

## Annex F: Impact Framework

Dimensions of Change	Indicators	Assumptions	Lines of Enquiry
<b>Strategic Goal 1: Promotion of a vibrant and open debate nationally and internationally</b>			
<p>Vibrant national and international debate on poverty reduction.</p> <p>National and international participation of CSOs in the development of the Paris Declaration.</p>	<p>Examples of international debate that Denmark has contributed to.</p> <p>Examples of role of national CSOs in international fora and networks.</p>	<p>National and international debate supports pro-poor development outcomes and achievement of MDGs.</p>	<p>How have the debates changed?</p> <p>How has what has been supported contributed to the participation and voice of national CSOs in international fora and networks?</p> <p>(See also Strategic Goal 3)</p>
<p>Enabling frameworks for civil society participation in developing countries.</p>	<p>Civicus index.</p> <p>Southern CSO perceptions of context.</p> <p>Examples of changes in social, legal, political operating context for CSOs.</p>	<p>The formalisation of CSOs rights and responsibilities in national legislation and their inclusion in dialogue contributes to promoting constructive public debate.</p>	<p>What has changed in relation to the enabling frameworks and space for civil society action over the period? What difference has this made and to whom?</p> <p>How has Denmark responded to challenges to the space available for civil society action?</p> <p>What has Denmark supported – financially or non-financially – to promote enabling frameworks?</p> <p>How far have international frameworks evolved to support civil society participation in relevant debates and fora?</p>

**Strategic Goal 2: Promotion of a representative, legitimate and locally based civil society**

<p><b>Diversity</b></p> <p>Increased diversity of CSOs reflecting the needs and circumstances of many different groups.</p>	<p>Civil society mapping exercise available.</p> <p>Diverse categorisation of civil society actors/groups that are supported.</p> <p>Analysis of types of organisations not supported.</p>	<p>Diversity in civil society is a value in its own right.</p> <p>“Diversity gives civil society the legitimacy and potential to ensure that the voices of marginalised groups are heard”.</p> <p>Diversity in civil society, therefore, contributes also to Denmark’s development goals e.g. pro-poor human development, good governance etc.</p>	<p>How far is Danish support based on a detailed analysis and understanding of the range of civil society organisations operating in the context?</p> <p>How broad is the range of CSOs (in relation to geography, theme, target group) directly or indirectly supported by the CS strategy?</p> <p>How has this changed since 2008?</p> <p>Are there significant civil society actors/groups not supported by the CS strategy who could be more influential in achieving pro-poor outcomes?</p> <p>To what extent do different funding mechanisms support a broader reach and diversity?</p>
<p><b>Legitimacy</b></p> <p>Greater emphasis and adoption by Southern CSOs of good governance, popular foundation and participation of target groups and constituencies in decision-making processes.</p>	<p>Number and % of organisations at different levels of community and constituency building (could use CAFOD voice and accountability tool).</p> <p>% of support that is going to organisations of poor and marginalised people themselves.</p>	<p>Social organisation is a value in itself and a force for social change.</p> <p>A popular foundation increases the relevance and legitimacy of CSOs in building effective and democratic states.</p> <p>CSOs enable poor and marginalised people to have a voice and to monitor how resources are used.</p>	<p>What is the relationship between intermediary organisations and target groups? What role are the intermediaries playing, has this changed at all?</p> <p>How far are the organisations supported responsive and accountable to the needs and priorities of poor and excluded groups?</p> <p>Are organisations supported strengthening the capacity for action of poor and marginalised people?</p>

	<p>Examples of strengthened capacity for action of the poor and marginalised.</p> <p>Examples of promotion of participatory and inclusive practices.</p> <p>Governance structures of CSOs visited.</p>		<p>To what extent are they organisations of poor an excluded group themselves?</p> <p>To what extent do the organisations supported promote participatory and inclusive (non discriminatory) approaches including gender equality?</p> <p>To what extent have the organisations supported strengthened and democratised their governance and management structures?</p>
<p><b>Adoption of Paris principles</b></p> <p><b>Results orientation:</b> Ability to demonstrate results to public authorities, the general public and other stakeholders.</p>	<p>Stakeholder perceptions of the quality of information available in CSO reports.</p>	<p>Improved capacity of organisations to monitor and demonstrate results leads to improved effectiveness.</p>	<p>Are CSOs developing M&amp;E systems that enable them to monitor and demonstrate results? How has their practice changed over the period and what are the consequences of this? (SG 9).</p>
<p><b>Ownership:</b> Increased capacity to assume independent responsibility to prepare and implement development activities.</p>	<p>See Strategic Goal 3 (capacity).</p>	<p>Increased independence and capacity of organisations to achieve their development goals contributes to Danida civil society and development goals.</p>	<p>See Strategic Goal 3 (capacity).</p>
<p><b>Coordination of efforts:</b> increased CSO capacity to collaborate on joint initiatives and shared goals.</p>	<p>Number and examples of improved harmonisation.</p>	<p>Increased collaboration between CSOs contributes to Danida civil society and development goals.</p>	<p>To what extent is Denmark promoting harmonisation with other donors when providing support to CSOs?</p>

			To what extent are NNGOs working to harmonise their support for CSOs?
<b>Strategic Goal 3: Promotion of capacity development, advocacy work and networking opportunities</b>			
Increased CSO capacity to assume responsibility to prepare and implement development activities.	<p>% of support being channelled to capacity development.</p> <p>Scope of capacity development initiatives and activities.</p> <p>Types of role and activity of Danish NGOs.</p> <p>Northern and Southern CSO perceptions of capacity development.</p> <p>Analysis of level of financial dependency on Danida or intermediaries.</p>	<p>Danish NGO partnership with Southern CSOs is a critical and effective means of increasing the independent capacity of Southern CSOs.</p> <p>Danish NGOs add value in their relationship with Southern CSOs by e.g. contributing professional knowledge; introducing a people-to-people dimension between communities in Denmark and in developing countries; linking partners through international networks; promoting knowledge on rights; and supporting diversity. SG 7 and 8.</p>	<p>What has changed?</p> <p>To what extent are activities supported targeted at capacity development of Southern CSOs.</p> <p>To what extent do different mechanisms promote local ownership by Southern CSOs and actors?</p> <p>What role are Danish NGOs playing and has this changed since 2008?</p> <p>How far do capacity development activities/methodologies give ownership to Southern CSOs i.e. how demand rather than supply led are they?</p> <p>To what extent do different approaches/mechanisms contribute to the sustainability of CSOs?</p> <p>To what extent are partnerships creating meaningful links between communities in Denmark and in developing countries? SG 7 and 8.</p>
Increased capacity to engage in advocacy and to influence policy and practice at local	Southern CSO perceptions of advocacy capacity.	CSOs supported in advocacy work are not affiliated to political parties.	To what extent have different mechanisms expanded the capacity of Southern CSOs to access other levels of influence or to increase

<p>national and international levels.</p>	<p>Frequency and types of engagement with government.</p> <p>Examples of Southern CSO influence on policy/practice.</p>	<p>CSOs can build bridges between government interests and the needs of marginalised groups to voice their views and influence social development.</p>	<p>their position and profile?</p> <p>Is there evidence of increased CSO advocacy capacity and activity in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Raising awareness</li> <li>- Getting issue on the agenda</li> <li>- Creating a constituency for change</li> <li>- Changing policy</li> <li>- Changing policy implementation</li> <li>- Changes in attitudes and beliefs</li> <li>- Changes in people's lives.</li> </ul> <p>What is the engagement between CSOs and government at different levels and how has this changed over the period?</p> <p>What role do Danish NGOs play in advocacy? How does this support the voice of Southern CSOs?</p>
---	---	--	---

<p>Increased CSO involvement in national, regional and international networks.</p>	<p>Examples of expansion of networking activity.</p> <p>Range of Southern CSO collaboration.</p> <p>Role of national CSOs in international networks.</p>	<p>Networks and alliances increase impact and influence; reduce transaction costs; prevent initiatives being hijacked by special interests; and offer opportunities for sharing and capacity building.</p> <p>Representatives and organisations from developing countries should be placed centre stage and given real influence and voice in North/South CSOs networks.</p> <p>Danish CSOs can contribute to network creation.</p>	<p>How much are CSOs involved in collaborating with others) to achieve development outcomes? At what levels (local, national, regional, international). How has this changed over the period?</p> <p>How broad is the range of actors they are collaborating with and how has this changed? <i>Strategic Goal 8</i></p> <p>What role have Danish NGOs played in networking?</p> <p>Are representatives and organisations from developing countries placed centre stage and given real influence and voice in international networks?</p> <p>How effective have these networks and alliances been in achieving development outcomes?</p>
--	--	---	---