

Annex C: Methodology

Evaluation approach

Key features of the evaluation

Our overall methodological approach has been guided by what we consider to be a number of key features of the evaluation as follows:

Firstly, we considered the purpose of the Evaluation of the PSF to be closer to that of **learning evaluation rather than a performance evaluation**. This is for two key reasons: 1) the forward learning orientation of the evaluation and 2) the absence of fully elaborated results chains and theories of change at the fund and programme level making a causally-robust evaluative assessment of performance under the criterion of effectiveness and impact unattainable. For these reasons the evaluation emphasises the identification of emerging key lessons, good practices and shortcomings. These inform the key recommendations efforts to strengthen Fund performance going forward, including through the identification and integration of theories of change within programming processes.

Secondly, we have considered that the **process** of the Evaluation will be as important as the product (this report). The evaluation has taken place at an important juncture in the evolution of the fund accompanying key stakeholders as they reflect on experience to date and look towards the next programming phase. This process orientated approach has necessitated close communication between the evaluation team and key stakeholders in then Evaluation Steering Group (ESG), to ensure that key findings are fed back promptly and are reflected in Fund activities. The evaluation team spent a week in Copenhagen in June 2014 following the field work in order to feedback key findings at an early stage, gather further data as necessary and facilitate a Theory of Change workshop with programme staff.

Thirdly, we have understood that ensuring **openness, transparency, and inclusiveness** is an important element of the evaluation. This was particularly evident in the decision by the ESG to organise meetings with key stakeholders outside of the Danish Government in Copenhagen in March 2014 early in the process. The team therefore replicated this type of stakeholder meeting in Nairobi during the field work missions.¹

The Evaluation used a mixed-methods approach drawing on a combination of data collection methods to support triangulation and corroboration of key findings. Data collection methods were predominantly qualitative, obtained through key informant interviews, stakeholder workshops and a desk review. However, this was supplemented by quantitative data in the form of an overview of budgets and disbursements according to a typology of interventions

The Evaluation reviewed the PSF against the four key evaluation questions highlighted in the Terms of Reference as follows:

1. With regard to relevance, have the interventions supported been relevant to the wider strategic priorities in Danish policies and the situations on the ground and has the intervention logic underpinning the Fund's interventions been sufficiently clear, realistic and robust?
2. With regard to efficiency and effectiveness, what are the comparative advantages of the Fund vis-à-vis other funding channels in addressing stabilisation through integrated approaches in conflict affected areas and what lessons are there related to synergies and coherence with other Danish funding channels?

¹ Efforts to meet with non-governmental stakeholders outside the PSF in Addis Ababa were not successful due to problems with scheduling.

3. With regard to coherence, what has been the Fund's success in combining and optimising diplomatic, defence, and development instruments into integrated approaches to stabilisation and conflict prevention?
4. With regard to results, and given the size of the Fund, how can the approach be optimised to secure impact?

These are broken down into further sub-questions identified by the team and listed in the evaluation framework in Annex E.

Evaluation strands

The Evaluation progressed along three interlinked strands:

A global review. The team captured lessons and key issues relating to performance at the overall strategic fund level in relation to, for example, fund management, decision making structures, tools, strategic choices and the overall approach of the fund, including through elucidating and reflecting on the broad implicit theories of change underpinning the fund.

A programme level review. This provided an assessment and distillation of lessons, including through elucidating and reflecting on the validity of the broad implicit theories of change at the level of regional programmes, while also informing the overall global review. The team focused on the Horn of Africa and Afghanistan Programmes, while also seeking to extract lessons from the newer programmes in both Syria and the Sahel. Initial consultations took place with some relevant programme related stakeholders based in Copenhagen and were followed up with further remote consultations in order to deepen the discussions around key themes identified from a more intensive programme document review. Field work was carried out in Nairobi and Addis Ababa in the Horn of Africa, while remote consultations were carried out with key stakeholders in Afghanistan, Pakistan, the Sahel region and Syria. A sampling framework identified the rationale and process of identifying individual projects within the programmes for more in depth examination.

A comparative review. This considered the PSF in relation to the UK's Global Conflict Prevention Pool and the Dutch Stability Fund in order to draw, where available, lessons and experience relating to the use of pooled funds to support integrated approaches and cross-government working. Particular issues of focus are reflected in the questions in the evaluation framework and included: approaches to developing theories of change and demonstrating results in cross-government stabilisation programming; fund management structures; and the utilisation of analytical tools. Data sources will include recent evaluations and interviews with key stakeholders.

The review drew on the same analytical framework contained within the evaluation framework at strategic and programme levels, to ensure consistency and coherence in the final aggregate review product. Gender and human rights were treated as cross cutting themes through the inclusion of specific questions in the evaluation framework.

Sampling Strategy for Projects Field Work and Remote Consultations

Purpose

The purpose of the sampling framework was to identify a selection of projects to be examined in greater depth through the field work, remote consultation and document review as a primary source of evidence and learning for the programme and fund level review.

Sampling selection and criteria

The sample was purposively selected in order to review a range of projects within the two regional programmes and outside of the regional allocations that represent the different sectors and modalities

of intervention the fund has supported. (The typology of Fund Interventions and allocations is outlined in Annex L.1). They include:

- Programmes from the Afghanistan/Pakistan, Horn of Africa, and country programmes portfolios;
- A mix of programmes managed directly by the Danish government, managed jointly with other governments, and managed by a third party;
- Projects from across a range of thematic sectors; and
- Projects receiving only DAC, only non-DAC, or both DAC and non-DAC funding.

The main sampling criterion for projects outside of the two regional programmes was that, being later allocations, their development and implementation might contain elements of learning in relation to the integration of theories of change, the development of results frameworks or programme management.

Finally, the selection was informed, to an extent, by access and availability of key stakeholders. So, for example, the list included those projects where the evaluation team was able to meet with key programme staff during the initial consultations in Copenhagen in March 2014.

It should be noted that, as highlighted elsewhere in this report, the evaluation did not seek to make judgements on the results and impact of individual projects selected through the sampling frame. Rather, a focus on these projects aimed to distil key lessons and examples to illustrate the broader programme and fund level assessment in line with the core evaluation questions and evaluation framework.

The sample included five engagements from the Horn of Africa programme, four engagements from the Afghanistan-Pakistan programme, and two engagements funded outside these regions. However, the evaluation was not limited to these projects since the full portfolio of projects was examined in order to make judgements as to their strategic relevance and coherence.

Table C.1: Programmes in the sampling frame and selected characteristics.

		Direct management	Joint management	Third-party management	Security & Justice	Counter-terrorism	Maritime & counter-piracy	Dialogue, peacebuilding, & political solutions	Counter-narcotics	border, money laundering and counter-	DAC component	Non-DAC component
		MODALITY			THEMES					§		
Horn of Africa	Improved rule of law in Somalia			X	X	X					X	X
	Capacity building of EASF		X		X						X	X
	Prevention of radicalization and violent extremism in Kenya	X				X						X
	Strengthening FIUs, anti-money laundering and counter-terrorism financing structures (Addis)	X		X		X	X					X
	International coordination on counter-piracy efforts: Working group 2		X				X				X	X
AfPak	Support to national and regional reconciliation in Afghanistan			X				X			X	
	Capacity building for ANSF - Contributions to ANA TF and bilateral support			X	X							X
	Capacity building for ANSF – bilateral support including Commander Pool	X			X							X
	Regional border management & counter-narcotics in South / Central Asia			X					X			X
	UNDP Helmand			X	X				X	X		
Other	Sahel portfolio, including Countering Violent Extremism in the Sahel and Contribution a la Consolidation de la Paix dans le Nord du Niger	X		X	X	X			X	X		
	Syria portfolio, including Track II initiative on the architecture of a peace agreement and Integrated Community Security Programme		X		X			X			X	

		Direct management	Joint management	Third-party management	Security & Justice	Counter-terrorism	Maritime & counter-piracy	Dialogue, peacebuilding, & political solutions	border, money laundering and counter-narcotics	DAC component	Non-DAC component
		MODALITY			THEMES					§	
Total	Total no. programmes	5	3	6	5	4	3	2	2	7	7
Total	Total funding (DKK m)	44	71	179	153	41	9.5	42	49	204	106

Evaluation Framework

The evaluation framework provides the analytical framework for the evaluation and a summary of the methodology by which the evaluation questions will be answered, including the overall evaluation questions, core evaluation questions, indicative sub-questions, data sources and data collection methods, indicators (where relevant) and methods for data analysis.

In **column one** each of the overall evaluation questions in the ToR are divided into two to three core evaluation questions (EQs). These are then supplemented by a number of indicative sub-questions in **column two** which focus attention on key issues as a guide for answering the overall evaluation questions. The identification of sub-questions has been guided by two sources: the findings and key themes emerging from stakeholder consultations in Copenhagen and initial desk review; and a reading of the original sub-questions in the ToR.

Indicators have been included in **column three** where thought useful and relevant in order to identify criteria used to determine answers to the sub-questions based on the information from different sources. The indicators are predominantly qualitative and will rely on judgements made by the evaluation team on the basis of available evidence.

Data Sources and Collection Methods

The following data and data collection methods will be used for each strand of the Evaluation:

Desk review of management information on budgets and disbursements

These were presented according to the mapping and typology of interventions outlined in Chapter 3 above in order to provide a snapshot of key expenditure, funding sources, implementation modalities and thematic areas at the global and programme level.

Face to face key Informant Interviews

A full list of stakeholders for key informant interviews is provided in Annex K.

The following table provides an overview of stakeholders for face to face key informant interviews (KIIs) by type, location and evaluation strand.

Table C.2: Overview of stakeholders

Stakeholder type	Stakeholder	Location	Evaluation Strand
Individuals engaged in fund management and decision making	Members of the Whole of Government Secretariat	Copenhagen	Global level
	Whole of Government Board		
	Stabilisation and Security Policy Team		
	Department for Development Policy and Global Cooperation		
Individuals engaged in PSF programme management and oversight in MFA	Middle East and Northern Africa Team	Copenhagen	Programme level
	Africa Team and Asia		
	Asia, Oceania and Latin America Team		
Individuals engaged in PSF projects / deployments / engagements	Danish Defence Command	Copenhagen	Programme level
	Ministry of Justice, Public Prosecutor for Serious Economic and international Crime		
	Centre for Legal Services		
	Desk Officers and Stabilisation Advisors within Royal Danish Embassies (RDEs) in Addis Ababa and Nairobi	Addis Ababa and Nairobi	
	Political, development and defence actors within the RDE		
	Individuals from implementing partners and final beneficiaries where possible		
Individuals from other donor agencies	Other donors engaged in the region	Addis Ababa and Nairobi	Programme level
External stakeholders	External stakeholders with an understanding of either a) Danish engagement in the region or b) regional conflict context (e.g. from think tanks, NGOs etc.)	Nairobi and Addis Ababa (tbc)	Programme level
Individuals involved in the management of other donor stabilisation funds and cross government	Individuals involved in managing UK Global Conflict Prevention Pool (DFID)	London	Comparative Review

stabilisation efforts

Remote consultations

The following table provides an overview stakeholder remote KIIs by type, location and evaluation strand.

Table C.3: Overview of remote consultations

Stakeholder type	Stakeholder	Evaluation Strand
Individuals engaged in projects/ deployments / engagements	Desk Officers and Stabilisation Advisors within Royal Danish Embassies (RDEs) in Kabul and Islamabad, Syria and the Sahel	Programme level review
	Individuals from implementing partners and final beneficiaries where possible	
	Political, development and defence actors within the RDE	
Individuals from other donor agencies	Other donors engaged in the region	
Individuals involved in the management of other donor funds and cross government stabilisation efforts	Individuals involved in managing the Dutch Stability Fund Members of the stabilisation leaders forum	Comparative Review

Desk Review

Annex J lists documentation consulted which includes:

- Foundational documents and other documents relating to the management and administration of the fund;
- PSF Programme and project documentation for the Horn of Africa, Afghanistan and Pakistan Programme, Sahel and Syria interventions;
- Programme and Policy documents relating to Danish country and regional programmes;
- All relevant review documents and results reports relating to the fund;
- Evaluations of the UK Global Conflict Prevention Pool; and
- Guidance and lessons documentation relating to stabilisation and integrated approaches, in particular relating to M&E of stabilisation efforts and context analysis.

A desk review matrix was developed by the team in order to organise data in line with the evaluation questions and core evaluation questions in the evaluation framework.

Methods for data analysis

Table C.4: Outline of methods of data analysis used

Approach	Brief description and rationale -	Relevant to...
----------	-----------------------------------	----------------

Theory based approach	A theory based approach will be used to assess the validity of assumptions and strength of the causal linkages/ intervention logics underpinning interventions. Using this approach will inform learning and the future direction of the fund, supporting the integration of a more explicit approach to ToC going forward.	Question 1
Contribution Analysis	Contribution analysis situates the programme within the broader context. It identifies and presents evidence for the range of factors and explanations for change, such as other related programmes, policies, economic or political trends or behaviour. Contribution analysis is a useful approach in complex, fluid environments where counterfactuals are absent and the number of variables influencing change make attribution of change to any one intervention or actor impossible. Using this approach will help to reduce uncertainty about the contribution made, and strengthen the plausibility of any emerging observations in relation to the intervention's impacts and effectiveness.	Questions 2 and 4
Comparison/ Gap Analysis	Comparison analysis will involve comparing the wider strategic priorities within Danish policies and fund objectives with what has been implemented in practice and explores the likely factors behind any disjuncture.	Question 1
Mapping and Typology of interventions	Interventions are to be mapped geographically and a typology of interventions developed to reflect the different modalities of interventions. An overview of budgets and disbursements will be presented according to this typology and serve as a data set to inform other forms of analysis – e.g. comparison analysis etc.	Question 1,2,3
Content, pattern and trend analysis	This involves analysing the content of responses from interviews in order to distil key findings in line with the evaluation framework. The team will also examine the data for patterns to decide whether responses are determined by certain variables (e.g. implementation partner type.)	Questions 1,2,3,4
Mixed methods integration/ triangulation	Since the team will be using a mixed methods approach, data collected from different methods will be integrated to arrive at findings. This enables the team to cross validate and verify or triangulate findings in order to create more confidence in their validity.	Questions 1,2,3,4