



ARTEMIS

Information Management

Since 1991

ORGANISATIONAL EVALUATION OF THE NGO WEGA AIDE HUMANITAIRE

In 2022, the Directorate for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs commissioned an organisational evaluation of 11 NGOs. Among these was WEGA Aide Humanitaire. The evaluation was carried out by “Artemis Information management s.a”. A summary of the main results is given below.

The analysis made and the recommendations expressed in this document represent the views of the evaluators and do not necessarily reflect those of the Ministry or of the NGO.


Evaluation carried out, for Artemis Information management s.a, by:

Violaine ALVES (Evaluator)

Marc ROURE (Organisational expert)

Sandrine BEAUJEAN (Quality assurance)

LUXEMBOURG
AID & DEVELOPMENT



Artemis Information Management S.A.

Share capital: EUR 93,750
RCS Luxembourg B36 326 – VAT no.: LU 18747036
Bank Account: BIL LU89 0027 1936 4368 6600
BGL-BNP PARIBAS LU42 0030 5011 9934 0000

27, Bld. Prince Henri
L-1724 Luxembourg

Tel: +352 45 91 45 - 1
Fax: +352 45 91 45- 71
Email: artemis@artemis.lu

Between November 2022 and April 2023, Artemis carried out an organisational evaluation of 11 Luxembourg Non-Governmental Development Organisations (NGDOs) on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs – Directorate for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Affairs (MAEE-DCDAH). These NGDOs included WEGA Aide Humanitaire. The MAEE and the NGDOs concerned were informed in advance of the methodology to be used during the evaluation, which included in particular a one-to-one meeting with the chairperson on the preliminary conclusions of the work, since it was not possible to find a date when the other members of the office could meet, and a meeting to present the provisional report to the MAEE.

WEGA was set up in 1995 and its first humanitarian activities took place in the Moscow and Tula regions. Since 2011, all WEGA's co-financed projects have been carried out in the Philippines, covering various integrated sectors. WEGA has not yet fully emerged from the critical organisational and financial situation it has been experiencing in recent years.

Organisationally, WEGA has seen a very high turnover in its committee over the past two years. A new committee has just been formed, whose members still need to get to know each other better so as to create a group dynamic. The formation of this new team and the arrival of a new president who has experience in other humanitarian aid and development NGOs has breathed new life into the NGO and it can now see the light at the end of the tunnel. Financially, WEGA lacks a communication and fundraising strategy; its financial resources are limited to the medium term, with few regular donors guaranteeing a sufficient regular income.

While the NGO's sustainability may be called into question as things stand, on account of its current organisational and financial capacity, WEGA has come up with some good ideas for the future and can rely on its president's network, in the private sector in general and in the world of finance in particular, to attract private funding.

The new team has launched a strategic planning exercise which was underway at the time of the evaluation. This exercise was carried out with a highly participatory approach.

The NGO suffers from a lack of learning and continuous improvement mechanisms, at both organisational and project level. The evaluation noted the new team's wish to learn from the past and to start over on a sound basis. WEGA is fully aware of its past weaknesses and knows that it needs to adjust its activities to avoid falling into the same traps in the future.

WEGA knows the Philippines well and has a firm foothold there on account of its president's experience and some members of the Filipino diaspora who are members of or close to the committee. On the other hand, WEGA's current committee still has limited skills for formulating, managing and monitoring projects, and knowledge of the general conditions governing relations between the MAEE and NGDOs is lacking. The NGO also suffers from a lack of clearly identified representatives to interface with its local partners and the MAEE, and to respond sufficiently quickly and efficiently to its partners' requests, which causes delays in the projects.

Partnerships are governed by agreements securing the framework of collaboration. Nevertheless, some partnerships in the North are subject to agreements that are limited solely to the financial aspect, while others provide for methods for the joint monitoring of co-financed projects, but do not envisage any possible synergy or the sharing of experience between partners. In the South, each partnership is subject to ad hoc agreements, without a standard model to ensure that all points are covered.

The many partnerships in the North are all opportunities for co-financing and pooling of resources. The evaluation noted a lack of capacity-building dynamics between partners and mutual dissatisfaction with the collaboration between WEGA and one of its partners, which is going to be resolved shortly.

In the field, the NGO also has plans to involve private sector actors to ensure the sustainability of its projects. However, the NGO has to define the criteria for identifying its future projects and partnerships

fairly quickly, as it has provided for in its strategic plan, but also needs to give itself the means to ensure a serious follow-up of projects so as to be more available and reactive for its local partners in the future.

In terms of the integration of cross-cutting themes, human rights are an enduring theme for the NGO. However, it is unclear how WEGA integrates this aspect beyond the good governance of local committees, and this requires clarification for the future. Environmental sustainability is a central focus of WEGA's activities. Gender mainstreaming is above all declarative, and it is not possible to assess from the project documents to what extent this theme has really been taken into account.

The evaluation identified two good practices with (1) a system of multiple co-financing of its projects and (2) the nascent idea of collaborating with a university or with the private sector, for example.

The evaluation put forward a set of 15 recommendations to the NGO WEGA, covering several main themes.

Regarding **strategy**, the evaluation recommends clarifying the NGO's name and aligning it with its development interventions, clarifying its strategy in terms of development education and starting out by implementing small self-funded projects before contemplating the submission of any co-financing requests.

Regarding **governance**, the evaluation recommends a better distribution and stabilisation of roles and functions among the members of the NGDO, and providing them with the tools needed for the success of their mission.

Regarding the **organisation of human resources**, the evaluation recommends defining a training plan based on the new objectives and mission defined for WEGA and finding a solution to the issue of the reporting language.

Regarding **financial capacity**, the evaluation recommends defining a communication and fundraising strategy.

Regarding **partnerships**, the evaluation recommends defining the selection criteria for partners (provided for in its new strategy), clarifying and straightening out the situation with a former local partner (on track), integrating the capacity-building dimension, improving communication with local partners and systematically drawing up partnership agreements in accordance with a standard model so that the obligations of each partner on all aspects of their relationship and of the project can be formalised in a balanced way.

Regarding **project management**, the evaluation recommends defining project selection criteria, identifying the person or persons in charge of project monitoring in Luxembourg, defining a project monitoring protocol, updating the project management skills of WEGA's members and ensuring that two important concepts of project cycle management, namely project monitoring and evaluation, are clearly separated.

Lastly, as regards **continuous improvement**, the evaluation recommends setting up systematic feedback and continuous improvement processes, concerning both the running of the NGO and its organisational model and activities.