassy in Bamako (totalling nearly NOK 6 million). Currently, funding from the Africa regional budget chapter post is managed by Norad's Civil Section as an addendum to the allocation from the civil society budget chapter post.⁷⁵ Additionally, some NOK 40 million were disbursed from the MFA's Humanitarian Section to NCA. In the first part of the period under review, these grants were based on annual grants following applications from NCA, but following the release of the 2018 humanitarian strategy, NCA successfully applied to become a strategic partner and receives multi-annual humanitarian grants. Total funds disbursed to NCA during the period covered by this evaluation are about NOK 176 million. Formally, there are no links between the MFA's Humanitarian Section and Norad's Section for Civil Society in relation to NCA, but they seek to keep each other informed. They also attend each other's annual meetings with NCA.

NOK 263 million were disbursed to CARE Norway for two contracts. One grant is for a food security and adaptation to climate change project in rural Niger (NOK 75 million). This has been managed by the embassy in Bamako. Prior to the establishment of the embassy, the funds were administered by the embassy in Accra.⁷⁶ The other contract pertains to the Mali and Niger components of CARE Norway's global Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Programme (NOK 188 million). This is funded from the civil society budget chapter (through the framework agreement between Norad and CARE Norway) and is managed by Norad's Section for Gender Equality.⁷⁷ Among Norwegian NGOs, CARE Norway is the second-largest recipient of grant funds (after NRC) for Sahel projects. CARE Norway does not receive funding from the MFA's Humanitarian Section (it was unsuccessful in its application to become a strategic partner).

Lastly, the support for the Atlas Alliance's Niger project was also examined. This intervention received NOK 37 million in disbursements in 2019 as part of an Atlas-led consortium of Norwegian NGOs engaged in Niger and focusing on inclusive education. The support to Atlas Alliance is managed by Norad's Section for Human Rights. Funding is provided from two different budget posts: the civil society budget chapter post and through a call for proposals from the budget chapter on equality and its new chapter post on vulnerable groups. The Niger project is part of a multi-country programme.

⁷⁵ For further details, see the Norad (2020) decision document and the 2023 appropriation letter from the MFA to Norad. See also Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2023. Tildelingsbrev til Direktoratet for utviklingssamarbeid, p. 10.

⁷⁶ See Royal Norwegian Embassy in Bamako. 2021. Decision document.

⁷⁷ See Norad. 2020. Decision document; Norad. 2021. Referat. Årlig møte mellom Norad og CARE Norge 09. desember 2021.

EDUCATION: THE STRØMME FOUNDATION AND UNICEF

Education is a main area of focus for Norwegian aid to the Sahel. The funding for education also includes funding provided as core and non-earmarked funding to multilateral institutions and funds (such as Global Partnership in Education (GPE)). Norwegian funding to education includes substantial humanitarian funding. Funding to the education sector is managed by Norad (core funding, earmarked funding to Mali and regional/multi-country programmes), the MFA (humanitarian funding to education in crisis and emergencies, mainly in the Lake Chad area) and the embassy in Mali (mainly to education in Niger, first through delegated authority with Switzerland and later as a direct contribution to the education fund of the Niger government).

The evaluation team examined two earmarked grants to two recipients: the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the Strømme Foundation. NOK 210 million were disbursed to the Strømme Foundation, mainly for education projects. These funds were allocated to the speed school projects in Mali, Niger and Burkina Faso. The Strømme Foundation was the biggest recipient of grants from a 2016 global Norad call for proposals as part of the allocations from the civil society budget chapter post.[1] The grant from Norad was for a three-year period, but implementation delays and the impact of Covid-19 led to no-cost extensions. No funding was originally provided for 2022, but bridging funding was made possible in early 2023, allowing for a continuation in 2023.[2] From 2024, it is expected that funding to the Strømme Foundation will have to come from Norad's regular civil society funding. The Strømme Foundation also uses funds from its regular framework contract with Norad for education-related projects in Mali, Niger and Burkina Faso. Grants for the the Strømme Foundation projects are managed by Norad's education section.

Total earmarked disbursements to UNICEF for the 2016–2021 period amounted to NOK 523 million. Norad's Education Section manages the education grants to UNICEF, which amount to NOK 388 million. These funds have financed a two-year agreement (2016–2018) related to Niger, a one-year agreement related to Mali (2016), and a three-year agreement from 2017 covering Mali, Niger and Burkina Faso. NOK 126 million were disbursed from the MFA's Humanitarian Section in connection with education in emergencies, including for Education Cannot Wait. The Sahel funding to Education Cannot Wait is mainly linked to the Lake Chad area. The total resources allocated to Education Cannot Wait include significant funding to Yemen and Syria. The humanitarian funding is provided both from the humanitarian and the education budget chapter posts.

Department for Evaluation