Q1. Does Germany publish the country strategy paper for the recipient countries?

German cooperation strategies for each recipient country are limited to documents outlining broad priority areas, broken down by sector. According to German Federal Ministry for Economic Development and Cooperation (BMZ) officials, German bilateral cooperation entails inter-governmental negotiations in which strategies for the future are developed regarding financial and technical cooperation. According to the BMZ website, the outcomes of the negotiations provide frameworks for a country strategy that is recorded in a legally binding agreement. However, beyond the outline of general priority areas, nothing amounting to a country strategy is publicly available (online) for any of the recipient countries. Thus, there is limited opportunity to substantiate the statements regarding this process. Country-specific details are listed below:

**Colombia:** Sectorial priorities are listed publicly in English and German on the BMZ website as well as being summarized in more detail in unofficial reports. There is also a separate regional strategy that is available for Latin America and the Caribbean, where an additional Colombia-specific strategy is listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liberia:** German strategic priorities are couched into a larger regional approach aimed at addressing clusters of fragile states. Funds allocated to Liberia are channelled through the joint Africa strategy on Fragile States in West Africa, but documents providing for a specific strategy for Liberia are not published.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nepal:** A country strategy paper for Nepal is only available upon request from the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. Generally, mainly descriptive information on Germany’s work and focal areas is published on the Internet. A strategy for Germany development cooperation is also available for Asia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sri Lanka:** Based on field and desk research, it is not possible to determine whether there is a country strategy for Sri Lanka.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. What are the main modalities used in German operations in the recipient countries?

---

1. Interview, Peter Hauschnik, GIZ, 14 March 2012; source applicable to paragraph description of process
3. [http://www.bmz.de/en/what_we_do/approaches/bilateral_development_cooperation/index.html](http://www.bmz.de/en/what_we_do/approaches/bilateral_development_cooperation/index.html); Information provided upon request by BMZ through the German Embassy in Colombia (22 March 2012).
5. Interview with GIZ official, Colombo, 21 March 2012.
German modalities in the four countries vary slightly, but the two most common forms of development assistance are: (1) financial cooperation administered through the German Bank of Reconstruction (KfW) and; (2) technical cooperation managed by several actors, though implemented primarily through GIZ, whose work is commissioned by the BMZ (as well as other German ministries). Projects are also implemented in collaboration with local non-government organizations (NGOs) as well as multilateral institutions such as the UNDP and the World Bank.

The findings for all four countries show that technical cooperation projects are always managed by GIZ in close collaboration with the relevant government counterpart.

Overall, German budgetary expenditures reflect a propensity for grants as a key feature of international cooperation. In the case of Nepal, Germany uses only grants, no loans. In addition, Germany contributes to basket financing and co-financing agreements. Germany has a clear policy in terms of modalities, which does not include budget support or loans to LDCs.

Financial cooperation and financing of technical cooperation, while jointly managed with partner governments, is generally not processed (i.e. disbursed) through national governmental channels.

Projects are carried out in three-year cycles. Project budgets are projected for all three years, but in reality fluctuate from year-to-year.

Q3. Does Germany have a policy/protocol on mutual accountability?

Germany does not have a uniform policy on mutual accountability, though there appear to be informal and or institutionalised protocols relating to mutual accountability in each recipient country.

Inter-governmental consultations mark a negotiation process that determines the scope of German cooperation in each country. However, broad program and sectorial areas are set prior to consultations through internal negotiations set between BMZ and the German Congress. Monitoring and evaluation protocols include a mid-term review with project partners, and at times, relevant government agencies (see Question 10). Several protocols are in place for each country, but the updating or mutual adherence to these goals or their respective principles is unclear.

Colombia: The drafting of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) takes place every two years through a series of consultations that includes the national agency tasked with development cooperation (Agencia Presidencial de Cooperación Internacional, APC), the Colombian Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well as German embassy, GIZ and KfW representatives.

Liberia: An MOU is drafted between relevant partner agencies, ministries and the German ambassador, which defines the respective role and commitment of each entity.

10 Interviews with German officials in Nepal, January 2012.
12 Interview with a German official in Nepal, January 2012.
13 Interview with a German officials in Nepal, January 2012.
15 Interview: Peter Hauschnik, GIZ, Bogotá, Colombia, Bogota, Colombia, January 2012
16 Interview, Peter Hauschnik, GIZ, 14 March 2012
17 Interview, Pilar Otero, Presidential Agency for International Cooperation (APC), 13 March 2012
Nepal: The government of Nepal has a Mutual Accountability Framework that defines its interaction with the donor community. It establishes clear rules and procedures to promote mutual accountability. In conducting the interviews, none of the development cooperation providers mentioned this specific framework. Rather, according to German representatives, the two countries have a bilateral, institutionalised protocol to ensure mutual accountability (although this information is not publicly available).

Sri Lanka: A formal policy and protocol is established by proxy through ‘project implementation agreements that are negotiated and countersigned by GIZ and government counterparts at each phase of the project. These documents are shared internally and are not made publicly available.

Q4. How are mutual accountability protocols determined and upheld within recipient countries?

Protocols and the monitoring of their implementation vary by recipient country, as outlined in further detail below. In general, German cooperation makes overt appeals towards mutual accountability which is one of the principles and indicators of the Paris Declaration commitments. However, desk and field research did not substantiate that this is occurring systematically across the four countries.

Colombia: German-Colombian negotiations appear to be carried out on a predictable schedule with relevant government and non-government counterparts. These negotiations determine accountability protocols for subsequent projects. The outcomes of the most recent round of consultations in January 2012 are publicly accessible on the website of the German embassy in Colombia. While consultations are the norm, there is one significant gap in planning for mutual accountability protocols. Funds that flow directly between the German government and German NGOs in Colombia are not accounted for in the government-to-government negotiations and therefore are not formally subject to mutual accountability protocols.

Liberia: Accountability protocols are not clearly outlined for Liberia as distinguished from the larger regional fragile states initiative through which most German cooperation is executed.

Nepal: Biannual rounds of consultations and/or negotiations take place. The results of the meetings are recorded in ‘minutes of meetings’ and are signed by ministerial representatives of both parties. However, the minutes are not published on the websites of the German development agencies. Based on the results of the negotiations, bilateral agreements and exchanges of notes are concluded to form the legal basis for the respective projects and program. Implementation agreements are also signed for the implementation phase

---

19 Interview with GIZ official, Colombo, 21 March 2012.
20 Internet search confirms this statement and interview with GIZ official (Colombo, 21 March 2012) validated this.
21 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (Paris: OECD, 2005).
23 The Nepali official of the MoF indicated that meetings are held with donors at regular intervals, but did not specifically refer to the process with Germany (interview, January 2012).
25 Written information provided by a German official in Nepal, August 2012.
of a program or project but these are not publicly available. These agreements are negotiated between both parties and outline the partner’s responsibilities and tasks.

Sri Lanka: Relevant line ministries both negotiate and countersign the ‘project implementation agreement’. Mutual accountability protocols are outlined in each agreement and do not follow uniform standards apart from Germany’s internal guidelines on monitoring and evaluation, in addition to benchmarking against the principal project implementation agreement. GIZ regularly reports to the government counterpart regarding project progress and funds spent. These reports include typically forward-looking projections on financial allocations (on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis).

**CATEGORY: DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION POLICIES**

Q5. Does Germany publish allocation policies and procedures for development cooperation?

||
| No | Partially | Yes |

Across all countries, aid allocation principles and strategies are designated first and foremost by the BMZ, enumerating broad geographic and technical priorities as well as the rationale for both.

Through the BMZ, Germany has set up a framework called ‘The principles of governing the implementation of development policy’ for its development cooperation. It consists of cross-cutting topics, to ensure alignment to the overall development strategy. Currently these topics include poverty reduction, promoting gender equality, participatory development and good governance, environmental and resource protection, crisis prevention, combating drug abuse, rural development and protecting tropical forests.

A catalogue of criteria serves to guide Germany’s development orientation. The catalogue comprises pro-poor and sustainable policies; respect for, protection and fulfillment of all human rights; democracy and the rule of law; efficiency and transparency of the state; cooperative stance within the international community. “These criteria form the basis for country-specific decisions of the BMZ (decisions regarding the volume of funds pledged, topics for government negotiations, priority areas of cooperation, etc.)."

In addition, Germany follows a set of design principles when it comes to policy design in a setting of bilateral, partnership-based cooperation. The principles include: participation, ownership and tailoring to local needs.

However, these policies and procedures are not published beyond priority areas of operation, and subsequent documents reflecting negotiated terms of implementation with partner governments.

Q6. Does Germany use participatory mechanisms to involve local/national stakeholders?

---

26 Sources consulted: German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, [http://www.bmz.de/en/what_we_do/countries_regions/asien/nepal/zusammenarbeit.html](http://www.bmz.de/en/what_we_do/countries_regions/asien/nepal/zusammenarbeit.html) (last accessed on 8 October 2012); GIZ (in German only), [http://www.giz.de/de/weltweit/378.html](http://www.giz.de/de/weltweit/378.html) (last accessed on 8 October 2012); KfW, [http://www.kfw-entwicklungsbank.de/ebank/EN_Home/Countries_and_Programmes/Asia/Nepal/Priority_Areas_of_Cooperation.jsp](http://www.kfw-entwicklungsbank.de/ebank/EN_Home/Countries_and_Programmes/Asia/Nepal/Priority_Areas_of_Cooperation.jsp) (last accessed on 8 October 2012).

27 Interview with German officials in Nepal, January 2012.

28 Interview: GIZ official, Colombo, 21 March 2012.

29 Interview with GIZ official, Colombo, 21 March 2012.


33 Claudia Hermes, GIZ. Monrovia, Liberia, 16 March 2012.
According to GIZ officials interviewed, Germany makes use of mechanisms that foster participation of local and national stakeholders in recipient countries, as well as domestic constituencies in Germany, either directly or indirectly. The nature of participation of both government and non-government stakeholders is elaborated in greater detail below.

Government: It appears that the broadest terms of cooperation, indicated by priority area, are first determined by German policy and subsequently presented for negotiation to relevant recipient government counterparts. Agendas include strategic interests such as the environment as well as normative interests such as human rights.

- **Colombia:** Government counterparts appear most engaged at the project-level, with increasing degrees of participation on larger flagship projects. There is little to no participation of recipient government counterparts in aid that is allocated directly from BMZ to German non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in recipient countries.

- **Liberia:** Government actors and agencies exercise participation through a regional council of 'fragile states' in West Africa that collectively contribute thought-leadership on regional projects undertaken with German technical and financial support.

- **Nepal:** All negotiations and consultations take place with the Government of Nepal, and it is the government’s responsibility to formally involve the parliament (which as of Oct 2012 is not in place) and locally elected government officials (which have not been in place since 2002). The contracts are made only between the German ministry and the Government of Nepal. At a project level, GIZ places staff members directly within the government organization to facilitate implementation and ensure feedback loops.

- **Sri Lanka:** Mechanisms utilized during project planning include joint needs assessment to identify priority areas. During project-implementation, participation is governed by project implementation agreements that are countersigned by GIZ and government counterparts during each phase of the project. Further, since country-level negotiations have been largely absent in Sri Lanka since 2006, negotiations are most visible at the project level. Further, GIZ staff members are permanently based within the counterpart government organization for the duration of implementation.

Non-Government and Civil Society Stakeholders: German cooperation initiatives appear to seek regular participation from non-government actors; most often those considered project beneficiaries. Participation of non-government actors can be more accurately described as the solicitation of input on existing project plans. Participation of these groups takes place after the initial terms of cooperation (including general funding, program area and time-horizon) have largely been determined at the BMZ headquarters level. For example, there are no open stakeholder meetings in Nepal with regards to the formulation of Germany’s aid policy in the country. According to GIZ officials, during the implementation phase, activities happen in close coordination with local partners in each country.

---

34 In the Nepal study, the question reads: Does (the development actor) use participatory mechanisms to involve local/national stakeholders in the formulation of its aid policy?;
36 See: Cooperación entre Estado y Sociedad Civil para el Desarrollo de la Paz (CERCAPAZ), website, http://www.cercapaz.org (last accessed 8 March 2012)
37 Interview with Claudia Hermes, GIZ, Monrovia, Liberia, 16 March 2012.
38 Interview with a German official in Nepal, January 2012.
39 This development corresponds to the launch of the large-scale overhaul of government development-aid management mechanisms. At that time, Germany cut down its development assistance to Sri Lanka almost by half. Interview with GIZ official, Colombo, 21 March 2012.
40 Interview with GIZ official, Colombo, 21 March 2012.
41 See: Cooperación entre Estado y Sociedad Civil para el Desarrollo de la Paz (CERCAPAZ), website, http://www.cercapaz.org/ (last accessed 8 October 2012)
42 Interview with a German official in Nepal, January 2012.
43 Interview with Peter Kluczny and Juliane Weymann, GIZ, Monrovia, Liberia, 15 March 2012; Interviews: Peter Hauschnik, GIZ, Bogotá, Colombia, January 2012.
Q6a. Do recipient governments use participatory mechanisms to involve local/national stakeholders?  

**Colombia:** Local and national stakeholders are involved in German-funded projects in cooperation with the Colombian government, including civil society, academics, and other public and private sector representatives. The Colombian central government facilitates communication with sub-national levels of government. However, since most German cooperation is implemented through the German technical operator GIZ, the Colombian government’s ability to involve relevant stakeholders is generally limited throughout the implementation process. Another challenge is information. While the country does have a series of measures that create channels for access to information, there is no single law or policy to guarantee relevant information can be accessed by individuals, NGOs and other actors.

No ☐ Partially ☑ Yes ☐

**Liberia:** With regard to inter-governmental participation, the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) forms the nexus for engaging with other actors around the areas targeted for development cooperation. There is a county system that fosters municipal participation in the strategy's creation. Each county has a county development officer (representing the ministry of planning and economic affairs) whose job is to work together with each respective superintendent (appointed by the president).

No ☐ Partially ☐ Yes ☑

With respect to non-state actors in Liberia, participation is touted as a central feature of aid provision to the country, though substantiating these statements was difficult. This may be due to the fact that citizens at large and the media still have very limited access to public data. A *Freedom of Information* Act is in place but its implementation is considered to be severely lacking.

**Nepal:** Nepal’s last official aid policy was completed in 2002. Over the last five years, the country has started on process of revising it, which provides insights into how the government is using participatory mechanisms to shape decisions on development cooperation. According to interviews with a Ministry of Finance official from Nepal, drafts of this policy have been circulated and discussed among various stakeholders, including civil society organizations as well as media, research institutes, universities and NGOs. The engagement of NGOs and businesses is particularly seen as necessary because the government is not able to cover all areas and delivery points for the plan. In the consultation, local governments have also been included (parliament committees, political parties).

No ☐ Partially ☑ Yes ☐

**Sri Lanka:** At the governmental level, the Department of National Planning engages a wide range of government counterparts in conceptualizing and outlining the priorities of national development. Line ministries and agencies are engaged in an on-going dialogue on how to align activities of development-cooperation as outlined in the *Mahinda Chintana*, the national development strategy. At the non-government level, the government has no formal consultation mechanisms with civil society players or other

---

44 In the Nepal study, the question reads: “Within the institutional framework, which participatory mechanisms have been put in place to involve the parliament, local government and/or non-state stakeholders in the formulation of (the development actor’s) aid policy”
45 Interview, Pilar Otero, Presidential Agency for International Cooperation (APC), 13 March 2012.
46 The strategy’s design is led by the minister of finance and includes a core team comprised by the ministers of planning and economic affairs, public works and defence. The team also includes the national coordinator of the Liberia Reconstruction and Development Committee (LRDC) Secretariat, the director general of the Liberian Institute of Statistics and Geo-Information Services (LISGIS) as well as chairs of the six cross-cutting working groups. Interview with Mr. Lee Mason, Acting Assistant Minister for Regional Planning, Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs, March 2012.
47 Interview with Mr. James Afif Jaber, County Development Office of Margibi County, Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs, March 2012.
48 Interview with Mr. Lamii Kpargoi, Program Director, Liberia Media Center, March 2012.
51 Interview with a Nepalese official, MOF, January 2012.
stakeholders. NGOs appear to be particularly excluded from the government’s decision-making processes, since the current governmental perception toward NGOs is not positive. There is no Right to Information law in Sri Lanka, severely limiting data access for citizens and the media and their ability to have informed engagement.

No  □  Partially  □  Yes  □

**CATEGORY: BUDGETARY PLANNING**

Q7. How much total development cooperation was effectively disbursed in calendar year 2011 for the recipient countries?

Information on total ODA is available for 2009/2010 in Sri Lanka, for 2010 in Liberia and 2011 for Colombia and Nepal. There are notable differences in the figures released by recipient governments, by the BMZ and those released as official development assistance (ODA) figures. Details on ODA per recipient country are listed below:

**Colombia:** According to the BMZ, US$ 42.08M was disbursed in 2011. However, this figure may not represent the actual disbursed amount in 2011 as reported by the Colombian government. Nor does it reflect the figure reported to the OECD and its Credit Reporting System (CRS): US$ 54.1 million. For 2012, the amount committed by Germany is € 59.75 million.

**Liberia:** Germany does not publish separate information on aid flows to the country on its site as its work is channelled through a broader fragile states initiative in West Africa. According to OECD statistics, US$ 50.1 million was disbursed in 2010. There are no figures for 2011.

Liberia’s Aid Management Unit reported that for the fiscal year (FY) 2009 to 2010, the commitment had been US$ 21.2 million, while the actual disbursement was US$ 17.9 million. These discrepancies in numbers could have arisen since a significant portion of German ODA to Liberia is channelled through a World Bank-managed trust fund as well as directly to NGOs, and for the latter, bypassing official development records.
Nepal: In 2011, the volume of German development co-operation (technical and financial cooperation) committed by Germany under intergovernmental agreements amounted to € 16.35 million. The start on one of the country’s programmes was delayed and consequently not all funds for this programme could be disbursed as planned. For all other programmes, all disbursements were delivered as scheduled. There are no project figures for 2012 from BMZ nor is the 2011 information available on CRS.

Sri Lanka: The External Resources Department (ERD) of the country reports a total of US$ 8.2M in foreign aid disbursements from Germany in 2009. The OECD/DAC database reports a total of US$ 34.4 million in disbursements from Germany to Sri Lanka in 2009 and a total of US$ 28.5 million in 2010 (as with the other countries, there are no 2011 figures on the CRS). The BMZ reports only the volume of projected commitments, standing at € 16.5 million (about US$ 21.6 million) on its website, though it does not publicly report the total of associated disbursements.

Q8. Does Germany publish forward planning budget or documents for the institutions they fund in the recipient countries for the next three years?

The German Ministry of Finance publishes its domestic budget for development cooperation (in German). Figures for development co-operation are disclosed both in this budget and the accompanying financial plan (including projections until 2015).

For its activities within specific countries, Germany does not exhibit a uniform policy with respect to the public availability of such forward budget planning. For Sri Lanka and Liberia, projections are only available for periods ranging from one to four years, expressed through private written or verbal commitments. Germany’s forward planning documents for Colombia are published. More details for each country are described below:

Colombia: Colombia is the only country for which Germany publishes a forward planning budget and financial plan. However, actual budget disbursements have fluctuated, sometimes significantly, when measured against original planning documents. There are several possible explanations that can account for these differences. Part of the cause may be a mis-match in policies. German policy prohibits implementers such as

---

68 Figures for commitments and disbursements may not be compared because commitments are always for a future multi year period, whereas disbursements are calculated retrospective on an annual basis.
70 Interviews with German officials in Nepal, January 2012. Actual figures for 2011 will be published in the OECD data set in 2013.
71 CRS and BMZ sites accessed on 8 October 2012.
73 Volume of German development cooperation per annum is defined as “funds for development cooperation per year (technical and financial cooperation) committed by Germany under intergovernmental agreements.” “Sri Lanka, Country Information,” BMZ, http://www.bmz.de/en/what_we_do/countries_regions/asien/sri_lanka/profile.html.
74 For this question in Nepal, the phrasing was “Does Germany publish the total development budget for the next three years, as submitted to parliament?”
GIZ from publishing a breakdown of aid expenditures in Colombia. According to GIZ representatives, a breakdown of aid expenditures is, however, mandatory to publish in Germany for purposes of domestic accountability.79

Liberia: There is no publicly available forward planning budget document. It appears that annual budgetary negotiations and commitments represent the extent of forward planning.80

Nepal: A forward planning budget can neither be found specifically for Nepal, nor for individual institutions or on a per-year basis.

Sri Lanka: While there is no comprehensive forward planning budget document made publicly available, there are budgets for some multi-year projects articulated in advance, accompanied by a timeframe and commitment of funds.81 Individual project offices also provide budgetary details on request.82 The 2011 ERD report, available online, provides a list of current German projects being negotiated for implementation between 2011 and 2014, for a cumulative amount of US$ 1 billion.83 Germany has outlined projects to be implemented on or after the year 2014.84

Q9. Does Germany monitor and evaluate the implementation of operations?85

Both GIZ and BMZ have clearly stated policies on their monitoring and evaluation policies.86 Germany’s monitoring and evaluation practices are concentrated at the project-level, as opposed to the national-level, in these four recipient countries.

Germany’s national-level evaluations are sparse in both Liberia and Sri Lanka.87 In Colombia, Germany conducts national-level evaluations by sectorial priority areas (i.e. peace development, environment, and sustainable development). It is difficult to assess the nature, scope and frequency of these national M&E practices given that they are not publicly available and the BMZ headquarters manages the process with participation from Colombia’s cooperation agency APC.88

It appears that German M&E practices at the local level are fairly rigorous, and conducted at interim as well as final phases for larger projects.89 These evaluations are conducted through third party auditors in cooperation with GIZ, or independently, with oversight from BMZ. Records and the executive summaries are

79 Interview, Peter Hauschnik, GIZ, 13 January 2012
80 Interview with Claudia Hermes, GIZ, Monrovia, Liberia, 16 March 2012.
81 Interview with GIZ official, Colombo, 21 March 2012.
82 Ibid.
84 Information based as of March 2012.
85 In the questionnaire for Nepal, this read: “Does Germany monitor the implementation of operations?”
87 Interview with Peter Kucznz and Juliane Weymann, GIZ. Monrovia, Liberia. 15 March 2012; Interview with Jasper Cummeh, Agenda for Development Action. Monrovia, Liberia. 16 March 2012; In Sri Lanka, without a uniform country strategy, in theory, evaluation of country-level initiatives or priorities cannot be undertaken.
88 Interview, Pilar Otero, Presidential Agency for International Cooperation (APC), 13 March 2012
89 Arturo Gomez, Presidential Agency for International Cooperation (APC), 14 March 2012; Interview, Philipp Schönrock, Director, CEPEI, 15 March 2012
published through the Parliament by BMZ, many of which are in English, for the German public. Full reports, written mostly in German, are available upon request. M&E procedures are used to track progress against original benchmarks, not to elaborate on broad outcomes or consequences of project-implementation.

While most of the evaluations are undertaken under the sole responsibility of the BMZ, evaluations are increasingly being undertaken as a joint effort with other donor countries and partners that subsequently share management tasks and financing. Moving forward, German officials indicated that an increased emphasis would be placed on supporting partner countries’ capacity for results-oriented performance monitoring as well as on continuing to align Germany’s own capacity for doing the same. According to GIZ officials, results of evaluations are utilized as feedback for the assessment of future projects. Greater insights into M&E practices in each recipient country are shared below:

Liberia: Project processes are reviewed twice a year along a three-year project cycle, with evaluations conducted externally and final recommendations conceived by the BMZ headquarters.

Colombia: Evaluation and auditing policies are enumerated on the BMZ website. APC also engages in continuous ‘assessments’ of German-funded projects, but does not directly participate in the M&E process at the micro-level.

Nepal: Financial monitoring of programmes is done continuously and according to the budgetary planning processes. Impact monitoring generally depends on the established structures and on how well these work. It is mostly done as a joint enterprise with the Nepali government, depending on the project organisation in the specific sectors. In practice, baseline studies are conducted and the impact chain is monitored over the course of implementation. The studies are typically not published on the websites of the German development agencies.

Sri Lanka: GIZ-supported projects undergo evaluations at both the mid-term and final stages of project-implementation. M&E processes are reported to include baseline data as well as assessments measured against that data. It appears that the results of those evaluations serve to guide the design of the future projects, though it is difficult to verify the degree to which this takes place.

Q10. Does Germany publish the evaluations of its aid programs in recipient countries?

90 Interviews: Peter Hauschnik, GIZ, Colombia, January 2012.
91 Interview with Claudia Hermes, GIZ, Monrovia, Liberia, 16 March 2012.
92 E-mail correspondence, Claudia Hermes, GIZ, Liberia, 26 July 2012.
95 Ibid.; Interview with Claudia Hermes, GIZ, Monrovia, Liberia, March 2012.
96 Interview, Pilar Otero, Presidential Agency for International Cooperation (APC), 13 March 2012.
98 Ibid.
99 Interviews with German officials in Nepal, January 2012.
100 Ibid.
102 Interview with GIZ official, Colombo, 21 March 2012.
103 In the Nepal study, the question reads: “Does (the development actor) publish its annual audit of its aid programs in Nepal?”
Colombia: Germany publishes some of its evaluations, complete with results achieved to date, for ongoing projects. Summaries of these evaluations are published online in German and often in English. However, full evaluation reports of projects are not published. Moreover, BMZ indicated that there is no public forum for sharing M&E results in Colombia.

For flagship projects that are framed in terms of cooperation between the state and civil society, project progress and results are nominally discussed within a public forum aimed at relevant stakeholders. M&E results and associated discussions are redirected internally towards stimulating dialogue and learning at the supervisory and project management levels.

Liberia: Annual reports are published on project level activities for GIZ at the regional level and progress is shared with relevant ministries. Evaluations are available in English within the programs themselves, and both internal and external evaluations are presented and discussed with Liberian partners. However, this information is not publicly available. Post-project debriefs are conducted through stakeholder interviews with various project participants, partners and beneficiaries.

Nepal: Information on annual audits of Germany’s aid programs is not publicly available. A thorough desk research confirms these findings. The findings also correspond to the results of the PWYF monitoring survey 2012.

Sri Lanka: Executive summaries of BMZ evaluations dating back to 2005 are available. GIZ officials interviewed stated that evaluation results are regularly shared and discussed with non-state actors to solicit feedback on project progress and impact, particularly at the interim stage. Most often, however, this discussion involves direct project stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Q11. How are disagreements dealt with between Germany and recipient countries?

German protocols for addressing disagreements differ in each recipient country. None are publicly available.

Colombia: Diverging approaches to policy or cooperation are resolved through a consensus-building process with APC at the helm. Furthermore, Colombian representatives emphasized that in these cases, cooperation is easily fostered as a result of the long-term tenure of individual Colombian and German counterparts.

Liberia: According to those interviewed, disagreements are infrequent. Rather, they were framed as concerns around the availability of funds committed and the process of project re-evaluation that occurs in those scenarios. Further interviews also indicated that issues arise related to ownership, when Liberian partners may have felt disenfranchised. However, neither anecdotal process, nor official protocol around resolving these differences was enumerated in any further detail.


106 Information provided upon request by BMZ through the German Embassy in Colombia (22 March 2012); also not available upon searching the BMZ evaluation database: [http://www.bmz.de/en/publications/type_of_publication/evaluation/index.html](http://www.bmz.de/en/publications/type_of_publication/evaluation/index.html).

107 Information provided upon request by BMZ through the German Embassy in Colombia (22 March 2012).


110 E-mail correspondence, Claudia Hermes, GIZ, Liberia, 26 July 2012.

111 Interview with Claudia Hermes, GIZ, Monrovia, Liberia, 26 July 2012.

112 Interview with Claudia Hermes, GIZ, Monrovia, Liberia, 16 March 2012.

113 Interviews with German officials in Nepal, January 2012.

114 Full reports are available upon request through usually in German except for international joint evaluations.

115 Interview with GIZ official, Colombo, March 2012.

116 Interview, Pilar Otero, Presidential Agency for International Cooperation (APC), 13 March 2012

117 Ibid.

118 Interview with Claudia Hermes, GIZ, Monrovia, Liberia, 16 March 2012.
Nepal: Disagreements between Germany and its Nepali counterparts are rare and usually are related to the pace of project implementation. There is no publicly available policy that sets out a standardized procedure to deal with disagreements or conflicts. In the case of disagreement, matters are discussed and negotiated. It would likely escalate along the hierarchy lines on both sides.

Sri Lanka: The practice of embedding a full-time GIZ staff person directly into counterpart ministries serves a number of purposes, one of which is to mitigate the potential for disputes before they arise. This contributes to a relatively equal relationship in resolving any friction – having arisen in the past for banal reasons including delays in project completion.

---

118 Ibid. The fact that disagreements are rare was corroborated in an interview with a Nepalese official, MoF, January 2012.
119 Interview with GIZ official, Colombo, March 2012.
120 Ibid.