

# Annex H Evaluation matrix

## H.1 Reworking of the evaluation questions

The terms of reference presents 38 questions for the evaluation team to answer. The evaluation team considered that this presented too many questions, particularly for key informant interviews, as these will be the backbone of the evaluation. The evaluation team reworked the questions to reduce the number of questions to 20 or so. Inevitably this has led to less attention on some topics, but it helps to ensure that the evaluation could be a little deeper.

Please note that the question on “Who Benefits?” has been moved from efficiency to effectiveness. The question on immediate or longer-term impact have been moved to sustainability.

**Table 22: Reworking of the ToR questions (repeated questions are shown with a grey background).**

<i>Original criteria</i>	<i>Revised criteria</i>	<i>Original question</i>	<i>Revised question</i>
Relevance	<i>Relevance</i>	To what extent are the Danish ROI activities in Afghanistan relevant vis-a-vis the “Strategy for Danish Political, Civilian and Military Efforts” (2008-12), the Danish ROI Strategic Framework and the new Danish Strategy for Development Policy?	To what extent is the ROI support in Afghanistan coherent with other relevant Danish policies?
Relevance	<i>Relevance</i>	To what extent is the Danish ROI support relevant vis-a-vis the Afghan National Development Strategy (ANDS), relevant sector policies, and interventions by other donors and agencies? Are there any unfilled gaps, and if so, are they justified? (e.g. was the deliberate decision not to deal with returnees in urban settings adequate?)	To what extent are the ROI plans and activities coherent with the policies of the Afghan Government and other development actors?
Relevance	<i>Relevance</i>	To what extent is the Danish ROI support relevant vis-à-vis local needs and priorities (as defined and perceived by e.g. local authorities and community organizations and other relevant actors)?	To what extent is the Danish ROI support relevant to local needs and priorities (as defined and perceived by e.g. local authorities and community organizations, men and women, and other relevant actors)?
Relevance	<i>Relevance</i>	Are the partners through whom Danish support is channelled aligning their implementation standards to national / sector guidelines and policies?	To what extent are the ROI plans and activities coherent with the policies of the Afghan Government and other development actors?

<i>Original criteria</i>	<i>Revised criteria</i>	<i>Original question</i>	<i>Revised question</i>
Relevance	<i>Sustainability</i>	Are the practical approaches of the Danish ROI support within the main areas of operation (legal assistance, shelter, water supply, rural development) appropriate and sufficiently balanced in terms of supporting immediate needs as well as longer-term development options?	What is the balance between meeting immediate relief/recovery needs and long-term development needs (physical targets/capacity building)?
Relevance	<i>Relevance</i>	Is the practical approach applied to gender equality issues, protection of children and ethnic minority groups (to the extent this is relevant) in the Danish ROI support appropriate?	How have ROI partners addressed gender equality and the protection of children and of minority groups?
Relevance	<i>Relevance</i>	To what extent is the Danish ROI support coherent vis-à-vis other ROI related activities implemented by the Government?	To what extent are the ROI plans and activities coherent with the policies of the Afghan Government and other development actors?
Relevance	<i>Relevance</i>	To what extent is the Danish ROI support harmonised with, and complementary to, ROI related activities supported by other humanitarian and development partners in Afghanistan?	To what extent are the ROI plans and activities coherent with the policies of the Afghan Government and other development actors?
Efficiency	<i>Efficiency</i>	Is the actual implementation deviating from the strategies and plans stated in the programme document, and if so what have been the reasons and consequences?	Is the actual implementation deviating from the strategies and plans stated in the ROI programme document, and if so what have been the reasons and consequences?
Efficiency	<i>Sustainability</i>	Is the Danish ROI support planned flexible enough to allow on-going adjustment to developments in the security situation and changing needs?	To what extent is the programme design flexible enough to cope with the identified major risks and to what extent does it include mitigation measures?
Efficiency	<i>Efficiency</i>	Is the balance between support to capacity development and physical targets appropriate?	What is the balance between meeting immediate relief/recovery needs and long-term development needs (physical targets/capacity building)?
Efficiency	<i>Efficiency</i>	To what extent has the use of different partner structures – National Government (mainly MRRD), UN organizations and NGOs – been appropriate and efficient? Has the deliberate decision to exclude direct support to MORR in the programme proved adequate and efficient?	Was the mix of partners appropriate for the ROI policy objective?

<i>Original criteria</i>	<i>Revised criteria</i>	<i>Original question</i>	<i>Revised question</i>
Efficiency	<i>Efficiency</i>	Have possibilities for coordination and synergies (e.g. through working in the same areas and establishment of information sharing mechanisms) between activities implemented by the different partners through which ROI support is being channelled been exploited to the extent relevant?	To what extent has there been synergy or duplication between the different elements of the ROI?
Efficiency	<i>Efficiency</i>	Has a clear division of labour been established, taking into consideration the comparative competencies of the implementing partners? Has duplication of activities been avoided?	To what extent has there been synergy or duplication between the different elements of the ROI?
Efficiency	<i>Efficiency</i>	How have the implementing partners contributed to overall coordination efforts with other stakeholders (both in relation to supporting repatriation and reintegration at the overall level as well as within the agencies' respective focus sectors)?	To what extent has there been synergy or duplication between the ROI activities and the activities of other stakeholders? What role have ROI partners played in coordination?
Efficiency	<i>Effectiveness</i>	Have the beneficiary selection processes been carried out appropriately?	To what extent do different groups (including gender and ethnic groups) benefit from the ROI initiative?
Efficiency	<i>Efficiency</i>	Is an appropriate number of beneficiaries being reached, considering the scope/magnitude of support?	How do the unit costs and the number of persons served compare for the different implementing arrangements?
Efficiency	<i>Efficiency</i>	To what extent has monitoring and other institutional arrangements been appropriate and efficient?	To what extent have monitoring and other institutional arrangements been appropriate and efficient?
Efficiency	<i>Efficiency</i>	Have the different implementing arrangements been cost-effective? (based on mapping of costs and comparison of costs as far as possible within the Afghan context).	How do the unit costs and the number of persons served compare for the different implementing arrangements?
Efficiency	<i>Sustainability</i>	Have the implementing partners demonstrated the required capacity to design and implement the ROI activities in line with their mandate, prior experience, and scope of the respective activities?	What factors (if any) related to planning and implementation of the Danish ROI support (including partner capacity and funding cycles) are limiting or may limit the potential for obtaining longer-term impacts?

<i>Original criteria</i>	<i>Revised criteria</i>	<i>Original question</i>	<i>Revised question</i>
Efficiency	<i>Efficiency</i>	Have lessons and experiences from the first phase of the Danish ROI support been taken into consideration in the design and formulation of the second ROI support phase?	How has the programme changed from the First Phase? To what extent were these changes driven by lessons learned?
Efficiency	<i>Efficiency</i>	Has the set-up of the ROI been efficient? E.g. is the current division of tasks and responsibilities for programme administration between the Danish Embassy in Kabul and HUC clear and appropriate? Could any possible alternatives be suggested based on wider experiences, best practice examples etc.?	How effective and efficient are the present management arrangements (division of responsibility between the Embassy and HUC)?
Efficiency	<i>Impact</i>	Is the current ROI programmatic approach appropriate and efficient?	Are there indications of early impacts related to the Danida supported ROI interventions? Are they likely to achieve the intended result?
Efficiency	<i>Efficiency</i>	To what extent has the right technical capacities and skills been applied in the implementation of the ROI activities?	What factors (if any) related to planning and implementation of the Danish ROI support (including partner capacity and funding cycles) are limiting or may limit the potential for obtaining longer-term impacts?
Effectiveness	<i>Impact</i>	Have the supported activities had the intended effects or are they likely to achieve the intended effects? An overall assessment of results as well as a more in-depth assessment of specific results should be achieved.	Are there indications of early impacts related to the Danida supported ROI interventions? Are they likely to achieve the intended result?
Effectiveness	<i>Effectiveness</i>	To what extent is the Danish ROI support being targeted towards areas where large groups of refugees return?	To what extent do different groups benefit from the ROI initiative?
Effectiveness	<i>Impact</i>	Is the Danish strategy to concentrate efforts “on a few selected implementation areas and with a relatively limited number of partners” contributing to “Denmark making a difference”?	To what extent is the ROI contributing to "Denmark making a difference"? How?
Effectiveness	<i>Effectiveness</i>	To what extent are the ROI activities leading to capacity development of national/local institutions and NGOs?	Which elements of the ROI have the greatest impact on the capacity development of local/national institutions and NGOs?

<i>Original criteria</i>	<i>Revised criteria</i>	<i>Original question</i>	<i>Revised question</i>
Effectiveness	<i>Effectiveness</i>	To what extent have ROI activities been developed based on a thorough risk assessment, including strategies for risk mitigation and exit?	To what extent have ROI activities been developed based on a thorough risk assessment, including strategies for risk mitigation and exit?
Effectiveness	<i>Effectiveness</i>	Are current procedures and systems for progress reporting and monitoring at programme level sufficient to document results and possible impacts from ROI interventions?	To what extent have monitoring and other institutional arrangements been appropriate and efficient?
Impact	<i>Impact</i>	Are there indications of early impacts related to the Danida supported ROI interventions? (i.e. are interventions likely to lead to improved livelihoods in the targeted areas such as through improved access to shelter, water and sanitation facilities, legal services, employment etc. as well as through the support to production and income generating activities?	Are there indications of early impacts related to the Danida supported ROI interventions? Are they likely to achieve the intended result?
Impact	<i>Sustainability</i>	What factors (if any) related to planning and implementation of the Danish ROI support are limiting or may limit the potential obtaining of longer-term impacts?	What factors (if any) related to planning and implementation of the Danish ROI support (including partner capacity and funding cycles) are limiting or may limit the potential for obtaining longer-term impacts?
Sustainability	<i>Sustainability</i>	To what extent has the cooperation with, and involvement of, national/local institutions, NGOs, CBOs and other groups or organisations been sufficient to create national/local ownership?	For which ROI activities has the cooperation with, and involvement of, national/local institutions, NGOs, CBOs and other groups or organisations been sufficient to create national/local ownership and promote sustainability?
Sustainability	<i>Sustainability</i>	To what extent are the practical approaches (including involvement of national/local partners) applied within the main areas of operation (legal assistance, shelter, water supply, rural development) leading to sustainability?	For which ROI activities has the cooperation with, and involvement of, national/local institutions, NGOs, CBOs and other groups or organisations been sufficient to create national/local ownership and promote sustainability?
Sustainability	<i>Sustainability</i>	What major risks may influence the possible sustainability of the interventions and to what extent are defined mitigation measures likely to help combat the identified risks? How could this possibly be strengthened?	To what extent is the programme design flexible enough to cope with the identified major risks and to what extent does it include mitigation measures?

<i>Original criteria</i>	<i>Revised criteria</i>	<i>Original question</i>	<i>Revised question</i>
Sustainability	<i>Sustainability</i>	To what extent are the current funding periods long enough to create sustainability?	What factors (if any) related to planning and implementation of the Danish ROI support (including partner capacity and funding cycles) are limiting or may limit the potential for obtaining longer-term impacts?
Sustainability	<i>Sustainability</i>	To what extent is the awareness in the Government regarding conditions of returnees sufficient to create ownership?	For which ROI activities has the cooperation with, and involvement of, national/local institutions, NGOs, CBOs and other groups or organisations been sufficient to create national/local ownership and promote sustainability?
Sustainability	<i>Sustainability</i>	Are there important gaps, areas, trends, drivers of change etc. within which Denmark has not yet engaged, but which might hold potential for future Danish ROI support?	Are there important gaps, areas, trends, drivers of change etc. with which Denmark has not yet engaged, but which might hold potential for future Danish ROI support?

## H.2 Evaluation matrix

The evaluation team developed the following matrix from the revised question list drawn from the ToR questions above. The following matrix shows the revised questions. The table also shows the basis for assessment, indicators, and the sources and methods the evaluation expected to use. This matrix has been slightly amended as a result of the fieldwork. In six cases, the “number of instances” has been changed to “instances” to reflect the fact that the evaluation team rarely encountered more than a few instances of particular conditions.

Table 23: Evaluation matrix

<i>Revised question</i>	<i>Basis for assessment</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Sources and methods</i>
To what extent is the ROI support in Afghanistan coherent with other relevant Danish policies?	Clear triangulated examples of coherence or conflict with other policies	Similar objectives, indicators, strategies, priorities, and targets between ROI and other Danish policies	Analysis of policy documents, interviews with key informants including other Danish actors
How have ROI partners addressed gender equality and the protection of children and of minority groups?	Clear triangulated examples of attention to these aspects in projects	Existence of gender analysis, of analysis of impact of projects on children and minorities	Analysis of project documents and interviews with key informants
To what extent are the ROI plans and activities coherent with the policies of the Afghan Government and other development actors?	Clear triangulated examples of coherence or conflict with other policies	Similar objectives, indicators, strategies, priorities, and the policies of the government and other actors	Analysis of policy documents, interviews with key informants

<i>Revised question</i>	<i>Basis for assessment</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Sources and methods</i>
To what extent is the Danish ROI support relevant to local needs and priorities (as defined and perceived by e.g. local authorities and community organisations, men and women, and other relevant actors)?	Clear, triangulated examples of relevance to local needs. Evidence of contribution by local community and beneficiaries to ROI activities	Contribution by the affected community. Match between community priorities and ROI activities. Community engagement with ROI project processes	Analysis of project report, and evaluations. Interviews with key informants, community meetings
What is the balance between meeting immediate relief/recovery needs and long-term development needs (physical targets/capacity building)?	The extent to which the efforts of partners focus on immediate or long-term goals	Budget allocations. The time-scale for partner objectives	Analysis of project plans and reports. Interviews with key informants
Is the actual implementation deviating from the strategies and plans stated in the programme document, and if so what have been the reasons and consequences?	Clear, triangulated examples of deviations from the programme document plans. Explanations for such deviation offered by documents and interviews	Level of completion of planned activities. Changes in project plans	Key informant interviews. Analysis of project reports, comparison of annual plans with overall strategy document
To what extent is the programme design flexible enough to cope with the identified major risks and to what extent does it include mitigation measures?	Clear, triangulated evidence of the adjustment of plans to changing security and other needs. Clear evidence of actions to mitigate risks	The level of changes and adjustment ascribed to security and other major risks. Articulated mitigation measures	Key informant interviews. Analysis of any changes in plans
Was the mix of partners appropriate for the ROI policy objective?	Clear, triangulated evidence of coherence between partners' objectives and ROI objectives	Coherence between partner priorities as expressed in partner strategy and project documents and the ROI objectives	Analysis of budgets. Key informant interviews
To what extent has there been synergy or duplication between the different elements of the ROI?	Clear, triangulated examples of synergy or duplication between the actions of different ROI partners	Instances of synergy between ROI partners, number of instances of duplication between ROI partners	Comparison of project proposals. Key informant interviews
To what extent has there been synergy or duplication between the ROI activities and the activities of other stakeholders? What role have ROI partners played in coordination?	Clear, triangulated examples of synergy or duplication between the actions of ROI partners and others. Clear examples of engagement in or leadership of coordination processes	Instances of synergy between ROI partners and others, number of instances of duplication between ROI partners and others. Instances of key coordination roles for ROI partners	Key informant interviews. Analysis of evaluations and other project documents. Community meetings
How do the unit costs and the number of persons served compare for the different implementing arrangements?	Calculation of unit costs per capita	Costs per capita	Analysis of project reports

<i>Revised question</i>	<i>Basis for assessment</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Sources and methods</i>
To what extent do different groups benefit from the ROI initiative?	Clear, triangulated evidence of the pattern of distribution of benefits	%age of benefits flowing to the neediest.%age of benefits flowing to those best able to make use of them	Key informant interviews. Analysis of project reports
To what extent have monitoring and other institutional arrangements been appropriate and efficient?	Clear, triangulated evidence of monitoring activities that inform planning and establish the extent to which activities contribute to the strategic aims of the ROI	%age of ROI activities for which monitoring is up to date. Number of changes in projects attributed to monitoring	Key informant interviews. Comparison of monitoring reports with project plans and strategy
What factors (if any) related to planning and implementation of the Danish ROI support (including partner capacity and funding cycles) are limiting or may limit the potential for obtaining longer-term impacts?	Clear, triangulated evidence that ROI activities are well planned and implemented and relatively free from internal constraints	Instances where the potential of a longer-term impact are limited by planning and implementation constraints. Instances where plans proved impossible to implement due to internal factors	Key informant interviews. Monitoring reports. Progress reports
How has the programme changed from the First Phase? To what extent were these changes driven by lessons learned?	Clear, triangulated evidence that changes were based on lessons learned in the first phase	Number of instance where changes were based on lessons learned	Analysis of changes between the first and second phase documents. Key informant interviews
How effective and efficient are the present management arrangements (division of responsibility between the Embassy and HUC)?	Clear, triangulated evidence of any needed improvements in the current management arrangements	Instances where interviewees identify opportunities for significant improvement in the current management arrangement	Key informant interviews in both Copenhagen and Kabul. Interviews with other development actors on their administrative arrangements
Are there indications of early impacts related to the Danida supported ROI interventions? Are they likely to achieve the intended result?	Clear, triangulated evidence of any early impacts of different elements of the ROI	Instances where early impact looks likely	Key informant interviews. Analysis of project documents and evaluations
To what extent is the ROI contributing to "Denmark making a difference"? How?	Clear, triangulated evidence of any difference attributable to Danish support	Number of examples of where positive differences are attributable to the ROI	Key informant interviews
Which elements of the ROI have the greatest impact on the capacity development of local/national institutions and NGOs?	Clear, triangulated evidence of the capacity development impact of different elements of the ROI	Proportion of budget for capacity building. Instances of improved capacity due to capacity building	Key informant interviews, especially with partners. Project documents



<i>Revised question</i>	<i>Basis for assessment</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Sources and methods</i>
To what extent have ROI activities been developed based on a thorough risk assessment, including strategies for risk mitigation and exit?	Clear, triangulated evidence of a thorough risk assessment	Existence of a history of comprehensive and up to date risk assessments	Analysis of project documents. Key informant interviews
For which ROI activities has the cooperation with, and involvement of, national/local institutions, NGOs, CBO's and other groups or organisations been sufficient to create national/local ownership and promote sustainability?	Clear, triangulated evidence of the exercise of ownership of ROI activities by others	Instances of community and local government control of ROI interventions	Key informant interview. Project documents
Are there important gaps, areas, trends, drivers of change etc. with which Denmark has not yet engaged, but which might hold potential for future Danish ROI support?	Evidence of potential for future Danish ROI support	Instances of potential future Danish ROI activities	Key informant interviews. Evaluations of other interventions in Afghanistan