Evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society

Annex E: Survey Methodology

March 2013

INTRAC International NGO Training and Research Centre
tana
indevelop.

Introduction

In order to gather data from a broad range of Southern CSOs in receipt of Danida funding, we conducted an online survey (a copy is included at the end of this document). The methods, data collection and data analysis strategy underpinning the survey were as follows.

Population

The population for this survey was southern CSOs in receipt of Danida funding in 11 countries (Bangladesh, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nepal, Somalia, Tanzania, Uganda, Yemen and Zimbabwe). These organisations receive their funding through a variety of mechanisms including:

- Danish NGOs including Framework NGOs, Programme NGOs and members of CISU
- Danish embassies in the selected countries
- Pooled (multi donor) funds in the selected countries
- Direct funding from Danida (from different departments)

All Danish NGOs, Danish embassies and Pooled Funds that receive Danish funding in these 11 countries, were asked to provide contact details for all the Southern CSOs they work with that receive Danish funding. We then sent the survey directly to these organisations.

An exception was 3F who sent details of partners in relevant countries, but not contact details and requested that they send the survey to their own partner organisations. Another exception was CISU who sent contact details for all partners of member organisations in the 11 countries but again requested that their member organisations be responsible for sending out the survey. The survey population therefore constitutes all Southern organisations that we received accurate contact details for plus the number of partners CISU and 3F sent the survey to. The population is therefore: **n = 1,062 (+ CISU and 3F partners)**.

CISU had identified 102 organisations supported by their Danish members in the 11 countries and 3F asked to send the survey to eight organisations. However, it was clear from one query we received from a CISU partner organisation that the survey had also been emailed to other organisations on their mailing list, which were additional to the organisations contained in the list originally provided by CISU (in this example it was a very new partner that was included). While this should not affect the results, it does affect the population.

Another potential issue is that the quality and amount of information we received from the different embassies and pooled funds varied. It was also impossible to find a correct email contact for at least one pooled fund which was on the list. Therefore some Southern organisations who receive Danish funding may have been excluded from the survey because we either did not know of their existence or were unable to contact them.

Sample

The survey was sent to all organisations, minus the 12 organisations who participated in the pilot, therefore no sampling was done. The total sample size following the pilot was **n = 1,050 (+ CISU and 3F partners)**.

Population	Pilot	Sample
n = 1,062 (+ CISU and 3F partners)	n = 12	n = 1,050 (+ CISU and 3F partners)

Survey design

The survey was designed online using Survey Monkey. While this limits the range of organisations able to complete the survey to those with email addresses, it was deemed necessary in order to process the number of responses expected. The survey was designed to give answers to key questions of the Evaluation Framework and to the expected mechanisms and outcomes identified by the Theory of Change.

The survey had five sections:

1. Identification questions (country, type of organisation, organisational income)
2. Questions evaluating funding delivered through Danish NGOs
3. Questions evaluating funding delivered through Danish embassies
4. Questions evaluating funding delivered through Pooled Funds
5. Questions evaluating Danida Civil Society Strategy (Strategic Goals 1 and 2)

All respondents were asked to complete Sections 1 and 5, and asked to only complete the relevant sections out of Sections 2, 3 and 4. As the survey was designed using Survey Monkey, this was achieved using logic questions. For example, at the beginning of Section 2 respondents were asked whether they receive finding from a Danish NGO. If they answered 'yes' they then be asked to complete Section 2 in full; if they answered 'no' the respondent would skip straight to Section 3.

The survey was available in three languages: English, French and Spanish. Translations were conducted using professional translators. Due to the limitations of the online provider used, three identical but separate surveys were designed, one in each language. Organisations received a link to the relevant survey depending on which country they were located in e.g. those in Burkina Faso received a link to the French versions of the survey and those in Bolivia received a link to the Spanish version of the survey.

Data Collection and analysis

A pilot was conducted prior to sending out the survey. The survey was piloted with 12 CSOs selected at random, of which five organisations responded, and was reviewed based on these responses. The 12 organisations included in the pilot were then removed from the list the final

survey was sent out to 1,050 organisations. CISU and 3F, who requested that they be able to send the survey to their own partner organisations, were then asked to forward the link to their partner organisations. As a result we do not know the total number of organisations that received links to the survey, which has some implications for calculating response rates (see below).

Of this number, two organisations requested that the interviews take place in Arabic. This was done over the phone using a translator. The data was then inputted into Survey Monkey alongside all the other responses.

The survey was sent out using five separate collectors: Framework NGOs, Programme NGOs, embassies, Pooled Funds and Direct Funding. CSOs were each assigned a collector depending on the primary category of funding they received e.g. those organisations that primarily receive funding from a Danish Framework NGO were placed in the Danish NGO collector. Each of these collectors used a different link, meaning we could monitor how many respondents replied from each category.

As mentioned previously, it was not possible to calculate an overall response rate for the survey as the overall sample size is unknown. This is because two programme NGOs (CISU and 3F) requested that they send the survey on to their partners, and although we had lists of the partners that should be receiving the questionnaire, it is clear from some of the subsequent queries that additional partners may have been included. Therefore we cannot be sure of the total number of which partners received the survey. We have the following data at the overall level:

Total sample	**Total uncontactable members of sample**	**Total returned questionnaires**	**Total usable questionnaires**
(1,050 + X[1])	199	485	273

However we can calculate exact response rates for four of the five categories (Framework NGOs, embassies, Pooled Funds and Direct Funding). It is not possible to calculate a response rate for Programme NGOs.

Categories	**Total sample minus uncontactable members**	**Total usable questionnaires**	**Response rate [2]**
Framework NGO	133	48	36.09 %
Embassies	115	37	32.17 %
Pooled Funds	429	101	23.54 %
Direct funding	7	2	28.57 %
Programme NGO	(167 + X)	85	n/a

[1] X = no. of individuals CISU and 3F forwarded survey to.
[2] Calculated as total usable questionnaires at Stage 2/(total sample minus uncontactable members).

The survey was closed on Tuesday 8th January 2012. Following the closure of the survey responses were cleaned using a two stage process:

Stage 1: Incomplete responses were deleted. Incomplete responses were defined as those that had just answered identity questions (Section 1) and not evaluative questions (Sections 2 - 5).

Stage 2: Inaccurate responses were deleted. Inaccurate responses were those responses where we can either prove or suspect that respondents entered data in the wrong place e.g. answered questions relating to Danish NGO funding when they should have answered questions relating to Pooled Funds. We used the following methodology to identify these responses:

Stage 2 Data Cleaning: Methodology

It was felt that it would be easier to find those responses that we knew were correct rather than those we either knew or suspected were incorrect. We used a multi-step process to identify these responses. At each step the correct responses identified were highlighted and given a code so that we could identify which step they were cleaned at. All responses that had not been given a code by Step 7 were deemed to be incorrect responses and were deleted. The steps used to identify correct responses were as follows:

Step 1: Answered 'no' to Q9, Q22 and Q34.

Step 2: Filter by Direct Funding and check (Where answered no to Q22 and yes to Q9 and/or Q34 and named NGO/ pooled fund.

Step 3: Filter by collector and select responses that answered 'yes' to relevant mechanism and 'no' to the other two mechanisms e.g. embassy collector, answered yes to Q22 and 'no' to Q9 and Q34.

Step 4: Filter by embassy and where said yes to Q22 and yes to Q9 and/or Q34 and named NGO/ Pooled Fund.

Step 5: Filter by NGO and where said yes to Q9 and no Q22 and yes to Q34 and named .Pooled Fund

Step 6: Filter by pooled fund and where said yes to Q34 and no to Q22 and yes to Q9 and named NGO

Number of usable questionnaires following each stage:

- Following Stage 1 we were left with **431** usable questionnaires.
- Following Stage 2 we were left with **273** usable questionnaires.

The survey collected a mix of qualitative and quantitative data. Data from sections 2 (Danish NGOs), section 3 (Danish embassies), and Section 4 (Pooled Funds) was extracted and compared using Microsoft Excel in order to compare the three separate mechanisms. Responses to qualitative and quantitative questions in Section 5 (on Danida Civil Society Strategy Strategic Goals 1 and 2) were disaggregated by collector (responses from Programme NGO and Framework NGO collectors were combined at this stage of the analysis). This enabled us to

compare and contrast mechanisms and make conclusions relating to the performance of each mechanism as well as overall.

Problems encountered

The primary problem encountered was that many organisations included in the survey did not know which mechanism they received their funding from. This meant that many respondents answered the wrong questions e.g. answered questions relating to Danish NGO funding when they should have answered questions relating to Pooled Funds because they were in the Pooled Funds collector. This meant that we had to delete a number of responses, which reduced the overall response rate of the survey.

The high scores achieved by embassies may have been biased by the high proportion of responses from Nepal and Uganda (37.3% of overall responses to the survey were from these two countries). However, actual response rates for these countries are comparable to overall response rate (the response rate for Nepal was 25% and the response rate for Uganda was 24.4%). This suggests that the higher proportion of responses from these countries is because they represent a larger proportion of the survey population, rather than more contact with the survey teams or more regular contact with Danida or the Danish embassies in these countries affecting the response rates within these countries as initially assumed. However, when data on embassies is disaggregated into responses from Nepal/Uganda and responses from other countries, it shows that results from Nepal/Uganda may be inflating overall scores for embassies quite significantly. This may be because of the high proportion of responses from these two countries and/or because embassies scored more highly in these two countries.

Strengths and limitations

Strengths:

- Strong mix of qualitative and quantitative data
- Good response rate spread across a range of countries and mechanisms
- Ability to compare results across funding mechanisms
- Captured views of Southern CSO in receipt of Danida funding
- Additional source of data, which allowed us to triangulate evidence gathered though case studies and interviews.

Limitations:

- As it is an online survey, only CSOs with an email address were included meaning views of those that don't have access to email are not reflected in the analysis.
- We were reliant on data provided by Danish NGOs, Danish embassies and Pooled Funds to establish the population. Therefore some Southern organisations who receive Danish funding may have been excluded from the survey because we either did not know of their existence or were unable to contact them because the data sent by the relevant Danish NGO, Danish embassy or Pooled Fund was incorrect.

- The number of CSOs the survey was sent to in different countries varies significantly. While this may reflect the different activities being funded in these countries, it may also be a product of the ability of different Danish embassies and Pooled Funds to provide us with data.
- A significant number of organisations did not know which mechanism they received their funding from, meaning that some respondents answered the wrong questions. Although this limitation has been mitigated through data cleaning and quality assurance, some caution is still required regarding comparative analysis of funding mechanisms.

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

Overview

INTRAC (The International NGO Training and Research Centre) is carrying out a review of Danish Government (DANIDA) support to civil society on behalf of DANIDA and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Denmark. This support is delivered through three funding mechanisms:
• Danish NGOs
• Danish Embassies
• Regional programmes and pooled or multi-donor funds

Your organisation has been selected to take part in this survey because it receives support from one of these funding mechanisms. It is important that civil society organisations in receipt of Danish Government funding are given the opportunity to participate in this review, and this survey is the primary means of supporting this.

The questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. The survey contains 'closed' questions (in which you click on one of the choices provided beneath the question) and 'open' questions, where you will have space to provide your comments. The deadline for completion of this survey is 21st December 2012.

All responses will be treated as confidential. The data and comments you provide will be fed back into the review on an anonymous basis.

Your organisation

1. In which country is your organisation located?

- Bangladesh
- Bolivia
- Burkina Faso
- Ethiopia
- Kenya
- Nepal
- Somalia
- Tanzania
- Uganda
- Yemen
- Zimbabwe

2. When was your organisation established?

- In the last 2 years
- In the last 5 years
- In the last 10 years
- Over 10 years old

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

3. Which description best fits your organisation?

- Community-based organisation
- Social movement
- National NGO
- Network
- Sub-national NGO
- Other

4. What was your organisational income in the last financial year (in USD $)?

- 0 - $49,999
- $50,000 - $99,999
- $100,000 - $199,999
- $200,000 - $499,999
- More than $500,000

Awareness of Danish support

The Danish Government (DANIDA) provides funding to Southern civil society organisations (CSOs) through a variety of different funding mechanisms, including Danish NGOs, Danish Embassies, regional programmes, and pooled or multi-donor funding mechanisms. You have been selected for the survey because you receive funding from one of these sources.

*5. Are you aware that you receive support (either directly or indirectly) from the Danish Government?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Awareness of Danish support - continued

6. Please indicate how many years you have been in receipt of funds from the Danish Government.

- Less than 1 year
- 1 - 3 years
- 3 - 5 years
- Over 5 years

Awareness of Danish Government's Civil Society Strategy

The Danish Government has a Civil Society Strategy, which aims to a) promote a vibrant, open debate on poverty

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

reduction and b) promote representative, legitimate and locally-based civil society.

***7. Are you aware of the Danish Government Civil Society Strategy?**

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Awareness of Danish Government's Civil Society Strategy - continued

8. Do you find its strategic objectives of a) promoting a vibrant, open debate on poverty reduction, and b) promoting representative, legitimate and locally based civil society, relevant for the context in your country?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Funding from Danish NGOs

The Danish Government (DANIDA) provides funding to Southern civil society organisations (CSOs) through a variety of different funding mechanisms, including Danish NGOs, Danish Embassies, regional programmes, and pooled or multi-donor funding mechanisms.

***9. Do you receive funding from a Danish NGO?**

- Yes
- No

Funding from Danish NGOs: Your funding

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

10. Which Danish NGOs do you receive funding from? Please tick all that apply.

- [ ] AC Børnehjælp
- [ ] Action Aid Denmark (Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke)
- [ ] ADRA Danmark
- [ ] Care Denmark (CARE Danmark)
- [ ] Caritas Danmark
- [ ] Danish Family Planning Association (Sex & Samfund)
- [ ] Danish Mission Council (Dansk Missionsråds Udviklingsafdeling)
- [ ] Danish Red Cross (Dansk Røde Kors)
- [ ] DanChurchAid (Folkekirkens Nødhjælp)
- [ ] Danmission
- [ ] Disabled People's Organisation (DPOD) (Danske Handicaporganisationer)
- [ ] IBIS
- [ ] Save the Children Denmark (Red Barnet)
- [ ] Sustainable Energy (Vedvarende Energi)
- [ ] Trade Unions in Developing Countries (Ulandssekretariatet)
- [ ] World Forests (Verdens Skove)
- [ ] WWF Denmark (Verdensnaturfonden)
- [ ] Other Danish NGO (Please specify)

11. Approximately what proportion of your organisation's annual income in the last financial year comes from Danish NGOs?

- ○ Less than 25%
- ○ 25 - 50%
- ○ 50 - 75%
- ○ 75 - 100%

12. Is the funding you receive from Danish NGOs restricted to project/programme funding or is it an unrestricted organisational grant?

- ○ It is restricted to project/programme funding
- ○ It is an unrestricted organisational grant

Funding from Danish NGOs: Capacity building

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

13. To what extent has funding from Danish NGOs supported your organisation to build its capacity? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

14. To what extent has the funding from Danish NGOs supported your organisation to build its capacity in the following areas? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Internal systems e.g. finance, HR	○	○	○	○	○	○
Leadership and governance	○	○	○	○	○	○
Monitoring and evaluation of programmes	○	○	○	○	○	○
Development of mechanisms to support accountability to poor and excluded groups	○	○	○	○	○	○
Technical skills and expertise	○	○	○	○	○	○
Organisational sustainability	○	○	○	○	○	○
Learning and sharing with peers	○	○	○	○	○	○

Funding from Danish NGOs: Advocacy

15. To what extent has the funding from Danish NGOs supported your organisation's capacity to engage in advocacy and influence policy and practice? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

16. To what extent has the funding from Danish NGOs supported your organisation to improve its advocacy in the following areas? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Increased engagement with and influence on local government	○	○	○	○	○	○
Increased profile and influence at a national level	○	○	○	○	○	○
Increased support for action by poor and excluded groups	○	○	○	○	○	○
Raising awareness of an issue	○	○	○	○	○	○

Funding from Danish NGOs: Networks and Alliances

17. To what extent has funding from Danish NGOs supported your organisation's capacity to participate in alliances and networks? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

18. To what extent has funding from Danish NGOs supported your organisation to improve its ability to participate in the following types of networks and alliances? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Alliances with other CSOs at a local or national level	○	○	○	○	○	○
Alliances with other actors e.g. universities, private sector	○	○	○	○	○	○
Regional and international alliances and networks	○	○	○	○	○	○

Funding from Danish NGOs: Management & partnership

19. How satisfied are you with the management of this funding? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not satisfied at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very satisfied").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

20. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding this funding source?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	N/A
The application process is clear and transparent	○	○	○	○	○	○
The funding requirements are easy to meet	○	○	○	○	○	○
The reporting requirements are easy to meet	○	○	○	○	○	○
The funding is flexible (budget lines can be adjusted according to needs)	○	○	○	○	○	○
The funding is provided in a timely fashion	○	○	○	○	○	○
We feel able to influence decisions	○	○	○	○	○	○

21. To what extent does this funding support leadership and ownership of development activities by Southern CSOs? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

Please comment

Funding from Danish Embassies

The Danish Government (DANIDA) provides funding to Southern civil society organisations (CSOs) through a variety of different funding mechanisms, including Danish NGOs, Danish Embassies, regional programmes, and pooled or multi-donor funding mechanisms.

***22. Do you receive funding from a Danish Embassy? (This includes the HUGOU unit in Nepal)**

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Funding from Danish Embassies: Your funding

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

23. Approximately what proportion of your organisation's annual income in the last financial year comes from Danish Embassies?

- Less than 25%
- 25 - 50%
- 50 - 75%
- 75 - 100%

24. Is the funding you receive from Danish Embassies restricted to project/programme funding or is it an unrestricted organisational grant?

- It is restricted to project/programme funding
- It is an unrestricted organisational grant

Funding from Danish Embassies: Capacity Building

25. To what extent has funding from Danish Embassies supported your organisation to build its capacity? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

26. To what extent has funding from Danish Embassies supported your organisation to build its capacity in the following areas? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Internal systems e.g. finance, HR	○	○	○	○	○	○
Leadership and governance	○	○	○	○	○	○
Monitoring and evaluation of programmes	○	○	○	○	○	○
Development of mechanisms that support accountability to poor and excluded groups	○	○	○	○	○	○
Technical skills and expertise	○	○	○	○	○	○
Organisational sustainability	○	○	○	○	○	○
Learning and sharing with peers	○	○	○	○	○	○

Funding from Danish Embassies: Advocacy

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

27. To what extent has funding from Danish Embassies supported your organisation's capacity to engage in advocacy and influence policy and practice? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

28. To what extent has funding from Danish Embassies supported your organisation to improve its advocacy in the following areas? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Increased engagement with and influence on local government	○	○	○	○	○	○
Increased profile and influence at a national level	○	○	○	○	○	○
Increased support for action by poor and excluded groups	○	○	○	○	○	○
Raising awareness of an issue	○	○	○	○	○	○

Funding from Danish Embassies: Networks and Alliances

29. To what extent has funding from Danish Embassies supported your organisation's capacity to participate in alliances and networks? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

30. To what extent has funding from Danish Embassies supported your organisation to improve its ability to participate in the following types of networks and alliances? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Alliances with other CSOs at a local or national level	○	○	○	○	○	○
Alliances with other actors e.g. universities, private sector	○	○	○	○	○	○
Regional and international alliances and networks	○	○	○	○	○	○

Funding from Danish Embassies: Management & partnership

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

31. How satisfied are you with the management of this funding? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. “not satisfied at all”) and 5 is positive (e.g. “very satisfied”).

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

32. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding this funding source?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	N/A
The application process is clear and transparent	○	○	○	○	○	○
The funding requirements are easy to meet	○	○	○	○	○	○
The reporting requirements are easy to meet	○	○	○	○	○	○
The funding is flexible (budget lines can be adjusted according to needs)	○	○	○	○	○	○
The funding is provided in a timely fashion	○	○	○	○	○	○
We feel able to influence decisions	○	○	○	○	○	○

33. To what extent does this funding support leadership and ownership of development activities by Southern CSOs? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

Please comment

Funding from regional programmes and pooled funds

The Danish Government (DANIDA) provides funding to Southern civil society organisations (CSOs) through a variety of different funding mechanisms, including Danish NGOs, Danish Embassies, regional programmes, and pooled or multi-donor funding mechanisms.

***34. Do you receive funding from a regional programme (e.g. Women in Africa Programme) or a pooled and multi-donor funding mechanism?**

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Funding from regional programmes and pooled funds: Your funding

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

35. Which regional programme or pooled or multi-donor funding mechanism do you receive funding from? Tick all that apply.

- [ ] HYSAWA (water & sanitation) (Bangladesh)
- [ ] Red de Participation y Justicia NGO Civil Society Network (Bolivia)
- [ ] Fonds Comun Genre (Burkina Faso)
- [ ] PAMAC (HIV/AIDS) (Burkina Faso)
- [ ] FONAENF (Alphabetisation) (Burkina Faso)
- [ ] Drivers of Accountability Fund (Kenya)
- [ ] Rights, Democracy and Inclusion Fund (RDIF) (Nepal)
- [ ] Foundation for civil society (Tanzania)
- [ ] Tanzania Media Fund (Tanzania)
- [ ] Legal Services facility (Tanzania)
- [ ] Independent Development Fund (Uganda)
- [ ] Democratic Governance Facility (DGF) (Uganda)
- [ ] UWASNET (Uganda)
- [ ] Strengthening civil society for improved HIV/AIDs and OVC service delivery (Uganda)
- [ ] Women in Africa Programme
- [ ] Other (please name)

36. Approximately what proportion of your organisation's annual income in the last financial year comes from these sources?

- ○ Less than 25%
- ○ 25 - 50%
- ○ 50 - 75%
- ○ 75 - 100%

37. Is the funding you receive from these sources restricted to project/programme funding or is it an unrestricted organisational grant?

- ○ It is restricted to project/programme funding
- ○ It is an unrestricted organisational grant

Funding from regional programmes and pooled funds: Capacity Building

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

38. To what extent has funding from this source supported your organisation to build its capacity? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

39. To what extent has funding from this source supported your organisation to build its capacity in the following areas? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Internal systems e.g. finance, HR	○	○	○	○	○	○
Leadership and governance	○	○	○	○	○	○
Monitoring and evaluation of programmes	○	○	○	○	○	○
Development of mechanisms that support accountability to poor and excluded groups	○	○	○	○	○	○
Technical skills and expertise	○	○	○	○	○	○
Organisational sustainability	○	○	○	○	○	○
Learning and sharing with peers	○	○	○	○	○	○

Funding from regional programmes and pooled funds: Advocacy

40. To what extent has funding from this source supported your organisation's capacity to engage in advocacy and influence policy and practice? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

41. To what extent has funding from this source supported your organisation to improve its advocacy in the following areas? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Increased engagement with and influence on local government	○	○	○	○	○	○
Increased profile and influence at a national level	○	○	○	○	○	○
Increased support for action by poor and excluded groups	○	○	○	○	○	○
Raising awareness of an issue	○	○	○	○	○	○

Funding from regional programmes and pooled funds: Networks and alliances

42. To what extent has funding from this source supported your organisation's capacity to participate in alliances and networks? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

43. To what extent has funding from this source supported your organisation to improve its ability to participate in the following types of networks and alliances? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Alliances with other CSOs at a local or national level	○	○	○	○	○	○
Alliances with other actors e.g. universities, private sector	○	○	○	○	○	○
Regional and international alliances and networks	○	○	○	○	○	○

Funding from regional programmes and pooled funds: Management & partnership

44. How satisfied are you with the management of this funding? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not satisfied at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very satisfied").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

45. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding this funding source?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	N/A
The application process is clear and transparent	○	○	○	○	○	○
The funding requirements are easy to meet	○	○	○	○	○	○
The reporting requirements are easy to meet	○	○	○	○	○	○
The funding is flexible (budget lines can be adjusted according to needs)	○	○	○	○	○	○
The funding is provided in a timely fashion	○	○	○	○	○	○
We feel able to influence decisions	○	○	○	○	○	○

46. To what extent does this funding support leadership and ownership of development activities by Southern CSOs? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not supportive at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "very supportive").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

Overall effectiveness of Danish Support to Civil Society

47. Please describe one key achievement that you would not have been able to realise without Danish support.

48. To what extent has Danish support contributed to building a representative, legitimate and locally based civil society in your country? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. "a great deal").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

If appropriate, please provide an example from your organisation.

49. To what extent has Danish support contributed to open and vibrant debate on poverty reduction? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is negative (e.g. "not at all") and 5 is positive (e.g. " a great deal").

1	2	3	4	5
○	○	○	○	○

If appropriate, please provide an example from your organisation.

INTRAC evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society: Survey of

50. The strategic objective of the Danish Government's Civil Society Strategy are to support a) a representative, legitimate and locally-based civil society and b) open and vibrant debate on poverty reduction. Do you have any suggestions about how it might improve the way it works to achieve these strategic objectives better in the future?

Thank you!

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey.