

PPA GRANTEE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT COMMENTS TABLE

Organisation: Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)
Contact name: Lian Bradley, Institutional Donor Adviser
Telephone: +47 90 73 61 37
Email address: lian.bradley@nrc.no

Note: This table should be used to identify clarifications, errors and evidence that *has not* been used appropriately. No new evidence will be accepted. **ONLY** include evidence that was originally available for assessment.

Please return completed forms to: jessica_perrin@coffey.com
 Please return completed forms by: **Close of business on Tuesday 18 December 2012**

Incorrect fact / text	Page / paragraph reference in Grantee Performance Assessment	Reason for correction or amendment	Suggestion for correction / amended wording	Reference to existing evidence source supporting case for correction / amendment – refer to document item, page and paragraph (e.g. APR, p.23, para 3.)	Evaluation Manager response (Note: Grantees do not complete)
The greatest weaknesses in the reporting data relates to demonstrated organisational learning and innovation.*	Page 3, Overall Performance	The midterm evaluation was conducted 10 months after we received funds from DFID. NRC therefore considers that it is premature to criticise NRC’s learning at this early stage in the programme. This is especially true given that the first year of the grant for projects which will	As the grantee was only 10 months into a 3 year programme at the time of the midterm evaluation, there is not yet evidence of organisational learning and innovation. However, important initiatives (such as climate induced displacement, urban	Date that the funds were transferred to NRC v. date of the evaluation. Management Response ‘Annex A’ Perceived Utility of the IPR, page 2, point 5. Annual review P5 (output indicator 1.2) and P9 (output indicator 2.2) Annual review p22 (g) and p30 (Part C)	

		ultimately generate evidence and learning, has focussed on set up, planning research, developing focus areas, strategy development etc. (outputs 1.2 and 2.2). Having said that, NRC is able to clearly demonstrate evidence of learning at the country level within the APR.	displacement, women's HLP) have been set up and include evidence based learning from in-country programmes. The results and learning from these initiatives would need to be assessed at the end of the three year funding.	NRC Business Case	
Mixed perspective from the IPR in regards to representativeness is somewhat too difficult to harmonise with the APR*	Page 4, paragraph 1 Representativeness	We agree, the findings on constituency involvement initially appear mixed. However, beneficiary engagement/ participation is not highlighted as one of the report's recommendations (evidence that the IPR team did not consider this a real weakness in NRC's work).	Although the independent evaluator has highlighted some areas of improvement for NRC in regards to representativeness (which are actually already being addressed in the Management Response), overall, the APR and IPR demonstrate some evidence of NRC's representativeness.	Evidence from the IPR: That 'the programme is considered very relevant as it represents and responds to ever-existing priority needs of the targeted groups' (p 8), we consider this to be the main conclusion of the independent consultant. Evidence of this in the IPR report includes: 'Beneficiary selection was properly carried out according to the pre-defined and well-established vulnerability criteria in all countries visited' (p 21) 'NRC's global programme supported by DFID CHASE funding is very relevant as it represents and responds to ever-existing	

				<p>priority needs of the targeted groups. NRC is reaching a population that is highly marginalised and vulnerable, often ‘forgotten’ (p 16) APR p 16 – 17 (Outcome Indicator b), p 19 (d), p 27 (Direct Feedback from Beneficiaries), p 28 – 29 (Part Bii Relevance, representativeness and targeting).</p>	
<p>I) The APR finds that focus on targeting is of mixed quality. II) There is not much coherence in the selection of the wide variety of countries could be traced.</p>	<p>Page 4, Paragraph 2 Targeting Strategy</p> <p>As above</p> <p>As above</p>	<p>I) There seems to be confusion between two separate issues within this section of the performance assessment: country targeting and beneficiary targeting. These two issues should be distinct as they are two separate issues and the evidence within the report is quite different for each. The IPR states that beneficiary selection is conducted based on vulnerability criteria and then the annexes from the country visits illustrate how NRC serves poor and marginalised people in these fragile places.</p>	<p>NRC has demonstrated its ability to target the most poor and marginalised.</p>	<p>IPR p 21: ‘Beneficiary selection was properly carried out according to the pre-defined and well-established vulnerability criteria in all countries visited’</p> <p>IPR p 16: ‘NRC’s global programme supported by DFID CHASE funding is very relevant as it represents and responds to ever-existing priority needs of the targeted groups. NRC is reaching a population that is highly marginalised and vulnerable, often ‘forgotten’</p> <p>IPR Country reports (annex 4a, b &c) APR p 19; d) Access to the most vulnerable PADs, p 16 – 17 (Outcome Indicator b), p 27</p>	

		The criticism from the evaluation really focuses on (II) the coherence in the selection of countries. However, the reasoning is highlighted in both the proposal to DFID and the business case.		(Direct Feedback from Beneficiaries), p 28 – 29 (Part Bii Relevance, representativeness and targeting). Proposal to DFID (page 1, section 2.1 and p 1-2 section 2.2 vision and impact) and the business case (p 3 paragraph 4 and 5)	
The NRC has not provided sufficient evidence of the issue of organisational learning.	Page 4, Effectiveness, Learning	It is unlikely that we would generate concrete evidence based organisational learning within the first 10 months of the partnership, given the setup of NRC's PPA.	NRC's chosen use of funds means that it is difficult to capture organisational learning at this early stage of the partnership.	NRC PPA log frame, proposal and business case.	
Limited evidence of contextual learning being fed back into the organisation.	Page 5, Effectiveness, Learning to improve contextual knowledge	The quality of evidence in the IPR section is too weak to make a judgement on NRC's performance within this category. As the IPR states (p21, 3.6), their findings are restricted to only one part of NRC's learning environment. In addition, they only focus on 3 of the pilot countries (where as the APR collates evidence from all 7	There are some examples of contextual learning being fed back into the organisation (please see reference to the Delta area shelter programme above).	APR p 22 (change as a result of learning) and p 30 IPR p 21, 3.6)	

		<p>countries). Finally, the performance evaluators' evidence was 'observations and the opinions of senior field management', which is subjective evidence.</p> <p>In addition, in the 'Learning' section of the performance assessment report, Coffey highlights examples of evidence of contextual learning being fed back into the organisation (reference to the learning from the Delta area, which contradicts this overall finding). It is unclear why the Delta example is not included within this specific section.</p>			
Lack of evidence within both the APR and IPR on learning to share with others.	Page 5, Effectiveness, Learning to share with others	There are a number of examples of learning to share with others within the APR.	NRC has demonstrated a number of examples of learning shared with others and their log frame and business plan outline that this will be accelerated as further evidence is generated in years 2 and 3 of the	APR p 5 point 4 (principled humanitarian action), p 8 c) (Findings and feedback presented in Bogota in an advocacy event with Columbian institutions, national and international organisation and Embassies, p 11, indicator 3.1)	

			grant.	APR p 12 - 13 Output 5.1	
APR spends little time examining innovation and is underdeveloped in the IPR (which is diminishing cost-efficiency benefits). There is no evidence of radical innovation.	Page 5, Innovation	NRC has initiated a number of innovative projects through this funding. The timelines and plans are clearly outlined in the NRC business case and APR.	NRC has initiated two innovative evidence based projects with this PPA funding. The first being linked to Output 4 (access to appropriate assistance and durable solutions for PAD in urban settings) and Output 5 (provision of expertise on displacement related to natural disaster).	APR p 12 &13 (output 4 and 5.) NRC PPA log frame Business plan p 4, p 9, p 21 (climate change)	
Cost Effectiveness – NRC does not justify its costs, issues around short term planning, maximizing outputs discourages cost-efficiency which is a structural issue for the NRC. No justification about paying more than peers in terms of quality or the	Page 6, Cost Effectiveness	The IPR does give an explanation about cost drivers within the management assessment section. The country annexes also detail the following points; NRC is median compared to other peer organisations in Colombia and its activities are difficult to compare as it is 'unique and there is no other programme being implemented with the regional approach and	NRC has higher costs than other organisations for some specific activities, however, it demonstrates evidence of effectiveness through provision of unique programmes (Colombia) and higher quality products which are delivered in a reliable manner (Myanmar).	IPR (p 28 -29). IPR Annex 4a, 4b and 4c.	

<p>implementing environment.</p>		<p>scope of its programmes' (demonstrating the value of the programme). IPR Annex 4b: Columbia the 'value for' aspect of efficiency was not assessed. In IPR Annex 4c the Myanmar report explains that NRC delivered superior quality shelters and also provided extras such as NFIs and WASH training. The final statement on this is that NRC does cost more, but that they provide quality products in a constant and reliable manner.</p>			
<p>Limited impact due to three constraints: (i) scattered and large number of programmes and locations = reduced efficiency, ii) generic needs assessment for overall programme = unspecific</p>	<p>Page 6, Results, Performance against log frame (and reference to IPR section 3.1)</p>	<p>The IPR provides evidence of early impacts as a result of programme activities. i)As previously stated in the Management Response, NRC has distributed the funding utilising a framework rather than a programme approach and this is how NRC has set up our log frame. NRC states in the Management Response</p>	<p>NRC has demonstrated that it is reaching vulnerable PADs , responding to their needs and achieving the milestones set out in the PPA log frame and is demonstrating progress towards achieving their outputs, While more work is on-going to improve outcome indicators, the IPR</p>	<p>IPR p 16 and 21: See reference above regarding beneficiary selection/targeting and response to needs.</p> <p>IPR p 19: "Certain impacts as a result of programme activities are, however already apparent. Examples of these are the successes of institution building in and increased credibility in Columbia, as evidenced by regular</p>	

<p>programme, iii) limited funds per programme and targeting too small number of beneficiaries.</p>		<p>that it will continue to improve indicators with a focus on outcomes. NRC would appreciate support from Coffey on how to set up a final evaluation which takes this approach into consideration, but we do not see evidence of how it limits the outputs as set out in the log frame.</p> <p>ii) As demonstrated in the APR and IPR country reports, specific in-country needs assessments are undertaken and regularly updated to ensure that new needs are taken into account. The IPR statement about generic project design refers only to the Columbia case, a regional intervention covering four countries.</p>	<p>provides evidence of early impacts as a result of programme activities.</p>	<p>meetings and permanent contacts at all levels between the countries involved. “</p> <p>IPR annex 4a IV and VI, 4b VI and 4c IV and VI</p> <p>APR Output review and scoring p 2-12</p> <p>APR 28-29, Part B: Relevance: examples on needs assessments in Columbia, oPt, DRC, Somalia and Pakistan</p> <p>Management Response p 1, 8-9</p>	
<p>Outputs indicators are not objectively measurable or precisely formulated.</p>	<p>Page 6, Results, Performance against the log frame</p>	<p>NRC disagrees with this statement about their Output indicators. As noted in the Management Response, NRC has identified potentials for</p>	<p>NRC’s output indicators are objectively measurable and precisely formulated. This is evidence by NRC’s demonstrated</p>	<p>NRC PPA log frame</p> <p>Management Response p 1</p> <p>APR Output review and scoring p 2-12</p>	

		improvement of indicators at the outcome level. NRC has demonstrated that the outputs are measurable by achieving the milestones set out in the PPA log frame and the demonstrated progress towards achieving their outputs.	ability to achieve the milestones set out in the PPA log frame and by NRC's progress towards achieving their outputs.		
No evidence on changes in civil society	Page 6, Results, Changes in civil society	This section is not included within the IPR because NRC received the TOR after the evaluation had already taken place. This has put NRC at a disadvantage, despite having the existing format agreed with DFID. In addition, changes in civil society is not a focus of NRC's log frame and as a humanitarian organisation we do not consider it legitimate to compare our results in this section against other PPA organisations who are funded through the General PPA and are directly working towards	This is not a focus of NRC's PPA and so there are currently no indicators or evidence linked to changes in this area. However, evidence is found within the APR of changes in civil society at the output level for example, through NRC's work with settlement representatives and women's committees in Iraq and through pioneered trainings on Law 1448 with strategic partners in Colombia.	NRC PPA log frame Management Response APR p 3 (output indicator 1.1.2) and p 7-8 (output indicator 2.1.1)	

		strengthening civil society within their log frames. As stated in the MR, NRC is not a partner based organisation, although we recognise the principles for partnerships as agreed upon by the international community. Although NRC does not focus on this within our log frame, evidence can be found within our country level reports in the IPR and the narrative of the APR which demonstrates our work with civil society. As previously mentioned, this is not captured in the log frame. If DFID/Coffey would like to see an indicator on this and thinks all PPA holders should establish a system to measure impact on civil society, NRC should be informed immediately so that we can rectify this situation.			
No evidence of why PPA funding is	Page 6, Additionality	The IPR and APR give many examples of how	There is strong evidence of additionality within	APR p 22 – 23 (Additionality), p 25 (taking risks and innovations).	

different to other funding in most parts of the APR		this funding is different to other types of funding.	the IPR and NRC's case study within the APR.		
The IPR shows poor application of standards in procurement and financial systems	Page 7, Additionality, Value for money (VfM)	<p>The IPR reference to financial and procurement standards concerns IPs and not NRC and should therefore be removed.</p> <p>NRC has demonstrated effective finance and procurement systems through the due diligence undertaken by KPMG.</p> <p>As set out in the Management Response, NRC continuously strives to comply fully with the financial and logistics rules and regulations of all our donors.</p>	Remove statement regarding application of standards in procurement and financial systems	<p>IPR p 30</p> <p>Business Case p. 17 "Assessment of the Norwegian Refugee Council VFM through procurement: ...The Norwegian Refugee Council has demonstrated that it has effective procurement mechanisms/systems in place."</p> <p>Management Response p 7</p>	