

Annex B Methodology

This annex summarises the evaluation methodology that was developed during the inception phase.

Demarcating the evaluation subject

The evaluation is of Danish use of country programme and project-specific development multi-bi.

- **Multi-bi** is defined as earmarked ODA that is channelled to a multilateral organisation.¹ The earmarking may be by sector, theme, amount, country (recipient), or region.²
- **Multilateral organisations** are defined as international institutions “with governmental membership which conduct all or a significant part of their activities in favour of development and aid recipient countries”,³ as listed by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC).⁴
- The TOR targets **programme and project-specific development support** earmarked for multilaterals within country programme allocations. This is taken to refer to all modalities noted by the OECD DAC modality classifications (and managed as earmarked funds channelled to multilaterals at country level for development purposes) except for core contributions to non-governmental organisations, private bodies, public–private partnerships and research institutions (DAC CRS code B01) and multilateral institutions (DAC CRS code B02).
- **Country programme and project specific** is defined as bilateral support that is earmarked for specific countries. In the evaluation these are the development engagements identified in CPs, and additional engagements (outside of CPs) that are earmarked for exclusive use in specific countries.
- ODA for **development purposes** (excluding humanitarian ODA) is taken to be ODA that is not classified as Emergency Assistance under the OECD DAC purpose classifications.

Evaluation questions

The detailed evaluation questions (EQs) are set out in the table below.

Table 1 Main evaluation questions and sub-questions

EQ 1. What was the context and rationale, which led to the use of multi-bi and the specific multi-bi modality?		
<i>Context, Danida rationale and processes for selecting multi-bi</i>	1.1.	What were important sector, country, Danida and/or multilateral features over the evaluation period affecting management and implementation of development cooperation engagements?
	1.2.	Why was a multilateral channel selected?
	1.3.	Did the decision to use a multi-bi channel rely on the country strategy/program?
	1.4.	How and why was the specific multilateral organisation selected?
	1.5.	To which degree were Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark (MFA) in Copenhagen and Danish multilateral representations consulted?
	1.6.	Why was the specific modality (including degree and type of earmarking) applied?

¹ Where earmarked means limitations on the multilateral’s authority to spend the funds at the multilateral’s discretion.

² OECD DAC, 2018.

³ OECD DAC, 2021a, Glossary of Terms, [link](#).

⁴ OECD DAC, 2021b, CRS List of Codes, [link](#).

EQ 2. What role, if any, was (is) Denmark playing in the management and implementation of the multi-bi funded activities?

<i>Arrangements for managing and implementing multi-bi engagements</i>	2.1.	How were/are the multi-bi activities being monitored?
	2.2.	Was/is there /any contact between the Embassy/Representation, MFA in Copenhagen, and relevant Danish multilateral representations regarding the implementation of the Danish funded multi-bi activities?
	2.3.	Was/is there any contact between the Embassy/Representation, MFA in Copenhagen Denmark, and headquarters of multilateral organisations regarding the implementation of the Danish multi-bi activities?

EQ 3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Danish multi-bi contributions?

<i>Relevance</i>	3.1.	How relevant was/is the use of multi-bi?
<i>Coherence</i>	3.2.	Were/are Danida's multi-bi contributions coherent?
<i>Effectiveness</i>	3.3.	How effective was the use of multi-bi development aid at country level?
	3.4.	Were/are multi-bi contributions an effective instrument to promote Danish interests in core-multilateral aid?
<i>Efficiency</i>	3.5.	Did the use of multi-bi contribute to the efficiency of Danida development cooperation?
<i>Cross-cutting questions contributing to several criteria</i>	3.6.	Were/are Danish use of multi-bi contributions flexible as an instrument?
	3.7.	Were/are multi-bi contributions an instrument to ensure sharing of risks?
	3.8.	Did the criteria used for the selection of multi-bi modalities adequately consider the benefits and risks of different modalities and were they applied well?
	3.9.	Were/are information sharing and learning sufficiently addressed in the Danish funded multi-bi activities?

EQ 4. What lessons learned and recommendations can be made for future multi-bi contributions

<i>Conclusions and recommendations</i>	4.1.	Were/are multi-bi activities more relevant and effective in specific contexts and sectors?
	4.2.	Were/are some forms of collaboration and engagement in multi-bi activities more relevant and effective?
	4.3.	Were/are some modalities (for instance types of earmarking) more relevant and effective?
	4.4.	Was/is the guidance from MFA in Copenhagen level on multi-bi activities sufficiently detailed?

Evaluation criteria

Table 2 under shows how the standard OECD DAC criteria were used in addressing the EQs.⁵

Table 2 Definition of Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria, definition and notes	Application in the evaluation
Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right things?	
Definition: <i>The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiary, global, country and partner/ institution needs, policies and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.</i>	<p>The evaluation will consider whether the choice of delivering a country engagement through a multilateral partner and the design of the intervention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • responded and continued to respond to the needs, policies and priorities of Danida, the multilateral partner, the final partner and the country; • was sensitive to and continued to be sensitive to the context of Danida, the multilateral partner, the final partner and the country;

⁶³ Based on *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*, OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation, Adopted by the DAC on 10 December 2019.

Evaluation criteria, definition and notes	Application in the evaluation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • was considered by the evaluation to demonstrate relevance; • was appropriate for overall Danida multi-bi use across sectors within countries and across countries; • was appropriate for Danida’s use of multi-bi for multilateral partners at country level across countries; and • catered to the different needs, priorities and policies of different stakeholders.
Coherence: How well does the intervention fit?	
<p>Definition: <i>The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.</i></p>	<p>The evaluation will consider the extent to which Danida’s multi-bi interventions satisfy the need to be:</p> <p>Internally coherent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • by addressing synergies and interlinkages with other Danida interventions in the sector and country; and • by being consistent with Danida’s policies, norms and standards <p>Externally coherent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • by being consistent with other interventions by the multilateral partner and its policies, norms and standards; and • by adding value to (and avoiding duplication in) the collective effort. <p>There is a possibility of trade-offs between internal and external coherence.</p>
Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?	
<p>Definition: <i>The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and its results, including any differential results across groups.</i></p>	<p>The evaluation will consider the strengths and weaknesses of multi-bi as an aid-funding instrument. This means assessing the realisation of the expected (and unexpected) benefits of selecting a multilateral partner for Danida at country level, and at global level, versus the costs.</p> <p>For individual interventions:</p> <p>The evaluation will assess whether the reasons for Danida selecting multi-bi was valid (realised) and their realisation made a net contribution to the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, flexibility and sustainability of Danish aid as expected.</p> <p>For multi-bi as a whole:</p> <p>Evaluating if the use of multi-bi achieved its objectives ‘beyond the intervention’ depends on whether the expected country-wide and global benefits ensued for Danida and the multilateral from the use of multi-bi. The quality of monitoring and learning from multi-bi interventions should be considered.</p>
Efficiency: How well are resources being used?	
<p>Definition: <i>The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.</i></p>	<p>The updated definition of the efficiency criterion embraces dimensions of timeliness and operational efficiency as well as cost-effectiveness. The quantitative assessment of the cost-effectiveness of a multiplicity of multi-bi interventions is not practical for the evaluation. However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First, the evaluation will consider whether the use of multi-bi allowed economic and timely delivery of Danida development engagements financed in this way by assessing cost drivers and qualitative evidence. This will include consideration of administrative costs, including for engagements eligible for the 1% coordination levy on tightly earmarked funds introduced by the UN Secretary General in 2018. • Second, the evaluation will consider whether (different designs of) multi-bi engagements are managed well to realise their expected benefits, including whether Danida has efficient and timely feedback mechanisms, or potential to establish efficient and timely feedback mechanisms to realise expected global benefits from the use of multi-bi.

Two additional criteria were defined for use in the evaluation:

- The TOR asked whether multi-bi contributions were **flexible** as an instrument. Flexibility is not defined as an OECD DAC evaluation criterion. The evaluation used a common usage definition of a flexible instrument, namely (i) that the resources can be reprogrammed fast and with low transaction cost and used in ways that address priority or operational needs; or (ii) that fund management arrangements can be adjusted fast and with low transaction cost to address operational needs.
- The analytical framework includes references to ‘**sustainability**’ (an OECD DAC criterion). Sustainability was not considered as a separate criterion with its own evaluation question(s). However, where multi-bi interventions targeted better sustainability as a benefit of using multi-bi, sustainability was assessed for those interventions. The OECD definition of sustainability applied, i.e., sustainability is the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

Theory of Change

The evaluation used a **theory-based analytical framework** to guide the development of an evaluation framework/matrix and subsequent data collection and analysis. The theory-based analytical framework, based on information gathered during the inception phase, presented a schematic view of how Danida expected that the use of multilateral partners would help Danish multi-bi development engagements perform, and identified implicit assumptions and risks for investigation in the evaluation. The framework developed during inception is shown in Table 3 under. This framework guided the structure of the multi-bi engagement taxonomy (Table 4 under) and the questions in the detailed evaluation matrix (Table 5 under). There are important common assumptions that apply across the table and were seen as key for the evaluation to test. These are, like many of the other assumptions, potential risks and costs of the choice to provide development support via a multilateral partner.

- The sum of benefits from using multi-bi is not outweighed by the loss of flexibility for the donor.
- Danida will not lose visibility, or any loss of visibility is offset by any benefits realised from the use of multi-bi.
- The multilateral partner can provide enough and reliable information to Danida, and feedback loops on multilateral performance between Danida’s management of core funding and embassies enable sound engagement choices.
- Reporting on multi-bi interventions satisfies Danida’s needs for accountability and demonstrating results.

Table 3 Theory-based analytical framework on the use of multi-bi by Danida

Fr = fragile context; Sp = specialist issue/sector; Mgt = management constraints on Danida

Rationale	Underlying assumptions	Relevant DAC criteria	Contexts			
			Fr	Sp	Mgt	Other
At the level of specific interventions, selecting to implement through the multilateral will deliver on Danida's priority because:						
Multilaterals – especially UN organisations – are considered more neutral.	Danida itself does not have a comparative advantage through previous work in this context. Bilateral aid and Danida would be considered to be tied to specific interests. Governments perceive multilaterals as neutral.	Relevance (access), coherence (ability to work alongside government and other agencies)	X	X		X
Multilaterals support work at greater scale, with greater reach and wider geographical coverage.	Multilaterals have access to/can pool more resources.	Relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness	X	X	X	X
Multilaterals have better technical capability.	The effectiveness of the intervention is dependent on drawing on a pool of expertise; Danida does not have this expertise to the same extent as the multilateral. The multilateral can adjust its advice to the specific context.	Relevance, effectiveness		X		X
Multilaterals have important convening power.	Collaborative working and dialogue with country authorities is important for the intervention. Danida has more influence through collective dialogue.	Coherence, effectiveness, efficiency	X	X		X
Danida multi-bi may leverage other support/contribute to pooled funding for greater leverage.	Multi-bi funding may have a catalytic effect (snowball effect in fragile contexts), or by adding funding, help produce a threshold effect (in specialised sectors).	Coherence, effectiveness, efficiency	X	X		
Multilaterals have more stamina – their presence will continue when Danida (and other bilaterals) withdraw.	Increased flexibility (hence reduced risk) for Danida is not outweighed by increased risk (loss of flexibility and unpredictability of funding for the multilateral).	Relevance, coherence, efficiency (multilateral spreads bilateral risk; Danida has flexibility without affecting efficiency of the intervention), sustainability	X	X	X	X
The multilateral has superior operational capabilities.	Multilaterals have the necessary implementation machinery in place to manage security, fiduciary, reputational and programmatic risks. Multilaterals operate more efficiently.	Relevance (access), efficiency (timeliness, cost), effectiveness	X			X
Multilaterals have a particular normative role.	Because of the normative role, it is necessary to use multi-bi. Danida lacks relevant expertise/authority and/or it is valuable to maintain support for the normative agency.	Relevance, effectiveness		X		

Rationale	Underlying assumptions	Relevant DAC criteria	Contexts			
			Fr	Sp	Mgt	Other
The multilateral has aligned interests/an aligned programme/is an easier partner.	Use of multi-bi is less demanding on embassy resources than direct implementation. Danida can influence the multilateral's strategic and implementation choices for the programme.	Relevance, efficiency, coherence, effectiveness				X
The multi-bi approach supports the humanitarian, development, peace (HDP) nexus.	Working through multilaterals increases coherence between humanitarian, development and peace interventions.	Coherence, sustainability	X			
At the level of the country portfolio, there are compelling reasons for Danida to encourage the use of multi-bi because:						
Use of multi-bi enables Danida to work in insecure environments.	Multilaterals have capacity and arrangements to implement programmes in insecure environments.	Relevance, effectiveness	X			
Use of multi-bi reduces overall administrative costs for Danida and thereby helps support a balanced portfolio.	Multilaterals operate efficiently. Use of multi-bi is less demanding on embassy resources. Balance between multi-bi and other modalities reflects Danida's comparative advantage. Administrative economies for Danida are not outweighed by costs shifted to other parties.	Coherence, efficiency, sustainability (ensuring continued Danish support for such interventions)	X	X	X	X
Use of multi-bi increases flexibility and responsive aid management for Danida.	Use of multi-bi facilitates short-term injections of funds when needed (by Danida/the programme); multilaterals can/will continue funding/cope when Danida has to stop funding. Use of multi-bi allows a more balanced portfolio at country level.	Efficiency (timeliness), relevance	X		X	X
Use of multi-bi reduces risks for Danida.	Multilaterals' management capability reduces fiduciary risk. Reputational risk is reduced as Danida is one level removed. Programmatic risk is reduced because of multilaterals' higher expertise and implementation capability. Reduced risk for Danida is not outweighed by increased risks/costs for others.	Efficiency (administrative costs), sustainability (supports likelihood of continued support for aid from Denmark)	X	X	X	X
At the global level, more use of multi-bi at country level is desirable for Danida and the multilateral system because:						
Use of multi-bi is an effective way of supporting the multilateral system.	The multilateral system (or specific multilateral) is a global good. Multi-bi financing complements core funding of multilaterals. The additional support for the multi-bi at country level strengthens the multilateral (i.e. outweighs any fragmentation, loss of flexibility, loss of efficiency for the multilateral because of multi-bi).	Effectiveness, efficiency, coherence	X	X	X	X
Use of multi-bi enables Danida to influence multilaterals overall.	Danida can learn from multi-bi experiences (has systems to acquire learning). Danida has mechanisms in place that will allow such learning to be channelled to Danida offices managing core multilateral support. Coherence exists between multi-bi funding and the core relationship with multilaterals. Multilaterals accept feedback on specific instances.	Relevance (appropriate design), coherence, sustainability	X	X	X	X

Taxonomy of multi-bi development engagements

The **taxonomy of multi-bi development engagements** built on the theory-based analytical framework and was applied at the individual engagement level to provide a controlled reference framework by which the evaluation could describe and analyse Danida's multi-bi portfolio. The classification has three levels: the first describes the class of classification; the second and third set out hierarchical relationships for each class where Level 2 is the category and Level 3 the values in the categories described in each class. In aggregate, the taxonomy describes the engagements in terms of where they were delivered, their size and duration, their sector, the multilateral cooperation partner, the modality and earmarking, further partners and management mechanisms. The classification of engagements used OECD DAC categories and data to describe the size, sector and the cooperation partner of engagements, but used evaluation-generated categories and data regarding the rationale for using multi-bi, modality and earmarking, further partners and management mechanisms. For the modality description, the framework refined the OECD categories, coding sub-types based on evaluation data. In line with EQ4, the framework was critical to guiding evaluation conclusions and recommendations. The detailed taxonomy is provided in Table 4 under.

Table 4 Taxonomy of multi-bi engagements

LEVEL 2 Category	LEVEL 3 Values	Definition source or Definition
Class 1. Engagement descriptors		
Engagement name	Unique	Evaluation, using Danida engagement names and acronyms (in our database these will associate with OECD DAC unique identifier codes)
Number of commitments	0 (no data),1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
Danida role	Existing Co-created Danida added to existing programme or project	Defined by evaluation If the programme/project existed when Danida started funding and Danida is scaling up the programme/project If Danida and multilateral partner (and others) created a new programme/project using Danida funding If Danida joined an existing programme/project but added aspects, such as more regions, new activities
Class 2. Location		
Country	Country name	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
Region	Europe, North of Sahara, South of Sahara, South America, America, Middle East, South Asia, Central Asia Far East Asia, Caribbean, Central America, Melanesia Micronesia, Polynesia	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
Fragility	Fragile, Extremely Fragile, Not Fragile	Evaluation, mid-point of the grant utilising World Bank fragility classification list.
Humanitarian crisis context	Not subject of Humanitarian Response Appeal Natural disaster Conflict Migration Mix	Evaluation, but using United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs designation and descriptions Mid-point of grant, classification using United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Global Humanitarian Overview lists and descriptions
Income	Least developed countries (LDCs); Other low-income countries (LICs); Lower middle income countries (LMICs); Upper middle income countries (UMICs); High-income countries (HICs)	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
Class 3. Rationale for multi-bi at intervention level		
Neutrality of multilateral	3,2,1,0	

LEVEL 2 Category	LEVEL 3 Values	Definition source or Definition
Better scale, reach and coverage of multilateral	3,2,1,0	The rationale is aligned with the rationale stated here, and this was the principal (3), a significant (2), material (1) rationale for the engagement This was not a rationale or only a negligible rationale for this engagement (0).
Technical capability of multilateral	3,2,1,0	
Convening power of multilateral	3,2,1,0	
Danida contributes to greater leverage by pooling funds	3,2,1,0	
Greater stamina of multilaterals	3,2,1,0	
Superior implementation/operational capabilities of multilateral	3,2,1,0	
Normative role of multilateral	3,2,1,0	
Multilateral has aligned programmes and is an easy partner	3,2,1,0	
Supporting the humanitarian, development, peace (HDP) nexus	3,2,1,0	
Other	Text field to specify	Free text field
Class 4. Country level rationale for using multi-bi		
Reduced overall administrative costs for Danida	3,2,1,0	The rationale is aligned with the rationale stated here, and this was the principal (3), a significant (2), a material rationale but one of many (1) for the engagement This was not a rationale or only a negligible rationale for this engagement (0).
More flexibility and responsive aid management	3,2,1,0	
Reduced risk for Danida	3,2,1,0	
Enables work in insecure contexts	3,2,1,0	
Other	Text field to specify	Free text field
Class 5. Duration		
Start Year	Before 2013; 2013; 2014; 2015; 2016; 2017; 2018; 2019	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
Duration	Less than 1 year; Year; Two years; Three years; More than three years	As derived OECD DAC CRS definitions and data but can be modified if better information from engagement documentation
Class 6. Sector		
Social Infrastructure & Services	Health, Population Policies/Programmes & Reproductive Health, Water Supply & Sanitation, Government & Civil Society, Other Social Infrastructure & Services	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
Economic Infrastructure and Services	Transport & Storage, Communications, Energy, Banking & Financial Services, Business & Other Services	
Production sectors	Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Industry, Mining, Construction, Trade Policies & Regulations	
Multisector/cross-cutting	General Environment Protection, Other Multisector	
Commodity Aid/General programme assistance	General Budget Support, Development Food Assistance, Other Commodity Assistance	
Humanitarian aid	Emergency Response	
Unallocated	Unallocated/Unspecified,	
Mokoro refinement	As taxonomy level 3 OECD DAC definition	This field will use the data as reflected by the OECD DAC data , but classify unallocated/unspecified, humanitarian aid according to the DAC sectors to identify coherence nexus points

LEVEL 2 Category	LEVEL 3 Values	Definition source or Definition
Class 7. Cooperation partner		
UN Agencies	As per OECD CRS list	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
World Bank Group	International Development Association (IDA), International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), International Finance Corporation (IFC)	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
Regional Development Banks	African Development Bank (AfDB), Asian Development Bank (ADB), European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
EU Institutions	European Commission (EC), EDF, European Investment Bank (EIB)	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
Other multilateral	As per OECD CRS list	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
Class 8. Final partner		
Final partner	Direct, data not available, mixed Government, other multilaterals, NGOs and CSOs, etc.	Direct means the multilateral partner itself is implementing; mixed means that different types of final partners are utilising the funding. Evaluation to apply OECD DAC CRS Parent Channel definitions to identify by whom the engagement is implemented.
Class 9. Modality		
Budget support	General budget support; sector budget support	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
Core contributions and pooled programmes and funds	B03 for not in-depth cases. For in-depth cases: B031 Contributions to multi-donor/multi-entity funding mechanisms; B032 Contributions to multi-donor/single-entity funding mechanisms; B033 Contributions to single-donor funding mechanisms and contributions earmarked for a specific funding window or geographical location; B04 Basket funds/pooled funding	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data The CRS database does not report at the more disaggregated category level (B031, B032 and B033) routinely yet, but only as B03. The team will use data collected on in-depth case study engagements to classify these according to the lower-level disaggregation. ⁶
Project type interventions	Project type interventions	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
Experts and other technical assistance	Experts and other technical assistance	As per OECD DAC CRS definitions and data
Class 10. Earmarking Type (allows degree of earmarking to be derived)		
Project	Yes/No	Evaluation defined A specific multilateral programme or fund is specified in engagement agreement.
Sector	Yes/No	Evaluation defined A sector or sub-sector is specified in engagement agreement.
Input	Yes/No	Evaluation defined Specific inputs are specified or excluded in engagement agreement.
Geographic area	Yes/No	Evaluation defined Specific geographic regions are specified or excluded in engagement agreement.

⁶ As the OECD DAC will only be applying the B031 to B033 sub-categorisation from 2021 ODA statistics, it means that the evaluation will be using the definitions to categorise past multi-bi engagements. This component will therefore be Mokoro-classified but OECD DAC defined for the evaluation.

LEVEL 2 Category	LEVEL 3 Values	Definition source or Definition
Final recipient	Yes/No	Evaluation defined Specific end partners are specified or excluded in engagement agreement.
Beneficiaries	Yes/No	Evaluation defined Specific groups of beneficiaries are specified or excluded other than by geographic location in engagement agreement.
Other	Free text field to describe earmarking not covered by the existing categories	Evaluation defined Any other means of earmarking as specified in the engagement agreement.
Class 11. Source of earmarking		
Source of earmarking	Donor specified Danida specified Mix Cannot be determined	The multilateral partner structured the engagement agreement with earmarking by one or more of the earmarking categories. Danida structured the engagement agreement with earmarking by one or more of the earmarking categories. Mixed: earmarking was by Danida and multilateral partner.
Class 12. Organisation/interaction forms (in-depth cases)		
Copenhagen involvement	Formal Informal, very active Informal, occasionally active No role Cannot be determined	Formal: The engagement was subjected to specific formal programme/project processes that involved MFA in Copenhagen, such as appraisal or review. Informal: MFA in Copenhagen has not had a formalised role, but has been involved through advice, or review of documentation. Very active: MFA in Copenhagen has provided informal support often for the programme/project. Occasionally active: MFA Copenhagen has provided support or oversight at least once, but not often. No role: MFA Copenhagen has not had any discernible role in the engagement.
Danida role in programme/project planning and budgeting	Formal Informal, very active Informal, occasionally active No role Cannot be determined	Formal role: Danida's active role in programme planning and implementation and results oversight is formalised in engagement documentation. The role may include sitting on a steering group and formally signing off or having a no-objection on budgets, plans and reports, formal/required participation in review, learning and evaluation processes. Informal role: Danida is active in programme planning and oversight, such as by meeting with the partner and end-partners, commenting on documents, joining site visits, participating in reviews and evaluations and learning, but this role is not formalised in engagement documentation. Active: Danida participates often and regularly. Occasionally active: Danida has participated at least once but not often or regularly. No role: Danida has no role/is a silent partner formally and informally.
Danida role in programme implementation and results oversight	Formal and active Informal but not active No role Cannot be determined	
Danida role in dialogue associated with the programme (other than through planning, budgeting and implementation results oversight)	Formal Informal, very active Informal, occasionally active No role Cannot be determined	
Danida role mechanisms	Common forms of Danida participation and involvement in engagement management No role	The team will assess common Danida role mechanisms (such as steering committees, right to comment on documents, participation in review processes) in the in-depth cases to develop fields.
Disbursement triggers	Commonly used triggers No trigger	The team will assess disbursement requirements of in-depth cases to discern commonly used triggers (if any).
Reporting	Narrative and financial more than once a year Financial only, more than once a year Narrative & financial once a year Financial, once a year Narrative and financial occasional Financial occasional	Narrative reports refer to substantive information on the implementation and results of the project/programme. Financial only refers to reports that predominantly consists of financial information, with no substantive and systematic information on implementation and results. Occasional means reports that are not regular but linked to specific events such as disbursements.

Table 5 Evaluation matrix (complete)

Criterion	Main and sub-questions	Judgement criteria [EQ3]	Data and analysis needs	Data collection
FACTUAL/CONTEXTUAL QUESTIONS				
<i>Context, Danida rationale and processes for selecting multi-bi</i>	EQ 1. What was the context and rationale that led to the use of multi-bi and the specific multi-bi modality?			
	1.1. What were the important sector, country, Danida and/or multilateral features over the evaluation period affecting management and implementation of development cooperation engagements? 1.2. Why was a multilateral channel selected? 1.3. Did the decision to use a multi-bi channel rely on the country strategy/programme? 1.4. How and why was the specific multilateral organisation selected? 1.5. To what degree were the MFA in Copenhagen and Danish multilateral representations consulted? 1.6. Why was the specific modality (including degree and type of earmarking) applied? Which criteria were applied for selection of modalities of multi-bi (for instance types and degrees of earmarking)?	Documented and primary key informant interview (key informant)/focus group discussion/information about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danida, multilateral, country, sector context and how it evolved • Practices of other bilateral donors in sector/country • Danida’s strategic, budget and organisational context in country and globally, and their evolution • The formal processes, roles and responsibilities, rules, criteria and guidance to select multi-bi and the specific partner and modality, specifically guidance on any contact within Danida between the embassy, Copenhagen and Danish multilateral representations • Actually used processes to select multi-bi and agree the intervention, actually used reasons and criteria and informal rules for selecting multi-bi, the specific multi-bi partner and the specific modality Analysis of case country multi-bi interventions against taxonomy Process mapping ⁷ and analysis of commonality of processes across multi-bi with potential for expanding the typology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary documentation on country context • Country strategies of comparator bilateral donors • Country strategies and engagement documentation (including the DED, appraisals, programme committee documentation and partner programme documents) • Quantitative information on Danida multi-bi and other interventions, other donors’ multi-bi and overall aid • Key informants with Danida incumbent staff at time of agreeing multi-bi interventions (as available), in country, in key review/approval/advisory positions in Copenhagen and in offices managing core multilateral aid to the bilateral • Key informants with multilateral partners at country level • Key informants with government and other end partners at country level • Key informants with comparator bilateral donors in country/sector 	
<i>Arrangements for managing and implementing multi-bi engagements</i>	EQ 2. What role, if any, was (is) Denmark playing in the management and implementation of the multi-bi funded activities?			
	2.1. How were/are the multi-bi activities being monitored? 2.2. Did/does the Danish embassy/representation have a formal or only informal role in the management and implementation of the multi-bi activity? 2.3. What are multilateral monitoring evaluation and learning processes? What are relevant Danish monitoring evaluation and learning actions and processes?	Documented and primary key informant/focus group discussion information about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The multilaterals’ own financial, operational and technical monitoring, evaluation and learning processes or any that were agreed • The designed arrangements for and realised management and implementation of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement documentation (including reports) • Key informants with Danida incumbent staff at time of agreeing multi-bi interventions (as available), in country, in key review/approval/advisory positions in Copenhagen 	

⁷ Mapping facts of who is involved with what responsibility, what documents, information and interaction are produced and used, how, why, and with what results.

Criterion	Main and sub-questions	Judgement criteria [EQ3]	Data and analysis needs	Data collection
	<p>2.4. Was/is there any contact between the embassy/representation, the MFA in Copenhagen and relevant Danish multilateral representations regarding the implementation of the Danish funded multi-bi activities?</p> <p>2.5. Was/is there any contact between the embassy/representation, the MFA in Copenhagen, Denmark and headquarters of multilateral organisations regarding the implementation of the Danish multi-bi activities?</p>		<p>disbursements, implementation and reporting against Danida multi-bi funding (structures, roles and responsibilities, information flows, rules, timing)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Specifically formal and informal roles of Danida in the above • Any contact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ between embassy, Copenhagen and Danish multilateral representations ▫ between embassy, Copenhagen, Danish multilateral representations and multilateral's headquarters and country offices • Analysis: process mapping (as above) and analysis of commonality of processes across multi-bi with potential to adjust the taxonomy organisation/engagement class to indicate forms of collaboration and engagement 	<p>and Danish multilateral representations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informants with multilateral partners at country level • Key informants with Government and other end partners at country level

EVALUATIVE QUESTIONS:

To identify strengths and weaknesses of Danish use of multi-bi, identify the lessons learned and provide recommendations on the use of the instrument in future

EQ 3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Danish multi-bi contributions?				
<p>Relevance <i>The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to differing beneficiaries', global, country and partner/institution needs, policies and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change</i></p>	<p>3.1. How relevant was/is the use of multi-bi?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Were/are multi-bi funded activities relevant? ▫ Was/is the use of multi-bi relevant to Danida globally or in country? And/or: ▫ Was/is the use of multi-bi relevant to strengthening the multilateral globally or in country? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The activities funded were relevant because their objectives and design responded and continue to respond to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ the policies, needs, priorities and standards of Danida globally, and in context ▫ the policies, needs and priorities of the country government and/or end beneficiaries ▫ the policies, needs and priorities of the multilateral globally and/or in context ▫ the policies, needs and priorities of the beneficiary partner, if not Government ▫ the specific requirements of the sector • The selected funding arrangements were/are going to enable Danida to ensure that appropriate trade-offs between these different relevancies were/are reached, to ensure the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danida's CP priorities, objectives and risks overall and in sectors <p>For in-depth case studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The multilateral's financial policies, priorities, needs, capacities and risks overall, in country and in sectors • Country government policies, priorities, needs, capacities • Sector-specific requirements in context • End beneficiary needs and priorities • Qualitative information on Danida and/or comparator donors delivering in sector and context through direct implementation • Process analysis: analysis of formal process map(s) for management of multi-bi to identify gaps, strengths and weaknesses • Qualitative analysis of relevance of case country multi-bi interventions against taxonomy, across interventions within country, across countries and across multilateral partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement documentation (including reports) • Multilateral partner documentation and reports on the intervention (for in-depth intervention cases) • Country sector documentation and reports (for in-depth intervention cases, e.g. sector strategies, joint reviews or annual reports) • Other donors' documentation on intervention or other secondary documentation (e.g. research studies) • Key informants with Danida staff, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ incumbent staff at time of agreeing/implementing multi-bi interventions (as available) ▫ currently in country ▫ in key review/approval/advisory positions in Copenhagen for multi-bi

Criterion	Main and sub-questions	Judgement criteria [EQ3]	Data and analysis needs	Data collection
		<p>relevance of the intervention in context and to Danida's priorities and interests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of multi-bi contributed to this relevance because Danida was merited in expecting (by intervention or overall in country) that it will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ enable Danida to work in insecure environments and/or ▫ deliver on Danida's global and country strategic priorities (including development of country systems) and/or ▫ aid dialogue with Government and/or ▫ aid the intervention being at required scale and with the required reach and coverage and/or ▫ ensure appropriate technical advice and oversight, and/or ▫ be flexible for Danida, i.e. allow Danida to adjust funding volume without affecting the efficiency and effectiveness of the intervention and sustainability of the results, and/or ▫ reduce risk and transaction cost for Danida in line with its needs and capacities, and/or ▫ leverage or support the multilateral's normative role re the priority funded • The use of multi-bi was relevant, by intervention or by multilateral, because Danida's processes for managing core and non-core multilateral support would enable Danida to influence the multilateral globally or strengthen the multilateral's position in country and/or globally • Contribution to relevance 		<p>development, multilateral and humanitarian aid</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ in offices managing core multilateral aid to the multilateral ▫ with long experience of Danida ODA, especially at country level • Key informants with multilateral partners at country level • Key informants with government and other end partners at country level • Danida staff survey (on flexibility of Danida's support for multi-bi; mechanisms for feedback between core and non-core multilateral support; Danida strengths and weaknesses in managing ODA at country level; relevance of use of multi-bi at country level) • Key informants with comparator bilaterals (country and global)
<p>Coherence <i>The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a</i></p>	<p>3.2. Were/are Danida's multi-bi contributions coherent with:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In emergency contexts, the use of multi-bi contributed to the HDP nexus by: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about other Danida interventions in the sector in country, including funded via the CP, and regional and global bilateral, humanitarian and multi-bi programmes and projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative information on Danida multi-bi and other interventions, other donors' multi-bi and overall aid (OECD DAC

Criterion	Main and sub-questions	Judgement criteria [EQ3]	Data and analysis needs	Data collection
<i>country, sector or institution</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ other Danida interventions in the sector or with the multilateral ▫ other contributions in the sector, including of the end partner, and/or ▫ other interventions of the multilateral, including humanitarian interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ helping to align/integrate development interventions and humanitarian interventions ▫ strengthening more integrated management of humanitarian and development support ▫ strengthening the context for peace and stability • In all contexts multi-bi interventions and the way they were managed were coherent with (supported and did not undermine or duplicate, and vice versa) other interventions of the multilateral partner, in the sector and for the end partner • In all contexts the use of multi-bi and the way in which it was managed was coherent with (supported and did not undermine, and vice versa) regional and global multi-bi in the sector and relative to the partner, and the feedback loops were well integrated • The multi-bi was coherent because (any or all of the following): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ it strengthened work alongside Government ▫ allowed coherent multi-donor delivery at scale and with coverage/helped reduce fragmentation in donor funding ▫ it strengthened collective dialogue • In combination with other Danida funding (to the country, sector) the use of multi-bi reflects Danida's comparative advantage • Contribution to coherence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about multilateral interventions in the sector in country, including in emergency contexts, their humanitarian interventions • In humanitarian contexts, information about the management of sector humanitarian interventions • For in depth case studies, qualitative information on Danida and/or comparator donors delivering in sector and context through direct implementation • Information about other interventions in the sector in-country • Process analysis of the management of country development and other multi-bi for the same multilateral/sector • Qualitative analysis of coherence of case country multi-bi interventions against taxonomy, across interventions within country, across countries and across multilateral partners 	<p>development statistics and Open Aid)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As for EQ3.1, but added for the Danida staff survey: question about the degree of integration of development multi-bi with Danida-funded humanitarian interventions at regional and country-level; and question about the need for and realisation of coherence between multi-bi at country, regional and global level flowing to the same multilateral
Effectiveness <i>The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any</i>	<p>3.3. How effective was the use of multi-bi development aid at country level?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Were/are Danish multi-bi contributions effective? ▫ What were the intended and unintended positive and negative contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection of a multilateral partner was merited because the envisioned benefits ensued, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ enabling Danida to support development in insecure environments effectively, including by enabling a functioning HDP nexus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about the implementation and results of multi-bi interventions (case study country interventions, and especially in-depth intervention case studies) • For in-depth case studies, information about context and other development interventions affecting results in the sector and in context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As for EQ3.1 and taking together with sources of information on country and sector context from EQ1 and 2 • Quantitative information on Danida multi-bi and other interventions, other donors' multi-bi and overall aid (OECD DAC

Criterion	Main and sub-questions	Judgement criteria [EQ3]	Data and analysis needs	Data collection
<i>differential results across groups</i>	<p>from selection of multilaterals as partners to (i) the effectiveness of multi-bi interventions; (ii) the delivery of Danida aid in country?</p> <p>Were/are multi-bi contributions an effective instrument to promote Danish interests in core-multilateral aid?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ delivering on Danida's global and country strategic priorities (including development of country systems) ▫ aiding dialogue with Government and the promotion of Danish interests in dialogue with Government ▫ aiding the intervention to be at required scale and with the required reach and coverage ▫ ensuring appropriate technical advice and oversight ▫ increasing the efficiency of Danida's aid ▫ leveraging or supporting the multilateral's normative role re the priority funded ▫ strengthening the multilateral at country, regional or global level ▫ other, as emerging from the evaluation research • The realised benefits increased and did not distract from the effectiveness of the interventions (or any loss was merited because of benefit to Danida, the multilateral globally) • Danida and multilaterals' arrangements/processes to manage multi-bi partnerships and interventions, support the effectiveness of the intervention, including effective accountability and planning, monitoring, evaluation and learning at the intervention level • Danida has been able to effectively use multi-bi experiences with multilaterals to influence multilaterals at global level • Contribution to effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about the effectiveness of multilateral partners, and drivers of effectiveness/lack of effectiveness • Information about how comparator donors manage multi-bi (from intervention to global level) and lessons from their approaches • Contribution analysis of in-depth country case studies against Danida's rationale for using multi-bi in each case • Process analysis of the management of country development multi-bi interventions for gaps, strengths and weaknesses • Analysis of lessons from the use of multi-bi across cases within case countries, across multilateral partners and across countries, against the taxonomy (for different types of multi-bi) 	<p>development statistics and Open Aid)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added question to the Danida staff survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Identification of specifically successful or problematic use of development multi-bi at country level, and a brief motivation of why the case is being highlighted
Efficiency <i>The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an</i>	3.4. Did the use of multi-bi contribute to the efficiency of Danida development cooperation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The multi-bi funded interventions were delivered in a timely manner, and were well-run because of (any of the following): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ economies of scale resulting from pooled funding/larger projects/ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about administrative costs associated with multilaterals and other partners • Information about earmarking of intervention • Qualitative information about Danida embassy resources needed to deliver relevant, efficient, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative information on Danida multi-bi and other interventions, other donors' multi-bi and overall aid (OECD DAC development statistics and Open Aid)

Criterion	Main and sub-questions	Judgement criteria [EQ3]	Data and analysis needs	Data collection
<i>economic and timely way.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Were the Danish multi-bi contributions efficient (timely, well run)? ▫ Was the management of multi-bi interventions efficient? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shared implementation machinery with other projects and programmes ▫ higher ability of multilaterals to put in place effective/functional operations to deliver project, including access to supply of quality services and goods, technical resources, logistical systems, and for back-office functions like procurement, financial management ▫ labour division/collective dialogue • The size and frequency of commitments and disbursements is aligned with partner risk profiles/needs for efficient intervention management • Disbursements timely & predictable • The earmarking agreed between Danida and the donor helped ensure efficient, predictable and accountable delivery of the intervention • The administrative costs of multi-bi interventions are justifiable and on rapid assessment seen as not more burdensome than Danida's own resource costs should it have opted for direct implementation • There is less demand on embassy resources than with direct implementation/use of multi-bi overall reduces administrative costs for Danida • Contribution to efficiency from criteria (and for conclusion from findings) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> coherent and effective development multi-bi interventions relative to direct implementation • Information about commitments and disbursements • Quantitative analysis of multi-bi interventions relative to other Danida interventions in sector • Process analysis: analysis of formal process map(s) for management of multi-bi to identify gaps, strengths and weaknesses re efficiency • Qualitative analysis of efficiency of case country multi-bi interventions against taxonomy, across interventions within country, across countries and across multilateral partners, supported by feasible quantitative analysis within available data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added question to Danida staff survey on experience of resources needed to deliver on different multi-bi modalities
<i>Flexibility contributes to</i> Relevance, efficiency and effectiveness <i>But will be analysed separately</i>	3.5. Were/are Danish use of multi-bi contributions flexible as an instrument?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of multi-bi provides flexibility for Danida by allowing adjustment of funding volume (downwards and upwards) without affecting the efficiency and effectiveness of the intervention and sustainability of the results • The arrangements for managing multi-bi interventions are sufficiently flexible to allow efficient implementation of the interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on evolution of multi-bi interventions in context, especially current instruments in the context of COVID-19 • For in-depth case studies, information about flexibility of other similar development interventions in context or sector managed through other channels • Qualitative analysis of relevance of case country multi-bi interventions against taxonomy, across interventions within country, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as for EQ3.1, and using context information from EQ1 and EQ2 • Added question to Danida staff survey on staff views on flexibility of multi-bi relative to other channels used by Danida in response to COVID-19, request to identify examples to support response

Criterion	Main and sub-questions	Judgement criteria [EQ3]	Data and analysis needs	Data collection
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual interventions are flexible so they respond to changes in the context, e.g. in responding to COVID-19 	<p>across countries and across multilateral partners</p>	
<p><i>Contributes to Effectiveness and efficiency</i> <i>But will be assessed and analysed specifically</i></p>	<p>3.6. Were/are multi-bi contributions an instrument to ensure sharing of risks? 3.7. Did the criteria used for the selection of multi-bi modalities adequately consider the benefits and risks of different modalities and were they applied well? (added as an evaluative question associated with the question on criteria under the TOR EQ3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of multi-bi reduced (reputational, fiduciary, programmatic, operational) risk and transaction costs for Danida in line with its expectations, needs and capacities Danida using multi-bi (also) reduced reputational, fiduciary, programmatic and operational risks for the multilateral, other donors and the final partner The spread of risks and trade-offs between risks for Danida and its partners were managed so that net risks were reduced overall for the intervention by Danida using multi-bi The criteria used and modality selected adequately considered the benefits and risks of different modalities of multi-bi 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the in-depth case studies information and analysis of the risks and benefits for Danida, other donors, the multilateral and final partner and the intervention Process analysis: assessment of the information used and design processes of Danida multi-bi for strengths and weaknesses in considering risks Qualitative assessment of risks and benefits in non-multi-bi development engagements for Danida in context Qualitative analysis of risks and benefits of case country multi-bi interventions against taxonomy, across interventions within country, across countries and across multilateral partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as for EQ3.1 Added question to Danida staff survey on staff views on risks associated with multi-bi for Danida, and request to identify examples to support their response
<p><i>Contributes to Relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness</i> <i>But will be assessed and analysed separately</i></p>	<p>3.8. Were/are information sharing and learning sufficiently addressed in the Danish funded multi-bi activities?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The management of the intervention is sufficiently transparent: Danida has access to enough of the right information to satisfy its needs for accountability and performance monitoring, evaluation and learning Multilateral partners' performance monitoring, evaluation, learning processes are robust & deliver the right information Danida has learned from the use of development multi-bi at country level (about the instrument, the sector and the multilateral) and applied this learning in the sector, at country level and globally <p>Note that learning about the development partner for application in the intervention and application elsewhere is assessed under <i>Effectiveness</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information from EQ2 Process analysis, including of the information flows between the multilateral and Danida (timing, content, formats) relative to Danida's needs Information about lessons from the design and implementation of multi-bi interventions, including about effective accountability and performance monitoring, evaluation and learning Information on application of learning from multi-bi interventions to intervention and Danida's engagement elsewhere in-country and across countries Information on why adjustments to multi-bi interventions were made For in-depth case studies, information about information sharing and learning in other similar development interventions in context or sector managed through other channels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as for EQ3.1

Criterion	Main and sub-questions	Judgement criteria [EQ3]	Data and analysis needs	Data collection
Relevance, efficiency and effectiveness (flexibility)	3.9. Were/are Danish use of multi-bi contributions flexible as an instrument?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of multi-bi provides flexibility for Danida by allowing adjustment of funding volume (downwards and upwards) without affecting the efficiency, effectiveness of the intervention and result sustainability The arrangements for managing multi-bi interventions are sufficiently flexible to allow efficient implementation of the interventions Individual interventions are flexible so they respond to changes in the context, e.g. in responding to COVID-19 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on evolution of multi-bi interventions in context, especially current instruments in the context of COVID-19 (what drivers, what responses) For in-depth case studies, information about flexibility of other similar development interventions in context or sector managed through other channels Qualitative analysis of relevance of case country multi-bi interventions against taxonomy, across interventions within country, across countries and across multilateral partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as for EQ3.1, and using context information from EQ1 and EQ2 Added question to Danida staff survey on staff views on flexibility of multi-bi relative to other channels used by Danida in response to COVID-19, request to identify examples to support response
Conclusion and recommendations	EQ 4. What lessons learned and recommendations can be made for future multi-bi contributions			
	4.1. Were/are multi-bi activities more relevant and effective in specific contexts and sectors?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of the findings and conclusions against Question 3, and how these differ by context, sector, modality and forms of collaboration and engagement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis against Questions EQ1, 2 and 3.
	4.2. Were/are some forms of collaboration and engagement in multi-bi activities more relevant and effective?			
	4.3. Were/are some modalities (for instance types of earmarking) more relevant and effective?			
	4.4. Was/is the guidance from MFA in Copenhagen level on multi-bi activities sufficiently detailed?			

Country case studies

Nine country case studies provided in-depth insights on how using a multilateral organisation as the implementing partner for engagements, contributed to the performance (or not) of these engagements. Four country cases – Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia – were done in-country with extensive interviews with Danish embassy staff, Danida’s multilateral partners, government stakeholders where relevant, and other bilateral donors and partners. Additional documentation was accessed at this level.⁸ The remaining five cases were done through desk-study, complemented by more limited primary interviews.

The country cases were pre-selected by the MFA but provided good representation of the Danish country multi-bi development portfolio (see Box 1 under).

Box 1 Overview of country cases

Six of the nine case study countries are classified as least developed countries (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Mali, Niger and Somalia), four of which are also in the World Bank’s 2020 list of fragile countries, with two experiencing high intensity conflict (Afghanistan and Somalia, with Mali and Niger being the other two).⁹ Three countries are lower-middle income (Kenya, Ukraine and Palestine). Palestine is also classified as fragile. At the start of the period, Afghanistan, Somalia, Mali and Palestine were considered fragile.

The nine case study countries received 56% of Danish country development multi-bi commitments 2013-2019 by volume (see Table 6 under). All nine fall in the fourth quartile of countries receiving Danish ODA, with Afghanistan topping the list, and in the fourth quartile of countries receiving country development multi-bi, representing eight of the top ten recipients.

Table 6 Case study countries: ODA, multi-bi ODA and development multi-bi ODA

Country name and ranking (1 st to tenth recipient of country development multi-bi)	ODA commitments 2013-2019 USD 2019	Multi-bi as a share of total country ODA	Development multi-bi as a share of total country ODA	Country development multi-bi as a share of total Danish development multi-bi
Afghanistan (1)	512	48%	40%	19%
Bangladesh (9)	180	35%	18%	3%
Ethiopia (3)	259	39%	33%	8%
Kenya (12)	218	14%	13%	3%
Mali (5)	347	12%	11%	3%
Niger (10)	108	23%	23%	2%
Somalia (2)	269	43%	26%	6%
Ukraine (6)	106	52%	48%	5%
West Bank and Gaza Strip (4)	171	45%	41%	6%
Total	2 171	On average 34%	On average 28%	56%

Source: OECD DAC Development Statistics.

In-depth reviews of multi-bi engagements

All case studies started by building internal country dossiers, drawing on existing documentation and data. The dossiers set out the country context, and summarised Danida’s country priorities and engagement portfolio over the period. After initial engagement with the country embassies, two to four in-depth case studies of multi-bi engagements were agreed. These in-depth cases provided opportunity to track (i) the

⁸ In three of the cases the country fieldwork was done in person. In the fourth case, Ethiopia, COVID-19 travel restrictions and internal conflict prevented the planned in-person fieldwork, with the result that the study was conducted online.

⁹ World Bank, 2021, List of Fragile and Conflict-Affected situations, 2006-2021, [link](#)

rationale and effectiveness of management processes, and to assess (ii) the impact of the selection of multi-bi as a modality on efficiency, effectiveness, etc. of these engagements. Altogether 25 multi-bi engagements were researched as in-depth cases, covering 10 multilateral partners and eight sectors and a variety of partnership structures, earmarking modalities and funding vehicles. Eleven of the cases were in conflict-affected countries, three in otherwise fragile countries, and 11 in non-fragile low and medium-income countries. Table 7 under provides the list of multi-bi cases, with the in-depth cases in each country in light grey. Please note that the commitment values reported, are the total commitments against the engagement recorded on the OECD DAC CRS database, in constant USD million (2019).

Table 7 List of country multi-bi engagements in case study countries

Afghanistan			USD million (2019)
Multilateral Partner	Title	Year	Commitment 2013-2019
UNDP	Contributions	2013	2.2
Asian Development Bank	Greshk Electricity Services Improvement Project (GESIP)	2013	2.5
UNESCO	Contribution to UNESCO	2013	1.5
International Organisation for Migration (IOM)	Population policies and reproductive health programmes	2013 and 2018	0.4
Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe	Contribution	2014	0.3
World Bank	Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF) on public financial management and civil service effectiveness	2014-2017	40.3
		2019-2020	29.3
UNDP	Enhancing Legal and Electoral Capacity for Tomorrow – Phase II (ELECT II)	2014-2017	3.0
World Bank	ARTF Support for Basic Education	2014-2017	52.9
		2018-2021	7.4
World Bank	ARTF National Horticulture and Livestock Project (NHLP)	2014-217	4.5
		2019-2020	9.8
UNDP	Afghanistan Law and Order Trust Fund	2012, 2013-2014 & 2018-2019	38.9
European Union		2015-2017	33.2
UN Habitat	Contribution	2017-2018	3.0
UNOPS	Salaam Support Group II Project 2019-2020	2019-2020	0.3
UNDP	Support for Anti-Corruption Civil Society Organisations	2019-2020	9.6
Bangladesh			USD million 2019
Multilateral Partner	Title	Year	Commitment 2013-2019
UNDP	Agriculture and Food Security Project in the Chittagong Hill Tracts (AFSP III)	2016-2021	7.4
UNDP	CHT Climate Resilience Project	2018	6.3
UNDP	Sustainable Democratic Union Parishad Project (SDUP)	2016-2019	5.0
ILO	Promoting Social Dialogue and Harmonious Industrial Relations in Bangladesh Garment Industry	2016-2019	2.3
World Bank	Strengthening Public Expenditure Management Programme	2011-2016	5.9
IFC	Waste to Energy Engagement	2014	8.6

UNDP	Partnerships for Inclusivity and Tolerance in Bangladesh	2017	0.5
UNDP	Support to the UNDP Human Rights Programme	2014	1.1
IFAD	Rural Enterprise Micro-Transformation Project	2019	8.2
Ethiopia			USD million (2019)
Multilateral Partner	Title	Year	Commitment 2013-2019
IOM	Enhancing Migration Management in Ethiopia and Promoting Voluntary Return and Reintegration of Ethiopians	2 016	2.2
UNFPA	Towards Universal Access to Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights Services in the Somali Region (UNFPA)	2017	3.0
UN Women	Combating violence against women and girls in Ethiopia	2018	0.7
UN Women	Enhancing Psychosocial Support and Economic Empowerment of Women and Girls Survivors of Violence in Oromia Regional State	2015	1.1
UNDP	CP-TP 4 support to UNDP Governance and Democratic Participation Programme	2018	3.8
UN Women	CP-TP4 Ensuring Gender Responsive Democratization and Preventing Violence against Women and Girls	2018	3.0
UNHCHR	Small-scale activities aggregated	2014	0.2
UNDP	Support to the Electoral Process of Ethiopia UNDP	2014	0.3
IOL	Building sound industrial relations for sustainable development and competitiveness	2014	0.9
World Bank	Accelerating Wind Power Generation in Ethiopia	2016-2019	2.5
Global Green Growth Institute	CP-TP3 Climate Resilient Forest Livelihood	2018	0.1
World Bank	Productive Safety Net Programme - food and natural resources productive capacities in the drylands of Ethiopia	2012-2018	56.7
UNHCR	Opportunities for refugees and host-communities in Ethiopia (2018-2020)	2018-2020	12.8
WFP	CP-TP2 Sustainable Livelihoods and Food Security Programme Innovative approaches to building resilience for refugees and host populations in Ethiopia from humanitarian assistance to self-reliance between	2019-2022	9.3
Kenya			USD million (2019)
Multilateral Partner	Title	Year	Commitment 2013-2019
World Bank	Support to the Kenya Accountable Devolution Programme	2016-2020	5.6
World Bank	Water and Livelihoods Programme in Refugee, Host and Other Vulnerable Communities of Kenya	2016-2019	12.9
UNFPA	UNFPA Support to Reducing Preventable Maternal, Newborn and Child Deaths	2017-2019	6.2
International Law Organisation	Access to Justice, Rights and Equality	2016-2019	4.0

UNDP	Small-scale activities aggregated	2015	0.1
Mali			USD million (2019)
Multilateral Partner	Title	Year	Commitment 2013-2019
UNICEF	UNICEF Protection and care of girl and boy victims or at risk of child rights' violations in Mali	2019	0.5
UNICEF	Support to Sanitation	2014-2015	1.8
World Health Organisation	Project for the prevention and response to the risk of the Ebola epidemic	2014	0.8
IFAD	Inclusive financing of agricultural value chains INCLUSIVE Project 2018-2024	2018-2024	20.4
World Bank	Mali Conducive Environment for Growth Entrepreneurship Multi-Donor Trust Fund	2018	4.2
UNDP	Stabilization Fund - Malian roadmap for transition period 2013-2014	2013-2014	7.0
UN Women	Promoting women's role in peace-building.	2017-2022	4.2
WFP	Support to resilience-building in fragile regions of Northern and Central Mali	2017-2022	7.5
United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPO)	Support to community peace dividend projects in conflict-affected areas.	2017-2022	9.8
United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPO)	MINUSMA Trust Fund and Social Accountability Transitions programme Mali 2015-2016 3/3	2015, 2017-2022	15.8
Niger			USD million (2019)
Multilateral Partner	Title	Year	Commitment 2013-2019
European Union	Strengthen and fund women's and youth civil society organizations, and those working for gender equality	2014	1.2
World Bank	Programme for the Promotion of Employment and Economic Growth in Agriculture in Niger	2014	17.5
IOM	Niger, Democratic governance, stability and migration, 2017-2022	2017-2022	1.1
UNDP	Niger, Democratic governance, stability and migration, 2017-2022	2016, 2017-2022	6.5
UNFPA	Strengthen national capacities for obstetric care, community-based interventions for family planning, sexual integration and reproductive health of young people in national policies, laws, plans and programmes	2014-2017	10.6
Somalia			USD million (2019)
Multilateral Partner	Title	Year	Commitment 2013-2019
EU	AMISOM through the EU's African Peace Facility	2014	1.5
UNHCHR	Thematic Programme Governance and State Building - SCP 2019-2023	2019-2023	0.7
UN Office on Drugs and Crime	Support to UN Office on Drugs and Crime Maritime Crime Programme	2013	2.0
EU	Integrated Local Economic Development Programme (Private Sector and Safety Nets)	2019-2023	8.2
World Bank	Multi-Partner Fund (following private sector development, PFM and recurrent and operational transfers programme)	2014-2018, 2019-2023	36.9

UNOPS	Local Government Development Programme (Channelled through the UN Trust Fund before transitioning to the UN MPTF)	2015	8.2
UNDP	Local Government Development Programme (Channelled through the UN MPTF but as a separate engagement)	2019-2023	21.9
UNDP	UN MPTF - Joint Programming on State Formation, Youth Employment, Rule of Law, Human Rights and the UNDP Constitutional Review	2014-2018, 2019-2023	9.2
UNOPS	Support for Immigration HQ in Mogadishu	2017-2018	3.4
UNICEF	Rebuilding Somalia Education	2013	3.1
UNICEF	Protection for women, girls and boys in Somalia	2019-2023	12.0
IFC	Support to improving the investment climate	2019-2023	6.0
UNDP	Support to the Rule of Law Programme in South Central Somalia	2013-2014	5.0
UNOPS	Support to UMSOM	2013	0.2
Ukraine			USD million (2019)
Multilateral Partner	Title	Year	Commitment 2013-2019
OSCE	Support to the special monitoring mission in Ukraine	2013-2019	11.2
ILO	Inclusive labour market for job creation 2017 - 2022 (ILO)	2017-2022	0.6
UNDP	Recovery and Peacebuilding Programme (RPP)	2018-2022	3.9
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Contribution to the Ukrainian multi-donor account	2014-2017	1.7
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Programme 2014-17.	2014-2017	1.5
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Support to Chernobyl Shelter Fund. New Safe Confinement Project	2015	0.8
EU	Democracy, Constitution Reform and Decentralisation Programme 2015	2015	5.5
EU	Support to Combatting Corruption in Ukraine 2017-2019	2017-2019	1.5
Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe	Support for Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe election efforts ahead of Ukraine's presidential election	2014	0.2
UN Women	Small-scale activities aggregated	2018	2.3
UNDP	Civil Society for enhanced democracy and human rights in Ukraine.	2012-2016	3.5
UNDP	Democracy and Human Rights Programme	2015-2018	10.3
UNDP	Ukraine Small and Medium Enterprise Development	2019	2.9
Council of Europe	Cooperation with Ukraine Immediate Measures Package	2014	0.6
Palestine			USD million (2019)
Multilateral Partner	Title	Year	Commitment 2013-2019
EU	PEGASE Direct Financial Support (DFS)	2014-2016	1.3
World Bank	Municipal Development Programme	2014-2016	56.8

EU	Support State Building Efforts, Development in Area C of the West Bank	2014-2016	2.1
FAO	FAO: Reform and Development of Markets, Value Chains and Producers' Organisations	2017-2020	18.2
OHCHR	Contribution	2017-2020	1.2

Source: OECD DAC CRS Database 2021, Country Programmes, interviews.

Survey of Danish embassy staff

The evaluation conducted a survey of current and past Danish embassy posted staff and national embassy staff in post in May 2022, to collect views on current and past multi-bi operations. The survey asked about the rationale for multi-bi, and Denmark's role and problems in multi-bi management. Survey respondents identified multi-bi engagements where they have had a role, and answered questions about the relevance, coherence, effectiveness and efficiency of these multi-bi engagements. The finalised online survey was sent to 98 Danida staff, and 41 valid responses were received. For details of the survey and its results see **Fejl! Henvisningskilde ikke fundet.**

Constraints

The evaluation relied on existing monitoring and review data and documentation, as well as stakeholders' views, regarding the performance of the multi-bi engagement case studies. It did not undertake a full evaluation of the engagements themselves, but used them as data-points on the performance of multi-bi as an instrument. This imposes limitations on the evaluation, as there were data gaps on engagement performance in most cases.

The evaluation design did not include the establishment of full-blown counterfactuals. In the in-country case studies the evaluation made enquiries about how experiences of multi-bi engagements compared to engagements delivered with other partners, to provide limited comparative perspectives. The review of Danida country documentation also collected information on cases where the use of multi-bi was justified in relation to other channels. However, evaluating the delivery of development engagements through partners other than multilaterals to the same extent was outside the scope of the evaluation.

There were challenges around the availability of documents and other data, particularly at country and engagement level. The evaluation was not able to get full sets of documentation for all the in-depth case studies. In-depth case studies of multi-bi support in the early years of the evaluation were especially challenging and these are under-represented in the sample of cases. Remote working for five of the nine country cases, increased the difficulty of assembling the required material for the cases that went ahead. It was not possible to get full data on the number and type of Danida personnel in embassies over time. These gaps presented challenges to the evaluation regarding specific development engagements, countered in the overall findings by cross-engagement and cross-country triangulation of findings.

