**ANNEX 3**

Table 1: Staff member(s) responsible for grants within the institutional development portfolio, percent of time dedicated to work on the portfolio, and description of key tasks

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Staff** | **Number of Grants** | **Estimated time dedicated to the portfolio (%)** | **Key Tasks** |
| Daniela Aydin | 2 | 10% | * Institutional Development Perception Survey- design of the survey and analysis of the data * Manages two institutional development grants as lead reviewer * Provides feedback on eligibility recommendations |
| Edlira Majko | 12 | 80% | * Reviews institutional development proposals * Processes the grants in FC * Communicates with grantees and provides resources on institutional development * Undertakes field visits * Collects and generates portfolio data * Manages 12 grants |
| Mensur Haliti | 0 | 25% | * Provides strategic design * Provides feedback on proposals as support reviewer * Lead staff on community organizing modelling |
| Anita Czinkoczi | 2 | 5% | * Reviewed two grants * Provides feedback on reports |

*Figure 1:* Returning vs New Grantees

*Figure 2:* Expenditure Distribution of Grants per Grantee (Total portfolio $380,226)

Note: \*For CRIS and CESD grants include both institutional development and programmatic support; however approved amount mentioned in the chart includes only the institutional development component of the grant.

*Figure 3:* Proportion of OSF Funding against grantees’ budget for 2012

Note: \* The organizations included here are start-ups organizations which did not have an operational budget in their first year of existence. \*\*The organizations included here are organizations in their second (2) or third year (1) of existence.

*Figure 4:* Geographic Distribution of the Total Portfolio Budget

Figure 5*:* Duration of program relationship with grantees

*Figure 6:* Year of Establishment of Grantees

*Figure 7:* Annual Expenditure (2012)/Number of NGOs

*Figure 8:* Institutional Development Objectives

**Some of the Data from the Grantee Perception Survey**

*Figure 9:* How useful did you find the guidelines?

*Figure 10:* Perceived pressure to modify proposal

*Figure 11:* Importance of site visits for RIO institutional development grantees

*Table 2:* Why do you think it is important for RIO to visit your organization?

|  |
| --- |
| * *To become clearer about our filed and community operations, to see impacts of our work and to keep up with real developments and changes especially related to problematic and unstable political situation in the country.* |
| * *To evaluate on site the result of the activities that was proposed.* |
| * *to get feedback about the progress of the project and discuss new opportunities for the development of the organization* |
| * *This would help RIO to better monitor the activity of our organization and provide suggestion for improving our work* |
| * *To exchange information and views, RIO to better understands our activities and goals.* |
| * *to improve our work and to exchange best practices* |
| * *We think is very important because that is how we will show the results of our work, have external monitoring of the program, and increase the transparence of our organization* |
| * *Because can understand better the context in which is the organization developing. Can see the products of the organization.* |
| * *In order to develop more our planed aims* |
| * *whether we are moving in the right direction* |
| * *Because we would like to show them what changes have happened since the starting of the grant and because we want them to visit our targeted communities in order to know about the changes that happened inside those communities since the grant period started.* |