

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Danish collaboration with multilateral organizations in partner countries

1. Background

Danish multilateral development assistance has recently been analyzed in various studies. These analyses show that Danish development assistance to and through multilateral organizations constitutes an increasing share of Danish development assistance, and that there is a trend away from core to various forms of multi-bi contributions. This trend is not only visible within humanitarian aid, but also in other sectors, and in different Danish partner countries. In 2018, almost half of the Danish multilateral contribution was provided as multi-bi¹. A similar trend can be found in other DAC countries².

Multi-bi funding is usually understood as earmarked contributions channeled through multilateral organizations, and in OECD's Creditor Reporting System overall distinctions can be made between 'Programmatic' and 'Project-type', and between 'Country-specific' and 'Global, regional or sub-regional' earmarked funding to the multilateral system³.

There exists a number of analyses of the background and reasons for delegation of aid to multilateral organizations⁴. A related literature is concerned with modalities of this support, including degrees and types of earmarking, and the effects on the multilateral organizations⁵.

¹ See Boesen, N., Andersen, O. W. and Arnoldi, T. (2021). Identification and Analysis of Main Trends in Danish Multilateral Development Assistance. Evaluation Study, January 2021. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.

² OECD (2020). Earmarked funding to multilateral organizations: how is it used and what constitutes good practice? OECD Development. October 2020.

³ Ibid., 3-4. The paper does also provide the relevant codes in the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS).

⁴ Ibid., Chapter 6, contains an overview and a brief discussion of main explications for using multilateral channels as well as some references.

⁵ Examples of relevant academic literature are Barder, O., Richie, E. and Rogerson, A. (2019). Contractors or Collectives? Earmarked funding of multilaterals, donor needs and institutional integrity: the World Bank as a case study. Center for Global Development. Policy Paper; Eichenauer, V. Z. and Reinsberg, B. (2017). What determines earmarked funding to international development organizations? Evidence from the new multi-bi aid data. The Review of International Organizations 12, 171-197; Gulrajani, N. (2016). Bilateral versus multilateral aid channels. Strategic choices for donors. ODI March, 2016; Reinsberg, B. (2017). Five steps to smarter multi-bi aid. A new way forward for earmarked finance. ODI, April, 2017; Weinlich, S., Baumann, M.-O., Lundsgaarde, E. and Wolf, P. (2020). Earmarking in the multilateral development system: Many shades in grey. German Development Institute. Studies 101.

Thus, the background for this evaluation is the increasing use of multi-bi contributions in Danish development assistance. Danish multi-bi contributions have not been evaluated before, and the focus will be on collecting, assessing and summarizing gained experiences of ‘Programmatic’ and ‘Project-type’ earmarked funding, which is ‘Country specific’. The effects on the multilateral organizations of increased Danish use of earmarking will not be part of the evaluation.

2. Objectives

The main objective of the evaluation will be to provide lessons learned for future use of the multi-bi instrument in Danish development assistance.

3. Outputs

The following outputs are envisaged:

- An Inception Report, including an overview over the relevant portfolio and collaboration modalities, a review of the evaluation questions (EQs) in an evaluation matrix, and a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology and work programme (not exceeding 20 pages plus annexes).
- Short briefs (maximum five pages) for each case study to be shared for comments with ELK and the relevant embassy.
- A preliminary findings paper, for discussion in the Evaluation Reference Group (maximum 15 pages).
- A draft main Report and a final version (not exceeding 40 pages plus annexes)⁶.

4. Scope of work

The evaluation will focus on Danish multi-bi contributions for development purposes. Multi-bi to humanitarian purposes will only be considered to the extent that it is relevant for the assessment of multi-bi contributions for development purposes.

As a background for the assessment of the four evaluation questions (EQs) (see next section), the Evaluation Team will establish an overview of Danish multi-bi support to

⁶ For layout guidelines, see Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. Evaluation Department, Danida (2016). Layout guidelines for evaluation reports. https://um.dk/~media/UM/Danish-site/Documents/Danida/Resultater/Eval/Layout%20guidelines_www_2013.pdf

countries which have received Danish multi-bi support 2013-2019. The overview should include (i) type of aid and degree of earmarking; and (ii) sector composition of the Danish multi-bi support. The overview should also include an assessment of the extent to which the Danish multi-bi portfolio complements Danish bilaterally managed development assistance in the partner countries as well as of the complementarity between Danish ‘Country-specific’ and ‘Global, regional or sub-regional’ multi-bi contributions. It is expected that the OECD Creditor Reporting System will be used as a basis for this quantitative overview of the Danish multi-bi portfolio.

In the evaluation context, the countries that have received Danish multi-bi contributions in the period 2013-19 have been divided into three groups:

- Four countries have been pre-selected as case countries. The countries are Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia. These countries will be analyzed in more depth, including field visits, with Somalia covered by the visit to Kenya.
- Five countries have been selected for virtual interviews and analyses. It is envisaged that interviews will at least include the relevant Danish embassy/representation. These countries, which have received a relatively substantial level of multi-bi support over the years, are Afghanistan, Mali, Niger, Palestine and Ukraine.
- Other countries which have received Danish multi-bi contributions 2013-19.

5. Evaluation questions (EQs)

The evaluation will focus on the following four evaluation questions, which should be addressed both for past and current activities:

EQ1: What was the context and rationale, which led to the use of multi-bi and the specific multi-bi modality?

The evaluation will consider the following sub-questions:

- Why was a multilateral channel selected?
- Did the decision to use a multi-bi channel rely on the country strategy/program?
- How and why was the specific multilateral organization selected?
- To which degree was Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) in Copenhagen and Danish multilateral representations consulted?
- Why was the specific modality (including degree and type of earmarking) applied?

EQ2: What role, if any, was (is) Denmark playing in the management and implementation of the multi-bi funded activities?

The evaluation will consider the following sub-questions:

- Did/does the Danish Embassy/Representation have a formal or only informal role in the management and implementation of the multi-bi activity?
- Was/is there /any contact between the Embassy/Representation, MoFA in Copenhagen, and relevant Danish multilateral representations regarding the implementation of the Danish funded multi-bi activities?
- Was/is there any contact between the Embassy/Representation, MoFA in Copenhagen Denmark, and headquarters of multilateral organizations regarding the implementation of the Danish multi-bi activities?
- How were/are the multi-bi activities being monitored?

EQ3: What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Danish multi-bi contributions?

The evaluation will consider the following sub-questions:

- Were/are the multi-bi funded activities relevant?
- Were/are the Danish multi-bi contributions effective and efficient – for instance in terms of administrative costs?
- Were/are the multi-bi contributions flexible as an instrument – for instance to ensure coherence with other activities (e.g. humanitarian assistance) and to adapt to situations like Covid-19?
- Were/are multi-bi contributions an effective instrument to promote Danish interests (e.g. in relation to reforms of the multilateral organizations, and in the policy dialogue with partner countries)?
- Were/are information sharing and learning sufficiently addressed in the Danish funded multi-bi activities?
- Were/are multi-bi contributions an instrument to ensure sharing of risks?
- Which criteria were applied for selection of modalities of multi-bi (for instance types and degrees of earmarking)?

EQ4: What lessons learned and recommendations can be made for future multi-bi contributions?

The evaluation will consider the following sub-questions:

- Were/are multi-bi activities more relevant and effective in specific contexts and sectors?
- Were/are some forms of collaboration and engagement in multi-bi activities more relevant and effective?
- Were/are some modalities (for instance types of earmarking) more relevant and effective?
- Was/is the guidance from MoFA in Copenhagen level on multi-bi activities sufficiently detailed?

6. Methodology

The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with the MoFA/Danida evaluation guidelines (January 2018)⁷. The updated (2019) OECD-DAC evaluation criteria will be applied as appropriate, and as the focus will be on learning, the first three of the DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, coherence and effectiveness) will be particularly important⁸.

The analyses of the case countries (Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia) will be based on field visits and a thorough document review. Interviews should be conducted with staff from MoFA in Copenhagen, Danish embassies and partners in the countries, relevant departments in MoFA in Copenhagen, and relevant Danish multilateral representations.

For the second group of countries (Afghanistan, Mali, Niger, Palestine and Ukraine), the evaluation will also include interviews, but conducted virtually, and a thorough document review.

The quantitative analysis of the portfolio will comprise multi-bi assistance to all countries which have received Danish multi-bi contributions during 2013-19.

It is envisaged that the identification and review of relevant documents and the final selection of interviewees will be made as part of the inception phase. This also applies for interview protocols.

⁷ See: Evaluation Guidelines (Danida/MoFA, 2018),
http://www.netpublikationer.dk/UM/evaluation_guidelines_january_2018/Index.html

⁸ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

The assessment of the EQs will be based on the conducted interviews and document reviews, as well as international experience and literature as appropriate. Thus, it is envisaged that contrasting the Danish experience with available comparable international experience will be an element in the evaluation.

7. Timing and reporting

A tentative schedule for the evaluation is as follows:

Activity	Date/period	Responsible
Contract signed	June 2021	ELK and ET (Evaluation Team)
Inception, including work programme	June-September 2021	ET
Draft Inception Report for discussion with ERG	October 2021	ET & ERG
Main evaluation phase, including case studies	October-December 2021	ET
Preliminary findings paper for discussion with ERG	January 2022	ET & ERG
Draft Report submitted and possible ERG meeting	March 2022	ET
Final Evaluation Report	April 2022	ET
Launch of Report with possible seminar in Copenhagen	May 2022	ELK

8. Organization of the evaluation

Management

The evaluation will be managed by the Evaluation, Learning and Quality (ELK) Department in the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA). The management will:

- Participate in the selection of the Evaluation Team based on received tenders.
- Provide feedback to the Evaluation Team. Comment on the draft Inception Report, field visit reports, preliminary findings, and the draft Evaluation Report as well as approve final reports.
- Organize and participate in meetings of the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG).

- Facilitate a possible dissemination workshop after the completion of the evaluation.

Evaluation Team

The DAC evaluation principles of independence of the Evaluation Team will be applied. The Evaluation Team will carry out the assignment based on a contract with the MoFA and will:

- Prepare and carry out the evaluation according to the terms of reference, the approved Inception Report, the OECD-DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and the Danida Evaluation Guidelines.
- Be responsible to the management for the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.
- Ensure that quality assurance is carried out and documented throughout the evaluation process according to the consultant's own Quality Assurance Plan (as described in the tender proposal).
- Report to the evaluation management regularly about progress of the evaluation.
- Organize and coordinate meetings and studies, and other key events, including debriefing sessions and/or validation workshops in the three countries visited by field trips (Bangladesh, Ethiopia, and Kenya (also comprising Somalia)).

The Team Leader is responsible for the organization, quality assurance and reporting of the work of the team. The Team Leader will participate in meetings of the ERG and a final workshop in Copenhagen.

Evaluation Reference Group

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) will be established and chaired by ELK. The mandate of the ERG is to provide advisory support and inputs to the evaluation, e.g. through comments to draft reports. The Reference Group will work with direct meetings, e-mail communication and/or video-conferencing. The main tasks of the ERG are to:

- Comment on the draft Inception Report, draft findings papers, case study briefs and the draft Evaluation Report in order to ensure that the evaluation is based on factual knowledge about programmes and projects and how they have been implemented.

Other key stakeholders may be consulted at strategic points in time of the evaluation either through mail correspondence or through participation in stakeholder meetings/workshops.

9. Composition and qualifications of the Evaluation Team

A core team of three consultants supported by local consultants will undertake the evaluation. The anticipated profile of the Team Leader will be an evaluation specialist with extensive experience with international development assistance, including both bilateral and multilateral aid and preferably multi-bi funded activities. Two other specialists, where one of them will have a senior profile, will participate as core team members. Both specialists will be familiar with the implementation of development programmes and/or projects and have experience from both multilateral and bilateral development assistance.

In addition, and in order to undertake thorough assessment of the projects and programmes funded in the selected case countries, national specialists with experience from both bilateral and multilateral development assistance in the relevant countries or regions will participate in the evaluation. The CVs of these local consultants will be assessed in the evaluation of tenders together with the CVs for the core team positions.

Tenderers may decide to include personnel for additional functions, e.g. subject matter specialists, although these persons will not be assessed on an individual basis but as part of the overall team composition and backup. The team members are expected to complement each other.

The need for additional subject matter specialists should be justified in the technical proposal. The organization of the team's work and the distribution of work days between team members will be assessed as part of the assessment of the technical proposal under the criterion "organization".

The following **minimum requirements** apply to the qualifications of the evaluation team:

- All team members must be fluent in English.
- At least one core team member must be able to read Danish.
- At least one core team member must be able to read and communicate in French.
- The core team must have prior working experience from Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia.
- The Team Leader will participate in all field visits to selected case countries.

Further specification of the qualifications of the team members is outlined in Annex 1.

10. Financial proposal

The total budget for the consultancy services is a maximum of DKK 2.5 million. Any tenders with a price above the budget will be rejected. The budget shall include all fees and project

related reimbursable expenses required for the implementation of the contract, including surveys, field trips, participation in ERGs and a final workshop in Copenhagen.

The tenderer's financial proposal shall include all costs for fees and project related reimbursable expenses. It is the responsibility of the tenderer to ensure that the products and outputs specified above and all other tasks specified in these terms of reference are performed within the framework of the financial proposal and the specified ceiling amounts.

The cost of quality assurance (QA) should be included in the tenderer's overhead.

ELK will cover the expenditures incurred for preparing the final Evaluation Report for publication.

11. Eligibility

The OECD-DAC evaluation principles of independence of the Evaluation Team will be applied. In situations where conflict of interest occurs, candidates may be excluded from participation, if their participation may question the independence and impartiality of the evaluation. In other words, any firm or individual consultant whose independence and impartiality may be questioned will be excluded from participation in the tender.

Tenderers are obliged to carefully consider issues of eligibility for individual consultants and inform the Client of any potential issues relating to a possible conflict of interest.⁹

12. Requirements for home office support

The Evaluation Team's home office shall provide the following, to be covered by the Consultants fees:

General home office administration and professional back-up (to be specified in the tender). Quality assurance (QA) of the consultancy services in accordance with the quality management and quality assurance system described in the tender. Special emphasis should be given to quality assurance of draft reports prior to the submission of such reports. ELK may request documentation for the QA undertaken in the process.

⁹ See: Evaluation Guidelines (Danida/MoFA, 2018), annex 1.
http://www.netpublikationer.dk/UM/evaluation_guidelines_january_2018/Index.html

The Tender shall comprise a detailed description of the proposed QA, in order to document that the tenderer has fully internalized how to implement it and in order to enable a subsequent verification that the QA has actually been carried out as agreed.

Annex 1 – Composition and Qualifications of the Evaluation Team

Team Leader, international evaluation specialist

General experience

- Higher academic degree in a field relevant to the assignment.
- A profile with 15 years or more of relevant international experience from assessment of development assistance.
- Experience as Team Leader of at least five evaluations of similar scope and complexity.

Adequacy for the assignment

- International experience from evaluation of bilateral and multilateral development assistance.
- Extensive international experience from designing and undertaking evaluation work, including field experience.
- Other analytical work or research in the areas related to the evaluation.

Senior Specialist on evaluation of bilateral and multilateral development assistance

General experience

- Higher academic degree in a field relevant to the assignment.
- 10 years or more of relevant professional experience from international cooperation.
- Experience as team member for evaluations of a similar scope and complexity.

Adequacy for the assignment

- Experience from programme design or implementation in areas related to the evaluation.
- Experience from analytical work in areas related to the assignment.
- Experience from relevant sector and thematic programme evaluations.

Specialist on evaluation of bilateral and multilateral development assistance

General experience

- Higher academic degree in a field relevant to the assignment.
- Five years or more of relevant professional experience from international cooperation.
- Experience as team member for evaluations of a similar scope and complexity.

Adequacy for the assignment

- Experience from programme design and implementation in areas related to the evaluation.
- Experience from analytical work in areas related to the assignment.
- Experience from relevant sector and thematic programme evaluations.

Local Consultants

General experience

- Experience from multilateral and bilateral development assistance.
- Experience as team member of international teams.

Adequacy for the assignment

- Familiarity from selected case countries
- Experience from relevant reviews and/or evaluations of development programmes.