

# PROLINNOVA E-evaluation 2011

Marissa Espineli, Laurens van Veldhuizen and Mariana Wongtschowski

## Respondents

### ❖ Round 1

A total of 13 responses representing 10 organizations and 21 respondents (South Africa (2), Uganda (3) Ethiopia (1), Mozambique (3), Cambodia (1), Ghana (2), Tanzania (1), Nepal(1), IIRR (4) and the Secretariat (3))

### ❖ Round 2

The second round received 9 responses representing 9 organizations (*Ethiopia, Uganda, Ghana (2), Niger, South Africa, Kenya, Cambodia, IIRR (4) and ETC (3)*) representing 15 respondents

# Process

## Round 1

1. Governance
2. Learning, sharing of information among partners and country programs
3. Capacity building
4. Functioning of the IST and the Secretariat
5. Increased international awareness on PID/Prolinnova
6. Self- assessment

## Round 1: Summary assessment (with last year's scores)

<b>Governance</b> 3.72 (3.9)	Functioning of POG 3.85 (4.3)	Influencing decision making 3.62 (3.5)	Efficiency/ transparency in fund mgt 3.85 (3.7)	Joint strategy devt and PME 3.54 (4.1)
<b>Learning, sharing of info</b> 3.44 (3.8)	Direct Country to C exchange 2.85 (3.2)	Sharing: yahoo group/ website 4.0 (4.1)	Sharing and learning thru intl meetings 3.69 (3.7)	Cross-country visits 3.23 (4.2)
<b>Capacity building</b> 3.32 (3.2)	International wkshops/sems 3.38 (3.3)	Training events at international level 3.69 (3.4)	"On the job" support during visits 3.67 (3.4)	Backstopping by other CPs 2.54 (2.7)
<b>Functioning of the IST and the Secretariat</b> 3.88 (3.9)	Secretariat's role 4.09 (4.3)	Regular IST support 4.27 (4.3)	Facilitating n support M&E at various levels 3.27 (3.4)	Support FRaising and devt of new sub programs 3.91 (3.5)
<b>Increased international awareness</b> 3.45 (3.6)	Recognition/ partnership with international research org 3.46 (3.8)	Number and quality of intl Prolinnova publications, spread and use 3.85 (3.4)	Reference to PID and Prolinnova experiences in publications, websites 3.17 (4.3)	Actual institutional change towards PID in intl partners/orgs 3.31 (3.0)
<b>Self assessment</b> 3.36	Reaching goals 3.45	Governance at CP level 3.73	Functioning of Secretariat CP 3.73	Communication bet partners 3.73

## Summary assessment

Potential for continuation without funding  
from Prolinnova international – 2.18

Over all performance average – 3.53

International level – 3.56

National level – 3.36

## Round 2

### Contentious issues

1. Functioning of POG related to fundraising
2. Country-to-country exchange of info
3. Capacity building ideas, backstopping by other CPs
4. The IST role in monitoring and evaluation
5. Quantity and quality of publications
6. Self-assessment: fundraising, leadership and communication practices

## Analysis: Governance

- ❖ Generally happy
- ❖ Not fully understanding the role of POG by those coming from the CPs
- ❖ Suggested roles: leads in fundraising, sharing donor info, sharing successes of other CPs
- ❖ Other issues: IST's role, CPs role, Secretariat role,

## Analysis: Country to Country learning and info exchange

- ❖ Creative ways for learning and exchange between and among CPs, IST, POG and Secretariat
- ❖ Only two CPs were able to do country-to-country this year
- ❖ Use of Skype, You Tube, podcasting, etc
- ❖ Regionalization as an approach
- ❖ Focal person for each CP on info exchange

## Analysis: Capacity building

- ❖ Backstopping by other CPs none
- ❖ Information from international events do not filter down to national partners or if it does, very limited
- ❖ Use of the internet
- ❖ Role of country back stoppers
- ❖ Awareness on the abilities of other CPs

## Analysis: Role of IST/Secretariat

- ❖ IST support positively recognized, Secretariat's role highly valued: fundraising, support to planning, slow transfer of fund
- ❖ Monitoring and evaluation: given attention at the international level not sufficiently supported at the national level
- ❖ Different CPs at different stages of M&E development
- ❖ Inability to synchronize activities unable to tap opportunities

## Analysis: Increased international attention to PID/PROLINNOVA

- ❖ Respondents had difficulty rating institutional change towards PID at the international level
- ❖ Mixed views on quality of publications: awareness on the list
- ❖ CP to contribute to international journals
- ❖ Not sure how PROLINNOVA is creating impact internationally (individual vs network-wide interaction)

## Self assessment

- Transparency and decentralization in fund management are good practices
- Good communication and leadership empowers national coordination
- Irregularity of NSC meetings, usurpation of roles, marginalizing partners and lack of transparency considered not helpful
- Recognition that CPs are at different levels of institutionalizing Prolinnova

## Conclusion

In 2010, PROLINNOVA has performed well as an international network, **3.53** rating. Compared to 3.7 in 2009, 2010 rating is a little lower.

- ❖ Self assessment – continuation without Prolinnova funding score is lowest, review of partnership at the local level
- ❖ Clarity in fundraising role
- ❖ Less opportunities for training
- ❖ Backstopping by CPs has not happened
- ❖ M&E at national level

## Action Areas

Action areas	Proposed actions	Possible lead
Governance: POG's role in fundraising	❖ Clarity on the role of POG, IST, Secretariat and CPs	POG
	❖ Identifying lead organization in CPs	CPs
	❖ Review of cost sharing note	POG

## Action Areas

Action areas	Proposed actions	Possible lead
Learning and sharing: Cross visits, and internet - based info exchange	❖ Provide information about CPs on capabilities	Secretariat
	❖ Regionalization	CPs
	❖ Structured activities: conferencing, yahoo groups	All

## Action Areas

Action areas	Proposed actions	Possible lead
International capacity building: backstopping by other CPs and face to face meetings	❖ Awareness on the abilities of other CPs	All, Secretariat/ POG lead
	❖ Linking CPs	CPs
	❖ Sharing information to others in the NSC and CP	CPs



## Action Areas

Action areas	Proposed actions	Possible lead
Functioning of IST/Sec re M&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Review and analyse present M&amp;E functioning: what is already being done? What are gaps at various levels? How do we use info for reflection? The role of focal point?</li> </ul>	Secretariat , IIR, CPs
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Plan focused capacity building on M&amp;E at all levels, use of local resource people and back stoppers</li> </ul>	CPs + Secretariat , IIRR

## Action Areas

Action areas	Proposed actions	Possible lead
International awareness creation: publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Publications distribution strategy that would allow tracking</li> <li>❖ Assessing usefulness</li> </ul>	Secretariat + ? IIRR
Monitoring and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Capacity building for some CPs in early stage of development</li> <li>❖ Roles, functions, finalizing revised guidelines</li> </ul>	IST/IIRR /CPs IST/IIRR
Self-assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Review of partnership arrangements at CP level</li> <li>❖ Revival of enthusiasm</li> </ul>	POG/IST /CPs

## Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop in Ethiopia

- Participatory monitoring and evaluation:  
Basic concepts and principles
- The Importance of Strengthening the  
Learning in the PMEL System
- The PROLINNOVA M&E system,
- Facilitating PM&E in a project environment
- Facilitating PM&E in a network  
environment
- Sharing and utilizing PME results.

## Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop in Ethiopia

- Alternative tools: Outcomes mapping, Most  
Significant Change and the Writeshop Approach
- Fieldwork
- Reviewing the current M&E framework for the  
network
- Timeline workshop for the Network research
- Networking action research Workshop
- Approaches to fundraising
- Action Plan

## IIRR's 2011 plan

- Electronic evaluation
- Electronic backstopping on M&E to country programs in preparing their M&E framework
- Finalization of the revised M&E guidelines
- Support to CP partnership consolidation work
- Face to face backstopping on M&E (2)