

Annex C - Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation matrix contains the evaluation questions, which have been structured along the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria (plus coherence) in view of the terms of reference for the evaluation. The questions were answered by applying the research methods detailed in the Inception Report. The means for answering each question is listed in the table below.

To ensure fulfilment of the task set out in the terms of reference, an additional table below lists the ‘preliminary specification of the main questions to be examined’ referring back to each of the Evaluation Matrix questions.

Criteria	EQ	Evaluation questions	Means of verification
Relevance	1	A. Intra-Denmark relevance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. How did the APP Phases I-III match the overall objectives of Danida as set out in prior strategy documents ('the World 2030 for Phase IV'). B. Extra-Denmark relevance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. How did the APP match Denmark's international commitments? 	A. Evaluation judgement of match between listed documents and Danida officials perception of match; B. Degree of match with Danish international commitments in the areas of peace and security.
	2	A. Regional/ Country level relevance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Did the implicit programme logic match the actual security and in designated regions of Africa? b. Did the implicit programme logic accurately describe the causal links related to APSA and AGA institutional developments? c. Were the resources adequate in relation to the objectives set in the programme documents in terms of theme, geographical scope and stakeholders? d. Did the partner selection match the objectives set out in in the programme documents for each phase? How were the partners selected? e. Did the APP allow for sufficient flexibility to remain relevant to the changing country and regional circumstances, including how the partner institutions evolved? 	a. Experts' analysis of security developments in Africa; b. Stakeholders' descriptions of institutional developments; c. Perception and degree of satisfaction of stakeholders ¹ of components meeting their objectives; d. Perception of stakeholders and comparison to other comparable organisations; e. Perception and degree of satisfaction by stakeholders of the flexibility of the component.
Effectiveness	3	A. Component effectiveness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What were the component outputs (Phases I-III)? 	A. Component effectiveness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. List of component activities;

¹ Stakeholders refer to partner institutions, Danida officials at post and in Copenhagen, and third-party experts (including other bilateral and multilateral donors).

Criteria	EQ	Evaluation questions	Means of verification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. How well did each component achieve its stated objective? c. What were the main factors contributing to the outcome? <p>B. Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How well did Copenhagen, embassies and partner institutions anticipate and manage context-specific risks? <p>C. Programme effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How well did APP achieve its stated objective? b. What were the main factors contributing to the outcome? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Perception by stakeholders; c. Perception by stakeholders. <p>B. Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evidence of analyses and contingencies built into programming. <p>C. Programme effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. List of programme outcomes; b. Perception by stakeholders.
Efficiency	4	<p>A. Cost effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Did the components and the overall programme achieve the outcomes with its allocated resources within the timeframe set out? <p>B. Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Communication: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. How frequent is the communication between the embassy and partner institutions? What is the quality of the communication? ii. How frequent is the communication between the embassy and Copenhagen? What is the quality of the communication? b. Reporting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Are the reporting requirements for implementers adequate? ii. Are the reporting requirements for embassies adequate? c. Level of authority: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Are decision-making and reporting tasks allocated to the most appropriate person in the project management cycle? d. Staff resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Are the staff resources (number, level, location) adequate for efficient programme management? 	<p>A. Cost effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Timelines and budgets. <p>B. Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Communication: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Frequency; perception of quality by stakeholders; ii. Frequency; perception of quality by stakeholders. b. Reporting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Perception of adequacy; ii. Perception of adequacy. c. Level of authority: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Perception by stakeholders; comparison to other (comparable) programmes. d. Staff resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Perception by embassies and implementers; comparison to other (comparable) programmes.
Impact	5	<p>A. Theory of change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What baseline was utilised to design the component and the overall programme? b. How did the MFA envisage change (theory of change)? What inputs would lead to what outputs? And what outputs would lead to what impacts (in the broader environment)? <p>B. Evidence:</p>	<p>A. Theory of change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evidence of data, context analysis, needs analysis; b. Evidence of an explicit and implicit programme logic (expected chain of results). <p>B. Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Perception of stakeholders; expert analyses/reports. <p>C. Contribution:</p>

Criteria	EQ	Evaluation questions	Means of verification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What changes have occurred in the environment targeted by the component and the programme? C. Contribution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What APP activities are likely to have contributed to the changes in the overall and specific environment? D. Overall impact towards APSA and AGA vision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Has the programme contributed to developing peace and stability in Africa? b. What are the unintended positive and negative consequences of the project? E. Future impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If the programme has not (yet) delivered any impacts, what are likely future impacts? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Potential changes and unintended consequences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Perceptions of stakeholders. D. Overall impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evidence of linkages between programme stakeholders and outcomes; b. Perception of stakeholders; reports. E. Future impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Forecasting by stakeholders.
Sustainability	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What mechanisms will ensure that the project will continue to deliver benefits? b. What financial and other constraints are likely to diminish a sustained impact? B. Resilience to risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How have the project stakeholders been prepared for risks? C. Ownership: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Has or will the intervention transfer project ownership to others? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Institutional capacity; ii. Physical assets; iii. Norms and processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Presence of alternative funding sources, organisational models that allow for continuation of project benefits; b. Perception of future capacity gaps. B. Resilience to risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Perception of project stakeholder's levels of resilience. C. Ownership: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Perception of increase in institutional capacity; ii. List of physical assets transferred/ to be transferred; iii. Perception of range of norms and processes that have been (or will be) transferred, adopted or developed.
Coherence	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Intra-Denmark coherence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. To what extent is there coherence between the various Danish instruments and policies, especially APP and PSF? b. Do formal or informal coherence mechanisms exist to ensure a comprehensive approach between and within the relevant Danish services? c. Did the APP allow economies of scales or ensure a comprehensive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Coherence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Perception of stakeholders; b. Evidence of internal Danish mechanisms (meetings, reporting structures) to ensure comprehensive approach; c.

Criteria	EQ	Evaluation questions	Means of verification
		<p>approach to crosscutting or transnational issues relating to peace-building?</p> <p>B. Extra-Denmark coherence:</p> <p>a. To what extent is there coherence between the Danish programming (APP and other instruments) and programming by other donors?</p>	

The terms of reference set out a list of eight questions, which served as a 'preliminary specification of the main questions to be examined.' The table below lists those questions while referring back to each of the Evaluation Matrix questions. This demonstrates that the Evaluation Matrix questions cover the scope defined by the TOR, while also ensuring that the evaluation methodology adheres to the standard OECD/DAC criteria.

Preliminary specification of main question		Evaluation criteria addressing ToR question	Specific EQ addressing ToR question
1	How have the main regional organisations (the AU, ECOWAS and IGAD) made use of the Danida funds in establishing and consolidating peace, security and governance architectures as well as specific initiatives and processes (e.g. capacity building)?	Effectiveness Efficiency Impact	3A a, b, c 4A a 5D
2	With respect to APSA, how has capacity strengthening of the regional organisations led to better conflict prevention, peacekeeping and resolution?	Effectiveness Impact	3A a, b, c 5D
3	Concerning AGA, how are the regional organisations making a difference in terms of good governance and addressing human rights?	Effectiveness Impact	3A a, b, c 5D
4	What has driven the selection of partners funded through the APP?	Relevance Effectiveness	2A d 3A a, b, c
5	How have the partnerships between the AU and the key regional organisations as well as between the AU and member states evolved since 2004 with respect to the effectiveness of peace, stabilization and governance initiatives?	Relevance Effectiveness	2A e 3C a, b
6	In the context of the multiple initiatives to tackle peace, security and governance problems in Africa, how has the coherence of the APP been ensured vis-a-vis support provided through the Danish PSF for specific operations, through bilateral programmes and with other funding streams (from other donors, notably the European Union)?	Relevance Coherence	2A c 7A a, 7B a
7	What roles are played by CSOs (think tanks) funded by Danida in the regional peace, security and governance architecture and how do these organisations contribute to conflict prevention and resolution as well as to improved governance?	Relevance Effectiveness Impact	2A c, d 3A a, b, c 5C a, 5D a
8	How can the leverage of the Danish APP be enhanced in terms of influencing the APSA and AGA and in	Relevance	The answer and

Preliminary specification of main question	Evaluation criteria addressing ToR question	Specific EQ addressing ToR question
terms of both funding and joint donor approaches with key organisations? ²	Effectiveness Efficiency Impact Sustainability Coherence	recommendation relate to all criteria in the evaluation matrix

² For example, strategic use of experts, ambassadors, special envoys, etc. might be considered, in concert with the EU and UN coordinated peace and stabilisation processes.