

# Annex D: Evaluation Framework

## D1.1 Criteria: relevance

OVERALL QUESTION IN THE TERMS OF REFERENCE			
<p><i>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?</i></p>			
Core Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Indicative sub-questions	Indicators	Data Sources
<p>1.1 Do the objectives and activities supported by the Fund address the wider strategic priorities in Danish foreign, security and development policies and Fund objectives and principles (including human rights and the role of women)?</p>	<p>How have the most important strategic priorities been identified? Has there been a process for mediating between competing priorities? If so, how has it functioned?</p> <p>To what extent has the Fund been used strategically to initiate new or catalytic (integrated) initiatives? What lessons have emerged from these initiatives?</p> <p>To what degree do the programmes reflect the human rights principles, including the role of women in accordance with UN 1325, on which Danish foreign policy is founded?</p> <p>What are the key barriers to doing this?</p> <p>What are the emerging good practices with regards to ensuring relevance of fund activities to strategic and fund priorities? What is the role of fund governance and management arrangements?</p>	<p>Extent to which activities and objectives supported by the fund address strategic priorities and objectives.</p> <p>Proportion of spend on priority issues and geographical locations.</p> <p>Proportion of programme activities that are new or catalytic interventions</p> <p>Extent to which programmes reflect human rights principles, including the role of women.</p>	<p>Policies and PSF foundational documents (list)</p> <p>Programme and project documents (list)</p> <p>Mapping and typology of interventions and overview of fund disbursements.</p> <p>Interviews with stakeholders engaged in programming and project development, appraisal, decision making, management and review.</p> <p>Programme and project reviews</p>
<p>1.2 Have the objectives, activities, and</p>	<p><b>Sub-questions:</b></p>		<p>Conflict analysis for Horn of</p>

<p>programming approaches (including regional focus) supported by the Fund addressed and been consistent with the challenges and key drivers of conflict and instability faced by the regions and countries encompassed by the programmes?</p>	<p>What tools and approaches are used to generate an understanding of the conflict context and what are their strengths and weaknesses?</p> <p>What lessons have emerged regarding optimising a (shared) understanding of context and reflecting this within programming?</p> <p>How can context analysis best be integrated into programming going forward? (bearing in mind the imperative of fast and flexible responses)?</p> <p>Have the objectives pursued by the fund been the most critical for addressing the key drivers of conflict?</p> <p>What key tensions and trade-offs have existed between pursuing Danish security and political priorities through the fund and addressing the underlying causes of conflict?</p> <p>How can these be best managed going forward?</p> <p>To what extent have the principles of conflict sensitivity been integrated within programming processes?</p> <p>To what extent has a regional approach been relevant to addressing the key drivers of conflict?</p>	<p>Evidence of use of tools and structured approaches to support understanding of the conflict context.</p> <p>Extent of alignment between fund programme and project objectives and activities (including regional approach) and the findings of conflict analysis in relation to the key drivers of conflict.</p> <p>Evidence of the use of tools and approaches within programming to ensure conflict sensitivity (i.e. to support a greater understanding of the context; the interaction between the intervention and the context and subsequent efforts to minimise any negative impacts).</p> <p>Strength of the evidence or theory of change logic linking outputs to outcomes of conflict management/ peacebuilding.</p>	<p>Africa, AfPak and Sahel and Syria.</p> <p>Interviews with stakeholders engaged in programming and project development, appraisal, decision making, management and review.</p> <p>Programme and project documents (list)</p> <p>Programme and project reviews</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>1.3 Has there been a sufficiently robust analytical and strategic underpinning for the fund and PSF interventions with a clear, realistic and robust intervention logic?</p>	<p>Have PSF programmes and projects employed realistic, evidenced and useful theories of change or interventions logics?</p> <p>What are the implicit (or explicit) theories of change underpinning programme objectives and intervention approaches?</p> <p>How valid are these?</p> <p>What are the key constraints for PSF programmes in employing evidenced and useful ToC and intervention logics? (e.g. tensions between rapid programming and the development of well evidence ToC)</p> <p>What are the emerging lessons regarding employing evidenced theories of change and how can this approach be optimised going forward?</p>	<p>Extent of evidence of clear, realistic and robust intervention logic and analytical underpinning in programme documentation.</p> <p>Feedback on key constraints and emerging lessons.</p>	<p>PSF project and programme documents</p> <p>Policy documents and PSF foundational documents</p> <p>Programme and project reviews</p> <p>Interviews with stakeholders engaged in programming and project development, appraisal, management and review.</p>
---	--	--	--

**D1.2 Criteria: Efficiency and Effectiveness**

OVERALL QUESTION IN THE TERMS OF REFERENCE			
<p><i>With regard to efficiency and effectiveness, what are the comparative advantages of the Fund vis-à-vis other Danish 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?</i></p>			
Evaluation questions (EQ)	Notes and possible sub-questions	Indicators	Data sources
<p>2.1 What are the comparative advantages of the Fund vis-à-vis other Danish funding channels in supporting <i>efficient</i> stabilisation</p>	<p>To what extent are the management structure, decision making processes, requirements of funding sources, administrative procedures, guidance, size of programme and choice and monitoring of</p>	<p>Evidence to demonstrate that the management structure, decision making processes, administrative procedures, guidance and choice of</p>	<p>PSF project and programme documents</p> <p>PSF guidance documents</p> <p>Interviews with stakeholders</p>

<p>efforts through integrated approaches in conflict affected areas?</p> <p>2.2 What is the range of factors influencing the efficient functioning of the PSF.</p>	<p>implementing partners (e.g. smaller vs. larger multilateral partners), programming process (identification, formulation, appraisal and quality control/ risk management) conducive to supporting efficient integrated stabilisation engagements (e.g. fast and flexible, cost-efficient, integrated etc.).</p> <p>What are the emerging lessons from the evolution of the fund to inform the efficient performance of the fund in addressing stabilisation through integrated approaches going forward?</p> <p>Is the capacity at embassies/at the MFA/MoD to provide technical and administrative oversight, to support evaluation and learning and to manage and adapt programmes as the context changes adequate? What are the key constraints?</p>	<p>implementing partners has supported efficient integrated programming.</p> <p>Description of the comparative advantages of the PSF relative to other funding channels in supporting efficient stabilisation.</p> <p>Evidence and feedback on the adequacy of capacity at embassies and in the MFA/MoD to provide technical and administrative oversight and to adapt programmes?</p> <p>Understanding of MFA/ RDE staff of the fund, its objectives and management procedures.</p>	<p>engaged in programming and project development, appraisal, management and review.</p> <p>PSF programme and project reviews</p>
<p>2.3 What are the comparative advantages of the Fund vis-à-vis other funding channels in supporting <b>effective</b> stabilisation efforts through integrated approaches in conflict affected areas?</p> <p>2.4 What are the range of factors impacting on the Fund's ability to support effective stabilisation efforts through integrated approaches in conflict affected areas?</p>	<p><b>Note:</b> <i>Limited programme level results frameworks, including indicators and related data collection at the programme raise evaluability issues in relation to evaluating the fund's performance along effectiveness criteria. We will be working within these constraints and may only be able to identify outcomes the level of individual projects.</i></p> <p>What is the range of factors influencing the effectiveness of the fund in supporting integrated stabilisation efforts? e.g. choice of implementation modality and partner, size of engagement (large multilateral vs smaller bilateral engagements), programming process (identification, formulation, appraisal etc.), risk management, fund administration and budgetary requirements?</p> <p>To what extent has the Fund's focus on</p>	<p>Description of the comparative advantages of the fund vis-à-vis other funding channels in supporting effective stabilisation efforts through integrated approaches in conflict affected areas? (e.g. feedback from stakeholders)</p> <p>Description of the range of factors the range of factors that impact on effectiveness of Fund interventions.</p> <p>Feedback from key stakeholders on the feasibility and effectiveness of the Fund's</p>	<p>Interviews with stakeholders engaged in programming and project development, appraisal, management and review.</p> <p>PSF programme and project reviews and appraisals.</p>

	<p>regional approaches been considered a) feasible b) effective by key stakeholders?</p> <p>What are the emerging lessons in order to optimise the performance of fund in supporting effective integrated stabilisation efforts going forward?</p>	focus on regional approaches.	
<p>2.5 What lessons emerge from the activities of the Fund to date related to synergies and coherence with other Danish <b>funding</b> channels?</p>	<p>How has the Fund sought to maximise synergies and coherence with other funding channels?</p> <p>What have been the key constraints and emerging lessons?</p> <p>How can synergies and coherence be optimised going forward?</p> <p>Is it clear what the PSF should be used for and when/how PSF should be used instead of other modalities?</p>	<p>Description of efforts and mechanisms to maximise synergies and coherence with other funding channels.</p> <p>Description of key constraints and emerging lessons?</p>	<p>Interviews with stakeholders engaged in programming and project development, decision making, appraisal, management and review – of PSF and other Danish funding channels.</p> <p>PSF programme and project reviews and appraisals.</p> <p>Programme and policy documents relevant to other Danish funding channels.</p>

**D1.3 Criteria: Coherence**

**OVERALL QUESTION IN THE TERMS OF REFERENCE**

*With regard to coherence, what has been the Fund's success in combining and optimizing diplomatic, defence, and development instruments into integrated approaches to stabilisation and conflict prevention?*

<b>Evaluation questions (EQ)</b>	<b>Notes and possible sub-questions</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Data sources</b>
<p>What has been the Fund's success in combining and optimizing Danish diplomatic, defence, and development instruments into integrated (or 'whole of government') approaches to stabilisation and conflict prevention?</p>	<p>What other mechanisms exist to support integrated working?</p> <p>What has been the value added of the PSF in facilitating cross-government working and coherence in support an integrated approach?</p> <p>i.e. the integration of diplomatic, defence</p>	<p>Feedback from key stakeholders on the added value of the fund in facilitating cross-government working and integrated approach and key supporting or limiting factors, e.g. supporting new working relationships</p> <p>Evidence of fund mechanisms</p>	<p>Interviews with stakeholders engaged in programming and project development, appraisal, decision making, management and review.</p> <p>PSF programme and project reviews and appraisals.</p>

	<p>and development objectives and activities under a common strategic framework? Joint funding of programmes etc.</p> <p>What factors have supported or limited the achievement of coherence and cross-government working through the fund? How can this be optimised going forward?</p>	<p>supporting cross-government working and greater coherence.</p>	<p>Programme and Policy documents relating to Danish country and regional programmes</p>
<p>What has been the fund's success in supporting coherence and integrated approaches within the overall partner efforts in the country/ region concerned?</p>	<p>To what extent have fund interventions sought coherence with overall partner efforts in a country/region? Including to ensure critical mass?</p> <p>What strategies have fund stakeholders employed to promote coherence and integrated approaches with overall partner efforts in a country/region?</p> <p>Are specific strategies more effective than others?</p> <p>What are the constraints and emerging lessons with regard to partner coherence with partner efforts?</p> <p>How can partner coherence be optimised going forward?</p>	<p>Evidence of efforts to seek coherence with overall partner efforts. E.g. discussion of fund programming within joint working groups, alignment with broader strategic frameworks, joint or parallel programming.</p> <p>Feedback on key constraints and emerging lessons.</p>	<p>Partner country strategic frameworks (e.g. Somali Compact); common donor strategic frameworks.</p> <p>Interviews with stakeholders from Denmark and other donor agencies engaged in stabilisation programming and project development, appraisal, decision making, management and review.</p>

**D1.4 Criteria: Impact**

OVERALL QUESTION IN THE TERMS OF REFERENCE			
<i>With regard to results, and given the size of the Fund, how can the approach be optimised to secure impact?</i>			
Evaluation questions (EQ)	Notes and possible sub-questions	Indicators	Data sources
With regard to results, and given the size of the Fund, how can the approach be optimised to secure impact?	<p>What lessons can be identified to inform the future measurement of results/ results framework for the fund going forward and the identification of theories of change?</p> <p>What lessons can be captured in this respect from the newer programmes?</p>	Feedback from key stakeholders	Interviews with stakeholders from Denmark and other donor agencies engaged in stabilisation programming and project development, appraisal, decision making, management and review.
What outcomes and impacts of the programme can be identified?	<p><b>Note:</b> <i>Limited programme level results frameworks, including indicators and related data collection at the programme raise evaluability issues in relation to this question. We will be working within these constraints and may only be able to identify outcomes and impacts at the level of individual projects.</i></p> <p>We will however endeavour to capture programme and fund level outcomes and impacts where they are evident.</p>	<p>Description of the range factors explaining change in the context</p> <p>Description of the contribution of the programme or project relation to these other factors.</p>	<p>Interviews with stakeholders from Denmark and other donor agencies engaged in stabilisation programming and project development, appraisal, decision making, management and review.</p> <p>Interviews with regional and country specific experts.</p> <p>Conflict and context analysis.</p> <p>PSF programme and project reviews and appraisals.</p>

**D1.5 International Comparison**

**Issue: Comparison of the Danish Peace and Stability Fund to similar funding mechanisms of the DFID Conflict Pool (UK) and Stability Fund (Netherlands)**

Evaluation questions (EQ)	Notes and possible sub-questions		
---------------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

<p>7.1 How does the administration and decision making processes of the Fund compare with mechanisms of HMG Conflict Pool and the Stability Fund (Netherlands)?</p>		N/A	<p>Key documentation describing the administration and decision-making processes of the DFID conflict pool and the Dutch Stability Fund.</p> <p>Interviews with key stakeholders in HMG and the Dutch MFA.</p>
<p>7.2 What lessons and experiences can be drawn from other donors, including the DFID Conflict Pool and Netherlands Stability fund across issues such as utilisation of analytical tools and methodologies to support cross-government working and enhanced coherence, the development of joint programmes, and approaches to optimising measuring and demonstrating results in risk prone, fragile contexts.</p>	<p>What lessons and experiences have emerged with regard to fund structures and decision making processes and managing budgets?</p> <p>What lessons and experiences have emerged with regard to the programming of interventions (in terms of identification, programming, appraisal, monitoring).</p> <p>What lessons have emerged regarding optimising a (shared) cross-government understanding of context and reflecting this within joint programming?</p> <p>How have other funds sought to integrate context analysis best be integrated into programming going forward, bearing in mind the trade-offs between fast and flexible and context specific responses?</p> <p>What are the emerging lessons regarding employing evidenced theories of change within cross-government stabilisation funds and how can this approach be optimised going forward?</p> <p>What lessons have emerged with regards to ensuring optimal stabilisation capacity?</p>	N/A	<p>Reviews and evaluations of the DFID conflict pool and the Dutch Stability Fund.</p> <p>Interviews with key stakeholders in HMG and the Dutch MFA.</p>