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1 Introduction

The present cross-cutting evaluation of DanChurchAid’s (DCA) partnership programmes in Malawi and India focuses on added value in partnerships. In line with the Paris Declaration, donors have increasingly decentralised and prioritised working directly with national institutions and organisations, and the intermediary role of Northern, international NGOs (INGOs) has consequently been questioned. Based on these recent reflections in the global aid community, DCA has taken up the challenge to explore the question of the DCA value added to work and activities done by Southern civil society partners: is there more to the partnership than efficient administration of funds vis-à-vis back donors? 

The evaluation has been a positive experience - not only has it been conducted in an open and embracing environment, keen to learn from the exercise, but the overall picture of DCA partnership approach is positive. "Has the Evaluation Team (ET) been seduced during the process?" one may ask. We think not - we have deliberately looked also for subtracted value, but found very little. This, however, does not imply that there is no room for improvement, as the report will show.

Learning is a never ending process, to which DCA has committed itself. Programme development is therefore in general well documented and discussions and reflections are an in-built part of the learning culture. To a certain extent, we found that most information was already available within the organisation; what was missing was matching it with information from partner organisations’ perspective and back donors. A good part of the thinking had been done already! What became our task was putting the jigsaw puzzle together for the picture of added value to be visible. Based on this, findings and recommendations from the present evaluation will hopefully provide input for on-going organisational learning on how to take partnerships further.

---

1 Partnership is crucial for the programme implementation and advocacy activities undertaken by DCA and therefore chosen as the first of a number of so-called cross-cutting evaluations, which DCA has planned over the coming years.

2 Terms of Reference, p.18. Enclosed as Annex 1.
1.1 Objectives of the evaluation

The evaluation objective is:

- to assess how DCA contributes to strengthen partners’ ability to fulfil their role in civil society.

In order to further guide the assessment of DCA’s contribution to partner organisations, three evaluation questions are formulated:

1. What are the benefits (if any) of channelling development and humanitarian assistance funding through DCA, assessed by partners and donors?

2. Does DCA make a difference?
   a) Does the programme approach contribute to partners work and the partnership? If so, how does it make a difference? (Development)
   b) How does working with DCA affect partners’ ability to respond effectively, professionally and accountable in emergency situations? Does DCA make a difference? (Relief)

3. What are the most significant changes DCA partners have achieved - fulfilling their role as civil society working towards sustainable development?

The three evaluation questions have guided the analysis and are - when appropriate - assessed in relation to DAC evaluation criteria. Furthermore, the evaluation has been guided by a number of added value entry points identified by DCA and further explored through interviews.

Finally, it may be useful to bear the following question in mind when analysing added value in partnerships:

One may ask who implements on behalf of whom?! Are the partners fitting into the DCA programmes and as such helping DCA to fulfill the implementation of its programmes? Or is it the other way around - that DCA supports partner organisations implementing their programmes?

1.2 The evaluation team

COWI was contracted to undertake the evaluation, which ran during the period of January to June 2009. The Evaluation Team (ET) consisted of three consultants: Bente Topsoe-Jensen (COWI, Denmark) as team leader, Justin Nyondo (Management International, Malawi) and Khilesh Chaturvedi (ASK, India) as team members. The team has worked in close collaboration with the Pro-

---

1 ibid.
2 DAC/OECD evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.
3 Question asked by Clara Arenas, Core Group member; interview 22.04.09. DCA itself has reflected upon this dilemma: Role and Responsibilities of the Partners in the Programmes - experience gained and lessons learned in DCA, DCA Programologisk Forum, n.d.
gramme Development Unit (PDU) at DCA in Copenhagen and Regional Offices (RO) in Malawi and India during the evaluation.

1.3 **Focus and limitations**

When considering the focus of the evaluation, the following issues are of importance to bear in mind:

- The evaluation takes its point of departure in the perception of value added held by DCA as expressed in policy and programme documents, as well as by DCA staff at headquarters (HQ) and regional offices. Against this, is held the perception of other informants - partner organisations and back donor representatives. The evaluation exercise is as such a large triangulation based on interviews with informants and stakeholders from these categories.

- The intangible matter of the evaluation calls for a modification of the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. Consequently, we will consider the criteria of relevance, effectiveness and sustainability, whereas efficiency and impact will not be a main focus.

- In order to counterbalance the narrow focus on the positive aspects that an analysis of added value in itself reflects, it is important to keep an eye on possible subtracted value in order to make sure that the flip-side of partnership is also taken into account.

- Partnership goes both ways - and it is therefore important to consider not only what DCA does for its partners, but certainly also, what partners do for DCA in terms of added value. Implicit in this lies the question of *why partnership?*

In addition to this, there are a number of limitations to the scope and depth of the current evaluation, which are likewise important to bear in mind when reading the report:

- The evaluation has been limited to the two pre-selected countries - Malawi and India. The two countries are very different in terms of socio-political-cultural-economic-historic context - and consequently so are the DCA programmes! The immense diversity bears a risk of not sufficiently being able to address the issue of added value through partnership at a more generic level and consequently only to draw indicative lessons.

- The evaluation questions address both humanitarian response and development interventions. However, the selection of partner organisations for in-depth interview has been made according to programmes. \(^6\) Consequently, DCA operates with a number of programmes, i.e. PT 1 - Political Space, PT3 - Rights to Food, PT4 - HIV/AIDS, PT5 - Humanitarian response. Under each of the overall pro-

---

\(^6\) DCA operates with a number of programmes, i.e. PT 1 - Political Space, PT3 - Rights to Food, PT4 - HIV/AIDS, PT5 - Humanitarian response. Under each of the overall pro-
quently, as there are more development programmes and partners than humanitarian programmes and partners, the number of development partner organisations interviewed is higher than humanitarian response partner organisations. As the financial weight of the humanitarian response programme by far exceeds the development programme, the information obtained from partner organisations is biased in terms of relative financial weight.

- Based on the Terms of Reference (TOR), the current evaluation is an added value assessment and does not intend to be: 1) a system evaluation of DCA programme management tools; 2) a project evaluation at partner project level dealing with outputs and impact; 3) include regional programmes and 4) it does not involve end-beneficiaries or rights holders. As a consequence of the latter, when stated by partner organisations that RBA has been adopted; that villagers now claim their rights; that men and women openly address and discuss GBV issues; and that poor people claim their rights and hold duty bearers accountable - we have taken the information for face value and based our analysis on the statements.

- The evaluation has drawn upon information from three main sources: DCA itself, partner organisations and back donors. The number of interviews with back donors has been very limited. Consequently, statements can easily be biased by informants’ personal opinions and should therefore be carefully explored by DCA as a follow-up of the present evaluation.

- Few outside-the-DCA-family stakeholders could be consulted during the evaluation. In the enlightened hind sight it would have been useful to get outsider opinions on the added value of DCA partnership approach as well - not only from back-donors and sister organisations, but also from government officials, academics, consultants, other INGOs etc.

- Finally, the entire ET never met, as Bente worked with Justin in Malawi and with Khilesh in India. Better learning and enhanced discussions would have been advantages of bringing the team together.

1.4 Structure of the report

The backbone of the report is the evaluation questions, to which the evaluation seeks answers. There are, however, a number of additional entry points to the analysis: the policy framework of DCA and other organisations, the DAC/OECD evaluation criteria, and analysis of perceptions of added value held by key groups of informants.

programmes, several programmes can be implemented within one Regional / Country programme. See Chapter 3 DCA and partnership for more information.

Regional programmes have, however been included as two of four programmes implemented by DCA India are regional.
The Introduction is followed by a chapter on Methodology, outlining the steps taken to provide the necessary information. In Chapter 3, a brief introduction to DCAs policy framework and regional programmes in Malawi and India is presented together with a mapping of other INGOs’ partnership policies. Chapter 4 presents the perceived added value held by the three main groups of informants: DCA itself (staff, Board and Core Group), partner organisations and back-donors. In Chapter 5, main findings according to the evaluation questions are presented. Finally, Chapter 6 contains key recommendations based on analysis of findings.

The report has been compiled with substantial input from team members. The responsibility for the final version of the report lies, however, with the team leader.

Finally, the ET would like to thank all who have contributed to the evaluation. Not everybody will find specific reference to their contribution in the report. Please be assured that quoted or anonymous, every contribution has added value to the analysis.
2 Methodology

The core issue of the evaluation has been the perception of added value among partner organisations, back donors, DCA staff and a number of other stakeholders. The subject has been the quality and characteristics of the relationship between DCA and its partner organisation.

The evaluation has had a learning focus. Open dialogue, explorative discussions and continuous reflection, involving not only team members, but also DCA staff, partner organisations and other stakeholders have been basic principles for the ET’s work. This approach has helped to create common understanding of the process and ownership to findings.

The entry point for the analysis is the perception of added value held by DCA, which represents the mirror against which the perceptions of by partner organisations and back donors are held for reflection.

2.1 Tools and methods step-by-step

- Document review. The ET received an overwhelming lot of documents from DCA, which has been categorised and reviewed according to its direct importance and general value for the process. The following documents were given first priority: policy papers, programme documents, progress reports, review and evaluation reports; whereas minutes from Partner Platform-meetings, various events, project documents, correspondence etc. were reviewed on an ad hoc basis to clarify specific issues. Reference is made to the list of documents consulted in Annex 2.

- Explorative interviews with HQ staff served to understand the perception of added value in partnerships held by HQ staff. An interview guide was used, but many interviews were broader in scope, providing background information on DCA’s activities.

- Partner organisations’ self-evaluation. The objective of the self-evaluation by all partner organisations was twofold: 1) It provided the evaluation team with a solid and broad basis for identifying key issues and entry points on value added to be further explored with selected partner organisations and other stakeholders; and 2) It provided each partner

---

organisation with an opportunity to reflect upon the partnership relation and to present its own views on how and why partnership with DCA has any added value to their work and fulfilment of their role in civil society. Reference is made to Annex 3: Guidelines for self-evaluations.

- **Selection of partner organisations** for in-depth interviews was undertaken during the Inception Phase in close coordination with DCA in Copenhagen and DCA Regional Offices. Parameters for selection of three partner organisations per programme per country were: Humanitarian / development organisation; small and or grass root / national umbrella organisation; “weak” / “strong” organisation; rural / urban organisation; new / old partnership with DCA; advocacy / service delivery activities; related to one or more DCA programmes. The end-result was a representative selection, not a random sample. Annex 4 contains an overview of selected partner organisations.

- **Inception Note.** Before departure to Malawi and India an inception meeting was held with the DCA International Department’s Management Forum in Copenhagen. The team leader presented an Inception Note for discussion and valuable input was received in terms of focus and scope.

- **In-depth interviews with selected partner organisations** were undertaken as semi-structured interviews following an interview guide (Annex 5). Many interviews have been conducted as focus-group discussions, encouraging the exchange of opinions, but also individual interviews have been held, where no other option existed. The interview form and structure has been adjusted along the four weeks field work. Some issues e.g. have been dealt with more in-depth towards the end than in the beginning, as they have emerged along the process. In Malawi, Programme Officers (PO) participated in interviews as resource persons, whereas in India they did not. Although their participation represented a risk of bias, it was an overall positive experience, not least due to the learning approach, guiding the evaluation exercise. The change in methodology was justified by differences in culture and the strong point made by DCA staff in India of not wanting to influence partners. Interviews in Malawi were carried out in English; in India, some focus group interviews were conducted in Hindi, translated by one of the participants or the Indian team member to the team leader.

- **Focus-group discussions with sister organisations** were undertaken in Malawi with Norwegian Church Aid (NCA) and Christian Aid (CA), and in India with CA and ICCO.

- **Partner workshops to discuss preliminary findings** were conducted at the end of each country study. In Malawi, all partner organisations participated, whereas in India a selection of partner organisations were invited. The difference in approach was justified by the logistic and budgetary constraints of inviting all partners in a vast country as India. The workshops focused on presentation of preliminary findings, group and plenary discussions of a number of “emerging issues”, and gathering of input.
In Malawi, a specific **debriefing meeting** was held with Regional Office (RO) staff after the partner workshop, whereas in India, this was suspended, as we felt that the partner workshop in which the programme staff participated had exhausted the discussion.

**Interviews with back-donors** have taken place in Copenhagen, Malawi and India. The interviewed parties have been Danida, EU and ECHO, and it is important to stress that the volume of information available through interviews of back donors is not as big as the information obtained from partner organisation interviews.

**Presentation of preliminary findings to the RR-meeting** in Copenhagen was done by the team leader prior to compilation of the draft report. The discussions served as a reality check in relation to expectations for the evaluation held by key staff members in DCA, as well as providing a broader feeling of ownership and knowledge to the evaluation exercise within DCA.

**Interviews with DCA Board members, a DCA Core Group member and the Secretary General** were undertaken after the field visits as a group discussion and two individual interviews.

The **draft report has been circulated widely among DCA staff and partner organisations in Malawi and India for comments**, which have helped enriched the final version of the report.

The following **interim outputs** have been delivered during the evaluation:
- Inception Note, 26 February 2009
- PP-presentation for Inception meeting, 3 March 2009
- PP-presentation for Malawi Partner Workshop, 19 March 2009
- PP-presentation Introduction to DCA RO India, 23 March 2009
- PP-presentation for India Partner Workshop, 2 April 2009
- PP-presentation for RR-meeting in Copenhagen, 15 April 2009

### 2.2 Clarification of concepts

During the interviews in Malawi and India, we have come across the need to make clear the definition of two issues:

**Added value.** While explaining the purpose of the evaluation to partners, the term *added value* has been re-phrased in various ways to ensure proper understanding of our core concern. Based on the assumption, that partnership with DCA has brought about changes, among which one or several would qualify as most significant, we have used the term *most significant change* during the self-evaluations as a simplified expression of added value. While explaining what we were looking for, we have also used the term *comparative advantage* to encircle the added value of DCA partnership. Partners have often jumped to comparing their relationship with DCA to that of other INGOs, which means that we have chased the *uniqueness* of DCA. And for many partner organisations
added value lies in the accomplishment of concrete project objectives and goals - or is even synonymous to the tangible support in terms of assets and equipment! Finally, it is important to consider linguistic nuances created by different languages - English, Chichewa, Hindi.

**Partner organisations’ role in civil society.** The overall objective of the evaluation considers the influence of DCA partnership on partner organisations’ ability to carry out their role in civil society. Partner organisations’ view upon their own role is very diverse. Some see themselves primarily as service providers in humanitarian response work and/or development; others see their main role as fighters for rights, often actively engaged in advocacy and policy issues. DCA’s consistent rights based approach (RBA) does of course bridge the two under a common programme approach, but the organisations’ own understanding of their role is still important.
3 DanChurchAid and partnership

The present evaluation is an internal exercise, and therefore only a limited introduction to DCA is provided. In the following chapter, we focus on basic aspects of the organisation relevant to set the scene for analysing added value in partnership.

DCA’s development and humanitarian programmes are governed by the mission, vision and objectives outlined in the Vision & Plan 2006-2010 document, stating the DCA vision as a world at peace, free from poverty, discrimination and oppression. A world where resources are evenly distributed and where individual dignity is respected. The document stresses the need for strong civil society organisations and social movements in order to counterbalance the inequality and secure rights for poor people. The role of church-based development organisations is specifically recognised as important, and DCA activities are based on fundamental principles of diakonia: the North-South cooperation of partners shall be characterised by mutual respect and equality ensured through a close, loyal and open dialogue.9

In order to sustain and develop its programme activities, DCA has embarked upon a growth strategy, aiming at an annual turnover of DKK 700 mio by 2012.10 Much effort is vested in reaching the ambitious goal, and discussions within DCA focus on whether the drive for expansion not only through diversification of funding base, but also through the drastic increase in volume may jeopardise the core values of partnership, i.e. shared (moral and ethical) values, dialogue and long-term commitment. DCA management stresses that although the increase in volume may require expansion in terms of more partnerships and maybe more countries, there is no intention to divert the thematic focus.11 The delicate balance of adhering to the growth strategy and respecting partner organisations’ often limited absorption capacity is a challenge.

An important aspect of DCA in relation to the added value in partnership evaluation is the decentralisation of programme implementation responsibility12 and establishment of country offices, based on the Board decision in 2002.

---

9 DCA Vision & Plan 2006-2010, p.4.
10 Økonomiske Udfordringer for Folkekirkens Nødhjælp, Juni 2007, p.4
11 Interview with Christian Friis Bach and Klaus Lokkegaard, 23.02.2009
12 Thematic Review of Danish Church Aid with special focus n Organisational Decentralisation and HIV/AIDS, Ministry of Foreign Affairs/ NCG, June 2006.
The aim is fourfold: better quality of work through closer contact with partners, better documentation for evidence based advocacy, expanded fundraising and increased effectiveness. Findings of the present evaluation confirm that the intentions have been met as the in-country presence is a key factor in value addition to partnerships. DCA has no specific intentions to register as national NGOs in the countries of operation, as this could jeopardise the programme and partnership strategy through which partner organisations - not DCA - are responsible for implementation. Through registration, DCA may well become a competitor to its partners in terms of quest for funds and political participation.\(^{13}\)

While decentralisation of implementation responsibility takes place, DCA is simultaneously strengthening its **international alliances** with APRODEV-partners\(^ {14}\) and through the ACT alliance\(^ {15}\). Latest, DCA has joined the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP), which is a self-regulatory body within the humanitarian sector.\(^ {16}\) Malawi has been chosen as a pilot country for the implementation of HAP-standards.

Fundamental for understanding the framework for DCA’s partnership relations is the **programme approach**, which was adopted with the decentralisation in 2002. A limited number of programme types has been defined to facilitate strengthened competences within a few sectors and a more qualified support to partners.\(^ {17}\) At a global level, 25 programmes\(^ {18}\) are currently developed in partnership with DCA partner organisations and managed by the DCA decentral-

---

\(^{13}\) Interview with Henrik Stubkjær, 22.04.2009.

\(^{14}\) APRODEV is the association of the 17 major protestant development and humanitarian aid organisations in Europe, which work closely together with the World Council of Churches (www.aprodev.net). APRODEV-partners have a common RBA-agenda as expressed in a recent publication: *Rights-based Development from a Faith-based Perspective*, **APRODEV Joint Position Paper, June 2008**

\(^{15}\) Action by Churches Together (ACT) International is a global alliance of Protestant and Orthodox churches and related agencies working to save lives and support communities in emergencies worldwide (www.act-intl.org) ACT Development brings together churches and related organisations in a new global alliance aimed at eradicating poverty, injustice and the abuse of human rights. This alliance will focus on long-term development, building on the emergency response work already undertaken by ACT International (www.actdevelopment.org). The two branches of ACT will be joined by 2010.

\(^{16}\) Established in 2003, HAP International is the humanitarian sector’s first international self-regulatory body. Members of HAP are committed to meeting the highest standards of accountability and quality management. In addition, HAP certifies those members that comply with the HAP Standard in Humanitarian Accountability and Quality Management, providing assurance to disaster survivors, staff, volunteers, host authorities and donors that the agency will deliver the best humanitarian service possible.


\(^{18}\) Programme Monitoring Guidelines, final draft, February 2009
ised regional offices. There are five types of programmes\(^{19}\) and for each programme a policy document has been elaborated.\(^{20}\)

- Political Space (PT1)
- Rights to Food (PT3)
- HIV and AIDS (PT4)
- Humanitarian Assistance (PT5)
- Humanitarian Mine Action (PT6)

The programmes are all formulated and implemented with strong focus on RBA and gender equality.\(^{21}\) The establishment of partner platforms\(^{22}\) for each programme is a key feature of the programme approach, aiming at facilitating capacity building, sharing of experience and knowledge and increased partner influence.

DCA has a comprehensive toolbox for programme implementation, management and monitoring, which is aimed at enhancing organisational learning. Detailed 4-steps guidelines for project identification, formulation and approval exist to facilitate Programme Officers (PO) to work in a participatory way with partner organisations. Programme documents are systematically structured and the 4th objective in all programmes focus on partnership relations and programme coherence and synergy. However, the monitoring system has no specific registration of partner organisations’ perception of added value in relation to partnerships, albeit information on added value related issues are available.\(^{23}\) Several learning loops established can provide entry points: At local level through the partner platforms; cross-cutting collaboration between POs from different country programmes; formulation of project applications, involving partners, POs, RO administrative & finance staff, country coordinators and Global Funding Unit (GFU) in Copenhagen; active follow-up on programme reviews and programme evaluations.

Important for monitoring and enhanced accountability is also the HAP Audits\(^{24}\), which focus on procedures and adherence to international and own standards for humanitarian work. The compliance with HAP procedures and standards supports DCA to operate in a transparent and accountable manner vis-à-vis its partners and beneficiaries / rights-holders.

Due to organisational changes like decentralisation, growth strategy and programme focus, DCA operates with a relatively new mass of partner organisations and programme staff. The overall partner portfolio has more than doubled since 2005 and at regional offices more than half of the programme staff has

\(^{19}\) The Humanitarian Mine Action programme has not been part of the present evaluation.
\(^{20}\) DCA Programme Policies: Political Space; The Rights to Food; HIV and AIDS; Humanitarian Assistance, May 2007.
\(^{23}\) Interview with Kirsten Duus, 26.01.09
been employed during the last two years. This means that the institutional memory among partners and programme staff is very short. This has had implications in terms of tracing the development of added value over time in Malawi and India, e.g. in relation to questions of decentralisation and introduction of programme approach. Furthermore, one should consider that two opposite tendencies are in play: the decentralisation of programme implementation responsibility to ROs, with a simultaneous increased focus on programme monitoring, aimed at (central) organisational learning and satisfaction of back donors’ reporting requirements.

3.1 DCA in Malawi and India

DCA has chosen Malawi and India as the countries to be used as examples in the evaluation of added value in partnerships based on a number of selection criteria: well established offices, long term commitments and on-going development programmes and humanitarian response activities; a recently launched ACT appeal in at least one of the countries; and at least one African country.

Malawi and India are some of the older DCA programme countries, both characterised by +30 years of engagement and some very long-term partnerships within the humanitarian response programme. This said, there are few similarities between the two countries and the two DCA partnership programmes. The country context influences the ‘shape’ of the programmes, as do the people who implement them.

Within the framework set by the guiding policies of DCA in terms of RBA, gender and specific programme themes, DCA Malawi operates with a predominantly church-based partner portfolio which has recently been supplemented with a few secular or Muslim partner organisations. A main challenge is to gradually introduce the new principles of RBA and gender equality among partners who have been used to work primarily from a needs based approach, addressing food security and livelihood issues, and where traditional gender practices have not been challenged in any fundamental way. DCA India on the other hand, has chosen to change the geographical focus from South India, while at the same time establishing partnerships with a large number of secular organisations, which were already focussed on RBA and gender equality. It is evident that the two different approaches to introducing RBA have implications not only for the profile of the partner portfolio, but the organisational identity of the DCA country / regional programme itself.

25 Interview with Henrik Stubkjær, 22.04.09.
26 Brief Country Information sheets are included in Annex 6.
27 Terms of Reference, p.19
The following programmes are being implemented in the two countries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Mid-term review</th>
<th>Number of partners*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT1 Malawi Civic &amp; Political Space</td>
<td>2006-2009</td>
<td>July 2008</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT5 Malawi Relief</td>
<td>2006-2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT1 India Social Justice</td>
<td>2007-2011</td>
<td>Nov 2009</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT1 South Asia** Safe Migration</td>
<td>2007-2011(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT3 India Rights to Food</td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
<td>Sep. 2008</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT5 South Asia Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
<td>Mid-2010</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some partner organisations are engaged in more than one programme. Consequently the number of partners indicated in the table does not add up to 20 partner organisations in Malawi and the 42 in India / South Asia.

** The TOR specifically underline that the evaluation should deal only with Indian partners, but as two of four programmes implemented by the DCA India office are regional, a few regional partners under the Safe Migration programme have been interviewed.

### 3.2 DCA Partnership approach

The DCA partnership approach is governed by a number of policy papers, of which the DCA Partnership Policy provides the overall conceptual frame for partnership programmes in development and humanitarian response work. The Vision & Plan 2006-2010 document outlines the DCA objectives in relation to development of effective national and international partnerships and alliances as being based on long-term cooperation, equality through dialogue and systematic consultation procedures, support to partners’ autonomy and support to global trends, alliances and networks.

---

28 Only to some degree structured under a programme, TOR, p. 16 and correspondence with Cecilie Bjørnskov-Johansen / PDU 8 Dec. 08.
29 DCA Partnership Policy document, 2006
DCA has been working in partnerships long before adopting the 2006 Partnership Policy for International Co-operation, which is therefore based on previous experience of partnership collaboration. The DCA Partnership Policy guides the collaboration with local development and humanitarian relief work partner organisations. The Partnership Policy is basically a vision and outlines DCA’s ambition on partnership.

The document provides the key interpretation of partnership as seen by DCA: a partnership is based on mutual ownership, accountability, participation, equality, harmonisation and alignment. The Partnership Policy challenges the traditional donor-beneficiary relationship, seeking a stronger, mutual relationship, based on shared values. Partnership is seen as relationship beyond limited project funding, in terms of time and content.

Although based on Christian values, DCA Partnership Policy extends its collaboration to partners of other faiths, of an inter-faith nature as well as non-religious organisations.

Central to DCA are a number of key motivating forces of working in partnership: maintaining a rights-based perspective; decentralising decision-making and focussing on programmes; responding positively to the increased quality requirements from back donors; and addressing the need for long-term strengthening of local disaster response capacity.

Partnership activities address the need for creating spaces for dialogue, funding and/or fundraising capacity, as well as capacity building and cooperation on advocacy. The development of strong local ownership and accountability is crucial for the successful partnership development, acknowledging that organisations must build accountability vis-à-vis own constituencies and right-holders.

DCA recognises that the increasing demands from various international donors and/or partners pose a heavy burden on local organisations and therefore strives to harmonise and align through the development of multilateral partner strategies.

The principles for DCA partnership collaboration tallies with the three main preconditions stated in the official Danish Civil Society Strategy31: 1) partners in development countries must assume primary responsibility for implementation of activities; 2) partner organisations must be provided with opportunities to participate in international networks, and 3) efforts must be made to secure the partner organisations’ financing from several different sources. Furthermore, the DCA partnership approach aligns with priorities and strategic focus

---

31 Strategy for Danish Support to Civil Society in Developing Countries, p.34, MFA Denmark, December 2008.
of the (draft) Danish Humanitarian Action Strategy\textsuperscript{32} by focussing on i.a. the strengthening of vulnerable groups’ ability to deal with emergencies, on climate change and on strategic choice of partners.

The DCA partnership concept is based on mutuality and complementarity, which means that DCA acknowledges its role as the resource strong part in any partnership. The challenge is to pass beyond the donor / recipient roles into a mutually beneficiary relationship. It is through the building of strong local organisations that the development work carried out by DCA becomes sustainable.

### 3.3 Mapping of partnership approaches

A specific task of the evaluation has been to undertake a summary mapping of other INGOs’ partnership policies\textsuperscript{33} to screen for different approaches and inspiration, which could feed into the analysis of DCA added value evaluation: \textit{Can something be learned from sister and like-minded organisations’ policy papers?}

Based on a review of the organisations’ partnership policies, a summary matrix is presented in Annex 7. The main issues emerging from the mapping are.

- As it appears, all the included organisations are dedicated to engaging in closer relationship with new and existing partners in the South and North. Most organisations emphasise working around shared values and goals and through sharing of experiences and responsibilities. Accountability, advocacy, networking and organisational development are also important aspects of most organisations’ partnership principles.

- DCA and MS are the only organisations that present formats for partnership agreements in their material (DCA in the policy paper itself\textsuperscript{34}, MS as an annex to their note on partnerships\textsuperscript{35}), which provides a good and transparent picture of the expected commitment, content and structure of actual partnerships. Some of the other organisations mention various types of partnership agreements being applied, but give no or very limited information as to their content and scope of application.

\textsuperscript{32} The strategy has recently been revised and is currently up for public hearing: http://www.um.dk/NR/rdonlyres/F8427225-C5D2-422F-ABD6-A4AB78167DAF/0/StrategyforDanishHumanitarianAction20102015.pdf

\textsuperscript{33} The mapping of partnership approaches by DCA’s sister organisations: Norwegian Church Aid (NCA), Christian Aid (CA) Diaconia, and ICCO, as well as a couple of like-minded, Scandinavian organisations: Mellemfølkeligt Samvirke (MS) and Norwegian People’s Aid (NPA).

\textsuperscript{34} Currently, DCA has only few partnerships, where the ideal type of partnership agreement, including basket funding arrangements is applied.

\textsuperscript{35} MS Partnerships, 2009.
• Most of the organisations studied have criteria in place for selecting and assessing potential and existing partner organisations. Some furthermore distinguish between short-term and long-term partnerships and/or different categories of partners.

• The mapping exercise has furthermore revealed that exit strategies are given very limited attention in the organisations’ partnership approaches.

• When comparing DCA’s partnership approach with that of other organisations, the DCA policy appears clear and operational. DCA’s Partnership Policy depicts the types of partners worked with and the main partnership principles and provides a specified framework for partnerships in the form of a partner agreement format. The policy paper is comprehensive and contains relevant information in one single document. For some of the other organisations, information on partnership-related issues has to be assembled from a number of different documents.

The ET finds that DCA may find inspiration for addressing the issues of sustainability or time limitedness versus eternity (exit strategies) from NCA and ICCO, whereas the input for a possible classification of partnerships may be found in the policy papers from NCA, ICCO and MS. The different levels of partnership in terms of intensity and degree may need some elaboration. Otherwise, the overall impression from the mapping is that the DCA partnership policy is comprehensive and clear.
4 Perception of added value

Added value in relation to the partnership process is an intangible issue, where the relationship in itself is the core target of attention. Focus has been on soft evidence, i.e. from document review and interviews with key informants among DCA staff at HQ and Regional Offices; from partner organisations’ self-evaluations and in-depth interviews with selected partner organisations; through discussions at partner workshops; from interviews with sister organisations in Malawi and India, as well as with back-donor representatives in Malawi, India and Denmark.

This chapter contains information on the main informant groups’ perception of added value.\(^{36}\) We have grouped main categories provided by DCA\(^ {37}\) - policy development, capacity building, programme development, fundraising and advocacy - and used them to structure the presentation of DCA’s and back donors’ perception. Partner organisations’ perception follow a different, but comparable structure, as it adheres to the evidence provided through partner organisation interviews.

4.1 DCA perception of added value

Explorative interviews with DCA staff at HQ level and ROs have confirmed the main categories of added value as perceived by DCA, but added details and new dimensions to the list. There is no doubt that there are many different perceptions within the organisation, depending on the different entry points - development or humanitarian response, head quarter or regional office, programme type and system / administrative entry point versus technical implementation. The organisational concern for added value and the need for documentation is reflected in PPM tools and various synthesis reports, reviews and evaluations.\(^ {38}\) There is, however, no specific focus on partner organisations’ perception of added value through partnership in the DCA monitoring system.

---

\(^{36}\) No references are made directly to interviewed persons in order to respect confidentiality, as well as to present generic statements.

\(^{37}\) Annex 2B of Terms of Reference.

\(^{38}\) Meta analysis of evaluations of DCA supported projects and programmes since 2003 and recommendations for evaluation policy, DCA document, 17.10.2006; Summary of discussions and decisions, International Seminar 2008, p.6-7; 2008 Programme Progress Report; programme progress reports, reviews and evaluations.
which makes it difficult to systematically trace information, experience and best practices.

a. Policy development
DCA sees partnership basically as a question of shared values, providing basis for common critical and confident interaction and exploration of new avenues. Policy development in partnership is based on on-going dialogue and discussion - and the process itself is considered an added value. The general aid architecture shaped by the Paris Declaration and increasing focus on government budget support requires that INGOs assume the responsibility of the human dialogue.

Policy and strategy guiding DCA development and humanitarian response work is a core added value from the point of view of key informants within DCA. The capacity to act innovatively and introduce new approaches and ideas with partners is seen as important. Examples were given of the insistent introduction of HIV/AIDS work through church-based partners in Malawi, as well as the mainstreaming of a RBA in all programmes. Through the determined focus on RBA, DCA helps setting higher standards, e.g. among partner organisations that would not necessarily work from a RBA. Consistent focus on other cross-cutting issues like gender and conflict sensitivity is also considered an added value.

b. Capacity building
Capacity building in broad terms is a core added value in partnerships - as seen not only by DCA, but also by partner organisations and back donors. The capacity building embraces organisational and strategic development, management, administration, finances, planning, monitoring and evaluation.

Specifically the increased administrative capacity leading to possible additional fund raising by partners themselves is considered important. Based on the principle of dialogue, the capacity building often takes place through learning-by-doing, e.g. in elaboration of EU-applications. Another example given is the entire process of negotiations and discussions which will lead to the merger of ACT International and ACT Development in 2010 - the process itself is capacity building.

The examples given are related to fundraising or administration of funds, which corresponds with the fact that DCA sees its strength in the mix between technical and administrative capacity and funding weight.

c. Programme implementation
For DCA there are two main added values in relation to programme implementation: the linking of relief rehabilitation and development (LRRD) in longer term humanitarian assistance and development programmes; and the entire programme approach with partner platforms as the pivot, where cross-learning is stimulated and advocacy invigorated through synergy between partner organisations and DCA and on a peer basis among partners. DCA sees its technical capacity in relation to Sphere Standards and DCA Humanitarian Assistance focus and within DCA programme focus as an added value. At a cen-
DCA sees the participation in ACT as an added value - to ACT and to partners - through the strength in combining relief and resource mobilisation.

Organisational learning through knowledge sharing about programme design, also between countries is a central issue in programme implementation, and examples of e.g. cross-border learning between Malawi and Zambia were given, just as the regional approach in some of the South Asia programmes is an added value in itself. DCA understands flexibility in planning and implementation as an added value.

Through the decentralised programme implementation, DCA is closer to partners and engages in project implementation through dialogue and sparring, i.e. engages in co-implementation with partner organisations. It also involves establishment of networks and alliances, e.g. ACT fora, Partner Platforms and coordination with sister organisations.

d. Fundraising

Talking about fundraising in relation to added value becomes very literal. It is, however, an important issue, as DCA adds value through support to partner organisations’ fundraising. The secure and stable funding base through longer term engagement in humanitarian programmes is likewise an added value, just as providing access to alternative funding sources is.

The general development in the aid environment does, however, constitute a threat, as there is an increasing competition among sister organisations within APRODEV and ACT for the same resources.

e. Advocacy

Engagement in evidence-based advocacy is for DCA a key added value, which is possible due to the vertical links established from grass root level through partner organisations to national, regional and global levels. Advocacy is based on values deriving from being a church-based organisation with access to an enormous constituency in the North. DCA’s engagement in advocacy, information and campaign work in the North is based on solidarity and brings partners on board to global agendas, e.g. facilitating partners’ participation in the coming Climate Summit COP15 in Copenhagen. DCA provides a broader perspective to the global world - or as expressed by a Board member: represents globalised professionalism.

At programme level, DCA’s commitment to RBA strengthens local accountability and law enforcement endeavours through advocacy.

DCA sees the Volunteer-programme as an added value for the organisation in the North. The value of exposing young people to an engaged and humanitarian world view is an incomparable investment in the future. But it is acknowledged that it is to a certain extent a burden to partner organisations. This was actually confirmed by a partner representative, who told that he had been sleepless for several weeks out of concern for the two young girls left alone in the village!
4.2 Partner organisations’ perception of added value

Information for this chapter derives mainly from in-depth interviews carried out with selected partner organisations in Malawi and India\(^{39}\), supplemented with information from the self-evaluations carried out by partner organisations prior to the field visits\(^ {40} \).

Based on the information gathered and discussions held at partner workshops at the end of each country field visit, a clear picture of partner organisations’ main priorities in terms of perceived added values is seen. A Top-5 list is used to structure the present chapter for presenting partner organisations’ perception of added value through partnership with DCA.

The partner organisations’ Top 5-list of added value

1. Capacity building & organisational development
2. Flexibility in funding
3. Programme approach & partner platforms
4. In-country presence & staff attitude
5. Introduction of new perspectives

1. Capacity building & organisational development

The fact that DCA increasingly promotes capacity building in areas of RBA, gender mainstreaming and financial management is much appreciated.\(^ {41} \) The various forms applied for training - courses and study tours enrich learning prospects. DCA has also taken up carefully selected themes, e.g. global understanding and “communal harmony”\(^ {42} \) for discussion. The fact that DCA sees audit as capacity building, not a control mechanism is also seen as an added value emphasising the importance of a learning approach.

Capacity building and organisational development are seen as closely related and as part of building sustainability in partnerships. Organisational development is perceived as skills up-grading rather than changes in internal organisational structure. It was expressible appreciated that DCA respects the organisational integrity of their partners through supporting their strategies (as

---

\(^{39}\) In-depth interviews were carried out with 10 partner organisation in Malawi and 15 in India/South Asia. In addition to that 28 partner organisations participated in workshops at the end of each of the country field visits.

\(^{40}\) A total of 30 self-evaluations were carried out (15 in Malawi and 15 in India).

\(^{41}\) Similar findings are presented in the Review of Lessons Learned and Recommendations for further Development of DCA’s Global Funding Capacity, January 2009.

\(^{42}\) The expression ”communal harmony” is used in India and covers issues related to promotion of peace, justice and diversity at all levels.
opposed to getting into the *machine room*!). For partner organisations, organisational development also involves **provision of equipment and assets** as a tangible added value.

Partners feel that they have learned to **negotiate with Government** rather than creating confrontations through partnership with DCA, and the activities are linked to the macro-level discussions. The fact that partner organisations have gained **recognition and credibility in relation to other resource partners** and donors through the capacity building and partnership with DCA is an added value.

2. **Flexibility in funding**
The willingness to undertake **budget revisions and adjustments** according to needs presented by partners, as well as timely disbursements\(^\text{43}\) is an added value much appreciated by partners. Flexibility covers also the fact that DCA is willing to support **core funding** or organisational running costs, which is different from most other funding partners. Related to funding is also the support given by DCA in **preparation of project applications** for other funding sources (mainly EU), where the **interactive approach** applied is considered unique - in some cases DCA even engages in preparing the proposal, when they do not themselves benefit from an approval!

Related to funding, is the added value of **ACT-forum coordination** recognised especially by humanitarian response partners. The ACT-forum also provides a forum for North-South exchange of experience.

The ET observed that only few partners complained about the volume of the funding\(^\text{44}\) and the fact that it has been reduced with the shift to programme approach. The fact that partner organisations in general do not find the rather limited level of funding a problem indicates that **there is more to the partnership than funds**. Also the fact that cross-cutting funds are administered by DCA and that funds are spent on partner platform meetings and other joint events was never questioned by partners during the in-depth interviews.

3. **Programme approach & partner platforms**
For most partner organisations, the **partner platform meetings** (PPM) represent the concretisation of the programme approach. It is through the PPM that networking, synergy, mutual exchange and learning take place and a stepping stone for advocacy is provided. Several partner organisations have appreciated that they meet people they would otherwise not meet through the PPMs, e.g. church-based organisations meet secular organisations, or Christian partners meet partners from other faiths. PPM **agendas are developed by partners**, not

\(^\text{43}\) In India, some complaints about delayed disbursements were presented to the ET, but it was also appreciated that the DCA RO makes an effort in finding out why delays occur and when funds will be available.

\(^\text{44}\) Some of the older (humanitarian response) partners complained that after DCA had settled with permanent programme staff and taken on board more partners, "the cake had to be divided among (too) many".
by DCA, which is mentioned as an added value, strengthening the sense of ownership and relevance.

The participatory approach applied during programme formulation creates ownership and anchorage among partner organisations, although it may be questioned whether partners who come aboard during implementation sense the same ownership towards the programme. Partners find that the programme approach with a clear focus has helped them strengthen their own focus and the 3-5 years perspective is an added value as compared to shorter term engagements.

Advocacy is not mentioned specifically as an added value, but seen as a spin off of PPM and programme approach. As an example was mentioned DCA’s long-term engagement and commitment with Dalit issues in India through advocacy for Dalit-issues in Denmark, Brussels and UN.

PPMs provide the opportunity to work with new organisations and bring people from all parts of the country together, which is in itself an added value. It is appreciated that DCA promotes a spirit of mutual recognition rather than competition among partners. Partners appreciate the PPM concept of a meeting combining training with field visit and peer monitoring of programme implementation. The introduction to DCA objectives and discussion of cross-cutting issues (RBA, gender, climate change) help partners plan for future activities. Consequently, many partners say the PPM is an added value in itself.

4. In-country presence & staff attitude
Among partners, there is a unanimous positive response to the DCA in-country presence: technically competent national POs in the forefront, in-depth understanding of political context, language skills, easy access, frequent contact and regular feed-back are among the added values related to in-country presence and established ROs. The presence of a Regional Representative (RR) further eases decision making. However, the tendency to fundamental changes in approach when a new RR arrives has been commented by partner organisations. Much depend on the personality and individual interpretation of DCA policy, which can lead to abrupt changes in programme development - not necessarily a bad thing, but seen from partner organisations’ point of view not necessarily a result of deliberate policy choices either.

In the case of India, special attention was called to the fact that DCA - unlike other donors, who have moved out because of the economic growth - has stayed on and even reinforced its programme addressing issues of social exclusion and marginalisation. For partner organisations, however, it is important that DCA, unlike other international organisations, does not cross the borderline to the public arena, where only national organisations should be engaged in advocacy and political issues.

45 Reference is made to the observation in the 2008 Programme Progress Report, p.17, where it is observed that few programme platforms are actually engaged in joint advocacy initiatives, although a number of platforms have carried out advocacy training.
DCA is seen as **accessible, non-intrusive and a practitioner of openness**. The true partner attitude is characterised by **recognition, respect and reliability**. Examples were given of DCA allowing potential partners to discuss and criticise concept papers for different programmes, which has created a greater sense of ownership. Likewise, DCA attends partners’ meetings and events and visit their offices. The consistent **demand for quality** adds value to the partnership.

5. **Introduction of new perspectives**
DCA’s initiative and responsibility in terms of introducing new concepts and approaches - **RBA, gender, climate change, HAP-programme** - provides a window to the international development and humanitarian arena and is as such an added value. DCA’s consistent focus on the most marginalised groups is another example given on introducing new approaches, as well as the **increased capacity of communities to claim rights**.

Through PPMs, DCA has been able to attract high-thinking people into their **network for cross-fertilization and exchange**. The special attention to new ways of thinking and acting is an added value. An example was given by partners in India, where the external DCA gender resource person is now providing support to the education programme of one of the PT1 partners as a result of networking at the DCA South Asia partner meeting - an example of innovative match-making.

The introduction of new perspectives is seen as linked to the determination to support **filling the knowledge gap**, which exists in many areas. An example of untraditional partnership thinking is the support given to the Indian Food Commissioner’s Office in India to undertake studies and provide evidence of food shortage, poverty and deficient rights accomplishment. Supporting development and humanitarian work is not only through direct action, but also through providing the necessary documentation for local organisations to act.

4.3 **Back-donors’ perception of added value**
The ET interviewed key informants among DCA’s main back donors. Information from interviews has been supplemented by back donors’ policy and strategy documents. The perception of possible or actual added value encountered among donors represent considerations related to the expected added value by DCA, but also by INGOs in general.

It is important to consider also back donors’ different expectations to collaboration with the organisations they fund. Danida engages in a close dialogue with

---

46 Vulnerability studies undertaken by the Food Commissioner’s Office in 2008.
47 Information is based on interviews held with Danida / Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, EU Delegations in Malawi and India and ECHO delegation in India, as well as e-mail correspondence with ECHO in Brussels.
48 Strategy for Danish Support to Civil Society in Developing Countries, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, December 2008; draft Danish Humanitarian Action Strategy; EU regional/country strategies.
the frame organisations, seeing the NGO programmes as part of the overall Danish development assistance. Without neglecting mutual learning and strive for improvement, ECHO looks strictly at results in terms of effectiveness and adherence to administrative procedures. As long as outcome is successful and management is good each partner can organise itself as it intends to work and in function of its characteristics and the type of projects undertaken. As mentioned in Chapter 1.3 Focus and limitations, it is a general problem that information from back donors is based on a limited number of interviews.

Finally, it is also important to remember that most back donor representatives interviewed refer to part of the overall DCA programme activities. Comments may therefore be made based on knowledge of a limited part of the overall programme.

a. Policy Development
In terms of policy development, the role of DCA (and other INGOs) in introducing new trends and ideas is seen as an important added value to overall development practice. DCA is recognised as a creative and innovative organisation, which strives to walk the talk.

b. Capacity building
All back donors interviewed pointed to the importance of capacity building, when considering the value added by INGOs in supporting local organisations. The focus on capacity building is in line with the official Danish Civil Society Strategy, where the efforts to empower local partner organisations to become independent are a key element when considering added value, a fact also stressed by EU in India.

It was, however, questioned by one informant, if DCA to the extent necessary has geared the organisation to RBA, when it comes to capacity building competences. The shift from sector specific capacity to a mainstreamed RBA for all programmes poses new challenges to DCA in terms of the required competences and skills to support partners in their role as implementers of the programmes. The ET has observed that although DCA strives to mainstream RBA in all aspects of programme work, it may still be an issue dealt with by specific persons in the organisation.

c. Programme implementation
In terms of programme implementation, the consistent approach of working through local partners was considered an added value as it is cost effective, secures greater contextual understanding, flexibility of decision-making etc. But it may also be a potential weakness. Several informants were of the opinion that DCA may have gone too far in terms of focussing on RBA and trusting partners’ capacity when it comes to technical skills, while also implementing too many diverse programmes, where specific technical back-stop knowledge would be required?49 In some cases, the peer support among partners within a specific programme or between programmes is encouraged and serves to fill

49 DCAs capacity in Food Security and Protection issues were acknowledged, but it was questioned if there is necessarily sufficient skills in e.g. HIV/AIDS, water supply etc.
this gap. The question is whether this is always sufficient and systematically practised?

In India, ECHO questioned if DCA partners always have the necessary technical capacity to implement the humanitarian response programmes. And if not - where will DCA seek support?! The courage to trust partners’ capacity was acknowledged, but also seen as a possible risk for failure.

In programme implementation, dialogue is considered an added value in development and humanitarian assistance through INGOs. DCA has established good practices of dialogue with local partners - and not necessarily through Danish personnel. It is appreciated that DCA is lean on Danish field staff, which counterbalances the otherwise cost-heavy in-country presence through RO and local staff. Through in-country presence and outreach through local partners, DCA holds a remarkable in-depth understanding of the local, political-cultural context, which one does not normally see among INGOs.

DCA is acknowledged for its innovativeness in disaster response, i.e. DCA goes beyond resolving the immediate problems and thinks long term. There is a consistent focus on sustainability through partners’ sense of ownership and continuity in DCA engagement. The dual engagement (LRRD) in development and humanitarian response is an added value in terms of being able to engage in long-term risk reduction and disaster mitigation. It is a general experience that the major organisations which have both branches tend to do better, as they have the resources - and partnerships - available for long-term commitment. In addition to this, a consistent targeting of the most vulnerable is considered an added value when engaging with DCA.

d. Fundraising
DCA is by some respondents seen as adding value to partnership with local organisations through the ability to provide matching funds for e.g. EU-funding. This is a very literal interpretation of added value - but consistent with perceptions held by many of the interviewed partner organisations and DCA itself.

DCA’s ambitious Growth Strategy is questioned as it may be counter productive in relation to local partner organisations’ limited implementation and absorption capacity. Some hesitation was expressed by Danida as to the use of Danida frame funds as seed money to obtain other donor funds. The ET found that this is mainly due to the fact that Danida may wish to be able to trace Danida contributions, which is less visible, once the funds are fungible.

e. Advocacy
Surprisingly few opinions on the role of DCA in global advocacy were presented. Although it was acknowledged that DCA stands up for its cause in spite of the political risk it may represent, others commented that it was a cautious balance of not acting on behalf of partner organisations. The fact that local

---

50 Økonomiske Udfordringer for Folkekirkenes Nødhjælp, Juni 2007.
partners are facilitated access to international fora through partnership with DCA is seen as an added value.

Donors commented on the importance of working through a church-based network and saw the broad constituency and outreach as an added value - in Denmark as well as in the countries where DCA operates.

Finally, partnering with DCA makes it possible for local organisations to undertake certain activities, which - often for political reasons - would entail risks or not be possible. The partnership with DCA (and other INGOs) offers protection in terms of exposure, particular in human rights issues.

4.4 Concluding remarks on perceived added value

The presentation of the perception of added value held by different DCA stakeholders provides an interesting picture of diversity and alignment at the same time. As mentioned, the DCA main categories of added value have been easily applied in relation to the information gathered from back donors, whereas the partner organisations have expressed their priorities in a slightly different language. And consequently, the presentation has followed other headings.

When comparing the content, however, a surprising alignment is seen. Annex 8 DCA added value summary matrix shows that the designation of the headings may differ and the priority given to the different added values may not be the same, but the content reflects very much a coherent and corresponding view upon what adds value to the partnership.
5 Main findings - evaluation questions

Based on the perceived added value, the main findings are discussed through the structure of the evaluation questions in the present chapter. Key findings and areas for improvement are summarised at the end of each sub-chapter. The overall objective of the evaluation, i.e. assessment of how DCA contributes to strengthen partners’ ability to fulfil their role in civil society is unfolded through the details discussed in this chapter.

The short version of the conclusion is, yes - there is added value through partnership! Main areas highlighted through interviews with partner organisations and back donors are: raised partner credibility vis-à-vis donors, increased capacity in all aspects of programme implementation and management, increased advocacy skills and networking access, reduced transaction costs in humanitarian response work, active engagement of rights holders in emergency mitigation, and access to new perspectives on development and humanitarian response work. These issues are further unfolded below and have been confirmed through the identification of most significant changes.

5.1 DCA as a channel for funds

The general move towards budget support in international development aid has caused decentralised donor agencies to reduce staff and consequently little capacity is available for the often time consuming engagement with local civil society organisations. Donors are, however, to an increasing degree recognising that support to local civil society is an important counter balance to budget support. And although local civil society is increasingly capable of administering funds, they still see a legitimate room for INGOs to operate, especially when it comes to capacity building. This is only gradually being re-recognised, and the focus of the present evaluation to document whether there is more to partnership than being an efficient fund administrator fits well into this process.

DCA has established a well-functioning administration, which satisfies donors’ requirements in terms of fund administration, monitoring and reporting, although some donors point to the fact that there is still room for improving the monitoring and reporting to tally with the RBA. However, this may be a two-way challenge, as donors’ requirement on reporting is often results based and less geared towards process outcome. If DCA shall qualitatively change reporting to match RBA, it requires dialogue and common understanding with back donors.
Closely linked to the issue of fund administration is fundraising, which is central for DCA and the organisation’s relationship to partners. DCA head quarters is the driving force of the ambitious 2012 Growth Strategy, where fundraising with and through partners is pivotal. The implementation of the Growth Strategy takes place through intensive work by RO and partner organisations in elaborating applications.

The channelling of funds through DCA is generally a positive arrangement, where partners benefit from on-going capacity building in both fund administration and management, as well as elaboration of project proposals and alternative fundraising. There is, of course need for fine-tuning, and improvements can be made, but the consistent focus on building partners capacity for future sustainability and independence is an overall added value, recognised by partner organisations as well as back donors.

In the following, fund management, capacity building and fund-raising will be discussed with the objective of addressing its relevance and consequently its added value in relation to partnerships.

**Fund management**

The following findings sustain the overall picture of a smooth and well-functioning fund administration, appreciated by partner organisations, which find that DCA disburses money in a consistent manner, unlike back donors who tend to delay in disbursing funds disrupting implementation of project activities. DCA has even in some cases pitched in, when other donors’ funds are delayed or have been abruptly withdrawn. The fact that DCA is flexible in terms of shifting items on the budget to address emerging issues, allowing project activities to remain relevant is an advantage. According to partners, some donors insist on the original plan even when things on the ground have changed, risking the project becoming irrelevant. DCA has the capacity to ensure adherence to the stipulations of back donors, helping to maintain the flow of funds, thus ensuring continuity of project activities. Partners and donors see DCA as able to stand in as a guarantor for funds from back donors. DCA is seen as less bureaucratic ensuring quick responses to funding requests, whereas back donors tend to be bureaucratic in the manner they disburse or manage funds.

Partner organisations often used the term *flexibility* when referring to DCA fund administration. This relates to the fact that DCA disburse funds for core operational activities and acquisition of assets and equipment, ensuring that partner organisations are able to discharge of their responsibilities. Another aspect is the end-of-year budget revisions undertaken of the Danida frame funds, which allows for reallocation of funds and in some cases additional funds for the individual partner organisation. Finally, there are transparent principles for fund management, based on adherence to HAP principles.

In spite of the many positive statements regarding the DCA administration of funds, there were also suggestions from partner organisations as to how the system could be improved:
Some partner organisations claim that they did not systematically receive notice when funds had been transferred, which could make it difficult to trace in the banking system. Furthermore, some partners raised the problem that no written intimation on which kind of funds were released is received (in cases where more than one type of funding is involved).

In India, almost all partner organisations raised the question of need for DCA to follow the Indian financial year (April to March). Currently, the partners have to merge the audits for the two overlapping financial years to fulfil obligations to the Government of India and to DCA respectively. This is both cumbersome and costly.

The ET found that while most of the programme implementation responsibility is decentralised to the RO, release of funds still takes place from Copenhagen to partners. Partner organisations pointed to the fact that other INGOs (Oxfam, Concern, ActionAid) have decentralised fund management. DCA ROs only administer the funds for cross-cutting issues, i.e. training, PPMs etc. In India, this is due to specific legislation, which may not allow the RO to manage funds received from Denmark. It does, however, seem that some of the above mentioned problems could be solved if a decentralised fund management was operated.

**Capacity building in fund management and fundraising**

DCA links the issue of fund administration with a dynamic development in the funding base. Initiatives not only to diversify, but also to increase the funding base are spelled out in the 2012 Growth Strategy. The expansion of funds has hitherto been concentrated on EU-funds, but also the flexible application of e.g. Danida funds as seed money for other funding has been tried out. In Denmark, efforts on raising corporate and private funds have yielded results. In humanitarian response, the coordinated fundraising through the ACT system dates back to the 1990es and presents a good example of different funding arrangements, e.g. the coordinated fundraising for emergency situations. Partners are increasingly being involved in the fundraising initiatives through joint elaboration of applications and on-going capacity building in fund administration.

All partners appreciated the initiatives on capacity building in both fund management and fundraising. The fact that partner organisations build up credibility vis-à-vis other donors through DCA capacity building is an important contribution to organisational sustainability of partner organisations. However, the convenience of operating with DCA as a buffer between the partner organisation and the back donor was also appreciated by partners - conveniently taking care of reporting requirements and covering up for delays in disbursement to secure a smooth implementation.  

---

51 A new modality for support in South Asia is that DCA supports partners to develop and submit concept notes and proposals to back donors directly with DCA as accompanying partners providing technical support and funds as own contributions of partners. Comment from Nina Ellinger, RR, 20.05.09.
Capacity building in fund administration takes place through courses and PPM meetings, and through learning-by-doing exercises on preparation of project proposals and applications. Partner organisations stress that there is help from Programme Officers to prepare proposals: "They work along with constant back and forth dialogue – we as implementing organizations have an assurance that they have support and that this aspect will be taken care of."

The ET also found that back donors emphasise the role of DCA in capacity building of its partner organisations as an important added value. It points towards sustainability and independence of local organisations, which in the view of the donors is very important.

The DCA capacity building is characterised by being of a general nature, i.e. not only targeted building capacity for administration of DCA provided funds, but goes beyond and is a general support to strengthening the organisations’ independent activities. This also includes the pre-partnership assessment, which provides baseline knowledge of existing capacity within the partner organisation. The fact that inputs go beyond the DCA projects is underlined by partner organisations in terms of added value and true partnership, especially as organisational integrity is respected.

**Communication on fund management**

Some of the long-term partner organisations in humanitarian response work have been able to offer a longsighted perspective on the development of DCA partnership. They have experienced the move through project financing to programme approach, the decentralisation and establishment of ROs and the change of focus and approach from emergency, relief to LRRD and latest to RBA in both humanitarian response and development work. There have among other things also been a change in terms of funding volume and conditions. The change from e.g. Danida-frame funds for organisational operational costs to specific EU project funding has implications on the flexibility of fund application, which is not always advantageous to the partner organisation, although at an overall level the volume may be increased and the scope for alternative funding broadened.

Furthermore, some longstanding partner organisations experience that the expansion of the partner portfolio has created a situation, where "the cake has to be divided in (too) many pieces". They are apparently reluctant to accept this situation.

Another area where partner organisations expect more transparency from DCA is in situations of budget reductions from back donors. Examples were given of information of an 8% budget reduction from the back donor, but the partner organisation did not get any indications as to where DCA itself had reduced budgets. The ET found that communication on reason for and implications of

---

52 In 2008 the Danida Frame Grant to all DCA Regional Offices were cut 8.5 % in August with effect from 2009. The cut was decided by DCA management in order to accommodate establishment of new Regional / Country Offices. Thus reductions given with short notice put further pressure on RO and partners to increase fundraising from back donors as pro-
shift in funding and other changes is often not sufficient for partners to fully accept the situation.

**Long-term commitment**

In South Asia, all DCA programmes operate with a 5 years period and DCA Malawi has extended the previously applied 3-years programme period to 5 years for the recently approved Food Security programme. This allows partners to operate with a longer horizon and consequently plan better for the implementation, as well as for possible provision of additional and/or alternative funding.

The ET observed that although the programme funding is 3-5 years, DCA sees the partnership as ideally having a longer time perspective (+10 years). It is, however, a problem that for most partner organisations, project or programme funding period partnership is often synonymous to partnership period. Consequently, the long-term perspective of partnership is not necessarily seen by partner organisations. Furthermore, some partner organisations have rightfully raised the problem concerning the dilemma between DCA’s and back donors demand for quick results and the long term character of changes induced through RBA.

**Summary points**

- Majority of findings are centred on the following topics: fund management, capacity building in fund management and fundraising, communication on fund management and the long-term commitment.

- The perceived added value or main benefits of channelling funds through DCA is shared by partner organisations and back donors: a smooth and flexible administration; DCA as a guarantor for the quality; raising partner organisations credibility via-à-vis donors; and linking funding and capacity building.

Possible areas for improvement are:

- DCA could enhance its own transparency on financial issues in relation to partners in terms of better communication on transfer of funds, rationale for changes of funding practice and division of overheads in cases of joint fundraising.

- DCA experience of capacity building on fundraising and financial management could be applied broader, allowing for support to partner organisations’ own fundraising, i.a. through facilitation of access to a broader network outside the "DCA family".

gramme plans and partner commitments otherwise could not be met. Comment from Nina Ellinger, RR, 20.05.09.
• Decentralisation of responsibility for fund transfer could be considered as a means to ease the transfers and enhance ROs mandate on partner allocations.

• The fact that partnership period is interpreted as equal to the project financing period is problematic and need attention to emphasise the joint value base and political-strategic common denominator also characterising partnerships.

5.2 The DCA programme approach

The DCA programme approach has been a main focus during interviews with partner organisations, as the PPMs are where the partnership is concretised. In the following, different aspects of the partnership approach will be discussed with the objective of analysing the effectiveness and thus added value of the programme approach itself.

General

The DCA programme management guidelines outline a systematic approach to programme identification, formulation, approval, implementation, monitoring, review, adjustment and evaluation. The systematic structure of programme documents, where objective no.4 focuses on partnership relations, programme coherence and synergy, allows for cross-programme comparisons and analysis of expected partnership added value. All DCA programmes are therefore designed in a thorough and systematic way, through steps 1-4, including the preparation of comprehensive context analysis prepared by external academics or analysts. Potential partners or on-going partnerships as well as external resource persons and institutions are involved through consultative workshops and discussions of needs and objectives, which secure quality enhancement. The consultative process also helps to enhance the ownership to the programme, not only among DCA staff involved, but also among partner organisations actively engaged in the programme preparation activities.

The ET found, however, that it is often questionable to which degree the partners see the overall picture, i.e. the full programme to which partner organisations selected by DCA must fit into. For DCA, each partner has its specific role in relation to the fulfilment of objectives for the overall programme. In this context, it is relevant to recall Clara Arena’s polemic question quoted in the Introduction of the present report: Do partners sustain the implementation of the DCA programmes? Or is it the other way around, i.e. that partners receive support from DCA to implement their programmes? Findings among partner organisations sustained this view i.e. that fulfilment of the overall DCA programme is not the most important, compared to fulfilment of their own objectives. However, strong partner organisations see the advantage of a holistic and complementary approach, where different partners contribute to the overall programme accomplishment. Smaller, less analytical partner organisations, do not always grasp the global picture of the programme approach, but are more narrowly focused on their own part of the picture.
The degree of ownership among DCA RO staff members is also reinforced when they have had the opportunity to participate in the development of a specific programme of which they are later in charge of. Having accompanied the process gives them a strong sense of ownership to the programme and its partners.

In general, from DCA’s point of view, the programme approach has facilitated linkage of project activities to overall goals of the DCA programme and the determination of linkages between various activities thus promoting a more synergistic and coordinated approach to development. It has also facilitated monitoring and evaluation of project activities at partner level, hence ensuring learning and informed decision-making. However, it is still relatively new and both DCA and partners have yet to learn how to best make use of the approach. Finally, the programme approach is being implemented in a context where many resource partners and back-donors are still using a project approach to funding of activities. There are challenges in reconciling the two approaches. These challenges manifest in areas of project monitoring and reporting.

Partner portfolio and organisational identity
Two issues can be highlighted in relation to the composition of the partner portfolio: the volume and the character of partners.

DCA has through decentralisation, growth strategy and programme approach embarked upon an expansion of the partner portfolio, and some old-time partner organisations have commented and expressed concern that available funds are now being subdivided among too many. The expansion of volume is justified through expansion of funding, as well as the introduction of programme approach, where the dialogue and networking is central rather than fleshy budgets. As mentioned elsewhere and shown in Annex 4 Overview of selected partner organisations, the budget for the individual partner organisations are not that big, underlining that there are other poles of attraction for the partner organisations to collaborate with DCA.

Regarding the character or organisational identity of the partner organisations, DCA’s partnership approach is clearly based on Christian values and the principles of diaconia, just as the name of the organisation reflects its Christian roots. DCAs long-term partners in Malawi and India are church-based organisations and only in more recent years are secular and other faith-based organisations included in the partner portfolio. According to DCA management in Copenhagen, each (thematic) programme must have a critical mass of church-based partner organisations. It is, however, acknowledged that it may not always be easy to secure, and DCA therefore chooses partners among secular organisations and organisations from other faiths. It is also recognised that the growth strategy may pose a challenge to minor church-based organisations, as they may not have the absorption and/or implementation capacity to manage e.g. EU-funded projects, and that a specific effort in terms of capacity building is required.

53 The use of the RBA among duty bearers was not investigated. It is therefore not clear how they are actually responding to it.
In Malawi, where the majority (approx. 80%) of the population is active church attendees, (civil) society is also characterised by many faith-based organisations. The fact that DCA is a Christian / faith based organisation becomes in itself an added value, as it reflects moral and ethical values to which most people can relate. Partner organisations - also Muslim and secular organisations - easily relate to DCA and acknowledge the values that the organisation stands for.

In India the situation is different, as Christian communities represent only a minority (approx 2,5%) of the population. In spite of this, the church-based partner organisations in India have a broad constituency and outreach, which is very important in humanitarian and development work as well in advocacy work. Through a broad interpretation of ecumenical to include also faith-based organisations from other religions, DCA is able to make use of the outreach and at the same time add a sharp, political profile to the programme.

Some of the longstanding Christian partner organisations expressed concern about the tendency of working increasingly with secular organisations, fearing that the core Christian values of DCA are being diluted. Others expressed their concern about the Christian roots of DCA and underlined that although they enjoy partnership with both DCA and CA, they did not always openly advertise with the partnership in publications etc. A Christian partner organisation in India indicated that in some cases the use of acronym and not the full name of DanChurchAid was chosen: "Church is a very dangerous term!" This was not a denouncement of the Christian values, but a pragmatic attitude to politically touchy issues. In general, Christian partner organisations in India see their faith as a rights issue to be flagged.

There is no doubt that the well-consolidated church organisations in Malawi hold an enormous potential through their constituency and outreach, once they have adopted the RBA. But the introduction of RBA has not been particularly easy with these organisations, and DCA Malawi has seen it as a strategic advantage to take on board some new partners - with more strategic approach to development to secure diversity within the partner platforms. In India, being predominantly a non-Christian country, the RBA has caused a major intake of secular partners and consequently changed the profile of the overall partner portfolio drastically. As discussed above (Chapter 4.2 Partner organisations’ perception of added value) there is ample room for the individual RR to chose in which way strategies and policies are implemented.

The ET found that the profile and composition of the partner portfolio in Malawi and India is based not only on the conditions for programme implementation given by the local context and the history of the DCA engagement in the country, but is also determined by the wide room given to RRs for interpretation of their mandate. Except for what is outlined in the specific programme documents, there seems to be no clear selection criteria for new partner organisations.

It is the opinion of the ET that the differences in composition of partner portfolios in Malawi and India respectively are inevitable and respond well to the specific conditions of each country. However, changes in partner portfolio must be carefully communicated and information shared with partners in order to
counterbalance unnecessary speculations. The ET finds that DCA must carefully monitor the development in partner portfolios in order to secure that the necessary critical mass of both church-based organisations and secular civil society organisations is represented. The planned revision of the Malawi partner portfolio in early 2009 should take this into consideration.

**Partner platforms and advocacy**

To most partners, the partner platforms represent the concretisation of the DCA programme approach. It is through the partner platform meetings (PPM) that value is added in terms of capacity building. The learning approach to programme implementation and organisational development, based on openness and sharing of experience is practiced at PPMs. Introduction of new perspectives on current development approaches and aid architecture by DCA also takes place through the PPMs. The partner platforms are pivotal to the implementation of partnership programmes and the exponent of an interactive partnership.

The partner platforms are established primarily as a *programme implementation tool* by DCA, although in many cases there are *aspirations of further development into national advocacy platforms* with independent status.

---

The PTI Civic and Political Space platform in Malawi holds elements for future independence and has acted independently in contributing to the Constitutional Review.

The partners in the Tsunami programme platform in South Asia have decided to continue after the termination of the programme - albeit yet to be seen if this actually happens.

---

Many partners have stressed the fact that agendas for PPMs are jointly formulated as an indicator for joint ownership to the partner platforms. But the fact remains that the funding and initiative come from DCA, and that many partners have expressed hesitation and doubts concerning the possible continuation of PPMs once DCA funding is no longer available.

Through the DCA programmes, which establish vertical links between grass root organisations at village level and national level civil society organisations, there is an excellent opportunity for evidence based advocacy. The ET found that these opportunities are not sufficiently explored in Malawi, where the contact between the DCA partner platforms and the national civil society structure is informal and not sufficiently institutionalised.  

---

54 The 2008 Programme Progress Report, p. 17 confirms this and states that it is, however, difficult to document whether there is any impact on the actual implementation of activities by partner organisations.

55 Examples were given from e.g. HIV/AIDS work, where DCA platform partners participate in annual good practice workshops, but where no replication mechanisms are ensured.
the link from the ground to national agendas is properly established. Experience from India is different, as many of the organisations involved with DCA have strong independent links to national umbrella organisations and platforms.

DCA Malawi recognises that it would be an ideal situation if partner organisations could align directly with existing civil society structures, and it may be a future goal, but also important to recognise that the partner organisations often lack advocacy skills and experience. The partner platforms are therefore excellent "nursery schools" to strengthen future direct engagement in national advocacy agendas.

One partner in India commented that the partnership approach with intensive interaction in e.g. platform meetings may be a straight-jacket, but recognised the need for DCA to have an operational frame for the support. The platform provides greater coherence, but has to offer high quality input to partners to be attractive and prioritised. It may be a choice of what to attend, and that e.g. the Rights to Food campaign meetings would have priority, unless DCA comes up with something very special! This is of course a problem, as DCA is striving to support initiatives like the Rights to Food Campaign, but it is a fact that the same few key persons are often overstretched. It is necessary to strike a balance between donor’s need for framework and the partners’ outreach.56

In continuation of this, a last concern regarding the partner platforms, deals with the transaction costs imposed on partners in terms of time consumed for participation. It is important to link with the lack of coordination between donor / sister organisations, causing partners to participate in different partner workshops and meetings organised by different donor organisations. Instead of competing on partner organisations’ time resources, DCA and sister organisations should strive for alignment and coordination.

DCA itself has commented on the meeting intensity of the programme approach, a fact agreed by partners who feel that two meetings per year is an adequate frequency - if more, it becomes a burden through increased transaction costs in terms of time. One of the responses from the self-evaluations indicated that there were too many visits from DCA and too many meetings!

Some partners in India commented on the tendency to hold PPMs at posh places and advocate for more modest facilities in order to reduce costs and make all partners feel comfortable attending the meetings.

**Cross-programme synergy**

The discourse on programme synergy differs from Malawi to India. In Malawi, the issue of how to establish synergy between different DCA programmes to counterbalance the isolation of each programme is central. DCA Malawi has recently tried to establish regional platform meetings (North, Centre, South), where partners meet across the three (four) programmes to exchange and coor-

---

Further, the ET found that contact to the national human rights forum could be strengthened to allow for exchange of experience.

56 Also a concern raised in 2008 Programme Progress Report, p. 17.
dinate on a geographical basis. The initiative seems to be welcomed by partners. It is, however, a further consolidation of the tendency to establish parallel structures, and may easily add to the transaction costs imposed on partners in terms of time spent on meetings within the "DCA family”. In Malawi, solutions to both synergy and isolation are primarily sought within the DCA programme, not necessarily by establishing links to other stakeholders.

In India, similar area-based initiatives exist, i.e. to organise state-based partner meetings and an annual South Asia meeting. At an overall level, the programmes seek partnerships with stakeholders well-connected to the Indian civil society as well as with untraditional partners (e.g. the Food Commissioners’ Office), which provide synergy with circles outside the "DCA family”.

Although these differences are mainly based on the specific situations of each of the programme countries, the ET sees possibilities of applying some of the experience from India in the Malawi programme to enhance synergy and cross-programme learning.

The programme approach has also meant that partners are stretched - in some cases beyond their capacity - in terms of implementation of activities. It is thought that encouraging closer collaboration and working relationships between partners may help them play to their strengths, other than getting the partners to work in areas beyond their mandate and core competencies. The following example illustrates this problem.

In Malawi, WOLREC, a RBA-organisation working primarily on women’s rights under the Political Space-programme has realised that strengthening of women’s political and social bargaining power requires economic empowerment. They have therefore embarked on a goat rearing project. WOLREC does not have the sufficient technical capacity to implement a goat rearing project at village level and have therefore sought peer support and advice from CCAP Livingstonia, a DCA partner from the Food Security-programme.

**Replication of best practices**

Through partner organisations, the DCA programmes generate valuable experience and in some cases develop best practices. The experience is usually shared with peers within the programme platform, or it may be fed into national advocacy agendas. In Malawi, the ET found little evidence that systematic links to national agendas and government institutions are established to avoid that best practices are grown on isolated project islands and not harvested for the benefit of a wider group. Attention should be paid to how best practice replication mechanisms are established. Best practice replication mechanisms should ideally link not only to other civil society organisations, but also to relevant gov-
government bodies. For an INGO, this is, however, not always easily established - and especially for DCA with its public low-profile approach.  

In Malawi, the National Aids Council (NAC) organises a yearly Best Practice Conference, where DCA and partners participate. There is, however, no guarantee of replication, as NAC has no follow-up mechanisms in regard of participants’ adoption of presented best practices.

Under the PT1 Civic and Political Space programme in Malawi, the Constitutional Review process was influenced, which means that experience from RBA is carried into the national level policy discussion.

Recent initiative to host a conference on Economic Empowerment of Women in Malawi as part of the MDG3 Torchbearer responsibility to do something extra for gender equality and women empowerment is a step towards public use of experience.

Next level partnerships

DCA’s own partnership policy wants to challenge the traditional donor-beneficiary relationship and seek a stronger, mutual relationship, based on shared values. Partnership is seen as relationship beyond limited project funding, in terms of time and content. The partnership policy of DCA does not contain anything on termination of partnerships, unlike some of the sister organisations. Partnerships are apparently terminated only when problems occur or when decisions on major changes in geographical or thematic focus is decided by DCA head quarters.

The ET has asked what is needed to take the step further towards improving the current partnership relation? At least from partners’ perspective, the relationship is still very much characterised by a traditional donor-recipient relationship and confined to the time limits of the actual project funding.

During the partner workshop at the end of the field visit to Malawi, the issue of next level partnership and possible exit strategies was discussed by using the term graduation. This caused a very heated discussion, as the term graduation brings connotations of separation and termination to mind, not reflecting the felt need of an on-going partnership. It was argued that there will always be new perspectives and issues coming up and consequently a need for continued support from DCA. It is clear that exit strategies are not an issue often debated within the DCA programme. The ET has focused on the issue from the perspective of ensuring a continued dynamic in partnership relations - not necessarily leading to exit or termination, but to the next level of partnership.

57 Official DCA policy is to leave the floor to local partner organisations. DCA sees its role as facilitating (at district level) - and the sustainability is secured through the partner organisations’ strengthened capacity. Interview with Lennart Skov Hansen, RR, Malawi, 14.03.2009.
Some of the elements for reaching next level partnership identified by the ET were:

- **Feed-back mechanisms and reverse monitoring.** Although mid-term reviews and annual partner meetings allow for ad hoc feedback during workshops, there are no formal, structured mechanisms for DCA to seek partners’ feedback, compile and analyse it to assess the effectiveness with which it is playing its role. In contrast to the DCA Vision & Plan document’s objective of implementing systematic consultation procedures, one partner stated that: “We do not have a mandate to monitor them”. Partners can provide feedback in an informal manner to DCA – some innovative ways such as role plays where partners played the DCA officers and vice-versa have also been used to seek feedback; feedback is given at the end of PPMs, and the current evaluation and earlier mid-term reviews were other opportunities when feedback has been sought. The ET found that there is plenty of potential spaces for feedback, as well as a positive ambiance, even for critical issues. There are, however, no formal mechanisms that ensure that feedback is captured and fed into the learning loops of DCA beyond the level of country/regional programme. DCA Board expressed interest in obtaining input from partners also on DCA’s general operation. The HAP complaint mechanism is clearly a step in the right direction and can be further unfolded to the benefit of enhancing systematic consultation procedures.

- **Partnership agreements and project contracts.** DCA has committed itself to increasingly strengthen the equality in partnerships and the programme implementation tools operate with Partnership Agreements which go beyond project funding. In reality, only few partnership agreements have been signed to date, basket funding arrangements are rare and most partners relate to the project contracts. The ET has found that the signing of agreements - be they project contracts or partnership agreements - have limited room for negotiations, which means that limited ownership and mutuality is embedded in the agreements. For the agreement to become a true partnership tool, explicit commonly agreed and mutual expectations must be formulated as an integrated part of the agreement. Only then can the agreement form the basis for mutual assessment.

- **Long term commitment not tied to projects.** DCA HQ encourages establishment of +10 years partnerships. In Malawi and India, DCA has increasingly moved towards 5-years programmes to provide longer term commitment to partners within a time frame that allows for adjustments and learning. Partners do, however, still advocate for longer term commitment beyond project funding. It is, however, still a problem that DCA’s overall policy may be subject to changes in terms of political or geographical focus, which will have negative implications for long term commitments.

---

Summary points

- Majority of findings are centred on partner portfolio and organisational identity, partner platforms and advocacy, cross-programme synergy, replication of best practices and next level partnerships.

- The added value of the programme approach is the contribution to partners’ work and the partnership through adoption of a systematic approach to programme design, implementation and monitoring with learning loops established and enhanced sense of ownership; PPMs provide an entry point for networking and capacity building, especially in terms of advocacy training; the shared value base in terms of RBA (and Christian values).

- Although the picture of the overall programme(s) is clear to DCA, it is not always the case for the partner organisations. Consequently, there is a risk that the programme approach becomes a practical arrangement rather than a political approach.

Possible areas for improvement are:

- Acknowledging that different partners have different objectives, also in relation to the DCA partnership, DCA should make sure that also local grass root partner organisations with a narrow scope see the full picture, including advocacy potential and effect.

- It is a challenge in terms of monitoring and reporting that back donors (and DCA with them) are still geared towards results-based reporting. RBA is process oriented, and DCA (and back donors) needs to work on the inversion of focus.

- DCA is a Christian faith-based organisation, which interprets Christian values as rights defence. Striking the balance in composition of partner portfolio is not always easy, as country specific context, civil society dynamic and availability of Christian partner organisations influence the composition. DCA should pay attention to the balance in order to assure that the core organisational identity is maintained.

- DCA is not always completely transparent when it comes to rationale for changes in intervention strategy and partner selection. There is room for improving transparency related to selection criteria.

- In the case of Malawi, links to national advocacy agendas, civil society networks and social movements outside DCA family could be further explored to assure cross-fertilization and synergy. This could counterbalance isolation and provide ground for best practice replication.

- The issue of next level partnership (exit strategies) could be addressed more systematically, e.g. through benchmarking and joint monitoring of partnership progress separated from project implementation monitoring.
5.3 Impact on partners’ emergency response

The humanitarian response programmes represent the major part of DCA’s overall operations, but in the current evaluation, collection of information through partner organisations has been based on the number of organisations per programme, and consequently the humanitarian response programme has not been dealt with in proportional terms according to budget weight.

Coordination - ACT and sister organisations

Humanitarian response partners have consistently stressed the advantage of operating through ACT when launching appeals for funding of emergency situations. The fundraising, release and management of funds become much less troublesome for partners through a coordinated structure like ACT. Through ACT and DCA, new players have emerged in the area of humanitarian response, thus improving the level of coverage of disaster prone areas. Through ACT, partners have been enabled to advocate for international help leading to greater amounts of resources being made available for humanitarian response work.

The ET has observed that the coordination through ACT-forum and with sister organisations involves a major part of the partner portfolio in Malawi than is the case in India. This is due to the difference of partner portfolio composition in the two countries, where in Malawi, most partner organisations are church-based organisations and naturally link up with both ACT and APRODEV organisations. In India, ACT and APRODEV partners are important to the church-based humanitarian response organisations, whereas of little importance in day-to-day implementation for the remaining part of the partner portfolio, which is neither engaged in humanitarian response activities, nor Christian organisations.

This said, there is still room for much improvement in terms of coordination among APRODEV organisations, especially in India. Most partner organisations interviewed stressed that different reporting requirements is a burden, and the ET saw only few examples of joint funding arrangements where lead responsibility was entrusted one of the sister organisations, in spite of the fact that partner organisations advocated for such a set-up. In most cases, the situation was that of funding of different projects to the same partner organisation, thus creating the problem with dual reporting. Discussions with sister organisations indicated that although there are policy decisions on coordination, collaboration and joint basket funding arrangements, each of the organisations is still very much focussed on establishing itself and securing individual room for operation. In India, coordination appears to be limited to occasional exchange of information. An Indian partner organisation has characterised the relationship between sister organisations as that of sibling rivalry and sees joint funding as wishful thinking. Others comment that the collaboration between sister organisations has been debated for decades, but seems to get worse, as more specific objectives and approaches are defined by the individual organisations. This leads the partner organisation to conclude that the best to hope for is to avoid serious duplication!
In Malawi, coordination and collaboration is far more advanced, probably due to the relative importance of APRODEV and ACT for the majority of partner organisations. Partner organisations pointed towards the fact that sister organisations share office premises and/or are neighbours in Lilongwe, which eases access and communication.

**Emergency response**
The ET found that the shift from a needs to a rights based approach has been welcomed by humanitarian response partners in the sense that it has changed focus from being on short-sighted solutions to immediate problems to deal with long term mitigation measures and addressing of structural causes to emergency situations. Some long-term humanitarian response partners did, however call attention to the fact that they think they have operated with RBA long before DCA introduced the approach!

Due to this shift, partner organisations’ capacity in the area of humanitarian response has grown significantly enabling them to undertake assessment with greater levels of professionalism. Partners have also managed to facilitate the development of structures that are able to manage humanitarian response efforts in a more transparent fashion than before, as targeting in the past has sometimes led to the most vulnerable groups being left out.

*In Malawi, CARD tells how the identification of needy households and families was previously done by project staff. After the introduction of the RBA, a more participatory approach has been applied and empowerment, sustainability and ownership is in focus. Although primarily met with reluctance, CARD has experienced that the poor are now much better targeted. Villagers are now themselves involved in and responsible for the identification of households to benefit from relief schemes. Previously, the headmen’s family members were among the first to be enlisted. Nowadays, they may not even be on the list at all! Not only the immediate needs are addressed, but also the structural causes of poverty are being addressed through RBA.*

Partners have also been enabled to undertake preventive measures in areas where it is known that climate change and deforestation have led to persistent or chronic crisis situations. The issue of climate change upon which DCA has recently embarked, is seen by partner organisations within the programmes of Food Security, Disaster Risk Reduction and Humanitarian Response as important in terms of providing a coherent, long-term view upon the causes of emergency situations.

The ET finds that the RBA has contributed to help DCA and partners to focus on long term solutions and disaster risk reduction measures in addition to addressing emergency situations. Whether this at the same time enhances partners capacity to deal with emergency situations is not easily answered, except for the fact that funding is eased and administration related to fundraising and reporting is reduced considerably is an enormous advantage in itself.
Summary points

- Majority of findings are centred on coordination through ACT and with sister organisations and emergency response.

- Added value in terms of effective emergency response of partners is less transaction costs working through ACT, as well as the RBA which has engaged rights holders as active participants rather than passive receivers.

- ACT and APRODEV coordination is an integrated part of programme implementation in Malawi, whereas in India it mainly plays a role for the church-based partner organisations. For secular partner organisations, other networks or alliances may be more relevant.

Possible areas for improvement are:

- Coordination among APRODEV sister organisations could be improved in India, where partner organisations characterises the situation as one of sibling rivalry and coordination is limited to occasional exchange of information. DCA should consider the implications of the partner portfolio composition in India in relation to APRODEV and ACT coordination.

5.4 Most significant changes

The last of the four evaluation questions include the overall evaluation objective as well, seeking the most significant changes achieved by DCA partners in fulfilling their role as civil society towards sustainable development. The information on partner organisations’ own perception of added value has already provided answers to this question. The majority of the most significant changes are related to items on partner organisations’ Top 5-list of added value: capacity building & organisational development and introduction of new perspectives, but the focus on Most Significant Changes also showed other focus areas: impact at the level of rights’ holder / beneficiaries and enhanced advocacy activities.

In the following, we present the areas where most partner organisations have indicated significant changes occurred through partnership with DCA: capacity building, introduction of new perspectives, changes at the level of rights holders and advocacy activities. The quotes from the self-assessments are not evenly distributed from Malawi and India, a reflection of the difference in priority given by partner organisations.

A summary is presented at the end of the chapter, but areas for further improvement is not included in this chapter, as they will be reflected in Chapter 6 Recommendations.

---

59 Organisational development has been discussed during the interviews, but has not specifically been mentioned in the partner organisations’ self-assessments.
a. Capacity building

Capacity building leads to a number of competences and increased visibility among other donors, which the following quotes sustain:

“SASO has greatly improved with DCA relationship and support, as it is now effective, accountable and transparent in programming, which has also made SASO to win donor confidence.”

“Involvement of DCA has led to improved transparency and accountability, which has in turn contributed to CCJP being able to win donor confidence and further financial support from other development partners.”

“WOLREC started implementing a DCA funded project when the organisation was still in its infancy. The organisation had just been established. WOLREC had approached several donor agencies both within Malawi and outside but none was willing to fund WOLREC since it had no track record. The grant from DCA helped to raise the profile of WOLREC, helping it to secure grants from other donors.”

“The most significant change is the heightened visibility of CHRR as an organisation since it partnered with DCA. This resulted in CHRR being included as one of the three lead implementers in the 50-50 campaign coordinated by Ministry of Women and Child Development. Implementers were chosen based on credibility of their work in women promotion.”

“SWAM is now able to monitor project implementation and advocate on issues which make women and girls vulnerable to HIV/AIDS, improving the organisation’s visibility tremendously. SWAM can hold government agencies accountable. And new funding opportunities have become available after donors saw the SWAM/DCA partnership.”

“Earlier the team of CDR was very small working with the minimum resources but after getting support from DCA now CDR has a well equipped office”.

b. Introduction of new perspectives

The introduction of new perspectives is another area where many partner organisations have indicated most significant changes since the partnership with DCA was established:

“Enabled ELDS to shift its focus in programme design and implementation approach. It now embraces a more rights based approach, is more gender sensitive and accountable to beneficiary community and aim at empowering the local community structures.”

“Since MIAA with support from DCA conducted a state and faith dialogue session on ARVs versus divine healing, there has been increased collaboration between MIAA, Pentecostals and Charismatics who were not part of..."
MIAA."

"CHAM states that the most significant change is that the intervention supported by DCA has raised understanding of rights and duties in the community, leading to them being able to claim their rights."

"DCA’s strong support to PW has widened the scope for new initiatives, for further expansions of our initiatives and building new models helped in influencing government policy decisions and changes suitably."

c. Changes at rights holders’ level
A third area of most significant changes encountered is at the level of rights holders / beneficiaries:

"For CSC the most significant changes are linked to the training of staff, which has made them more articulate on the ground. This has led to a raise in the quality of the programmes. There are healthy people in the villages, reduced deaths, skills are upgraded, project ownership enhanced and commitment and motivation increased."

"For ERDP the increased food security (availability, access, utilisation) among communities is the most significant change."

"CCC states that family empowerment has greatly improved the retention of reintegrated children in their homes."

"Setting up the Radio Station (Maziko Radio Project) will be the most significant tool for grassroot mobilisation to participation in decisions that affect them."

"LWSI states that disaster situation (during and after) raises conflict environment on different issues such as water availability, food, livelihood. The skills to understand the root causes behind the entire vulnerable environment can be achieved through peace talks and psychological support. DCA has provided the opportunity to understand the difficulty in ensuring peaceful atmosphere in a disaster situation."

"DCA’s quiet but steady support (not only financial but also solidarity in different forms, sometimes even at the cost of their own admin needs – like denial of visa etc) has enabled PW to empower the most marginalized communities like Dalits, women, activists, grassroot organizations and others, which really strengthened the sustainability of our work."

"For RCDC Orissa, the demonstration of sustainable agriculture by taking initiatives on organic farming, SRI method of cultivation, vermin compost, liquid manure and organic pesticides by which the farmers could able to increase their productivity in their farming is one of many significant changes. Now the farmers are skilled enough to impart training on vermin compost"
and SRI like any professional trainer."

"Sahanivasa reports that rural landless poor are able to acquire 12450 acres of land (worth of Rs.622.5 millions) and 90% of it is assigned for women ownership. The families got land trying to put this land into biodiversity agriculture to become self sufficient in food and get out of hunger."

"The School children’s developed an interest for knowing about disability so SRSC Orissa did awareness for them and they used to do loving paintings related to disaster and how the disabled managed themselves."

d. Advocacy activities
The support to undertake advocacy activities fighting for rights is often stated by Indian partner organisations:

"The financial support from DCA helped the ASTHA team to work on the effective implementation of NREGA. The government administrative responsibility increased and people increased their certainty of getting work under NREGA. Labourers are thinking to demand Rs. 100 as minimum wages in the 100 days of NREGA employment /work."

"Since 2004 when CDR has come into partnership with DCA, the Dalit Women issue is being highlighted and their self respect and dignity is being realized. The judiciary also realizing that the cases of Dalit women rights violation are the genuine cases and refrain from their earlier prejudice of falseness."

"In a situation where the government of India was formulating a migration policy without involvement of the civil society organizations and representatives migrant workers, CEC and MFA engaged scores of organisations from different parts of the country in the formulation of the components of an alternative migration policy, which was effectively communicated to the government and the public by organising a parallel event to the Pravasi Bharatiya Divas at Chennai in January 2009 with support from DCA."

"At a time when many international agencies were withdrawing from human rights in India in the naïve hope that the State with its economic power would look after the poor and working people, whereas in fact the poor were becoming poorer and violence and discrimination was increasing, the DCA India office stood like a rock with the human rights groups including HRLN, and was able to identify the genuine and struggling organizations, and helped build internal strength and capacity."

"Through the Safe City Campaign strategy, JAGORI has reached out to a wide range of people and institutions at different levels. It has also been noted that a significant intensification in public discourse around the issue of women’s safety and rights is being articulated in the public places and elsewhere and the response has moved beyond the realm of the NGOs to citizens."
as well.”

"Before MSS was addressing the issue of cross border trafficking that is a part or end point of unsafe migration. Presently, the organization has been addressing migration issue in broader way. In other words, we can say that MSS has been hammering on roots of trafficking, exploitation and violence in terms of addressing various components of migration like migrants rights, overseas employment polices, migration policies within country & unilateral and bilateral efforts to ensure safe migration etc.”

"TNDWM reported that Dalit women were supported to participate in the World Social Forum and their issues were highlighted. Dalit Women at the grass-root level were supported to meet others at the Global Level. Dalit Women are exposed more social problems.”

e. DCA staff attitude

Finally, comments to the positive attitude of DCA staff have been many throughout the interviews with partner organisations. The following quote from DISHA shows the human face of the DCA partnership relations:

“There are many most significant changes but we have to select one. That is why we are mentioning this because this is the base of the partnership which builds up our confidence, trust and liberty to work with a feeling of back up support and sense of security. This character also trickles down the line strengthening the entire team and the organisation. Otherwise, there is high probability that other successes would (have) not happened: "I feel proud of the respectable partnership with DCA and not feeling inferior in any other meetings of other donors. I do not get tensioned when talking with our Programme Officer whom I regularly approach and do not get headache and do not take pain killer. I feel secured, comfortable and relaxed and work with high efficiency for the DCA project.”

Summary points

• Majority of findings are centred on capacity building, introduction of new perspectives, changes at rights holders’ level and advocacy activities.

• Concerning added value in the form of most significant changes achieved by DCA partners in fulfilling their role as civil society organisations towards sustainable development, the following main areas stand out:

• Enhanced capacity in areas of transparency and accountability, which leads to enhanced donor credibility and access to additional funds. Better working conditions through acquisition of equipment also contribute to fulfilment of partner organisations’ objectives.
• The introduction of RBA as a new perspective has helped communities to claim their rights, made influence on government policy decisions possible and improved the dialogue between like minded partner organisations (networking).

• At the rights holders’ level, DCA collaboration has led to retention of re-integrated children in their families, as well as to food security and improved livelihood through sustainable agriculture and land acquisition. Rights holders participate in decision making and marginalised groups are empowered. And finally, a better understanding of root causes to e.g. poverty and trafficking is obtained.

• Financial support from DCA has made it possible for partner organisations to engage in advocacy and lobby activities, leading to increased self-esteem among marginalised groups and articulation of women’s rights. Poor women have had the opportunity to engage in international networking.
6 Recommendations

The discussion of findings on added value in partnerships provides basis for the presentation of key recommendations. There are various entry points to the recommendations: the discussion of perceived added value held by different informants, the evaluation questions and the criteria of relevance, effectiveness and sustainability.

At an overall level, recommendations deal with adjustments of existing practices. The general conclusion after analysing available information from interviews and documents confirms the relevance of the DCA partnership programme. The framework in terms of policies and guidelines is solid - but the service check demonstrates that some practices must be strengthened and refocused to add further value to partner organisations. Much experience exists within DCA, and cross-fertilisation can be further explored to make use of gained knowledge and best practices. DCA is on the right track in terms of adding value to partnerships, and the following recommendations are therefore aimed at fine-tunings, not radical shifts.

We present a limited list of 5 key recommendations. Each of the recommendations touches upon various interlinked aspects of added value in partnership and can be unfolded further. Areas where improvement can be made have been summarised in Chapter 5 Main findings at the end of each sub-chapter. Not all issues raised are necessarily included in the five key recommendations below. Argumentation is kept short in this chapter, as background analysis is presented in previous chapters.

1. Next level partnership

The issue of next level partnership has been discussed in both Malawi and India. DCA has an ambitious partnership policy, which guides the development of partnerships. The evaluation has revealed areas, where the practice can be strengthened to fulfil the intentions of true partnership. DCA stresses that partnership goes both ways and that mutuality and complementarity are bearing principles. DCA is still very much a donor, wanting to get into the machine room of the partner organisations, as expressed by one partner informant. But will DCA allow the partner organisations into its own machine room? Can learning be reverse, i.e. from partners to DCA?

- It is recommended that DCA continuously reflects upon its own role in partnership - not so much of a donor, but as a partner. This could include
increasing partner organisations’ knowledge about international advocacy activities.

DCA has - in spite of an elaborate monitoring system and several learning loops established - little formalised room for partners’ feedback. The HAP complaint mechanism provides possibilities for rights holders to raise complaints related to project implementation - but so far only on pilot basis in Malawi. For partner organisations to systematically give feedback or undertake reverse monitoring of DCA no structure is in place. The mechanisms should primarily be a means for communication between partner organisations and ROs. The further aggregation of experience should be captured through the DCA monitoring system.

- It is recommended to **design an annual feedback mechanism to systematically seek views of the partners on the role and added value of partnership** with DCA as a formal mechanism to assess the quality of input and support provided through partnerships in meetings, trainings, platform meetings etc.

Partner organisations have often difficulties in distinguishing between the partnership and the programme / project period. Partnerships should be long term - this is acknowledged by both DCA and partners. The intentions of extending partnership beyond the time limits of project funding are clearly spelled out in DCA policy documents. But in reality, the perception of partnership is still tied to funding, if not of projects then at least of the programme. Furthermore, there is little room for negotiations, which means limited ownership and mutuality.

- It is recommended to **enhance discussions with partners to formalise long-term partnership independent of project funding** through the Partnership Agreements. This would involve identification of shared vision and common goals.

• It is recommended to **operate with negotiable Partnership Agreements** with explicit commonly agreed and mutual expectations stated to obtain an efficient tool for mutual assessment. This would include benchmarks and monitoring mechanisms, which allows for mutual follow-up.

Partnerships are inevitably influenced by the inherent inequalities (north-south, donor-recipient). The inequality is recognised by DCA and partners, but a further development of partnership would require more openness and transparency from DCA, allowing also partners to enter their machine room.

- It is recommended that measures are taken to **enhance transparency** on rationale for overall changes in intervention strategies (e.g. geographical focus, changes in partner portfolio) as well as on issues related to financial management.

DCA has no practice of working with exit strategies, and the term is not particularly welcomed among partners. The ET finds, however, that benchmarking of partnership development would be useful and facilitate the delinking of part-
nnership with funding through focusing on other elements of the partnership: shared values, organisational maturity etc.

- It is recommended that DCA engages in discussions about next level partnership in their dialogue with partners as well as including a section on this important issue in the Partnership Policy. An even more committed step would be to add exit strategies and sustainability as yet another point to be included in the partner agreement format.

2. Partner portfolio

The ET acknowledges the differences of the two country programmes included in the current evaluation, and the difference in terms of partner portfolio composition caused by different contexts. We do, however, find that there is a need for establishing mechanisms to secure that the partner portfolio is composed in such a way that not only RBA as a political and strategic value is the common denominator, but to take Christian values as a basis for RBA, i.e. that a critical mass of organisations representing the key values and strategic choices of DCA is included in the partner portfolio.

- It is recommended that DCA HQ monitor development in partner portfolios to secure a critical mass of organisations representing core values and strategies of the organisation be included.

The ET has noticed that although guidelines for pre-partnership assessment exist, there seem to be no specific selection criteria for partner organisations to be included in DCA programmes. DCA operates with a wide range of partners-funded, non-funded, organisations, institutions, long-terms or short-term. Some partnerships are considered strategic for different not very explicit or commonly agreed upon reasons. In order to provide basis for better formulated mutual expectations in partnership, it would be helpful to have a clearer categorisation of partnerships.

- It is recommended that DCA consider adopting criteria for partner selection as well as categorisation of partnerships to create more clarity on expectations and objectives. Inspiration on how to categorise partners could be taken from some of the other organisations, e.g. ICCO and MS. Clarity on partner categories and the content of each relationship could make the framework for DCA’s partnership approach even more concise.

The programme approach which actively involves actual and potential partners in programme formulation is highly commended as a true participatory approach. Ownership becomes thoroughly anchored among partner organisations through the interactive process. Partners have commented that they have not been consulted in matters of inviting new partner organisations on board. Furthermore, it has been noticed that organisations which have not participated in the programme formulation are not necessarily seeing the full picture of the programme.

- It is recommended to establish practices for screening of potential new partners, which involve consultation with existing partners.
• It is recommended to pay more attention to integration of new partner organisations invited in after the programme formulation process has taken place.

3. Capacity building

Capacity building is identified as one of the cornerstones in partnership. There is no doubt about the appreciation of capacity building among partners, who see the relevance of trainings in terms of increased credibility and skills enhancement. According to partners, most training has taken place on a one-size-fits-all basis, but there is an interest in more specific needs based training activities.

• It is recommended that tailor-made training for individual partner organisations is available in future as part of the next level partnership development. This should include the development of long-term capacity building plans.

The shift in focus and the mainstreaming of RBA and gender equality in all programmes have, however posed some challenges to DCA.

• It is recommended that more efforts are put into defining what skills at various staff levels are actually required within the organisation to fully mainstream RBA and gender equality. Knowledge on organisational development, process approach and facilitation skills are important, also for staff with technical advisory responsibility.

At the same time, the RBA and gender equality focus poses a challenge in terms of providing technical backstopping to partner organisations. It requires networking to secure that the technical capacity for implementing of partners’ projects and programmes is available.

• It is recommended that a systematic approach is adopted to secure that technical capacity is provided through networking within as well as outside DCA to the extent that it is not available within DCA.

4. Coordination and programme management

Listening to partner organisations, one main area of complaint stands out: the need for DCA to coordinate with other funding partners to minimise partner organisations’ transaction costs in terms of meetings and reporting requirements. The ET sees room for improvement in terms of coordination with other funding partners (e.g. ACT-partners, APRODEV-organisations) to ease transaction costs for meetings and the monitoring and reporting burden of partners dealing with several funding partners. Enhanced coordination would further reduce the potential conflicts raising out of differences by funding partners and promote a more harmonised approach to development programming from the point of view of the partner organisation. It is, however, necessary to consider the specific influence on partner portfolio composition on the relative importance of ACT-forum and APRODEV-coordination. As discussed above, the relative importance of ACT and APRODEV sister organisations in India is less than in Malawi.
- It is recommended that DCA **considers to what extent it is realistic to strive for coordination** among APRODEV sister organisations, taking the country context and partner portfolio in consideration. This consideration is closely linked with the monitoring of composition of partner portfolio.

- It is recommended that DCA to a wider extent **coordinates and align with sister organisation** when involved with the same partner organisation. This could imply leaving lead contact to one of the sister organisations as well as further use of **basket funding**.

Monitoring and reporting of activities and programmes implemented with RBA pose new challenges to partners, DCA and back donors. RBA represents a shift from results based to process based implementation. This represents a complete change of main-set at all levels.

- It is recommended that DCA **takes up the discussion with back-donors as to how RBA can best be monitored**. There is a methodological challenge in RBA monitoring and reporting, which DCA is in an advantageous position to take up through its consistent focus on RBA in implementation.

5. **Advocacy and best practices**

DCA has an excellent base for evidence based international and global advocacy. DCA is an active player in advocacy in Denmark and at the global scene, but it seems not to be clear to all partner organisations. Reference to global advocacy was only mentioned in specific, isolated cases, and most local organisations, with the exception of the Dalit-organisations in India were not specifically aware of DCA’s international advocacy work. The local and national advocacy agendas seems to be more than sufficient for most partner organisations to relate to. The ET therefore sees a need for DCA to increase information to partner organisations on engagement in international advocacy activities.

- It is recommended that DCA makes an effort in **increasing the visibility among partner organisations of the international advocacy** work carried out with evidence from partner programmes. Especially the climate change issue deserves attention due to the delicate dilemma of north-south responsibility.

The DCA programmes are comprehensive and with a wide reaching network through partner organisations. In Malawi, the ET noticed that the comprehensiveness of the programmes caused a certain sense of self-containedness, which limits the linkage to national networks and agendas.

- It is recommended to **link systematically to national advocacy agendas** in order to ensure application of experience and ensure outreach.

DCA produces experience and develops best practices, but mechanisms for replication of best practices are not sufficiently systematic. There is a risk of developing isolated project island experience.
• It is recommended to pay attention to **best practice replication** not only within DCA, but also in relation to national institutions and other organisations, as well as across country programmes. This could also involve establishing **direct websites** for the ROs\(^6\) (i.e. not access through the main DCA website), inclusion of best practice sections in reports and at seminars, and "awards" for best practice. It is important to create room for exchange of best practices and subsequent integration in implementation plans, as well as monitoring of replication.

The ET finds that DCA has developed new ways of working with partnership and development, i.e. acknowledging that development and fighting for poor and marginalised people’s rights must be done at different levels. Efforts to fill the knowledge gap by supporting organisations and institutions to undertake studies and produce facts based evidence is an important activity.

• It is recommended to undertake more in-depth analysis and studies and replicate the valuable **experience on filling the knowledge gap from India to other country programmes.**

---

\(^6\) The proposal proposed by Indian partners.
Annex 1: Terms of reference

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

DanChurchAid objectives
DanChurchAid combines emergency and development assistance with advocacy in the South and the North as well as with information activities in Denmark. In cooperation with popular and church-based organisations, DanChurchAid will strive to improve the lives and rights of the poor and excluded and fight for a just distribution of the world’s resources.

Key role and added value
One of DCA’s key roles to play in relief and development work is to support and strengthen civil society in the south. In addition to fundraising “strengthening of partners” is often mentioned as an important value that DCA adds in our development cooperation, and more generally it is considered one of the key points that justify northern NGO’s intervention between donor governments/institutions and southern civil society organisations. It is also an important aspect of the DCA partnership policy where partnership cooperation at organisational level is encouraged, moving from project activity focus to organisational performance.

Concentration and programming
Over the last few years DCA has introduced significant changes to its work and organisation. A broad project approach where DCA worked in numerous countries has changed into a situation where DCA made substantial geographical concentration and introduced a programme approach guided by overall policies. The present working focus is within five programme types: Political Space, Food Security, HIV/AIDS, Humanitarian Assistance and Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA).

For good and obvious reasons DCA’s relief work/projects are only to some degree structured under the frame of a programme. Even in situations where DCA Humanitarian Assistance projects stand alone, there will be value added in these partnerships, however it may differ and vary depending on different situations and local contexts.

Cross cutting commitments
DCA is committed to work with rights based development and gender equality as two important cross cutting approaches. Working rights based is DCA’s strategy to ensure not only to deliver service to the poor but working on influencing the structural barriers that prevent development for the poor. In practice this means that DCA is seeking a project balance in each of the programmes involving three important different aspects; accountability/advocacy, political empowerment and protection/service delivery and further ensuring that gender equality and equal rights is reflected and dealt with in all aspects of project and programme work. DCA has during the past 3-4 years launched around 25 partnership based programmes to be administered together with partners mostly within development and some within humanitarian Assistance.

Partnership and policy
Churches and progressive forces in civil society play a significant role, not least in advocating the cause of oppressed and marginalised groups and individuals. DanChurchAid works through local Christian partners – but also Hindu, Muslim and secular – development organisations, human rights groups, health and agricultural organisations. This approach develops local ownership and commitment to
projects and programmes, and the partnership ensures that the relief reaches the poorest and that projects can continue when and if DanChurchAid withdraws its support.

In 2006 DCA developed a partnership policy as a result of a comprehensive consultation process with the partners. DCA envisions ideal partnerships as mutually beneficial relationships that go beyond financial support and the traditional time-bound development or relief project. In practice, however, an ideal partnership is difficult to build. Inequality in access to resources and funding, multiple partnership relations, demands for control and the mere distance – physically, culturally and organisationally – are significant challenges that cannot easily be overcome. However, the vision is and should be to build horizontal – instead of vertical – relationships between DCA and its partners.

In the spirit of the Paris Declaration/donor harmonisation trend, DCA is involved in several decentralised alignment arrangements with members of the Action by Churches Together - family and in some of the DCA focus countries DCA is searching for ways to enter into partnership agreements (contracts) with selected partners for budget support.

**Decentralisation**

DCA is now decentralised with regional offices in 11 regions in Africa, Asia, and Latin America respectively. The DCA office is located in what DCA has defined a focus country within a particular region. In all focus countries DCA is obliged to have one Political Space programme adding one to three other programmes depending on the local context. Most of the current programmes are development programmes. Only recently a few DCA relief programmes have been approved. The major bulk of DCA relief work is implemented through partners but not within the frame of a programme. Both in DCA focus countries where DCA has larger offices, and in counties where DCA does not have presence Humanitarian Assistance projects are implemented through partners.

Getting closer to DCA’s partners through presence and obtaining improved understanding of the local context are two key pre-requisites for improved dialogue with partners and thereby strengthening the DCA value added aspect. Understanding the local context is a pre-requisite for working rights based.

**2012 growth objective**

DCA board has set an ambitious growth objective and strategy called “2012”. The aim is to increase the annual turnover from DKK 350.000.000/400.000.000 to DKK 700.000.000 by the end of 2012. An increased focus on budgets and fundraising may influence partner choices and partner relations. A changing funding base towards more short term funding may change DCA’s role in the partnership and DCA added value.

**ACT alliance**

Internationally, we are part of the ecumenical network related to the World Council of Churches (WCC), the Lutheran World Federation (LWF), and Action by Churches Together (ACT). One of the key visions of DCA is to work closer in networks and alliances. It is important that programme development and Humanitarian Assistance activities in DCA are viewed in relation to the ACT alliance process that is currently taking form.

DCA is one of the founders of and a member of Action by Churches Together (ACT) International. ACT’s International members are Protestant and Orthodox churches and their related agencies, drawn from the membership of the WCC and LWF. ACT International offers assistance to victims of natural and
environmental disasters as well as in emergencies caused by war and civil conflict. Based on actions and information from its members, ACT issues Alerts and Appeals for assistance to people affected by emergencies. ACT can also respond through a Rapid Response Fund to meet urgent humanitarian needs. Members in Europe, North America, Asia and the Pacific raise funds for this work from private donations, church collections, national governments and the European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office, ECHO.

DCA is also one of the founders of ACT Development - a worldwide development alliance of church related development organisations - and one of the largest international actors, present in 157 countries with more than 14,000 employees. ACT Development brings together churches and church related organizations in a new global alliance aimed at eradicating poverty, injustice and the abuse of human rights. The alliance will focus on long-term development, building on the emergency response work already undertaken by ACT International.

2. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVE AND KEY QUESTIONS

2.1 Evaluation Purpose
DCA has a long history of working in partnerships and has funded projects across the world since 1922. Only recently back donors and to some extend civil society has started reflecting and questioning what value northern NGOs add to the work done by southern civil society besides transferring funds to locally implemented projects. Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation is to assess DCA added value in partnerships.

2.2 Evaluation objective
The evaluation objective is:

To assess how DCA contribute to strengthen partners ability to fulfil their role in civil society.

Focusing on the partnership – the relationship between DCA and partners – has some implications to what will NOT be in focus for this evaluation. One important point to raise here is that this evaluation will NOT look into DCA’s added value in terms of outcome/impact at rights holder’s level. The evaluation will certainly take a close look at several of the aspects and points raised in DCA Partner Policy, but it will not be a systematic evaluation of that particular Policy either. Finally, DCA Humanitarian Mine Action work aspect is not included in this evaluation.

2.3 Key questions
To reach a shared understanding between DCA and the team of consultants and to ensure that the evaluation team is guided in the right direction three key questions to be explored are formulated.

The consultants should carefully assess the key questions in relation to Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability whenever appropriate:
1. What are the benefits (if any) of channelling development and humanitarian assistance funding through DCA, assessed by partners and back donors?

2a. Development: Does the programme approach contribute to partners work and the partnership? If so, how does it make a difference?

2b. Relief: How does working with DCA affect partners ability to respond effectively, professionally and accountable in emergency situations? Does DCA make a difference?

3. What are the most significant changes DCA partners have achieved - fulfilling their role as civil society working towards sustainable development?

2.4 Added Value Entry Points

In assessing how DCA contributes to strengthening partner’s ability to fulfil their role in civil society the potential added value that DCA brings into the partnership must be defined and carefully explored.

DCA partners might have other ideas and experiences of what DCA brings into the partnership and should also be viewed and carefully assessed. The added value entry points listed in Annex B are those aspects of our work that we typically assume bring added value to our partners work. All options are to be explored as a part of this evaluation (please refer to Annex 2B).

It is also acknowledged that exactly what it is that DCA brings into the partnership may differ quite substantially depending on whether it is experienced by a DCA relief partner (project approach), a DCA programme partner (mostly development, some relief), depending on partner capacities/resources, nature of partnership, depending on back donor funding, history, and many other aspects. DCA has never systematically explored in what situations and in what partner relations DCA contribute the most to the partnership.

As a point of departure this evaluation should explore this further, with special attention on how and what DCA partners define and experience as DCA added value. It is therefore essential that the team of consultants explore this question by being open in methods and approaches used and thereby getting an in depth understanding of what DCA partners find is relevant to the partnership.

3. SCOPE

The evaluation will be carried out in March/April 2009. This evaluation is both exploring DCA added value in partnerships in DCA development and relief work. DCA expects to learn from this evaluation how relevant and effective DCA’s programmes approach is as a frame for DCA added value in partnerships. The views of partners, back donors, DCA staff and others will be reflected in this evaluation.
Geographical focus
Two DCA focus countries have been selected for this evaluation; Malawi and India. Humanitarian Assistance work in Zimbabwe is managed from Malawi, but this is not a part of this evaluation. The India office is a regional office also covering Bangladesh and Nepal, however, this evaluation is only covering partners and project/programme work in India.

One criterion for country selection for this evaluation has been to choose DCA focus countries where DCA has well established offices, long term commitments and ongoing development programmes and relief activities. DCA has deliberately chosen not to include countries of pure Humanitarian Assistance operations where DCA has no development work, no programming, countries where DCA has no or very few DCA staff and no longer term commitments. One criterion for country selection is that an ACT appeal has been launched recently in at least one of the countries.

Another important criterion for selection of countries has been to choose at least one African country. In terms of budget and number of countries where DCA are engaged Africa is the largest region. Second comes Asia as a priority and in both of these regions DCA is heavily engaged in both development and relief work.

When focusing on DCA added value in partnerships it is important to look at the programme platforms activities/ACT Forums. It will add value to this evaluation if the countries chosen have different (good and bad) experiences in this regard. Also the evaluation will benefit from a country selection that reflects the wide range of partners that DCA engages with; e.g. from small and very grass root based NGOs that needs strengthening of capacity in a wide range of areas to large NGOs with strong capacities to meet donor requirements who may seek partnership with DCA for other reasons than capacity building purposes.

All experience so far show that the partnership relationship is somehow different depending on funding source. At least one of the countries chosen should have a diversified funding base, meaning a combination of Danida Frame funds/Danida AKT stykke funds, DCA own funds, EU (development and/or relief), and other back donors and funds.

In Malawi and India the geographical project/programme focus will be proposed by the consultants and commented by CC/PTA.

Selection of projects/programmes and partners
The evaluation should include a wide range of partners (covering all programmes and selected Humanitarian Assistance projects) in Malawi and India. The team of consultants will conduct in depth interviews/discussions with approximately three partners from each programme and three relief partners in each country - both capital- and field based. The partner portfolio to be interviewed should be represented by small/large organisations, old/new partners to DCA, preferably some partners that feed into more than one programme, and it should be a good mix of partner in terms of advocacy/empowerment/service delivery.

Special attention should be given to DCA cross cutting activities/platform work under each of the different programmes, and in relation to relief work special attention should be given to activities that relates to “DCA added value” nature (refer to DCA added value entry points listed in Annex B).
The team of consultants should facilitate a preparatory partner platform meeting in Malawi and India where all DCA partners are invited and added value discussions facilitated (development and relief).

The team of consultants will present draft findings and draft recommendations to DCA staff (Malawi and India), who will be given the opportunity to clarify misunderstandings etc. - if any.

**Fields visits in Malawi and India**

It is expected that the evaluation team will conduct project field visits to a selected number of projects. Project areas are agreed jointly between the consultant team and the DCA regional offices.

**Interviews outside Malawi and India**

Interviews with DCA staff from DCA HQ/Copenhagen are to be conducted prior to field visit to Malawi/India. A selected number of DCA core group members are to be interviewed after the field visit to Malawi/India.

**Time Frame**

The evaluation will take place end February - April 2009.

Terms of Reference is shared with DCA Malawi and India office and all DCA partners in Malawi and India, preferably at partner platform meetings/ACT forum or other similar meetings during October/November 2008. It is the responsibility of DCA regional representatives to provide Head of Programme Development Unit (PDU) with key feedback and comments before end of October.

An international Consultant will team up with two local consultants, one from Malawi and one from India. The international consultant is the team leader and refers directly to Christian Friis Bach, International Director at DCA HQ. On a day-to-day basis head of Programme Development Unit Cecilie Bjørnskov-Johansen is the contact person in DCA HQ.

All three consultants has 10 days to prepare the evaluation; including document reading, interviewing DCA HQ staff and planning in more detail the evaluation. A detailed programme for Malawi and India field visits will be developed by the consultants, DCA regional offices, and head of PDU. The international consultant travels to Denmark for introduction and HQ staff interviews continue to Malawi to conduct a two week field visit jointly with the consultant from Malawi. The international consultant goes directly from Malawi to visit India where a two week field visit is jointly conducted with a consultant from India. Before the International Consultant goes back to his/her home country a meeting will take place with DCA HQ in Copenhagen, with the aim of sharing findings and recommendations.

The team of consultants have 1.5 week to prepare a draft evaluation report which will be shared with DCA Regional Offices in Malawi and India and HQ in Copenhagen. The team of consultants will receive comments to the draft evaluation report and will finalise it within 0.5 week. All in all the evaluation is planned to take seven and a half weeks.

**4. STAKEHOLDERS**

To ensure ownership to evaluation findings and recommendations stakeholder involvement is crucial. The following stakeholders should as a minimum be consulted but others may be relevant to include as well:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFP no.</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17393/HQ/Malawi/India</td>
<td>23 September 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DCA board member(s)
A couple of board members are selected for interviews

DCA Core Group
DCA Core Group should be interviewed (long distance)

DCA staff
DCA Staff in HQ and at the two regional offices (Malawi and India) should be interviewed. Group interviews/discussions may have relevance. Key staff in HQ is:

Henrik Stubkjær, Secretary General
Christian Friis Bach, International Director
Klaus Lykkegaard, Development Director
Lisa Henry, Relief Director

Lars Jørgensen, Country Coordinator/Malawi
Jonas Nøddekaer, Country Coordinator/India
Allan Duelund Jensen, Head of Global Funding Unit
Cecilie Bjeranskov-Johansen, Head of Programme Development

Key staff at Regional Offices:
Lennart Skov Hansen, Regional Representative in Malawi
All Programme- and finance officers in Malawi office; approx. seven officers in total
Nina Ellinger, Regional Representative in India
All programme- and Finance officers in India office; approx. nine officers in total

DCA partners
The DCA partners are key stakeholders for this evaluation.

Rights Holders/Beneficiaries
During field visits the team of consultants will interview beneficiaries from different DCA project/programmes (both Humanitarian Assistance and development).

Back donors
Key back donors such as Danida/Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Denmark (HUM), Danida/Embassies and EU Representations (EU development and ECHO offices) should be interviewed in Malawi and India.

EU Malawi contact:
William Dothi, William.DOTHI@ec.europa.eu, Responsible for Civil Society
Marika UOTILA, Marika.UOTILA@ec.europa.eu, Programme Manager for NGOs in the Rural Development & Food Security Section.

EU India contact:
Yassine Gaba, ta03@echo-india.org, technical advisor ECHO
Renuka Srinivasan, Renuka.SRINIVASAN@ec.europa.eu, EU delegation

Sister organisations
Sister organisation representatives in Malawi and India.

The above list is not exhaustive and the consultant is welcome to suggest additional stakeholders.

RFP no. 17393/HQ/Malawi/India
Date: 23 September 2008
5. METHOD
A number of policies and standards, programme/project documents, surveys, studies, evaluations and background material will be provided to the consultants. This will together with DCA HQ interviews (only with the consultant team leader) provide the consultant team with a thorough understanding of DCA programming and partnership approach and commitment before travelling to Malawi and India. It is up to the Consultants to elaborate further on the Evaluation Methodology, including but not necessarily limited to:

Use of background information
Data collection in the field ensuring a good balance of quantitative and qualitative information
Sampling techniques for the selection of projects and interviewees
Type of interviewees
Participatory techniques
Partner workshop
What measures to be taken to ensure confidentiality and dignity of the participant’s.
Etc.

The evaluator can use a range of methods including documentation review, semi-structured interviews with stakeholders, individual partner discussions, partner workshops and focus group discussions. The methods intended to be used need to be clearly developed in their proposals. However, methods must allow for active and open participation of partners in all discussions. Participatory tools will therefore be highly valued. It is further important that the combination of methods chosen facilitate adequate cross-checking of information to ensure the representation and accuracy of the evaluation’s findings. All findings and recommendations need to be shared with partners before their final presentation to DCA.

6. TEAM COMPOSITION AND DCA CONTACT POINTS
The team of consultants:
Team leader: International consultant
One local consultant, India
One local consultant, Malawi

DCA contact points:
DCA contact person HQ: Cecilie Bjørnskov-Johansen, Head of Programme Development Unit
DCA contact person India: Nina Ellinger, DCA Regional Representative
DCA contact person in Malawi/Ethiopia: Lennart Skov Hansen, DCA Regional Representative

7. TIMING, LOGISTICS/FACILITIES AND OUTPUTS
The evaluation is expected to take place end February-April 2009:

25th February– 8th of March (1.5 week) Preparation, document reading and interviews/consultations with DCA HQ
9th of March – 22nd of March (2 weeks) Malawi field visit
23rd March – 5th of April (2 weeks) India field visit
6th of April – 17th of April (2 weeks) Meeting in Copenhagen, share findings and recommendations.

- Draft evaluation report is expected to be submitted to DCA
latest 13th of April.
- Comments from DCA HQ and Regional offices
- Final evaluation report (one original and two copies) to be submitted in English latest 17th April, 2008 to:
  Cecilie Bjørnskov-Johansen, Head of Programme Development Unit
  Nørregade 13
  1165 Copenhagen K
  Denmark

No facilities are to be provided by the contracting authority such as accommodation or computers.

Output: Evaluation report (one original and two copies) in line with DCA recommendations for Evaluation Report Structure.
Annex 1A: List of Documents

Vision and Planning:
Vision and Plan 2007-2011
2012 Growth Strategy
International Seminar 2008, minutes

DCA programme policies:
Political Space Policy
Food Security Policy
HIV/AIDS Policy
Humanitarian Assistance Policy

Cross Cutting Policies:
DCA Partnership Policy
Rights Based Approach
Gender Equality

PME documents:
PPM (selected)
Meta analysis (evaluation)

Project and Programme documents:
All Malawi and India Humanitarian Assistance project documents/cooperation agreements
Selected number of Malawi and India Project documents/cooperation agreements (different back donors) and evaluations (development)
All Programme documents incl. LFA
All Programme reviews and evaluations
Uganda Gender and Rights Audit

ACT Forum and Programme Platform meetings:
Minutes from regular meetings
Reports, appeals, assessments, studies, notes etc. from joint initiatives taken by ACT Forum and/or programme platforms

Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) Reports:
HAP/DCA HQ Report
HAP/DCA Malawi Report

Back Donor Documents:
Danida, Civil Society Strategy 2008
EU policies and strategies of relevance for Malawi and India
Annex 1B: Added value entry points

Main added value points to explore could be the following but not necessarily limited to:

**DCA Added value entry points – development work**
- Policy and strategy developments guiding DCA development work
- DCA technical capacity within DCA programme focus (Programme Technical Advisors (PTAs) and staff at DCA regional offices (Regional Representative, project/programme officers, and finance officers))
- Cross cutting commitments; gender equality and rights based development
- Act Forums and Programme Platforms
- Synergies between programmes
- Networks and alliances including closer cooperation with DCA sister agencies and church organisations.
- Organisational Development, incl. strategic development/management, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME), administration, finance and other
- Accountability, advocacy and legal enforcement
- Long term commitment and engagement
- Fundraising (does a changing funding base change aspects of DCA added value in partnerships?)
- Advocacy, information and campaign work in the North
- Co-implementation (DCA staff actively participating in project implementation)

**DCA Added Value entry point – relief work**
- Policy and strategy developments guiding DCA Relief work
- DCA technical capacity e.g. in relation to Sphere Standards and DCA Humanitarian Assistance focus (Programme Technical Advisors (PTAs) and staff at DCA regional offices (Regional Representative, project/programme officers, and finance officers))
- Cross cutting commitments; Conflict sensitivity, Gender equality and Rights based work,
- Networks and alliances; ACT International as a very important coordination mechanism
- Organisational Development, incl. strategic development/management, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME), administration, finance and other
- Linking Relief Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD); longer term engagement in DCA Humanitarian Assistance Programmes
- Accountability
- Stable funding base/longer term commitment and engagement
- Fundraising (does a changing funding base change aspects of DCA added value in partnerships?)
- Advocacy, information and campaign work in the North
- Co-implementation (DCA staff actively participating in project implementation)
Annex 2: List of documents

1. DCA Documents

**Vision and Planning:**
- Vision and Plan 2007-2011
- 2012 Growth Strategy
- International Seminar 2008, minutes
- Review of Global Funding Unit decentralisation

**DCA programme and Cross-cutting policies:**
- Political Space Policy
- Food Security Policy
- HIV/AIDS Policy
- Humanitarian Assistance Policy
- DCA Partnership Policy
- Rights Based Approach
- Gender Equality

**PME documents:**
- PPM (selected)
- DCA Standard format for Evaluation reports
- Programme Monitoring Guidelines (final draft)
- Manual for Participatory Gender & Rights Audit
- Meta analysis (evaluation)

**Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) Reports:**
- HAP/DCA HQ Audit Report, 2007
- HAP/DCA Malawi Audit Report, 2007

2. Back Donor Documents
- Danida, Civil Society Strategy 2008
- EU Africa Strategy
- EU policies and strategies of relevance for Malawi and India

3. Other organisations’ partnership policy

**NCA**
- Global Strategic Plan 2005-2009
- Prinsipdokument, 2008

**Christian Aid:**
- Partnership: the Cornerstone of Christian Aid’s International Work, 2004
- Partnership Criteria, 2008
- 2005-2010 Strategic Framework

**ICCO**
- ICCO Partnership Policy, 2003
Diakonia
- www.diakonia.se - Partner Point

Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke
- Partnership against Poverty, 2005
- MS Partnership, 2009

NPA
- NPA Partnership Cooperation in Civil Society, 2004

4. Programme documents

General
- All Malawi and India Humanitarian Assistance project documents/cooperation agreements
- Selected number of Malawi and India Project documents/cooperation agreements (different back donors) and evaluations (development)
- All Programme documents incl. LFA
- All Programme reviews and evaluations
- Uganda Gender and Rights Audit
- Reports, appeals, assessments, studies, notes etc. from joint initiatives taken by ACT Forum and/or programme platforms

Malawi

General documents
- EU in Malawi 30 years, 2006
- EU Country Strategy in Malawi, 2008-2013

PT1 Political Space Programme
- Civic and Political Space, Programme Document, 2006-09
- Annual Programme Report, 2006
- Annual Programme Report, 2007
- Rolling Plan report 2007
- Partner Platform Meeting Minutes, March 2008
- Civil Society Planning Meeting, May 2008
- PME visit Conclusions, March 2007
- Feedback Programme Monitoring Reports, 2006
- Feedback Programme Monitoring reports, 2007
- Mid-term Review Political Space Programme July 2008
- Various partner project documents

PT3 Food Security Programme:
- Annual Report, May 2007
• TOR End of programme Review, 2007 (?)
• Food Security Platform Project, End of Programme Report, 2006
• Gender Mainstreaming, August 2006
• Malawi Food Security Review May 2006
• Minutes of the Food Security Platform meeting, June 2005
• Various partner project documents

PT4 HIV/Aids
• HIV/Aids programme document 2005
• HIV / Aids programme mid-term review 2007
• Summary of Thematic Review (HIV/Aids) 2006
• Follow-up memo Oct 2007
• Biannual Report Jan-June 2006
• HIV/AIDS programme Report Jan to Dec 2006 + follow-up
• HIV/AIDS Programme Report Jan to Dec 2007
• Lessons learned in Participatory Community Dialogue in Project design, Feb 2008
• Minutes Partner Platform meeting 1 Dec 2006
• Minutes Partner Platform meeting 2 May 2007
• Minutes Partner Platform meeting 9 Oct 2007
• Stakeholder consultative meeting on Stigma & Discrimination Advocacy Strategy, 22 March 2007
• Minutes from HIV/AIDS focal persons from NCA, DCA and Christian Aid, March 2009
• CHALLENGES OF SECONDARY PREVENTION IN THE FIGHT AGAINST HIV/AIDS, Dec. 2008
• REPORT ON THE JOINT REGIONAL PLATFORM CENTRE, Nov. 2008
• Report on peer monitoring visit to Malawi, Nov 2008
• Various partner project documents, minutes and workshop papers

PT5 Relief
• ACT Review Report, March 2006 (3 pdf-files)
• Various ACT-forum documents (minutes)
• Minutes of ACT Forum in Malawi, April 2006
• Minutes of ACT Forum in Malawi, February 2008
• HAP Audit Report Malawi, May 2008
• Malawi AFMW51 Review, draft April 2006
• Malawi ACT appeal AFMW51, Review Final eport, 2006
• Various partner project documents

India

General documentation
• EC Regional Strategy for Asia 2007-13
• DCA South Asia Partnership Meeting Programme, Jan.2009
**PT1 Access to Social and Economic Justice Programme**
- Progress Report, Jan - June 2008
- Annual Report, Jan - Dec 2007
- Programme Cohesion Matrix, 2009
- Monitoring Visit Report (CPSC, HRE), July 2008
- PT1 Partner Platform Meeting Minutes, Feb 2008
- PT1 Partner Platform Meeting Minutes, Sep 2008
- STEP 2 on new project ideas for DMKS, ASTHA and ACPS, Jan 2007
- A Special Report on Most Vulnerable Social Groups and Their Access to Food, Commissioner of the Supreme Court, 8th report, Aug. 2008
- Equal access to justice for poor people and deprived communities in India, DCA & SLIC, EuropeAid project application cum budget, (2007?)
- Partner project documents, agreements, field and monitoring visit reports and other documents

**PT1 Safe Migration Regional Programme**
- Regional Programme Consultation on Trafficking and Safe Migration in Asia, Meeting Report December 2007
- Asia program on Safe Migration and Anti-trafficking measures, Reporting in 2008 (matrix)
- PT1 Partner Platform Meeting minutes, Nov.2008
- STEP 1+2 on new project idea for NDWWT, March 2007
- Partner project documents, agreements, field and monitoring visit reports and other documents

**PT3 Food Security / Rights to Food Programme**
- Food Security Mid-term Programme Review, Sep.2008
- PT3 Programme Advisory Board Meeting Minutes, Oct.2006
- PT3 Partner Platform Meeting Minutes, June 2006
- PT3 Partner Platform Meeting Minutes, March 2007
- Evaluation of the Rajasthan Development Project (Phase III), CASA, March 2008
- Ensuring Food Security For the Rural Poor f Rajasthan through a major Emphasis on NREGA, ASTHA half yearly report Jan - June 2008
- A Fistful of Rice, DCA video documentary, (2008?)
- Partner project documents, agreements, field and monitoring visit reports and other documents
PT5 Disaster Risk Reduction Programme

- Rights Based Disaster Risk Management: Disaster Resilient Communities in India, Nepal and Bangladesh Jan 2008-Dec 2012, final draft (2007?)
- Regional Disaster Risk Reduction Program, PP-presentation, Jan.2009
- Lessons Learnt Workshop for Floods 2007 response project staff in Guwahati, May 2008
- Tsunami Programme Assessment for Learning, draft report, DCA India, January 2009
- After the Cyclone: lessons from a disaster, Oxfam Briefing Note, Feb.2008
- Rehabilitation support to most marginalised flood affected families in Assam, India, EU Project application cum budget, DCA & CASA, April 2008
Annex 3: Guidelines for self-evaluations

Introduction

DCA has decided to undertake a cross-cutting evaluation of the added value in partnerships. The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess how DCA contribute to strengthen partners’ ability to fulfil their role in civil society. In other words: Does it make a difference for partner organisations to work in partnership with DCA? This implies taking a closer look at how partnerships are perceived, not only by DCA itself, but also by involved partner organisations, back donors and other stakeholders.

The country programmes in Malawi and India have been chosen for the evaluation, which will run from mid-January to early June 2009.

The evaluation will involve all partner organisations in Malawi and India, albeit to varying degrees of detail. The evaluation team will interact with partner organisations at three levels:

1. **self-evaluation**, which will involve all partner organisations through a simple method. This will take place in January-February.

2. **in-depth interviews** (by visits or telephone) with selected partner organisations from each programme.

3. **Partner Organisation Workshop** at the end of the field mission.

The current note is a guide to partner organisations and DCA Regional Offices for undertaking the self-evaluation.

1. **Objectives of the self-evaluation**

The objective of the self-evaluation by all partner organisations is twofold:

1. It provides the evaluation team with a solid and broad basis for identifying key issues and entry points on value added
to be further explored with selected partner organisations and other stakeholders; and

2. It provides each partner organisation with an opportunity to reflect upon the partnership relation and to present its own views on how and why partnership with DCA has added value to their work and fulfilment of their role in civil society.

Experience from various evaluations has shown that organisations often want to have the opportunity for self-assessment. The self-evaluation serves to engage as many partner organisations as possible.

The focus of the self-evaluation is on added value through partnership approach. We have chosen to apply the method of Most Significant Change (MSC) to best identify the added value points.

Guidance on how to undertake the self-evaluation using the MSC analysis is given below.

2. Most Significant Change analysis

The MSC analysis is participatory and simple. With MSC you ask people to identify the positive or negative changes observed over a period of time within a given domain of interest. The same people are asked which changes they find the most important, and why they have chosen it as the most significant change. The outcome of the exercise will be a number of recorded ‘stories’ about change. A MSC workshop can be a very good sharing and learning experience for the participants.

Looking at the organisation’s capacity to fulfil its role as civil society organisation working towards sustainable development, the key question to be addressed in the self-evaluation is:

---

61 For example Joint External Evaluation, The Health Sector in Tanzania, 1999-2006, for Danida and joint donors, COWI et al October 2007

• What are the most significant changes the partner organisation has achieved since the DCA partnership was established?

A standard model for a MSC analysis / workshop, which the partner organisations may follow, is presented below.

3 How to make a MSC mini-workshop?

A useful approach would be that the partner organisation organises a MSC mini-workshop with key actors from within the organisation (board members and staff).

A MSC mini-workshop with 5-10 participants is optimal for a 3 hours event.

The steps in the workshop would typically be:

1. The purpose of the MSC workshop is carefully explained to the participants by the DCA Programme Officer or a key person from the organisation.

2. Index cards (A4) and fat speed-markers are distributed to all participants who are invited to write stories on the cards (one story per card). Each person writes a maximum of three cards/stories on the changes occurred due to DCA partnership collaboration.

3. Describe what major changes have occurred since partnership with DCA was established? Look at areas of holding government accountable, ability to carry out activities, and internal capacity.

Each individual participant writes his/her statements independently. It is important that each individual writes his/her own personal opinions.

With a group of say 5 people and each person writing 3 cards there will be a total of 15 stories on changes occurred due to DCA partnership collaboration.

4. When statements have been filled in, the participants present their stories and stick the card on the wall. If some stories overlap, the facilitator may group them.
5. Chose among the identified changes occurred due to DCA partnership the Most Significant Change. Give a short justification for nomination of the story.

The subsequent ‘steps’ concern reporting.

4. **Reporting from the MSC mini-workshop**

The report from the MSC mini-workshop will consist of a list of identified changes and the justification for choosing the Most Significant Change.

A note-taker captures the main points raised in the discussion and a **brief summary can be prepared**.

All **story cards should be saved** and send / handed over to the DCA Regional Office, which will hand it over to the evaluation team together with the summary.

A **list of participants** should be included.

Some - most - participants may prefer to write their statement cards in vernacular. A discussion in vernacular languages is also likely to be preferable. The evaluation team, however, prefers **reports in English**.

Information to be included in the summary:
- Name of the organisation
- Contact details (address, phone number, e-mail, web site etc.)
- Number of members
- Main area of activities
- DCA partner since (state year)
- Write all stories presented
- Present the Most Significant Change and the justification for choosing this particular story
- Attach a list of participants

We ask you kindly to deliver the **report and story cards no later than February 13th, 2009** to the DCA Regional Office.
5 Contact with the evaluation team

If need for clarification or any other question arises during the self-evaluation the evaluation team will do our best to assist you. We propose that our Malawi and India based consultants back-stop and provide guidance and clarification if necessary:

Malawi
Justin Nyondo
justin-nyondo@magintmw.org
mobile phone….

India
Khilesh Chaturvedi
khilesh@askindia.org
mobile phone….

We hope that the self-evaluation will be a good experience and look forward to share your views and assessments.

Best regards on behalf of the evaluation team,

Bente Topsoe-Jensen
bstj@cowi.com
+45 2257 2207
Annex 4: Selected partner organisations
### DCA Malawi: Selected partner organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PARTNER ORGANISATION</th>
<th>GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PARTNER</th>
<th>BUDGET 2009 (DKK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>QMAM (PT4)</td>
<td>Quadria Muslim Association of Malawi (QMAM) is a faith-based organisation working with HIV/AIDS and other development issues. The objective of QMAM is to fight against all AIDS related stigma and discrimination, gender inequalities and human rights violations amongst the HIV/AIDS affected in the Salima district. A large share of the Quadria Muslim community in Salima (especially women and girls) is illiterate and severely hit by HIV/AIDS, largely due to their religious as well as traditional beliefs and practices. QMAM attempts to reduce the impact of HIV/AIDS by intervening in these practices and provides psychosocial support to people living with AIDS. <em>QMAM is considered to be a strategic partner of DCA, as it is outside the core partners has DCA traditionally supported. It has led to unique lessons being about how to tackle the HIV and AIDS epidemic in communities that are ‘closed’ to the outside world and led to the improvement of relations between such communities and those outside.</em></td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SWAM (PT4)</td>
<td>Society for Women and AIDS in Malawi (SWAM) is a member of the Pan African organisation Society for Women and AIDS in Africa (SWAA). SWAM became operational in Malawi in 2003 and focuses on promoting access to prevention, care, support and counseling to people living with AIDS. Gender inequalities and women’s rights are main issues in SWAM’s HIV/AIDS advocacy work. With support from DanChurchAid SWAM hopes to increase the accessibility for young men and women to reproductive information and services, to reduce the gender inequalities that further the spread of HIV/AIDS as well as to promote the modification and elimination of negative cultural practices. <em>Considered to be a strategic partner of DCA as it is working in an area not frequently tackled by the traditional partners of DCA. SWAM groups of mean and women considered high risk in terms of infection of HIV and AIDS.</em></td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CHAM (PT4)</td>
<td>Christian Health Association of Malawi (CHAM) is an umbrella organisation, which aims at promoting and coordinating the health services provided by 167 member hospitals and health clinics owned by the Protestant and Catholic Church. The member units of CHAM account for approx. 40 per cent of all health institutions in Malawi. Food security, HIV/AIDS and nutrition are all integrated components of CHAM’s health work. Within the area of food security, CHAM trains vulnerable rural families in the cultivation of crops, nutrition, sustainable farming and prevention of HIV/AIDS. The organisation also intends to strengthen HIV/AIDS care and support services and improve the nutrition status through home gardening.</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHAM (PT3/Health)

CHAM provides technical support to its affiliates in the areas of Capacity building and institutional strengthening; technical and administrative support to members on health issues and problems; and facilitates communication between its members and important stakeholders such government and cooperating partners and providing information on current developments and issues in Health Care to its members.

CHAM also facilitates resource mobilisation for its affiliates; undertakes grants management of salaries and projects; provides assistance in mobilizing resources for training; helps with the management of drugs and medical supplies; mobilizes and distributes donated materials and equipment.

CHAM also provides assistance in emergency situations by mobilising and distributing drugs, food and other emergency materials for immediate needs of vulnerable groups in the health facilities, as well as building capacity of CHAM health facilities in emergency preparedness and response. **CHAM participates in the health sector Swap, so as to achieve a more coordinated approach to the delivery of health services. It has however, indicated that it has not received the financial support it was promised.**

As opposed to government, a significant number of CHAM's services are on a cost recovery basis. Government pays for a significant number of CHAM, but has at times had difficult sustaining its financial commitments.

It is not clear to what extent CHAM works with such bodies as ELDS, CARD CCAP Synods in providing relief in emergency situations. Clearly, there is scope for DCA that supports all of them to encourage greater coordination in service delivery in these agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PARTNER ORGANISATION</th>
<th>GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PARTNER</th>
<th>BUDGET 2009 (DKK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4   | CARD (PT3/Relief)    | Churches Action in Relief and Development (CARD) is a well-established church-based organisation with 19 Protestant member churches. It maintains good working relations and cooperation with district assemblies and NGOs represented in the organization’s impact areas in the Southern Districts of Malawi. DanChurchAid supports CARD’s development activities which aim at improving the food security situation for smallholder farmers in rural areas. HIV/AIDS is an integrated component of the development work. CARD also works with relief activities and has been supported by DanChurchAid since the 1980s. **CARD has been receiving support from DCA since the 1980s. There seems to be scope to ‘graduate’ the organisation to a place of ‘real’ partnership where it is able to venture into some programmes jointly with DCA.**  

The Southern districts in which CARD have been prone to flood and hunger situations since time immemorial. The communities have reluctant to heed government advice to move to locations that are less prone to ca- | 315,625 towards relief (Danida AKT-Stykker), 679,350 (Danida frame funds) and 70,650 (X-Mas Catalogue) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PARTNER ORGANISATION</th>
<th>GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PARTNER</th>
<th>BUDGET 2009 (DKK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ELDS (PT3/Relief)</td>
<td>Evangelical Lutheran Development Service (ELDS) works in all of the three regions of Malawi and is well-established and respected in the local communities. As with the other partners within the food security programme, DanChurchAid supports ELDS in development activities with an integrated HIV/AIDS component aimed at improving the food security situation for smallholder farmers in rural areas. ELDS also works undertakes relief activities. Christian Aid Scotland also supports ELDS. emergency work in Phalombe, southern Malawi contributing to their emergency programme which provides food aid, seeds, fertilizer, water pumps, farming training and livestock. It also funds a separate disaster preparedness project, which provides seeds and livestock, and helps farmers to build a dam and set up irrigation plots. A field visit to one of its project sites supported by DCA revealed remarkable cooperation between its staff and the community in various community activities. In at least one village visited, the activities seemed to have had a tremendous positive impact on people’s lives with indications that the activities are likely to be sustainable. The progress made was attributed to the DCA inspired Rights Based Approach to development, which seems to have elicited the active involvement of various stakeholders in development work. ELDS is a member of Action by Churches Together.</td>
<td>315,625 (Danida AKT-Stykker) and 95,000 own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CCAP LIVINGSTONIA: DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (PT3/Relief)</td>
<td>The Church of Central African Presbyterian (CCAP) Synod of Livingstonia runs the largest local NGO in the Northern Region. DanChurchAid has supported the synod since 2002. CCAP facilitates and implements sustainable church and community based development programmes, and rights and social justice have become important issues in CCAP’s work. Within the area of food security, CCAP trains farmers from the poorest households in amongst other things the use of low cost sustainable agricultural technologies and food processing. The Synod is also involved in relief work to alleviate suffering among communities that have suffered chronic hunger for years or those that are in flood prone areas. Has embraced the right based approach in its programming.</td>
<td>315,625 (Danida AKT-Stykker for relief), 523,160 for development, and 66,840 for X-mas catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CSC (PT3)</td>
<td>Christian Service Committee (CSC) is a well-known national broadly based church NGO and DanChurchAid’s oldest partner in Malawi. CSC’s role within DanChurchAid’s food security programme is development activities with an integrated HIV/AIDS component aimed at improving the food security situation for smallholder farmers in rural areas. The organisation mainly focuses on families affected by HIV/AIDS. CSC trains farmers in modern methods of processing and utilizing different food items and promotes the</td>
<td>604,585 (Danida frame funds), 70,650 X-mas catalogue, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>PARTNER ORGANISATION</td>
<td>GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PARTNER</td>
<td>BUDGET 2009 (DKK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diversification of food crop and livestock production as well as sustainable natural resource management. Although, the CSC is the oldest partner of DCA in Malawi, there is no evidence that its capacity is stronger than the newer partners. If anything, it seems to have serious problems with ability to account for funds.</td>
<td>74,765 own funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>WOLREC (PT1)</td>
<td>The NGO Women’s Legal Resources Centre (WOLREC) was founded in 2004 with the aim of promoting access to justice for women in Malawi. The organisation provides legal assistance to rural and poor urban women, information on human rights and gender issues and conducts research and documentation on law issues affecting women. WOLREC mainly works in Salima and Mzimba districts where the NGO attempts to improve the participation of women in civic and political life by equipping them with critical knowledge on gender and human rights and empowering them to be assertive. WOLREC also seeks to improve the economic status of women through setting-up small-scale businesses. <strong>WOLREC is one of the newest partners of DCA. In fact DCA is its first partner. The partnership with DCA has helped WORLEC attract other donors.</strong></td>
<td>411,960 (Danida frame funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CCAP NKHOMA SYNOD: CHURCH AND SOCIETY (PT1)</td>
<td>The Church of Central African Presbyterian (CCAP) Synod of Nkhoma was established in 2003 and covers 117 congregations. The synod encourages its members to engage in the social and political affairs of the nation with the aim of promoting unity and peace in the country and safeguarding the rule of law and human rights. The Synod of Nkhoma has embarked on a project aiming at strengthening the governance and respect for human rights by empowering communities to claim and demand their rights. The organisation’s activities include providing information and doing awareness raising in order to enable communities to make informed choices.</td>
<td>344,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10</td>
<td>CCJP (PT1)</td>
<td>The Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace (CCJP) was established in 1996. The objective of the commission is to create awareness and knowledge on social justice and human rights issues in order to provide a breeding ground for integrated development and peace in the country. The organisation has recently translated the Malawian Constitution into two local languages and educated local trainers who distribute the constitution in villages and educate communities on human rights. CCJP also focuses on creating networks with the government and other organisations working to improve justice, human rights, democracy and good governance. Furthermore, the organisation conducts research and counselling in justice and peace issues.</td>
<td>491,195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DCA India: Selected partner organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PARTNER ORGANISATION</th>
<th>GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PARTNER</th>
<th>BUDGET 2009 (DKK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ASTHA (PT1 and PT3)</td>
<td>ASTHA was formed in 1986 and has been working in the Rajasthan province on issues of Right to Food, Budget analysis of the state government and Tribal rights. ASTHA currently works with and through People’s movements, strengthening them to be self sustained.</td>
<td>452,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>CASA (Relief, PT3 and PT 5)</td>
<td>CASA is an old partner. It is a faith based organization. CASA is a National level organization operational throughout the country with various programs. CASA is also an ACT member.</td>
<td>1,575,000 / Danida frame 697,000 / ECHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>CDR (PT1)</td>
<td>CDR is a relatively small organization initiated by retired government servant and a Lawyer. It is an organization working on Dalit rights. The main project is co funded by DCA and Christian Aid. The organization very much adopts a rights based approach and is working with the Legislature, Police and Judiciary and regularly interacts with the media on issues pertaining to rights of the Dalits.</td>
<td>281,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>CEC (PT1)</td>
<td>CEC is a development agency with a distinct identity as a National level Labour Resource centre, working to address the issues of the unorganized labour in the country and the region. It has strong research, documentation and information program. It is a regional partner of DCA.</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>CPSC (People’s Watch) (PT1, Tsunami)</td>
<td>People’s Watch is a Human Rights organization involved in the Human Rights monitoring, Human Rights redress and Human Rights Education. Based in Tamil Nadu, the organization has an operational spread throughout the country. With DCA, People’s Watch implemented a Human Rights Education Program and also a Tsunami response program.</td>
<td>340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Disha (PT3)</td>
<td>Disha is a grassroots level organization based in Orissa. It works with a rights based approach with strong community mobilization with focus on tribal issues.</td>
<td>233,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ekta Parishad (PT1)</td>
<td>Ekta Parishad is a National level organization working on the issue of Land rights, especially for the tribals in various states of the country. The assistance from DCA is also on the issue of Land rights</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Food Commissioner’s office (PT3)</td>
<td>It was in response to a Public Interest Litigation by People’s Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL) that the Supreme court of India appointed a Food Commissioner to monitor the implementation of various right to food related schemes. DCA, through HRLN / SLIC, assists the Food Commissioners office to conduct ongoing research and assessment and link up with various grassroots NGOs</td>
<td>420,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>HRLN / SLIC (PT3 PT1, Institutional support)</td>
<td>HRLN is an organization established by noted Lawyers with reach throughout the country and working through the legal instruments to address the issues of the various marginalized and excluded groups. HRLN is supported by DCA with Institutional support, matching grant for the Europe Aid project on ensuring equal access to justice for deprived communities in India. DCA also supported HRLN for its Tsunami relief and rehabilitation monitoring project which was implemented in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands</td>
<td>588,958 / Danida frame 1,037,405 / EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>LWSI (PT5)</td>
<td>Lutheran World Service of India is an old partner of DCA. It is a National level organization and gets supported for relief programs all over the country by DCA. It also receives grants for development works in Orissa and West Bengal</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>National Domestic Women Workers’ Trust (PT1)</td>
<td>The National Domestic Workers’ Movement is a non-governmental organization working for and with domestic workers, child domestic workers and migrant workers. NDWWM is active in 22 states of India and work towards the recognition of domestic work on both a national and international level. The Movement networks with Human rights lawyers, doctors and counselors to help in the process of rescue, rehabilitation and repatriation. Since 1990, the Movement took special concern and interest in the rights of Children Domestic Workers.</td>
<td>199,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>NSS (PT1)</td>
<td>NSS is a small grassroots level organization in Orissa and is part of Political space program. The organization works on the issue of Dalit women rights. The organization also has certain service delivery components in its work. DCA is the only major contributor of funds to NSS.</td>
<td>125,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>RCDC (PT3)</td>
<td>RCDC works on the theme of Natural resource management with focus on the Tribals’ right over the natural resources and right to food. RCDC works with a combination of service delivery and rights based approach and is beginning to undertake advocacy action at the state level on the Tribal rights issues</td>
<td>366,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 14. SEEDS (Tsunami)

SEEDS was a Tsunami program partner. It implemented a school safety program in the Andaman Islands. SEEDS is a National level organization working on the theme of Disaster Risk Reduction with several projects on ground in different parts of the country and also providing training and capacity building on the theme to other organizations.

100,000 / earmarked

### 15. SMRC (PT5)

SMRC is a state level organization working in Orissa. The organization is strong in its advocacy work on the issue of rights of the Persons with Disability.

75,000 / earmarked

### 16. SPREAD (PT3)

SPREAD works on the issues related to right to food. The organization works in Orissa on rural development issues, particularly focusing on tribal issues and forest rights. The organization works with a community mobilization and rights based approach.

230,398

### 17. SURE (PT3)

SURE is a local grassroots organization based in villages Barmer which are the international border with Pakistan. The region is also very dry with very little rainfall. The organization is strong in its community mobilization efforts and works on Dalit inclusion. The organization also works closely with the local government.

300,000

*Yellow figures* are budget figures from project/programme documents. Other figures are based on information from RO India (22.04.2009).
Annex 5: Interview guide
The following Interview Guide contains a long-list of guiding questions. They should not necessarily all be asked during an interview, but serve to make sure that the aspects reflected in the questions be covered during the interviews. The detailed questions have been elaborated based on input from DCA, self-evaluations and explorative interviews conducted during the Inception Phase.

Guiding for the interviews will be the focus on perceived added value from DCA collaboration and approach. But the detailed focus during the interview will depend on which category we interview. We operate with 4 categories of interviews:

A Donor agencies (Danida, EU, ECHO) - focus on funding, partnership approach, technical and administrative capacity, advocacy, MSC for partners
B Sister agencies (Christian Aid, ICCO, ACT-forum etc.) - focus on partnership approach, synergies and coordination, advocacy
C DCA staff (Copenhagen, Malawi, India) - all aspects to be included
D Partner organisations (single organisations / project level, platforms / programme level) - all aspects to be included

The end result of the evaluation will be a triangulation of perceptions in relation to the DCA perception of added value (re. TOR, Annex 2B).

The Interview Guide will be a living document during the evaluation to allow for changes and corrections as we move along and become wiser!

☺
Bente

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCA Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Additional explorative questions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What are the benefits (if any) of channelling development and humanitarian assistance funding through DCA, assessed by partners and back donors? | **Funding & fund management**  
1. What are the **key capacities of DCA** in terms of fund management? How is DCA assessed in terms of **effectiveness and efficiency** in terms of fund management?  
2. What is the **specific composition of the DCA funding base in Malawi and India**? How does this reflect the main funding base of DCA? | Special focus in relation to the DAC evaluation criteria for this Evaluation Question will be on relevance and impact.  
**Generic questions are:**  
Relevance: |
1. Is there any change in terms of **possible added values in case the funding base is changed**?

2. How can/has a **changing funding base** strengthen(ed) the manner in which DCA can fulfil its partnerships role and add value?

3. How does the **DCA project preparation process** involve partner organisations?

**Capacity building**

4. How did DCA **technical capacity** (eg. from Programme Type Advisors; RCU; DCA programme, project and relief staff; global funding officers, regional representative in the DCA regional offices) add value to DCA’s partners work?

5. How much value did **organisational development and capacity-building initiatives** add to the partnerships? Have these initiatives adequately responded to partners’ needs?

**Networking & Advocacy**

6. Do DCA partners benefit from DCA’s **cooperation with sister agencies**? If so, in what way?

7. Do DCA partners benefit from DCA’s **membership in strategic networks or local working groups** beyond their own reach?

8. What is the benefit - or disadvantage - of the **DCA established Partner Platforms**?

9. Are there any **political or strategic advantages of working through/with DCA**? Is credibility and accountability best secured?

- To what extent are the objectives of the programme valid?
- Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?

**Impact**

- What has happened as a result of the programme or project?
- What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
- How many people have been affected?
through DCA? Is channelling of funds through DCA a means to partnership and dialogue or rather an obstacle?

12. To what degree have **DCA advocacy interventions** at Danish/international level supported and added-value to partnerships?

**Intervention strategy**

13. How important is it to partners that DCA has a declared **long-term engagement in its focus countries**? How has that long-term engagement been reflected and to what degree has it strengthened partners’ work?

14. Has the **decentralisation of DCA programme staff** made any changes? Has the dialogue been strengthened? Do you feel closer to or more distant to decision-making in DCA?

15. Do DCA **cross cutting commitments** (gender, rights-based development, conflict sensitivity, sphere standards) add value to partners seen from partner’s point of view? Are RBA and gender equity seen as key contributions?

**Relief & Development**

16. Does DCA in practice add value to partner work by fulfilling their role as a donor/partner that can **link relief, rehabilitation and development**? How?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a. Development: does the programme approach contribute to partners work and the partnership? If so, how does it make a difference?</th>
<th>Programme approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Did the introduction of <strong>DCA programme policies and strategies</strong> in both development and relief work add value to DCA’s partnerships? In what way? Have there been <strong>any negative effects</strong> seen from a partner perspective? What are the changes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Are the programme objectives and scope <strong>shared with and owned by the partners</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. How did <strong>DCA/local partners contribute</strong> to achievements and results?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. In the case of <strong>regional programmes</strong> - are there any specific challenges for partners and/or for DCA? Communication? Different political contexts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner platforms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. How do DCA partners’ assess the <strong>benefits of participating in Programme Platforms</strong>? Do they experience or foresee any particular challenges or limitations? Good / bad experience? Increased transactional costs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synergies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Do DCA partners benefit from <strong>synergies between different DCA programmes</strong> in country? If so, how? Is there any interaction between different partners belonging to the same programme?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Has the <strong>programme approach</strong> been a <strong>cost effective</strong> way to facilitate DCA added value to the partnerships?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special focus in relation to the DAC evaluation criteria for this Evaluation Question will be on <strong>effectiveness and efficiency</strong>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Generic questions are:**

**Effectiveness:**
- To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

**Efficiency:**
- Were objectives achieved on time?
- Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

OBS - we will not look into efficiency in the traditional way of cost-benefit and comparing budgets with execution. Due to the nature of the evaluation, the issue of efficiency will be dealt with based on statements and interviews, i.e. related to **perception of efficiency**.
24. Has the **budget set aside for cross cutting activities** under the frame of DCA programme been used efficiently? Could DCA and DCA partners have achieved the same with fewer resources? Would it have been possible to achieve more results with the same resources?

**Best practices**

25. What examples or **best practices** can be listed to illustrate the benefit of the programme approach? Most significant changes since partnership was established?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2b. Relief: How does working with DCA affect partners ability to respond effectively, professionally and accountable in emergency situations? Does DCA make a difference?</th>
<th><strong>Capacity</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Have you experienced any difference in <strong>your capacity to respond to emergency situations</strong>? Examples?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. What <strong>kind of support</strong> has DCA provided for strengthening the rapid response ability and procedures?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Funding</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. <strong>How flexible are funding mechanisms</strong> in relation to sudden-onset disasters and recurring/protracted emergencies?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Coordination</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. How did <strong>DCA/local partners contribute</strong> to achievements and results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Where <strong>ACT forums</strong> exist, what is the added value for implementing partners of participating in such a forum with DCA? Good / bad experience? How do these relate to any relevant DCA partner fora in countries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. What are the most significant changes DCA partners have</th>
<th>31. How do DCA partners define <strong>their own role in sustainable development</strong>? What are the key capacities and resources necessary to fulfil the</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special focus in relation to the DAC evaluation criteria for this Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved - fulfilling their role as civil society working towards sustainable development?</td>
<td>role? Does the DCA partnership provide these capacities and resources? Will DCA partners ever graduate from DCA funding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Is DCA funding <strong>project specific (e.g. EU financing)</strong> or core funding of the organisation? Are there any other INGOs financing the partner organisation? Coordination between the INGOs? Who is in the driver’s seat in terms of coordinating - the partner organisation or the INGOs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. What <strong>major changes</strong> have partners been able to achieve with the support from DCA? How has DCA contributed to these changes? Situation before and after partnership with DCA? Are there any specific comments to the ‘Scandinavian management approach’?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Did partners experience any changes in terms of being able to <strong>hold their governments accountable</strong> that can be attributable to DCA support?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Did partners experience any change in their <strong>ability to carry out their service-delivery role</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Did partners experience any change at staff level or at organisational level due to OD/capacity building initiatives facilitated/supported by DCA?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Did the OD strengthen partner’s <strong>ability to strengthen civil society</strong> in their given context?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 6: Country briefs
Malawi

Malawi is a land locked country in Sub Saharan Africa. It shares boundaries with Zambia (North West), Tanzania (North and North East) and Mozambique (East, South and South West). The country covers an area of 118,484 square kilometres of which 94,276 square kilometres is land. According to preliminary results of the latest Population and Housing Census, Malawi’s population is currently estimated at 13.1 million.

Malawi became independent in July 1964 and gained republican status in July 1966. It became a multi-party state in 1994 and is a young democracy, with a relatively undeveloped civil society. The country is divided into three regions namely, Northern, Central and Southern. There are 28 districts: six in the Northern region; nine in the Central region, and thirteen in the Southern region. Administratively, the districts are sub-divided into Traditional Authorities (TAs), presided over by chiefs. The traditional authorities are composed of villages. These are the smallest administrative units and they are presided over by village headmen.

Agriculture is the single most important sector of the economy. Malawi’s main export commodities are tobacco, tea and sugar. The agriculture sector employs about 80 per cent of the workforce and generates over 80 per cent of foreign exchange earnings, thereby contributing significantly to national and household food security. However, the sector is characterised by low and stagnant yields, vulnerability to weather related shocks, low level irrigation development, and low uptake of improved farm inputs.

To date, Malawi has been suffering from chronic poverty. According to the UN Human Development Report (2005), around 42% of the population lives on less than one dollar a day. Four out of five people live on less than two dollars a day. About one third of the population is malnourished. Most people have a short and basic education, which brings the illiteracy rate of Malawians of over 15 years of age to 36%. Like many Sub-Saharan African countries, Malawi has been severely affected by HIV/AIDS.

Malawi’s long term development agenda is guided by the Vision 2020, which is concretised in the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) that runs from 2006/07 to 2010/2011. The MGDS serves as a single reference document for policy makers in Government, the Private Sector, Civil Society Organisations, Donors and Cooperating Partners and the general public on socioeconomic growth and development priorities for Malawi.

The overriding goal of the MGDS is poverty reduction through sustainable economic growth and infrastructure development. The MGDS identifies six key priority areas that should be addressed to achieve economic growth and improvement in the economic well-being of Malawians. These include i) agriculture and food security; ii) irrigation and water development; iii) transport infrastructure development; iv) energy generation and supply; v) integrated rural

63 Integrated Household Survey. Page 13
development; vi) prevention and management of nutrition disorders, HIV and AIDS.

In order to support the six priority areas, the development framework of the MGDS is built around five broad thematic areas namely i) sustainable economic growth; ii) social protection; iii) social development; iv) infrastructure development; and v) improved governance. A number of multilateral and bilateral agencies are supporting Malawi to achieve objectives set out in the MGDS. For instance, the European Commission (EC) over the period 2008 – 2013 is intended to support implementation of the MGDS with particular emphasis on agriculture and food security and on regional interconnectivity with focus on infrastructure\textsuperscript{64}.

\textsuperscript{64} Country Strategy Paper and National Indicative Programme for the Period 2008 – 2013. page 9
India

India is a South Asian country bordering Pakistan (West), China, Nepal, and Bhutan (North) and Bangladesh and Myanmar (East). The land covers 3,287,590 square kilometres of which 2,973,190 square kilometres are land. According to recent estimates, India’s population currently stands at around 1.2 billion.

India gained its independence in August 1947. It has multi party democracy with power balancing mechanisms, independent election commissions, free and fair elections as well as free media. The country is renowned for its long standing tradition of reform movements and voluntarism, which as led to a maturing civil society sector. Administratively, India is divided into 28 states and 7 union territories. Each state or union territory is divided into 610 districts, which are in turn divided into a local administration towns (tehsils) and villages.

With an average growth rate of around 6% in the last two decades, India is one of the fastest growing world economies. The services sector accounts for more than half of India’s economic growth. However, agriculture is the sector that absorbs more than half of the labour force, rendering the national focus on rural economic development highly relevant for growth and poverty reduction.

Having followed a government controlled economy after independence, India has gradually opened up its markets in the 1990s. Economic reforms brought foreign competition, led to privatisation of certain public sector industries, opened up sectors hitherto reserved for the public sector and led to an expansion in production of goods. The emerging middle class with skills, education and knowledge of English have reaped the benefits of such opportunities. Yet, these benefits have not trickled down to the poor and marginalised.

The gaps are in fact growing at an alarming pace. Religion and the caste and joint family systems are perceived to have played a critical role in denying access and right of marginalised groups, including women. The Human Development Index (HDI, 2006) ranked India as 132 out of 179 countries, indicating low life expectancy at birth, low educational attainment and low income. Poverty data indicate that 35 % of the total population lives on less than one dollar a day. According to the Planning Commission of India, there are around 193.4 million persons living below the poverty line of 2 dollars a day. While the Constitution guarantees basic services such as food, water, shelter, education, health care, good governance and social security, these rights have not been provided. The Indian poor continue to struggle with realities such as deaths due to hunger, unclean and inaccessible drinking water, lack of access to health infrastructure and education, gender disparities and violence against women, forced migration and high unemployment, land alienation heightened through the formation of Special Economic Zones, over and unsustainable exploitation of natural resources, pollution and environmental degradation.

The present Central Government of the United Progressive Alliance spoke of “Development with a human face” emphasising an inclusive approach to de-
velopment. The inclusive development approach is proposed as an alternative to poverty alleviation approach which targets the poor in a token way and does not open up opportunities that mainstream those on the margins. Some path breaking laws and schemes such as National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) and a scheme for social security for the unorganized labour have come into force. The challenge is whether these laws and approaches will be fully implemented.
Annex 7: Partnership approach mapping
### Partnership approaches: Mapping of different organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best way to ensure lasting, locally owned development and eradication of poverty, injustice and insecurity. To challenge the traditional donor-recipient relationship. To obtain mutual benefits.</td>
<td>Main strategic option to ensure that resources meet the needs and strengthen the rights of poor and vulnerable people.</td>
<td>More likely to ensure lasting, locally owned development and the eradication of poverty and injustice. To challenge systems, structures and processes working against the poor or marginalised.</td>
<td>To end the injustice against poor and excluded people by making use of comparative advantages of NGOs in the North &amp; South. Partnership to create change in North &amp; South.</td>
<td>The most effective way to address main development issues is through people’s qualitative participation and ownership to processes.</td>
<td>Mutual understanding and respect constitute the foundation for development cooperation.</td>
<td>A two-way co-operative relationship, sharing complementary resources, in order to fulfil objectives related to oppressed social groups. NPA’s role is to accompany partners in their development efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| How? | Through project or partnership agreements, based on partner assessments, agreed goals and contracts. | Types of partners: 1. Core partners 2. Resource partners 3. Strategic alliances 4. Ecumenical organisations | Formal project agreements are being introduced. Purpose of agreements is to limit mismanagement clarify roles, hold to account. | Three types of relationship: 1. Programme: only funding 2. Institutional: formal agreement 3. Strategic: long-term proc- | Through application to Diakonia for partnership support. Long-term commitment - through project support or organisational | 3 partnership categories: 1. Short-term: based on MoU or Project Doc. 2. Core: partnership agreement lasting up to 4 years | Distinction btw project partners and strategic partners. Scope of partnership: - geographical level - short- |

[^69]: www.diakonia.se - "Partner point"
[^70]: Partnership Against Poverty, 2005; MS Partnerships, 2009.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>Church/faith-based organisations, and secular organisations.</th>
<th>Church/faith-based organisations and secular organisations. Clear criteria for selection and assessment of partners exist.</th>
<th>Church/faith-based organisations and secular organisations. Clear criteria for selection and assessment of partners exist.</th>
<th>In principle all organisations, which are formally registered, with exception of political parties.</th>
<th>In principle all CSOs and state institutions that aim at contributing to poverty eradication. Clear criteria for selection of partners exist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership Mutuality Flexibility Dialogue Advocacy Networking Development Workers Democratic practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Core funding &amp; project funds. DCA aims at moving towards budget support where it can improve impact/</td>
<td>60% of long-term assistance and advocacy funds will be given to core partners.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Core funding &amp; project funds.</td>
<td>Core funding &amp; project funds. MS aims at participating in basket funding if relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit strategies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>On the agenda for annual partner meetings is sustainability incl. exit strategy.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Clear objectives at the start of the partnership help to identify when phasing-out should occur.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 8: Perceived added value summary
## Summary matrix: Perceived added value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>DCA</strong></th>
<th><strong>Back-donors</strong></th>
<th><strong>Partner organisations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Policy development** | • dialogue and discussion  
• introduce new approaches and ideas  
• setting higher standards  
• consistent focus     | • introducing new trends and ideas  
                        | Introduction of new perspectives  
• RBA, gender, climate change, HAP-programme  
• increased capacity of communities to claim rights  
• network for cross-fertilisation and exchange  
• filling the knowledge gap |
| **Capacity building**  | • administrative capacity  
• elaboration of EU-applications                                           | • empower local partners to become independent              | Capacity Building and Organisational Development  
• RBA, gender mainstreaming, financial management  
• audit as capacity building  
• building sustainability in partnerships  
• equipment and assets  
• recognition and credibility in relation to other resource partners |
| **Programme implementation** | • LRRD  
• programme approach & platforms  
• technical capacity  
• participation in ACT  
• combining relief and resource mobilisation  
• organisational learning  
• cross-order learning  
• regional approach  
• flexibility in planning and implementation  
• co-implementation  
• networks and alliances | • working through local partners  
• dialogue  
• in-depth understanding of local context  
• innovativeness in disaster response  
• dual engagement (LRRD)  
• targeting the most vulnerable | Programme Approach & Partner Platforms  
• Partner Platform Meetings  
• agendas developed by partners  
• participatory programme formulation  
• partners’ own focus strengthened  
• 3-5 years perspective  
• opportunity to work with new organisations  
• peer monitoring  
• mutual recognition rather than competition  
• negotiation skills and enhanced |
## DCA partnership - any added value?

### Presence in-country & staff attitude
- in-depth understanding of context
- easy access and frequent contact
- non-intrusive
- true partners - respect, reliability, responsiveness
- respects the organisational integrity of its partners
- demand for quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundraising</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • support partner’s fundraising  
• secure stable funding base  
• access to alternative funding | • evidence based advocacy  
• vertical links  
• information & campaigns in North  
• solidarity  
• brings partners on board to global agendas  
• globalised professionalism  
• volunteer-programme |
| • providing matching funds | • local partners get access to global for a  
• church-based network  
• broad constituency and outreach  
• political protection through partnership |
| **Flexibility in funding**  
• budget revisions and adjustments  
• core funding  
• preparation of project applications  
• interactive approach  
• joint funding from sister organisations through ACT-forum coordination | • advocacy as a spin-off of PPM |
## Annex 9: List of persons met

DCA Partnership Evaluation
List of persons interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; organisation</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Meeting held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DCA Head Office in Copenhagen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrik Stubkjær, DCA Secretary general</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hst@dca.dk">hst@dca.dk</a>&lt;br&gt;Direkte tlf.: 33187831&lt;br&gt;Mobil tlf.: 29700600</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.4.09 at 17.00&lt;br&gt;Hotel Ib-lsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Friis Bach, International Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cfb@dca.dk">cfb@dca.dk</a>&lt;br&gt;Tlf. 33187864&lt;br&gt;Mobiltlf. 25337711</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.01.09&lt;br&gt;DCA, Nørregade 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaus Løkkegaard, Development Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kl@dca.dk">kl@dca.dk</a>&lt;br&gt;Direkte tlf.: 33187883&lt;br&gt;Mobil tlf.: 29700640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Henry, Humanitarian Response Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lih@dca.dk">Lih@dca.dk</a>&lt;br&gt;Tlf. 33187863&lt;br&gt;Mobiltlf. 29619904</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.1.09&lt;br&gt;DCA, Nørregade 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Johnson, Humanitarian Response Unit</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ejo@dca.dk">ejo@dca.dk</a>&lt;br&gt;mobil: 2970 06 05</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.01.09&lt;br&gt;DCA, Nørregade 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilie Bjørnskov-Johansen, Head of Programme Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cbj@dca.dk">cbj@dca.dk</a>&lt;br&gt;Tlf. 33187749&lt;br&gt;Mobiltlf. 29699132</td>
<td>On-going contact during whole period</td>
<td>8.1.09&lt;br&gt;DCA, Nørregade 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Duelund Jensen, Head of Global Funding Unit</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adj@dca.dk">adj@dca.dk</a>&lt;br&gt;Tlf. 33187727&lt;br&gt;Mobiltlf. 29699133</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.1.09&lt;br&gt;DCA, Nørregade 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Jørgensen, Country Coordinator Malawi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lin@dca.dk">lin@dca.dk</a>&lt;br&gt;Tlf. 33187748</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1.09&lt;br&gt;26.1.09&lt;br&gt;DCA, Nørregade 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonas Nøddeker, Country Coordinator India</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jno@dca.dk">jno@dca.dk</a>&lt;br&gt;Tlf. 33187780&lt;br&gt;Mobiltlf. 29699121</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1.09&lt;br&gt;DCA, Nørregade 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten Duus, Adviser Monitoring</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kdu@dca.dk">kdu@dca.dk</a>&lt;br&gt;Tlf. 33187734</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.1.09&lt;br&gt;DCA, Nørregade 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Rask, Adviser RBA</td>
<td>+4529700635</td>
<td>Based in Pretoria</td>
<td>17.2.2009&lt;br&gt;DCA,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Regional Representatives &amp; HQ programme staff</td>
<td>Presentation of preliminary findings &amp; discussion</td>
<td>Nørregade 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4.2009 at 13.00-16.00</td>
<td>DCA Nørregade 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DCA Board members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kirsten Lund-Larsen</th>
<th><a href="mailto:kll@kfuk-kfum.dk">kll@kfuk-kfum.dk</a></th>
<th>17.4.09 at 13.00</th>
<th>DCA, Nørregade 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knud Vilby</td>
<td><a href="mailto:knud@vilby.dk">knud@vilby.dk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorkild Høyer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hoyer@advocate.dk">hoyer@advocate.dk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DCA Reference Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fatima Burnad</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Fatima Burnad did not arrive in Copenhagen in time for the interview.</th>
<th>22.4.2009 at 18.30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clara Arenas</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel Ibsen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Danida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lars Kjellberg</th>
<th>33921442</th>
<th>28.1.09 Ministry of Foreign Affairs Asiatiske Plads 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ulla Schiøtt Frederiksen</td>
<td>33921791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mette Knudsen Africa-kontoret</td>
<td>33920378 <a href="mailto:metknu@um.dk">metknu@um.dk</a></td>
<td>Telephone interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Birgitte Albrechtsen HUM</td>
<td>3392000 <a href="mailto:annalb@um.dk">annalb@um.dk</a></td>
<td>Telephone interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorte Vizard DK Embassy New Delhi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dorviz@um.dk">dorviz@um.dk</a> <a href="mailto:delamb@um.dk">delamb@um.dk</a></td>
<td>@mail inquiry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EU Brussels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herman Mosselmans</th>
<th>Her- <a href="mailto:man.Mosselmans@ec.europa.eu">man.Mosselmans@ec.europa.eu</a></th>
<th>@mail inquiry</th>
<th>Response by 4.5.09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**List of persons interviewed**

**DCA Malawi**

**11 - 22 March 2009**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>11.3.2009 DCA Regional Office</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lennart Skov Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocencia Chirombo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etness Kayoyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugede Chiumya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Kambwiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman C. Gonambali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Vilili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Lumphezi Banda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thandi Kadzamira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Kamanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrine Haarh Lorentzen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>12.3.09 CCAP Livingstonia</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sangster Nkhandwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales Singini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Sulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chawezi Tembo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>13.3.09 CHAM</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Kachule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Kumwenda-Ngoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellios Chasukwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Nayupe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>13.3.09 ELDS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Ngopola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Mponga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Jere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Spencer Mngongonda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Alick Msuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alick Kaunda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>13.3.09 ELDS field visit Dowa West</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Msowoyya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fyness Kagwamminga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Nyirenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha Kasiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Kapaliza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villagers in Undi Village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>16.3.09 CSC</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Chimutu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Martha Mkandawire  Finance & Administration Director
Melina Mtonga  Regional Manager / Team Leader
              Food Security

16.3.09 WOLREC
Maggie Banda  Executive Director

16.3.09 CARD
Melton Luhanga  Acting Executive Director
Adalireni Nkhata  Finance & Administration Manger
Yazimapo Chavula  Deputy Administrative Manager
Arthur Lichenye  Project Officer Msanja
Emmanuel Kabvalo  Assistant Project Officer Thyolo
Emma Matiya Mpatso  Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist
Charles Kapitapita  Senior Project Officer
Jack Karnylachale  Assistant Accountant

17.3.09 SWAM
Gavelet Mzembe  Country Coordinator
Solomon C. Phiri  District Project Officer

17.3.09 QMAM
Manuel Mbendera  Programme Coordinator
Ousmane Chunga  Programme Officer

17.3.09 DCA sister organisations
Charlot Timson  Country Manager, Christian Aid Malawi
Kari Øyen  Country Representative, Norwegian Church Aid Malawi

18.3.09 CCAP Nkhoma Synod
Rev. A.M.Kuthyola Mwale  Acting Director
Mr Chagudza  Programme Manager
Mr Moya  Accountant
Mrs Banda  Administrative Secretary
Mr Chilopa  Project Manager

18.3.09 CCJP
Patrick Chima  Programme Officer
Enork K. Phiri  Monitoring & Evaluation Officer
Asha Banda  Assistant Legal Officer / Field Officer

18.3.09 European Union delegation
William Dothi  Project Manager / Rural Development & Food Security
### List of persons interviewed

**DCA India**

**23 March to 3 April 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCA South Asia Regional Office</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>March 23, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nina Ellinger</td>
<td>Regional Representative, New Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jaison Thomas</td>
<td>Regional Funding Officer, New Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mani Kumar</td>
<td>Regional DRR Programme Officer, New Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ravi Shankar Behera</td>
<td>Programme Officer (Food Security), New Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sudhanshu Shekhar Singh</td>
<td>Relief Officer, New Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Govinda Neupane</td>
<td>Programme Funding Officer, Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Seeta Sharma</td>
<td>Regional Programme Officer, New Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hasina Inam</td>
<td>Programme Funding Officer, Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jerome D´souza</td>
<td>Programme Officer (PT1 India), New Delhi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDR / DMKS</td>
<td>Jaipur, Rajasthan</td>
<td>March 24, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P.L. Mimroth</td>
<td>Chief Functionary, CDR, Jaipur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satish Kumar</td>
<td>Director, CDR, Jaipur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prem Bairwa</td>
<td>Asst. Accountant, CDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tashita Verma</td>
<td>State Coordinator, CDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chansu Bairwa</td>
<td>Prog. Coordinator, CDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Babulal Kiroriwal</td>
<td>Administrator, CDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tara Chand Verma</td>
<td>Office Secretary, CDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mukesh Kumar Mehrna</td>
<td>Accountant, CDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gopal Ram Verma</td>
<td>Coordinator, CDR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASTHA, SURE, EKTA PARASHID &amp; CASA</td>
<td>ASTHA Training Centre, Udaipur</td>
<td>March 25, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ramesh Sharma</td>
<td>National Campaign Coordinator, Ekta Parashid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position in Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lata Lalwani</td>
<td>Supervisor, SURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lata Kaelhawala</td>
<td>Joint Secretary, SURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shrivastava</td>
<td>Prog. Coordinator, ASTHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ashawani Paliwal</td>
<td>Prog. Coordinator, ASTHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bhanwar Singh Chandna</td>
<td>Coordinating Director, ASTHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Raghav Dautt</td>
<td>Prog. Coordinator, ASTHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chandan Kariya</td>
<td>Prog. Coordinator, ASTHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dinesh Chandra</td>
<td>Prog. Coordinator, CASA (Rajasthan), Udaipur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gopilal Rao</td>
<td>CASA (Rajasthan), Udaipur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sharda Jain</td>
<td>Accounts &amp; Finance, ASTHA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner Organisation**: NDWWT  
**Location**: Mumbai  
**Date**: March 26, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sister Christen Mary</td>
<td>Coordinator, Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner Organisation**: HRLN / SLIC  
**Location**: Mumbai  
**Date**: March 26, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Deepika D’souza</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kranti L.C</td>
<td>Asst. Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner Organisation**: RCDC, SPREAD, LWSI, DISHA, NSS  
**Location**: Bhubaneshwar  
**Date**: March 27, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Saneet Panda</td>
<td>Researcher with State Advisors Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jitendra Rath</td>
<td>Researcher with State Advisors Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kailash C Dash</td>
<td>Executive Director, RCDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sushil Ray</td>
<td>Regional Manager, RCDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bidyut</td>
<td>Secretary, SPREAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ashim Kr. Sarkar</td>
<td>Project Coordinator, LWSI - KLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Monalisa Bhanga</td>
<td>Project Coordinator, LWSI - BBSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shaiau Abul Kalam Azad</td>
<td>Secretary, DISHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reena Mohanty</td>
<td>Project Coordinator, SMRC-BBSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Prof. Asha Hans</td>
<td>Vice President, SMRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Smita Rani Pattanaik</td>
<td>NSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Swarnanani Gunnan</td>
<td>Coordinator, NSS, Angul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pratima Duriredy</td>
<td>Accountant, NSS, Angul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner Organisation**: Food Commissioner – State Advisor’s Officer
### DCA partnership - any added value?

**Location**  
Bhubaneshwar, Orissa

**Date**  
March 27, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rajkishor Mishra</td>
<td>State Advisor, Orissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sameet Panda</td>
<td>Researcher with Orissa State Advisor Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jitendra Rath</td>
<td>Researcher with Orissa State Advisor Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner Organisation**  
PW-TN

**Location**  
Bhubaneshwar, Orissa

**Date**  
March 28, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M Louis</td>
<td>Director – Programme &amp; HRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pradipta Nayah</td>
<td>State coordinator, IHRE/PW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>K.C Sarangi</td>
<td>State Advisory Board Member Orissa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner Organisation**  
PW-TN

**Location**  
DCA South Asia Regional Office, New Delhi

**Date**  
March 28, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Henri Tiphagne</td>
<td>Executive Director, PW-TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Santosh Kumar Samal</td>
<td>Executive Director, Dalit Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institution**  
European Commission / ECHO

**Location**  
ECHO Office, New Delhi

**Date**  
March 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yassin Gaba</td>
<td>Technical Assistant for India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institution**  
European Commission

**Location**  
EC Office, New Delhi

**Date**  
March 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ellen Pedersen</td>
<td>Attaché Development Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner Organisation**  
Food Commissioner’s Office

**Location**  
New Delhi

**Date**  
March 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harsh Mander</td>
<td>Special Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Biraj Patnaik</td>
<td>Principal Adviser to the Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tanveer Ahmad</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dipa Sinha</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yamini Jaishankar</td>
<td>Lawyer / Research Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Susnita Goru</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gayatei Sahgal</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DCA partnership - any added value?

**Partner Organisation**: CASA  
**Location**: CASA Office, New Delhi  
**Date**: March 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jayant Kumar</td>
<td>Head of Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nirmal J. Singh</td>
<td>Head of Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>K.R.P. Kosala</td>
<td>Head of Finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sister Organisations**: ICCO, Christian Aid, FMSF  
**Location**: DCA South Asia Regional Office, New Delhi  
**Date**: March 31, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Belinda Bennet</td>
<td>Christian Aid Regional Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sanjay Patra</td>
<td>FMSF Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frederika Meijer</td>
<td>ICCO Regional Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nina Ellinger</td>
<td>DCA Regional Representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner Organisation**: CEC  
**Location**: CEC Office, New Delhi  
**Date**: March 31, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>J. John</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner Organisation**: SEEDS  
**Location**: SEEDS Office, New Delhi  
**Date**: March 31, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shivanga Chavda</td>
<td>National Programme Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual interviews**  
**Location**: DCA Office, New Delhi  
**Date**: April 1, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position in Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kalyani Menon Sen</td>
<td>Gender consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Telephone interviews with regional partners (PT1 Safe Migration)**  
**Location**: From DCA Office, New Delhi  
**Date**: April 1, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bandana Patnaik</td>
<td>GAATW, Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Irene Fernandes</td>
<td>Tenganita, Malaysia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Partner organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sushant Agrawal</td>
<td>Director CASA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>George Varshese</td>
<td>Programme Manager LWSI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location

From DCA Office, New Delhi

### Date

April 2, 2009

### Partner organisation

Partner workshop

### Location

From DCA Office, New Delhi

### Date

April 2, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mani Kumar</td>
<td>DCA Regional Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dinesh Chandra Vyas</td>
<td>Programme Officer CASA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sceta Sharma</td>
<td>DCA Regional Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ravi Shankar Behera</td>
<td>DCA Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Abdul Kalem Azal</td>
<td>Secretary DISHA Orissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>P Swrira Rajuni</td>
<td>Executive Director Sahanivasa, A.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bhanwar Singh Chadawa</td>
<td>Coordinating Director ASTHA Udaipur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sunceta Dhar</td>
<td>Director JAGORI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jerome D'Souza</td>
<td>DCA Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tasny Thomas</td>
<td>DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sudhamha S. Songh</td>
<td>DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>George Varshese</td>
<td>Programme Manager LWSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>P.L. Mimroth</td>
<td>Chairperson DMKS Jaipur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gita Kavarana</td>
<td>CSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ruth Manorama</td>
<td>President NAWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Seema Seivarsasa</td>
<td>Assistant Director JAGORI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nina Ellinger</td>
<td>DCA Regional Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bader Jehan</td>
<td>DCA Programme Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>S.Venkatejan</td>
<td>DCA Programme Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 10: Field visit programmes
### Evaluation of DCA Added Value (Field Trip to Malawi: 10.03 – 22.03)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Travel</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Meeting type</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>Resp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Am: Bente arrives in LL</td>
<td>Pacific Hotel</td>
<td>DCA Mw Office</td>
<td>Team meeting; late afternoon</td>
<td>Bente &amp; Justin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pm: within LL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pm: within LL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>9 am: within LL</td>
<td>Mzuzu lodge</td>
<td>DCA Mw Office</td>
<td><strong>DCA Regional Office Meeting: 9 – 12 am</strong></td>
<td>RR, Programme Officers, Finance &amp; Admin, Funding Officers</td>
<td>RR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pm: Travel to the North (4 hr drive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bente, Justin, Mercy, Driver</td>
<td>Mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>Thur</td>
<td>8:30 am: within Mzuzu</td>
<td>CCAP Livingst.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indiv. / collective meeting</td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff (ED, dep ED, PM, PO, Relief PO)</td>
<td>Mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pm: travel back to LL (4 hr drive)</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>8 am: within LL</td>
<td>CHAM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indv./Collective meeting</td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. Staff</td>
<td>George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 am: within LL</td>
<td>ELDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Org Meeting at H. Office</td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff (ED, 2 PCs, PO, M&amp;E, Relief )</td>
<td>Mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 pm: travel to Dowa &amp; back (1 hr drive)</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Field/village visit to Food security impact area</td>
<td>Bente, Justin, Mercy, Driver, Proj. staff &amp; community</td>
<td>Mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Free time / Bente meeting with Justin</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>DCA office</td>
<td>Team meeting – Bente &amp; Justin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Am: Free time</td>
<td>Chilembwe lodge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 pm: travel to BT (3 hr drive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agnes &amp; Lugede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>8 am: within BT</td>
<td>Chilembwe</td>
<td>CSC, WOLREC, CARD Indv. / collective meeting</td>
<td>Management (ED, PM), Management &amp; Proj. staff (ED, PO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 am: within BT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff incl. Relief PO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 pm: within BT</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>SWAM, QMAM, NCA &amp; CA Indv. Meeting, Indv. Meeting</td>
<td>Management, Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister Organisations, Lennart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Am: travel back to LL (3 hrs)</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Pacific NCA &amp; CA Collective meeting</td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 pm: within LL</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 pm: within LL</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 pm: Working Dinner</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>8 am: within LL</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>CCAP Nkhoma, CCJP, EU delegation Office, DCA Office</td>
<td>Indv. meeting, Indv. /Collective meeting, Indv meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 am: within LL</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 pm: EU Area 14; LL</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 pm: within LL</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management &amp; Proj. staff Back donor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>Thur</td>
<td>8:30 am: within LL</td>
<td>Kalikuti Hotel</td>
<td>Partner workshop</td>
<td>Partner representatives &amp; DCA Mw staff RR, Inno &amp; Etness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>10 am: within LL</td>
<td>DCA Mw office</td>
<td>Winding up meeting with DCA Mw</td>
<td>Bente, Justin &amp; DCA Mw staff RR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.03</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Partners to be interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Head Office location</th>
<th>DCA Proj Impact Area</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOLREC</td>
<td>Blantyre – South Mw</td>
<td>North Mw</td>
<td>Maggie Banda – ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAP Nkhoma</td>
<td>Lilongwe – Centre</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Ntchisi Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCJP</td>
<td>Lilongwe - Centre</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Peter Chinoko – National Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDS</td>
<td>Lilongwe - Centre</td>
<td>South &amp; Centre</td>
<td>Judith Jere - ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>Blantyre - South</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Patrick Chimutu - ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAP Livingstonia</td>
<td>Mzuzu- North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Sangster Nkhandwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAM</td>
<td>Lilongwe - Centre</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Francis Gondwe – ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAM</td>
<td>Lilongwe - Centre</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Gavelet Mzembe – National Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMAM</td>
<td>Lilongwe - Centre</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Manuel Mbendera – PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief Projects &amp; ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>Blantyre - South</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Melton Luhanga - ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAP Livingstonia</td>
<td>Mzuzu - North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Grace - PO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDS</td>
<td>Lilongwe - Centre</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Alick kaonda - PO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Field Trip India 22.03 – 3.04

- **ACT Forum and Programme Platform Meetings:** Minutes from regular meetings, reports, appeals, assessments, studies, notes etc. from JOINT initiatives taken by ACT Forum and/or programme platforms (anything of relevance in order to assess added value of our ACT/Programme Platform meetings).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Meeting type</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>22.03</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23.03</strong></td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>DCA RO</td>
<td>DCA Regional Office Meeting:</td>
<td>RR and Programme Officers incl Funding Officers</td>
<td>NIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.03</strong></td>
<td>Morning Flight</td>
<td>Udaipur</td>
<td>Org meeting</td>
<td>CDR management and staff</td>
<td>JdS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi/Jaipur</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>India PT1</td>
<td>CDR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening flight</td>
<td>Jaipur/Udaipur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25.03</strong></td>
<td>Udaipur</td>
<td>India PT1/3</td>
<td>Indiv/</td>
<td>Management Project staff</td>
<td>JdS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.03</strong></td>
<td>Udaipur - Mumbai</td>
<td>Asia PT1</td>
<td>NDNWWT national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>SURE, Rajasthan</td>
<td>collective meeting in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CASA RDP Rajasthan</td>
<td>ASTHA training centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.03</strong></td>
<td>Flight Mumbai-</td>
<td>India PT3</td>
<td>SLIC EU project national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolkata</td>
<td>Kolkaytta Bhubaneswat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28.03</strong></td>
<td>Morning flight</td>
<td>Bhubaneswar</td>
<td>Individual Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolkata</td>
<td>Kolkatta</td>
<td>India PT3 / 5</td>
<td>LWSI HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LWSI DISHA?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29.03</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orissa State Advisor</td>
<td>Organization meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ravi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RCDC, SPREAD, LWSI DISHA?</td>
<td>Orissa PT3 partner meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>DELHI</td>
<td>Prepare partner meeting, Telephone interviews</td>
<td>Meena</td>
<td>Nina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DELHI</td>
<td>As many partners as possible, Jagori, CSE, CEC ASTHA, CASA, CDR, SLIC, HRLN, LWS India, (NAWO)</td>
<td>09.00- 14.00 Partner Meeting w Delhi based and visited partners</td>
<td>Meena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.04</td>
<td>DELHI</td>
<td>Prepare partner meeting</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Meena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.04</td>
<td>DELHI</td>
<td>Prepare partner meeting</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Meena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.04</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Debriefing</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Nina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**November 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>DELHI</td>
<td>Prepare partner meeting</td>
<td>Meena</td>
<td>Nina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DELHI</td>
<td>As many partners as possible, Jagori, CSE, CEC ASTHA, CASA, CDR, SLIC, HRLN, LWS India, (NAWO)</td>
<td>09.00- 14.00 Partner Meeting w Delhi based and visited partners</td>
<td>Meena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.04</td>
<td>DELHI</td>
<td>Prepare partner meeting</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Meena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.04</td>
<td>DELHI</td>
<td>Prepare partner meeting</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Meena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.04</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Debriefing</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Nina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>