

Annex B: Progress against 2014 Evaluation recommendations

2014 Key recommendations	Progress identified in 2022 Evaluation
Deepening the Danish integrated approach to stability	
1. To deepen the integrated approach to stabilisation, the evaluation recommends that the IMSC strengthen its strategic guidance and oversight of the PSF (policy, priority results and financing).	The 2022 Evaluation has identified a continued limitation in the strategic guidance and oversight of the IMSC and recommends further strengthening. (see evaluation recommendation #9)
2. To further deepen the integrated approach to stabilisation, the evaluation recommends ensuring that PSF thematic programmes are coherent with other engagements (security, development and political/diplomatic), including through broader strategic frameworks where they exist (such as the Somalia policy).	Considerable progress has been made in terms of aligning PSF programmes with other Danish military, diplomatic, development and humanitarian efforts in the examined contexts. Room exists to improve further coherence, including through country strategies where these exist. (see evaluation recommendation #6)
Matching political ambition with human and financial resources	
<p>3. The evaluation recommends the IMSC ensure resources are available for adequate stabilisation capacity at the level of embassies and at headquarters within Copenhagen (Regional Departments and the Secretariat).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PSF programmes require a stabilisation advisor and programme management capacity on the ground. At headquarters there is a need for a more adequately resourced secretariat, with less turnover, and dedicated programme staff within MFA Regional Departments with adequate time allocated for programme management throughout the entire programme cycle. In addition to a modest increase in the number of dedicated staff, the development of a stabilisation/conflict cadre within the PSF ministries would be an important contribution to the future success of the PSF and provide critical support to Denmark's stabilisation objectives. 	<p>The Evaluation has identified that capacities have remained stretched in the period 2014-2020.</p> <p>At HQ, there is a continued need to adequately staff SAMSEK.</p> <p>(see evaluation recommendation #10 and #13)</p>

If these human resources are not available, then the political ambitions of the PSF should be reduced commensurately.	
<p>4. The evaluation recommends that the IMSC (at the highest level) ensure that Parliament is made aware of the negative consequences of the budget law on the effectiveness of the PSF as a stabilisation instrument.</p> <p>The requirement under the 2012 Budget Law that non-ODA resources must be spent in the budget year that they are committed reduces the flexibility of the PSF.</p>	No related findings or recommendation.
Sharpening the PSF's focus on key stabilisation issues	
<p>5. To sharpen the PSF's focus on key stabilisation issues, the evaluation recommends that the Fund retains its current broad overarching policy framework but that the IMSC ensure that the Fund's guidance includes direction on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • linking political, security and development objectives and instruments and • integrating gender concerns and compliance with UNSCR 1325. 	<p>The evaluation identifies the need to continuously assess the priority areas of the PSF (including the identified thematic areas).</p> <p>While some progress has been made, further room exists to deepen the PSF's engagement on WPS.</p> <p>(see recommendation #3 and #5)</p>
Strengthening the PSF's capacity for assessing context and developing theories of change as a basis for PSF programming and monitoring	
6. To strengthen the PSF's capacity for assessing the context in which its funding is applied.	<p>Further room exists to deepen the analysis that precedes programming and to continuously update the analysis over time.</p> <p>(see recommendation #1)</p>
7. To improve guidance on and use of Theories of Change (ToC) in programming.	<p>The use of Theories of Change has become more prominent in the period 2014-2021.</p> <p>Room exists to further sharpen the ToCs, including keeping them realistic (and not over-ambitious) and identifying all relevant assumptions.</p> <p>(see recommendation #7)</p>
Ensuring adequate flexibility in the use of PSF funding	
8. To ensure adequate flexibility in the use of PSF funding, the evaluation recommends that the IMSC ensure the proportion of unallocated funds within regional/country programmes is 25-30%.	The maximum portion of unallocated funding in programmes has been increased to 20% in the PSF Guidelines 2020.

Ensuring that the Fund's comparative advantage is adequately reflected in programming	
<p>9. In order to ensure that the Fund's comparative advantage is adequately reflected in programming, the evaluation recommends that the IMSC ensure that these comparative advantages are articulated in the 2014 Fund Guidelines so that they are understood by key Fund stakeholders and reflected alongside the specific principles in programming, including when considering the Fund's relationship to other funding sources and suitability for use within any given context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its capacity to fund projects that are not classed as ODA or to combine ODA and non-ODA funding, making it particularly well suited to working at the nexus of security and development; • Its facilitation of agency to agency approaches; • Its ability to mobilise a range of Danish instruments, capacities and perspectives across different parts of government; • Its preference to work at a regional level; • The availability of unprogrammed funding facilitating an ability to respond to windows of opportunity or emerging issues in high risk and politically sensitive areas. 	<p>The Fund's comparative advantages are relatively well reflected in the updated Fund Guidelines.</p> <p>Nonetheless there is room for continuous updating on the priority areas of the Fund to enhance its strategic, including with regard to the complementarity between ODA and non-ODA funds.</p> <p>(see recommendation #9 and #10)</p>
Strengthening the management of the Fund to further enhance the effective and efficient use of PSF resources	
<p>10. The evaluation recommends that the IMSC ensure that an M&E system is developed and implemented by each PSF programme, under the direction of the responsible unit at headquarters (e.g., Regional Department) that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematically captures engagement outcomes; • Uses ToC approach to help identify intermediate objectives ('enabling conditions') between engagement outputs and higher-level goals (strategic or component objectives); • Tracks the contribution of engagements against intermediate and thematic component objectives, including through using additional monitoring information captured by Programme Managers; • Directly feeds monitoring information into decision making regarding programme adjustments including being part of the reporting requirements stated within the 2014 Fund Guidelines; • Ensures that adequate resources are allocated to M&E across the PSF portfolio (a rule of thumb among donors is 3% of the value of the total portfolio; larger engagements/programmes may require more and smaller ones less); and • Provides guidance on remote monitoring in environments where security considerations do not 	<p>The evaluation finds that continuous room exist to report on outcome level.</p> <p>(see recommendation #8)</p>

enable those responsible for overseeing PSF engagements to travel.	
<p>11. The evaluation recommends that the IMSC ensure that the 2014 PSF Guidelines are revised to include the following good practices followed by PSF programme managers in the Horn of Africa for identifying and managing partners or implementing mechanisms (such as UNSOA or the ANA Trust Fund):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map the strengths and weaknesses of available partners or mechanisms in terms of achieving PSF objectives, including integrated working. • Review the efficiency and effectiveness of the partner or mechanism (e.g., by looking at recent evaluations, drawing on the perspectives of other donors). This involves understanding both the partner's track record and importantly the current status of the partner's capacity (i.e. track record isn't everything). • Consider the transparency of the partner in terms of ability to monitor and report on progress. • Recognise the extent of oversight that may be required, particularly for multi-lateral implementers. There is strong evidence that multilateral implementers can require considerable oversight to ensure efficient and effective use of PSF funding. It is important to factor that need into the choice of implementing partner. • Monitor partner performance. Methods of monitoring the performance of implementing partners includes obtaining information from partners in a way that can support overall component and programme monitoring, regularly checking up on progress, and applying pressure to ensure that partners are on track and doing what they are supposed to be doing. 	No findings or recommendation.
<p>12. The evaluation concludes that efforts to exploit opportunities to build on the success of smaller 'pilot' type initiatives are not undertaken systematically. The Evaluation recommends that the IMSC ensure that the 2014 PSF Guidelines include guidance on how to make the 'seed funding approach' an explicit funding model.</p>	No findings or recommendation.
<p>13. The evaluation recommends that the IMSC ensure the procedure (process action plan) for programming the regional/country programmes provides adequate time for context assessments to be undertaken, theories of change elaborated and appropriate partners to be identified.</p>	No findings or recommendation.