



**MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF DENMARK**
Danida

Appendix 1 Scope of Services

Tender for Evaluation of Management of Danish Development Cooperation 20 years after decentralisation

Terms of reference

Section A: Assignment Specific Conditions

Comprise general information and specific conditions with regard to the Assignment.

Section B: Technical specifications

Comprise information with regard to the minimum requirements and wishes that apply to the tender.

Forms for Letter of Tender

Section C: The Consultant's Technical Schedules

Comprise templates to be completed by the tenderer and included in the tender (will be included in the Agreement as part of this Appendix 1 and apply to the Assignment).

Section D: Signature(s)

The tenderer must clearly mark and specify any provisos in the tender and sign this document.

Terms of reference

Section A: Assignment Specific Conditions

1. Background

The management of Danish bilateral development cooperation was decentralised in 2003. The overall aim of the decentralization was to improve the quality of Denmark's development cooperation. Even though initiated prior to the Paris declaration from 2005, the rationale behind the decentralisation tallied well with the aid effectiveness agenda with its emphasis on partner country ownership, alignment and harmonisation and a focus on results. The decentralisation included devolving the programme formulation and implementation to the embassy level within the context of approved overall country strategies and budget frames, devolving administrative responsibilities and changes in roles and responsibilities between embassy level and headquarter based advisory services. The decentralisation was also accompanied by a strengthened approach to quality assurance. In 2005, a large share of Danish multilateral support was also decentralised, devolving the administrative responsibility for the day-to-day management (from the identification of strategic objectives to the oversight over financial contributions to the monitoring of the organisations' performance and results) to Danish multilateral representations and units close to the headquarters of the organisations with the aim to reinforce Denmark's relations with major multilateral partners¹.

An evaluation of the decentralization of the Danish bilateral development cooperation was conducted in 2009 to assess the need for adjustments in the decentralization (Danida, 2009), while the decentralization of multilateral support has not been subject to a specific evaluation². In the 2009 evaluation, the principles of ownership, alignment and harmonization processes, key elements of

¹ For some multilateral and international organisations, the administrative responsibility remained with units at the headquarters of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. See OECD-DAC Peer Review of Denmark (2007) and Evaluation of the Decentralisation of Danish Aid Management (2009) for more regarding the approach and implications of the decentralisation of bilateral and multilateral development support.

² Management issues in relation to multilateral support has been addressed in various evaluation, latest in the evaluation of so-called multi-bi support (MFA, 2023). However, there has not been an evaluation with a specific focus on the decentralization, as was the case for the decentralization of bilateral development cooperation.

the Paris-agenda, was used as point of departure for assessment principle for the quality of aid management. Thus, the assessment principles reflected the international and domestic context of Danish aid management at the time of the evaluation³.

The explicit use of the Paris principles has been less pronounced since the former evaluation, not just in Denmark, but also in the international donor community, but the principles have not been abandoned. In recent years, a range of common principles have been adopted, which highlight the need to ensure adaptability of development cooperation to changed circumstances, partnership and localization, to mention a few points. At an overall level, these principles are embodied in the Doing Development Differently (DDD) Manifesto from 2014. In a Danish context, DDD was conceptualized and launched by the MFA in 2019. The implementation of the DDD approach has been guided by a project plan (August 2019 to July 2020) and annual action plans⁴. Further, the MFA has adopted a guidance note on adaptive management (MFA, 2020) in order to support the implementation of DDD in both bilateral and multilateral Danish development cooperation. This translates into a focus on synergies and strategic coherence between the various development instruments and between development cooperation and broader Danish foreign and security policies (both at country level and between levels and engagements), and local ownership, continuous learning and adaptive approaches. These principles and focus areas are not considered as contradictory to the Paris declaration, but rather as a more recent call for an approach to development cooperation that underpins both aid effectiveness and local ownership and is aligned not only with developments in Danish development policies and strategies, but also the international context for development cooperation.

Although other Danish evaluations have directly and indirectly touched upon management of Danish development cooperation, no evaluation with a specific focus on management has been conducted since 2009. The present evaluation will take place approximately 20 years after the decentralization of Danish aid management in 2003 of Danish bilateral development cooperation and will reflect the current status of development cooperation and management hereof. To establish a basis for decisions on the design of the new evaluation, the Department for Evaluation, Learning and Quality (now LEARNING) commissioned a paper, which outlined and considered various perspectives for the new evaluation (Engberg-Pedersen, 2022). Key points in this paper were both the changed context of international and Danish development cooperation and the marked changes in the ways in which it is managed. These latter changes comprise a number of elements, including new and revised strategies, policies and guidelines; an increase in multilateral and multi-bi aid; a larger share (app. 70 %) of development support administered from the central level; a

³ While current terminology emphasizes development cooperation rather than aid, to better reflect the focus on partnerships, existing guidelines are still titled as aid management guidelines. Thus, when referring to documents, the concept of development aid and aid management will also be used. This does not entail any specific differentiation between development aid, development support and development cooperation, but simply reflects differences in terminology.

⁴ A review of the implementation of DDD is planned for 2023 and will be made available to the evaluation team once finished.

number of new instruments; and a reduction in staff. Thus, the current evaluation will not be focused solely on decentral management of bilateral development cooperation but will cover management at both the central and decentral level, and by implication assess a broader range of modalities and instruments (see further on scope below).

Based on the above, it is the intention to carry out an evaluation which investigates whether and how management principles and practice as it has evolved, supports the aims and ambitions of Danish development cooperation, in light of the changes in Danish development cooperation.

2. Objectives

The evaluation will be mainly forward looking and focus on learning. The evaluation has three objectives:

- To assess whether and how changes in development cooperation since 2009 have been addressed by aid management in a relevant and appropriate manner, in line with the intentions behind the decentralisation.
- To assess whether and how the changes since 2018-19 in management are conducive to fostering conditions for achieving the intentions embedded in the DDD and adaptive management approach.
- To provide lessons learned regarding strengths and weaknesses in management of Danish development cooperation as well as enabling and hindering factors, and to present issues for consideration, including identification of dilemmas or trade-offs, and recommendations on adjustments as relevant.

In order to achieve these objectives, it will be needed to establish a descriptive overview of the main developments in management of Danish development cooperation since the last evaluation in 2009. The description will comprise both developments in Danish development support, including its size, instruments, and composition, and developments in policies and principles that have guided the management of Danish development cooperation, as well as the broader donor landscape/aid architecture and international development agenda.

3. Outputs

The following outputs are envisaged:

- An Inception Report, including a proposed outline for the main evaluation report, a review of the evaluation questions (EQs) in an evaluation matrix and a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology and work programme (not exceeding 20 pages plus annexes)
- Brief case study reports (each not exceeding 10 pages)
- A Preliminary Findings Paper (not exceeding 20 pages plus annexes)
- A draft Evaluation Report (not exceeding 50 pages plus annexes)
- A final Evaluation Report (not exceeding 50 pages plus annexes).

4. Scope of Work

Coverage of modalities and MFA management of development cooperation

In this evaluation, management will be used to describe MFA management of support to development cooperation. This includes the management of both bilateral and multilateral development support at headquarter level in Copenhagen and at embassies/missions. This implies that programmes implemented by other ministries and institutions but managed in Copenhagen will be covered by the evaluation (e.g. Strategic Sector Cooperation (SSC)). Here, focus will be on MFA's role and management in relation to such activities, not on the management by other actors. Development-related activities in Denmark, such as in-donor refugee costs, will be excluded from the evaluation, as will development support channelled through the EU. The aid management guidelines are a key set of documents that set out the formal requirements for the management of development cooperation.

It will not be a purpose in the evaluation to assess the implementation of the various development cooperation activities per se or the results hereof. Focus will be on the management of development cooperation, and how well it underpins the development support. Thus, it must be noted that the management system is not solely responsible for whether the development cooperation fulfils the aims and ambitions of Danish development cooperation policy, and the evaluation must therefore address the management system as an important, but not the only, element that shapes Danish development cooperation practice, and consider the interplay between the management system, requirements, processes etc., and the aid portfolio, organizational set up and other relevant factors.

To provide a point of departure and as part of the elaboration of the analytical framework, a description of the developments in MFA's approach to the management of development cooperation as understood by the evaluation team is expected to be outlined. This should include a description at the overall level as well as at the level of different unit's portfolio at home and abroad (see further in the section on approach and methodology below).

It should be noted that a range of recent evaluations have had a focus on specific modalities or management of support (such as the evaluation of use of multi-bi support and others), and that a joint evaluation of use of multi-donor trust funds will run alongside this evaluation. The present evaluation will, where relevant, draw on information from these evaluations as well as a stocktaking of implementation of the DDD approach to be carried out in the autumn of 2023 (see further in section 6 Approach and methodology).

Timeframe

With regards to time frame, the evaluation will cover the period since the last evaluation in 2009, but due to the learning-oriented perspective of the evaluation, it is envisaged that the evaluation will have a particular focus on the evolvement since app. 2018-19, to ensure that lessons and considerations on adjustments also reflect the current situation. A solid contextual understanding regarding trends, changes and rationales is seen as an important foundation for the in-depth analysis leading to forward-looking lessons and considerations. The lessons and considerations shall be relevant for the current development cooperation.

Cases studies

The evaluation is not limited in geographic scope, but in order to allow for sufficient depth and specificity in the investigation and analysis, it is suggested to work with case-studies. The cases should comprise multilateral, regional and bilateral support and represent different examples of programmes, projects and constellations of management of development cooperation. The tender should be based on the preliminary case selection suggested below. The final selection of cases will be done in the inception phase. The suggested cases are:

- Multilateral support: Current MFA aid management of multilateral support as exemplified by UN representation in NY, with a focus on UNICEF; possibly with a sectoral focus on support to child protection activities or the interplay with management of support to water/WaSH;
- Regional support managed from Copenhagen: Current MFA management of The Danish-Arabian Partnership;
- Development support to countries with targeted partnerships, where SSC and/or other types of Danish development cooperation activities are implemented, with support to Vietnam as case;

- Development support to countries with expanded partnerships, where both bilateral, decentralised development cooperation and other types of engagements are implemented, with support to Ethiopia and Uganda as cases; and delegated cooperation, with support to Niger as case.

The case studies will imply visits to up to five partner countries (Ethiopia, Niger, Uganda, Vietnam and one DAPP partner country) and one multilateral mission (UN, New York), as well as substantial work at HQ level and with relevant partners (see further in the section on approach and methodology).

It is expected that comparisons are made with other Nordic countries (e.g. Norway and Sweden). The comparisons should comprise the management at policy and strategic level as well as relevant aspects of the management of programming and implementation of development support. The comparisons will not imply additional visits.

5. Evaluation Questions

The evaluation questions (EQs) and sub-questions to be addressed in the evaluation are outlined below.

EQ1: What are the main developments in Danish development cooperation and the management hereof since 2009?

The evaluation will consider the following sub-questions:

- 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?
- What are the main developments in Danish strategies, policies and principles that have guided management of Danish development cooperation 2009?
- To which extent and with which rationale(s) has the management of Danish development cooperation adapted to changes in the international and Danish context for development cooperation?

E2: To which extent have overall changes since 2009 in management of Danish development cooperation been relevant and appropriate in light of the intentions behind the decentralisation and subsequent changes in the international and Danish aid context?

The evaluation will consider the following sub-questions:

- How have roles and responsibilities been distributed between headquarters level and embassies and missions, and between MFA entities and other ministries and institutions, with regards to development support and management?
- How has the decision to decentralise some multilateral engagements and not others worked in practice?
- To which extent have key changes and differences in different types of development cooperation (*i.a.* bi- and multilateral support, support managed from central or decentral level, instruments, support within different financial thresholds) been reflected in management procedures?
- To which extent have the main changes and differences in conditions for management depending on context and institutional set-up been reflected in management procedures?
- To which extent can changes in management of Danish development cooperation (including of development of strategic frameworks, programming and implementation) be considered as relevant and underpinning effective and efficient processes, flexibility and ownership?

EQ3: To which 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?

The evaluation will consider the following sub-questions, as a more specific investigation into recent initiatives related to management:

- To which extent does management of Danish development cooperation underpin the achievement of synergies and strategic cohesion between various development instruments?
- To which extent is management of Danish development cooperation facilitating local partnerships and ownership?
- To which extent is management of Danish development cooperation supporting greater use of and strategic influence on the multilateral organizations, including policies, strategies and implementation?
- Do tools for greater flexibility (e.g. un-allocated funds, adjustment and adoption procedures) have the potential to bring about adaptation as relevant?

- To which extent does management of Danish development cooperation facilitate documentation/monitoring, knowledge management, dialogue and learning?
- To which extent does the MFA adapt its management procedures based on relevant information (results reporting, reviews and evaluations etc.)?

EQ4: What lessons regarding aid management can be identified, and what issues should be considered for relevant adjustments in management of Danish development cooperation?

The evaluation will consider the following sub-questions:

- What are the strengths and weaknesses and the enabling and constraining factors in the present management of Danish development cooperation?
- What works well and what are the bottlenecks, dilemmas or trade-offs, in the present management of Danish development cooperation in practice?
- What key lessons and considerations for the future can be identified?

6. Approach and methodology

Assessment principles and criteria

Assessing the management of Danish development cooperation is a broad and complex exercise. Both development cooperation and management has changed over time, and in order to investigate and assess whether and how management support the aims and objectives in a relevant and appropriate manner, it is needed to assess both the management of the different modalities and engagements as well as implications of the interplay between the different types of management, with regards to both intended and unintended consequences.

In the last evaluation from 2009 aid management was assessed based on elements like (i) distribution of authorities and tools; (ii) mechanisms for quality control and accountability; (iii) and human resources, against the overall backdrop of the Paris declaration and priorities such as partner country ownership, alignment and harmonization and effectiveness. These issues are expected to continue to be relevant, but the assessment frame should also reflect the changes which have taken place since 2009 in both the international and Danish context for development cooperation, including the current context of DDD and adaptive aid. Here, the guidance note (MFA, 2020) points to the following overall purposes of adaptive management of Danish development cooperation:

- Ensuring larger coherence and synergies between various Danish development instruments to reinforce a more holistic approach to Danish development cooperation. The holistic approach also calls for stronger linkages between embassies and headquarter, and for increased focus and influence on multilateral/EU policy and strategies.
- Applying an adaptive approach focusing on results, continuous learning and decision-making, and local ownership in development cooperation.

The guidance note further describes DDD and adaptive management as a response to the complexity, uncertainties and politics of development. The note focusses on five operational principles: (i) Strategic level portfolio perspective; (ii) Start where the partners and the partnerships are; (iii) Focus on tangible results; (iv) Explicit focus on learning, and (v) Recognize dilemmas. An important point is that the staff capacity needs should reflect the complexity of the programmes being implemented.

It is envisaged that these purposes will require *i.a.* knowledge of the context for the supported development activities and a developed system for quality assurance, and, by implication a strong focus on knowledge management. At the same time, it is clear that the specific needs will depend on the type of development cooperation and activities at hand, and that circumstances for engaging with partners or adapting to context etc. will vary. By implication, it is a key element of the evaluation to assess whether management procedures and processes are relevant and appropriate, both in light of the context of development cooperation and in terms of the aims and ambitions behind the management of development cooperation.

As mentioned, the DDD principles and focus areas are not considered as contradictory to the earlier intentions related to the decentralisation of Danish development cooperation. Rather, it is understood as a more recent call for an approach to development cooperation that underpins coherence, aid effectiveness and local ownership, and is aligned not only with developments in Danish development policies and strategies, but also to the international context for development cooperation. This includes that DDD and adaptive management principles are set out to cover both central and decentral development cooperation.

The assessment of management of Danish development cooperation shall thus consider the intentions behind the decentralisation as a point of departure, and whether changes in development cooperation have been addressed by aid management in an appropriate and relevant manner, and, whether the more recent changes in management are conducive to fostering conditions for achieving the aims and ambitions embedded in the DDD and adaptive management principles.

The evaluation will further be based on DAC's evaluation criteria and quality standards, with a particular focus on relevance and coherence, while effectiveness and efficiency will be viewed in the perspective of whether aid management is appropriate for its purpose. Both intended and unintended consequences should be considered. As the evaluation will have limited focus on impact in

the sense of investigating long-term and overarching results, the last two evaluation criteria – impact and sustainability – will be given less emphasis.

Analytical Framework

An analytical framework shall be established, both to support the focusing on the investigation, structure and explain the assessment and enable the evaluation to contrast and compare the variation and tendencies found across the case studies.

This implies that the framework shall express an understanding of the aims and objectives embedded in the management system, as well as how the practical management can achieve the aims, the assumptions and requirements linked to this and the role of potential enabling and hindering factors. In working with the framework it is expected to be important to be able to address key developments over time.

An outline of the approach to establishing the framework, theory-based considerations on assumptions and expectations regarding management of development cooperation etc. will be appreciated already as part of the technical proposal. The final framework is expected to be part of the inception report.

In line with the above, the analytical framework shall reflect the assessment principles. During the inception phase, the assessment principles should be unfolded and operationalised, to allow for assessing if the principles and practice of management of Danish development cooperation supports the aims and ambitions, and if the various requirements and enabling factors are in place in relation to the management of the current development cooperation portfolio. This can be seen as part of the theory of change-related framework for analysing and assessing management of development cooperation, in order to both identify and explain what works well and why, the influence of framework conditions and enabling and hindering factors, and to identify potential bottlenecks, dilemmas, effective tools etc., thereby allowing for presentation of lessons and considerations for adjusting the management system.

In order to be relevant and useful, it will be important to ensure that assessments are nuanced and well explained. For instance, DDD in management of Danish development cooperation is fairly young, and tools such as guidance notes have recently been rolled out. By implication, it will be relevant to distinguish between steps and initiatives that show promise and progress, even if they have not yet come to full fruition, and steps and initiatives that are seen as less likely to have the anticipated effects. Further, it is important that the evaluation addresses the issue of management of Danish development cooperation in light of the composition of the development portfolio and the resource distribution etc., so that the assessment and the lessons is relevant to the realities of Danish development cooperation. This implies that issues of for instance administrative costs, prioritization and trade-offs should be considered.

Case studies

Case studies will be an important part of the evaluation, and the preliminary sample has been given above. The selection of case studies is first and foremost to reflect a broad sample of types and modalities of development support, and by implication a broad sample of aspects of management, organizational contexts etc., and the cases/case countries are suggested as they will cover a wide range of types of engagements, instruments etc. Further, it is seen as relevant to explore potential differences between sectors/thematic areas as far as possible. Climate change mitigation and adaptation is a key priority for Denmark, and support to climate change mitigation and adaptation will be a key focus sector for all cases. In addition, the inception phase will identify at least one additional sector or theme for closer investigation for each case, to include a broader sector variation.

The selected cases will be assessed in more depth than the broader documentation, with the purpose to explore and understand management in more detail and nuance, including the implications of the management principles and requirements on one hand and the development cooperation portfolio and set up on the other hand.

The case studies are not expected to cover the management of the full portfolio of development activities of the cases in equal depth. Within the overall analysis for each case, a subset of specific engagements or activities shall be selected for more detailed analysis, in order to allow for assessing a broad sample of management procedures and processes as related to different types of development cooperation, as well as investigating the implications of different types of management across the portfolio, where relevant.

Information sources and data collection

In addition to the case studies, several other evaluation information sources and data collection methods are envisaged to be applied in the evaluation, including document reviews, case-studies, and interviews.

The evaluation will utilise available documentation as far as possible, including but not limited to evaluations, various guidelines (e.g. Aid Management Guidelines, 'how to notes', tools), documents on DDD and adaptive management, programme and project documents from the sample of cases.

In recent years, several evaluations have been conducted which includes analysis, conclusions and recommendations regarding various management-issues in relation to specific sectors or modalities, and these evaluations are expected to be utilized as part of the foundation for the evaluation (see list of background information). They may be used as information sources in their own right, thereby allowing the evaluation to focus on collecting data to supplement, deepen and validate existing information. In addition, a joint evaluation of support to multi-donor trust fund will be carried out, and the evaluation team focusing on development

cooperation should make sure to coordinate and communicate with the trust fund evaluation team, so as to maximize value and avoid duplication of effort.

Key information interviews and potentially focus group discussions are expected to be an important element of the case studies, and should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- Interviews with national and posted staff and management at embassies/missions
- Interviews with technical advisors with experience from different management setups, MEAL teams etc.
- Interviews with partners (representatives of partner countries and other national development partners, bilateral and multilateral organizations etc.)
- Interviews with other stakeholders, relevant Danish authorities, companies etc.
- Interviews with other Nordic countries/likeminded donor countries (embassies/missions and HQ)
- Interviews with staff at all levels at MFA HQ.

Surveys can be considered, for both posted and local staff as well as staff at HQ level.

Stakeholder involvement

Due to the learning focus and the intended use of providing input to deliberation on adjustments of management of development cooperation, broad consultations and dialogue with relevant stakeholders are expected to be key for ensuring a foundation for use of evaluation.

7. Timing and reporting

A tentative schedule for the evaluation is as follows:

Activity	Date/period	Responsible
Contract signed	December 2023	ELK and ET
Inception phase, including work programme	December 2023 – February 2024	ET
Draft Inception Report for discussion with ERG	February 2024	ET and ERG
Main evaluation phase, including case studies	March -May 2024	ET
Preliminary findings paper for discussion with ERG	June 2024	ET and ERG
Draft Report submitted and possible ERG meeting	August 2024	ET and ERG
Final Evaluation Report	September 2024	ET
Launch of Report with possible seminar in Copenhagen	October/November 2024	ELK

8. Team composition

The ET must consist of a core team of three consultants:

- Team Leader, senior specialist on evaluation of development assistance;

- Senior Specialist on evaluation of development assistance (bilateral);
- Specialist on evaluation of development assistance (multilateral).

In addition, the ET must include up to five consultants; four with national development experience (for the suggested four case countries) and one with regional experience (for the suggested regional programme, DAPP).

9. Management

Evaluation management (ELK, the Client)

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

- Provide feedback to the Evaluation Team. Comment on the draft Inception Report, field visit reports, preliminary findings, and the draft Evaluation Report as well as approve final reports.
- Organize and participate in meetings of the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG).
- Facilitate a possible dissemination workshop after the completion of the evaluation.

Evaluation Team (ET, the Consultant)

The Evaluation Team will carry out the Assignment based on the Agreement and will:

- Prepare and carry out the evaluation according to the terms of reference, the approved Inception Report, the OECD-DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and the Danida Evaluation Guidelines.
- Be responsible to the management for the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.
- Ensure that quality assurance is carried out and documented throughout the evaluation process according to the Consultant's own Quality Assurance Plan (as described in the tender).
- Report to the evaluation management regularly about progress of the evaluation.
- Organize and coordinate meetings and studies, and other key events, including debriefing sessions and/or validation workshops at the end of field trips.

The Team Leader is responsible for the organization, quality assurance and reporting of the work of the team. The Team Leader will participate in meetings of the ERG and a final workshop in Copenhagen.

The ET shall coordinate and communicate (as relevant) with the Client's consultant on the joint evaluation of support to multi-donor trust funds to maximize value and avoid duplication of effort.

In addition to the evaluation team, the process shall be supported by a technical QA expert (see Section B), to ensure that the team leader receives timely and substantial QA input to draft evaluation outputs.

Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) will be established and chaired by ELK. The mandate of the ERG is to provide advisory support and inputs to the evaluation, e.g. through comments to draft reports. The ERG will work with direct meetings, e-mail communication and/or video-conferencing. The main tasks of the ERG are to:

- Comment on the draft Inception Report, draft preliminary findings papers, brief case study reports and the draft Evaluation Report in order to ensure that the evaluation is based on factual knowledge about Danish management of development cooperation.

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

10. Security

If the Client and the Consultant agree that close protection is required during the Assignment, the Consultant shall use the security company provided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, regardless of whether staff from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs participates in the missions in an area of conflict or an area with high security risks. The Consultant hence accepts and agrees to use the security company used for close protection by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and accepts and agrees that this security company will carry out protection to the full satisfaction of the Consultant, as indicated in Section 19.03 of the Agreement. The Client will determine a fixed budget for the expenses to be paid to the security company, but the Client will reimburse the actual expenses to be paid to the

security company. The Consultant shall in a timely manner keep the Client informed in case the expense exceeds the budgeted amount.

11. Eligibility

The OECD-DAC evaluation principles of independence of the Evaluation Team will be applied. In situations where conflict of interest occurs, candidates may be excluded from participation, if their participation may question the independence and impartiality of the evaluation. In other words, any firm or individual consultant whose independence and impartiality may be questioned will be excluded from participation in the tender.

Tenderers are obliged to carefully consider issues of eligibility for individual consultants and inform the Client of any potential issues relating to a possible conflict of interest.⁵

12. Requirements for home office support

The Consultant's home office shall provide the following, to be covered by the Consultant's overhead:

- General home office administration and professional back-up.
- Quality assurance (QA) in accordance with the quality management and quality assurance system described in the tender. ELK may request documentation for the QA undertaken in the process.

13. Key Background Documents

Danida (2009). Evaluation of The Decentralisation of Danish Aid Management (other evaluations of relevance are published by ELK and [available online](#))

⁵ See: [Evaluation Guidelines \(Danida/MoFA, 2018\), annex 1.](#)

Engberg-Pedersen, L. (2022). Decentralised aid management today: Perspectives on an evaluation. Paper.

MFA. [Aid Management Guidelines](#) (current guidelines).

MFA. [Library, Aid Management Guidelines](#) (former guidelines).

MFA: [Danida Open Aid](#). Data and information about Denmark's official contribution to international development cooperation.

MFA (2021). [Identification and Analysis of Main Trends in Danish Multilateral Development Assistance](#).

MFA (2020). [Guidance Note: Adaptive Management](#).

OECD DAC (2021). [OECD DAC Peer Review of Denmark 2021](#) (also includes earlier peer reviews).

Section B: Technical specifications

The schedule below stipulates information ("I"), minimum requirements ("MR") and wishes ("W").

Information

Information is provided by the Client in order for the tenderer to understand the Assignment and be able to submit a sufficiently detailed tender. Information does, however, not include any requirements or affect the assessment of whether or not a tender is regarded compliant.

All information are marked "I".

Minimum Requirements

The tender must be in compliance with all minimum requirements. If one or more minimum requirements are not fulfilled the tender will be disregarded as non-compliant.

Unless explicitly stated in the column "documentation" the tenderer is not required to submit documentation to substantiate that the tender is in fact compliant with the minimum requirements.

All minimum requirements are marked "MR".

Wishes

The Client strongly encourages tenderers to do their best to fulfil the stipulated wishes to the greatest possible extent. The evaluation of each single sub-criterion set out in Instructions to Tenderers will in part be based on an assessment of the extent to which a tender fulfils the wishes stipulated in relation to such sub-criterion, please see the Instructions to Tenderers. Non-fulfilment of wishes does, however, not affect the assessment of whether or not a tender is compliant.

The tenderer should include a description of how the tenderer will fulfil each particular wish. The tenderer is strongly advised to use the templates in Section C.

All wishes are marked "W".

No	Description	I MR W	Documentation
Adequacy of Methodology and Work Plan			
Technical Approach and Methodology			
1.	The technical proposal must outline the proposed methodological approach, including the approach to collection of data, analysis and reporting, and the specific evaluation methods to be applied.	MR	Technical Approach and Methodology
2.	The Client will appreciate if the technical proposal describes how the changing international context for aid management will be addressed in the evaluation.	W	
3.	The Client will appreciate if the technical proposal describes how the changing Danish context for aid management will be addressed in the evaluation.	W	
4.	The Client will appreciate if the technical proposal explains and justifies the main assessment principles and methods to be applied in the evaluation.	W	
5.	The Client will appreciate if the technical proposal explains how the decentralisation principles as well as DDD will be addressed in the evaluation.	W	
6.	The Client will appreciate if the technical proposal explains the draft analytical framework, including considerations on assumptions and expectations regarding management of development cooperation and how the case studies will be approached and used in the evaluation.	W	
7.	The Client will appreciate if the technical proposal describes its approach to how lessons learned will be identified.	W	

No	Description	I MR W	Documentation
Work Plan			
8.	The technical proposal must include a work plan for the Assignment with outputs and tasks in accordance with the timetable in Section A, 7 Timing and reporting.	MR	Outline Implementation Plan
9.	The Client will appreciate if the work plan is elaborated with activities and sub-activities of the Assignment, including a plan for the case studies.	W	
10.	The Client will appreciate if it is explained and justified how the different phases of the evaluation will be managed and implemented in line with the outputs and timetable in Section A, 7 Timing and reporting.	W	
Organisation			
11.	<p>The Consultant's ET must consist of three specialists with international development cooperation experience (Key Staff):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team Leader, senior evaluation specialist • Senior evaluation specialist • Evaluation specialist <p>The three specialists will be evaluated individually.</p>	MR	CVs
12.	<p>In addition, the ET must include up to five consultants (Key Staff); four with national development experience (from Ethiopia, Niger, Uganda, Vietnam) and one with regional experience (from the DAPP region).</p> <p>The national and regional consultants will be evaluated as a team.</p>	MR	CVs

No	Description	I MR W	Documentation
13.	The Client will appreciate if at least one of the Team Leader, Senior Evaluation Specialist and Evaluation Specialist has experience from evaluations of climate change mitigation and adaptation support.	W	
14.	The Client will appreciate if the ET has experience with a broad range of bilateral donor instruments, including instruments such as strategic sector cooperation, regional support, and various forms of multilateral support.	W	
15.	The Client will appreciate if the ET demonstrates a good coverage of experience with the international development agenda since 2009, aid management and the methodological approach needed for the evaluation.	W	
16.	The Client will appreciate if the Team Leader, Senior Evaluation Specialist and Evaluation Specialist complement each other, including in experience from the preliminary selection of case countries (Ethiopia, Niger, Uganda, Vietnam and the DAPP region).	W	
17.	At least one of the Team Leader, Senior Evaluation Specialist and Evaluation Specialist must be able to read Danish at level C1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages scale .	MR	CV
18.	At least one of the Team Leader, Senior Evaluation Specialist and Evaluation Specialist must be able to understand French at level C1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages scale .	MR	CV
19.	The Team Leader must participate in all field visits.	MR	
20.	The tender must include a Key Staff Assignment Chart with the exact input and distribution of working days included (in total and per Key Staff).	MR	Key Staff Assignment Chart

No	Description	I MR W	Documentation
21.	The Client will appreciate if the number of working days in the field is adequate in light of the content of the technical proposal.	W	
22.	The Client will appreciate if the organisation of the ET's work, including division of responsibilities and distribution of workdays between Key Staff is justified based on the Consultant's Technical Approach and Methodology and Work Plan.	W	
Quality Assurance and BIMP			
23.	The Consultant must have an operational Quality Assurance (QA) management system in order to document that QA has actually been carried out.	MR	Outline of QA management system
24.	The Consultant must have a Business Integrity Management System (BIMS).	MR	Outline of BIMS
25.	<p>The Consultant must have a designated QA manager to be responsible for home office QA.</p> <p>The QA manager must not be directly involved in the execution of the evaluation.</p> <p>The QA manager is a Key Staff but part of the internal quality management and quality assurance to be covered by the Consultant's overhead.</p>	MR	CV of QA manager
26.	<p>The Consultant must have a designated technical QA expert to be responsible for quality control.</p> <p>The technical QA expert must be separate from and not employed by the Consultant (i.e. a Subcontractor) and must not be directly involved in the execution of the evaluation.</p> <p>The technical QA expert is a Key Staff and must be included in Appendix 3.</p>	MR	CV of technical QA expert

No	Description	I MR W	Documentation
27.	The CVs of the QA manager and the technical QA expert will be assessed as part of the assessment of Quality Assurance and BIMP.	I	
28.	The Client will appreciate if the technical QA expert has experience with the evaluation of international development cooperation and knowledge of recent approaches, methodologies, and technologies.	W	
29.	The Client will appreciate if the technical QA expert has experience with assessments of aid management systems.	W	
30.	The Client will appreciate if special emphasis is given to quality control during the evaluation process and of draft deliverables/reports to ensure that they have the required quality level and meet the Client's reasonable expectations prior to the submission of such deliverables/reports.	W	
31.	The Outline Implementation Plan should include the QA activities of the technical QA expert during the Assignment.	I	
32.	The Key Staff Assignment Chart should include an allocation of an adequate number of working days to the technical QA expert during the Assignment.	W	
33.	The Task Assignment Chart should include QA by the technical QA expert in the activities and sub-activities during the Assignment.	I	

No	Description	I MR W	Documentation
Qualifications and Competence of Key Staff			
Team Leader			
General Qualifications			
34.	The Team Leader must have at least 15 years of experience with the evaluation of international development cooperation as a core area of work.	MR	CV
35.	The Team Leader must have a higher academic degree (master's degree).	MR	CV
36.	The Client will appreciate if the Team Leader has demonstrated experience as team leader on at least five large evaluations within the last 10 years.	W	
37.	The Client will appreciate if the Team Leader has demonstrated experience as team leader for multi-disciplinary teams (evaluations or other substantial investigative/analytical work) within the last 10 years.	W	
38.	The Client will appreciate if the Team Leader has demonstrated experience with a variety of qualitative and quantitative approaches within the last 10 years.	W	
Adequacy for the Assignment			
39.	The Client will appreciate if the Team Leader has demonstrated experience with assessments or evaluations of aid management systems or aid organisations within the last 10 years; preferably for bilateral donors.	W	
40.	The Client will appreciate if the Team Leader has demonstrated practical experience with management of development cooperation within the last 10 years.	W	

No	Description	I MR W	Documentation
41.	The Client will appreciate if the Team Leader has experience with organisational and/or capacity assessments with the last 10 years.	W	
Experience in the Region and Language			
42.	The Team Leader must be able to understand, speak and write English at level C1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages scale .	MR	CV
43.	The Client will appreciate if the Team Leader has evaluation experience from both Africa and Asia within the last 10 years.	W	
44.	The Client will appreciate if the Team Leader has experience from the preliminary selection of case countries (Ethiopia, Niger, Uganda, Vietnam and the DAPP region).	W	
Senior Evaluation Specialist			
General Qualifications			
45.	The Senior Specialist must have at least 10 years of experience with the evaluation of international development cooperation as a core area of work.	MR	CV
46.	The Senior Specialist must have a higher academic degree (master's degree).	MR	CV
47.	The Client will appreciate if the Senior Specialist has demonstrated experience as team member on at least five large evaluations within the last 10 years.	W	
48.	The Client will appreciate if the Team Leader has demonstrated experience with a variety of qualitative and quantitative approaches within the last 10 years.	W	

No	Description	I MR W	Documentation
Adequacy for the Assignment			
49.	The Client will appreciate if the Senior Specialist has demonstrated experience with assessments or evaluations of bilateral aid management systems or bilateral aid organisations within the last the 10 years.	W	
50.	The Client will appreciate if the Senior Specialist has demonstrated practical experience with management of bilateral development cooperation.	W	
51.	The Client will appreciate if the Senior Specialist has experience with organisational and/or capacity assessments with the last 10 years.	W	
Experience in the Region and Language			
52.	The Senior Specialist must be able to understand, speak and write English at level C1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages scale .	MR	CV
53.	The Client will appreciate if the Senior Specialist has evaluation experience from both Africa and Asia within the last 10 years.	W	
Evaluation Specialist			
General Qualifications			
54.	The Specialist must have at least 5 years of experience with the evaluation of international development cooperation as a core area of work.	MR	CV
55.	The Specialist must have a higher academic degree (master's degree).	MR	CV

No	Description	I MR W	Documentation
56.	The Client will appreciate if the Specialist has demonstrated experience as team member on at least three large evaluations within the last 5 years.	W	
57.	The Client will appreciate if the Specialist has experience with organisational and/or capacity assessments within the last 10 years.	W	
Adequacy for the Assignment			
58.	The Client will appreciate if the Specialist has demonstrated experience with assessments or evaluations of multilateral aid management systems, multilateral aid organisations or multilateral support from bilateral donors within the last the 10 years.	W	
59.	The Client will appreciate if the Specialist has demonstrated practical experience with management of multilateral development cooperation within the last 10 years.	W	
60.	The Client will appreciate if the Specialist has documented experience with organisational and/or capacity assessments with the last 10 years.	W	
Experience in the Region and Language			
61.	The Specialist must be able to understand, speak and write English at level C1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages scale .	MR	CV
62.	The Client will appreciate if the Specialist has evaluation experience from both Africa and Asia within the last 10 years.	W	
Consultants			

No	Description	I MR W	Documentation
General Qualifications			
63.	Each consultant must have experience from development cooperation within the last 10 years.	MR	CV
64.	Each consultant must, as a minimum, have a bachelor’s degree.	MR	CV
65.	The Client will appreciate if each consultant has a higher academic degree (master’s degree).	W	
66.	The Client will appreciate if each consultant has experience from international teams within the last 10 years.	W	
Adequacy for the Assignment			
67.	The Client will appreciate if each consultant has experience from at least three reviews and/or evaluations of development cooperation within the last 10 years, preferably including with a focus on development cooperation with bilateral donors.	W	
68.	The Client will appreciate if each consultant has demonstrated experience in applying different qualitative data collection methods in the field.	W	
69.	The Client will appreciate if the team of consultants has experience from evaluations or assessments of aid management.	W	
70.	The Client will appreciate if the team of consultants has experience from evaluations or assessments of different aid instruments.	W	
Experience in the Region and Language			

No	Description	I MR W	Documentation
71.	Each consultant must be able to understand, speak and write English at level C1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages scale .	MR	CV
72.	The consultant assigned to Niger must be able to understand, speak and write French at level C1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages scale .	MR	CV
73.	The Client will appreciate if the consultant assigned to the DAPP region is able to understand, speak and write Arabic and/or French at level C1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages scale .	W	

Forms for Letter of Tender

Section C: The Consultant’s Technical Schedules

This section comprises templates to be completed by the tenderer and included in the tender.

With reference to the Criteria and Method of Evaluation, the evaluation of the sub-criterion Quality is based on the information that the tenderer submits under this section C. The headings stipulated correspond to the criteria in the method of evaluation.

As set out in the Criteria and Method of Evaluation, the evaluation of the sub-criterion Quality will – among other things – be based on the extent to which wishes (“**W**”) are fulfilled. Therefore, the tenderer is strongly encouraged to make it as clear as possible to which extent the tenderer fulfils the wishes set out in Section B.

The tenderer’s submissions will be included in the agreement as part of this Appendix 1 and apply to the Assignment.

Adequacy of Methodology and Work Plan

Technical Approach and Methodology

The completed sections regarding Technical Approach and Methodology **should not exceed 10 pages**.

[Explain the tenderer’s understanding of the objectives of the assignment]

[Highlight the issues and their importance]

[Explain the proposed technical approach the tenderer will adopt to address the issues]

[Explain the methodologies the tenderer proposes to adopt]

[Demonstrate the compatibility of those methodologies with the proposed approach]

Work Plan

The completed sections regarding Work Plan **should not exceed 2 pages.**

[Describe the main activities of the assignment, the content and duration, phasing and interrelations]

[Describe the milestones (including interim approvals by the Client)]

Organisation

The completed sections regarding Organisation **should not exceed 5 pages.**

[Describe the structure and composition of the tenderer's team and its links to the Client]

[Describe the proposed technical and support staff]

[Describe the extent to which the Key Staff have worked together previously]

[Describe the roles and responsibilities of the Key Staff and whether duties and responsibilities will be shared]

Quality Assurance and BIMP

The completed sections regarding Quality Assurance and BIMP **should not exceed 3 pages.**

[Describe the tenderer's standard quality management systems (e.g. by reference to EN ISO 9000 standards or similar)]

[Identify the specific quality standards, reporting requirements, procedures, and controls to be used for the assignment]

[Describe how the tenderer's standard quality management procedures will be tailored to the assignment]

[Describe the tenderer's Business Integrity Management Plan (BIMP) for the assignment, including the tenderer's approach to compliance with Danida's anti-corruption code of conduct and the principles of the UN Global Compact]

Qualifications and Competences of Key Staff

General Qualifications, Adequacy for the Assignment and Experience in the Region and Language

The tenderer is to complete and submit a Curriculum Vitae (CV) for each Key Staff based on the format below.

In the CV, the tenderer is encouraged to insert a description of the fulfilment of wishes ("W") set out in Section B.

Each completed CV **should not exceed 10 pages**.

Documentation of language skills

The Client reserves the right to require that the tenderer submits documentation in order to substantiate the language skills stated in one or more of the CVs submitted.

Thus, the tenderer should be prepared to submit the requested documentation within reasonable time (and prior to the conclusion of the agreement) as the Client reserves the right to reject the tender if the tenderer fails to submit documentation.

Examples of documentation (similar documentation can be accepted):

- [Official diplomas to certify and validate your French skills](#) delivered by the French Ministry of National Education
- [IELTS test](#) issued by British Council

Assignment:		
Proposed position on the proposed team:		
1. PERSONAL DATA		
Family name:	First Name(s):	
2. EMPLOYMENT RECORD (Most recent employment first)		
Employer's company name and contact information:	Period of service: from (month/year) to (month/year)	Position / nature of the tasks performed / level of responsibility:
3. EDUCATION AND TRAINING (Most recent completed education and or training first)		
Institution (University, etc.), city and country:	Length of education Date: from (month/year) to (month/year)	Degree/Diploma obtained:
4. EXPERIENCE IN THE FIELD RELEVANT TO THE ASSIGNMENT AND THE PROPOSED POSITION (Indicate the following information for maximum the 10 most relevant assignments that best illustrate the experience of the Key Staff) (Add number of assignments as applicable)		
Name of assignment:		
Main project features:		
Period of service: (From month/year to month/year)		
Location:		

Client and contact information:				
Position held and field of responsibility:				
Activities performed by the Key Staff: (State the total level of effort and specific tasks performed)				
Fulfilment of Wishes ("W"): (Refer to the number of each wish and describe how the wish is fulfilled by the experience from the assignment)				
5. HOW EXPERIENCE WILL BE UTILIZED (State how the experience of the Key Staff will match and/or support the proposed technical approach and methodology and help achieve the desired outcomes)				
6. EXPERIENCE IN THE REGION (State the years of experience and number and duration of assignments in the country of assignment or in countries with similar cultures, administrative systems, and government organisations)				
7. LANGUAGE SKILLS OF RELEVANCE TO THE ASSIGNMENT (According to the Common European Framework of Reference for Language scale)				
Language:	Formal Education:	Understanding level:	Speaking level:	Writing level:
8. OTHER INFORMATION OF RELEVANS TO THE ASSIGNMENT				
9. FULFILMENT OF WISHES ("W") (Summarize how each wish is fulfilled)				
Number of wish:	Fulfilment of wish:			

Section D: Signature(s)

Provisos

The tenderer must clearly mark and specify any provisos in the tender.

However, the tenderer is encouraged not to include provisos, as the Client is, in general, entitled to reject tenders with provisos.

The tender includes the following provisos:

[insert or state "the tender does not include provisos"]

Declaration of compliance

The tenderer declares by its signing of this document that the tender is fully compliant with all minimum requirements, unless specifically stated above under provisos, and that all statements, descriptions, etc. in this Appendix 1 are accurately and correct.

Further, the tenderer acknowledges with its signature that the statements in this Appendix 1 take precedence over the tenderer's other statements and/ or indications in the tender, if any.

Signature

Date: [insert]

Signature:

Name and title: [insert]