

# Evaluation of the Peace and Stabilisation Fund (PSF)

## Terms of Reference

June 2021

### 1. Background

The Danish Peace and Stabilisation Fund (PSF) was set up in 2010 as an inter-ministerial, flexible funding mechanism aimed at contributing to enhanced peace and stability in some of the world's conflictual "hotspots." A comprehensive, "whole of government" approach was adopted to manage the fund, which involves the Prime Minister's Office (PMO), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA), the Ministry of Defence (MoD) and the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). Since the establishment of the fund a wide range of mostly three-year programmes have been carried out across Africa, the Middle East and Eastern Europe with a diverse set of partners.<sup>1</sup>

The thematic and geographical scope of the PSF as well as the financial resources allocated to the Fund have increased significantly over 10 years. DKK 155 million was available for projects and programmes in 2010 and over DKK 500 million in 2020. According to the annual reports, since 2015 the PSF focuses primarily on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16: "peace, justice and institutional development." Activities funded include landmine clearance, the provision of basic services (notably water and sanitation), training of police and security forces, combatting violent extremism (CVE), various forms of capacity development through support for United Nations peacebuilding operations and NATO, the provision of advisory services for conflict resolution and strengthening maritime security. As "whole of government" instruments, the PSF programmes are generally associated with diplomatic, military and police interventions.<sup>2</sup>

As noted above the PSF is intended as a mechanism to respond to international geopolitical challenges affecting and influencing Danish foreign, security and development cooperation policies. Initially the main concern was to tackle the problems of so-called "fragile states", where violent conflicts disrupt development processes, where Danish military forces were involved in stabilisation efforts (notably in Afghanistan) and where civil unrest and piracy had seriously disrupted societies and economies (notably in the Horn of Africa). In the period from 2016-17 the focus of the PSF expanded to encompass tackling what are considered as major threats to peace and security in Europe, including terrorism and migration. Thus, as noted in the background "scoping" study (Footnote 1, below), the PSF programmes have shifted "with the emergence of new hotspots: from a focus on the global war on terror to including issues related to security in the European neighbourhood" (p.3). In this context PSF resources are available for a series of initiatives ranging from inter alia "community security" in Ukraine

---

<sup>1</sup> A background ("scoping") study has been prepared to inform this evaluation, published by the Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS): <https://www.diis.dk/en/research/how-to-strengthen-danish-stabilisation-engagements>

<sup>2</sup> Annual reports and other information about the PSF are available at: <https://um.dk/da/udenrigspolitik/sikkerhedspolitik/skroebeligestater/>

(2018-21), to “dialogue, reconciliation and democratic control of the security sector” in the Sahel (2018-21) and to “maritime responses, strategies, dialogue and training” in the Gulf of Guinea (2019-21).

In addition to security threats and the conflicts themselves, the PSF responds to other challenges, including a changing international institutional framework in which multilateralism and rules-based approaches are being questioned. This has important implications in terms of the choice of partners, where the effective operations of various UN agencies in peace and stabilisation processes are at stake and where other actors play important roles (e.g., the French military forces in Sahelian West Africa). Although Denmark has opted out of the European (EU) defence cooperation arrangements, there are various international mechanisms for security collaboration and many potential partners for PSF programmes. Furthermore, tensions associated with the consequences of climate change and impact on fragile states are increasingly apparent in some regions.

In short, as noted in the scoping study, there are a number of important general questions to be considered in assessing the past and future directions of the PSF:

*“What picture emerges when taking stock of the past decade of engagements? What are the Danish policy processes for further developing the [peace and] stabilisation agenda? What have 19 years in Afghanistan and recent developments in Mali, for example, taught us and what does this mean for how [peace and] stabilisation engagements will – and can – be approached in the years to come? Will stabilisation still be a preferred tool of Danish policymakers, of our partners and if so, of which partners? Is the [peace and] stabilisation agenda progressing, failing or finding new ground?” (p.5).*

As noted above, the PSF is managed by an inter-ministerial steering committee, chaired in rotation between the MoFA and the MoD. This committee approves and provides overall supervision of the programmes of the Fund. A joint secretariat (Samsek) with staff from MoFA and MoD supports implementation and administration. The programmes under the PSF are managed and monitored by Danish embassy teams and MoFA/MoD units.

An evaluation of the PSF was carried out in 2013-14.<sup>3</sup> It is worth re-stating some of the main conclusions:

- Through the “whole of government” approach, there is a need for the inter-ministerial steering committee to provide strategic guidance in terms of priorities and the goals for Danish engagement in any given country;
- Prioritizing the use of limited resources entails determining the level of ambition for the PSF (between political aims on one hand and human resources on the other);
- The importance of focusing on Danish comparative advantages with respect to peace and stabilisation;
- There is a need to assess political and economic conditions in programme areas and develop theories of change accordingly;
- Ensuring financial flexibility, such that the Fund can respond to new challenges;

---

<sup>3</sup> See: [https://um.dk/en/danida-en/results/eval/eval\\_reports/publicationdisplaypage/?publicationID=17ED03EE-DB80-4D8D-969A-CCE34AD01CF9](https://um.dk/en/danida-en/results/eval/eval_reports/publicationdisplaypage/?publicationID=17ED03EE-DB80-4D8D-969A-CCE34AD01CF9)

- The importance of following up (monitoring) the implementation partners in order to ensure that intended results are achieved;
- The need to introduce a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system for the PSF, which will enable effective documentation of lessons learned.

Aside from the PSF, the MoFA (Danida) provides considerable funding for regional peace initiatives in the Sahel and the Horn of Africa through the “Africa Programme for Peace” (APP), with the African Union (AU) and regional organisations as major partners. Furthermore, the MoFA together with the MoD and the MoJ has recently published a new action plan for women, peace and security arising from the United Nations Security Council Resolution (UN SCR) 1325.<sup>4</sup> It is worth noting that support for peace processes through the APP was evaluated in 2017-18 and the Danish national action plans for UN SCR 1325 were evaluated in 2019.<sup>5</sup>

Given the considerable expansion in activities since 2010 and the importance of continued peace and stabilisation efforts in numerous conflict zones around the world, it has been decided that a follow up evaluation of the PSF will be undertaken. Danish initiatives within the humanitarian, development and peace “nexus” as well as the recent strategic shift towards “doing development differently” will constitute important contextual frameworks for this assessment. Thus, strengthening the strategic coherence as well as the flexibility of development engagements – including bilateral “country programmes”, humanitarian assistance and support to multilateral and international organisations – are intended to ensure the best ways of organizing and implementing Danish development cooperation.<sup>6</sup>

## 2. Objectives of the evaluation

The objectives of the evaluation are threefold:

- To document the achievements and main results of PSF programmes with respect to their objectives and theories of change, both in terms of outcomes “on the ground” and in terms of overall policies adopted and carried out through the “whole of government” approach;
- To analyse critical issues in peace and stabilisation and responses as illustrated by the PSF programmes;
- On the basis of a synthesis of main lessons learned, to propose recommendations for improved operation of the Fund.

---

4 See: <https://um.dk/da/udenrigspolitik/sikkerhedspolitik/kvinder-fred-og-sikkerhed/>

5 The evaluation of the APP can be found at [https://um.dk/en/danida-en/results/eval/eval\\_reports/publicationdisplaypage/?publicationID=C39B0F13-4AD8-4E77-ADED-35B7FD03E5FF](https://um.dk/en/danida-en/results/eval/eval_reports/publicationdisplaypage/?publicationID=C39B0F13-4AD8-4E77-ADED-35B7FD03E5FF) and of the action plans in support of UN SCR 1325 at [https://um.dk/en/danida-en/results/eval/eval\\_reports/publicationdisplaypage/?publicationID=193C70DF-D33D-4AC4-B4A0-399C265FD128](https://um.dk/en/danida-en/results/eval/eval_reports/publicationdisplaypage/?publicationID=193C70DF-D33D-4AC4-B4A0-399C265FD128)

6 “Doing development differently” is reflected in the new guidelines for country strategic frameworks, programmes and projects as well as in the new guidelines for support to multilateral and international organisations. See: <https://amg.um.dk/>

### 3. Outputs

The following outputs (deliverables) are envisaged:

- an inception report including a portfolio update and analysis of PSF programmes, a thorough outline of the evaluation methodology and work programme, a review of the evaluation questions (EQs) in an evaluation matrix, etc.
- three brief (20-25 page) case study reports;
- a preliminary findings paper for discussion in the evaluation reference group (see below);
- a draft main report and a final version (not exceeding 50 pages plus annexes).

### 4. Scope of work and evaluation questions (EQs)

The full portfolio of PSF programmes will constitute the basis for the evaluation. A summary of these programmes is included in the DIIS “scoping” study and further information is available in the annual reports (referenced above). An updated overview of the portfolio will be prepared during the inception phase of the evaluation and will be used for assessing the results and outcomes of the PSF.

In addition to the Danish PSF, similar programmes and initiatives funded and run by other key agencies will be taken into account, notably those of European Union (EU) and the United Kingdom (UK). Collaboration between different organisations and agencies is important in the context of peace and stabilisation activities in conflict zones. Common trends and lessons learned from evaluation of these peace and stabilisation efforts will be synthesized in the inception phase, in order to inform the assessment of the Danish PSF.

Three case studies of PSF programmes will be undertaken following preparation during the inception phase of the evaluation. These will aim to provide in-depth analysis of the results as well as difficulties encountered and opportunities arising. Examining in particular the results in the period since 2014, the case studies will deal with peace and stabilisation initiatives undertaken through the regional programmes in: i) the Horn of Africa (Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia and Somaliland; ii) Syria and Iraq; and iii) the Sahel (Burkina Faso, Mali and Niger).

On the basis of the analysis of the portfolio focusing on the results and outcomes of PSF since 2010, the main themes to be explored through the evaluation include:

- issues related to overall policy making and strategic options guiding the PSF (i.e., the relevance and coherence of the Fund);
- the quality of PSF programme design and implementation, including theories of change, scope, choice of partners, etc. (i.e., effectiveness and efficiency considerations);

- issues related to information about the political economy of peace and stabilisation in conflict zones, the quality of the monitoring and evaluation arrangements for tracking results (i.e., assessing the impact of the Fund);
- organisational matters pertaining to the Fund, notably assessment of the whole of government approach as reflected in steering committee decision making, allocation of funds and administration of the PSF (efficiency).

Thus, the following evaluation questions (EQ) have been identified:

**EQ1** In the context of shifting peace and stabilisation agendas and taking into account the strategic objectives of the PSF, what are the main **achievements** of the programmes funded since 2010, both through results “on the ground” and in terms of Danish policies and inter-ministerial collaboration?

- A sub-topic for the evaluation is whether and to what extent the “whole of government” approach has led to value added and achievements that would not have resulted from a “silo” approach. In other words, are there examples of added value from “whole of government” peace and stabilisation efforts, particularly at field level?
- A second sub-topic concerns unexpected outcomes. Are there examples which might inform PSF initiatives and programmes?

**EQ2** At the overall policy level, the question of the **strategic guidance** determining the use of the PSF resources is critical. Is the Fund being used in a coherent (and relevant) manner in the context of peace and stabilisation challenges and within the framework of development and humanitarian assistance in the regions (countries) where programmes are being undertaken?

- A sub-topic is to determine whether the outcomes of Fund programmes (de facto) are consistent with strategic objectives.
- Another sub-topic concerns the strategic direction of the PSF, particularly in responding to crises or providing longer-term development assistance. Are there options and possibilities for greater thematic or geographical concentration and focus?

**EQ3** In terms of **programme design and implementation** – given the scope and limits of Danish funded initiatives - what are the lessons learned concerning intervention in conflict zones and what measures need to be taken to ensure effective programmes with maximum impact?

- An important sub-question concerns the rationale for the choice of partners and the processes of selection during design.
- A second sub-topic is the extent to which knowledge and information concerning the political and economic dimensions of any given conflict are effectively used to inform design (through defining theories of change, etc.) and implementation.
- A third sub-topic concerns how effective and informative are the methods and indicators used to monitor and document results (i.e. the M&E system), including in terms of adaptability?

**EQ4** The arrangements for PSF **management & organization** are also important topics. Is the inter-ministerial committee adequately ensuring leadership, knowledge and information exchange as well as guidance on the specific programmes underway?

- A sub-question concerns the expansion of the PSF since 2010. Is there a case for strengthening administrative and analytical capacities? Conversely, could the administrative procedures be simplified in the light of available capacities?
- Another sub-topic concerns the value added in the division of labour between the steering committee and the secretariat (Samsek).
- Furthermore, the value for money of the PSF set up is worth considering: could the same “whole of government” results be generated through a leaner administration?

#### 5. Methodology, timing and reporting

The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with the Danida/MoFA evaluation guidelines (January 2018). The updated (2019) OECD-DAC evaluation criteria will be applied as appropriate, including assessment of the PSF and projects, programmes and contributions to organisations in terms of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.<sup>7</sup>

A tentative schedule is as follows:

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Date/period</i>	<i>Responsible</i>
Contract signed	June 2021	ELK and ET (evaluation team)
Inception, including work programme	June-September 2021	ET
Draft inception report for discussion with ERG	September 2021	ET & ERG
Main evaluation, including three PSF programme (case) studies	September-November 2021	ET
Draft findings for discussion with ERG	November 2021	ET & ERG
Preparation of evaluation report	December 2021-January 2022	ET
Final report submitted and possible ERG meeting	January 2022	ET
Management response and approval of evaluation	February 2022	Dept. for Stabilisation (MNS) & ELK
Launch of report with possible seminar in Copenhagen	March 2022	ELK

As noted above, during the inception phase of the evaluation the full portfolio of PSF programmes and grants to partner organisations will be updated and consolidated. The evaluation team will have access

<sup>7</sup> See: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

to documents and reports pertaining to the specific grants, including any reviews and other studies. This will be used as the basis for drawing up survey and interview protocols, etc. Other relevant documents will also be examined at this stage. It will be particularly important to examine how the findings and recommendations of the 2013-14 evaluation of the PSF have been followed up.

Data collection, surveys and interviews will be undertaken by the evaluation team in accordance with a work programme to be specified in the inception report. Indicators will be determined to measure the outcomes, based on the theories of change and results frameworks used. The programme case studies as well as consultations with representatives of other international partners as identified above (“scope”) will constitute the basis for an assessment of the processes associated with the PSF, including the quality of project and programme preparation and implementation. To the extent possible the case studies will trace the evolution of PSF initiatives in the three regions, including the theories of change underpinning the programmes, the identification of priorities, the selection of partners, etc.

Consultations and interviews will be carried out with all key stakeholders. An online survey may also be conducted. The evaluation team will collect and organize all information and data gathered in the course of the country studies and other consultations to be included in the reports as appropriate.

## 6. Organisation of the evaluation

### *Management*

The evaluation will be managed by the Evaluation, Learning and Quality (ELK) Department in the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA). The management will:

- Participate in the selection of the evaluation team based on received tenders and assisted by an independent tender consultant.
- Coordinate with all relevant evaluation stakeholders.
- Ensure that quality control is carried out throughout the evaluation process. In so doing, ELK may make use of external peer reviewers.
- Provide feedback to the evaluation team. Comment on draft versions of the inception report, the work plan, annual field visit reports and the summative evaluation report. Approve final reports.
- Organise and participate in meetings of the evaluation reference group.
- Facilitate and participate in evaluation workshops, including possibly an open dissemination workshop towards the end of the evaluation.
- Organise presentation of evaluation results and follow-up on the evaluation for the internal Danida Programme Committee (the responsible department drafts the management response).
- Advise relevant stakeholders on matters related to the evaluation.

### *Evaluation team*

The DAC evaluation principles of independence of the evaluation team will be applied. The evaluation team will carry out the assignment based on a contract with the MoFA and will:

- Prepare and carry out the evaluation according to the terms of reference, the approved inception report, the OECD-DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and the Danida Evaluation Guidelines.
- Be responsible to the reference group and management for the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.
- Ensure that quality assurance is carried out and documented throughout the evaluation process according to the consultant's own Quality Assurance Plan (as described in the tender proposal).
- Report to the evaluation management regularly about progress of the evaluation.
- Organise and coordinate meetings and studies, and other key events, including debriefing sessions and/or validation workshops in the three countries selected for in-depth analysis.

The Team Leader is responsible for the team's reporting, proper quality assurance and for the organisation of the work. The Team Leader will participate in meetings of the evaluation reference group and other meetings as required and upon request.

#### *Evaluation reference group*

An Evaluation reference group (ERG) will be established and chaired by ELK. The migration, stabilisation and fragility department (MNS) at the MoFA will participate in the ERG. Other members will include representatives of the inter-ministerial group (PMO, MoD and MoJ) as well as the Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) and relevant NGOs.

The mandate of the ERG is to provide advisory support and inputs to the evaluation, e.g., through comments to draft reports. The reference group will work with direct meetings, e-mail communication and video-conferencing. The main tasks of the ERG are to:

- Comment on the draft inception report, draft findings papers and case study reports and the draft evaluation report with a view to ensure that the evaluation is based on factual knowledge about programmes and how they have been implemented.
- Support the implementation of the evaluation and promote the dissemination of the evaluation conclusions and recommendations.

Other key stakeholders may be consulted at strategic points in time of the evaluation either through mail correspondence or through participation in stakeholder meetings/workshops.

#### 7. Composition and qualifications of the evaluation team

A core team of three consultants will undertake the evaluation. The anticipated profile of the team leader will be an evaluation specialist with extensive knowledge of peace and stabilization policies and programmes as well as international development assistance. Two governance, peace and stabilisation specialists will also participate as team members. Both specialists will be familiar with the implementation of development programmes and projects in the sphere of peace and stabilisation. One



of the specialists will be experienced in the assessment of governance programmes dealing with peace and stabilisation schemes. The other specialist will have particular knowledge of project and programme design as well as monitoring systems.

In addition, and in order to undertake thorough assessment of the projects and programmes funded in the selected case countries, specialists with in-depth knowledge of each of the countries (regions) will participate in the evaluation. Taking into account the regional experience of the core team, the proposal shall include at least one in-country expert from each of the three case study regions: i) the Horn of Africa (Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia and Somaliland); ii) Syria and Iraq; and iii) the Sahel (Burkina Faso, Mali and Niger).” The CV’s of these experts will not be assessed in the evaluation of tenders.

Tenderers may decide to include personnel for additional functions, e.g., subject matter specialists, although these persons will not be assessed on an individual basis but as part of the overall team composition and backup. The team members are expected to complement each other.

CV’s for the following core team positions will be assessed as part of the tender proposal:

- Team leader, international evaluation specialist;
- Governance, peace and stabilisation specialist;
- Programme design, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) specialist.

The need for additional subject matter specialists should be justified in the technical proposal. The organisation of the team’s work and the distribution of workdays between team members will be assessed as part of the assessment of the technical proposal under the criterion “organisation”.

The following **minimum requirements** apply to the qualifications of the evaluation team:

- All team members must be fluent in English;
- At least one core team member must be able to read Danish;
- At least one core team member must be able to communicate fluently in French with a view to undertaking the Sahel region study;
- The team leader will participate in all case studies and the other two core team members will participate in at least two case studies each.

Further specification of the qualifications of the team members is outlined in an annex (below).

## 8. Financial proposal

The total budget for the consultancy services is a maximum of DKK 3.0 million. This includes all fees and project related expenses required for the implementation of the contract, including surveys, field trips and workshops.

The tenderers financial proposal shall include all costs for fees and project related reimbursable expenses. It is the responsibility of the tenderer to ensure that the products and outputs specified above, and all

other tasks specified in these terms of reference are performed within the framework of the financial proposal and the specified ceiling amounts.

The cost of quality assurance (QA) should be included in the tenderer's overhead.

ELK will cover the expenditures incurred for preparing the final evaluation report for publication as well as any additional dissemination activities in Denmark as and if agreed upon.

## 9. Eligibility

The OECD-DAC evaluation principles of independence of the evaluation team will be applied. In situations where conflict of interest occurs, candidates may be excluded from participation, if their participation may question the independence and impartiality of the evaluation. Any firm or individual consultant that has participated in the preparation or implementation of the evaluated Danida programmes will be excluded from participation in the tender.

Tenderers are obliged to carefully consider issues of eligibility for individual consultants and inform the Client of any potential issues relating to a possible conflict of interest.<sup>8</sup>

## 10. Requirements for home office support

The Evaluation Team's home office shall provide the following, to be covered by the Consultants fees:

- General home office administration and professional back-up (to be specified in the tender).
- Quality assurance (QA) of the consultancy services in accordance with the quality management and quality assurance system described in the tender. Special emphasis should be given to quality assurance of draft reports prior to the submission of such reports. ELK may request documentation for the QA undertaken in the process.

The Tender shall comprise a detailed description of the proposed QA, in order to document that the Tenderer has fully internalized how to implement it and in order to enable a subsequent verification that the QA has actually been carried out as agreed.

---

<sup>8</sup> See: Evaluation Guidelines (Danida/MoFA, 2018), annex 1.  
[http://www.netpublikationer.dk/UM/evaluation\\_guidelines\\_january\\_2018/Index.html](http://www.netpublikationer.dk/UM/evaluation_guidelines_january_2018/Index.html)

## **Annex – composition and qualifications of the evaluation team**

### **Team leader, international evaluation specialist**

#### General experience

- Higher academic degree at master level, preferably Ph.D - MR
- A profile with major emphasis on international evaluation with 15 years or more of relevant international experience from development cooperation, preferably with significant experience from fragile and conflict-affected contexts;
- Proven track record in evaluation methods and preferably in political context analysis;
- Experience as team leader of evaluations of similar scope and complexity;
- Fluent English (C1) – MR

#### Adequacy for the assignment

- Extensive international experience from designing and undertaking sector programme evaluation work, including field experience;
- Experience with peace and stabilisation approaches, programming and key actors, e.g. through evaluations or other sector work in this area.
- Other analytical work or research in thematic areas related to the evaluation.

#### Experience from the region

- aggregate experience of at least three years from the countries in the three case study regions - MR

### **Governance, peace and stabilisation specialist**

#### General experience

- Higher academic degree, minimum master level – MR
- Major emphasis on peace, stabilisation and development with 15 years or more of relevant professional experience from international cooperation, at least 10 which should be from working directly in or with fragile and conflict-affected contexts;
- Experience as team member for evaluations of a comparable level is preferred.
- Fluent English (C1) – MR

#### Adequacy for the assignment

- Major emphasis on peace and stabilisation, including thorough knowledge of Danish and other agencies' peace and stabilisation approaches, funding mechanisms and types of programming;

- Experience with peace and stabilisation programming, including, e.g. diplomatic, development, military, police and CVE interventions and their inter-linkages through “whole of government”;
- Experience from programme design or implementation in thematic areas related to the assignment.

Experience from the region

- aggregate experience of at least three years from the countries in the three case study regions - MR

## **Programme design and monitoring specialist**

General experience

- Higher academic degree, minimum master level – MR;
- Major emphasis on programme design and monitoring systems with 15 years or more of relevant professional experience from international cooperation, at least five of which should be from working directly in fragile and conflict-affected countries;
- Experience as team member for evaluations of a comparable level is preferred;
- Fluent English (C1) - MR

Adequacy for the assignment

- Strong programme design experience, including knowledge of designing, monitoring and evaluating theories of change etc.;
- Strong programme implementation experience, particularly in fragile and conflict affected settings, including good experience with e.g., remote management, remote or third-party monitoring, programme adaptation, risk management, etc.;
- Experience with peace and stabilisation approaches, programming and key actors, e.g., through evaluations or other sector work in this area.

Experience from the region

- aggregate experience of at least three years from the countries in the three case study regions - MR