

Synthesis Study – Response form

Recommendations: Please respond here to the recommendations generated by the study. The recommendations are listed first; fill in your response in the space provided, indicating whether and why you find the recommendation valid and useful, and if and how you propose to follow-up on the recommendation; and who will be involved in the follow-up and an indicative time period for the follow up.

Recommendations for strategy	Response	Follow-up action	Who	When
1. Evaluate whether NIMD wishes to remain a political party niche organization or to broaden its focus towards democratization more generally				
	<p>The NIMD mandate and niche clearly dictate that NIMD is and will remain a political party assistance provider, from a multiparty angle. Nevertheless, NIMD acknowledges that for its programmes to be effective they need to link to the environment surrounding them and that these programmes should thus be rooted in a wider democracy assistance context. As such, active linking of programmes, partners and fundraising opportunities to other actors in the wider democracy assistance community and beyond increases both the relevance and the effectiveness of NIMD’s interventions. The management accepts the recommendation but underlines its clear choice to remain a niche organisation.</p>	<p>1) Invest in programming (and fundraising accordingly) that more strongly reflects that political parties need to be receptive to civil society actors, sectors and demands; This is already part of the new SP framework.</p> <p>2) Continue to present NIMD as a political party assistance organization that maintains clear links to local and international actors that work towards strengthening democracy assistance through maintaining relevant networks.</p>	<p>1) PMs</p> <p>2) NIMD management, particularly the Executive Director</p>	<p>Continuously</p>
2. Consider whether NIMD wants to retain its Dutch identity, or internationalize fully				
	<p>Not so valid and partly useful; The NIMD was founded by seven political parties represented in Dutch Parliament. Although these parties are no longer directly represented in the NIMD Supervisory Board, they remain close to NIMD’s work and</p>	<p>A distinction should be made between the Dutch nature of the organisation and its international (global) performance. Therefore the NIMD management will further nurture the relation with the founding Dutch political parties and while</p>	<p>NIMD management, particularly the Executive Director</p>	<p>1) Link with NL PP: continuously</p> <p>2) GPMD: founding</p>

	<p>provide NIMD with its mandate. The Dutch identity also gives NIMD an impartial status. On the other hand NIMD has created over the 15 years of its existence a solid and unique network of partners in the various countries where it runs its programmes. On the basis of this network it is currently co-founding the 'Global Partnership for Multiparty Democracy' (GPMD), which reinforces the NIMDs international status. The management accepts the recommendation and reiterates that NIMD will remain an organization rooted in Dutch politics and society, but through playing a leading role in the creation the GPMD it will strengthen its international ambitions, network and presence.</p>	<p>continuing to play a leading role as a partner in founding and growing the GPMD.</p>		<p>in 2016 , consolidation in 2017 and beyond</p>
--	--	---	--	---

3. Decide whether NIMD wants to continue to localize its programmes into a looser network, or whether it wants to strengthen itself as a unified organization

	<p>The management is of the opinion that the recommendation is partially valid and useful. NIMD HQ should provide a policy framework, which should lead to strong strategic direction and policy choices at country programme (as the local context dictates so). The focus is on localising programmes and further decentralizing its programme implementation, especially for longer running programmes, so more should be invested in strengthening the local management of programmes and ensuring strategic direction is being provided at local level. Nevertheless, although programmes</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Continue a policy of decentralization and regionalization of programmes, assisting partners in strengthening their policies and capacities where needed. In doing so there should be a differentiated policy towards NIMD country offices and NIMD partners in programme countries, as the latter are independent organisations. 2) Strengthen partner relations, especially under the GPMD. 3) Invest in strengthening the capacities of country programme implementation partners to better 	<p>NIMD management , particularly the Head of Finance and Organisations and the Director of Programmes under 1), the Executive Director under 2) and jointly under</p>	<p>Continuously</p>
--	--	--	--	---------------------

	should be largely locally owned, NIMD needs to secure from its HQ that the Theory of Change and intervention logic provide a framework for programme design and implementation.	develop a country and context based programmatic strategy. If necessary NIMD representatives can exist next to NIMD partners, as they can help in boosting capacity strengthening. 4) Invest in rolling out systems and policies (ToC & intervention logic) from HQ to country programmes, taking into account that partners are autonomous and country offices are part of NIMD.	3 and 4, in coordination with EDs of country programmes.	
--	---	--	--	--

Recommendations for programming	Response	Follow-up action	Who	When
4. In general:				
4.1 Ensure that interventions are more systematically based on a detailed analysis of the political, social and economic contexts.	Valid and partially already addressed. NIMD has developed various planning & monitoring tools and instruments in the past years, including the Baseline and Review Toolkit (BART) and country-level ToCs. BART includes a political context scan which is compulsory for country programmes to complete and review at least every 3 years.	1) Monitor whether BART Political Context Scans are sufficiently used and in-depth analyse if they have led to choices of interventions. 2) Apply peer-reviews of the country BART and ToC 3) Ensure the political analysis scan is regularly updated, assess if country level ToCs have appropriate detail and the results are taken into account by Programme staff, country staff/partners. The results of the scan and the reviews should be carefully documented.	1) PME-C, DoP 2) PMs, FPOs 3) PMs and PME-C	Continuously
4.2 Continue to proactively balance the key principles of impartiality and inclusiveness.	Not completely valid and less useful (also see 5.2). In each NIMD country programme clear criteria are developed from the onset to ensure impartiality and inclusiveness. It is	The BART tool serves as a framework to assess, capture and report in a unified way. 1) Ensure the BART programme scan is	1) PMs, EDs	1) Continu

	<p>true, though, that these criteria are not always well communicated and shared. Throughout time the BART political analysis scan and the Programme scan will have to ensure the NIMD core principles of inclusivity and impartiality are regularly tested and rebalanced if the country programme situation dictates so. NIMD has planned for the BART political party capacity scan, which it will have to quickly finalise, as it is a missing element in the range of instruments it has to its disposal for reviewing programmes.</p>	<p>regularly updated and the results are taken into account by Programme staff, country staff/partners. The results of the scan and the reviews should be carefully documented.</p> <p>2) Ensure the BART political party capacity scan is finalized so that PMs and partners are able to use it.</p>	<p>(check by PME-C, DoP)</p> <p>2) PME-C, (check by DoP)</p>	<p>ously</p> <p>2) Q2 2016</p>
<p>4.3 Be willing to think outside traditional models to achieve NIMD's overall objective.</p>	<p>Valid and useful to a point. In the field and under the circumstances NIMD is working (volatile and fragile political systems) applying traditional models is not an option. NIMD has always abstained from that. NIMD has most recently with its ToC and intervention strategies at system, actor and culture level followed the non-traditional model. However, it is true that in programme countries which have been running for a long time change and innovation are not always as present as they should be. NIMD recognizes that there is a need to ensure that it should try to keep being daring and innovative on a continuous basis and that it should always try to seek for solutions that are out-of-the-box. In doing so it will as an organization always work with political parties (as this is its mandate). However, alongside it will more actively search for cooperation and coalitions with</p>	<p>1) Put the Knowledge and Innovation Unit into action with a clear mandate to assist and support, but also to challenge country programme managers to actively seek less traditional coalitions and solutions.</p> <p>2) Put mechanisms in place to ensure cross-fertilization can take place between programmes by peer learning</p> <p>3) Have mechanisms in place to regularly analyse if a) others would be better suited to do interventions and b) decide to quit interventions if results are not met</p>	<p>1) Executive Director</p> <p>2) DoP, PMs</p> <p>3) DoP, PME-C</p>	<p>1) Q4 2016</p> <p>2) Continuously</p> <p>3) continuously</p>

	<p>organisations that are working with other actors and themes and that might spin the wheel differently. The putting in place of a “Knowledge and Innovation” Unit within NIMD will contribute to that, as will the active cross-fertilization between programmes at NIMD.</p>			
<p>5. To strengthen multi-party dialogue interventions:</p>				
<p>5.1 Design and manage a platform with a view to ensuring its continued salience and fit in the political context, and relevance for powerful political players, rather than a generic thematic focus or replicating a specific structure.</p>	<p>Valid and useful. NIMD has never applied a “one-size fits all” approach to the design and implementation of its dialogue platforms. Therefore the recommendation is not accurate. Nevertheless, NIMD recognizes that it should ensure that the platforms continuously serve its purpose and remain salient and relevant. The application of instruments and mechanisms that allow for continuous monitoring and reflection (like BART) and ensuring the existence of an on-going constructive dialogue between NIMD and its local partners will have to ensure the platforms remain relevant for its main stakeholders, the political parties.</p>	<p>Regularly review current platforms critically in terms of relevance to the key political parties and functionality; if key political parties are not participating at a relevant level, and / or the platform takes no decisions, or does not contribute to increased inter-party trust, undertake appropriate re-design or other platform-management action ; encourage PMs to within their teams question each other’s intervention strategies and do solid peer review of annual plans.</p>	<p>PM and EDs</p>	<p>2016 onwards</p>
<p>5.2 Develop consistent, contextually sensitive criteria for participation, including for non-parliamentary parties, civil society and other actors which may not be part of the political party system but are important for pluralistic dialogue.</p>	<p>Partially valid and useful (also see 4.2). In most of its programme countries NIMD and its partners have applied strict criteria for the participation of political parties in NIMD activities. These criteria vary per country, as the political situation varies. These criteria should be regularly checked (at least after each election) and reviewed when necessary. Where clarity as to criteria or party representation on a platform is not clear these need to be made clear. Regular</p>	<p>Also see 4.2: Ensure clarity per country of the criteria for participation in the platform; investigate and introduce interventions and models for engaging non-party actors in pluralistic dialogue with political parties.</p>	<p>PMs & EDs</p>	<p>Continuously</p>

	<p>application of the BART can be of help when doing so. It should be noted that regarding participation of other actors which are not part of the system but which may be important for pluralistic dialogue, there is a risk that broader participation may undermine the political relevance of the platform. Creating a parallel multi-actor platform may be a solution in that regard.</p>			
<p>5.3 Not delay in changing its approach and proactively considering when platforms should come to an end.</p>	<p>Useful and valid (also see 5.1). On top of that timely review of the model and modality of each platform would be a first step. If after careful revision that does not lead to the necessary changes, retrieving from or closing a platform should certainly be an option that NIMD applies.</p>	<p>1) Develop programme knowledge on criteria for when platforms are not or no longer relevant or functional (see 5.1 above) 2) Apply these during country programme reviews</p>	<p>1) K&I unit 2) PMs</p>	<p>Q2 2016 and onward</p>
<p>6. To improve results from direct party assistance:</p>				
<p>6.1 Be much clearer on the overall objective: is it about parties' own capacity, the party system as a whole or the role parties play in linking citizens with the state?</p>	<p>(see also point 1) The work NIMD does aims to strengthen the political party system. As such it's programmes are multiparty. NIMD recognizes that it does not have such clear results to show for when it comes to Direct Party Assistance (DPA). However, depending on the analysis of the local situation NIMD will continue to choose which programmatic entry strategy it is aiming for in a given country (system, actor and/or culture). In general terms NIMD will make direct party assistance much more of an exception and focus mainly on multiparty assistance support. NIMD accepts the recommendation to be more specific in its objectives in case of DPA and design a more tailored approach in cases where it works on DPA to achieve</p>	<p>1) Recommendations made in this evaluation will be aligned with the recommendations made in the DPA evaluation, including a more structural use of the Strategic Planning tool for political parties. 2) PMs will be asked to more specifically indicate what results can be expected from direct party support in annual plans.</p>	<p>1) PME-C and DoP 2) PMs</p>	<p>1) Q1-2016 2) Continuously</p>

	clearer results. This is also in line with the recommendations presented in the DPA evaluation finalised in 2014 and which are currently followed through.			
6.2 Develop consistent, contextually sensitive criteria on political party participation.	Also see 4.2 and 5.2: NIMD develops tailored criteria per country programme when it comes to political party participation. We acknowledge that these criteria are sometimes not so clearly shared and presented.	Ensure clarity per country of the criteria for participation of political parties and make these explicit and public;	PMs & EDs	Continuously
6.3 Make a more significant difference, over the longer term, in addressing the political party system rather than working directly with individual parties	Partially valid and useful. In NIMD's vision political parties as a whole need to be active participants in both the debate and reform of the systems they are part of, as part of a multiparty, but also multi-actor approach. For this to happen NIMD believes it should work on three sides: a. critically analyse the political system and assist in actively reforming that b. assist the primary actors, political parties, in strengthening their capacities in order to ensure they are able to effectively take part in the political system (including an effective and efficient link towards citizens). In doing so it will try to do this increasingly through working in a multiparty way and on the basis of strategic plan developed by the parties c. invest in enhancing a democratic culture in societies and thus also in parties. Per specific situation and on the basis of an ever sharper analysis, NIMD designs its specific approach for a given country, as no situation is the same. This might include the	See 6.1 and 6.2	idem	idem

	<p>facilitation of new actors coming into the system or a stronger emphasis on marginalised groups. However, cooperating with the powers that be and investing in changing them is necessary to make the changes lasting and sustainable. Therefore the recommendation made by the evaluators should not lead to simplified choices between two poles or extremes. It is not a matter of “one or the other”, but more a careful design that takes into account both sides of the spectrum, but at the same time recognises that actors as NIMD and its partners can only facilitate part of the change, as the beneficiaries are the ones that need to make the real changes.</p>			
<p>6.4 To address the severe crisis of political representation, NIMD needs to work with a broader range of actors than only political parties, or even parliaments. This could become a more systematic guiding objective, emphasizing the role of parties in representing interests. This could mean an explicit NIMD goal of greater inclusivity and participation combined with multiparty democracy.</p>	<p>See 6.3. Additionally NIMD recognises that building links with civil society actors might be strategic and necessary at given moments in time, especially when severe crisis should be addressed. This should however not lead to situations in which NIMD loses its impartiality. The NIMD management does not believe it should change this into a more systematic guiding objective, as this would alienate NIMD from its mandate and niche. A solution to better target these situations when they arise, would be building coalitions with other organisations that are better placed to work with Civil Society actors.</p>	<p>In NIMD’s 2016-2020 MAP the organization has chosen to focus more explicitly on lobby and advocacy, building ties between the NIMD mandated work and other actors that specialize in strengthening civil society. NIMD management, Programme managers and Executive Directors at country level will carefully monitor and manage this cooperation.</p>	<p>NIMD Management , PMs and EDs</p>	<p>2016 and onwards</p>
<p>6.5 NIMD should decide the place of parliamentary assistance in its strategy,</p>	<p>Valid and useful. The parliament is the place where in the end the acting of political parties is put to the test. Much of what is</p>	<p>1) K&I unit, with input from NIMD management, to prepare a policy note on how working with</p>	<p>1) K&I Unit and NIMD</p>	<p>1) Q4 2016</p>

policy and programmes.	precooked by multiparty agreements and consensus should find its way into policy and legislation. However, NIMD believes there is a difference in “providing Parliamentary Assistance” and “working with parties in Parliaments and with those structures of Parliament that play a role in enhancing democratic reform”. In certain circumstances NIMD will, depending on the specific context, therefore work directly with Parliaments, but preference will be given to work with organisations that specialise in Parliamentary Assistance. The NIMD management agrees with the recommendation that working with Parliaments and specifying the ways in which this could take place, should be better described.	Parliamentary structures fits with NIMDs mandate. 2) Every programme country should decide, on the basis of the country and programme analysis, if working with parliamentary structures and processes should be part of the NIMD programme and decide if the NIMD programme could take this up by its self or if it needs to engage with other democracy assistance providers.	manage ment 2) PMs and EDs with Director of Program mes or equivalent	2) Q1 2016 and regular updates
Recommendations for programming	Response	Follow-up action	Who	When
7. To enable significant contributions by Democracy Schools and civil-political society processes:				
7.1 Maintain a context-sensitive approach and not introduce a standard approach to the Democracy Schools or this objective across countries.	The NIMD management is of the opinion that this recommendation is valid and useful. Both the Democracy Schools and broadly the interventions stimulating civil-political society interactions have not been well-grounded in a country-specific ToCs yet. NIMD should establish parameters that outline when talking about democracy schools or other capacity building programmes to create more programmatic clarity. At the same time the difference between “democracy education” and “political education” should be well	1) Ground these interventions properly in the new country ToCs, monitor selection of participants and curriculum design. (Continue the) design of programmes for to follow graduates and maintain them engaged. 2) Create more sophisticated PME systems to better understand what longer-term programme results are being reached through Democracy Schools. 3) Capture NIMDs policies on Democracy	1) PM and EDs 2) PME-C and EDs 3) K&I Unit	1) Continuously 2) Q2-4 2016 3) Q1-2

	described.	and political education		2016
7.2 Make sure engagement is not limited to 'professional NGOs' but really reaches out to grassroots organizations and citizens	Not valid and partially useful. The evaluators point to a risk that when widening participation in civil-political society processes, organizations are identified that have no citizen basis in civil society ,(eg "professional NGO's", party satellite organizations). NIMD will in its development and design of democracy and political education programmes take this recommendation into account. However, engagement at level of grass roots organizations can only be done by local organisations, as working directly with the grassroots level is too granular for NIMD (working mostly in capitals and at national level.) and neither its comparative advantage. NIMD should work with local civil organisations that are capable of working with legitimate and representative civil society representation.	At programme country level, NIMD will have to ensure it works with national CSO that are capable of working with legitimate and representative civil society representatives and thus engage in an indirect way with truly grounded civil society organizations. Working directly with the grassroots is not within NIMD's mandate.	PM and EDs	Continuously
7.3 Adopt a strategic approach that tracks behaviour change through appropriate M&E, thinks about sustainability from the start and links activities to the objective of improved civil-political society relations and a democratic culture	Valid and useful. However, NIMD is already stepping-up time and efforts in designing and shaping stronger and more appropriate PME instruments to track behavioural change as a result of interventions aimed at enhancing democratic culture. In close cooperation with its local partners it will continue to design monitoring systems that track change and link the results to the programme contributions. This will continue at increased speed. At the same time more time and energy will be spent to link the structures that have been designed to local	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) NIMD will organize a PME system to monitor outcomes, including on civil – political society relations and democratic culture through data collection on appropriate outcome and intermediate behavioural change indicators. 2) Ensure sustainability by linking up with local partners and institutions. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) PME-C, PMs and EDs 2) PMs and EDs 	

	actors and institutions (e.g. Universities).			
8. To achieve results under the new 2016-2020 MAP gender and diversity theme:				
8.1 Adopt a more systematic and resourced approach that includes dedicated staff, support from the centre, guidance, tools, M&E and exchange of experiences.	Valid and useful. In the last few years NIMD has invested in designing policy papers and programme strategies that are being tested in selected countries. However, these have not yet been rolled-out massively towards all country programmes. In its new multiannual period (20-16-2020) NIMD first needs to have clear what the organization can commit to.	Develop a concrete and realistic gender and diversity agenda as a follow-up to the gender and diversity policy developed in 2014.	K&I Unit	2016
8.2 Start from an analysis of the country context and barriers to political participation, which may identify new inclusion priorities such as religion, class and geography, rather than gender, youth and ethnicity.	Valid and useful. In its BART Political Context Scans, country programmes should analyse existing barriers more broadly and on the basis of that decide if this can be prioritised and look in a more detailed way which groups it will focus on during a certain period of time.	Ensure every BART Political Context Scan focuses on a wide variety of potentially under-represented groups.	PMs and EDs	Continuously
8.3 This political and social analysis should also include a reflection on the country team's capacity to address these deeply socially embedded issues.	Valid and useful. NIMD will have to ensure its staff is well capacitated to give attention to this issue. On top of that it will ensure that, as part of the BART Organisational Capacity Scan, that country teams analyse if partners or country offices are able to address these deeply socially embedded issues.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) On the basis of the outcomes of the BART Organisational Capacity Scan programme teams should decide to invest in increasing capacities of partners or country offices or to seek collaboration with other local organization that are better placed and equipped to address these deeply socially embedded issues. 2) Cooperate with specialised local organisations to tackle the issues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) PMs and EDs 2) Idem 	2016 and onwards

Recommendations for organizational ops	Response	Follow-up action	Who	When
9. To strengthen its internal systems and support to country teams:				
9.1 Complete existing internal reforms in order to adopt more effective strategic management system, and roll them out to country programmes.	Valid and useful. NIMD recognizes that too much focus is on details and not on direction. A process of designing and adopting more strategic management systems has been started at NIMD HQ level, but lacks coherence between the different disciplines and full implementation. In agreement with recommendation that NIMD initiates too many reforms that are not properly followed –up. However, NIMD needs to have a clear oversight about the resources it will have at its disposal under the 2016-2020 MAP and what that implies. Only if that is clear, NIMD will be able to see what is the manoeuvring space for NIMD to finalise and undertake the needed reforms. In doing so it will have to differentiate clearly between country offices (that are integral parts of the organisation) and partner organisations (that are autonomous organisations with which NIMD cooperates).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Implement results-based approach as described in SP and DfS frameworks, at country level; adapt Toolbox to reflect new results-based systems; conduct training and baseline measurement sessions for programme countries. 2) From 2016 onward more strategic planning approach to be implemented through working with MAPs per country and per discipline (HR, Quality, Finance etc.). These will have annual breakdown (annual plans) and MYRs and adjustments for the upcoming year. 3) Management Review to contain section of how NIMD Management Team performs in planning , review and adjustment process. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) PME-C with PMs and EDs; Toolbox team 2) PMs and FPMs 3) Quality Manager 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Q1 2016 onwards 2) Q1 2016 onwards 3) Q3 2016 onwards
9.2 Appoint a ‘change manager’ or allocate in a different way sufficient staff resources dedicated to implementing perhaps fewer priority reforms.	Partially valid and useful. Fewer reforms need to be prioritized, as current reform implementation lags behind and needs to be resolved first. Appointing a Change Manager is not the right solution, as it is the responsibility of the NIMD Management to set priorities, ensure implementation and monitor it.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) NIMD Management to identify current reforms that have lagged behind, and develop a plan-of -action to complete these, supervised by an appointed staff member. 2) NIMD Management to review ambitions in the transition plan and to identify fewer priority reforms which can be implemented in a timely and realistic way. 	NIMD Management assisted by the Transition Team	Q4 2015- Q2 2016

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3) Link these with the capacities and ambitions of partners and country offices. 4) Carefully manage the strategic priorities. 		
9.3 Provide more support to country programmes that need it, in particular with systems improvements, and ensure sufficient country programme capacity before further decentralization of responsibilities.	<p>Valid and useful. Relationship with the country offices and corresponding division of responsibilities have not been properly and uniformly set. Respective mandates, roles, and relations between HQ-CO are not always clear. Country office capacities vary and not all can absorb decentralization of responsibilities.</p> <p>In the case of partner organisations NIMD will have to see to what point it is able and capable to support strengthening of capacities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Internal audits of country offices have been started in 2015 and will be continued on a regular basis for all country offices. These audits will focus on the financial accountability of the country offices with a capacity strengthening follow up if necessary. 2) HQ to finalize CO policy; spend time to assess systems needs (including through audits) and systems use in country programmes; connect this to focused HQ supported capacity building sessions before implementing new MAP's decentralization proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) FPMs and PME-C 2) NIMD Management, FPMs, PME-C, PMs and EDs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Start in Q2 2016 2) Start in Q2-Q4 2016
9.4 Assist country teams in focusing on the theory of change and ensuring that they use it directly to inform their work, to help translate the 2016–2020 MAP into strategic, context-specific programmes.	Valid and useful, and already in practice for the new 2016 funding windows.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Finalise the country ToCs and MAP 2) In regular programme review sessions, revisit country level ToCs and review programming interventions if necessary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) PMs and FPMs, 2) PMs and FPMs, DoP and EDs 	Ongoing, from mid 2016
9.5 Ensure greater HQ capacity to identify and share learning that supports innovative and effective country delivery	Valid and useful. This has been identified in the MAP 2016-2020 as a priority through the creating of a Knowledge and Innovation unit (K&I Unit), yet it is dependent on human and financial resource availability. In its new agreement with the Netherlands MFA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Develop a genuine content driven learning agenda (as announced in the 2016-2020 MAP and SP proposal) 2) To be implemented with specifically allocated financial and human resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) PME-C, K&I unit and DoP 2) K&I, PME-C and PMs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Q2 2016 2) Q4 2016 and onwards

	(Dialogue for Stability) NIMD has been able to secure part of the existing funds top support this, but not as much as in previous years.			
--	--	--	--	--

Recommendations for future evaluations	Response	Follow-up action	Who	When
10. To undertake a more rigorous evaluation in the future:				
10.1 Improve preparation and management of an evaluation process by planning now how to evaluate the impact of the 2016–2020 MAP, using improved M&E systems.	<p>The NIMD management finds this recommendation valid and useful, especially detailed recommendations on pp. 46-47, though evaluating impact has proven to be hard across democracy assistance programming. NIMD should, however, be able to commit to improve severely on reporting on the results its programmes have contributed to.</p> <p>NIMD recognises the need to start early on with the preparations for the next institutional evaluation. It is very important to secure political understanding and capacity in the evaluators, as in this sense NIMD is different from other NGO/CBO evaluations.</p> <p>Although much energy and resources have been put in upgrading PME systems and processes during past MAPs, the level of data collection and accurate measurement of results of NIMD interventions has been lagging behind. In designing its programmes under the 2016-2020 MAP NIMD has put far more emphasis in creating systems of data collection and results measurement. In the</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Constitute evaluation advisory board under SP agreement (see full text in Chapter 4 of Programme Document), and design an evaluation approach and timeline from the start of the funding period, taking into account the recommendations on p 46, especially relating to -ensure enough time to prepare evaluation and select consultants 2) Applying the BART in each country programme 3) Assessing the BART reports, providing suggestions for improvement and ensuring BARTs are regularly updated 4) Developing country ToCs 5) Assessing the country ToCs, providing suggestions for improvement and ensuring ToCs are regularly updated 6) Finalising the updated PME System and implement new PME frameworks for SP and DfS funding, including baselines in 2016 and PME trainings at PM and country level on common 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) PME-C and DoP 2) PMs, EDs and FPMs 3) PME-C, HoF & DoP 4) PMs, EDs and FPMs 5) PME-C & DoP 6) PME-C, PMs, EDs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 2016 2) 2015 3) Q1-2016 4) 2015 5) Q-1 2016 6) 2015, Q-1 2016

	<p>past few years under the 2012-2015 MAP a Baseline and Review Toolkit (BART) which enables the organization to collect data in a more unified way. It has also developed a Theory of Change (ToC) to strengthen its theoretical underpinning of its programmes and share the underlying assumptions, providing a basis for an improved overall intervention logic and the possibility for tailored ToCs and intervention logics at programme (country) level. Finally NIMD has almost finished its qualification for a full quality assurance system These three elements provide a solid basis for an improved PME system and thus a stronger basis for measuring results at the end of the 2016-2020 MAP.</p>	<p>outcome and intermediate indicators and data collections strategy.</p> <p>7) Budget resources and HR for overall PME and country level PME to reflect new focus on data collection and outcome changes measurement.</p> <p>8) Finalising Quality Assurance qualification</p>	<p>7) FPMS, PME-C, PMs</p> <p>8) HoF, Quality Manager</p>	<p>7) 2015</p> <p>8) 2016</p>
--	---	---	---	-------------------------------