

EVALUATION
OF KEPA

FIELD OFFICE ADMINISTRATION

IN NICARAGUA, ZAMBIA AND
MOZAMBIQUE

Veikko Vasko

EVALUATION
OF KEPA

FIELD OFFICE ADMINISTRATION

IN NICARAGUA, ZAMBIA AND
MOZAMBIQUE

Veikko Vasko, Vasko Architects and Consultants Ltd, Helsinki, Finland

Kepa´s reports 38 / 2000

ISBN 951-8925-60-7

ISSN 1236-4797

Layout: Esa Salminen



Kepa´s activities are financially supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland

Contents

<i>Abbreviations and acronyms</i>	7
0.Executive Summary	11
1.Introduction	14
1.1 <i>Background</i>	14
1.2 <i>The Task</i>	15
1.3 <i>The Missions</i>	16
1.4 <i>Comments on the Terms of Reference</i>	17
1.5 <i>Acknowledgements</i>	19
2. Nicaragua	20
2.1 <i>The Programme</i>	20
2.2 <i>The Field Office</i>	20
2.3 <i>Budget outline</i>	21
2.4 <i>Observations</i>	22
3. Zambia	24
3.1 <i>The Programme</i>	24
3.2 <i>The Field Office</i>	25
3.3 <i>Budget outline</i>	26
3.4 <i>Observations</i>	26
4. Mozambique	27
4.1 <i>The Programme</i>	27
4.2 <i>The Field Office</i>	28
4.3 <i>Budget outline</i>	29
4.4 <i>Observations</i>	30
5. Kepa office in Helsinki	31
5.1 <i>The structure</i>	31
5.2 <i>Observations</i>	31

6. Conclusions	32
6.1 <i>General conclusions</i>	32
6.2 <i>The Four Alternative Scenarios</i>	42
7. Comments on the scenarios	47
8. Recommendations	49
9. Epilogue	53
Annex 1: Terms of reference	55
1. <i>Background</i>	55
2. <i>Objectives of the evaluation</i>	56
3. <i>Conclusions and recommendations</i>	57
4. <i>Methodology</i>	58
5. <i>Timetable</i>	60
6. <i>Reporting</i>	60
7. <i>Evaluation team</i>	61
Annex 2: Mission programmes	62
1. <i>Nicaragua</i>	62
2. <i>Zambia</i>	65
3. <i>Mozambique</i>	68
Annex 3: Persons met / Interviewed	72
1. <i>Nicaragua</i>	72
2. <i>Zambia</i>	74
3. <i>Mozambique</i>	75
4. <i>Finland</i>	77
Annex 4: Key addresses	78

Abbreviations and acronyms

Nicaragua

APN	Ayuda Popular Noruega, Norwegian NGO
CEDEHCA	Centro de Derechos Humanos, Ciudadanos y Autonomicos
Comité Costeño	Group of NGO's established for action after hurricane Mitch = Consejo Autónomo para el Desarrollo de la Sociedad Civil Costeña
GPC	Grupo Propositivo de Cabildeo, lobbying group of NGO's
MMPMV	Movimiento de Mujeres Paula Mendoza Vega, Siuna
MMSEDV	Movimiento de Mujeres Siuneñas en Defensa de la Vida
ONG	Organización No-gubernamental = NGO
OXFAM	Major British NGO
RAAN	Región Autónoma Atlántica Norte
RAAS	Región Autónoma Atlántica Sur
SIMSKULT	Sikilta Community Development Organisation
URACCAN	Universidad de las Regiones Autónomas de la Costa Caribe de Nicaragua
NIC	Nicaraguan currency unit Cordoba. 1 USD = 11,75 NIC (June 1999)

Zambia

Afronet	Inter-African Network for Human Rights and Development
CCJP	Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace
DWDA	District Women's Development Association
ECAZ	Environmental Conservation Association of Zambia
ICRAF	International Centre for Research on Agro-Forestry
JCTR	Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection
MS	Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke, Danish NGO
NGOCC	Non-governmental Organisations Coordinating Committee
NGOTSU	Non-governmental Organisations Technical Services Unit
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programme
SNV	Stichting Nederlandse Vrijwilligers, Dutch NGO
VAC	Visual Arts Council
ZMK	Zambian currency unit Kwacha. 1 USD = 2,400,- ZMK (July 1999)

Mozambique

FAC	Field Advisory Committee
FAMOD	Forum das Associações Mocambicanos dos Deficientes
FDC	Fundação para o Desenvolvimento da Comunidade
GAS	Grupos Africa da Suecia (ex ARO)
LINK	Forum of Mozambican and international NGO's
MBEU	A community theatre group
MICAS	Ministério de Coordenação de Accão Social
MS	Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke, Danish NGO
SAFOD	Southern African Forum of the Disabled
SPPF	Physical Planning Office of Gabo Delgado Province
UEM	Universidade Eduardo Mondlane
UFICS	Unidade de Formação e Investigação em Ciências Sociais
UNAC	União Nacional de Camponeses (Peasants' National Union)
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
MZM	Mozambican currency unit Metical, Meticais. 1 USD = 12.750,- MZM (July 1999)

Others

Afrodad African Forum and Network on Debt and Development

ABILIS Foundation of Finnish NGO's working on disabilities

CBO Community based organisation

DIDC Department of International Development Cooperation (of MFAF)

DW Development worker

Eurodad European Forum and Network on Debt and Development

Eurostep Lobby organisation of European NGO's

FAD Finnish Association of the Deaf (Kuurojen liitto)

FAMR Finnish Association on Mental Retardation (Kehitysvammaliitto)

FIDIDA Finnish Disabled People's International Development Association

FO Kepa Field Office

INGO International non-governmental organisation

Kepa Kehitysyhteistyön Palvelukeskus r.y. (Service Centre for Development Cooperation)

KIOS Foundation of Finnish NGO's working on human rights

KyO Kehitysyhteistyösasto (MFAF-DIDC in Finnish)

MFAF Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland

NGO Non-governmental organisation

VSO Volunteer Service Overseas (UK)

WID Women in development

USD US Dollar = 5,85 FIM (July 1999)

0. Executive Summary

Kepa, the Service Centre for Development Cooperation, is the central organisation of some 200 Finnish non-governmental organisations working in international development cooperation.

Earlier it was a volunteer sending organisation, but is now working on the basis of cooperation and partnership agreements with citizen organisations of the South. It has permanent field offices in Mozambique, Nicaragua and Zambia cooperating with, respectively, 7 partner organisations in Mozambique, 6 in Nicaragua and 10 in Zambia. A number of other countries are covered through services of mostly one person, a liaison officer, assuring contacts between Kepa and the field.

As an integral part of its ongoing strategic planning, Kepa had decided to carry out an evaluation in 1999 to assess the administrative structures, resources and costs of the field administration.

Besides that, the evaluation was expected to consider various alternative scenarios for the further development of Kepa's partnership programme.

The evaluation was carried out through documentary studies, key informant interviews and visits to the three field offices and meetings with partner organisations in the respective countries. The evaluator, Mr Veikko Vasko, travelled to Nicaragua (Managua and Siuna) in June and to Zambia (Lusaka and Chipata) and Mozambique (Maputo and Matola) during the first half of July 1999. A draft report was circulated for comments in August, and finalised for a Kepa Board meeting in early September 1999.

The main findings of the evaluation are

(a) The field offices are in a good shape and in very good hands; the new partnership approach has been well adopted by the field offices which now, after a difficult period of reorientation, are getting their teams and working methods functioning as intended. Kepa is well known and appreciated in the field and has good relations with the local NGO-communities, governments as

well as the Finnish embassies. Member organisations are satisfied with the services provided.

(b) The new organisation of Kepa Helsinki is still a concern; there are difficulties in communication and decision making as well as in financial planning and management. Even if much improved during recent years, the organisational setup and division of responsibilities still needs polishing.

The main recommendations are

(1) Kepa should continue working in the three programme countries through the existing field offices, which can and should be further developed on the operational level. Decentralisation of their functions partially to the provinces of main focus, closer to the partners, should be considered.

(2) More independence in operational and financial decision making should be given back to the field offices. There is little reason to control their normal work with too heavy reporting. The Development Cooperation Unit in Helsinki should rather increasingly serve the new individual liaison officers posted in new countries where they have fairly limited resources.

(3) Establishment of formal regional offices is not recommended in the present programme setting. Administrative or economic reasons hardly justify it, it could be considered only if genuinely regional activities make it necessary and regionally operating partners are identified. Central America is the most likely area for that because of its small size, language and cultural unity.

(4) The operational and financial planning of the field offices, if not all Kepa, should be organised on the basis of a four year cycle so that every four years a country review by a carefully combined 4-person team should be made. On the basis of that, a new country policy for that field office for the coming four years would then be made. This would give the much needed security, continuity and solidity to all field work. The reviews should not be made the same year for all, but separately for each country office. The fourth year could be reserved for the review of the other field activities.

(5) Partnership agreements should be made only after an initial pilot period, first for two years with a possibility of extension for another two years. A local review should be carried out in the beginning of the fourth year so as to allow for an iteration of programme work and adjustments in expenditures to be made

before the end of the programme period. Partner relations should be thought long standing, in the range of ten years; e.g. first a pilot period for testing and adjusting, then two times four years for programme work plus one year of *planned* phasing out.

(6) An outside consultant should be hired by Kepa to work out a system for financial administration including one bookkeeping programme in English for all offices, a budget follow-up and planning system - which is totally lacking now - and the necessary training. The two-plus-two-year cycle outlined above should be taken as basis for budget planning and follow-up.

(7) Kepa should give high priority to policy development in the organisation as a whole, producing clear and well thought out guidelines for several major issues, such as staff development, information, working languages, reporting, etc. and to make those known to all concerned. This work should contribute to improvements in the organisation of Kepa office in Helsinki.

Veikko Vasko
Evaluator
August 1999

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Kepa, the Service Centre for Development Cooperation, is the central organisation of some 200 Finnish non-governmental organisations working in international development cooperation. Earlier it was a volunteer sending organisation, but is now working on the basis of cooperation and partnership agreements with citizen organisations of the South. It has permanent field offices in Mozambique, Nicaragua and Zambia cooperating with, respectively, 7 partner organisations in Mozambique, 6 in Nicaragua and 10 in Zambia. In a number of other countries contacts between Kepa and the field are assured through services of mostly one person, a liaison officer.

An Evaluation of Finnish Personnel as Volunteers in Development Cooperation was carried out by an international team of consultants for the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland and published by the latter in 1995. As a consequence of that and after a period of extensive discussions a profound reform of Kepa, its organisation and working methods was carried out during 1996-97.

In Kepa's Declaration of Principles of 28.11.1997 the basic tasks of the organisation were formulated as follows:

Kepa's basic task is to encourage, support and organise the Finnish civil society to participate in actions that promote global responsibility. The main instrument for the fulfillment of this goal is the Partnership Programme through which Kepa

1. increases the awareness of global issues in Finnish civil society and improves its ability to act by organising information, training, campaigns and service activities for and in cooperation with Finnish non-governmental organisations and
2. strengthens the civil societies in the developing countries through their own field activities as well as through building co-operation networks between Finnish and southern non-governmental organisations.

As an integral part of its ongoing strategic planning, Kepa had decided to carry out an evaluation in 1999 to assess the administrative structures, resources and costs of the field office administration. Besides that, the

evaluation was expected to consider various alternative scenarios for the further development of Kefa's partnership programme.

The evaluation was carried out through documentary studies, key informant interviews and visits to the three field offices as well as meetings with partner organisations and similar NGO's in the respective countries by the evaluator Mr Veikko Vasko of Vasko Architects and Consultants Ltd, Helsinki, Finland during June and July 1999. A draft report was due in early August, after which it was circulated for comments and finalised for a Kefa Board meeting to be held in early September 1999.

1.2 The Task

The subject of the evaluation was limited to the administration of Kefa partnership programmes in Mozambique, Nicaragua and Zambia - the administrative structures, resources and costs of the field administration. For specific details, please see chapter 2. Objectives of the Evaluation in the TOR given in Annex 1.

The main objective of the evaluation was to serve the ongoing strategy work by providing facts, views and suggestions to be used as instruments in taking decisions on the future development and directions of the three field programmes. In addition, the evaluation was to consider the following four scenarios, as possible directions that the programmes could take in the future, and make recommendations regarding the administrative organization for each one of them. The hypothetical alternatives given were:

1. The Partnership programme maintains its present (financial) volume, but the number of cooperating organizations will reduce to a few. The number of development workers will be small (or more or less the present amount).
2. The financial volume of the Partnership programme will go down and the number of partner organizations will be reduced to two or three, at the maximum, per country.
3. The Partnership programme will be developed towards a regional programme (Southern Africa, Central America, etc.), with partner organizations in several countries. The Kefa support will consist of institutional and project funding as well as a certain number of development workers.

4. The active role of the field offices in the development policy work will be strengthened considerably from the present. The work, which is not only through the partnerships with Kepa's local partner organizations, is very labour intensive.

In these considerations the evaluation was suggested to take into account the various auto financing opportunities that the field offices could use in the future.

1.3 The Missions

The field mission to Nicaragua was carried out from 14 to 22 June 1999 and the missions to Zambia from 30 June to 9 July and further to Mozambique from that day to 16 July (return to Finland on 17 July). The detailed mission programmes are given in Annex 3.

The TOR assumed an evaluation team of two persons, the other one being from the South, fluent in English, Portuguese and Spanish, but not being citizen of any of the three countries to be visited. Due to the short preparatory period no such person could be found. As a substituting measure it was suggested that programme officers from other field offices would join the evaluator during his visits. This arrangement proved impossible, time being too short for properly preparing such trips and the persons in question having other commitments.

The order of visits was influenced by practicalities; Nicaragua first because of the holidays starting, Zambia next in an effort to make the above exchange round possible. The visit to Zambia thus fell unfortunately on two public holidays. In Mozambique the information officer was unfortunately on sick leave right at the time of the mission.

In spite of such minor issues, all missions were very successful, thanks to the good preparatory work done by all field offices and to the time given and effort made by their staff members. Many devoted their holidays, week-ends or evenings for assisting the evaluator. Without that the short time reserved for the missions would not have been enough.

Visits to partner organisations were organised not for evaluating the programmes but to illustrate the field work done under Kepa partnership agreements. In Nicaragua, Siuna in the autonomous area of RAAN was visited and in Zambia Chipata in the Eastern Province. In

Mozambique the visit initially planned for Pemba in Gabo Delgado was cancelled because it would have taken four days and because major partner representatives could be met in Maputo. A visit to meet a group of parents of disabled children was arranged instead in Matola near Maputo. It was very impressive.

1.4 Comments on the Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference for the evaluation are given in full in Annex 1. The TOR had been distributed in advance to most interviewees by the field offices, in Mozambique even translated into Portuguese. For others a small introduction leaflet was handed in the beginning of the meetings.

One of the most common remarks made by several interviewees was, that it was not logical to evaluate field office administration *before* the Kepa strategy had been drawn up. For many a better order would have been to first formulate a strategy and then to see what kind of field organisation would best serve the needs. This is, of course, logical but experience from the recent reform work in Kepa seem to suggest that both will have to be done; the evaluation mapping alternatives, then strategy work – which is not a fast exercise – and then again an analysis of the consequences for the field administration.

The scope of the evaluation was limited to the field offices only. Some informants pointed out that Kepa field operations should be seen as an integrated whole in which the *new countries* with only one person posted in the Dominican Republic, in Indonesia, in Thailand, in Uganda and two in Tanzania should also have been considered. This is obviously very true and the issue came up very often during the field missions. There are two organisational models now in use, three solidly established field offices with relatively good resources on one hand, and very light units with mostly one person with hardly any supporting services on the other. The question arises, whether there could be something in-between, perhaps developed from some of the new liaison officer posts. However, it can be said that it is too early to evaluate the new field posts, those are experimental and experience must be gained first.

The Terms of Reference were quite demanding and proved partially unrealistic. The time reserved for interviews alone clearly exceeded the time planned for all preliminary work, study of documenta-

tion and administrative files included. Obviously the TOR had been designed for a two-member team. Proper *participatory methods* could not really be used during the short missions. Yet talks with all field office staffs were open and interactive, particularly in Zambia, where regular meetings of different groups could be followed and real productive group discussions developed.

The assessment of the costs of the field administration is a difficult issue, as was stated clearly also by the 1995 evaluation team, which, in spite of much bigger resources, could not properly tackle those matters and therefore suggested a separate study to be made. On the other hand, some comparative work has been done in the meantime by different INGO's in the three countries and some general conclusions could be made on Kepa's position.

The field missions showed that more time should have been devoted for meetings with *other INGOs working in the programme countries*. There is much to learn from the experience of others. They proved extremely positive and helpful, certainly because of their good relations with the local Kepa office, but also because even an evaluation can become mutually beneficial if comparisons are made in an interactive manner. It may be that all such contacts should not necessarily be with fully 'likeminded' organisations, but also with others originating from different cultural backgrounds.

The timing of the evaluation was somewhat unfortunate because it partially fell on the holiday season in Finland and Nicaragua and on some public holidays in Zambia, as well as on the process of moving Kepa Helsinki to new offices. As a result, some intended interviews could not be made.

1.5 Acknowledgements

Warm thanks are due to all those persons met and interviewed in the three programme countries as well as in Finland; their names are given in Annex 3. I am particularly grateful for Marjaana Pekkola, Fred Brooker and Marko Lehto, the coordinators of the field offices, for their time, effort and friendly reception. Many thanks also go to all the patient drivers who carefully moved the evaluator around like a package from door to door to all the meetings, sometimes having to wait through it all outside, sometimes driving for 8 to 9 hours on not so good roads to take him to the field visits in the countryside.

I am also grateful to the partner organisations, women, mothers, parents of the disabled and others, who illustrated so well what partnership is and what cooperation can make. And finally, my best thanks to Sirpa Mallea, Director of Development Cooperation Unit at Kepa Helsinki for her good advises and support to my work. Gracias, zikomo, kanimambú.

2. Nicaragua

2.1 The Programme

Kepa Nicaragua has 6 partnership agreements with local NGO's as follows:

Organization	Field of Activity	USD/1999	Duration
1. URACCAN	Development policy	82.800	1998 - 2000
2. MMSEDEV	WID	18.000	1998 - 2000
3. MPMV	WID	16.200	1998 - 2000
4. Centro Humboldt	Environment and land issues	14.400	1998 - 2000
5. CEDEHCA	Human rights	14.400	1998 - 2000
6. Bluefields Municipality	Environment	14.400	1998 - 2000

In the above programmes there are development workers as follows:

Organisation Ending	Function	Contract
(2.)(3.) WID Programmes in Siuna	Training coordinator	10 /1999

In addition there are DW's among the field office staff as shown below.

2.2 The Field Office

Kepa Nicaragua field office has the following staff:

Function Contract Ending	Nationality	
1. Coordinator	Finnish	05 /2000
2. Deputy Coordinator	Nicaraguan	Permanent
3. Liaison Officer (DW)	Finnish	02 /2000
4. Administrator /Accountant	Nicaraguan	Permanent
5. Information Officer (DW)	Finnish	02 /2000
6. Information Officer (part time)	Nicaraguan	Permanent

7. Receptionist	Nicaraguan	Permanent
8. Technical Assistant	Nicaraguan	Permanent

In addition there are three Nicaraguan guards.

The field office is regularly using services of a local consultant for the development of group work methods and internal evaluation.

The office works in a rented house downtown Managua. Field office has recently moved from the large compound it earlier occupied in a more expensive area, thus introducing major savings.

2.3 Budget outline

Total budget 1999	574.571USD	100 %
PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMME	179.900	60 %
Cooperation / Partnership agreements		31 %
Liaison services		8 %
Project support		6 %
Technical support		11 %
Seminars, meetings & training		2 %
Campaigns		1 %
SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	231.500	40 %
Information services		11 %
International networking /coordination		1 %
Study and research work		2 %
Administration		26 %

2.4 Observations

All six partners of Kepa Nicaragua operate in the Atlantic regions of the country. This brings automatically up the question about the field office's presence in those areas. It is quite clear that the whole FO cannot be moved there, at least not immediately, presence in the capital is necessary for many reasons, such as communication with the government and the embassy, servicing of Kepa member organisations, networking with other NGO's and access to information. There has been one DW in Siuna assisting both WID projects there and helping in liaison, information and other communication work. Her contract ends in October 1999. A more functional location for a FO member appears to be Bluefields. It would be reasonable to place initially one person there. An opportunity for this comes at the moment when the contract of the actual liaison officer ends in February 2000. Whether the person would primarily be liaison officer or programme officer, remains to be studied in detail and with the view on potential candidates. In any case both functions will have to be assumed. The field office coordinator has suggested a Nicaraguan person, originating from the Atlantic region and speaking both English and Spanish.

It appears that the general interest of Finnish NGO's in Nicaragua has gone down from the best years of solidarity, there are about ten of them operating in Nicaragua. Some experienced NGO's do not need Kepa's services. This raises the question about the necessity for having a full time liaison officer for Nicaragua. One possible solution was outlined above, another suggested is giving regional duties to the new liaison officer, with an emphasis on development policy work.

An extreme alternative would be to move the whole FO to the Atlantic region and only leave one liaison officer or deputy coordinator to Managua. That may not in the long run please all those who want cooperation with Spanish speaking world and Latino-American cultures.

Development policy work and networking are taking a major share of Kepa Nicaragua's work. It has recently invested much time in the preparation of its own strategy for the period of 1999-2002. So far that work has remained on a rather general level, but it goes on and is heading towards more practical applications. Focus is also on information services and active participation in discussions concerning global issues in cooperation with other likeminded INGO's and NGO's. Nicaragua is the only Kepa field office having opened its own Internet homepage. It is also producing its own newsletter *Pikanic* which is now published

as a part of Kefa's newsletter Uutiskirje in Finnish.

Attention should be paid to the fact that the contracts of all three expatriates in the FO end in the year 2000, as well as that all 6 partnership agreements end the same year. Continuity is at risk and Kefa should look into the matter soonest.

Networking with other INGO's has become useful for all in increased transparency among local partners and NGO's placing applications for support.

APN of Norway in Nicaragua has a programme of 18 partnership agreements and a budget of close to USD 700.000,- Their staff is 1 country representative (South American), 2 coordinators (Nicaraguan professionals) and 3 technical staff (Nicaraguans). Their administrative costs are about 23 %. Visits to or from Norway are seldom made and the field office has a relatively independent role and decision making powers. They wish to diminish the amount of partners, some of them being too small and causing disproportionate administrative work.

OXFAM Nicaragua has 24 partners located in the regions of León and Las Minas. They have an office in all countries of the region and also a regional office in Managua. Yet, whenever they have regional programmes, they are handled countrywise, by the country offices. OXFAM representatives praised the good synergy they have with Kefa Nicaragua, good coordination and communication as well as Kefa's initiatives.

3. Zambia

3.1 The Programme

Kepa Zambia has 10 partnership agreements with local NGO's as follows:

Organisation	Field of Activity	USD/1999	Duration
1. DWDA Chama	Women's development	7.200	1998-2000
2. DWDA Chipata	"	13.000	1998-2000
3. DWDA Chadiza	"	5.300	1998-2000
4. DWDA Katete	"	27.200	1998-2000
5. ECAZ	Environmental conservation	21.600	1999-2001
6. ICRAF Chipata	Afroforestry	62.500	1999-2001
7. TEVETA/FAMR	Disability issues	39.500	1998-2000
8. Chipata CBR/FIDIDA	Community based rehabilitation	35.600	1998-
9. VAC	Culture /visual arts	49.600	1998-2000
10. CCJP	Structural adjustment and debt	15.000	1999-2000

In the above programmes there are development workers as follows:

Organisation Ending	Function	Contract
(6.) ICRAF Chipata	Forest Extension Officer	- 12 /1999
(7.) TEVETA/FAMR	Placement Officer	- 02 /2000
(8.) Chipata CBR	Rehabilitation Advisor	- 12 /2000
(9.) VAC	Documentalist	- 08 /1999

In addition there are DW's among the field office staff as shown below.

3.2 The Field Office

Kepa Zambia field office has the following staff:

Function	Nationality	Contract Ending
1. Resident Representative	USA	05 /2000
2. Programme Officer	Zambian	Permanent
3. Liaison Officer (DW)	Finnish	06 /2000
4. Information Officer (DW)	Finnish	07 /2000
5. Information Officer	Zambian	Permanent
6. Accountant	Zambian	04 /2000
7. Administrative Secretary	Zambian	08 /1999
8. Administrative Assistant	Zambian	Permanent
9. Office Attendant	Zambian	Permanent
10. Caretaker	Zambian	Permanent

In addition there are three Zambian general workers on a temporary contract. Guards are hired through a local company.

The field office occupies premises which were offered to Kepa free of charge by the Finnish Government in 1998. The complex comprises of two office buildings (former houses), houses for DW's, a guest house, meeting rooms with a pool and sauna, and service facilities in a fenced and guarded area with pleasant gardens. The guest house is used for housing visitors, DW's from the province and partner representatives. Scaled fees are collected from outsiders and other facilities can be rented for meetings and other Kepa related activities. The coordinator and the liaison officer are housed outside the complex.

3.3 Budget outline

Total budget 1999	686.700 USD	100 %
PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMME	406.000	59 %
Cooperation / Partnership agreements		42.0 %
Liaison services		2.7 %
Project support		3.6 %
Technical support		10.5 %
Seminars, meetings & training		0.8 %
Campaigns		-
%		
SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	280.700	41 %
Information services		12.2 %
International networking /coordination		0.8 %
Study and research work		- %
Administration	190.700	27.8 %

3.4 Observations

Kepa Zambia has recently invested a lot of work to develop its services to Kepa member organisations and to get its working methods and routines organised in an efficient manner. Much of that is based on the new intranet system introduced with the help of an expert from Kepa Helsinki. The Calendar system, allowing all in the net to follow the travel and meeting calendars of the others was being tried and studied with enthusiasm, its advantages for information and coordination already being so obvious to everybody.

The contracts of the three expatriates will expire in the middle of the year 2000 with one month intervals which is going to create a moment of risk in continuity of Kepa Zambia's work. Main partnership agreements will also end during 2000.

'Tikambilane' a gathering of local NGO's hosted by Kepa for discussion of timely issues is a much appreciated speciality of Kepa Zambia. Another form of service and instrument for networking is the new Info Centre with library and Internet services open to partners and other cooperating bodies that will open still this year. Kepa Zambia is

preparing a much needed brochure for its information purposes.

The excellent premises of Kepa Zambia are a major asset, justifying for their part the continuous presence of a Kepa field office in Zambia, so long they continue to be free at Kepa's disposal. There is some risk there, however, since the Zambian Government has recently claimed some project housing back from other embassies and organisations. Modest income is generated making the use of premises payable to outsiders.

There has been also in Zambia local comparison of salaries and benefits between INGO's. The Dutch volunteer sending organisation SNV uses ambulant regional advisers of its own to help their country offices in East Africa to solve administrative and training problems. MS Zambia presented their system of regular country reviews made every 5 years with related country policy. Instead of going for a regional approach, which they reject, they consider establishing provincial offices in Zambia.

4. Mozambique

4.1 The Programme

Kepa Mozambique has 7 partnership agreements with local NGO's as follows:

Organisation	Field of Activity	USD/1999	Duration
1. ABC /MICAS	Rehabilitation of disabled	166.700	1998-2000
2. 8 associations	Institutional development of the disabled	41.700	1998-2000
3. National Library	Institutional development	60.250	1998-2000
4. Provincial library	Institutional development of Nampula	16.850	1998-2000

5. Cabo Delgado Environment Environment SPPF		7.700	1998-2000
6. Forum Mulher	WID	17.100	1999-2000
7. UNAC Cabo Delgado	Land rights	16.000	1999-2002

In the above programmes there are development workers as follows:

Organisation Ending	Function	Contract
ABC /MICAS (Maputo)	Adviser /Mental retardation	03 /2000
ABC /MICAS (Beira)	Adviser /Deaf work	06 /2001
ABC /MICAS (Maputo)	Adviser /Deaf work	08 /1999
ABC / "	successor"	08 /2001

In addition there are DW's among the field office staff as indicated below.

4.2 The Field Office

Kepa Mozambique field office has the following staff:

Function	Nationality	Contract Ending
1. Coordinator	Finnish	05 /2000
2. Programme Officer /South	Mozambican	renewed yearly
3. Programme Officer /North	Mozambican	"
4. Liaison Officer (DW)	Finnish	12 /1999
5. Information Officer (DW)	Finnish	06 /2001
6. Financial & Administrative Officer	Mozambican	renewed yearly
7. Secretary	Mozambican	"
8. Maintenance & Logistics Officer	Mozambican	"
9. Administrative & Logistics Assistant	Mozambican	"
10. Guardian & Receptionist	Mozambican	"

In addition there are employed Mozambican guards.

Field office works in a rented house in a good area (Sommersfield) in Maputo. It recently moved there because of lacking security in the former area; yet the rent went down.

4.3 Budget outline

Total budget 1999	715.800 USD	100 %
PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMME	400.700	56,0 %
Partnership agreements /social sector		29,8 %
Liaison services		4,5 %
Project support /culture		11,3 %
Technical support		7,5 %
Development policy work		3,4 %
Other		9,5 %
SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	315.100	44,0 %
Information services		7,1 %
International networking /coordination		5,1 %
Study and research work		0,1 %
Administration	226.850	31,7 %

Figures are indicative only, since the original budget information from Kepa Mozambique is composed differently from Nicaragua and Zambia.

4.4 Observations

Characteristic for the Mozambican situation is that national NGO's are young and the whole sector is not very developed. There is a clear need for institutional support in partnership relations. Finnish NGO's show great interest in Mozambique there being more than 30 of them operating. This makes the liaison officer and the whole Keba Mozambique a much needed service centre. The Portuguese language adds to the need for help.

Keba Mozambique has continued work with its Field Advisory Committee, it is useful, gives good feed back, they read papers and know Keba. Relations with other INGO's are good, there is a special forum for both international and national NGO's in Mozambique, LINK. Keba has also had its own discussion forum 'Pate Papo' for invited NGO's. In Mozambique the coordination and networking between Keba and other NGO's does not happen so much on national level as sectorally, e.g. between organisations working on the disabled etc.

Keba Mozambique has already placed one programme officer to the region of main partners in the province, Cabo Delgado. This is necessary because of the great distances and poor communication facilities as well as for the need to know local language.

Major Dutch NGO's like HIVOS, Bilance, ICCO and NOVIB have no more permanent offices in Mozambique, HIVOS established regional office in Harare, which, according to Mozambican informants, has not worked for the part of Mozambique. They have had to notice that presence in the country concerned is a must. A good illustration was given by one interviewed Keba development worker: How would it feel and work if Keba Iceland would be in charge of what happens in Finland?

5. Kepa office in Helsinki

5.1 The structure

At the time of writing Helsinki staff is 33 persons (not including 4 temporary conscientious objectors) as compared with 28 in the field offices (8 in Nicaragua, 10 in Zambia and 10 in Mozambique - not including their temporary staff nor security services).

They are divided into four units, the Development Cooperation Unit (Kenttäyksikkö KY), the Policy and NGO Services Unit (Järjestöyksikkö JY), the Information Unit (Tiedotusyksikkö TY) and the Unit for Administration and Finance (Taloushallintoyksikkö THY) each having a Director who works directly under the Executive Director.

The headquarters moved in June 1999 to new offices in Helsinki where all units are again together in the same place.

5.2 Observations

Much criticism is presented in the field offices and even among local informants about the performance of Kepa Helsinki office. Main points of criticism are related to communication, amounts of information and paper, lack of delegation and priority thinking, heavy decision making procedures and slow reactions to queries, lack of general feed back and the practical difficulties in financial administration procedures. Use of Finnish in communication and documents as well as computer programmes is an obvious difficulty for local staffs. It is generally agreed that staff is highly qualified, hard working and enthusiastic – the only explanations to problems relate to organisation. It is also generally agreed that the organisation has much improved during the last years, but that work must still go on.

This evaluation being about the field office administration, it is not possible to go into further detail in trying to analyse the problems on the basis of some interviews only. Modern methods of analysing working environment and the organisation's working culture, such as psychodrama or new methods of business administration, could be used to find out where changes should be made.

6. Conclusions

6.1 General conclusions

- **All three field offices are in a good shape and in very good hands.**

The new partnership approach has been well adopted by the field offices which now, after a difficult period of reorientation, are getting their teams and working methods functioning as intended. Their staffs are qualified and dedicated to their work, loyal to and proud of Kepa, some having worked for it for nearly a decennium. Compared to all that, problems occurring are of minor order and can be worked out. Kepa's member organisations are generally satisfied with the services provided.

- **The field offices with their local knowledge and image represent a value as such.**

Kepa is well known and appreciated in the field and has good relations with the local NGO-communities, governments as well as the Finnish embassies. Their major strength is local knowledge and cultural understanding as well as sound judgement of social situations and networks, largely based on their local staff. Their presence is important, since face to face contact is still the only one that finally works in most cooperation countries. Working with and through Kepa gives to member organisations extra value beyond mere services provided.

It would be a shame and a waste to now close or dramatically change any of the field offices because they have just recently been reorganised and developed to finally become efficient in their new role. They should now be used to what they are best for - as resource centres.

- **The transfer to partnership programmes has been successful but field projects with development workers on the grassroot level should not be given up.**

Practically speaking all persons interviewed agree that the new partnership approach is the right one, including emphasis on development policy work,

but many continue that it should not lead to a situation where Kepa would not be directly involved with projects on grassroot level. It is felt that this is needed for Kepa's credibility and organisational learning and that sending Finnish development workers is still a valid function. It is feared that without concrete participation, Kepa would loose touch with the realities of the South and at worst become an academic organisation only working verbally in seminars and conferences. The balance between global activities and operational field work appears by most to be correct as it is now, both sides supporting the other.

- Administration can not be analysed or developed separately from programme activities.

Some persons interviewed had earlier expected that the workload of the field offices would decrease when the amount of volunteers was being cut down. The experience of Kepa and other similar organisations has been the opposite, partnership requires much more work, presence and continuity and quite another set of skills from the staff, such as the liaison officers. The field offices have to be up to date with national and local developments in order to identify needs and to assess the adequacy of requests coming in. Moreover, they are expected to deal with many disciplines, manage an international office in local circumstances and influence Helsinki on behalf of the country. The nature and substance of the programmes influences administration and makes mechanical comparisons, based on e.g. project quantities or budget sizes, quite useless.

- We don't need a new policy every Monday morning.

This refers to the saying of world famous architect Mies van der Rohe, who said that we don't need a new *architecture* every Monday morning. This is quite not the case with Kepa, but is a fact that Kepa has changed much and fast. The time is now becoming ripe for Kepa to start stabilising its policies in order to get better continuity to its work. There are examples of how solid policy work can be developed and how it can become a backbone for the whole organisation. For example MS makes a review of each country office every five years with a 4-person team consisting of one outsider, one local expert, one MS field worker (e.g. the country director of a neighbouring field office) and one FO staff (normally the country director). On the basis of the review a country policy for the coming five years is prepared *for that country*. The role of HQ is only to follow the process and to approve the policy.

It is obvious that a similar system would create an atmosphere of solidity and continuity also to Kepa's work. The 5-year cycle would be too slow for Kepa, but something shorter should be considered. The

system is interesting because, done by each country office, it gives them independence and allows for locally sensitive approaches to be adopted. It should also give planning more perspective and better feeling of job security to all concerned.

- There is a need to calm down the excessively active reform period and to create an atmosphere of continuity, stability and work security.

Kepa has been fast in developing. That has brought about some negative side effects, such as frequent changes in policies and practices, rumours about closing of the field offices, etc. all of which have created an atmosphere of uncertainty among the staffs. There have been cases of stress and tension among the staff members, competition and jealousy, some having overcharged themselves, etc. Too much work is sometimes done because of mere enthusiasm or because of a certain social isolation in new circumstances, but the organisation should be better aware of the risks, and coordinators or their superiors should pay more attention to work psychology, with the help of outside advisers, if necessary. Staff is the resource number one.

- Staff is the resource number one and the cost number one.

Salaries are about half of the administrative costs and the expatriate staff is clearly more expensive than local. It is therefore tempting to look critically at staff composition when demands for savings are coming up. Listening to people and analysing work plans and job descriptions makes believe that everyone is necessary and most have too much work, no one is useless.

Staffing must be under constant scrutiny, if savings have to be made some functions will also have to be given up. In all organisations, particularly in the small ones, the organisation model and division of responsibilities depends on the qualities of individuals and job descriptions must be made to match people's properties. In happy cases some jobs can be combined.

In all three countries Kepa has participated in comparisons made by or together with other INGO's about salary levels and staff benefits. Kepa is well in range with the others and there is no reason why the coordinators could not be given full responsibility to decide about benefits. No universal rules apply, local systems and standards are important to follow in salaries and benefits.

Staff development and responsibility on people are issues in which Kepa should work out clear policies.

- Everybody has not to be a Finn.

Analysing which staff members in the field offices should be Finns (or comparable expatriates) brought about the conclusion that, at the extreme, only one of the information officers in each FO should be a Finn, because he or she should be able to write in Finnish and to understand what is news in Finland and how things should be interpreted culturally. According to some, the liaison officer also must be a Finn for similar reasons, in order to know and understand Finnish NGO-field and its requirements and to be able to assist those member organisations who have limited language knowledge.

The nationality of the coordinator is a sensitive matter of image. There are cases where some NGO's have local directors, but most seem to agree that it is better for the organisation's presence, if the representative is from the home country of the organisation. The title 'coordinator' is common in both Nicaragua and Mozambique and sounds 'NGO-like', whereas country director and resident representative sound business-like or even bureaucratic. Titles carry a message.

It is interesting to note that in some foreign NGO's there are no expatriates (APN in Nicaragua, having 18 partnership agreements), in some only the Country Director and the Administrator/Accountant (MS Zambia) are from the country of the organisation. It is nice to note that all Kepa accountants are nationals of the field office countries, a matter of trust.

There are local staff members with long Kepa experience who are ready to take major responsibilities in running the regular work of the field office, thereby liberating the coordinator and others to concentrate more on development policy and other topical themes. The role and status of deputy coordinator is good in many situations, including vacations and travel.

- Kepa is to a large extent an administration organisation.

It is understood that MFAF-DIDC (KyO) would want to see the administrative costs of Kepa field work to be reduced to about 10% while they are at the moment in the average about 30 % of the FO budgets. This appears unrealistic.

The definition of what is administration is of course a problem as such, but an old thumb rule already says that more than one third of every professional's working time in most organisations goes for administration. Kepa field offices are largely there for administration only, arranging, assisting, monitoring and reporting on a large amount of operational activities of their own and of others. In the developing countries such work is far more cumbersome and time consuming than in the North. Kepa staff often have to take care of administrative tasks of partner organisations also because of their lacking resources or skills.

- Communication is work.

One of the most common complaints within Kepa, both in Helsinki and in the South, is that it is producing too much information, even internally, so much that no one can read it all. Some filtering mechanisms should be developed and information should be classified according to its importance or priority. There have been efforts to make reporting systems more rational, but those do not appear to be fully introduced in practice. It is not very rational for one person to report in writing to another without that the same can be used for more extensive distribution. In fact Kepa, as a dynamic modern organisation should be a forerunner questioning old reporting systems inherited from the times of diplomatic pouches and work out what modern media really can make in practice. Sometimes reports are not read because all concerned know the contents already through e-mail or other communication media. Use for record and files and formal administrative or legal purposes is another matter, but also that could be studied, preferably in cooperation with those for whom such reporting is intended.

- Use of Linux

According to some international sources quoted in Finnish press recently, the Linux operating system for personal computers has done more good to the developing world than all bilateral aid together by allowing for the use of the system free of charge and by making the use of simple old fashioned computer hardware possible. This is perhaps somewhat outside the core of this evaluation, but would it not be in line of Kepa's principles to fight against multinational companies having dominant positions on the market and, consequently, to promote the use of Linux and to make itself use of it?

- Information work needs policies.

Information is growing in importance and there are already much resources reserved for that, two full time persons in Zambia, one and a half in Nicaragua

and one in Mozambique. In addition to that others, like the coordinators, liaison officers and desk officers in Helsinki participate in information work. Ideally information should not be separated from action, any operation is ready when it has been told about to others and that should best be done by those who actually operated. The need for journalist skills, knowledge about the press and media for the distribution of information makes it a job of specialists. The work is divided in internal Kefa information to and from the South, and external towards Finland and towards the societies in the South. Development policy discussion happens between still other actors. Written and spoken word, pictures, videos, CD, tv and others make the picture even more complex. In all this, Kefa needs an information strategy and policy, priority thinking and clearer structures for decision making and reporting. Liaison officer is the closest companion at work. Local colleagues are important in cultural interpretation of the societies. Administratively information officers are DW's and working rather independently and in a self-regulating manner.

- The language policy of Kefa is a tricky issue - more clarity is needed.

Kefa operates in 5 languages. There is much complaint about the excessive use of Finnish not only in letters and e-mail, but also in bookkeeping programmes etc. Use of Finnish in the field is unpolite and appears as lacking transparency.

On the other hand, the use of Finnish – or Swedish - is a right and duty in the member organisations. What is the credibility of an organisation defending e.g. minorities' rights to their languages in the South but not its own? It would be artificial and ridiculous to use English in meetings and minutes when all participants are Finns. Should English dominate the whole world? The knowledge of English is not so common in Mozambique, nor in Nicaragua. Translation costs are high in e.g. Kefa Mozambique and still many staff members must use their time for translations every now and then.

Instead of geographic organisation, it has been sometimes suggested that Kefa should be organised on the basis of themes. The idea is often received enthusiastically but it soon appears that the choice of the themes is not so easy, everything is integrated and overlapping, nobody has come up with a good division. The organisation could not be by themes but perhaps by language lines, Kefa not working on a country basis but by cultures. This would mean

that there would be in the field an English speaking Keba, a Portuguese Keba and a Spanish one. The conditions of the South would dominate, the field offices would operate in their language and it would be for Keba Helsinki to solve any language problems and translation needs, if there were any. The accountancy only should be in one language, English. Another problem are the local languages now quite totally ignored.

- Use of hired services is flexibility and pays.

All three field offices have positive experience of the use of locally hired short term services from outside. Typical tasks are regular consulting in internal working methods and evaluation in Nicaragua, computer experts, lawyers, librarian (a graduate student on scholarship basis in Zambia), translators and the security companies. For using short term assistance, budgetary flexibility is necessary.

- There are some auto-financing possibilities, but nothing very promising could be identified.

Much attention could not be devoted to this issue. There are some modest efforts made e.g. the charging of liaison officer services from member organisations, making the use of guest house and some office facilities payable to outsiders in Zambia, and the organisation of a seminar for KATU.

Conference services, minor consultation and training, publications and multimedia products, etc. are others. The legal basis for such gainful activities and possible taxation has not been worked out, and therefore some care should be exercised until the position is clear.

Member organisations who need Keba's services in the field are apparently quite prepared to pay for it. The establishment of separate companies for income generating activities is a possibility tried for by some national NGO's in Mozambique.

- Much can be learned from other INGO's working in the field.

In all three countries the INGO field offices have found each others to compare salaries and other expenditure levels in the host countries, also comparing their partners' programmes and billing in order to avoid overlapping. Keba has been active in this, particularly in Nicaragua, and the results appear useful. The

5-year review /policy process of the Danish MS was touched upon earlier.

In this evaluation more time should have been devoted for visits to other INGO's. Increased direct cooperation and sharing of services with a likeminded organisation may lead to mutual savings.

- Kepa should be careful for not extending its geographic coverage too much.

The problem of Kepa is to be medium-size. Really big INGO's such as MS or OXFAM do not have the problem where to be, since they are nearly everywhere and their policy discussion is therefore not so country-oriented. Kepa is struggling with the dilemma of vast needs and interests and limited resources. It has three solid long-standing partner countries on one hand, and a number of others where its presence is minimal, on the other. The 'old countries' have experienced ups and downs of interest from the Finnish NGO field, but there is constantly a number of member associations who find it useful and satisfactory to operate in those. In fact it is quite the same where certain universal problems are being worked on, since Finnish resources and particularly the resources of Kepa or its member organisations are just a drop in the ocean of real needs.

The problem of Kepa stems from the principles of member equality; some smaller members, having interest in other parts of the world, would also wish to have their share of Kepa's services. Kepa cannot pull, or push, all of them to the three programme countries just by offering better services there. The risks with any new countries would be the same that Kepa experienced in the beginning in the old ones; as a result of limited knowledge of local culture and networks, mistakes were made in arbitrary selection of projects and partners. It would be important to analyse carefully the real reasons for the will to expand to new areas; is it fashion, attractive new contacts or tiredness with the old places 'that we already know so well'. Jumping from one country to another is not cheap. Superficiality lurks round the corner.

- The system of new field posts needs further study.

Kepa has recently placed new independent liaison officers to five 'new countries'; the Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Tanzania, Thailand and Uganda. This expansion is being criticised sometimes on such arguments as presented in the previous chapter. It is said that one person cannot cover large countries,

nor all professional questions rising or the practical needs that come up, and that isolation and superficiality become main threats for them. The essential difference with the field offices is, however, that the new posts are not intended to operate by country, but by subject matter and in cooperation with local non-governmental organisations or INGO's working on that subject matter. Consequently, the approach must be different from the field offices. Which level of support services, and which type of organisation will be necessary in the future, are matters to be studied. After some experience gained, the field posts could be reviewed, because they are likely to become an integral part of Kepa's field work and a serious alternative in the future development of the field organisation.

- Coordination and learning from the other Kepa Field Offices is an untapped resource.

A southern round of programme officers visiting each others was planned in connection with this evaluation, but had to be postponed to a later occasion when it can be better prepared. Other possibilities exist also, since more of Kepa coordination meetings could be held in the South e.g. for information officers or accountants. There is no need to make the field offices similar or force them into any uniform mold, but reportedly visits from Kepa Helsinki by some key staff have proven so useful that mutual learning and improved communication is a very likely result of such exchanges.

- The organisation of Kepa Helsinki does not yet function in a fully satisfactory manner.

The new organisation of Kepa Helsinki is still a concern; there are difficulties in communication and decision making as well as in financial planning and management. There was much operational criticism in the field offices about relations with Kepa Helsinki. Even if much improved during recent years, the organisational setup and division of responsibilities still needs polishing.

It is not evident that the division into two main units is correct, since e.g. the Development Cooperation Unit and the Policy and NGO Services Unit in reality share staff and communication with field offices happens freely from all units through all available channels.

There are several clearly distinct functions: 1) NGO services in Finland, 2) Programme implementation in the South, 3) Development policy work, 4) Information, 5) Training and awareness raising, 6) Financial administration and 7) Personnel administration. All combina-

tions of the above should be studied with a critical mind. It is not evident that the combination of development policy work with NGO services is the most functional one. Nor is it obvious that financial administration and personnel questions should be combined, already now much of recruiting happens elsewhere and staff policy is strongly linked with e.g. training.

An extreme test question could be why the Development Cooperation Unit has to be located in Finland, could all its functions not be delegated to the South?

- Division of labour between Helsinki and the field offices in financial administration needs more clarity.

This is one of the main areas of dissatisfaction in all quarters. Even members of the Board suffer from lacking budget follow-up which has led to unnecessary cuts and losses of funds in the recent past. The complicated situation with many countries, languages, non-convertible currencies and communication problems make things more difficult than usual, but much could be done to make e.g. bookkeeping systems and reporting more clear. New systems have been introduced for accounting but they are not satisfactory, programmes being partially in Finnish, instructions for filing insufficient etc and changes too frequent. Staff working in financial administration is under heavy and constant pressure and cannot therefore be expected to manage a major reform. Outside expertise has to be hired to put systems in order, including necessary training.

6.2 The Four Alternative Scenarios

According to the TOR, the evaluation was to consider the following four scenarios, as possible directions that Kepa field programmes could take in the future, and make recommendations regarding the administrative organisation for each one of them.

1. The Partnership programme maintains its present (financial) volume, but the number of cooperating organizations will reduce to a few. The number of development workers will be small (or more or less the present amount).

This alternative would mean continuing more or less with the same field organisation as Kepa has now.

The amount of partnership agreements that a field office can handle is difficult to define. It depends very much on the substance matter of cooperation, of the geographic location of area of operation, and the character of the partner organisation, including its size and own capability. Many have suggested 4-5 as an optimal amount per country, but with the above reservations. The type and degree of Kepa's intervention needed varies from one country to another. If training is involved, the need for manpower and time increases dramatically compared to e.g. technical assistance or just financial support.

If the 'cooperating organisations' above mean Kepa members, and their amount operating in a country would drastically decrease, it would soon suggest the elimination of the liaison officer from the expatriate staff. But since one of the functions of liaison officers appears to be to promote their country of operation among Kepa member organisations, this would mean in a way giving up and would lead to a further weakening of the field office system.

A structural change to be recommended is the placement of programme officers closer to the partners in the provinces. This is already the case in Mozambique where the other programme officer has just been placed in Cabo Delgado province. This is justified with the long distance, high travel costs and poor connections as well as with the local knowledge of the person in question (in e.g. the local national language). The need is obvious also in Nicaragua where there are two possible places to choose on, Bluefields or Siuna. The person or persons

and their functions and exact job descriptions are still an open issue there. The situation with the Eastern Province of Zambia (Chipata area) is similar but the staffing question less clear.

2. The financial volume of the Partnership programme will go down and the number of partner organizations will be reduced to two or three, at the maximum, per country.

2-3 partnerships would hardly alone justify the presence of large field offices. Much depends on the activities of Kefa member organisations requiring services in the field. In principle the main solution would be to minimize the expatriate staff or to stop having it altogether. In the latter case local staff should have long experience with Kefa and should be kept well in contact with Kefa Finland.

Freely thinking, a minimum staff of a field office could consist of one expatriate representative combining about half and half the tasks of liaison officer and information officer, one local programme officer with some administrative tasks (accountancy and bookkeeping would be done through locally hired services), and two local technical staff, one for office work and another for logistics and transports. This would mean cutting representation and services to Kefa member organisations to a strict minimum and defining internal Kefa information clearly as a task of its own with a given volume in the job descriptions. Information work in the journalistic sense would have to be sacrificed to a large extent.

A key measure in trying to diminish costs is the cutting down of the amount of expatriate staff. The division of work between the liaison officers in the field and the programme officers in Helsinki is unclear. Both have their function and are useful and appreciated by those Kefa member organisations who use their services, but the risk of overlapping or duplication is there. In case of strong cuts one or the other should be sacrificed. According to most, it cannot be the liaison officer in the field.

MS Zambia is not employing local DW's, all are employed through partners. This is a clear principle, meaning that also the contract conditions are completely local and the length of work relation is tied with the

length of the partnership agreements.

Information work is said to be the most rapidly growing function in those INGO's that engage themselves in international development policy discourse. Taking Kepa's Declaration of Principles as the starting point, with its strong emphasis on influencing the Finnish NGO-field, information officers are necessary. Yet internal information and much of the writing in the press should be possible to be done by participating persons themselves if their job description so clearly stipulate. Journalist services could be hired or free lance journalists used for other information work.

3. The Partnership programme will be developed towards a regional programme (Southern Africa, Central America, etc.), with partner organizations in several countries. The Kepa support will consist of institutional and project funding as well as a certain number of development workers.

No regional offices of any other INGO could be visited during the evaluation but the matter was discussed with practically speaking all interviewed persons. Strong arguments were presented - by persons from inside Kepa as well as from other INGO's - against the system of regional offices as such, as an effort to rationalise or economise the organisation. It was feared e.g. that the regional system would only lead to neglecting even larger areas than now. It was pointed out that communication is often more difficult and costly, particularly in Africa, between neighbouring countries than with Finland and that the regional office could thus rather be Helsinki. Also, communication in Africa, and largely everywhere, has to be face to face; telephone, fax or e-mail are not a solution. And finally 'there is no place called region, all dynamics begin in the countries'.

Organisational models or interests should not be the starting point, but partners' needs. The precondition for any effort is the existence of regional activities or issues and partners operating regionally. In today's situation the establishment of formal regional offices is not recommended.

In all fairness it has to be noted that there are a number of key staff in Kepa who are in favour of a regional system. They include, among other, the director of the Development Cooperation Unit and the coordinators of Kepa Nicaragua and Kepa Zambia. For the time being, however, all that has been said about the regional office system ap-

pears as a vision and no convincing plans have been presented, nor cost analyses made. Yet, even if other INGO's are told to have had negative experiences, it is not by definition impossible for Kepa to develop its own approach for regional work. It only has to be prepared carefully. In that preparatory work the experiences of other INGO's should be taken as a starting point.

It should be decided first what is meant with region; is it a recognised geopolitical area like e.g. the SADC, or is it a 'Kepa-region' – a group of countries where Kepa is present, like e.g. Zambia, Tanzania, Uganda and Mozambique together. Or is it a region defined culturally, e.g. the lusophone countries of Africa. The most likely area for experimenting is Central America where regional interests exist and where the language and geographic conditions are favourable. Regional work could be tried there without too formal and costly institutional arrangements.

- a) One alternative model could be that one staff member in an existing field office would assume the responsibilities of a regional officer, travelling and working from time to time in the other countries of the region ('ambassador model'). The most natural person for this would be the liaison officer or a new special officer with tasks and skills for e.g. development policy work.
- b) Another model would be based on the field office, or field offices of the region, being run by primarily local staff and the expatriate coordinator taking care of regional issues in cooperation with them as a director of them all ('director model'). A version of that could be a system in which there is one field post in each country of the region with a minimum staffing ('thin net').
- c) A third basic alternative is that the whole professional staff of a field office operate within a region according to programme needs, with or without having persons posted in the other countries of the region (model 'without frontiers'). In this alternative the local staff members would logically be from several countries of the region.
- d) A fourth alternative could be that those countries of a region in which there is no Kepa presence, would be covered from one

regional office and the others from their field office. This should not prevent field offices to work on regional projects or seminars or at least engage in programmes across borders of a neighbouring country, if properly planned.

An unusual arrangement was reported about a British NGO (Save the Children) working for about ten years in Southern Africa mainly for disability training with a regional office moving from one country to another every two years (having all the time the same person as director).

4. The active role of the field offices in the development policy work will be strengthened considerably from the present. The work, which is not only through the partnerships with Keba's local partner organizations, is very labour intensive.

This approach would increase the need for qualified staff in research and information. A majority of them should be from the South. Partnership agreements would need to be made with organisations who themselves have similar qualified staff, and cooperation established with local or regional research institutions, universities as well as with globally operating INGO's. Organising seminars and conferences would increase in importance, an activity that requires special skills or experience. Such services can, however be bought from outside. The question arises how much this type of work is dependent on the locality of the unit doing that work. Regionally important urban centres, with international organisations and good communication facilities, would be natural environments for such networking. Keba would change.

It has been suggested earlier that Keba's organisation should be changed according to themes, instead of e.g. geographic organisation. The idea is popular until the question about how, by which themes, the organisation should be grouped comes up. Development issues are so integrated that such divisions do not easily become workable.

7. Comments on the scenarios

The scenario alternatives presented above assume that all three field offices would operate on the same basis. This is, however, not necessary. It could be well thought of that each one of them would have a different approach following different scenarios according to the circumstances in the region or following policy decisions made by Kefa. An example of such thinking can be found at OXFAM who have different policies formulated for different continents following the priorities felt most acute in that part of the world.

Another comment concerning both scenario 1 and 2 has been presented e.g. by the Zambia field office coordinator and others: The amount of partnership agreements is not an indicator of FO workload as such. Much depends on the nature and contents of the partnerships. The issue should not be tied to how many partnership agreements Kefa is funding, but to how many member organisations are working in the respective countries and what is the level of services they need from the field office.

A difference in thinking can also be found concerning the scenario 3: The original formulation assumes regional programme '*with partner organisations in several countries*'. The evaluation has come to the conclusion that one prerequisite for regional activities should be the existence of *regional programmes or regionally operating partners*. There is a difference there and it always has to be asked why partners should be selected from several countries if they have not much in common. In fact, two different scenarios could be worked out from the two approaches.

During the evaluation it could be noticed that the scenarios were difficult to handle in interviews and discussions. There are many components influencing each one of the alternatives and it is difficult to decide between them without rather exact financial or other resource limits. Much is also purely dependant on policy thinking and will and the priorities of e.g. Kepa's member organisations. The regional approach may have received too much attention because it is so clearly different and easy to conceive.

8. Recommendations

- Continue work through the three Field Offices

Kepa should continue working in the three programme countries through the existing field offices, which can and should be further developed on the operational level. Decentralisation of their functions partially to the provinces of main focus, closer to the partners, should be considered.

- Increase their operational independence, including financial decision making powers

More independence in operational and financial decision making should be given to the field offices. The limits for coordinators' powers are unnecessarily low. Consequently, the Development Cooperation Unit in Kepa Helsinki could devote more of its time and effort for serving the new independent liaison officers who now have so limited resources.

- Study activities and approaches of others carefully before going into regional organisation

Establishment of formal regional offices is not recommended in the present programme setting.

Administrative or economic reasons do not justify it, it could be considered only if genuinely regional activities make it necessary and regionally operating partners are identified. Central America is the most likely area for that because of its small size, language and cultural unity. Experiences of other international non-governmental organisations in their regional approaches should be studied in order to learn from their experiences.

- Give high priority to policy development in the organisation as a whole

Kepa should give high priority to policy development in the organisation as a whole, producing clear and well thought out guidelines for all main sectoral issues, such as information, staff development, pricing of services, working languages, reporting, etc. and to make those known to all concerned. An organisation defines itself by its policies. Good policies work better and last longer.

- Develop a new 4-year cycle for continuity and solidity in planning plus work security

The operational and financial planning of the field offices, if not all Kepa, should be organised on the basis of a four year cycle so that every four years a country review by a carefully combined 4-person team should be made. On the basis of that, a new country policy for that field office for the coming four years would then be made. This would give the much needed security, continuity and solidity to all field work. The reviews should not be made the same year for all, but separately for each country office.

- Continue participating in field projects through partnership agreements

Partnership agreements should be made only after an initial pilot period, first for two years with a possibility of extension for another two years. This would work as an incentive to the partner. The partners should apply for continuation and justify it. The second period would then be dominated by the will of both parties to get things done and finalised. A local or internal review should be carried out in the beginning of the fourth year so as to allow for an iteration of programme work and adjustments in expenditures to be made before the end of the programme period. Phasing out should always be *planned*, and either included in or added to the end of the second period.

- Hire outside consulting to get financial management systems on rail

An outside consultant should be hired by Kepa to work out a system for financial administration including one unified bookkeeping programme in English for all offices, a budget follow-up and planning system - which is totally lacking now - and the necessary training. It should be studied whether field office auditing could be done in the programme countries. The forthcoming introduction of Euro should be taken as a possibility to simplify conversion practices. The two-plus-two-year cycle outlined above should be taken as basis for budget planning and follow-up. This should ideally be introduced into practice in cooperation with the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

- It should be studied whether more responsibilities could be given to field offices and partners in the South in financial administration and follow-up, particularly in bookkeeping routines

The new account system should be run in first and tested in practice. Then the bookkeeping and auditing concerning project support and technical support, campaigns, etc should be done locally. Bookkeeping by partners may require much training and more follow-up but on the other hand be a part of their institutional development. It should increase overall efficiency if the field office could direct and control partners to a practical maximum so that communication in day-to-day work with Helsinki could be minimized.

- Keep sufficient ad hoc financing in reserve for flexibility and testing of new partners.

Like in every organisation, the variable parts of budgets that are not fixed in advance, are those where the possibilities for development lie. The field offices should have a chance to react on new situations and intervene quickly when situations arise. This would give them possibilities to gain goodwill and visibility as well as access to processes where new partners can be identified and tested before going into more long standing relations. The longer the planning period is, the more flexibility there should be, since the circumstances in the countries in question change constantly.

- Adjust contract cycle of key staff so that changes do not coincide

There have been cases in the recent past where too many key staff have changed at the same time causing dramatic policy changes and difficulties for both Kefa and the partner organisations. For the sake of continuity and smooth transition of duties, contracts should be so timed that some months would be available for passing over the baton. Another way to enhance continuity would be to rotate staff from the field to Kefa Helsinki and from Helsinki to the field. The more there is field experience in Kefa Helsinki, the easier it will be for it to remain realistic about its proposals and demands.

- Organise more visits in the South and to the South in order to enhance communication and institutional learning

The exchange round of southern programme officers planned to be held in connection with this evaluation should be carried out so that two would visit together the third in her office. Visits should be well prepared and include partner visits as well. Similar round for financial administrators could also prove useful at the time of the introduction of any new practices. Regular liaison officer meetings as well as information officer meetings should from time to time be kept in the field offices. Those could well be

combined with seminars or other professionally useful events. Visits of Kepa Helsinki key persons in the South have proven useful, Board members may also benefit from such visits. Similarly, visits of key staff from the field offices to Finland is necessary and should be continued as well as representatives of major partner organisations.

- Keep the organisation of Kepa Helsinki under a continuous scrutiny

In addition to what was said earlier about financial planning and administration and staff rotation, the basic structure of Kepa Helsinki is also of concern. The organisational setup and division of responsibilities still require attention, there are many critical voices inside the organisation. The changes should be suggested by the staff and based on functional arguments. An outside facilitator, e.g. using psychodrama techniques or other modern methods to free communication among the staff members and open up fruitful discussion should be used. Team work methods may prove to be more suitable for dynamic NGO-minded staff than any rigidly hierarchical setups.

- Develop internal work of the Board by dividing responsibilities in the follow-up

Considering the workload of Kepa Board members it is suggested that a kind of twinning relation between certain members and certain countries or field offices be developed. This would invite the members to better read and follow at least their own area, but not prevent anyone from taking up any issue anywhere. Those members should also visit 'their' country offices.

9. Epilogue

Understanding that one characteristic of NGO-work is, or should be, that it is also fun, I would like to take the freedom to try and test the famous *Six Memos for the Next Millenium* by the Italian writer Italo Calvino. In the early 1980's he prepared a series of six lectures to be held at Harvard University, USA, in which he set out his testament in a form of theses that should help literature or any other field of culture in its struggle to survive. His criteria may be useful also for Kepa in setting its goals and choosing its approach, method and style of work in the future: *

1. Lightness: Kepa will avoid too heavy organisation and procedures and increasingly use small multinational and multidisciplinary teams on ad hoc basis.
2. Quickness: Decision making will be decentralised as much down as possible and procedures simplified. The use of electronic media in communication will be developed further.
3. Exactitude: Kepa will work out clear terminology and agree about meanings and invest in conceptual clarity. Solid data is valuable and good preparatory work is needed to raise the right questions Focusing of work is essential.
4. Visibility: The role of Kepa as a giving partner suggests new areas of cooperation to be found in participating in the global development discourse. Information and journalism will grow in importance as well as Kepa's local presence in the South organising seminars and workshops.
5. Multiplicity: Through partners a much larger impact can be reached than through the work of individual development workers. Kepa will look for new development policy partners operating regionally

* Lezioni americane. Sei proposte per il prossimo millenio. Palomar S.r.l., 1993.

or globally. Also others than the actual partners shall benefit.

6. Consistency: Kepa will build on it's experience and strengths, invest more in producing good policies e.g. in order to keep its best staff. Changes will be planned well in advance and partnership relations will grow longer. The ordinary citizens in their local communities remain the top priority.

Note: The sketchy interpretations above are *not* Mr Calvino's. The Kepa strategy working group may wish to formulate its own interpretations of the six theses.

Annex 1: Terms of reference

EVALUATION OF KEPA FIELD OFFICE ADMINISTRATION
TERMS OF REFERENCE / FINAL VERSION / S. Mallea 26.5.1999

1. Background

Until 1996 Kefa was a volunteer sending organization and the recipient countries of Kefa volunteers (later development workers) were Zambia (since 1987), Nicaragua (since 1989) and Mozambique (since 1991). The field administration of these programmes was organized with the help of local Kefa offices.

After an external overall evaluation of Kefa that was carried out in 1995, the scope of the programme was changed and a new concept of partnership was introduced. A two- year transition period followed, during which the Volunteer Programme was gradually changed into a Partnership Programme. New modalities of cooperation were introduced, such as direct institutional support, support to projects and support to South-South cooperation. The technical assistance (personnel sending) remained as one mode of cooperation among the others, but the number of development workers started to go down rapidly. The Partnership Programme has two dimensions: the South and the North and the activities that Kefa carries out as well as its cooperation with southern partners should all be integral and feed each other.

With the new programme development policy work was introduced to Kefa's activities and this was reflected also at the field level. New tasks were adopted in the field offices and changes made in job descriptions.

In September 1997 the Kefa Board approved the general criteria for the selection of partner organizations and projects. In the same document the Board established two types of agreements to be used for the work in the South : the cooperation and partnership agreements. The field programmes adopted rapidly the new concept of partnership and since October 1997 proposals for cooperation and partnership agreements have been submitted to the Kefa Board. One of the proposals brought to the Board has been rejected.

It is expected – according to the Plan of Action- that Kefa will have 7 cooperating partners in Mozambique, 7 in Nicaragua and 12 in Zambia, in 1999. The agreements vary from one to three years. The partner organizations are very different, from small indigenous communities to state ministries, from grassroot to nationwide organizations. Since 1996 Kefa has started cooperation with several new partners in a number of other countries. The administration of these cooperation agreements and partnership relations is organized in different ways, varying from country to country and from organization to organization. There has been an agreement that no more local Kefa offices will be opened, but that the administration of the partner relations will be organized by other means in these new countries.

In November 1997, the Kefa General Assembly adopted a new Declaration of Principles, which states, among others, that Kefa will have its own Partnership programme in the south also in the future. The strategic planning process has gradually started; in Mozambique and Zambia, the programmes have already adopted preliminary strategic plans. Kefa Finland is carrying out this process during 1999. The evaluation of the field administration is going to be used as one instrument in taking decisions of the future development and directions of the three field programmes.

2. Objectives of the evaluation

The focus of the evaluation is on the administration of the Kefa Partnership programmes in Mozambique, Nicaragua and Zambia. The evaluators should assess the administrative structures, resources and costs of the field administration. It is to be noted, however, that in Kefa's Partnership programme there are several postings that belong to the administration, by classification, but which include a lot of development or operational tasks.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

2.1. Assess the administrative structures. To assess the roles of and the division of labour between the Helsinki office and the field offices in the administration of the Partnership programme. To assess the bookkeeping, its functioning and the division of labour between the headquarters and the field offices. To discuss the possibilities of use of hired services in different parts of the administration.

2.2. Assess the resources of the field administration. To assess the number of staff in the field offices in the framework of the present Partnership programme. To assess the professional profile –the educational background and the experience as well as the skills- of the staff in the context of the nature of the Partnership programme and Keba’s present partner organizations.

2.3. Assess the costs of the field administration. To discuss the level of Keba salaries and other benefits as compared to those offered by likeminded organizations. A couple of local umbrella / coordination organizations are used as reference organizations as well. To assess the administrative costs of the Partnership programme in the framework of the whole programme.

3. Conclusions and recommendations

The evaluators shall present conclusions and recommendations on the basis of their findings. Besides the basic evaluation, it is expected that the evaluators will particularly consider various alternative scenarios for the further development of Keba’s Partnership programme in the south, and on the basis of these alternatives, make recommendations for the development of the field administration, which –as mentioned- are all hypothetical options at the present.

The evaluators shall consider the four following scenarios, as possible directions that the programmes could take in the future, and make recommendations regarding the administrative organization for each one of them. These hypothetical alternatives are:

1. The Partnership programme maintains its present (financial) volume, but the number of cooperating organizations will reduce to a few. The number of development workers will be small (or more or less the present amount).
2. The financial volume of the Partnership programme will go down and the number of partner organizations will be reduced to two or three, at the maximum, per country.
3. The Partnership programme will be developed towards a regional programme (Southern Africa, Central America, etc.), with partner organizations in several countries. The Keba

support will consist of institutional and project funding as well as a certain number of development workers.

4. The active role of the field offices in the development policy work will be strengthened considerably from the present. The work, which is not only through the partnerships with Kefa's local partner organizations, is very labour intensive.

In these considerations the evaluators may wish to take into account the various auto financing opportunities that the field offices could use in the future.

4. Methodology

The evaluators may propose the methodology they wish to use. However, Kefa considers it important that it were as participatory as possible. One part of the assignment is to be conducted in Finland. This includes at least the following tasks:

Preliminary study of documentation and administrative files;

Interviews with people who are involved in the field administration or who have a role to play in it, in Finland; at least the following persons should be covered by the interviews: Sisko Leino, Kirsti Koho, Marika Heikkinen, Sirkku Pallasmaa, Kristina Oleng, Eija Mustonen, Anne Romar, Sirpa Mallea, Riikka Kämppi, Folke Sundman, Juha Rekola (all from Kefa Helsinki office).

Interviews with representatives of Kefa's member organizations: Tuija Halmari, Risto Isomäki, Riitta Työläjärvi, Seppo Kalliokoski, Pirkko Rytönen.

Interview with Mr Antero Järstä, who is in charge of Kefa matters at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Department for Development Cooperation.

Statistics and data to be collected.

Another part of the assignment is to be carried out in Mozambique, Nicaragua and Zambia. The following tasks should be included:

Study of documentation, files and other relevant material;

Interviews with, at least, the following persons:

1. In Mozambique: Marjaana Pekkola, Filomena João, Francisco Santos, Nina Keres, Erja-Outi Heino, Helena Chivite (all from Kepa), Mr. Duarte (MICAS), Ms. Terezinha da Silva, Representative of UNAC, Cabo Delgado, Mr. Luis Silva of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Mr Juhani Toivonen of the Finnish Embassy.
2. In Nicaragua: Marko Lehto, Ligia Moreno, Mariana Vega, Maarit Nikkanen, Jukka Aronen (all from Kepa), Dr. Myrna Cunningham and Dr. Guillermo McLean (URACCAN), Ms. Marina Siles (MMSEDV) and Ms. Alejandra Centeno (Movimiento de Mujeres Paula Mendoza) of Siuna, Ms. Heidi Pihlatie of the Finnish Embassy.
3. In Zambia: Fred Brooker, Priscilla Mwiindilila, Patrick Chileshe, Kari Bottas, Tiina-Maria Levamo, Oliver Kanene, Sabina Luputa (all from Kepa), Tarja Helanen (DW), Ari Lamminaho (DW), Chipata Women´s Organization, JJCP, Mr Leo Olasvirta of the Finnish Embassy.

5. Timetable

The tasks should be completed within a period of approximately six weeks. Of this, one and a half week will be spent in Finland in connection with the preparatory work and interviews, three weeks in the field (one week per country), and one and a half week for compiling the report and debriefing in Finland. The final written report should be submitted to Kepa Helsinki office (Sirpa Mallea) not later than 31st of August, 1999 and the debriefing should take place in one month's time.

6. Reporting

The evaluation team shall present a written report of its findings and recommendations. A draft report will be presented to Kepa for comments, corrections and feedback before the final report is finalized. Besides the written report, the evaluators will also report orally to the responsible officers of Kepa.

The written report is mainly meant for the Kepa staff and Board, for the further decision making and strategic planning. The report shall be written in English using Word programme, and submitted to Kepa both on diskette and in paper version.

The verbal report and / or debriefing shall be presented to the Kepa officers in charge of the corresponding field programmes, the field director and the executive director (in Helsinki), the Kepa administrative committee and the field coordinators in Mozambique, Nicaragua and Zambia. The persons in charge may wish to organize debriefing meetings for a larger number of staff, with the evaluation team. The debriefing in Mozambique, Nicaragua and Zambia is to be organized once the evaluators finalize their stay in these countries.

The quality and standard of the final report shall be such that its publication is possible without any further editing.

7. Evaluation team

The evaluation team will consist of one or two evaluators. In case the team is composed of two evaluators, at least one of them should be from the South, but not from the countries of evaluation. Besides having experience in evaluations, both of them are to have experience from NGO work in the South, preferably in the field of personnel management, and at least one of them should be fluent both in Spanish and in Portuguese.

The evaluation team will present their work plan, timetable and lists of interviews to the field director of Kefa, prior to the field work, for the approval and discussion.

In Helsinki, 26.5.1999

Sirpa Mallea
Director
Development Cooperation Unit
Kefa

Veikko Vasko
Consultant
Vasko Architects and
Consultants

Annex 2: Mission Programmes

1. Nicaragua

14.6.1999(Monday) Flight Helsinki – Managua arriving at 20:45.
Met by Coordinator Marko Lehto.

Short discussion with Marko Lehto.

Hotel Casa Fiedler next to Kepa Office.

15.6.1999 Introduction meeting with Kepa
Nicaragua Field Office staff.

Interview of Information Officers Jukka
Aronen and Magda Lanuza.

Interview of Liaison Officer Maarit
Nikkanen.

Short meeting with Mr Benigno Torres.

p.m. Lunch meeting with Coordinator Marko
Lehto.

Interview of Development Worker Laura
Lager.

Interview of Accountant Mariana Vega.

16.6.1999 Meeting at Kepa Office with Marko
Lehto, Mariana Vega and Programme
Officer Ligia Moreno.

Meeting at the Embassy of Finland
postponed.

Interview at Centro Humboldt;
Partner organisation working on
land and environment issues;
Amado Ordoñez and Herman
Sanchez.

Working lunch with Ordoñez,

- Sanchez, Lehto and Moreno.
- p.m. Interview of Coordinator Carmen Maria Lang at APN, Norwegian NGO.
- Interview at Kepa of Executive Director Miriam Hooker, CEDEHCA; partner organisation working on human rights issues in the Atlantic coast region.
- Interview at Comité Costeña of Executive Director Ana Isabel Morales and Reverend
- Norman Bent; organisation joining forces of several NGO's operating in the Atlantic region.
- Dinner with Kepa Office staff .
- 17.6.1999 Ride by car to Siuna 05:00 – 14:00 with driver Pedro Obando, Ligia Moreno, MD Riitta Nikula and Moisés León (anthropologist, Costa Rica)
- Hotel Desnuque, Siuna.
- p.m. Meeting with MMSEDEV (Movimiento de Mujeres Siuneñas en la Defensa de la Vida) at their centre. Presentation of work, visit to the pharmacy of traditional medicine and to the herb plantation. Visit to a training site in a housing area (Improved stoves).
- 18.6.1999 Meeting with MPPMV (Movimiento de Mujeres Paula Mendoza Vega), presentation of work and organisation, visit to the Clinica Monserrat Huerte.

Meeting of Ligia Moreno with representatives of SIMSKULT, partner organisation working on land issues in the Mayangna areas.

Interview of Marina Araúz, literacy trainer of MMSEDV.

p.m. Visit at URACCAN campus, meeting and in terview of teaching staff of the university of the autonomous regions of the Caribbean coast.

Interview at CEDEHCA of Coordinator Jacobo Charles.

Visit at a suburban youth group assisted by MMPMV and Oxfam.

Working dinner with representatives of Oxfam.

19.6.1999 Drive by car to Managua 05:00 – 14:30.

Reading mail and documents from Marko Lehto.

Evening at Ligia Moreno's with Kepa staff and Dr. Lorenzo Muñoz, consultant (Kepa adviser in autoevaluation etc.)

20.6.1999 Review of documents

(Sunday) Meeting with Marko Lehto at his home.

p.m. Interview of Rector Myrna Cunningham, URACCAN at her home.

Visit with Marko Lehto at the home of Anneli Nivel of the Embassy of Finland.
Interview in a restaurant.

21.6.1999 Debriefing at Kepa office with the remaining staff.

p.m. Flight from Managua to Helsinki arriving on 22.6.1999 at 17:30.

2. Zambia

- 30.6.1999 Flight from Helsinki
(Wednesday)
- 01.7.1999 Arriving in Lusaka at 10:35. Met by
Coordinator Fred Brooker.
- Accommodation in the Guest House of Kepa
Complex.
- Working lunch with Fred Brooker; review of the
programme.
- p.m. Introduction meeting with Kepa Zambia Field
Office staff.
- Participation in 'Tikambilane', Kepa
Zambia discussion group for national
NGO's.
- Evening Interview of Ari Lamminaho,
Development Worker /ICRAF Chipata, on visit
to Lusaka.
- 02.7.1999 Interview of Information Officer Tiina-Maria
Levamo
- Interview of Administrator Alfonso Fransen,
SNV (Dutch volunteer foundation)
- Interview of and lunch with Rev. Peter Henriot
of JCTR Jesuit Centre for Theological
Reflection; partner NGO.
- p.m. Participation in weekly Administrative Staff
Meeting at Kepa

- Evening Dinner with Fred Brooker
- 03.7.1999 Meeting with Fred Brooker
- p.m. Interview of Information Officer Oliver Kanene
- 04.7.1999 (Sunday) Ride by car to Chipata 08:00 - 17:00 with Accountant Patrick Chileshe, Administrative Secretary Sabina Luputa and Executive Secretary Helen Banda of DWDA Chipata District Women's Development Association; Kepa partner organisation.
- Accommodation at Kamocho Guest House, Chipata.
- Short conversation with DW Ari Lamminaho.
- 05.7.1999 (Heroes' Day - public holiday)
- a.m. Meeting with DWDA Chipata District Women's Development Association.
- Interview and lunch with Kepa Administrative Secretary Sabina Luputa.
- p.m. Interview with Kepa Accountant Patrick Chileshe.
- Visit to two rural villages with Helen Banda.
- 06.7.1999 (Unity Day – public holiday)
- Ride by car to Katete (DWDA) and to Lusaka, arriving at 17:00 hours.
- 07.7.1999 Participation in monthly Programme Staff Meeting.
- Interview and lunch with Liaison Officer Kari

Bottas.

Meeting at the Embassy postponed. Evening Discussions with Fred Brooker at his home.

08.7.1999 Meeting with Chargé d'affaires Leo Olasvirta at the Embassy of Finland.

Discussion with Counsellor Markku Laamanen at the Embassy.

Interview of Development Worker Tarja Helanen /TEVETA at the Ministry of Science, Technology and Vocational Training; Courtesy call to Mr Frederick Chitondo, Project Director.

p.m. Interview of Country Director Peter Ferdinand at Mellempfolkeligt Samvirke MS (Denmark).

Interview of Kepa Programme Officer Priscilla Jere (officially on maternity leave).

Evening Dinner with Kepa Zambia staff members

09.7.1999 Presentation of preliminary findings to Field Office Staff. Discussion.

p.m. To the airport by Fred Brooker for flight to Johannesburg at 14:05 hours.

3. Mozambique

- 09.7.1999 Arrival from Johannesburg to Maputo at 20:00 hours.
- Met at the airport by Kepa Mozambique Coordinator Marjaana Pekkola.
- Accommodation at Kepa development worker dwelling at Coop Housing area.
- 10.7.1999 (Saturday) Working on Zambia notes.
- p.m. Working lunch with Marjaana Pekkola.
- Discussion continued at Kepa Mozambique office and dinner in town
- 11.7.1999 Review of documents.
- p.m. Excursion to Matola and Boane with Marjaana Pekkola and Kepa Information Officer Johanna Laine. Home museum of sculptor Alberto Chissano.
- Review of documents.
- 12.7.1999 Introduction meeting with Kepa Field Office staff.
- Attendance of regular Monday morning staff meeting.
- Interview of Programme Officer Filomena João.
- Interview of Finance and Administration Officer Francisco Santos.

Working lunch with Marjaana Pekkola.

p.m. Interview of Chargé d'affaires Jussi Toivonen at the Embassy of Finland.

Interview of Executive Director Carlos Fumo at FDC (Fundação para o desenvolvimento da comunidade), new central organisation of Mozambican NGO's.

Review of documents at Kepa office.

13.7.1999 Interview of Francisco Tembe, Coordinator of FAMOD /Forum of disabled people's associations), partner organisation of Kepa.

Interview of National Director Duarte Joaquim at MICAS, Ministry of Coordination of Social Affairs.

Interview over lunch with architect Viriato Tamele of Vox Sud and other NGO's cooperating with Kepa.

Visit to the Provincial Directorate for Coordination of Social Affairs in Matola with Development Worker Ricardo Menezes of Kepa/ MICAS. Interview of District Chief Felicio Cambongwe and Coordinator of ABC Programme Adelaide Nhantumbo. Visit to meet a group of parents and facilitators of disabled children in Matola.

Interview of DW Ricardo Menezes.

14.7.1999 Interview of Coordinator Eva Boman of GAS (Grupos Africa da Suecia, ex ARO), umbrella organisation of Swedish Africa Groups.

Interview with Marjaana Pekkola of Director

Ismael Ossemane and Vice-President Renaldo Chingore João of UNAC (União Nacional de Camponeses), partner organisation of Kepa in Cabo Delgado.

p.m. Interview of Country Coordinator Hanne Roden of Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke (Denmark) at MS office in Maputo.

Interview of Director Terezinha da Silva of UFICS (Unidade de Formação e Investigação em Ciências Sociais) at University Eduardo Mondlane; member of Kepa Field Committee and activist in Forum Mulher, partner organisation of Kepa.

15.7.1999 Interview of Information Officer Johanna Laine.

Interview of Secretary Helena Chivite.

Interview of Deputy Director Patricia McLaughlin of Concern, Irish NGO.

p.m. Oxfam cancelled appointment; discussions with painter Gemuce in his atelier.

Interview of Coordinator Bodil Wikman of LINK; Forum of national and international NGO's operating in Mozambique.

Farewell dinner at Marjaana Pekkolas home.

- 16.7.1999 Visit with Marjaana Pekkola to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, meeting with Deputy Director Luis Adelino da Silva.
- Debriefing with Kefa Mozambique staff; presentation of interim observations and discussion.
- p.m. Departure flight at 17:55 hours for Johannesburg and London.
- 17.7.1999 Arrival at Helsinki at 15:10 hours.

Annex 3: Persons met / interviewed

1. Nicaragua

Mr Marko Lehto	Coordinator	Kepa
Ms Ligia Moreno	Programme Officer	Kepa
Ms Mariana Vega	Administrative Officer	Kepa
Ms Maarit Nikkanen	Liaison Officer	Kepa
Mr Jukka Aronen	Information Officer	Kepa
Ms Magda Lanuza	Information Officer	Kepa
Ms Laura Lager	Development Worker	Kepa, Siuna
Ms Xiomara Lara	Secretary	Kepa
Mr Benigno Torres	Consultant	
Mr Lorenzo Muñoz	MD, Consultant	
Mr Amado Ordoñez	Coordinator	Centro Humboldt
Mr Hermán Sanchez	Agriculture Expert	Centro Humboldt
Ms Carmen Maria Lang	Country Coordinator	APN (Norway)
Ms Miriam Hooker	Executive Director	CEDEHCA, Managua
Ms Ana Isabel Morales	Executive Director	Comité Costeño
Mr Norman Benth	Reverend	Comité Costeño
Ms Marina Siles	Coordinator	MMSEDV, Siuna
Ms Imperatriz Mejía	Training Officer	MMSEDV, Siuna
Ms Marina Araúz	Literacy Officer	MMSEDV, Siuna
Ms Dolores Suazo	Group Facilitator	MMSEDV, Siuna
Ms Alejandra Centeno	Coordinator	MMPMV, Siuna

Ms Mirna Campbell	Secretary of the Board	MMPMV, Siuna
Ms Alba Luz López	Board Member	MMPMV, Siuna
Ms Nubia Gatica	Director	Clínica Monserrat Huerte
Mr Jaime Montalbán	MD	Clínica Monserrat Huerte
Mr Luis Perez	MD	Clínica Monserrat Huerte
Mr Jacobo Charles	Coordinator	CEDEHCA, Las Minas
Mr Fernando Espinoza	Deputy	CEDEHCA, Rosita
Mr Justo Taylor	Chairman	SIMSKULT
Mr Normand Davis	Technical Assistant	SIMSKULT
Ms Myrna Cunningham Managua	PhD, Rector	U R A C C A N ,
Ms Thelma Sánchez	Vice Rector	URACCAN, Siuna
Ms Marina Ramirez	Assistant	URACCAN, Siuna
Ms Jacoba Dávila	Coordinator /Gender	URACCAN, Siuna
Mr José Luis Saballos	Project Officer	URACCAN, Siuna
Mr Victor Zúnica M.	Coordinator / Environment	URACCAN, Siuna
Mr Octavio Rocha	Coordinator	IEPA – Las Minas
Mr Charles Grigsby	Country Coordinator	Oxfam Nicaragua
Mr Carlos Vargas	Fair Trade Coordinator	Oxfam Guatemala
Ms Minna Nikula	MD, former Development Worker	Siuna
Ms Anneli Nivel	Cooperation Secretary	Embassy of Finland

2. Zambia

Mr Fred Brooker	Coordinator	Kepa
Ms Priscilla Jere	Programme Officer	Kepa
Mr Kari Bottas	Liaison Officer	Kepa
Ms Tiina-Maria Levamo	Information Officer	Kepa
Mr Oliver Kanene	Information Officer	Kepa
Mr Patrick Chileshe	Field Office Accountant	Kepa
Ms Sabina Luputa	Administrative Secretary	Kepa
Mr Luke Kapisa	Administrative Assistant	Kepa
Ms Mary Mwanza	Office Attendant	Kepa
Mr Ari Lamminaho	Development Worker	ICRAF Chipata
Ms Tarja Helanen	Development Worker	DTEVT/FAMR
Mr Alfonso Fransen	Administrator	SNV (Netherlands)
Mr Peter Henriot	Reverend	JCTR Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection
Mr Peter Ferdinand	Country Director	Mellemfolkeligt SamvirkeMS (Denmark)
Ms Lene Jensen	Administrator	MS
Ms Helen Banda	Executive Secretary	DWDA Chipata
Ms Tangu Nyirenda	Chairperson	DWDA Chipata
Ms Elizabeth Njovu	Treasurer	DWDA Chipata
Mr Leo Olasvirta	Chargé d'affaires	Embassy of Finland
Mr Markku Laamanen	Counsellor	Embassy of Finland

3. Mozambique

Ms Marjaana Pekkola	Coordinator	Kepa
Ms Filomena João	Programme Officer /South	Kepa
Ms Johanna Laine	Information Officer	Kepa
Mr Francisco Santos	Finance and Administration Officer	Kepa
Ms Helena Chivite	Secretary	Kepa
Mr Jorge Massinga	Maintenance and Logistics Officer	Kepa
Mr Pedro Rungo	Administrative Assistant	Kepa
Mr Francisco Tembe	Coordinator	FAMOD
Mr Duarte Joaquim	National Director	MICAS
Mr Ricardo Menezes	Development Worker	Kepa / MICAS
Mr Felicio Cambongue	Head of Social Action Unit	Maputo Province
Ms Adelaide Nhantumbo	Coordinator /ABC Programme	Maputo Province
Group of Parents and Facilitators of Disabled Children Matola		
Mr Viriato Tamele	Architect	Vox Sud
Mr Carlos Fumo	Executive Director	FDC
Mr Ismael Ossemane	Director	UNAC
Mr Renaldo João	Vice President	UNAC
Ms Terezinha da Silva	Director of UFICS	University
Eduardo Mondlane		

Ms Eva Boman	Coordinator	GAS (ex ARO Sweden)
Ms Hanne Roder	Country Coordinator	Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke
Ms Bodil Wikman	Coordinator	LINK NGO Forum
Ms Patricia McLaughlin	Assistant Director	Concern (Ireland)
Mr Adelino da Silva	Deputy Director	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation
Mr Jussi Toivonen	Chargé d'affaires	Embassy of Finland

4. Finland

Mr Folke Sundman	Executive Director	Kepa
Ms Sirpa Mallea	Director, Development Cooperation Unit	Kepa
Ms Riikka Kämppi	Director, Policy and NGO Services Unit	Kepa
Ms Sisko Leino	Director, Financial Administration	Kepa
Ms Eija Mustonen	Programme Officer	Kepa
Ms Anne Romar	Programme Officer	Kepa
Mr Max von Bonsdorff	Project secretary	Kepa
Ms Kirsti Koho	Accountant	Kepa
Ms Tuija Halmari	Coordinator, member of Kepa Board	FIDIDA
Mr Risto Isomäki	Writer, former vice-chair of Kepa Board	
Mr Antero Järstä	Counsellor	MFAF
Mr Seppo Kalliokoski	Kepa Board member	Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Mission
Ms Pirkko Rytkönen	Vice-chair of Kepa Board	FAD
Ms Riitta Työläjärvi	Vice-chair of Kepa Board	Finland-Nicaragua Association
Ms Sirpa-Leena Tapaninen	Consultant	Tanzania Evaluation / Kepa

Annex 4: Key addresses

Kepa Mozambique

Ms Marjaana Pekkola
Coordinator
C.P. 4441, Maputo, Mozambique
Rua João de Barros 322
Sommersshield, Maputo
Phone +258-1-496004
Fax +258-1-496001
marjaana.pekkola@kepa.fi

Kepa Nicaragua

Mr Marko Lehto
Coordinator
Apartado postal #1093
Managua, Nicaragua
Reperto Pereira, Casa #1318
De la C.S.T. 2 c. al sur, 1,5 abajo,
mano derecha, Contiguo a Casa Fiedler
Phone +505-2-2663478
Fax +505-2-686898
marko.lehto@kepa.fi
www.kepa.org.ni

Kepa Zambia

Mr Fred Brooker
Coordinator
P.O.Box 36524,
1010 Lusaka, Zambia
165-171 Roan Road, Kabulonga, Lusaka
Phone +260-1-261124/261119
Fax +260-1-261126
fred.brooker@kepa.fi

Kepa Helsinki

Ms Sirpa Mallea, Director
Development Cooperation Unit
Kepa
Sörnäisten Rantatie 25
FIN-00500 Helsinki, Finland
Phone +358-9-584 233
Fax +358-9-584 23 200
sirpa.mallea@kepa.fi

Evaluation consultant

Mr Veikko Vasko
Architect SAFA
Vasko Architects and Consultants Ltd
Ilmattarentie 16
FIN-00610 Helsinki, Finland
Phone +358-9-7572718
Fax +358-9-7570981
vasko.architects@co.inet.fi

Kepa, the Service Centre for Development Cooperation, is the central organisation of some 200 Finnish non-governmental organisations working in international development cooperation.

As an integral part of its ongoing strategic planning, Kepa had decided to carry out an evaluation in 1999 to assess the administrative structures, resources and costs of the field administration.

Besides that, the evaluation was expected to consider various alternative scenarios for the further development of Kepa's partnership programme.

The evaluation was carried out through documentary studies, key informant interviews and visits to the three field offices and meetings with partner organisations in the respective countries. The evaluator, Mr Veikko Vasko, travelled to Nicaragua (Managua and Siuna) in June and to Zambia (Lusaka and Chipata) and Mozambique (Maputo and Matola) during the first half of July 1999. A draft report was circulated for comments in August, and finalised for a Kepa Board meeting in early September 1999.

See also 'Internal Review of Kepa's Liaison Services in Tanzania', published in February 2000

KEPA