

Annex C Study Questions Matrix

Study Question – Relevance	Sub-questions	Lines of inquiry to address sub-questions	Sources of Information/ Methods and Tools
Portfolio level			
SQ 1. What are the overall trends in delegated cooperation from the EU to the MFA since 2014?	1.a What are the trends in terms of number of projects, volume of funding (absolute value and %), sector and region delegated to the MFA by the EU since 2014 (DA)	• Proportion and absolute amounts of EU, DK and, where relevant, other development partners, contributions to DC and as a percentage of the overall development budget • Specific trends related to number, size, theme/sector and geographic areas where the EU delegated to Denmark (DAs)	Project case studies and portfolio review of 20 DA/CAs and 9 TAs • EU and DK, project documents (document review) • Financial information from DK and EC as needed for budget analysis • Analysis of financial and sectoral trends
	1.b What are the key characteristic of the DA portfolio in terms of project design and implementation? (ToR SQ 1a)	• Overview of the key characteristics of the DA portfolio in terms of project design and implementation e.g. timing (in terms of the project cycle and length of time for approval of DA), management structure, roles of partners and identification of projects which have been audited and have had irregularities highlighted.	• Analysis of number, size, theme and geographic areas in DC • Analysis of key project characteristics • KIIs with MFA/embassies
SQ 2. How and why have EU and MFA delegated cooperation policies, procedures and guidelines evolved since 2014?	2a What is the MFA policy towards delegated cooperation with the EU, has this changed since 2014 and why? (ToR SQ 1c)	• Formal (and informal) policy and rationale for decisions on delegated cooperation with the EU as stated by stakeholders	Policy procedures and guidelines review • Document review and comparative analysis of development policies and policies related to the EU and MFA delegated cooperation
	2b What are the MFA requirements, guidelines and procedures for receiving delegated cooperation from the EU, how have these changed over time and why? (ToR SQ 1c)	• Analysis of key elements and trends in MFA guidelines, procedures and instructions since 2014	• Assessment of factors driving changes • KIIs with key MFA staff involved in delegated arrangements at a strategic and policy level
	2c What are EU requirements, procedures and guidelines for delegated cooperation to the MFA/other donors and to what extent have they changed since the 2016 evaluation? (ToR SQ 1b)	• Analysis and comparison of key elements of EU and MFA guidelines, procedures and instructions from since 2014 • Changes in requirements, procedures and guidelines responding to EU 2016 evaluation	• KIIs with EU (R4 and R7)
Project Level			

SQ 3. What factors promoted and impeded successful partnerships in delegated cooperation with the EU, where Denmark is the delegate?	3a What was the main rationale for choosing delegated cooperation and what were the expected benefits of this cooperation? (ToR SQ 1d and SQ2a – lines of inquiry)	• Stated rationale for engaging in delegated cooperation and why it was considered appropriate/ other options considered • Expected benefits (see list below)	5 project case studies and portfolio review • Document review of projects information (appraisals, reporting and reviews/evaluations) • KIIs with Embassy of Denmark managing project, MFA, implementing partner, participating donors and EU Delegation for case-studies • KIIs with EU (R4 and R7) • KIIs with Embassy of Denmark/MFA, EU delegation and implementing partner for 9 projects in the portfolio review
	3b What appraisals and approval processes were undertaken and how did these inform project design? (ToR SQ 1d)	• Processes for decision-making (units involved) • Assessments (EU pillar, partner and MFA internal capacity) undertaken • Project design – PMU, additional staff capacity • Information on any negotiations on terms with EU	
	3c Which direct and indirect administrative costs resulted from delegated cooperation? How are costs distributed between units and how is the overhead distributed and used? (ToR SQ 1f)	• Assessment of direct and indirect administrative costs • Policy on overheads (percentage and allocation to which budget)	
	3d Which management modality was chosen (was a management unit established?) and what were the strengths and weaknesses? (SQ2 c)	• Type of management modality (internal, external) • Strengths and weakness of different modalities	
	3e To what extent did the expected benefits occur? (ToR SQ1g)	• Expected benefits as defined by KIIs and programme documentation • Increased coverage of the programme • Effective division of labour between partners • Decrease in transaction costs for stakeholders • Strengthened dialogue with partner country • Increased visibility for Denmark and/EU • Other	
	3.f What were the main challenges including those ending in repayment requests by the EU and what have been the implications? (TOR SQ1 g and e), and SQ2 a-f reflected in lines of inquiry	Challenges as defined by KIIs and programme documentation • MFA/Embassy administrative burden/distribution of overhead/ staff capacity constraints • Project management set-up • Communication/coordination with the EU and other donors/actors • Capacity and role of EU delegation • Quality of monitoring framework	

		• Partner assessment undertaken to ensure implementing partner compliance with EU requirements • EU requirements on lead donor even when the donor agency was pillar assessed • EU financial management, audit requirements, repayment requests	
	3.g What were the main factors that either promoted or impeded a successful partnership with the EU? (chiefly SQ2 and SQ1g, with sub-questions reflected in lines of inquiry column)	• Project management modality (PMU, PIU etc.) • Choice of implementing partner • Overall context - (type of project, sector, number of donors delegating, capacity of EU delegation) • Financial and administrative capacity • MFA rules and guidelines/MFA support • Role of EU HQ or EUD • Quality of monitoring and reporting structures and processes • Scope for adaptation e.g. evolving circumstances and for ensuring local ownership within delegated cooperation • Other	
Comparison with the Experience of Like-minded Donors			
SQ 4. What relevant lessons on the management of delegated cooperation with the EU can be learned from like-minded donors, where they are the delegate?	4.a How do like-minded donor (Sweden, the Netherlands and GIZ) policies, requirements, procedures and guidelines for receiving delegated cooperation from the EU, compare to those of the MFA? (ToR SQ 3a)	• Similarities and differences in delegated cooperation policies and agreements with EU • Assessment of the extent to which there has been room to negotiate terms of cooperation with the EU (variations from standard rules and procedures)	Like-minded donors Review • Document review/ analysis from SQ2 • KIIs with like-minded donor Sweden, the Netherlands and Germany, Expertise France and the European Practitioners network) • KIIs with EU (R4 and R7) • Comparative analysis of like-minded donors and MFA policies and experiences • Analysis of key similarities and differences and lessons learned • Analysis of information from sub-questions above.
	4b What appraisals and approval processes are undertaken by LMD and how do these inform project design?	• Processes for decision-making (units involved) • Assessments (EU pillar, partner and MFA internal capacity) undertaken • Project design – PMU, additional staff capacity, use of overhead • Any negotiation on terms with EU	
	4c Which direct and indirect administrative costs result from delegated cooperation? How are costs distributed	• Assessment of direct and indirect administrative costs	

	between units and how is the overhead distributed and used? (ToR SQ 1f)	• Policy on overheads (percentage and allocation to which budget)	
	4d Which management modality is generally chosen (was a management unit established?) and what were the strengths and weaknesses? (SQ 2c)	• Type of management modality (internal, external) • Strengths and weakness of different modalities	
	4.e What are the main benefits and challenges that like-minded donors have experienced? (ToR SQ 1f)	<i>See expected benefits and challenges listed above (SQ3)</i>	
	4.f What were the main factors that either promoted or impeded like-minded donors' cooperation with the EU when they are the delegate? ToR SQ1c) -	• Project management modality (PMU, PMI) • Key project features - type of project, sector, number of donors delegating • Implementing partner's capacity (management, financial, administrative) • EU delegation's capacity	
SQ 5. What are the overall rules and procedures governing delegated cooperation with the EU since 2014 where the MFA is the delegator, and how do they compare with those of likeminded donors?	5a. What requirements, rules and procedures do Denmark, the Netherlands and Germany have in place for delegation to the EU and how do they compare with those of Denmark? (ToR SQ 3a)	• Comparison of guidelines, procedures, requirements of Denmark and likeminded donors in delegating funds to EU (similarities and differences) • Analysis of how these guidelines, procedures and requirements differ from when the EU delegates to the MFA or like-minded donors	Policy procedures and guidelines review • Document review and comparative analysis of policies, procedures and guidelines • KIIs with MFA and LMD representatives (Netherlands, Sweden, France and Germany, possibly observation at a European Practitioners Network meeting in Brussels on 29 October) • KIIs with EU (R4 and R7) • Case study on TA
	5b. What are the trends in terms of number of projects, volume of funding, sector and region for DC delegated from the MFA to the EU since 2014 (TA)	• Analysis of TA portfolio	
	5.c What benefits and challenges have been experienced with this type of cooperation? (SQ 3c and SQ 4d)	• Assessment of the benefits and issues experienced by the MFA and likeminded donors, and strategies for mitigating any problems • Experience of MFA and like-minded donors in negotiating terms of cooperation with the EU in general and for specific projects • Identification of any differences between the MFA and like-minded donor practices	

	5.d To what extent do the requirements and conditions for delegated cooperation (from both the EU and MFA) differ depending on whether the MFA (or like-minded donors) or the EU is the delegator, particularly regarding agreement requirements, rights and access (ToR SQ 3 b)	• Comparison between the requirements when the MFA is a delegator to the EU and when it is delegated to by the EU. • Identification of any differences
SQ 6. What lessons can be learned, what conclusions can be drawn, and recommendations made for the future use of delegated cooperation with the EU?	6.a What are the main strengths and weaknesses of the modality of delegated cooperation with the EU? (ToR SQ4a) 6.b How does the Danish experience compare to the experience of like-minded donors, and what additional insights can be learned from them? (ToR SQ4b) 6.c What factors should be taken into account when deciding whether to engage in delegated cooperation with the EU? What makes it more or less likely to successful arrangement? (ToR SQ4c) 6.d What has been the experience of the MFA and likeminded donors regarding the extent to which there is room for negotiating terms of cooperation with the EU, in general and for specific projects? (ToR SQ4d) 6.e Are the current Danish guidelines, procedures, and organisational setup for engaging in delegated cooperation (both as delegate and delegator) adequate in light of the study findings? If not, what changes should be considered, including for example potential minimum requirements to ensure a balance between expected benefits and administrative costs? (ToR SQ4e)	• Synthesis of information from SQ 1-5