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Respondents

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

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

Round 1

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Functioning of POG</th>
<th>Influencing decision making</th>
<th>Efficiency/ transparency in fund mgt</th>
<th>Joint strategy devt and PME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.72 (3.9)</td>
<td>3.80 (4.3)</td>
<td>3.42 (3.5)</td>
<td>3.20 (3.7)</td>
<td>3.04 (4.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning, sharing of info</th>
<th>Functioning of POG</th>
<th>Influencing decision making</th>
<th>Efficiency/ transparency in fund mgt</th>
<th>Joint strategy devt and PME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.44 (3.8)</td>
<td>2.85 (3.2)</td>
<td>4.0 (4.1)</td>
<td>1.69 (3.7)</td>
<td>3.23 (4.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity building</th>
<th>Functioning of the IST and the Secretariat</th>
<th>Secretariat’s role</th>
<th>Regular IST support</th>
<th>Facilitating n support M&amp;E at various levels</th>
<th>Support FRaising and devt of new sub programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.32 (3.2)</td>
<td>3.88 (3.9)</td>
<td>4.09 (4.3)</td>
<td>4.27 (4.3)</td>
<td>3.27 (3.4)</td>
<td>2.91 (3.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased international awareness</th>
<th>Functioning of the IST and the Secretariat</th>
<th>Secretariat’s role</th>
<th>Regular IST support</th>
<th>Facilitating n support M&amp;E at various levels</th>
<th>Support FRaising and devt of new sub programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.45 (3.6)</td>
<td>3.26 (3.8)</td>
<td>3.85 (3.8)</td>
<td>3.27 (4.3)</td>
<td>3.17 (4.3)</td>
<td>3.31 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self assessment</th>
<th>Functioning of Secretariat CP</th>
<th>Communication bet partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary assessment

Potential for continuation without funding from Prolinnova international – 2.18

Over all performance average – 3.53
International level – 3.56
National level – 3.36

Round 2

Contentious issues

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

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

Analysis: Country to Country learning and info exchange

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

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

Analysis: Role of IST/Secretariat

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

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

Self assessment

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

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

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

## Action Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action areas</th>
<th>Proposed actions</th>
<th>Possible lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance: POG’s role in fundraising</td>
<td>- Clarity on the role of POG, IST, Secretariat and CPs</td>
<td>POG CPs POG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identifying lead organization in CPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review of cost sharing note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Action Areas

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

## Action Areas

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action areas</th>
<th>Proposed actions</th>
<th>Possible lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functioning of IST/Secretariat M&amp;E</strong></td>
<td>Review and analyse present M&amp;E functioning: what is already being done? What are gaps at various levels? How do we use info for reflection? The role of focal point? Plan focused capacity building on M&amp;E at all levels, use of local resource people and back stoppers</td>
<td>Secretariat, IIRR, CPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International awareness creation: publications</strong></td>
<td>Publications distribution strategy that would allow tracking Assessing usefulness</td>
<td>Secretariat + IIRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring and evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Capacity building for some CPs in early stage of development Roles, functions, finalizing revised guidelines</td>
<td>IST/IIRR/CPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-assessment</strong></td>
<td>Review of partnership arrangements at CP level Revival of enthusiasm</td>
<td>POG/IST/CPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop in Ethiopia

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

Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop in Ethiopia

- Alternative tools: Outcomes mapping, Most Significant Change and the Writeshop Approach
- Fieldwork
- Reviewing the current M&E framework for the network
- Timeline workshop for the Network research
- Networking action research Workshop
- Approaches to fundraising
- Action Plan
IIRR’s 2011 plan

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