Terms of Reference for an evaluation of the international education programmes managed by the Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (Nuffic) on behalf of the Minister for Development Cooperation

6 April 2006

The evaluation and the Foreign Affairs Budget for 2006
Dutch international education policy as implemented within the development cooperation framework (policy article 5, operational objective 2 of the Explanatory Memorandum on the 2006 Ministry of Foreign Affairs Budget) is geared towards reducing the shortage of trained professional staff and permanently strengthening capacity in post-secondary education. The policy is driven by demand from developing countries. The Netherlands Fellowship Programmes (NFP) and the Netherlands Programme for Institutional Strengthening of Post-Secondary Education and Training Capacity (NPT) are the principal policy instruments. For 2006, budgeted expenditure for policy article 5, operational objective 2 is approximately €116 million, of which some €57 million will be spent on the NFP and NPT. The Explanatory Memorandum indicates that the NFP and NPT will undergo routine evaluation in 2006.

Background
Based on the findings of an interministerial policy review conducted in 1998, the Dutch government decided in 1999 to make radical changes to the existing international education programmes. At the time, there were four fellowship programmes (€24.5 million in total) geared towards reducing quantitative and qualitative shortages of trained professional staff in over 100 developing countries in the short term by providing training in the Netherlands. The Fellowship Programme for International Education Institutes (BIO, approximately €18.8 million) was designed for training at 14 Dutch international education institutes. There were also separate fellowship programmes for Dutch universities (UBP, approximately €2.2 million), student exchange (the Tinbergen Scholarship Programme, approximately €320,000) and special training needs (Special Fellowship Programme, approximately €3.2 million).

Three additional programmes sought to strengthen training institutes in developing countries through projects (€30.9 million in total). The Joint Financing Programme for Cooperation in Higher Education (MHO, €20.5 million) was characterised by long-term partnerships between Dutch universities and institutions for higher professional education and education institutions in developing countries. The Sail Projects Programme (SPP, €9.1 million) which was implemented by six international education institutes was designed to help boost sustainable development of higher education institutes in developing countries. There was also a third and relatively small-scale programme involving collaboration between Dutch HBO institutes and primary teacher training colleges in developing countries (HOB, €1.4 million).

The interministerial policy review found that available resources were being allocated to these seven international education programmes and the 14 BIO institutes by an inflexible method that had evolved over time. The findings led to the conclusion that the international education programmes needed restructuring in order to allow a more flexible system of government funding. In the future, resources would have to be allocated on a price-quality basis by an intermediary organisation. Furthermore, the programmes would have to dovetail more closely with the priorities of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and with the needs and priorities of partners in developing countries.
Based on the conclusions of the interministerial policy review, the government decided to phase out the seven existing programmes and to introduce three new ones (two fellowship programmes and a programme for strengthening institutional capacity), which would be run by an independent intermediary organisation. The new programmes would incorporate the following basic principles: a focus on fewer countries; better coordination between foreign and development policy priorities and a more demand-driven approach; greater flexibility and cohesion between the various international education programmes; and, in order to broaden potential supply and introduce a form of competition, allocation of grants to Dutch institutes on a tendered, competitive price-quality basis from among all the international education activities in the Netherlands relevant to the policy framework.

After intensive consultation with the chief stakeholders, in February 2001 the Minister for Development Cooperation sent a new policy framework to the House of Representatives of the States General (House of Representatives 2000-2001, 22541, no. 16), elaborating on the basic principles and outlining the remit of the intermediary organisation. Separate tenders were then invited from Dutch organisations to manage the two NFPs and the NPT programme for strengthening institutional capacity. Subsequently, on 7 June 2002, Nuffic was contractually engaged to run all three programmes for a period of four years.

In October 2005, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs decided to extend the management contract until the end of 2007, since the new programmes had been phased in very gradually and had only become fully operational in 2004. For this reason, there has hitherto been little information available about the results of the programmes. Moreover, time is needed for discussing possible adjustments to the policy framework in the light of new ideas on international education that have been put forward from various sources. In addition, possible interfacing with other Development programmes could lead to greater synergy. Nuffic and others have also put forward proposals for improving the NFP and NPT. In 2006, Dutch international education policy as implemented within the development cooperation framework is to be reviewed and, if necessary, amended. The process should be completed around the end of 2006. In 2007, the government will invite new tenders for the management of the international education programmes (in their current or updated form) with a view to having a new management contract effective from 1 January 2008.

Given these developments, the Cultural Cooperation, Education and Research Department (DCO) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is interested in analysing the advantages and possible drawbacks of the NFP and NPT programmes, and in the lessons learned. What have the various stakeholders gained from the new programmes, in terms of results, insight and experience? What has been achieved in terms of strengthening institutional capacity and reducing poverty? What sort of problems and limitations have there been? The evaluation may produce information that is useful for amending future programmes and setting up new structures for managing them.

The Cultural Cooperation, Education and Research Department envisages three primary target groups who could benefit from this evaluation: the Minister for Development Cooperation, Nuffic and implementing bodies of the programmes in the Netherlands and the South. The information, insights and lessons learned may:

- give the Minister a clear picture of the programmes’ modalities, their policy relevance, efficiency and effectiveness, and the way in which they are managed;
• provide the Minister, Nuffic and the institutions involved with lessons learned and recommendations for future policy, and for management and implementation of the programmes.

Description of current programmes

The overall aim of the international education programmes is to help reduce the quantitative and qualitative shortage of trained professional staff in developing countries, so as to build sustainable capacity within the poverty reduction framework (international education policy framework, February 2001) The main principles to be incorporated into policy are: a focus on fewer countries; improved harmonisation with broader development policy priorities; a demand-driven approach; greater cohesion between the various international education programmes; and, in order to broaden potential supply and introduce a form of competition, allocation of grants to Dutch institutes on a competitive price-quality basis from among all international education activities in the Netherlands relevant to the policy framework. (Information about the NFP and NPT can also be found at www.nuffic.nl).

NPT

The NPT aims sustainably to strengthen post-secondary education and training capacity in developing countries, so as to give them a better chance of generating their own training institutes and manpower in the longer term. The target group consists of organisations with post-secondary education and training capacity that are needed in bilateral cooperation sectors and in cross-sectoral or supra-sectoral fields (link with broader development policy priorities). Support may also be given to the post-secondary education sector in a more general sense.

In accordance with Dutch bilateral policy, the programme focuses on the group of 36 countries with which the Netherlands has already entered into a multi-year partnership. For the time being, the programme is being run in 15 selected countries (see annex). It is now operational in 14 of them, since activities in Eritrea were halted at the end of 2004, in view of the worsening political situation.

Ownership and a demand-driven approach are key concepts within the programme. The developing countries themselves indicate what their needs and priorities are in terms of support for post-secondary education and training capacity. Local stakeholder consultation structures play a vital role in identifying demand and setting national priorities. They indicate which sectors and/or cross-sectoral or supra-sectoral fields will be targeted by the programme. This is set down in a global action plan for NPT interventions, which specifies which higher education organisations will receive support from the programme. This need not be limited to education institutes. Other types of institution that play a key role in developing post-secondary education and training are also eligible (such as ministries, national committees and NGOs).

The organisations receiving support will work in projects with Dutch organisations, which supply technology and know-how. To this end they can draw on the entire supply available in the Netherlands. In order to match demand and supply as transparently and objectively as possible, grants are offered for tender on a competitive price-quality basis. Outlines for projects drafted by organisations in the South with Nuffic as facilitator are offered for tender to Dutch organisations.

Nuffic manages the programmes and, in close cooperation with the embassies, plays an important facilitating role in identifying demand and linking it to supply. Nuffic is also
mandated to provide project grants on behalf of the Minister for Development Cooperation and is responsible for external monitoring and evaluation. For each participating country, Nuffic gives a rough budget estimate, which can be fleshed out later to suit demand. The aim is to spend at least 50% of the programme’s funds on projects in sub-Saharan Africa. The DCO agreements with Nuffic are laid down contractually and include a budget and time-frame for the implementation plans to be drafted each year, project outlines, tenders and grant decisions. They also include agreements about monitoring, reports to the Cultural Cooperation, Education and Research Department (in the form of annual plans, and quarterly and annual reports), publicity and public relations.

An annual sum of €31 million is available for funding the NPT. However, between 2002 and 2005 the full budget was not spent on programme resources because some of the money was needed for phasing out the old programmes and starting up the NPT. Nothing at all was spent in 2002. Expenditure for the years 2003, 2004 and 2005 were €2.8 million, €13.5 million and €29 million respectively (source: Nuffic). By the end of 2005, 105 projects were being run in 14 countries. There were also 17 project outlines in preparation and 12 project outlines projects were at the tendering stage. A total sum of €4.5 million was budgeted for Nuffic’s management of the NPT between June 2002 and May 2006.

**Netherlands Fellowship Programmes**

The NFP consist of an academic programme for postgraduate (master’s and PhD) courses lasting at least one year (NFP-AP), and a programme for diploma courses and tailor-made group training courses provided partially or completely by Dutch organisations, lasting a maximum of one year (NFP-TP). The programmes aim to cater for short-term training needs and are geared to building capacity in a broad range of governmental, private and non-governmental organisations (education and planning institutions, government ministries, community-based organisations, businesses etc). The target group are graduates from post-secondary institutions who have been employed for several years. To be eligible for a fellowship, they must be nominated by their employer. The fellowship programmes are broad in scope and not confined to bilateral cooperation target areas.

The Netherlands Fellowship Programme is open to 57 countries (see annex). To give the fellowships a greater impact on capacity building, the grant system is linked to the institutional development of organisations in developing countries. Although fellowships are awarded to individuals, candidates’ training needs must be embedded within the institutional development of the local organisations they work for. The programme is characterised by a demand-driven approach. A new method of assessing demand is being piloted in a small number of countries. It entails identifying national organisations with which multi-year agreements are made enabling them to nominate members of their staff for an NFP-sponsored course. By the end of 2005, a total of 20 such multi-year agreements had been made in 8 countries. Depending on the results, more countries could be added to the scheme at a later date.

Tailor-made courses are only open to local organisations (individually or as a group) with a training requirement. They should apply through the Dutch embassies in their own countries. The fellowship programmes also offer scope for refresher courses for people who received training under the auspices of Dutch organisations at some time in the past. Refresher courses enable former students to brush up their knowledge and skills, and are designed to increase the impact and sustainability of previous courses. Applications for refresher courses can come from both developing countries and the Dutch organisations.
In order to offer the broadest possible response to the demand, NFP fellowships are available for the majority of international training courses offered by Dutch organisations (supply). The NFP-TP scheme covers international courses that do not confer degree status or academic titles, for instance existing diploma courses or individual modules for the master’s degree, and tailor-made courses that have to be developed specially. The NFP-AP scheme covers postgraduate master’s and PhD courses. Existing courses must meet certain minimum requirements, approved by the Minister, in order to be included in the fellowship programme’s shortlist. This list of approved courses is reviewed every year to enable a flexible and competent response to new developments. Refresher and tailor-made training courses are not included in the list. The Dutch expertise involved in NFT-TP courses need not be provided by teaching institutes. Other centres of knowledge such as research and training institutes may also offer short courses or provide tailor-made training.

Applications for fellowships for postgraduate degree courses and short diploma courses are selected as follows. In distributing scholarships account is taken of the total number of eligible applications and the extent to which the various courses contain a region-based component (flexible distribution of funds). Tailor-made courses may draw entirely on the total pool of expertise available in the Netherlands. For the best match between supply and demand, a grant tendering procedure is used, which involves a price-quality comparison.

Nuffic manages the programmes and, in close cooperation with the embassies, plays an important facilitating role in identifying demand, publicising courses, matching supply to demand, external monitoring and evaluation. In addition, Nuffic is mandated to act on behalf of the Minister for Development Cooperation in providing grants (in the form of fellowships) to Dutch organisations to set up and run tailor-made training courses or to enable selected applicants to attend the course in question. Administrative and logistic support is in principle provided by the Dutch organisation.

There is no question of pre-allocation to certain countries, nor is funding pre-arranged for the organisations with which multi-year agreements have been made. However, in its financial planning at programme level, Nuffic must take into account the multi-year agreements that have been made with organisations in the South. The aim is to spend a minimum of 50% of the programme resources on fellowship students from sub-Saharan Africa and to award at least 50% of the fellowships to women. The agreements with Nuffic are laid down contractually and include budgets and planning for annual number of applications and award of fellowships, list of approved courses, outlines and tenders for tailor-made courses, and multi-year agreements. They also include agreements about monitoring, reporting back to DCO, publicity and public relations.

In 2005, Nuffic received about 4000 grant applications for master’s programmes and short courses, while about 1000 courses were entered on the list of approved courses. In 2005, about 400 fellowships were awarded for master’s degree programmes and about 800 for short courses. Some 40 PhD fellowships were also awarded and 30 refresher courses were approved and added to the scheme. A total of 23 tailor-made courses were run. No programme resources were spent on the NFP in 2002. The expenditure for the years 2003, 2004 and 2005 were €9.95 million, €18.20 million and €24.30 million respectively (source: Nuffic). The total budget for managing the NFP between June 2002 and May 2006 is €4.3 million.
Aim of the evaluation
The aim of the evaluation is to provide insight into the development, management and implementation of the programmes since June 2002, to indicate any problems that arose and how they were dealt with, and to record results, both interim and final. The emphasis of the evaluation is on the policy relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the programmes.

Policy relevance is the degree to which implementation and results dovetail with the aims and basic principles of Dutch development policy and the policies of the country in question and the Southern partner. Efficiency has to do with harmonisation between the various tasks and cooperation between the partners involved. It includes matters such as failing to meet time and budget targets and balancing expenditure on managing the programmes against the results that have been achieved. Assessing effectiveness involves looking at the ways in which the direct results (output) have been achieved and how they have contributed to meeting the programme aims (outcome).

Core questions
NPT
The first part of the NPT evaluation deals with factual issues.
1. What developments have taken place since June 2002?
   - In the country in question, what processes were involved in identifying demand, setting national priorities and setting up an implementation strategy? Which stakeholders were involved, what was their role and what did they contribute? What role did Nuffic and the embassy play?
   - What processes were involved in setting up the project outlines? Who was involved, what was their role and what did they contribute? How did the stakeholders rate the quality of the outlines?
   - In practice, what processes were involved in the grant tendering procedure and procedure for allocating fellowships? In practice, what selection criteria were used?
   - Which budget was made available in each country, and how?
   - Which individual projects went ahead and what kind were they? (Specify name, aims, target group (Southern partner or partners), duration, country, geographical radius, sector, Dutch organisation(s) involved, budget, and region-based component.
   - How were the processes and results monitored?
   - Were there any problems? If so, what steps were taken by whom to solve them?

The NPT evaluation is heavily weighted towards the answers to the next three questions.

2. Policy relevance: to what extent do the processes and projects dovetail with the aims and basic principles of Dutch development policy and the policies of the country in question and Southern partners?
   - To what extent were these basic principles reflected in the international education programmes as formulated in the February 2001 policy framework? (harmonisation with broader development policy priorities, demand-driven, flexible, broader range of courses and price/quality comparison)
   - Were the stakeholders involved in identifying demand and setting priorities key figures in improving post-secondary education and training capacity in the countries in question?
• Do the management processes geared to identifying demand, setting national priorities, drawing up an action plan and drafting project outlines reflect the policy principles of ownership and demand drivenness?
• Do the action plan and the activities dovetail with the policy and plans of the country in question and the Southern partner?
• What proportion of the funding goes to sub-Saharan Africa?
3 Efficiency: were the processes efficient?
   • Did all the actors work together efficiently and were the tasks well-coordinated? (Nuffic, the embassies, the various parties in the partner countries, and the Dutch organisations)
   • To what extent were the DCO agreements made with Nuffic regarding the management of the programmes fulfilled in terms of achieving results and meeting deadlines? To what extent did these agreements contribute to the efficiency of the programme? If management agreements were not fulfilled, what were the contributory factors?
   • Have the programme activities been conducted to date within the projected time-frame and budget?
   • To what extent has monitoring been geared to results and process quality? What is being done with the findings?

4 Effectiveness: To what extent do the achieved results contribute to achieving the programme aims?
   • What insights does Nuffic have into the results that have been achieved and does it adequately update DCO about them?

NFP
The first part of the NFP evaluation deals with factual issues.

1 What developments have taken place since June 2002?
   • Specify the number of fellowship applications and awards per programme, the country, number of participants (male and female), name of course, name of employer, name of Dutch institution and region-based component.
   • Specify the number of multi-year applications and tailor-made training courses per country, the number of participants (male and female), name of course, number of employer and name of Dutch institution.
   • Specify the type of employers, candidates and Dutch institutions involved.
   • How were grant applications processed and demand identified for the various programme types? How was demand identified for multi-year agreements? Who was involved, what was their role and what did they contribute to the process? (Nuffic, embassies, employers, candidates and Dutch organisations)
   • Describe the way in which fellowships were allocated. What criteria were adopted for the various programmes?
   • Describe the procedures followed for grant tendering and grant allocation for tailor-made courses. In practice, what selection criteria were used?
   • How were the various fellowship programmes monitored?
   • Were there any problems? If so, what steps were taken to solve them?

The NFP evaluation should be heavily weighted towards the answers to the next three questions.

2 Policy relevance: To what extent do the scholarships and training courses and the processes leading to the award of scholarships dovetail with the aims of principles underpinning policy?
To what extent were these basic principles reflected in the international education programmes as formulated in the February 2001 policy framework? (harmonisation with broader development policy priorities, demand drivenness, flexibility, broader range of courses and price/quality comparison)

To what extent do the fellows’ employers play a key role in improving post-secondary education and training capacity in the countries in question?

Do the management processes relating to scholarship applications and identifying demand, reflect the policy principles of ownership and demand drivenness?

Does Nuffic have insights into the usefulness and relevance of the fellowships and/or training courses for the employers in question? What information is available about this?

What proportion of the funding goes to sub-Saharan Africa and to women?

3 Efficiency: were the processes efficient?

Did all the actors work together efficiently and were the tasks well coordinated? (Nuffic, the embassies, the various parties in the countries, and the Dutch implementing organisations)

Regarding the management of the programmes. To what extent were the agreements DCO made with Nuffic fulfilled in terms of achieving results and meeting deadlines? To what extent did these agreements contribute to the efficiency of the programme? If management agreements were not fulfilled, what were the contributory factors?

Have the programme activities been conducted to date within the projected time-frame and budget?

To what extent has monitoring been geared to results and process quality? What is being done with the findings?

4 Effectiveness: To what extent do the achieved results contribute to achieving the programme aims?

What insights does Nuffic have into the results that have been achieved and is it adequately reporting them to DCO on a regular basis?

What interim and final results (output) have been achieved so far? For instance, how many students have passed (output), and what have been the results (final or interim) of the multi-year agreements?

Supplementary questions:

1 Cohesion between NPT and NFP

One of the basic policy principles is to increase the cohesion between the NPT and NFP. The policy framework indicates that wherever possible, programme activities should be linked. What results have been achieved in this area since June 2002? Which actors were involved and what did they contribute? Have there been or can there be any gains in efficiency? Are other forms of synergy between the two programmes possible and desirable?

2 Lessons learned/recommendations

What lessons have been learned and what recommendations can be made regarding the programmes’ management, approach, sustainability and impact?
Parameters
The evaluation is to cover (1) the effects of the basic policy principles as put in practice in the NFP and NPT, and (2) the management structure of both programmes. The period to be evaluated is from 7 June 2002 to 31 December 2005. The February 2001 policy framework for international education and its basic principles do not, as such, come within the scope of the evaluation. A tracer study of the NFP will be carried out in 2007 and does not come within the scope of the evaluation either.

Available data
Certain data are available for the evaluation. They are contained in the Nuffic and DCO quarterly and annual programme-level reports on the NFP and NPT. In addition, Nuffic has access to internal monitoring data about NPT projects and NFP training courses (reports about the grant-assisted institutions and the monitoring outcomes) and to questionnaires completed by NFP fellowship students about the courses they attended. No NPT-related projects had been completed by the end of 2005. Most of the projects were still in the initial stages, so no final results are available yet. Practically all the NFP multi-year agreements had 2005 as their starting-date so they have not yet been evaluated. Equally, no evaluation or tracer studies have yet been conducted for the NFP.

Approach
The evaluators will compile an inception report based on an inventory of NPT activities and NFP fellowships and training courses. The inception report will contain an evaluation matrix (inputs, indicators and information sources) for both the NPT and NFP, a proposal for selecting activities and components for the desk and field studies and the data acquisition techniques. The work programme and an outline for the final report will also be included in the inception report.

Data will have to be gathered by the evaluator at the offices of Nuffic and at the Netherlands embassies in the countries where the NPT and NFP programmes are running. The plan is to conduct a lightweight digital survey amongst Netherlands embassies which will not substantially increase the workload at the embassies. A field study will also be needed in three countries, preferably Tanzania, Uganda and Yemen or Vietnam. This is a provisional list, and may be changed during the initial stage of the evaluation, depending on the preliminary findings and in consultation with the supervisory committee.

Evaluation team
The evaluator (the provider organisation, sub-contractors and team members) should not have been involved in implementing the NFP or NPT as programme managers, project leaders or instructors. The evaluator should have relevant evaluation experience, a sound understanding of capacity building and institutional strengthening in developing countries, good knowledge (and, preferably, experience) of higher education issues in developing countries, and organisational expertise. One of the team members should have sound knowledge of the Dutch language.
Supervisory committee
The evaluation will be conducted under the supervision of a committee that advises DCO about the quality of the evaluation process and the evaluation report. The committee will consist of the following individuals:

- an independent member (chair), professor Jean Berlamont of the Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium
- an independent member (representative of the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB)), Ms. Rita Tesselaar
- a member (representative of the Education and Development Division of DCO (DCO-OO))
- a secretary (working for DCO-OO), Hillard Tempelman

Nuffic will make data accessible for the evaluation, and will be asked to appoint a contact-person.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DCO) will formulate the evaluation assignment, and recruit potential evaluators through a limited bidding procedure. The supervisory committee will advise on the selection of the evaluator. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs will then appoint and contractually engage the provider to carry out the assignment, and will monitor the evaluation’s progress. The supervisory committee will conduct an introductory interview and comments, where it sees fit, on the inception report and any interim reports. The committee will also study the draft final report and give judgment on the quality of the evaluation process and report. It sets down its findings in a letter to the director of DCO, who discharges the evaluator, providing the external evaluation assignment has been completed satisfactorily and according to the terms of the contract.

The quality requirements pertaining to the evaluation are those set down in the Performance Data and Evaluations in Central Government Regulations drawn up by the Ministry of Finance. This means that the evaluation must satisfy the requirements for validity, reliability and usability. IOB regularly inspects the quality of evaluations commissioned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and has developed a list of indicators for testing validity, reliability and usability. This list can be obtained from IOB.

Budget and timetable
The maximum available budget is €136,000, not including Value Added Tax.

The introductory interview with the supervisory committee is planned to take place either on May 19 2006 or on June 9 2006. The inception report must be completed two weeks after the introductory interview. The supervisory committee will assess it within two weeks after receipt of the inception report. The draft final report must be ready no later than five months after the date of the introductory interview, and the supervisory committee will have two weeks within which to comment on it. The evaluator's final report must then be submitted within two weeks and must be in English.
### Annex: Lists of countries

#### NPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Country</th>
<th></th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NFP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Country</th>
<th></th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Palestinian Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Peru*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Rwanda*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ecuador*</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>South Africa*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Egypt*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Suriname</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Tanzania*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ethiopia*</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Uganda*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Vietnam*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Guatemala*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Yemen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Country with which multi-year agreements can be made
Annex 2: Responsibilities of the NFP and NPT actors

There are three levels of responsibility within the NFP and NPT:

1. **The Minister for Development Cooperation** is responsible for:
   - formulating programme policy
   - achieving the policy objectives of the programmes
   - financing the programmes
   - monitoring the progress of the programmes
   - implementing programme evaluations or having them implemented

2. **Nuffic** is responsible for:
   - achieving the aims of the programmes
   - competently implementing the programme in accordance with the objectives and basic principles of policy, and the management agreement
   - setting up a sound programme administration which facilitates efficient and transparent implementation and ultimately a sound use of resources
   - taking funding decisions, awarding grants on the Minister’s behalf to the organisations delivering projects and training activities, and arranging for implementation contracts to be signed
   - arranging external and independent evaluations
   - accounting (via quarterly and annual reports) for the content and financing of the programme activities
   - (only for the NPT and tailor-made training courses) appointing the members and secretary of the Tender Evaluation Committee, which is responsible for approving special project proposals.
   - The embassy is responsible for
   - Pre-selecting applications for NFP fellowships and facilitating demand indication for multi-year agreements, tailor-made training courses and the NPT.

3. **The grant recipients** are responsible for:
   - achieving the project or teaching objectives
   - competently implementing the programme in accordance with the project document or grant application
   - sound record-keeping and financial management
   - accounting for the content and financing of the educational or project activities by publishing a list of the activities and results achieved so as to show the extent of the grant-assisted activities and the manner in which they were conducted.
   - The fellowship programme participants are responsible for:
   - providing complete and punctual information
   - being willing and able to pass their course
   - intending to return to the own country in order to put what they have learned into practice there.
   - The participants’ employers are responsible for:
   - providing complete and punctual information
   - proposing suitable candidates
• being willing and able to allow returning fellowship students to put their newly acquired knowledge and/or skills into practice.