

FINAL REPORT

ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEW OF EMIS

Norad
Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

P.O. Box 8034 Dep, NO-0030 OSLO
Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway
Phone: +47 22 24 20 30 Fax: +47 22 24 20 31

Layout and print:
ISBN
ISSN 1502-2528

ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEW OF EMIS

FINAL REPORT

Oslo, August 2010

.Team members:

Jarle Haarstad, Scanteam
Knut Lakså, Norad

Acronyms

AIDSESP	Interethnic Association for the Development of the Peruvian Rainforest Coordinator of the Indigenous Organization of the Amazon
ASDA	Ethiopian NGO on development alternatives
COICA	Coordinadora de Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica
COP	Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
DF	Development Fund
EMiS	Environmental Movements in the South
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMP	Environmental Management Plan
FIVAS	Association for International Water Studies
FoE	Friends of the Earth
INGO	International Non-governmental Organisation
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NCG	Nordic Consulting Group
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NOK	Norwegian Kroner
NAPEDC	Norwegian Action Plan for Environment in Development Cooperation
NVF	Norges Naturvernforbund (Friends of the Earth)
NRM	Natural Resource Management
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OPIAC	Organization of the Columbian Indigenous Peoples of the Amazon
QA	Quality Assurance
RF	Rainforest Foundation
TOR	Terms of Reference
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

Table of Contents:

Acronyms	5
Table of Contents:	6
Executive Summary	7
1. Introduction	9
1.1 Origin and Function of EMiS	9
1.2 EMiS' Objectives	9
1.3 Contents of the report	10
2. Approach of the Organizational Review	11
2.1 Analytic Model for Interpreting Results	11
2.2 Data Sources	11
2.3. The Capacities of EMiS Members	12
3. Administrative and management aspects of EMiS	16
3.1 The EMiS Board and Secretariat	16
3.2 Selection of Countries	16
3.3 System for country and institutional assessments	17
3.3.1 Quality of assessments	18
3.3.2 Note on the templates	18
3.3.3 Score of assessments	19
3.4 Systems for project appraisals, approval and evaluation	20
3.5 Systems for financial management and anti-corruption	22
4. Networking and partnerships	24
4.1 EMiS' operational modalities	24
4.2 Advocacy and lobbying	26
4.3 Professional competence- and capacity-building	27
4.4. EMiS as a network and resource centre	28
5. Specific data sources	30
5.1. <i>Support to indigenous peoples in the Amazonas</i>	30
5.1.1 Objective	30
5.1.2 Project relevance, risks and results	31
5.2. Support to the Accra Caucus	32
6. The Added Value of EMiS	34
6.1 Added value of a different approach	34
6.2 Added value of new forms for cooperation and management	35
6.3 Added value of the members' professional competence	35
6.4 Summing up: strengths, weaknesses, risks, opportunities	36
7. Conclusions and Recommendations	39
7.1. Conclusions	39
7.2 Recommendations	40
Annex 1: Terms of Reference	42
Annex 2: People met and interviewed by the Team:	47
Annex 3: List of Country and Institutional Analyses	49
Annex 4: 2008-2-10 EMiS Prosjektliste	51

Executive Summary

EMiS is an umbrella organization consisting of seven Norwegian NGOs with partly different mandates and working methods. What these NGOs have in common is expertise in natural resource management, advocacy on environmental issues and experience with project management, as well as a common objective of strengthening environmental organizations in the South. Some of the reasons for forming a separate umbrella organization were (i) to create complementarity among the Norwegian partners, and (ii) the desire to create synergy effects both in Norway and cooperating countries that could add more value than what an individual organization achieved by its own. The idea was that these organizations and their partners could share knowledge, exchange experiences and benefit from each others' comparative advantages, both in Norway, in the international arena, and among partners in the targeted countries.

Norad has decided to carry out an organisational performance review of EMiS, since the project is now entering into its final pilot year (2008 – 2010). Simultaneously, EMiS has just commissioned an external evaluation with project assessment in three countries, undertaken by the Nordic Consultant Group (NCG)¹. Although there are some overlaps between the two studies, they are largely complimentary and should be read in conjunction to one another in order to get the best possible overview. Where NCG's report is emphasizing results in the field, partnerships and outcomes, this review has focused more on analyzing systems, procedures, activities, management, monitoring, technical input, etc. Although most of the report focuses on the administrative set-up of EMiS, some parts analyze the tentative results achieved by EMiS till now.

Thematically, EMiS is very relevant, directly relating to the Norwegian Action Plan for Environment in Development Cooperation. It is the team's opinion that focusing on capacity and advocacy of environmental movements in the South is important, and that funding should continue either through EMiS or other channels, also keeping in mind that support to capacity building and advocacy work constitutes a key part of the "Guidelines for support to Civil Society". In the team's opinion, there are some promising results from the pilot period, and the objective indicators have been met to some extent. "Measurable changes", however, have proven difficult to verify at this stage.

Apart from its function as a funding mechanism, EMiS has developed objectives, systems, templates and procedures for project proposals, reports, and country and institutional assessments. It has also developed an M&E plan and procedures for management, monitoring and follow-up. EMiS is governed by its Board, of 3 – 5 members. The EMiS Secretariat consists of only one full-time employee, in addition to some part time functions. Its capacity has consequently been limited to fulfill its – perhaps overly - ambitious strategy. Also, there are examples where EMiS does not implement its own management regulations – in particular related to undertaking institutional assessments and country studies. As a result, the umbrella organization's role has emphasized coordination, making suggestions and input to plans and reports, but it has not functioned as a forum for strategic assessments, quality enhancement

¹ Nordic Consulting Group: External evaluation of EMiS. June 2010.

and joint cooperation in the field. There have been a few noteworthy examples of cooperation between EMiS members in some countries, as well as two joint workshops with partners, in Kenya and the Philippines.

Although projects go through an initial screening process in the board, management and follow-up are left to the individual organization. Apart from the initial screening of projects, there have been few joint initiatives or projects. Additionally, there are some clear indications of conflicts of interest in the way the board has been constituted and its project-approval role. The three initial founding members have more or less divided the funds equally, and aligned projects according to some common criteria. It appears that critical rating of projects has lesser priority, and there are no examples where proposed projects have actually been rejected; only delayed in some cases. Despite having a system of country and institutional assessments in place, this system has not been utilized according to intentions, and has only to a limited extent functioned as basis for strategic choices, priorities as well as monitoring purposes.

EMiS has been running for a relatively short time, and many of the decisions made have been coloured by the fact that the members have certainty of funding for only three years. The review team believes EMiS's potential could be further developed. This would require a change of the organizational set-up of EMiS, and also a more active involvement by the Norwegian aid authorities in determining goals, eligibility of membership, and focal areas of operation and adopting or reviewing various administrative and management guidelines. The review contains a number of recommendations to that effect.

1. Introduction

1.1 Origin and Function of EMiS

EMiS was established as a response to the Norwegian Action Plan for Environment in Development Cooperation (2006), when the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) in December 2007 invited the Development Fund (DF), the Rainforest Foundation (RF) and WWF-Norway to elaborate a concept and an organizational model for how to further strengthen environmental movements in developing countries in line with the intentions of the Action Plan. In June 2009 four additional organisations joined EMiS: Bellona, Norges Naturvernforbund (NVF- Friends of the Earth Norway), Miljøagentene (Eco-agents) and the Association for International Water Studies (FIVAS).

EMiS concentrates its effort and funding in ODA-countries which are facing major environmental challenges, where the Norwegian EMiS member organizations are already represented and where suitable, qualified local partners are identified. EMiS's Norwegian member organisations have funded about 27 organisations in 22 countries (regions/areas) in Africa, Asia and South-America in the period 2008-2010. EMiS supports four thematic areas, of which the main is the protection of biological diversity and sustainable management of natural resources. The organizational review will particularly address this area. Other areas are water resources management, implementation of climate-related activities and reduction of hazardous substances (environmental poisons).

During 2008-2010, the level of funding from Norad is NOK 62.5 mill. In early 2008, the MFA added NOK 7.5 mill. for the initial period. All these projects are aiming at strengthening political advocacy and social mobilization capacity. Most of the participating organisations receive direct organizational support from Norad and some also funding through specific programmes like “Oil for Development”.

The EMiS support was initially only available to countries where the Norwegian EMiS member organizations had prior engagements. In the pilot period, long-term (3 year) project support was given mainly to those local partners with whom the EMiS member organization had already established relations. EMiS is also supporting regional environmental projects and networks. In addition, seed money and short-term support could be given to new potential partners in countries where the member organization is already represented. In 2010, new countries have also been added in response to the priorities proposed by two of the new EMiS members; NVF and Bellona.

1.2 EMiS' Objectives

The overall goal of EMiS is primarily environmental capacity development and enhancement of policy analysis and advocacy work of the partner organizations in Africa, Asia and Latin America..

EMiS aims in particular at NGOs with focus on:

- Assisting and strengthening NGOs that have competence in relation to the environment, natural resources and rights to property, and that seek to

persuade authorities at all levels in partner countries to put environmental issues higher on the agenda and pursue a more credible and effective environmental policy;

- Empowering local communities, including indigenous peoples, to claim their rights to the property, land and natural resources on which they depend for their sustenance;
- Promoting popular participation, particularly of women, in the management of natural resources;
- Helping to ensure that NGOs base their activities on sound sustainable development policies.

Key principles of EMiS are that the environmental movements must fully “own” their environment agenda, and that the purpose of the Norwegian contributions is to advise and support them in their capacity building effort with focus on advocacy, and mainstreaming the emphasis on women’s rights and their importance for development. Key values are *respect, dignity, equity/justice*, meaningful *participation* of all relevant stakeholders and *transparency* at all stages.

1.3 Contents of the report

In the TOR, the core issues of this organizational review are whether EMiS has an added value in the strengthening of environmental organizations/institutions/efforts to the benefit of selected developing countries. This hinges on such issues as its performance in -

- Selecting good/best partners and strengthening the local ownership;
- Instituting good measures for the cooperation and coordination of efforts;
- Supporting adequate forms of capacity building, advocacy and sharing of experiences;
- Promoting efficient forms of participation and networking;
- Achieving good performance as “change agents” for capacity development and accountability;
- Promoting efficient establishment/transfer of management systems, transparency and sustainability;
- Devising good systems for project planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting; and
- Establishing good systems for identifying and disseminating project results and lessons on “good practice”.

In Chapter 2, the approach and the data sources of this review are presented as well as the capacities of the seven EMiS members.

Chapter 3 sets out the administrative and management aspects of EMiS, including its board and secretariat. The list of cooperating countries is presented, together with the team’s assessment of country and institutional reviews that have been made. Further, the systems for project reviews, approval and monitoring and evaluations are assessed.

In chapter 4 the team reviews EMiS' specific operational modalities, of which the most important are capacity building and advocacy. Its function as a resource center is also assessed.

Chapter 5 includes the team's own field review of the support to indigenous organizations in the Peruvian part of Amazonas, and a questionnaire survey of the Accra Caucus's work on the aid modality Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD).

In chapter 6 the team assesses the added value of EMiS, compared to likely alternatives. For this purpose it also makes a "Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats" (SWOT) analysis, containing a table of "strength", "weaknesses", "risks" and "opportunities". This is followed by conclusions and recommendations in Ch. 7.

2. Approach of the Organizational Review

2.1 Analytic Model for Interpreting Results

The main methodology of the review is a SWOT analysis. It operates from the perspective that the organisation must have basic abilities/capacities and organisational performance, in order to deliver effective environmental and developmental cooperation. The team has identified especially four key capacities/abilities, which are assessed throughout the report. These are:

- **IDENTITIES.** The backgrounds and identities of the seven NGOs that form EMiS and their individual and combined professional capacities to inform and lead relevant and effective activities.
- **ORGANISATIONAL CAPACITY.** The professional and analytic bases in the seven NGOs and the combined umbrella system to design policies, make wise choices with regards to cooperation, and establish management systems to guide their work.
- **NETWORKING AND PARTNERING CAPACITIES.** The ability to analyze their own strengths, to determine their own roles and to engage in trusting and effective partnerships with relevant and effective developing country partners.
- **ADDED VALUE OF EMiS.** The ability to add the various partners' actual and potential capacities and to attain optimal implementation strength, through role sharing, coordination, delegation of responsibilities and knowledge management.

2.2 Data Sources

Since the total resources available for the external organizational review were more limited than the NCG-led evaluation, it was planned all along that the organizational

review would partly base its findings on the NCG-evaluation, and complement rather than duplicate its data collection.

The main data collection methods of the NCG-led evaluation were:

- a) an internal self-assessment questionnaire amongst the 20 project promoters and EMiS partners in the South:
- b) field visits to some of the main collaborating partners of EMiS in Malaysia, Uganda and Ethiopia (Africa receives around 50 per cents of the funds). . These projects seem quite representative for larger parts of the EMiS portfolio. Also, the countries clearly provided different challenges as regards the work of the NGO as change agents at various levels.

The main data sources for the current external organizational review were:

- Perusal of all relevant documents related to the establishment and the operation of the EMiS programme;
- Interviews with Norwegian aid authorities, the EMiS Secretariat and the seven member organizations, and well as NGOs which are not members of EMiS;
- Analyses of country and institutional assessments with respect to the standards/templates that EMiS had developed for both such assessments. The EMiS guidelines require special reviews of new organizations that are (to be) supported. It is also recommended that EMiS conduct special reviews of all cooperating countries. The team reviewed how these assessments had been utilized in practice and whether they form bases for (among other things) joint efforts by the EMiS partners, *inter alia* to bring out synergy in the cooperation.
- A questionnaire review of the effects and effectiveness of the exchange of international organizational experiences, with special focus on the capacity building and advocacy methods in the REDD context during the Climate Conference (COP 15) that were used in Copenhagen in 2009, in another climate conference and some seminars;
- A field evaluation of the project “An effective and innovative alliance with indigenous peoples for conservation and development of the Amazon”.

2. 3. The Capacities of EMiS Members

The majority of the seven implementing agencies that are currently members of EMiS have similar backgrounds and values. Even if there are some differences in their organizational background and their perspectives on environmental and developmental assistance, more factors tie them together than separates them. The eligibility criteria for membership in EMiS states that only Norwegian organizations whose main purpose - or one if its main purposes is environmental work may become members. The current members are:

- i) The Development Fund (DF). Established in 1978 as a separate Norwegian registered NGO, the DF currently has about 1350 regular contributors. It grew out of a broad-based environmental movement "The Future in Our Hands". The DF's strategic objectives comprise a) social mobilization of organizations representing poor and marginalized peoples; b) sustainable agriculture with main focus on agrobiodiversity; c) more secure environmental and natural resource utilization during periods of climate change; d) improved pastoral economies in dry-lands; and e) promoting a higher visibility of environmental and poverty issues.
- ii) The Rainforest Foundation Norway, which was founded in 1989 and has evolved to be a sizeable organization of its kind by European standards. It endeavours to preserve rainforests and the rights of the peoples who live in these forests. The bulk of its supporters are also members of "NVF", "Nature and Youth", "The Future in our Hands" and "Eco-agents". RFN advocates a rights-based approach to rainforest protection, believing that the peoples who for generations have developed their cultures and societies in balanced interaction with the vulnerable ecosystems of rainforests have fundamental rights to these areas, and that the most effective way of protecting rainforests is to secure the territorial rights of its indigenous peoples.
- iii) The Worldwide Fund for Nature Norway (WWF) founded in 1971. The main office of its parent organizations is in Switzerland, and counts "autonomous offices" in about 30 donor and recipient countries, and 5 "semi-autonomous" offices. The overall WWF organisation is one of the big international organizations, well financed and managed, but which is at times perceived to be collaborating more with governments and sponsoring firms than with local population groups. Initially it was seen as being more concerned with the protection of flagship species than with broader environmental and development problems. However, it has for quite a while also been pursuing strategies of getting much more involved with, and respectful of, local communities and indigenous peoples in their supported projects. In its advocacy work WWF is campaigning to reduce humanity's ecological footprint – the amount of land and natural resources needed to supply food, water, fibre and timber, and to absorb CO₂ emissions.

In 2009, EMiS was expanded to include four new members. These are Bellona, Eco-Agents, FIVAS and Friends of the Earth (NVF):

- iv) NVF was founded in 1914 and is Norway's largest environmental conservation organization with a total membership of about 19,000. NVF initiated its aid work during the 1980s, increasing the portfolio throughout the 1990s. Its main focus was on former Soviet Union and East Europe through its SPARE program on primary education. In 2004/5 NVF started working in Africa through Friends of the Earth in Nigeria, but NVF has recruited personnel who have a much longer track record within environmental and development assistance.
- v) Bellona was founded in 1986. It has since expanded quickly and has a high profile in various environmental issues especially in Norway and Russia, but also in Europa and the US. Its engagement in developing countries is relatively new. It perceives its merits in EMiS to be its competence and focus on environmental rights and environmental journalism, its relationships and cooperation with the

research and private sectors, and its engagements in combating releases of poisons and hazardous chemicals to water and the atmosphere. At present Bellona's role in EMiS is concentrated mainly on the initiation of a project in a new cooperating country, Ghana.

- vi) FIVAS, founded in 1988, is working for a “fair and sustainable water management in developing countries”. It maps and disseminates information about the likely consequences of large hydro-electric and other large water-related projects. It has international contacts to similar organizations. It is a very small organization; is not involved in the design or implementation of specific projects, and does not have capacity to sit on the board.
- vii) The Eco-Agents (Miljøagentene) is NVF's wing for children between 4 -14 years of age. There are about 4,000 members in this independent club. The organization focuses especially on providing environmental information and discussion points to youths. Miljøagentene is not represented on the board.

Table 1 below presents the team's description of EMiS members' competencies in the four thematic areas of emphasis by the Norwegian Environmental Action Plan: biodiversity/natural resource management, climate change, hazardous chemicals (environmental poisons) and water, as well as the organizations' networks in developing countries. Most activities have been undertaken within biodiversity/natural resource management, which was also the prioritized area in EMiS' pilot phase. The lack of engagement by anyone in the other three areas is thus not a surprise. However, if EMiS is entering a second phase, the team would recommend that all the four Action Plan areas are covered.

Of the two new EMiS members Bellona and FIVAS have respectively relatively long track records with hazardous chemicals and water resources. However, Bellona's experience is essentially from developed countries and countries with economies in transition. The experience of FIVAS is mostly related to advocacy work on the adverse effects of hydro-electric water projects carried out by Norwegian companies. FIVAS is also engaged in promoting the right to potable water as a central human right, and is often opposed to the World Water Council's promotion of turning drinking water into a commodity, since this threatens poor peoples' interests.

Table 1. EMiS member organizations' special background/competencies²

Organisation	Biodiversity, Natural resource mgmt.	Climate	Hazardous chemicals (environmental Poisons)	Water resources management	Experience in developing countries
DF	XX	XX		X	XX
RFN	XX	XX			XX
WWF-No	XX	XX			XX
NVF	XX	XX		X	X
BELLONA	X	XX	X		
FIVAS				X	X
ECO-Agents	X	X			

² X = partial experience; XX = experienced

Whereas most will view treatment of hazardous chemicals as large scale tasks carried out in national incinerators, there are also options for smaller scale bio-remediation. In any case, efforts for safe storage, use and disposal of environmental poisons are becoming increasingly relevant within farm management and elsewhere.

Given the increasing importance of water management in the context of climate change, it is the team's view that more efforts should in future be made within water resources management. There are other Norwegian organizations that have wide experience in areas such as rainwater harvesting, the construction of water catchments along small rivers to provide water for agricultural use, improvement of water storage systems, irrigation projects and more.

3. Administrative and management aspects of EMiS

3.1 The EMiS Board and Secretariat

Until mid-2009, EMiS was governed by a board consisting of one representative from each from the three founding organizations. It was then supplemented by two new members from among its new members. The board decides on annual workplans and budgets, as well as individual project allocations. The board has an advisory role and control function for programme and organisational matters. During 2008-2010, the budget support from Norad and MFA has been split in nearly three equal parts, which may be an indication that board representation has been a more decisive factor for project allocations than assuring quality of the applications. The allocations to the four new members have been very modest in 2010, with partly the exception of NVF.

The EMiS Secretariat consists of one full-time coordinator with some part-time assistance. The secretariat is responsible for the daily running of the organisation, networking, and communication and information work. This includes facilitation of exchanges, joint seminars and workshops in Norway and in the South, among other activities. The coordinator has also responsibility for programme management and coordination, including giving technical advice. The secretariat has undertaken the task of creating common systems for planning and management. Guidelines and templates have been developed for most aspects of the work, including assessments before inclusion of new countries and new organizational partners are included into the portfolio. There are also common formats for project application, project reporting and monitoring. The coordinator collects and evaluates narrative and financial reports for each project and, as regulated in the Norad contract, submits annual reports for the whole programme. There has also been a degree of harmonization of financial reporting and auditing.

The project preparation process is left to each EMiS member organization, while the other members of the board peer-review each others' projects at the application/approval stage.

3.2 Selection of Countries

According to strategy, funding is to focus on "ODA countries which are facing major environmental challenges, where the Norwegian EMiS member organizations are already represented and where suitable, qualified local partners are identified." The following countries are represented in the portfolio:

Africa: Ethiopia, Uganda, Madagascar, DR Congo, Malawi, Zambia, Kenya.

South and South East Asia: Indonesia, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Papua New Guinea

Latin America: Bolivia, Peru.

Regional programmes:

- Southeast Asia Regional Initiatives for Community Empowerment, SEARICE;
- Regional organization of Amazon Indigenous Peoples, COICA (See Ch. 5.1).

One regional programme the African Community, Biodiversity, Development and Conservation Programme, CBDC Africa (Zimbabwe, Malawi, Lesotho, Zambia, Ethiopia, Mali, Burkina Faso, Sierra Leone), has closed.

However, the above list of cooperating countries has been somewhat revised, as qualified partners have not been identified in all countries. EMiS is at present funding projects in 18 different countries³, in addition to three global programmes (see annex 4 for list of projects). According to the survey undertaken by NCG, 68 % of current partners were already working with one of the three founders prior to EMiS cooperation.

3.3 System for country and institutional assessments

The country and institutional reports provided an important source of information, and were expected to play a role in selection of partners and projects. Upon request, EMiS provided the team with seven country assessments, two regional assessments (on climate and oil extraction in Sub Saharan Africa), and 14 institutional assessments. The member organizations have sole responsibility for undertaking such assessments; the EMiS coordinator's role is limited to being informed of the assessments and providing input thereon. The need for an assessment shall be defined by the respective member organization, and shall be described in the annual application to EMiS (Plan for Monitoring and Evaluation"). Institutional assessments of any partner can be undertaken by one of the other members, "if and when practically possible." However, this has not happened so far.

Ideally, one would think that before a project is initiated, country reviews along with institutional assessments would form the basis of prioritizing funds among different countries, contexts and partners. However, most of EMiS's partners have a history of previous cooperation with the Norwegian EMiS members, and each institution has used different types of assessments in the past. Partly for this reason, some assessments have been undertaken that have not utilized the EMiS template. Also, a number of countries and partners have not been covered by such assessments, perhaps because it was not perceived as necessary given the members' previous experience, or because the number of EMiS members escalated due to an increase in developing country partners by 32% during 2008 - 2010. It is the team's impression that an EMiS expansion of new participating organizations is constituting a heavy burden for existing EMiS staff and procedures, and that the preference should be put on qualitative improvements rather than expanding the number of partners.

³ Note that the SEARICE project (DF), based in the Philippines, also involves work in nine additional countries in South East Asia: Lao PDR, Vietnam, Thailand, Bhutan, Indonesia, Burma, China, Malaysia and Timor Leste.

3.3.1 Quality of assessments

The team finds that the EMiS requirements of country- and institutional assessments before project selection and preparation represent necessary steps towards quality projects. Consequently, the team made an assessment of the existing EMiS country and institutional reports. Figure 1 presents the model for the analyses.

Figure 1. Model of a systematic approach to evaluation quality



Source: SIDA studies: 2008

Quality utilization indicates the actual benefit of the findings from the reports, as well as how and to what extent they are put to use. In this chapter, however, the team has concentrated primarily on the quality of the evaluation product - the reports- rather than their utilization. Reports were assessed according to specific indicators based on Norad's criteria for assessing organizational reviews and ODA's evaluation guidelines. In addition, the team was able to assess the utilization value from the reports, related to EMiS' overall objectives to some extent.

3.3.2 Note on the templates

The four dimensions generally covered by institutional assessments are identity, capacity, linkages and performance. These are again broken down into sub-dimensions that are assessed and rated. For instance, identity consists of characteristics such as governance, leadership and identity (purpose, values, strategy), and capacity involves human resources, systems and procedures, material and financial resources. The summary of these dimensions can point to the overall capacity of the organization.

The purpose of EMiS institutional assessments (IAs) is defined as follows:

- 1) to determine capacity and
- 2) to establish a baseline for institutional development and determine key strategic objective for EMiS.

In other words, IAs are intended to be used as planning and partnership appraisals, as well as in monitoring. The EMiS template for IAs covers the following dimensions: leadership (identity), strategic planning and direction (capacity), governance (identity), organizational structure and decision-making (identity), gender equality (identity/capacity), staff (capacity), infrastructure and technology (capacity), financial management (capacity), sources of funding (capacity), communication and

information (performance/ linkages/capacity), policy analysis and advocacy work (identity/performance), networks and positions within civil society (linkages), and relationship with government (linkages). Its clear emphasis is thus analyzing capacity and identity.

Some other sub-dimensions could have been further explored in the IAs, such as (degree of) commitment of staff, clear purpose, effectiveness, availability of funds/ability to fulfill obligations, legitimacy and responsiveness, etc. In total, the template seems to be covering most of the dimensions that are relevant for the defined purposes. For monitoring, however, it may be appropriate to wonder whether more emphasis should also be placed on analyzing linkages and performance/impact. The key issue is how the template is utilized. One suggestion could be to also utilize the IAs as a means of screening and selecting partners. But that would require a more consistent use among the EMiS members as well as a rating system, which is not included at present.

The country assessments provide a brief history of environmental civil organizations and assessment of major obstacles, relevant legislation, overview of other NGO actors, major donors, etc. The team finds the EMiS of this template to be short and deficient. There is, for example, little emphasis on the major environmental challenges, the major drivers for changes in the country and assessments of channels of influence.

The EMiS template on institutional assessments directs focuses on the capacity to implement activities and establishing a baseline for institutional development. The team finds, among other matters, that the issues of strategic planning in the organization, gender issues, the total financing - including contributions by the organization itself, (even if Norad may contribute 100% of particular projects) should have been emphasized more.

3.3.3 Score of the assessments

The reports were given a score in accordance with the team's ratings. Among 8 country assessments, four were rated as “satisfactory”, and the other four were found to be “not fully satisfactory”. Among 13 institutional assessments, seven were rated as “satisfactory”, and the other six were rated “unsatisfactory”.

The scoring was affected by several issues, such as the choice of criteria (defined by the team) and the format of the report (defined by EMiS). It also depends on whether institutional assessments should be considered informal appraisals, and not be judged according to higher quality standards. For instance, two of the institutional reports had been completed in two days for each, which appear grossly insufficient, if the assessments are to be held to the standard of formal appraisals. Most of the reports have a low score regarding data/validity, cost-efficiency and risks/mitigation. This low rating was probably a result of the fact that these factors are not mentioned specifically in the template. As a result, the team has also found this template to be only partially satisfactory. Also, one report is clearly a project evaluation, which was assessed (positively) against common evaluation criteria.

In summary, the team found that

- 1) The reports are of varying quality. This is probably due to the variability of access to resources for the review within the individual member organizations. As the role of the EMiS secretariat is only to be consulted and not perform quality control itself, it depends largely on the skills, systems and resources of the individual member performing the assessment. Considering this, a certain lack of critical review function seems to be a weakness of the overall strategic planning tools of EMiS.
- 2) The reports vary according to formality. Some bear the resemblance of informal, internal appraisals, whereas others are more methodically strict and credible (in terms of validity). This could suggest that in some contexts, EMiS is much more focused and strategic, whereas in other contexts its selection of partners may have been more coincidental. However, much depends on the actual utilization of the reports, which the team has not assessed thoroughly. However, most of the reports are kept by the organization which solicited the report, and are therefore only available to other organizations upon specific requests.
- 3) Several countries and partners have not yet been subject to assessments. This could be due to lack of time and resources or a perception that the need for new assessments are not considered very urgent, as ongoing (non-EMiS) partnerships have already provided the Norwegian donor with a clear picture of capacity needs and country context.
- 4) Many reports score low on the question whether the conclusions provide a sufficient basis for concrete actions. One report, for instance, simply states that there is space for collaboration and that the local NGO fits with the overall portfolio of the Norwegian EMiS member, without including any concrete suggestions on how the Norwegian NGO can improve working conditions of the organization, however, apart from suggested "collaboration". The conclusion is somewhat generic, and does not identify clear needs and gaps where a Norwegian EMiS member can add value (apart from funding).
- 5) The country-specific reports generally provide a good mapping of relevant actors, initiatives, etc, whereas the regional/thematic assessments are less focused on these matters. The question remains whether there is value in a report on general thematic issues that can easily be found elsewhere, instead of focusing on actors and networks where EMiS can add value.

There are several reasons for the varying quality, but the role of the organization as the commissioning agent seems crucial.

3.4 Systems for project appraisals, approval and evaluation

All projects are to be approved by the board. Every member has to submit an annual plan before September each year, whereas concrete project proposals may be assessed

throughout the year. Ongoing partnerships are treated separately from new projects, and there are different templates for programme and project funding

Under EMiS guidelines, project management is to be based on Norad's standards and routines. However, the project proposals are generally quite insufficient by themselves. This is especially the case since applications from EMiS members are not expected to be comprehensive, but only represent a summary of what EMiS has received from its project partners. The agreement on this standard of project document was based on the following: "If desirable, EMiS would receive the full project document from the member organization." (EMiS guidelines). Only in a few cases has the team seen evidence that full project design documents exist, and many examples in which the background documentation has not been turned into analytic project documents. In any case, even the project summaries lack major parts like the "theory of change-link" between inputs and outcome/impact, as well as an elaboration of potential risks factors and assumptions. Other deficiencies are the largely absence of baseline studies, clear benchmarks to be achieved at specific junctions, the time horizon for each project and an exit strategy for Norad funding. The latter is especially important for EMiS projects since they are in most cases fully financed by Norwegian aid funds.

Given the weaknesses of country and institutional background documents, the requirement for solid project documents is comparatively larger. The peer-review function by the board members is valuable, but far from sufficient, especially for larger, multi-year projects. Given the set up of the board, its members cannot be regarded as independent reviewers. The team therefore raises the possible need to institutionalize of such a function.

While these aspects of project planning are important in a planning and monitoring perspective, they are a prerequisite for a proper evaluation system. A framework for monitoring and evaluation was developed by EMiS in 2008 (in Norwegian), but no tools for M&E has been operationalised (see also the NCG-report). As of now, project applications need to relate to the defined areas as mentioned in the strategy. Eligible activities shall comply with the following criteria:

1. The activity must relate to the EMiS overall objective and be according to one or more of the EMiS thematic priority areas: Sustainable management of biological diversity and natural resources, Water resources management, water and sanitation, Climate change and access to clean energy, Hazardous substances.
2. The specific objective must relate directly to at least one of the 5 expected outputs in the Norad agreement (2008 – 2010).
3. The activity is based on a country- and institutional assessment, which describes civil society in the country, the current position and needs for the relevant implementing partner(s), and the institutional capacity of that partner.
4. The activity must be cost efficient and realistic.
5. The outputs must be measurable and linked to advocacy tasks. Core funding can be supported as long as it is linked to advocacy work.

It appears that most of the discussions in the EMiS Board, when peer-reviewing project proposals, relate to the five criteria. According to the minutes of the Board

meetings, the discussions centred on the projects' goals, objectives contents and budgets, which are key issues. The minutes do not reflect that the Board has actually rejected any application, only proposed slight revisions. Thus, it appears that all projects have been accepted in the end⁴. The need for baseline studies has been mentioned in several meetings. As the team witnessed in the case of WWF and Peru, the baseline has not been followed up afterwards. On the whole, project assessments do not seem to play a crucial role in EMiS decision making.

This indicates that the Board is hesitant to make tough demands or reject proposals, an impression that was also confirmed in interviews, as well as NCG's project assessment. Most of the organizations openly admitted this. Hence, funds have been distributed more or less equally, and not rated firstly according to quality or strategic assessments. The possibility that independent "outsiders" could be included in the board in order to avoid conflict of interest has been discussed, but a decision is yet to be made.

Some noteworthy decisions recorded in the minutes from one board meetings (28.05.08) required five out of nine project proposals to provide revised plans, mainly due to their failure to formulate specific goal/objectives, and the need for institutional assessments. In another meeting (13.11.08), a proposal was accepted with a downscaled budget due to the need for baseline study, and lack of clear goal formulations. On 19.01.10 support to ECO Forestry Forum was approved, but the board questioned why parts of the project were to be funded directly by Norad, and parts by EMiS. The question of whether the use of EMiS funding was considerably different from the regular Norad contributions to the same organizations is a larger issue which is also commented upon by the NCG-evaluation.

3.5 Systems for financial management and anti-corruption

According to the management routines of EMiS, the individual members have the responsibility for day-to-day follow-up of their respective partners/projects. The division of responsibility between each member and EMiS is regulated in the Membership Agreement, in which the role of EMiS is only to collect and evaluate yearly narrative and financial reports and prepare a combined annual report. Members are however, encouraged to peer review each other's projects at the appraisal/approval stage.

The membership contract commits the members to actively oppose corruption through the use of codes of conduct in the partner contracts and through various other means. Each individual member is charged with describing its anticorruption measures/work in the annual report by. According to the reports from DF, RF and WWF, there are a number of regulations and procedures developed to avoid corruption. The main procedures are the annual contracts, reporting and auditing requirements. DF mentions particular requirements such as keeping funds in a separate bank account, having clear rules of which individuals can sign documents on behalf of the organization, specifications on budget management, tender requirements, etc. WWF points out in the annual report that the issue of corruption has not been explicitly

⁴ The EMiS response to this finding is that the Board minutes are not all that detailed.

addressed in projects, but is something that is mentioned in the partner contract. RFN claims to have a number of internal regulations that are developed in cooperation with its partners in order to avoid corruption. No corruption in EMIIS projects have been discovered or suspected so far.

WWF, RFN and DF have individually been subject to organizational reviews by Norad. No major weaknesses have been identified. The WWF review (2008) is perhaps the most in-depth study of financial management, concluding that the system is comprehensive, sound and with few risks of fraud. The RFN review (2007) is less in depth on these issues, but suggests that financial management is adequate. Despite lacking a computerized system for project management and monitoring, RFN supervises financial management through a close “hands on” cooperation style and regular visits to partners. The DF review (2009) has a note that financial system could be improved, since some of the routines and contracts are not entirely up to date and there are no written guidelines for anti-corruption, even if anti-corruption efforts are discussed frequently with its partners. Norad has discussed all these reviews with the individual organization, and some improvements in the systems have been noted.

For the new EMIIS members however, no separate reviews have been undertaken. In the case of NVF financial reporting and management depends on the partners. Further, NVF has no specific control systems or follow-up apart from the annual audit, although NVF states that anti-corruption is included in the contracts and frequently discussed with partners.

A general observation is that there are differences among the EMIIS members in terms of the systems utilized, as well as the capacity to follow up projects and financial management. It is assumed by EMIIS that members with experience in project management have adequate systems in place, but there are no strict requirements or pre-assessments of members on such issues.

4. Networking and partnerships

The thematic priorities of EMiS are in line with the Norwegian action plan for Environment in development cooperation. Most projects focus on biodiversity/management of natural resources and climate. Two projects focus specifically on water resource management (NCDC/Nepal and ENWRA/Ethiopia) and one on the reduction of environmental poisons (NCDC/Nepal). It is not mentioned in any documents if this distribution reflects a strategic decision/relevance or practical issues. But, as mentioned in the 2008 annual report, several of the areas are interlinked and should be approached from a holistic perspective, although this is not easy to do.

Networking/partnering is the key operational modus for the EMiS partners. This applies to partnering both with other Norwegian NGOs for various types of advocacy and information work, and with international organizations, often for coordination of its development work, as well as with local organizations on project planning and implementation.

Networking at the international level by EMiS members is often a decisive factor for choice of country, type of interventions and choice of local partners. This is most clearly demonstrated by the WWF-Norway, which operates as a member of a large international NGO, with local offices in all its project countries. RFN frequently cooperates with the forest Foundation UK, in its advocacy work by local groups, e.g. concerning the Accra Caucus Group, which will be analyzed in Ch. 5.2. The NNVF is now a local branch of Friends of the Earth. The DF has a number of long-term partners, especially in Nepal, Ethiopia, Malawi and Zambia. This perspective has at least to some degree a bearing on the relatively low level of cooperation and coordination within EMiS, and was certainly an important factor for the ability to quickly identify prospective projects during 2007-2010.

4.1 EMiS' operational modalities

In its initial strategy EMiS defined the following as its main operational modalities:

i. Advocacy and lobbying: Support for political analysis, documentation and advocacy at the national and local level, addressing underlying reasons. Establishment of procedures aimed at developing objectives, strategies and tools to assess the achievements.

ii. Organizational development and leadership training: Strengthening of organizational set-ups; expansion of systems and practices for democratic grassroots-oriented decision-making processes; ensuring women's representation and better information flow; leadership training; development of human resources and of ability to act as change agent in relevant contexts.

iii. Professional competence- and capacity-building: Professional development of staff members, courses for administrative personnel, hiring of in-house or external expertise capable of promoting professional development or contributing to elucidating technical concerns. This encompasses training in organisational development, languages, presentation and writing techniques, as well as political work. It may involve the development of new departments, fields of inquiry, campaigns or disaster preparedness.

iv. Support for institutional core functions and administrative routines: *Enhancement of capacity to carry out democratic and analytical processes, contributing to the emergence of independent positions and initiatives. Emphasis is placed on the organisations boosting their autonomy and identity. Support may also go towards day-to-day operations, covering central administrative functions and costs, such as grants towards the remuneration of accounting staff and secretariat, or help to buy equipment and supplies.*

v. Support for networking: *Support for organisations joining forces and forming wider networks within their specialist fields.*

Both in the EMiS's Internal Evaluation (June 2010) and in other documents, the team intended to assess performance in each of these five modalities. With the exception of the Ghana Caucus (see para. 5.2), however, there is hardly any data at all on activities ii), iv) and v). EMiS's reporting largely focuses on outputs; as, admittedly, outcome may be difficult to identify due to the relatively short time span of the individual project. The documents report that training has taken place within "professional and organizational development," "leadership", as well as "institutional core functions and administrative routines." It is not possible to learn the extent to which this has increased the overall capacity of an institution, and has led to "measurable changes" in local, national or regional plans, strategies and legislation. Although the overall indicators for reaching objectives have been met, for the most part some need further enumeration. It is not possible to know what a "substantial strengthening" of an organization means if there are no benchmarks/measures for the baseline and the end-line.

Regarding capacity building, the team takes note, as does also the NCG team, of several organizational weaknesses such as lack of delegation, high staff turnover and lack of internal sharing of knowledge. The latter means that simply paying for salaries of key staff, without correcting key problems, is unsustainable.

As the monitoring and follow-up of projects rely on the individual member, EMiS has not put much emphasis on a joint strategy or building members' own competence with regard to capacity building. Gender aspects are included as part of the institutional assessments, but EMiS has not developed indicators for measuring results in this area. According to the annual report to Norad, support for networking would entail, support to WALHI (Indonesia), JOAS (Malaysia), AIDSESEP/COICA (Peru), LI-BIRD (Nepal) and FOBOMADE (Bolivia). In addition there are the regional seminars and the Accra Caucus Group attendance prior, during and subsequent to the UNFCCC COPs 14 and 15. The experience in "networking" is further addressed below.

Summing up, there is reason to believe that EMiS is largely providing funding to projects that focuses on the particular areas defined by the strategy, and have to some extent fulfilled the objectives. EMiS is lacking common tools for monitoring progress, as well as identifying risks and results of the EMiS support. Synergies and North-South exchange of experience have been little emphasised, as discussed in other parts of the report.

4.2 Advocacy and lobbying

According to the strategy, EMiS will support organizations that want to strengthen political advocacy. Increasing administrative capacity and core funding may be a means for this, but all outputs should be measurable and related to advocacy tasks. The template for institutional assessments focuses on mapping the kind of advocacy carried out, as well as its target, rate of success, etc. As such, it is a tool for prioritizing funding and activities relating to the individual partner. Thematically, advocacy activities have been focused on management of natural resources, biodiversity/conservation, environmental and human rights violations, legal protection and technical/managerial capacity.

Internationally, EMiS seeks to contribute through joint seminars, courses, exchange of organisational resources and experiences, with special focus on capacity building and advocacy methods. EMiS also aims at being a channel for contact, cooperation and coordination between local/national and foreign organizations, in particular related to the preparations that took place before UNFCCC COP15 in 2009. The strategy also mentions that the network may be expanded to include research, education and media circles. This is relevant to some of the individual projects, but has not been undertaken as a joint EMiS initiative.

EMiS has not defined advocacy further, and there is no clear strategy document on the issue. Instead, the type of advocacy proposed has most often been reflected in the various project documents – relating to the particular local/national context and/or the international level. According to minutes from a board meeting (13.11.08), the EMiS emphasizes support to “normative environmental movements” rather than grassroots movements. Consequently, the main focus is on influencing the national or international level. Still, some projects do not go much beyond the local level such as ASDA and AEDE in Ethiopia (DF’s partners in 2008). Given Ethiopia’s limited space for policy dialogue between government and civil society, DF’s strategy was to support NGOs that may not be very advocacy oriented, but that have as their ultimate goal the building an environmental movement in Ethiopia. When this did not materialize, none of the NGOs received funding beyond 2008. This focus on the local level and grassroots movements could be perceived as somewhat contradictory to the strategy. Still, it proves that EMiS has a conscious approach to what kind of advocacy EMiS should engage in.

A joint project of DF and WWF in Zambia addresses topics such as the rights of smallholder farmers and the ability of journalists to report on environmental policies, climate change and payment for environmental services. At the board meeting, the comment was made that there was possibly too much emphasis on livelihoods rather than environment. Nevertheless this constitutes one of the few examples of partnership synergies as a result of EMiS. WWF-Zambia is one of the implementing partners in addition to others, and a joint DF/WWF country study has been undertaken. Obviously, in this context EMiS has an added value beyond funding, due to the country presence and involvement of WWF. There is, however, no other similar example, except perhaps the collaboration between RF and WWF in DR Congo.

Noteworthy activities within this topic are the two regional workshops with partners in Africa and Asia, focusing on environmental advocacy. The workshops covered topics such as knowledge, attitudes and competency in environmental education, policy issues and legal frameworks at the national and regional levels. Both workshops were perceived as very useful, although the report from the Asian seminar has still not been posted on the website. In addition to the knowledge aspects, the southern NGOs met with similar organizations from other southern countries, which may have longer-term impacts towards expanding southern advocacy networks. South-south exchanges in Eastern Africa represent a direct follow-up. In brief, it seems that there is a need for more such initiatives by EMiS. The Accra Caucus network is another example that will be assessed in the following chapter. Further initiatives of this type have not been presented yet.

4.3 Professional competence- and capacity-building

According to the strategy, EMiS should focus on political advocacy as well as capacity for social mobilization. The main idea is to boost the autonomy and identity of organizations, enabling them to undertake advocacy more effectively.

EMiS may provide funding for training in organizational development, languages, presentation and writing techniques, as well as political work. Activities may also involve development of new departments, fields of inquiry, campaigns or disaster preparedness. In Norway, EMiS aims at serving as a resource centre that focuses on capacity building and monitoring, among other things. Internationally, EMiS aims at providing professional strengthening through joint seminars, courses, and the exchange of experiences and resource material.

Capacity building is a means to reach the overall objectives. In order to identify gaps and measure progress, as well as to measure advocacy achievements, baseline studies of the initial situation are needed. The baseline is to be described in the project application and annual plan, and activities shall be based on country- and institutional assessments (according to membership agreement). Project proposals shall describe indicators for goal attainment and plans for monitoring and evaluation. These shall again, relate to the overall indicators for EMiS:

1. Minimum 20 environmental organizations in Africa, Asia, Oceania and Latin America have enhanced their capacity in policy analysis and advocacy.
2. Minimum 5 environmental networks in Africa, Asia, Oceania and Latin America have been substantially strengthened in their regional, national or international endeavour.
3. Environmental movements in the South have expanded their membership, or boosted its national impact and scope for advocacy.
4. Important environmental policy processes have been influenced by environmental organizations and have led to measurable changes in local, national or regional plans, strategies and legislations.
5. Guidelines are established for a long term program for strengthening environmental organizations in the South which can continue after this pilot period (2008 -2010).

The five indicators are partly broken down to sub-indicators, which are used to a limited degree as points of reference in the project documents. In its evaluation report

NCG finds that indicators 1, 2 and 3 are mostly fulfilled– although the indicators are not set out in very clear terms. Again, the term “substantially strengthened” in indicator 2 is very loosely defined, and needs further precision in each case. The networks in question are the indigenous network in Peru (AIDSESP/WWF), the climate network in Nepal (LI.BIRD/DF), environmental network in Bolivia (FOBOMADE/RF), the climate change network internationally (Accra Caucus), the environmental network in Indonesia (WAHLI) and the indigenous’ network in Malaysia (JOAS).

Indicator number 4 depends on how the term “important” is understood, whereas indicator number 5 largely depends on the whether EMiS will continue or not.

An institutional analysis may contribute towards identifying baselines for some institutions (11), but more precise baseline benchmarks need to be defined in the project design documents. Based on the reporting, it likely that EMiS has had a positive impact on capacity development relating to the defined areas of the strategy, but the challenge is still to verify and measure such achievements in the absence of baselines and benchmarks.

4.4. EMiS as a network and resource centre

The added value of EMiS, as compared to each member organization individually, arises from 1) the sharing of knowledge, 2) joint planning and execution of seminars/workshops/events and 3) exchanges of experiences both in Norway and within the different regions. This is addressed in the EMiS’s first strategy, which states that:

“Internationally, the MIS network might serve as:

- A channel of enhanced and efficient professional strengthening by means of joint seminars, courses, exchange of organizational resources and experiences, with special focus on capacity building and advocacy methods.
- A channel for contact, cooperation and coordination between local/national and foreign organizations where appropriate. MIS will initiate a coordinated emphasis with the aim of high participation on environmental organizations in the South during the climate conference in Copenhagen in 2009.
- The network may also be expanded to engage various research, education and media circles.”

The team has looked at how EMiS organized its networking actions in the context of UNFCCC COP 15 in Copenhagen last December. In cooperation with the Norwegian umbrella organization ForUM, the EMiS Secretariat held a side event on more general climate issues. The report from this side-event has not been made available to the team and is not found on EMiS’ website.

The DF, which is particularly working on “adaptation”, received EMiS funding for supporting the attendance at COP 15 of its partner organizations in Malawi (CEPA), Nepal (Libird), Ethiopia (REST, FfE and Sri Lanka (GMSL).

By means of the EMiS/RFN's project to support the Accra Caucus, participants representing forest peoples in the key rainforest countries of Papua New Guinea, Indonesia, DRC, Brazil, Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia were also able to attend COP 15.. The WWF was well represented in Copenhagen, but did not access EMiS funds for this purpose.

Also noteworthy in this context is that the EMiS's coordination functions, beyond formalizing the sharing of the budget, have been very modest. Each member organization works on different aspects of climate change, and sees it as its primary interest to assist its current partners/clients. It is unclear what has been the added value of EMiS, compared to the individual undertakings and achievements of the member organizations.

5. Specific data sources

5.1. Support to indigenous peoples in the Amazonas

In 2008, WWF-Norway entered into an agreement with WWF-Peru worth NOK 1.575.860. Two projects were supported – one was the “Development of Strategic Environmental Assessments”, and the other was a project supporting indigenous peoples in the Peruvian Amazon termed ”Changing the Paradigm”. The latter project was extended throughout 2009 and 2010 with about an additional NOK 3.8 million. In the framework of the promotion of indigenous rights, the overall objective of the latter project was to conserve natural resources and biological diversity in an area of 1,700,000 km², constituted of communal territories and indigenous lands.

5.1.1 Objective

The project’s specific objective was:

- 1) to strengthen **AIDSESP**, a Peruvian national organisation, representing approximately 350.000 indigenous persons – including the regional indigenous organization CORPI in Marañon, and



- 2) to strengthen COICA, which is the international branch of Amazon indigenous organizations in Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, Colombia, Venezuela, Guyana, French Guyana, Surinam and Brazil (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: COICA - Organization of indigenous peoples in Amazonas

Until 2002, WWF-Peru was considered to be an environmental INGO, mainly concerned with the preservation of protected areas. To the extent WWF-Peru was involved with indigenous peoples, it was mainly through individual projects at the local level. This changed in 2002, however, when WWF-Peru and AIDSESP initiated strategic cooperation. In 2005, WWF-Peru hired the former president of AIDSESP to work as their first indigenous expert. The trust he had with the indigenous movement, and the fact that he himself was indigenous, provided a unique opportunity to further develop the partnership. As a consequence, WWF-Peru (and later WWF-Colombia through the EMiS project) widened its approach to work with indigenous organizations at the national and international levels. This partnership strategy

constitutes a new approach of WWF-Peru, and has substantially expanded WWF's collaborative network in the Amazon.

Although an innovative and new approach, however, this evolution also entails a potentially more controversial role vis-à-vis the Peruvian government. Hence, the Latin American desk of WWF, situated within WWF-US, has been somewhat reluctant to embrace such cooperation – for fear that it may damage conservation work of WWF in general. However, WWF-Peru has pursued a pragmatic and professional approach, working also directly with the Peruvian government.

5.1.2 Project relevance, risks and results

Most of the project's activities focus on capacity development of administrative, and financial issues, as well as strategic planning and providing technical input to the protection of indigenous territories from negative environmental impacts of oil extraction spills and potential environmental threats flowing from REDD projects. These objectives are very relevant considering a) the negative health and subsistence opportunities for indigenous peoples due to the extensive oil exploration, and b) the need to strengthen indigenous people's rights of use of natural resources, both at the sub-national, national and Amazon-wide levels. In summary, increasing the political influence of these institutions may create positive impacts regarding both indigenous' rights and the sustainable development and conservation of the Amazon. It seems that this is a relation WWF-Peru has been able to balance quite gracefully. The project could form a model for how WWF partners with indigenous peoples, without jeopardizing its strategic relations with national governments or compromising its focus on conservation.

It is the view of the team that the project has contributed to partnerships and synergies that are very relevant to several of the EMiS's objectives: strengthening biodiversity/management of natural resources, contributing to efforts to combat climate change and lessening the damage of hazardous spills from oil extraction. Again, however, it has not been possible to verify exact results relating to increased capacity of indigenous groups, as there are no clearly established baselines, whether in the form of systematic mapping of the improvements in capacity levels or monitoring of the improvement.

When the current WWF project started, the Rainforest Foundation Norway (RF) was already managing 17 projects to support indigenous organizations in Peru through its separate Amazon program, which totals NOK 25 mill. WWF-Peru and RF had different perspectives and strategies for their work, and so far there has been surprising little contact between them. This is in part due to a lack of institutional and country assessments, and in part lack of a common strategy or sense of a joint EMiS approach. Generally, better linkages and cooperation (including between other EMiS partners) and sharing of best practices, mutual help in international campaigns, etc, would most likely have added further value of EMiS support.

WWF-Peru is strategically well positioned and, with the support from EMiS, can have influence at the regional, national and sub-national levels. WWF-Norway should be credited for identifying this relevant and strategically important project.

5.2. Support to the Accra Caucus

In the run-up to UNFCCC-COP 14 - a group known as the Accra Caucus of around 40 representatives from civil society and indigenous peoples organizations from nearly 30 countries - met in Accra, Ghana to provide input to the ad-hoc working group on issues and concerns associated with Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD). This representation was partly funded by EMiS, through the Rainforest Foundation Norway. Additional funding has been made to participation by this group at the preparatory meeting in Poznan, two meetings in Oslo and at COP 15 in Copenhagen last December.

At the Ghana event, the representatives issued a statement

- that the REDD scheme should not violate the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities to their lands and resources;
- that state and private sector representatives should not take more control over the forests at the expense of indigenous communities;
- that the prior and informed consent of indigenous communities should not be violated; and
- that REDD should not divert attention from the real causes of climate change--increased emission of greenhouse gases in the industrialized countries.

The team made a questionnaire survey of the relevance and effectiveness of the funding of the participation in the above-mentioned events. The questionnaires were sent out in English, French and Spanish. Of about 28 persons who are likely to have received the questionnaires, 14 responded. Due to time constraints, only one additional reminder could be sent. In addition to a rather low response rate, it has to be mentioned that this information base cannot be regarded as fully impartial, because the answers of the respondents may also have been coloured by their self interests. Nevertheless, the team thinks that the data gives some objective insights into the effects of this EMiS project. Firstly, it seems that the invited participants were well selected. All fourteen respondents had contributed much or very much to influencing the civil society on the REDD issues before COP 15. The fact that only 11 had contributed after COP 15 may seem surprising, but may be due to effect of the results of COP 15, which many found disappointing.

Concerning the opportunities for influence, eight of the respondents stated that they had many or very many discussions with official representatives of their respective countries at the above-mentioned events, while 6 had only some or few of such discussions. Interestingly all 14 had many or very many such contacts after COP 15.

Another matter examined was the possibilities that the Accra Caucus group exerted national influence. Six respondents thought that the issues raised by the civil society were taken up to a high or very high extent by the national delegations, while eight respondents thought that the lobby efforts had high or very high measurable outcomes on the REDD issues in their respective countries after COP 15.

While 11 respondents thought that the principle of free, prior and informed consent for indigenous peoples had been strengthened only a little or somewhat strengthened during the time of the above-mentioned events, a total of 10 answered that the REDD

benefit-sharing mechanisms had been more or much more acknowledged in their respective countries after COP 15. Almost everybody (13) thought that the Norwegian funding and technical inputs had made much or very much of a concrete difference to improving civil society advocacy efforts.

It is the team's conclusion that this funding through RFN has been valuable towards strengthening the voice of indigenous and forest-dwellers organizations in REDD matters.

6. The Added Value of EMiS

This review has largely focused on the management and monitoring procedures of EMiS, as well as the thematic focus and competence that the members represent. It has also been relevant to analyse the level of cooperation between the member organisations and to assess the extent to which EMiS has created new forms of coordination, synergies and joint activities that would otherwise not have taken place.

Added value can be understood as the contributions from an organisation to all stakeholders (beneficiaries, networks, governments, etc), in addition to the financial input. Defined as such, the added value is what justifies administrative costs of EMiS as opposed to Norad itself channeling funds directly to its members and partners.

This is not to underestimate the importance of the political context and rationale in which EMiS came to be. It may be reasoned that without EMiS and the joint lobbying efforts of the three founding members, the funds may not have been made available in the first place. Obviously, this constitutes some sort of added value. It may also be argued that the Norwegian MFA did not demand a justification for setting up such a mechanism, and never considered any alternatives to EMiS. However, the team does not see this as valid arguments for whether today's EMiS should continue or not. No doubt, the thematic approach of EMiS is still just as important, with its basis in the NAPEDC. As the purpose of the review is to assess the added value of EMiS vs. channelling funds through other channels to environmental movements in the South, the team has taken for granted that Norad/MFA wishes to maintain funding to a similar thematic approach in the future. The question at stake is whether the current funding mechanism is better than the alternatives. The most apparent alternative would be that the funds were to be disbursed directly from Norad to the individual organisations. The team also considered whether ForUM could represent a secretariat function, but finds this less advisable, since ForUM has a very wide mandate and few resources to take on such a task.

6.1 Added value of a different approach

EMiS has largely provided funding to existing partners of the three founding members, but have also found room to include new partners. It is clearly more complicated to focus on capacity building and support to core functions of the organisations than to continue with the traditional projects approach. According to the EMiS members, this has enabled them to provide support that would otherwise not have been prioritised, with less strict focus on concrete activities on the ground. As an example, RF claims that NGOs such as FOBOMADE and WALHI would not have been prioritised otherwise. This approach has also provided an opportunity to provide complementary funding to core functions, alongside project activities funded directly by Norad funds. This has created an effect different than what regular project funding would have produced. However, there is not a categorical difference between "EMiS projects" and "Norad projects." The topics of advocacy and capacity building of civil society have been put squarely within Norad's principles of support to civil society

(2009). In principle, Norad's direct grants may have been used in all of EMiS's topical areas and forms of assistance.

6.2 Added value of new forms for cooperation and management

Although some level of contact and cooperation has existed previously between the member organisations, representation on the EMiS board has greatly increased contact and cooperation between the member organizations. This cooperation has in turn helped establish joint normative priorities and has led to a much better exchange of programme ideas and administrative functions, as well as screening of each others' project proposals and approaches. But the review function does not go much beyond the initial project screening. While it has provided valuable data and lessons on project selection, the country and institutional assessments have not functioned sufficiently as tools for mapping relevant institutions and setting priorities, or for monitoring purposes. For the most part, selection of partners and countries in which to operate has been based on previous experience and ongoing partnerships, and the funds have been divided in more or less equal portions between the founding organizations.

EMiS has developed management procedures based on Norad's criteria. These are largely considered sufficient as formal requirements, but management and follow-up fully depends on the individual member. Drafting sensible guidelines for monitoring and evaluation has been done, but these have not yet been fully operationalised. Generally, better linkage with other EMiS partners and sharing of best practices, help in international campaigns, etc, are most likely to add further value of EMiS in the future. Overall, the management systems and procedures of the individual organisation have not been much changed. In short, the members have by and large been conducting business as usual.

Still, as previously mentioned, some joint activities have taken place, such as the two workshops in Africa and Asia, joint cooperation in Zambia and DR Congo and some level of professional cooperation in Norway in addition to this South-South cooperation.

6.3 Added value of the members' professional competence

The criteria for selecting new EMiS members are: competence within the thematic priority areas, documented cooperation with environmental movements/networks in the South, experience within advocacy/organisational development, and experience within international project cooperation and management. A main requirement however, is that the organisation have environment as its main objective. Due to this, organisations such as SAIH, Norwegian Church Aid and FIAN Norway were excluded (only FIAN formally applied to the annual meeting), whereas Bellona, Friends of the Earth, Environmental Agents and FIVAS were accepted. It is dubious at best, if having environment as the main objective of an NGO ensures that the most relevant institutions are selected for membership. Some of the newly selected partners have no documented experience with environmental cooperation in the South or advocacy/organisational development, whereas other NGOs may have broader experience and networks, some of which are relating at least partly to EMiS' thematic areas. In the team's opinion, the exclusion of certain organisation, and the inclusion of others, has not been based on criteria relating to relevance of EMiS' overall

objectives. There seems to have been an absence of critical assessment of what role, competence and experience could be gained from new members. Instead, EMiS may have selected new members that do not have the capacity to compete for large portions of the funding. This might be coincidental, but still leaves the impression of a funding mechanism with obvious conflict of interest in the organisational set-up.

6.4 Summing up: strengths, weaknesses and risks/opportunities

A. MOTIVATION AND CAPACITIES OF EMiS MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS		
STRENGTH	WEAKNESSES	RISKS/OPPORTUNITIES
<p>The EMiS is mostly composed of well motivated and competent staff/organizations.</p> <p>EMiS's strategy is consistent with Norwegian policy on conservation of natural resources by empowering and giving voice and opportunity to forest dwellers, smallholders and other environmentally threatened/marginalized groups.</p>	<p>The recruitment of EMiS organizational members has mostly involved a too narrow base of organizations which have, for the most part, a common constituency. The organizations are more frequently working in parallel than in a well coordinated way, partly due to different connections to international organizations. Some of the newly recruited organizational members have little experience with working in developing countries.</p>	<p><u>RISKS</u></p> <p>Partly insufficient coordination between the EMiS member organizations may prove to weaken their combined effects. However, there are examples that the member organisations are expressing interests for increasing their common engagements.</p>
		<p><u>OPPORTUNITIES</u></p> <p>Over time the EMiS members may realize better the synergetic gains to be reaped by an increase in cooperation/coordination. A possible new phase of the EMiS programme may also give a greater width of the environmental efforts if higher priority is given to combating water resources problems and hazardous wastes (environmental poisons), which are part of the Norwegian Action Plan, and thereby create a more complete environmental programme and a broader base of organizations</p>

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AND MANAGEMENT ASPECTS		
STRENGTH	WEAKNESSES	RISKS/OPPORTUNITIES
<p>Organizational management statutes, templates and systems for planning and decision-making processes have been established, enabling EMiS to function separately as a legal entity.</p> <p>EMiS is using the Logframe planning and monitoring model in a large number of project documents. EMiS has worked on preparing an initial document on M&E guidelines and systems.</p>	<p>The organizational standards and tools are only partially satisfactory, and are often disregarded, partly due to lack of control functions and partly due to continued use of the member organizations' own toolboxes.</p> <p>Certain elements in project planning and evaluation, such as the "planned outcome" and "risks/assumptions" elements, are insufficiently specified. Baseline data are frequently missing.</p> <p>The draft guidelines have not yet been made part of the normal project cycle management.</p>	<p><u>RISKS:</u> Deficiencies in guidelines and operative planning/evaluation tools have raised issues of quality implementation. ,</p> <p><u>OPPORTUNITIES:</u> Having completed the pilot phase, the participating organizations have more experience and knowledge and can establish improved toolboxes, including M&E systems to enhance project quality.</p>
C. NETWORKING AND PARTNERSHIPS		
STRENGTH	WEAKNESSES	RISKS/OPPORTUNITIES
<p>Some EMiS member organizations have strong bonds to international or national organizations, which promotes quicker planning and simplifies coordination.</p> <p>EMiS is pursuing key tasks of national environmental capacity building and advocacy, which could be crucial to environmental progress.</p>	<p>The bonds/ties to regular external partners may at times conflict with (and may be an obstacle to) coordination within EMiS.</p>	<p><u>RISKS:</u> The competition for funds and traditional low degree of coordination in the field among EMiS organizational members could weaken the chances for enhanced internal cooperation.</p> <p><u>OPPORTUNITIES:</u> Coordination can and should take place at several levels. There is still much to gain from increased cooperation between Norwegian NGOs</p>

D. ADDED VALUE OF EMiS		
STRENGTH	WEAKNESSES	RISKS/OPPORTUNITIES
<p>The cooperation by EMiS members in the context of the Norwegian Action Plan has created many useful lessons and relations which have not yet been utilized fully.</p> <p>It is still a relevant and valuable approach for NGO Development Cooperation to focus on capacity building, training in advocacy and support to core functions of the organisations</p>	<p>Capacity building and advocacy work are already mainstreamed in Norad's civil society guidelines, and do not necessarily require a separate aid envelope.</p>	<p><u>RISKS:</u> For Norad, the running of too many special funds may make decisions on total allocations to individual organizations more complicated. EMiS funds are getting too scattered and the oversight may become weaker.</p>
		<p><u>OPPORTUNITIES:</u> Continuation of EMiS is a means to enforce Norway's strong environmental priorities.</p> <p>EMiS provides an opportunity to create and preserve specific Norwegian competency, which otherwise may be lost.</p> <p>EMiS may relieve Norad of the need for detailed decision making on all focal areas, which could otherwise increase bureaucracy</p>

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1. Conclusions

The Norwegian aid authorities quickly followed-up Norad's Environmental Action Plan by supporting the founding of EMiS as an active umbrella organization that can draw on a large number of competent and well motivated staff, and which has specialized particularly in conservation and combating the threats posed by climate change to forests and small-holder agriculture.

The EMiS' strategy is consistent with Norwegian policies concerning aid in general, and environment and poverty alleviation among impoverished small-holders and forest dwellers, in particular. Considering forest dwellers as an important ally in the fight for the conservation of the rainforest is a strategy which has been proven by research to be effective in a great number of instances.

The choice of new organizational members of EMiS in 2009, has not contributed much to widen the EMiS constituencies in Norway for support to environmental issues, nor has it yet led to better coverage of the two environmental areas which have mostly been neglected: water provision and combating hazardous chemicals (environmental poisons).

The members of the EMiS Board have in a number of instances had a conflict of interest between pushing for their own project proposals vs. focusing on the selection of the best projects. Neither does the board alone represent a sufficient review mechanisms for new proposals.

Planning methods and tools for the analysis and selection of support to cooperating countries, partners and projects have been established. The templates are only partially satisfactory and the guidelines are not always followed.

The project design documents are in part built on the logical framework approach. However, key elements of the Logframe like the "planned outcome", "key risks and assumptions" and baseline data are insufficiently included. Neither has EMiS yet prepared M&E guidelines, to be followed as the rule by partner institutions.

The members of EMiS are mostly part of important international networks, or are continuously supporting previous partners in the developing countries. This had the great advantage of allowing EMiS to quickly disburse funds to partners that were trusted. However, it has most likely led to less cooperation between the Norwegian EMiS partners, and also to less emphasis on identifying the environmental movements in southern countries which could have had most effects on furthering the environmental cause in general.

Institutional capacity building and advocacy are the key modalities of EMiS support. Although most EMiS actors have considerable experience in the focal areas and have

drawn useful lessons, the EMiS has not yet prepared general guidelines or strategies for these areas of work, which are more complicated than the EMiS partners' regular projects.

7.2 Recommendations

The team will not provide any recommendation on the continuation of EMiS as a separate funding mechanism, since the alternative scenario is not known. With the information and recommendations provided in this and the NCG report, the Norwegian aid authorities will be better placed to consider and decide on EMiS's future role. The decision to continue the umbrella organization or not will have implications for the relevance of some of the recommendations, and the team has for this reason divided its recommendations between general recommendations (applicable in any case) and recommendations which would be applicable if EMiS is continued.

General recommendations

The team wants to emphasize its view that strengthening of environmental organizations in the south has proved to be more important over time. It is recommended that in any case the level of funding to this area not be reduced. An overall strategy is needed, in which roles and responsibilities are better described, formalized and upheld than they are at present. Exchange of competence from North to South, as well as South-South, needs to be further concretised and operationalised.

Recommendations for a Potential Future EMiS.

A future EMiS should include a wider group of organizations, which have more field experience, and can also cover all Action Plan priority areas, including water and environmental poisons, in a better way.

The criteria for selecting new members to EMiS should be reconsidered. The interpretation of the current criteria excludes potential member organisations which are not working exclusively on environmental issues. The requirement that “environmental engagement is one main objective” of an organization should be regarded as sufficient.

EMiS needs a board that is more independent of its participating organizations, in addition to an independent project review mechanism - either in the form of an independent technical committee, or the requirement of independent project appraisals for project proposals above a certain threshold. There should also be stricter criteria for prioritizing and selecting projects.

Further, EMiS should more clearly define the roles and responsibilities of its members, as some may have expertise to engage in capacity building while others have more expertise on project management. The potential for synergies should be further explored, and the added value of each member mapped. The possibility of joint projects and workshops should be further emphasized.

Country and institutional analyses should be carried out systematically, and ideally it should be applied to more than one NGO. A critical peer-review function of the quality of the analyses should be applied. Country studies should form the basis for strategic choices and priorities, and be applied as a formal requirement rather than a voluntarily exercise, for countries where EMIIS wants to engage. For monitoring and evaluation purposes, more emphasis should be placed on analyzing linkages and performance in the institutional assessments, as well as developing quantitative indicators to measure progress.

A logframe (or causal chain) approach, including risk aspects, should be applied fully and systematically to the planning of all projects above NOK one mill. Regular project evaluations of all projects above a certain level - tentatively of projects above NOK one million annually - should be undertaken systematically.

Written guidelines should be prepared on capacity building, advocacy and anti-corruption.

The EMIIS project application template should only be an abbreviation of complete project design documents, which should include background information properly referenced, as well as adherence to Norad's templates with better logical coherence between objectives, outcomes, outputs, inputs and risks/assumptions and M&E.

The financial analyses must be based on the complete budgets and accounts of the cooperation partner (NGO's total budgets) in order to demonstrate that the EMIIS is supporting particular additional activities.

A certain level of co-funding - in cash or kind - must be required of budgets.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Organisational Review of EMIS

Terms of Reference

1. Background

Organisational reviews of partners are conducted on a regular basis as part of Norad's quality assurance of the support scheme for civil society. It is an important tool for dialogue between Norad and the organisation, and constitutes a basis for deciding on approach and prospects of future funding to the organisation.

Environmental Movements in the South (EMIS) is entering into its final year of the three years pilot period supported through a cooperation agreement with Norad (2008 – 2010). Norad has decided to carry out an organisational performance review of EMIS prior to deciding on further funding to this mechanism.

EMIS is a new umbrella organisation with 7 Norwegian environmental organisations as members. EMIS was established as a response to the Norwegian Action Plan for Environment in Development Cooperation (2006), when the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in December 2007 invited the Development Fund, the Rainforest Foundation and WWF-World Wild Fund for Nature Norway to elaborate a concept and an organizational model for how to further strengthen environmental movements in developing countries in line with the intentions of the Action Plan.

EMIS was established by the three founding members in December 2007, and in June 2009 4 new organisations joined: Bellona, Friend of the Earth Norway (Norges Naturvernforbund), Eco-agents (Miljøagentene) and Association for International Water Studies (FIVAS).

The overall goal of the organisation is to strengthen environmental movements in developing countries. The strategy for achieving this is primarily to enhance the capacity of environmental movements in policy analysis and advocacy. EMIS' specific objective is that environmental organizations in the South have been strengthened in their mission as change agents by means of enhanced competence and capacity. EMIS has four thematic areas: a) protection of biological diversity and sustainable management of natural resources, b) water resources management, c) implementation of climate related activities and increased access to clean energy, d) reduction of hazardous substances. The main efforts in the pilot phase have been directed towards point a).

EMIS is governed by a Board consisting of 5 representatives from the member organisations. In addition, it has a secretariat of one person. The Secretariat of EMIS is fully funded by Norad. The role of the secretariat is programme management and coordination, including technical advice to programme development and proposals. The secretariat is furthermore responsible for the daily running of the organisation, networking, and communication and information work. This includes among other things facilitation of exchange, seminars and workshops in Norway and in the South. The board has an advisory role and control function. It makes assessments and decisions on matters significant for strategic development of the programme and organisational matters, including joint assessments of individual project proposals and approval of grants.

EMIS has in the period 2008-2010 funded 27 organisations in 15 countries in Africa, Asia and South-America, through EMIS' Norwegian member organisations. Several of these organisations receive or received additional funding from the member organisations, also financed with Norad funding. The level of funding from Norad under the current agreement is NOK 62.5 mill for the period 2008-2010. In addition, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs funded the initial period with NOK 7.5 mill in early 2008. All these projects are aiming at strengthening environmental movements in the South's political advocacy and social mobilization capacity.

EMIS is only funding organisations in ODA countries where the Norwegian EMIS member organizations are already represented.

In the pilot period 2008-2010, mainly local partners with whom the EMIS member organization had already established relations would receive long term EMIS support. EMIS is also supporting regional environmental projects and networks. In addition seed money and short-term support could be given to new potential partners in countries where the EMIS member organization already is represented. In 2010, new countries are also added on a pilot basis, in response to the priorities proposed by the new EMIS members, Naturvernforbundet and Bellona.

2. Purpose of the review

The purpose of the review is to examine to what extent EMIS is a capable, useful and efficient mechanism.

The review should be an assessment of the added value of EMIS vs. channelling funds through other channels to environmental movements in the South, including directly from Norad to the member organisations.

The review shall analyse and draw conclusions regarding EMIS's suitability and ability to deliver desired results, and shall present recommendations for Norad's future cooperation.

2.1 Team composition and qualifications

The study shall be undertaken by a consortium of three professionals, one external team leader and 1-2 from Norad, with special knowledge and qualifications within the following areas:

- Good knowledge of organisations and civil society, including organisational management and efficiency.
- General knowledge of current Norwegian and international development policy.
- Thematic knowledge of environmental issues and environmental movements in the South.
- Documented experience with producing studies and reports of a similar form.
- Knowledge of the countries selected for in depth studies.
 - The external consultant needs to have knowledge of environmental movements in one or several of the following countries: Malaysia, Indonesia, Zambia, Uganda, Madagaskar, DRC, Kenya, Ethiopia, Bolivia, Malawi, Papua New Guinea, Sri Lanka and/or Nepal.

- Norad will have knowledge of Zambia, Ethiopia, Uganda and Indonesia (one or more).

The external team leader will have editorial responsibility of the report.

3. Scope

The review shall analyse and make recommendations regarding EMIS's ability to achieve goals, with the focus on the following areas:

3.1 Mandate, strategy and relation to Norwegian political priorities

(i.e contract with Norad, policy and strategy, reviews, annual reports, website and applications, applicable principles and guidelines for grants to civil society (2009 and 2010), White paper no. 13 (2008-2009 and other documents)

The analysis needs to address added value/comparative advantage of the organisation.

3.2 Organisational structure

Other aspects may be included, but the following shall be addressed:

- Management and executive bodies, roles and responsibilities
- Decision-making and internal communication
- Emis as separate entity/organisation compared to Emis as part of an already established organisational cooperation like Forum for utvikling og miljø.

3.3 EMIS' cooperation with partners

- Strategies for selecting and working with local partners.
- Are the most appropriate partners targeted?
- Roles, relations and contractual responsibilities, ownership in the South
- Transparency in all parts of the cooperation
- Capacity- and competence building in the South
- Sharing of experiences and lessons learnt
- Sustainability and exit strategies
- Advocacy work and networks
- South- South cooperation

3.4 Management capacity and financial management – including

- Systems for quality assurance and control
- Human resources
- Anti-corruption measures

3.5 Result based management – including

- Achievement of results
- System for learning and monitoring of results and relevance for end user

3.6 Coordination with other actors (including at country level)

- Ability to coordinate activities with other actors at country level
- Relation to national and local authorities

4. Work methods

4.1 Document studies and interviews with EMIS, member organisations, Norad and MFA

An initial in-depth study shall be presented to Norad and the organisation through an inception report. The inception report shall propose (a) hypothesis of the overall added value of the organisation, b) appropriate research design for the assignment (i.e. use of surveys, selection of partners to visit, case study design, narrative analysis, etc), and c) other particular areas of interest.

This is mainly a desk based assessment but with some complimentary field work. 3 countries should be chosen as case studies, but it will not be possible to undertake field visits to more than 1-2 countries. A one week field visit is suggested to one country. The purpose of this visit would be to gather data from partners and local stakeholders to analyse the added value of EMIS.

In addition, EMIS is itself carrying out project assessments in four countries, in January-March 2010. The organisational review team will have access to draft reports from these assessments in their preparation phase.

4.2 Time schedule

1. *Preparation phase* [March 2010: 15 – 30. March]
 - a. Background reading
 - b. Discussions and interviews
 - c. Plan field visit
2. *Present Inception Report* for comments to Norad [7. April 2010]
3. *Field visit* [April/May 2010] *and possible survey*
 - a. Adjust review methodology if necessary
 - b. Interviews with stakeholders
4. *Process & verify information* [May 2009]
 - a. Analyse information
 - b. Conduct additional interviews (if needed)
 - c. Produce draft report by 1. June 2010
5. *Final report* [15. June 2010]
 - a. Receive input comments on draft one week after circulation
 - b. Produce final report by 15. June 2010.

Norad stipulates 4 working weeks for the external consultant and 3 weeks for the Norad staff.

5. Reporting

Norad will call for an initial meeting with the consultants to clarify questions regarding ToR and other issues.

5.1 Inception report

The Team shall deliver an inception report to Norad no later than 7. April 2010 (which will be distributed to the Organisation) outlining its findings based on the document study, questionnaire(s) and interviews, as well as its plan for conduct of the country visits.

5.2 Draft final report

In order to allow an opportunity for comment and for correction of any factual errors and misunderstandings, the Team will present its draft final report to Norad (which will distribute to EMIS) no later than 1. June 2010, with a deadline for responses to the Team one week later (8. June 2009).

5.3 Final report

The final report shall be submitted to Norad (and the Organisation) no later than by 15. June 2010. It shall be written in English (word format), contain a summary of approx. 3-4 pages and be maximum 30 pages long. Appendices may be added. The report shall utilise Norad's template for review reports (attached to ToR).

The report shall be presented by Team leader (if possible the whole team) for all stakeholders and other interested parties.

Annex 2: People met and interviewed by the Team:

In Norway:

Camilla Dannevig, Coordinator, EMiS
Vibeke Hermanrud, former Coordinator, EMiS

Jack Herheim, EMiS board representative, Bellona,
Svend Søyland, Bellona
Dag Hotvedt, Bellona

Heidi L. Nilson, Environmental Agents
Trond Enger, Environmental Agents

John Lineikro, Norges Naturvernforbund

Yngve Kristiansen, Rainforest Foundation Norway

Christoffer Ringnes Klyve, Development Fund
Dorthe Holm, EMIS/Development Fund

Andrew Fitzgibbon, WWF-Norway
Andrew Kroglund, WWF-Norway
Morten Eriksen, WWF-Norway

Andrew Preston, FIVAS

Therese Vangstad, the Norwegian Church Aid

Rasmus Gedde-Dahl, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Gunvor W. Skancke, Norad
Marit Lillejordet Karlsen, Norad

In Peru:

Edwin Vasquez Campos, Director, COICA
Diego Ivan Escobar, Director, COICA
Gil Inoach Shawit, Adviser, COICA

Julio E. Estradad Cordeor, Director, OPIAC

Juan Reategui Silva, Director, AIDSESEP
Saul Puerta, Secretary, AIDSESEP
Roberto Espinoza, Consultant, AIDSESEP

Alberto Paniague, Executive Director, PROFONANPE

Guillermo Sundi Akumbari, Director, ORCA MOCADIP

Jamner Manihuari Curitima, President, CORPI
Manerto Maícu Perez, President, CORPI

Lily la Torre, Director, Racimos de Urungahui

Cecar Gamboa, Director, DAR
Rosemarie Avila, DAR
Pilar Camero, DAR

Aldo Soto, Amazon Programme Manager, WWF-Peru
Diana Fernández, Administrative coordinator, WWF-Peru
Genina Lucana, Technical adviser, WWF-Peru
Liliana Lozano Flores, Coordinator, WWF-Peru
María Fernanda Jaramillo, Coordinator, WWF-Colombia
Teddy Peñaherrera, Conservation Director, WWF-Peru

Annex 3: List of Country and Institutional Analyses

Land	Tematisk fokus	År	Forfatter	Aktøranalyse
Etiopia	Civil Society and the Environmental Movement in Ethiopia Country Analysis	2008	Utviklingsfondet	Myndigheter, lovverk og sivilt samfunn
Malawi	Country Assessment of the State of the Environmental Movement In Malawi	2008	Konsulenter	Myndigheter, lovverk og sivilt samfunn
Nepal	Country Assessments of the State of Environmental Movement in Nepal	2008	Utviklingsfondet /EMiS	Myndigheter, lovverk, sivilt samfunn
Sri Lanka	The Civil Society and Environmental Movement in Sri Lanka	2008	Konsulenter	Sivilt samfunn
Zambia	An Overview of the State of the Environmental Movement in Zambia A Status Report	2008	Konsulent	Myndigheter, lovverk og sivilt samfunn
Afrika	Climate Change in Africa: A Context Analysis	2010	Konsulenter	Oversikt over klima nettverk og aktører
Sørlige Afrika	Oil and gas development in Sub Saharan Africa –	2009	Konsulenter	A contextual analysis
Kenya	CSOCBO Capacity assessment	2009	WWF-Kenya	
Kenya	Baseline study: Policy Advocacy Status and Ability of Target Environmental Civil Society Organizations in Kenya	2009	WWF-Kenya	
Kenya	Project: Strengthening Environmental CSOs in Kenya	2009	WWF-Kenya	
Uganda	ASSESSMENT OF THE DISTRICT CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS	2008	WWF-Uganda	
Sri Lanka	Evaluation of the Environmental Conservation and Awareness Creation Project 2003-2005 and the Green Movement of Sri Lanka for the Norwegian Development Fund	2006	Green Movement, Sri Lanka (DF)	Konsulenter

Indonesia	Back to Earth: towards future campaigning	2007	Walhi (RFN)	Konsulent
Joint Volunteers for the Environment	A network of youth-oriented environmental organisations	2009	JVE International (NVF)	Konsulent
Nigeria	Institutional Assessment of Environmental Rights Action/ Friends of the Earth, (ERA/FoEN)	2009	Environmental Rights Action (NVF)	ERA/NVF
Africa, regional	Institutional Assessment of Oilwatch, Africa	2009	Oilwatch (NVF)	Oilwatch /NVF
Ethiopia	Institutional Assessment	2008	Ethio Wetlands and Natural Resources Association (UF)	Konsulent
Ethiopia	Institutional Assessment	2008	Forum for environment (DF)	Konsulent
Ethiopia	Institutional Assessment	2008	Movement for Ecological Learning and Community Action (DF)	Konsulent
Ethiopia	Institutional assessment	2008	Tigray Women's Professional Association in Agriculture (DF)	Konsulent
Malawi	Institutional assessment	2007	Centre for environmental policy and advocacy (DF)	DF
Malawi	Institutional assessment	2007	RUFA (DF)	DF

Annex 4: 2008-2-10 EMIS Projektliste

Including 5-10% technical follow-up and 8%admin

Implementing local institution	org	2008 expenditures	2009 approved	2010 (contin. proj.+10%)	SUM
SAM - Sahabat Alam Malaysia	rff	334,757	692,582	761,840	1,789,179
WALHI - Friends of the Earth, Indonesia	rff	1,131,300	1,235,590	1,359,149	3,726,039
Papua New Guinea Eco Forestry Forum	rff	1,188,000	1,189,080	1,307,988	3,685,068
JOAS - Jaringan Orang Asal Se-Malaysia	rff	358,776	669,600	736,560	1,764,936
RF Norway	rff	1,164,930	1,389,960	1,000,000	3,554,890
FOBOMADE - Foro Boliviano sobre Medio Ambiente y Desarrollo	rff	376,920	1,200,000	1,320,000	2,896,920
WWF EARPO - WWF Eastern Africa Regional Programme Office	wwf	438,666	1,142,744	1,257,018	2,838,428
WWF EARPO - WWF Eastern Africa Regional Programme Office	wwf	242,860	1,128,443	1,241,287	2,612,590
WWF - local office	wwf	702,162	0	0	702,162
WWF - local office	wwf	786,414	1,698,391	1,868,230	4,353,035
WWF Madagascar and West Indian Ocean Programme Office	wwf	162,132	812,464	893,710	1,868,306
WWF CARPO - Central Africa Regional Programme Office	wwf		1,573,215	1,730,537	3,303,752
CEPA - Centre for Environmental Policy and Advocacy in Malawi	df	574,981	1,187,999	1,306,799	3,069,779
Green Movement of Sri Lanka	df	461,984	356,400	392,040	1,210,424
LIBIRD - Local Initiatives for Biodiversity, Research	df	295,708	437,582	481,340	1,214,631
SEARICE - South East Asia Regional Initiatives for Community Empowerment	df	1,087,095	1,119,200	1,231,120	3,437,415
Harvest Help	df	777,605	750,816	825,898	2,354,319
ASDA - Association for Sustainable Development Alternative	df	163,845	0	0	163,845
AEDE - Association for Environmental Development in Ethiopia	df	169,506	0	0	169,506
RUFA - Rural Foundation for Afforestation	df	330,697	356,400	392,040	1,079,137
EWNRA - Ethio Wetlands and Natural resources Association	df	232,645	712,800	784,080	1,729,525
NCDC - Namsaling Community Development Centre	df	53,262	475,200	522,720	1,051,182
MELCA - Movement for Ecological Learning and Community Action	df		314,820	346,302	661,122
FfE - Forum for Environment	df		415,800	457,380	873,180
Development Fund	df		498,960	548,856	1,047,816
				8,236,505	8,236,505
		49,494	700,000	1,500,000	2,249,494
		267,938	950,000	1,300,000	2,517,938
	0	11,351,677	21,008,046	31,801,400	64,161,122

Fordeling per medl.org		2008	2009	2010	SUM
Regnskogsfondet		4,554,683	6,376,812	6,485,537	17,417,032
Utviklingsfondet		4,147,329	6,625,977	7,288,575	18,061,880
WWF		2,332,233	6,355,257	6,990,783	15,678,273
Total		11,034,244	19,358,046	20,764,895	51,157,185
Regional fordeling					
		2008	2009	2010	
Afrika		3,092,936	7,664,881	8,431,369	
Latin-Amerika		1,865,496	2,898,391	3,188,230	
Asia		3,823,788	5,786,654	6,365,319	
Globalt/regionalt		2,252,025	3,008,120	2,779,976	
Total		11,034,244	19,358,046	20,764,895	51,157,185