

Terms of reference

1. Background and Context

The Danish Energy Agency (DEA) is an agency under the Danish Ministry of Climate, Energy and Utilities (MCEU). DEA manages the Danish Energy Partnership Programmes (DEPPs), which are programmes that aim to assist public authorities improve policy and regulations in support of a green transition of energy sectors in emerging economies. To date, DEPPs have been established in ten different countries, that represent large, emerging economies, whose future energy mix will have a significant impact on global CO₂ emissions.

DEA manages the programmes, with technical assistance (TA) provided by DEA, the Danish transmission system operator (Energinet) and a consortium of Danish specialised consultants. Additionally, a continuous in-country presence is ensured through energy counsellors at Denmark's embassies and through the deployment of international Long-Term Advisers (LTAs) within key partner institutions. Finally, the Danish Fellowship Centre delivers technical courses.

Although the collective framework of DEPP was first introduced in 2017 with the launch of DEPP II, similar bilateral energy partnership programmes have been implemented by DEA's Low Carbon Transition Unit (LCTU) since 2012. Meanwhile, while DEPP has been part of the scope for broader thematic evaluations of the Danish Climate Envelope and Danish support to climate change mitigation, no specific programme evaluation has been carried out so far.

To document results and support learning for future programming, the MFA is now commissioning an evaluation.

1.1 History

Following the UNFCCC Bali Conference in 2007 and in preparation for the Conference of the Parties in 2009 (COP 15), Denmark established the Climate Envelope (2008–2012) as a mechanism for channelling dedicated climate funding to support mitigation and adaptation efforts in developing countries. The budget progressively increased from DKK 100 million in 2008 to DKK 500 million by the end of this initial period. The Climate Envelope was continued until 2023, where it was replaced by the Global Green Transition mechanism.

DEA was involved in several smaller projects from the first phase. In 2011, the Danish Government, through Parliamentary decision, divided the responsibility to initiate and implement climate funding between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and the Ministry of Climate, Energy and Utilities (MCEU). MCEU activities were to focus on climate mitigation in growth economies among developing countries, while the MFA was to focus on adaptation activities in other developing countries. All activities were to align with the overall strategies and principles of Danish Development Cooperation¹.

As a follow up to the 2015 evaluation of the Danish Climate Change Funding to Developing Countries (see below), a set of guiding principles for the Danish Climate Envelope were agreed by the MFA and MCEU in 2016². With regard to human rights-based approach (HRBA) and poverty issues, a *How-to-Note on Energy transition and emission reduction in Developing Countries* (2022)³ and a concept note on human rights and poverty developed by DEA (2022)⁴ were developed to guide the mitigation programmes implemented by MCEU and DEA. Furthermore, DEA and MCEU activities have been guided by the MCEU's international strategy, the Danish Climate Act and the Danish Finance Act⁵.

Overall responsibility for and approval of the funds remained with the MFA. Generally, the responsibilities of MCEU and DEA for initiating and implementing the mitigation programmes have been upheld throughout the period (with a few exceptions)⁶.

In 2012, the LCTU was established as a project unit within DEA, to transfer Danish experience in transitioning to a low-carbon society through government-to-government cooperation. Initially, the LCTU/DEA was engaged in standalone three-to-five-year country programmes in Mexico, South Africa, Vietnam and China. Together, these pre-DEPP II activities are considered DEPP I for the purposes of this evaluation. The standalone programmes were separately funded, with separate results frameworks, and

¹ Different strategies and policies have been in effect over since 2011. For current policies and strategies see: [Policies & strategies](#)

² [Guiding Principles for the Danish Climate Envelope](#)

³ [How to – Energy Transition and Emissions Reductions in Development Cooperation](#)

⁴ Forståelsespapir om det flerdimensionelle fattigdomsbegreb og den menneskelige tilgang i Energistyrelsens myndighedssamarbejder (Paper on the Multidimensional Concept of Poverty and the Human Rights-Based Approach in the Danish Energy Agency's Government to Government Cooperation). Will be made available to the evaluation team.

⁵ The Global Green Transition (Global Grøn Omstilling) account.

⁶ For instance, the initiative for the DEEP in Ethiopia came from the Danish Embassy.

included TA from consultants, study tours etc. LCTU provided TA and advisory support to these country programmes as well as to global initiatives, such as the Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMA) facility.

In 2017, the DEPP was introduced (with DEPP II), integrating LCTU resources and activities into country programmes with a single budget for TA, one results framework, a unified theory of change and a consolidated management structure. Thus, in DEPP II and later DEPPs, TA from DEA and consortia of consultants was provided through a single outcome-based budget.

DEPPs have since been established in Ethiopia, Kenya, India, Indonesia, Brazil, and Ukraine, in addition to China, Vietnam, South Africa and Mexico. The programmes in Ethiopia and Ukraine differ from the other DEPP programmes, however, as the initiative and responsibility for the management of these programmes is placed with the MFA (the Danish Embassy in Addis Ababa and central MFA in Copenhagen respectively). Some of the DEPP programmes are in initial phases (e.g. Brazil, Kenya) while others have been ongoing for longer (see annex 1 for a brief overview of each country's programme and the major partners). Countries have been selected as strategic partners due to their historic, current and forecasted acceleration in energy demand, significant greenhouse gas emissions and the potential for cost-effective reductions.

The DEPPs vary in structure. Some are integrated within a framework programme, such as DEPP II (2017-20) and III (2020-25) that include Mexico, South Africa, Vietnam and China, or DEPP 2025 (2025-29) which includes Kenya, Brazil, and India. However, some countries have individual DEPPs, such as Indonesia in INDODEPP (2020-2025) or Ethiopia in DEEP (2023-2028). The DEPP framework programmes were introduced with the intend to ensure coherence and strategic direction of DEAs offerings and to improve efficiency in programme preparation and management. The concept has been introduced selectively as timing of the initiation of new country programmes allowed.

Related to DEPP, though not included in results frameworks, the MCEU, DEA and the MFA have also undertaken several activities in climate diplomacy, contributed to Just Energy Transition Programmes (JETP), and to private sector development activities, which has resulted in joint initiatives with partner countries in international fora.

Also worth noting, at the time of the introduction of DEPP in 2017, DEA established the Global Cooperation (GC) to integrate DEA's activities within international development cooperation and a series of energy governance partnerships with other countries. As of

primo 2025, GC staff correspond to 108 full-time employees, hereof 65.5 assigned to the ten DEPPs.⁷ The DEPP III also provides funding for staff positions within the MCEU, supporting global initiatives and climate diplomacy. Further, one sector energy counsellor is employed at each of the ten embassies where DEPP runs. Table 1 below provides a preliminary overview of DEPP funding, including programmes under the LCTU, which the evaluation shall consider the first phase of DEPP – DEPP I.

Table 1: Preliminary overview of DEPP funding (commitments)⁸

	Mexico	China	South Africa	Vietnam	India	Indonesia	Brazil	Kenya	Ethiopia	Ukraine	Total
Million DKK											
LCTU/DEPP I (2012-2017)	-----60.0-----										60.0 ⁹
DEPP II (2017-2020)	38.1	29.1	22.2	25.6							115.0
DEPP III ¹⁰ (2020-2025)	64.2	64.2	67.6	100.0 ¹¹							296.0
INDEP (2020-2024)					69.0						69.0
DEEP (2023-2028) ¹²									60.0		60.0

⁷ With 9 dedicated to the programme in Ukraine and 2.4 to the programme in Ethiopia, which as mentioned are different from other DEPP programmes, as the initiative and management of these rest with the MFA.

⁹ This figures stem from three different appropriations. These appropriations covered LCTU activities beyond the supporting assistance for the embassies' programmes in Vietnam, South Africa, Mexico, and for the China National Renewable Energy Centre (CNREC).

¹⁰ All un-allocated funds and funds reserved for project management are distributed between countries for the purpose of this overview.

¹¹ DKK 26 million of these funds were originally allocated under the programme Low Carbon Transition in Energy Efficiency, which started in 2013, but was not distributed through that programme.

¹² As mentioned in the main text, the embassy has the responsibility for this programme. Of the DKK 60 million, DKK 23 million are for activities implemented through DEA.

INDODEPP (2021-2025)	75.0			75.0
UDEPP (2021-2026)				30.0
DEPP 2025 ¹³ (2025-2029)	95.0	53.2	71.8	220.0
Total				925.0

Note: In addition to the commitments listed in this table, the LCTU has been involved in programmes that the MFA had responsibility for. These LCTU engagements will also be within the scope of the evaluation, even though they are not included in the preliminary overview.

1.2 Approach and modality

The modality of the DEPPs is long-term peer-to-peer cooperation. With few exceptions, the DEPPs consist entirely of technical assistance (TA) aimed at strengthening the capacity in the energy sector as a whole. Today, the support is mainly provided within the following four thematic areas where DEA has significant experience, however, each partnership is intended to be adapted to the specific context and needs:

- Long-term energy modelling and planning with the aim of choice-awareness on cost-effective green transition for political decision-making processes and in administrative planning.
- Sharing tools and experiences with integrating variable energy sources into the energy mix, e.g. electricity market designs and operation of the power grid.
- Conducive framework conditions for renewable energy, notable but not exclusively offshore wind development
- Energy efficiency and district heating including sector-coupling, through regulatory schemes and measures targeting incentives.

Within these themes are a variety of sub-themes that in the country specific interventions target outcomes and outputs, which are intended to align with the maturity of existing regulations and technology applied in the particular country.

¹³ All un-allocated funds and funds reserved for project management are distributed between countries for the purpose of this overview.

Several forms of TA are provided by different entities and actors in the Danish energy sector. GC delivers technical expertise for modelling and planning activities, including e.g. advice and reviews of specific regulations, analysis/co-development of knowledge products and tools, and training. The DEPP modality also contains the possibility of deployment of technical expertise to partner institutions in the form of long-term advisers. An energy sector advisor at the embassies supports day-to-day dialogue and coordination with partners and other donors. The sector adviser also has the responsibility of coordinating applications from staff in partner institutions for specialised energy courses, which are provided by the Danish Fellowship Centre. The Danish Transmission System Operator (Energinet) provides TA to peer institutions, e.g. in regard to managing flexibility in the power system. Denmark's Technical University together with selected consultancy companies constitute a consortium that deliver specialised TA and from which GC contract experts for specific tasks. Apart from the long-term advisers mentioned above, TA is to a large degree provided on a short-term basis.

GC provides overall programme management, quality assurance and is responsible for partner dialogue on priorities and programme planning. Following the recent Mid-Term Review mentioned below, country level steering committees have been established in all programmes. A Programme Advisory Group (PAG), comprising DEA, MCEU and the MFA, is established to oversee operational decisions.¹⁴ Additionally, a Strategic Management Group (SAG), including the MFA, DEA and MCEU, addresses strategic issues across all programmes and approves programme changes.

All funds for the DEPPs, with the exception of the programmes in Ukraine and Ethiopia, are managed by GC in Denmark. Funds are primarily spent on activities performed by Danish organisations. With few exceptions, no funding is transferred to partner institutions.

1.3 Other DEA modalities

In addition to the DEPPs, DEA provides support for energy transition through two other programmes, funded by MFA. These include the Danish Energy Transition Initiative (DETI) and The Strategic Sector Cooperation (SSC/MYNSAM 2.0).

DETI was launched in 2021 by the DEA to provide short-term TA to developing countries focused on energy system challenges, particularly in renewable energy and energy efficiency. Colombia, Brazil, Pakistan, and Algeria were the four selected countries.

¹⁴ Though this does currently not cover the programmes in Ethiopia and Ukraine.

DETI had a five-year duration and a total budget of 15 million DKK (2021-2025). The modality was based on short-term TA, with a duration of 3-12 months and a maximum budget of DKK 1.0 million. It has been decided that there will not be a second phase of the programme.

SSC/MYNSAM 2.0 is a programme for cooperation between Danish government institutions or municipalities, and similar institutions in partner countries, and it also includes private sector involvement. It is implemented through framework programmes in different sectors, under which individual country-level projects are developed. The country level projects are implemented in collaboration with the Danish embassies and focus on capacity strengthening, supporting diplomatic relations, and involvement of the private sector. They typically have three phases each of three years with a budget of around 10 million DKK per phase. Several of the DEPP partner countries have been involved with DEA through an SSC in the energy sector prior to DEPP. This includes Indonesia, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, and Brazil.

Thus, both DEPP, DETI and SSC/MYNSAM 2.0 focus on capacity strengthening, but the DETI and SSC/MYNSAM 2.0 are smaller in scope than the DEPP. Some countries have over time moved from smaller SSC/MYNSAM 2.0 projects towards DEPP programmes, but this does not happen by design. THE DETI and SSC/MYNSAM 2.0 are not the focus of the current evaluation. However, when evaluating the efficiency of the DEPPs, the programme shall consider the added value of their broader scope and financial size compared to the SSC/MYNSAM 2.0.

1.4 Recent assessments of strengths and weaknesses of DEPP

No specific programme evaluation has yet been conducted for the various phases of the DEPPs. However, the programmes have been included within the scope of broader thematic evaluations, such as the evaluation of Denmark's climate change funding to developing countries (2015)¹⁵ and the evaluation of Danish funding for climate change mitigation in developing countries (2021)¹⁶.

One of the themes of the evaluation of Denmark's climate change funding to developing countries, was support for energy efficiency and renewable energy. This covered some of the activities under what the current evaluation will consider DEPP I, including with a country study in Vietnam. The evaluation noted that many projects were still under implementation at the time of the evaluation, which limited the evaluability of e.g. successes and sustainability. Meanwhile, findings included, that the agency-to-agency model

¹⁵ [2015.04 Evaluation of Denmark's Climate Change Funding to Developing Countries](#)

¹⁶ [Evaluation of Danish Funding for Climate Change Mitigation in Developing Countries](#)

employed appeared to work well where partnerships could be formed. But at the same time, that understanding challenges and sector set-ups and building partnerships with relevant stakeholders took time, and required long-term engagement. The evaluation further found that there was a lack of an overarching results framework at the Climate Envelope level¹⁷; indicator frameworks of projects and programmes were not harmonised and sometimes incomplete, which hindered the possibility for learning and assessing progress. The (at the time) ongoing work MCEU (then MCEB) on draft criteria framework was seen as an appropriate step in the right direction.

The later evaluation of Danish funding for climate change mitigation in developing countries (2021), also covered activities by DEA (both DEPP and other programmes), and some of the general findings related to this included:

- That the funding was relevant, and Denmark is in an exceptional position to offer useful technical support to other countries that wish to de-carbonise their energy sectors by expanding their renewable energy supply and energy efficiency capacity.
- That since 2012, DEA has established a network of agreements with diverse countries. In practice, these agreements have facilitated engagement across a broad spectrum of issues, ranging from narrow technical matters to sector-wide collaboration.
- That successful engagements were those where the leadership in the partner institution was involved directly in learning and practicing new skills, usually because national policy required them to do so. On the other hand, weaknesses in impact tended to occur where training targeted only technicians who had little influence over institutional practices. There was effective delivery of technical skills, but there was sometimes inadequate targeting of the best level of each institution, considering the policy and political economy environment.
- That capacity strengthening was addressed more comprehensively in the DEPP II and III programme documents, than in earlier engagements. However, a systematic approach to capacity strengthening was still lacking during implementation.
- That systematically documenting concrete results proved challenging, highlighting the need for the programmes to develop a more robust system for monitoring results.

Most mid-term reviews also confirm these observations. The 2024 mid-term review of the DEPP III programme in China, Vietnam, South Africa, and Mexico reaffirmed the value of government-to-government cooperation combined with climate diplomacy, with DEA recognised as a trusted partner in most institutions. It also confirmed the importance of long-term partnerships and embedding long-term advisers within partner institutions, which has yielded notable results, particularly in cooperation with China. The technical

¹⁷ This led to the establishment of a set of guiding principles for the Danish Climate Envelope, c.f. the background section.

quality of the deliverables of the GC and consortia was found to be good¹⁸. Further, the review found that linking high-level climate diplomacy with peer-to-peer cooperation has provided Denmark a position in the Just Energy Transition (JETP) process in Vietnam and South Africa and contributed to joint Danish, International Energy Agency, and China initiatives at the Conference of Parties (COP) 28.

At the same time, the review reiterated the importance of understanding country-specific political economy dynamics and securing partner ownership of the change process. This was evident in uneven programme progress, with Mexico, South Africa, and Indonesia significantly influenced by political factors and strong fossil fuel interest. The importance of taking an adaptive approach and see the programmes in a long-term perspective was emphasised. Furthermore, like previous reviews and the above-mentioned evaluation, it identified challenges in the approach to capacity strengthening and the solidity of planning and reporting processes¹⁹.

In regards to management structure, the review noted that fully developed project management system at the country level had not yet materialised in China, South Africa and Mexico, and recommended an acceleration of ongoing efforts to establish country level

¹⁸ For instance, the review of the DEPP in South Africa noted that "GC is delivering good and appreciated technical quality input under DEPP III and GC, Energinet and consortium consultants are appreciated by partners". The Review for China noted that "the quality of work under Development Engagement 1 is deemed to be excellent, considering the deliverables, the direct policy impact on the Chinese green transition (e.g. The Blue Book on the Development of New Power Systems), and the official recognition of the energy partnership between Denmark and China, which can be seen on public websites and announcements".

¹⁹ The review noted, for example, that "[Terms of Reference] for individual tasks address capacity development at an input/output and often individual level and does not include, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound (SMART) indicators for capacity and capabilities delivered. Work plans in their various forms do not address which institutional capacity will be developed, with which TA resources and EoM reports do not report on capacity building beyond input/output level." As such, it found that there was a "a discrepancy between TOR's focus on input/output and individual training and awareness and the [programme documents] requirements for increased focus on delivering capabilities and capacities of institutions." And questioned if sustainable capacity strengthening at the institutional level could be achieved, noting that "From a general perspective, DEPP III do, with important exemptions (Energinet sparring centred on problem solving, WASA, Balmore training in China and Vietnam), target individual capacity development and as such, sustainable capacity at the institutional level as aimed at in the programmes will only to some extent and in some cases be achieved."

management structures, work planning and progress reporting.²⁰ Overall, the review highlighted a continued need to strengthen the approach to capacity strengthening, improve documentation of results, and establish more systematic joint planning and reporting.

2. Purpose and objective

The evaluation has the overall dual purpose of supporting accountability and learning in relation to the DEPPs.

This entails that the evaluation shall identify, document and assess the results and contribution to change for the DEPPs, and unpack and assess the strengths and weaknesses of the approach to capacity strengthening so as to provide lessons learned and actionable recommendations to inform the design and implementation of future programmes.

3. Scope of Work

In line with purpose and objectives, the evaluation will:

1. Map the DEPPs and their integration within the broader portfolio of Danish support for climate change mitigation, and within other climate mitigation programmes and efforts in partner countries.
2. Describe and unpack the programmes designs, including e.g. their approach to capacity strengthening and to establishing equal partnerships, their management setups, partner selection, activities, outputs, monitoring etc.; and unpack the programmes theories of change.
3. Evaluate the programmes according to all six OECD-DAC evaluation criteria (see evaluation questions below).
4. Provide actionable recommendations and key lessons learned to inform future support.

Below, more specific considerations regarding scope are outlined:

²⁰ More specifically, the review noted that "There are risks that planning and monitoring within the programme becomes very GC-centred despite all good intentions for being demand-oriented. National and Consortium partners only have a limited contribution to the process (not neglecting GC's dialogue with partners) and do thus not own the process and plans."

3.1 Temporal and geographical scope

The evaluation will cover the entire period of the DEPPs, as well as their predecessors under the LCTU, considered DEPP I for the purpose of this evaluation. As such, the primary temporal scope of the evaluation will be the years 2012 to 2024. Cooperation in the energy sector in partner countries prior to this period will not be in focus for the evaluation, but the evaluation shall establish a sufficient understanding and overview of such activities to be able to consider the point of departure for the DEPPs, what they were building on, what results can be expected of the DEPPs, etc.

The primary geographic scope of the evaluation will be the countries where DEPP programmes have been in operation for at least one programme phase and/or new phases are under preparation. This implies that Mexico, China, South Africa, Vietnam, Indonesia and India will be in focus. Two to three of these countries will be selected for field visits (see methodology).

Newer engagements, such as the DEPP programmes in Brazil, Kenya, Ukraine²¹ and Ethiopia, are too recent to allow a meaningful assessment of their effectiveness, impact and sustainability. As such, they will not have the same focus in the evaluation as the longer-term programmes. However, they will still require some consideration for the purpose of exploring and assessing any new developments, changes in approach, integration of lessons learned from earlier phases etc., thereby ensuring that the overall assessment of the DEPP approach reflects these recent developments. Hence these countries will be covered by the evaluation to a lesser extent. By implications, the evaluation will also need to consider newer development up to 2025, but not with the same depth as for the main period.

3.2 Thematic scope and evaluation criteria

In terms of thematic scope and modality focus, the following shall apply:

- The evaluation will focus on understanding the results achieved in relation to various types and dimensions of capacity strengthening, and what has enabled or hindered results, including strengths and weaknesses in the approach taken. This shall feed into the identification of lessons learned and recommendations.

²¹ Which is also excluded due to the active war.

- It will cover all OECD-DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability; see evaluation questions below). With regards to effectiveness, it should be noted that beyond determining whether results have been achieved, it will analyse why or why not, considering factors such as modality choices, approaches, management set-up, overall programme design and quality of implementation, developments in context, etc. (cf. also Q3 below). With regards to impact and sustainability, it may be relevant to consider progress/trajectory towards likely impact and sustainability, as a more definite assessment may not be feasible in all cases, and considering that progress towards green energy transition may not be a linear process.
- The evaluation will assess the DEPP and how it has evolved over time both as an overall programmatic approach and at the level of specific country programmes. I.e. it will examine how support for capacity strengthening has been structured, what results it has produced, and both its expected and unintended impacts, considering DEPP both as an overall programmatic approach and the specific country partnerships / individual DEPPs. It is also important to consider the broader framework and conditions of relevance to DEPP, both in terms of i.a. the various – and evolving – strategies and policies at play, and the development in the understanding and architecture related to green energy transition.
- On the approach side, a key aspect will be understanding DEPP's Theory of Change, expected causal pathways, and prerequisites for contributing to changes in capacities and outputs (and again how they may contribute to transformational change towards improved energy planning, green energy transition etc). On the more practical side, this will require an analysis of programming and implementation, covering aspects such as e.g. needs assessments, approaches to building and maintaining equal partnerships, adaptability to changes in context, priorities etc, and ensuring that inputs are adequate and relevant in different contexts. When describing and assessing the DEPP approach and way of working, the follow-up to relevant evaluation and review recommendations should also be considered. In relation to adaptation to and consideration of context, the issue of coherence will also be important, both in relation to internal and not least external coherence.
- The evaluation must be framed within a broad understanding of the current state of play in international discussions about capacity strengthening interventions, incorporating knowledge of what works and current good practice considerations in capacity strengthening. This contextualisation is intended to inform the assessment of the DEPPs strengths and weaknesses and how these have influenced achievements, as well as the identification of lessons learned.
- When working with the identification, documentation and assessment of results, the evaluation will further need to pay close attention to the various levels of results, so as to be able to capture not just high-level outcomes or impacts, but also more

intermediary results, strengthened enabling factors etc. Consideration should be given to timeframes, the trajectories of results, prerequisites for sustainability etc.

- The evaluation will also to the degree possible assess the added value of DEPP's broader scope and financial resources compared to smaller government-to-government energy sector programmes through Strategic Sector Cooperation (SSC), c.f. Q4 below. This will require establishing an understanding of these programmes, reviewing documents, and consulting key informants, with sufficient depth to determine the added value of DEPP. This is linked to understanding whether and how DEPP resources are well spent in relation to achieving results, and as such is tied to the assessment of efficiency. It should however be noted, that there are expected to be limits to how rigorous such an assessment can be, as it will likely not be feasible to i.a. carry out more stringent comparisons, but softer comparisons and considerations on i.a. whether resources are well spent is seen as relevant.
- Finally, to ensure depth and analytical rigour, the evaluation will provide both a holistic assessment of DEPPs contribution to overall and long-term change in each country, and an examination of the progression of programming, ambitions, and results across different phases.

4. Evaluation questions

The evaluation must address the following questions and sub-questions:

Q0 Mapping and documentation of programmes (descriptive analysis): As a prerequisite for answering the evaluation questions below - and as valuable documentation in its own right - the evaluation will:

- Map the DEPPs within the broader context of climate mitigation programmes, c.f. bullet 1 of scope.
- Thoroughly unpack the theory of change, including implicit and explicit underlying assumptions, cf. bullet 2 of scope.
- Thoroughly describe and unpack the programme design and implementation of the DEPPs, including e.g. partner selection criteria and process, approach to capacity strengthening, decision-making, programme management, activities, outputs, results monitoring etc., cf. bullet 2 of scope.

Q1 Relevance: To what extent has the focus of DEPP, and the employed approach to capacity strengthening, been relevant in light of evolving Danish, partner country and partner institutions policies, priorities and needs, and considering partner country political, social, economic and energy sector contexts?

- Sub-questions include, but are not necessarily limited to: To what extent have the programmes' objectives and focus been relevant in view of evolving policies and priorities of Denmark and of partner countries? This includes both those policies specifically related to energy transition and pro-poor low carbon development, and those related to global goals such as the SDGs, and general standards, priorities and guidelines for development cooperation.
- Considering the complex political economy of just energy transition, how have the programmes considered the socio-economic and political economy aspects of the energy transition?
- To what extent have the programmes' overall approach to energy transformation and focus on predefined thematic areas been relevant, adaptable, and responsive to partner countries' specific contexts and evolving needs?
- To what extent have the programmes' designs, including the approach to capacity strengthening and equal partnerships been appropriate given the context and concurrent knowledge of best practices?
- To what extent have the programmes results framework been relevant and realistic.

Q2 Coherence: To what extent have the DEPPs been aligned and coordinated with other interventions, including in the energy sector or in other sectors/areas that contribute to the green energy transition, or that are affected by it?

Sub-questions include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- To what extent have DEPPs been aligned with other relevant Danish development cooperation in the partner countries (in the energy sector and otherwise), including multilateral support such as through IRENA, ESMAP, IISD, WRI, CIF, IDB, and IEA, as well as e.g. support to investment finance facilities, social sectors, etc.
- To what extent have DEPPs been aligned with and complemented national programmes and other actors' interventions in the partner countries, and to what extent have there been processes to secure communication, flow of information, etc?

Q3a Effectiveness: What results have been achieved by the DEPPs and to what extent have the DEPPs achieved their objectives (as originally planned or as adjusted in response to changes in contexts)?

Sub-questions include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- To what extent have the DEPPs achieved their intended results across different levels of the result chain, from outputs to higher-level outcomes, including the countries' ability to plan and integrate renewable energy? An important aspect to consider will be to what extent capacity strengthening activities have successfully fostered expected and sustainable changes in partner outputs and outcomes, such as products, services, regulations, tenders, investments, long-term energy planning and use of models, policies etc.
- To what extent have the DEPP led to unintended results, positive or negative, including e.g. in terms of social, economic or environmental outcomes?

Q3b Contributing factors for effectiveness: Which factors, internal and external to the DEPP, have influenced the achievement of results?

Factors to consider include, but are not limited to:

- The employed approach to capacity strengthening and the quality of implementation.
- The approach to partnerships, dialogue, and adaptability.
- The relevance and quality of implemented activities, including how well bottlenecks were identified and addressed, and the implications of the mix of different sources of technical assistance.
- Methods and indicators employed to continuously monitor and document results, as well as accountability measures employed to guide and manage the programmes adaptive approach
- How the programme has addressed and potentially adapted to external developments in contexts and priorities of partners.

Q4 Efficiency: How have DEPP resources been used and have they been well spent in order to achieve results. The analysis should consider both economic and operational efficiency to the degree possible, and e.g. pay attention to:

- Describing and unpacking the allocation of resources for the various elements of DEPP
- The implications of the mix of different sources of technical assistance and capacity strengthening including consultancies inside and outside consortium contracts, long term Danida advisers, short term inputs from DEA and embassy climate counsellors and local staff as well as training courses at Danish Fellowship Centre.
- The added value of the broader scope and financial resources of the DEPP as compared to smaller Danish government-to-government energy sector programmes (SSC).

Q5 Impact: To what extent are the outcomes of DEPP, particularly in terms of strengthened capacities, likely to have contributed to, or created prerequisites for, transformational change towards low-carbon societies, progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals, global climate action agendas, and any other significant higher-level effects, whether positive or negative, intended or unintended? Sub-questions to consider include but are not limited to:

- Are the results of DEPP likely to have contributed to impacts, positive or negative, in areas such as emissions reductions, energy security, affordability and access; transparency and governance in the energy sector, and anticipated co-benefits, including health, environmental improvements, job creation, and economic development? Alternatively, are there indications that they have created the necessary preconditions for such impacts?
- Are the results of DEPP likely to have contributed to improvements in the enabling environments for public and private investment in emission reduction schemes and to attracting investors? Alternatively, are there indications that they have created the necessary preconditions for such impacts?
- What indications are there, that DEPP has advanced Danish climate diplomacy and influenced global climate discussions?

Q6 Sustainability: To what extent are the results achieved by the programme so far likely to be sustainable?

Sub-questions to consider include but are not limited to:

- To what extent are the results of capacity strengthening activities anchored within the partner organisations, and do partners have the capacities to sustain programme results over time?
- To what extent is the strengthened capacity of partner institutions likely to contribute to a sustained energy transition process, beyond the duration of DEPP?
- To what extent have overall timeframes and exit strategies been defined for country interventions?

Q7 Lessons learned and recommendations: Based on the analysis, the evaluation will provide lessons learned and actionable recommendations for future support, addressing e.g. the approach to capacity strengthening and equal partnerships, the programme and modality at an overarching level, the selection of partner countries and institutions, results monitoring, etc.

5. Approach and methodology

The evaluation must be carried out in accordance with the MFA evaluation guidelines (January 2024)²². The updated (2019) OECD-DAC evaluation criteria will be applied as appropriate²³.

5.1 Overall approach

The evaluation will employ a mixed-methods approach, drawing on theory-based contribution analysis. In line with the explanation of scope above, this entails documenting and analysing the DEPP assumptions and expectations, programming and implementation, in order to both be able to identify results at various levels and in very different contexts, and assess credible contribution to higher-level results.

Findings and conclusions must be consistently backed by a clear, documented evidence trail, with rigorous validation and triangulation applied throughout to ensure transparency and reliability. The risk of bias should be considered in selection of interviewees, and in the use of interview information, triangulation of data sources etc. The strength of conclusions must be carefully weighed against the robustness of the evidence to provide a balanced and credible assessment.

5.2 Country visits, desk studies and synthesis analysis

Due to the highly diverse country contexts in which DEPPs have been implemented, it will be important that the evaluation considers both how the programme overall has understood and addressed these contexts, and, vice versa, how contextual factors have influenced programme trajectories and results.

This implies that in working with a theory-based contribution analysis approach, the evaluation will need to both set out the overall (implicit or explicit) Theory of Change (ToC) for the DEPP approach, and further examine how this has been adapted to and worked in the different country partnerships. The overall ToC is expected to provide an organising framework, which can help form the basis for the cross-cutting or synthesis analysis across the various country partnerships.

²² [Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. Evaluation Guidelines. 2024.](#)

²³ See for instance "[Applying Evaluation Criteria thoughtfully](#)", OECD DAC 2021

More specific ToCs for each country are expected to be necessary to understand how the DEPPs have provided input and contributed to results in each country. Given the substantial differences in contexts, the country studies may be seen as cases with regards to the DEPP core approach, but it is less feasible that they can be treated as case studies when it comes to analysis of results. Instead, assessing results and their influencing factors will likely require an individual analysis of each country partnership. Therefore, while partner country visits are expected to provide greater depth, nuance, and validation, it will be important that desk studies are also conducted in a way that captures and explores results as thoroughly as possible. This will help ensure a comprehensive overview and assessment of the DEPPs results.

The approach to addressing the interplay between the DEPP overall approach-level analysis and the country partnership-level analysis should be further refined during the inception phase. This will include determining how to ensure adequate analysis and reporting across the country-specific studies. A key challenge will be striking the right balance between:

- Identifying and reporting on core traits, commonalities and potential patterns in results across the individual country programmes
- Doing justice to the role of country-specific contexts and partner needs, and thereby variation in results, experience and lessons to be learned

This balance is critical and will require careful consideration. It will include consideration of how to strengthen both internal and external validity of the evaluation and country studies, ensuring that conclusions and lessons learned are presented with appropriate attention to their validity and context.

5.3 Analytical framework for analysing capacity strengthening efforts

In addition to documenting and analysing the ToC, the evaluation must develop a robust analytical framework for assessing capacity strengthening efforts. Such a well-defined analytical framework will help identify results, as well as the processes, mechanisms, and contextual factors that are likely to have shaped results. Further, it will feed into the identification of lessons learned and recommendations.

Given the complexity of capacity strengthening—encompassing individual skills, institutional structures, regulatory frameworks, and broader enabling environments—the framework should clarify the dimensions of capacity targeted by DEPP and how changes in

these areas can be meaningfully assessed. It should include key quantitative indicators and qualitative markers for assessing results, influencing factors and sustainability, while also allowing for nuanced exploration of challenges and unintended effects.

The framework should be developed from a broad understanding of the current state of play in capacity strengthening, knowledge of what works, and considerations on good practice. As such it must be based on a literature study regarding experience with capacity strengthening interventions in the energy sector and more broadly. As one input to this analysis, the evaluation team should consult the annex H of the 2015 evaluation of Capacity Development in Danish Development Assistance²⁴, which outlines Danida's approach to capacity strengthening over time, including the Results-Oriented Approach to Capacity Change²⁵, developed by Ole Therkelsen and Nils Boesen.

5.4 Selection of countries for visits

The ET will propose two to three countries for field visits, among the six focus countries (Mexico, China, South Africa, Vietnam, Indonesia and India), during the inception phase of the evaluation, based on explicit selection criteria. An inception visit must be made to one country. The criteria will be defined by the ET and approved by LEARNING during the inception phase and the choice of criteria must reflect careful and explicit consideration of how the cases will be used and analysed to ensure meaningful contributions to the evaluation conclusions. The selection should aim to express a diversity of setups, and dimensions to consider could include e.g.

- The duration of the Danish cooperation in the energy sector in the country (through DEPP and possibly prior)
- Whether countries are engaged in JETP processes
- Coverage of all main thematic areas of the DEPP (cf. above).
- Coverage of different sources of technical assistance and capacity strengthening (e.g. consultants, DFC, long term advisors, etc.).
- Coverage of different contexts as it relates to the degree of self-sufficiency in fossil fuel sources of energy and demand for renewable energy.

²⁴ [201506AnnexH \(4\).pdf](#)

²⁵ [A Results-Oriented Approach to Capacity Change](#)

5.5 Data sources

In line with the call for a mixed methodological approach, the evaluation is expected to draw on a wide range of data and data collections methods. This is expected to include:

- Literature study (academic and grey literature) regarding experience with capacity strengthening interventions in the energy sector and more broadly, in the context of development cooperation and beyond as relevant;
- Extensive document review, for context and development in partner countries, the Danish support as well as core information regarding support from other donors, reports and other output from partner institutions, existing evaluations, reviews, research and grey literature of relevance to the specific issue of green energy transition in partner countries;
- Key informant interviews with stakeholders (current and former), including from:
 - The MFA (central and embassies), the Danish Energy Agency, the Danish Ministry of Climate, Energy and Utilities.
 - Providers of technical assistance, including the Energinet, consultants in the consortium, the Danish Fellowship Centre, and posted advisers.
 - Stakeholders in partner countries at all levels, e.g. government and partner institution representatives.
 - Other development partners, including like-minded bilateral donors and multilateral organisations active in the energy sector in partner countries;
 - Independent researchers from e.g. universities or think tanks etc., and consultants that have been involved in DEPP reviews or relevant prior evaluations.
- The evaluation team may also consider a survey amongst key stakeholder groups.
- Field visits to selected partner countries to collect primary data and validate findings. Dialogue with partners and inclusion of partner experiences and perspectives is considered highly important.
- Use of existing quantitative data sources on relevant outcomes and impact measures, e.g. as it relates to the energy sector in partner countries, socio-economic impact indicators and overall climate mitigation metrics.

6. Outputs

The following outputs are envisaged:

- An Inception Report (expectedly not exceeding 15,000 words excluding annexes), draft(s) and final version, including:
 - A brief review of the literature on effective capacity strengthening interventions, and a description of how insights from this literature will guide the evaluation framework.
 - A preliminary mapping and documentation of the programme, cf. Q0 above, to be finalised during the main evaluation phase.
 - A review of the evaluation questions (Q1-Q7) in an evaluation matrix, including the elaborated sub-questions needed to cover the scope, and definition of indicators to be employed.
 - A detailed outline of the evaluation methodology, including selection of countries for field visits, and work programme.
 - An identification of key hypothesis to be addressed during field visits.
 - An annex with a short country visit report ((expectedly not exceeding 7,500 words)
 - A suggested outline for the main report
- Short country visit reports (expectedly not exceeding 7,500 words each);
- A Preliminary Findings Paper (expectedly not exceeding 15,000 words);
- Draft Evaluation Report(s) including Executive Summary (expectedly not exceeding 25,000 words excluding annexes);
- A final Evaluation Report including Executive Summary (expectedly not exceeding 25,000 words excluding annexes);

The final approved Evaluation Report will also serve as the Completion Report, cf. Section 1.01 of the Agreement.

7. Timing

A tentative schedule for the evaluation is as follows:

Activity	Date/period	Responsible
Contract signed	End of May 2025	LEARNING and ET

Inception phase, including one country visit	June - August 2025	ET
Draft Inception Report for discussion with ERG	End of August 2025	ET and ERG
Main evaluation phase, including two to three country visits	September - November 2025	ET
Workshop on emerging findings with DEA/MCEU	October/November 2025	ET, LEARNING, DEA, MCEU
Preliminary Findings Paper for comments from ERG	November 2025	ET and ERG
Draft Evaluation Report for discussion with ERG	January 2026	ET and ERG
Final Evaluation Report	February 2026	ET
Launch of Evaluation Report with possible seminar	March/April 2026	LEARNING

8. Team composition

8.1 Evaluation Team (ET, the Consultant)

The ET must consist of a team leader (Key Staff) and two to three core team members (Key Staff). The ET must have significant combined expertise in:

- Evaluation of capacity strengthening interventions
- Development cooperation in the area of energy transition
- Danish development cooperation

In addition, the ET must include national consultants (Key Staff) from each of the six focus countries (Mexico, China, South Africa, Vietnam, Indonesia and India), who are national energy sector experts.

The ET may optionally be supported by additional subject matter specialists (Key Staff), including technical experts.

9. Budget

The total budget for the evaluation (including one inception visit and three country visits during the main evaluation phase) is 4,300,000 DKK net of VAT. The budget shall include all fees and reimbursable expenses required for the provision of the Services and completion of the Assignment, including surveys, country visits, participation in ERGs, a workshop on emerging findings and a final workshop/launch of the evaluation report.

Within the total budget, the Client has determined a maximum budget of DKK 700,000 net of VAT to cover for the costs related to the third country visit, should the Client and Consultant during the inception phase determine that three country visits are required, cf. 3.1 (which indicates two to three country visits, to be decided during the inception phase).

It is the responsibility of the Consultant to ensure that the products and outputs specified above, and all other tasks specified (by the Client or the Consultant) are performed within the framework of the tender and the Contract Price.

A designated technical QA expert shall be assigned, with time set aside for technical/analytical QA, both in budget and in work plan.

The cost of internal quality assurance management must be included in the Consultant's overhead.

10. Reporting Requirements

The approved Final Evaluation Report will serve as Completion Report, cf. Section 1.01 of the Agreement.

11. Management

11.1 Evaluation management (LEARNING, the Client)

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

- Provide feedback to the ET;
- Comment on the draft Inception Report, country visit reports, Preliminary Findings Paper, and the draft Evaluation Report as well as approve the final Evaluation Report;
- Organize and participate in meetings of the ERG and the workshop on emerging findings;
- Facilitate possible workshop(s) after the completion of the evaluation in Copenhagen.

11.2 Evaluation Team (ET, the Consultant)

The ET will carry out the Assignment based on the Agreement and will:

- Prepare and carry out the evaluation according to Appendix 1 Scope of Services, the approved Inception Report, the OECD-DAC Evaluation Quality Standards²⁶ and the Danida Evaluation Guidelines²⁷;

²⁶ https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/dac-quality-standards-for-development-evaluation_9789264083905-en

²⁷ <https://um.dk/en/-/media/websites/umen/danida/results/evaluation-of-development-assistance/relevant-documents/evaluation-guidelines-2024.ashx>

- Be responsible to the evaluation management for the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- Ensure that quality assurance is carried out and documented throughout the evaluation process (as described in Appendix 1 Scope of Services);
- Report to LEARNING regularly about progress of the evaluation;
- Organise and coordinate meetings and studies, and other key events, including emerging findings workshop, debriefing sessions and/or validation workshops.

The Team Leader is responsible for the organisation, quality assurance and reporting of the work of the ET.

The Team Leader and the core team members will participate in meetings of the ERG, and the workshop on emerging findings. The Team Leader, and possibly core team members as relevant, will participate in the final workshop/launch of the evaluation report.

11.3 Consultant's home office and quality assurance

The Consultant's home office shall provide the following:

- General home office administration and professional back-up;
- Quality assurance (QA) in accordance with the quality management and quality assurance system described in the tender.

In addition to the ET, the Assignment shall be supported by a QA manager and a technical QA expert (see Section B) to ensure that the Team Leader receives timely and substantial QA input during the Assignment and to draft evaluation outputs.

The QA manager and the technical QA expert will participate in meetings during the inception phase.

LEARNING may request documentation for the QA undertaken in the process.

The Consultant must appoint a Consultant Representative who legally represents the Consultant in matters pertaining to the administration of the Agreement and implementation of the Services, cf. Article XXX of the Consultancy Agreement. The Consultant Representative shall upon request participate in meetings with LEARNING regarding delays in the performance of the Services, or if the Services do not live up to the reasonable expectations of the evaluation management.

11.4 Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)

An ERG will be established and chaired by LEARNING. The mandate of the ERG is to provide advisory support and inputs to the evaluation, e.g. through comments to draft reports. The ERG will work with direct meetings, e-mail communication and/or videoconferencing.

The main tasks of the ERG are to:

- Comment on the draft Inception Report, draft Preliminary Findings Paper, short country visit reports and the draft Evaluation Report to ensure that the evaluation is based on factual knowledge about Danish management of development cooperation.

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.

12. Security

If the Client and the Consultant agree that close protection is required during the Assignment, the Consultant shall use the security company provided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, regardless of whether staff from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs participates in the missions in an area of conflict or an area with high security risks. The Consultant hence accepts and agrees to use the security company used for close protection by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and accepts and agrees that this security company will carry out protection to the full satisfaction of the Consultant, as indicated in Section 19.03 of the Agreement. The Client will determine a fixed budget for the expenses to be paid to the security company, but the Client will reimburse the actual expenses to be paid to the security company. The Consultant shall in a timely manner keep the Client informed in case the expense exceeds the budgeted amount.

13. Eligibility

The OECD-DAC evaluation principles of independence of the ET 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.²⁸

14. Background Documents

Boesen, N. and O. Therkildsen (2005) A Results-Oriented Approach to Capacity Change. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.

Danish Energy Agency (2022) Paper on the Multidimensional Concept of Poverty and the Human Rights-Based Approach in the Danish Energy Agency's Government to Government Cooperation. Will be made available to the evaluation team.

LTS International (2015) Evaluation of Denmark's Climate Change Funding to Developing Countries. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark and Ministry of Energy, Utilities and Climate (2016). Guiding Principles for the Danish Climate Envelope.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark (2022) How to – Energy Transition and Emissions Reductions in Development Cooperation

Niras and Indevlop (2016) Joint Scandinavian Evaluation of Support to Capacity Development. Annex H, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.

Particip and Overseas Development Institute (2021) Evaluation of Danish Funding for Climate Change Mitigation in Developing Countries. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark

²⁸ See: [Danida Evaluation Guidelines, April 2024, Chapter 6 and Annex 1](#).

Other relevant documents can be found at the website of LEARNING and under Policies & strategies of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.