

Annex C – Evaluation Matrix

<p>EQ1. What are the main developments in Danish development cooperation and how was aid managed since 2009?</p> <p>(DAC criterion: Relevance)</p>			
Sub-question/Judgement criterion	Indicators	Methodology/comments	Sources of evidence
<p>1.1 What are the main developments in Danish development cooperation, e.g., in the aid portfolio, in modalities and instruments, and in the distribution of development support and approach to partnerships since 2009?</p>	<p>Trends in the share of ODA across different modalities, instruments, sectors, bilateral, multilateral, and multi-bi, SSC, and line ministries.</p> <p>Trends in distribution between different types of countries and partnerships (expanded partnerships, targeted partnerships, etc).</p> <p>Trends in staffing (if available) at embassy level.</p>	<p>Statistical analysis and graphical presentation.</p>	<p>Data from OpenAid and bespoke data requests.</p> <p>Danish Development Strategies</p> <p>DIIS approach paper and similar articles.</p> <p>Inception interviews.</p> <p>HR data</p>
<p>1.2 How far has the management of Danish development cooperation adapted to changes in the international and Danish context for development cooperation?</p>	<p>How did the aid management guidance respond to changes in the international context and Danish policy objectives?</p>	<p>Documentary analysis of AMG, cross-tabulated against international and Danish policy objectives.</p>	<p>AMG 2015, 2021.</p> <p>Guidance on Adaptive Management</p> <p>DDD</p> <p>Stocktaking</p> <p>Articles on international aid trends and trends in aid management</p>
<p>EQ2. To what extent have the overall changes since 2009 in management of Danish development cooperation been relevant and appropriate in the light of the intentions behind the decentralisation and subsequent changes in the international and Danish aid context?</p> <p>(DAC criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Coherence)</p>			
Sub-question / Judgement criterion	Indicators	Methodology/comments	Sources of evidence

<p>2.1 How have roles and responsibilities been distributed between the MFA in Copenhagen and embassies and missions, and between MFA entities and other ministries and institutions, with regard to development support and management?</p>	<p>Changes over time in the distribution of roles and responsibilities, level of autonomy and financial thresholds for bilateral cooperation? Changes for multilateral cooperation of the above. Changes between the MFA and line ministries.</p>	<p>Analysis of how actual distribution of roles shifted, then comparison with stated goals, e.g., decentralisation or other drivers.</p>	<p>Aid management guidance. Key informant interviews at the MFA in Copenhagen and embassy level. Electronic survey.</p>
<p>2.2 To what extent have the distribution of roles and responsibilities and the changes between the MFA in Copenhagen and embassies/missions, ministries, institutions, been appropriate and relevant to the changes in development cooperation policies and aid management principles related to decentralisation?</p>	<p>Fit between the distribution of roles and responsibilities and the development cooperation goals and aid management principles. These include local ownership, alignment with national goals, achievement of results, etc. I.e., the intent behind decentralisation? Fit with other factors such as shifts in the international context, new global policy goals, and how suited was aid to delivering these goals?</p>	<p>Map the changes in distribution against stated principles and policy goals. The starting point is aid effectiveness principles but also consider DDD, adaptive management, global goals, e.g., tackling climate change, and domestic concerns, e.g., security and migration, public expenditure, Danish geopolitical influence.</p>	<p>Trends from EQ1 mapped against policy goals taken from strategy and policy documents, triangulated against key informant interviews and survey data.</p>
<p>2.3 How have the choices about which multilateral engagements to decentralise worked in practice?</p>	<p>Pattern and trends in decisions on which engagements are managed from Copenhagen or by staff posted within the international financial institutions. Fit with aid management principles and</p>	<p>Comparison of decisions on decentralisation with stated policy objectives and/or other drivers.</p>	<p>Multilateral strategy/partnership documents. Key informant interviews. Multilateral case study.</p>

	multilateral policy objectives.		
2.4 To what extent have key changes in different types of development cooperation and instruments been reflected in aid management ?	Changes in use of different instruments. Changes in management procedures.	Map the instruments against the management procedures to identify degree of coherence/ rationale/ appropriateness	Trends in distribution of instruments from EQ1. AMG documentary review to establish the basic intent, plus interviews to understand how it works in practice, e.g., for severely time-constrained staff.
2.5 To what extent have changes to aid management been relevant and appropriate in light of the decentralisation aid management principles (or other objectives driven by the global and domestic context for Danish aid)?	Degree of fit between changes in management and aid principles. Extent to which conditions for results have been met with plausible connection to aid management changes.	Map the changes in management against the aid principles to establish the degree of fit/ mismatch. Analyse alternative explanations for AMG decisions.	AMG documentary review and interviews. Aid management principles from EQ1. Contextual analysis from EQ1.
2.6 How far did the use of the decentralisation aid management principles contribute to improving the conditions for achieving results .	Intermediate objectives/conditions achieved (e.g., ownership, use of country systems, fast learning loops) that are considered to be supportive of achieving intended results.	Use theory of change to identify plausible connections or lack thereof and HOW results are achieved. Dependent on data available on intermediate objectives such as ownership, flexibility, relevance, coherence.	Key informant interviews. Electronic survey and evaluations may provide relevant data.
EQ3. To what extent are the more recent changes to management (since 2018-19) supporting conditions that are conducive to the intentions behind the DDD and adaptive management principles? (DAC criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Coherence)			
Sub-question / Judgement criterion	Indicators	Methodology/ comments	Sources of evidence
3.1 To what extent does management of Danish	Availability of data at embassy	Draw on mainly qualitative data to explore	Key informant interviews with

development cooperation underpin the achievement of synergies and strategic cohesion between various development instruments?	level, mapping different instruments being used in a country. Level of coherence between instruments.	to what extent embassies are aware of all Danish activity within a country and able to ensure synergies.	embassy staff, country level data, workplans, and mapping of activities at embassy level.
3.2 To what extent is management of Danish development cooperation supporting greater use of and strategic influence on the multilateral organisations, including policies, strategies, and implementation?	Existence of clearly defined policies, strategies, and instruments for each multilateral organisation. Evidence that they are being successfully applied to deliver influence and impact.	UNICEF case study. Documentary review of strategies and instruments. Qualitative analysis to assess influence.	Key informant interviews with MFA staff, engaging with MOs, and MO counterparts. Electronic survey.
3.3 To what extent does management of Danish development cooperation facilitate documentation/monitoring, knowledge management, dialogue, and learning?	Existence of relevant reviews, evaluations, and learning products, and knowledge management systems, with evidence of follow-up for learning and dialogue.	Documentary review and qualitative analysis.	Relevant reviews, evaluations, management responses. Key informant interviews, especially with evaluation leads and monitoring, evaluation, and learning contacts.
3.4 To what extent does the MFA adapt its management procedures based on relevant information (results reporting, reviews, and evaluations, etc.)?	Evidence of follow-up on monitoring data, reviews, and evaluations being used to inform improvements in management procedures.	Documentary review and qualitative analysis.	Management responses and tracking of follow-up actions. AMG.
EQ4. What lessons regarding aid management can be identified, and what issues should be considered for relevant adjustments in management of Danish development cooperation? (DAC criteria: Effectiveness, Efficiency, Coherence)			
Sub-question / Judgement criterion	Indicators	Methodology/ comments	Sources of evidence

<p>4.1 What are the strengths and weaknesses and the enabling and constraining factors in the present management of Danish development cooperation?</p>	<p>Strengths and enabling factors identified in interviews and survey as compared with what is expected as per the ToC. Constraining factors. Positive/negative feedback from interviewees and survey.</p>	<p>SWOT analysis.</p>	<p>Key informant interviews. Case studies. Electronic survey. Evaluations and reviews.</p>
<p>4.2 What works well, and what are the bottlenecks, dilemmas, or trade-offs in the present management of Danish development cooperation in practice?</p>	<p>Identified bottlenecks, e.g., staffing/resources/planning Feedback on trade-offs and dilemmas, e.g., number of instruments vs number of policy goals, financial, and staffing resources.</p>	<p>Some overlap with previous sub-question. Note that final impact is out of scope.</p>	<p>Key informant interviews. Case studies. Electronic survey.</p>
<p>4.3 What key lessons and considerations for the future can be identified?</p>	<p>Triangulated lessons across different settings. Recommendations targeted at gaps/constraints.</p>	<p>Synthesis of lessons from case studies followed by workshop on recommendations.</p>	<p>Case study reports. Analysis of key informant interviews and survey. Workshop transcripts.</p>