

Annex B: Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Question in TOR	Sub-questions and type of evidence	Hypothesis	Sources of evidence
<p>Q1: What have been Danish priority areas within the field of human rights and how have they been addressed by the MFA and its partners?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are Danish policies on human rights reflected in programming? • How has Denmark developed its strategies to identify human rights concerns and respond to them? • How has Denmark selected partners and priorities? 	<p>Denmark has during the period 2006-2016 focused on all five priority areas and these have been continuously reflected in strategies, policy papers, programmes, projects and pursued at all three levels (programme/ bilateral/multilateral)</p> <p>Focus on capacity building, partnerships and impact with different terminology for duty bearers/right holders (HRBA) and ToC but the intention has been the same throughout the period.</p> <p>Since 2012, Denmark has strengthened its procedures for formulation; assessment and evaluation of proposals; programmes and projects to align them with strategies and to focus on impact and ToC</p>	<p>Danish strategy and policy documents concerning human rights</p> <p>Past evaluations reports</p> <p>Interviews with key informants</p>
<p>Q2: How have engagements been distributed between the thematic areas, channels of support and between partners?</p>	<p>What processes existed to ensure coherence between the MFA's HR policy priorities and actual programming?</p> <p>How did engagements balance the requirements of promotion and protection of human rights at the national, normative and bilateral levels?</p> <p>To what extent was coordination among development partners and with relevant beneficiary countries operational in the programming and implementation of development cooperation?</p>	<p>Based on its strategy and policies, Denmark has addressed the thematic/focus areas through engagement and dialogue with partners that are credible and capable of moving others towards the desired results and impacts at national; regional and/or global level or at several levels simultaneously</p> <p>Denmark has a robust assessment structure in terms of committee, board or council and dialogues with partners ensuring alignment with overall strategies and policies and quality of partners</p>	<p>Danida documentation on HR programmes</p> <p>Key strategy and policy documents on HR at multi-lateral level</p> <p>Interviews</p>
<p>Q3: What results have been generated as a result of the Danish engagements within the five selected focus areas? And to what extent have these results led to transformative changes for target groups, for countries and at the global policy level?</p>	<p>To what extent has Danish engagement (diplomatic and in terms of development cooperation) contributed to identifiable changes in the exercise of human rights in target countries and/or by target groups?</p> <p>To what extent has the capacity of duty holders to deliver on commitments in (any of) the five focus areas been enhanced?</p> <p>To what extent has the Danish engagement contributed to the human rights component of the "Right to a Better Life" strategy (protection of rights,</p>	<p>Denmark has systematically improved the capacity of relevant multilateral institutions; duty bearers and national civil society organisations in order to enhance the implementation of their mandate, objective and/or services for the benefit of the right holders within the five thematic areas.</p> <p>Countries, sectors and partners have experienced an improvement of their performance</p> <p>Denmark has based on its strategy and policies promoted and supported initiatives at national; regional</p>	<p>Case studies from four selected programme countries.</p> <p>Periodic reports including the Universal Periodic Review reporting</p> <p>Programme documentation</p> <p>Stakeholder interviews</p>

	democratic accountability, etc.)?	<p>and global level, that could support or contribute to the effective protection or promotion of human rights at national level and consequently also facilitate the impact of the support provided through programmes and projects at national level</p> <p>Denmark has to a less degree assessed the impact of programmes and projects upon the right holders but rather assessed the capacity of the partner to implement its mandate, objective or services</p> <p>Denmark has not systematically used experiences across programmes or projects in order to identify best practices for impacting rights holders</p>	
Q4: What factors have influenced or constrained the achievement of specific results? And what lessons of a general nature can be learned from this?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What have been key enabling/constraining factors in Denmark's ability to move from the output to the outcome level? • What were key enabling/constraining factors in achieving results in the political and social environment in programme countries? • What were key enabling/constraining factors in achieving results at the multilateral level? • How did Denmark acquire and make use of lessons learned, innovative tools, and trends, that promise further positive change? 	<p>Long term consistency and continuity in the engagement at national, regional and global level and clearly formulated strategies and internal policies generate results and impacts regardless potential biases against Denmark</p> <p>Credible and reliable partners and partnerships generate results and impacts regardless potential biases against Denmark.</p> <p>Programmes and projects with emphasis on technical support generate results and impacts</p> <p>Failure to manage expectations, unclear signals or abrupt changes in the character of support constrain the achievement of results</p> <p>National, regional and global resistance against a human rights agenda promoted by developed countries impair achieving results within the five thematic areas</p>	<p>Country case studies</p> <p>Interviews with stakeholders at programme level, programme country government level, multi-lateral representation in programme countries.</p>
Q5: How may coherence and synergy between the multilateral track and the bilateral track be strengthened?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence is there of linkages between Denmark's influence at the national, regional and international levels? • What were the implications of Danish engagement on the policies and practices of other donors? Are their objectives coherent? • What factors would further increase these transformative changes to create a more effective 	<p>Denmark's credibility as a trusted partner at national level eases the dialogue at national, regional and global level.</p> <p>Denmark's overall strategies are reflected in engagements at all three levels</p> <p>Denmark has not systematically used the potential, generated through support to partners at national level, to influence the regional and global level</p>	<p>Analysis of case studies</p> <p>Analysis of key policy instruments at multi-lateral track</p> <p>Interviews with stakeholders in Danida, HR specialists and multi-lateral for a (e.g.</p>

	pattern of mutual influence, leading to enhanced exercise of human rights?		OHCHR, Human Rights Council, and other UN bodies in Geneva and New York as well as the Danish representations).
Q6: Under what circumstances has Denmark been most effective in promoting the human rights agenda (foras, countries, themes) – and what are lessons learned of a general nature as a result of this?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the most transformative HR outcomes contribution to impact? • Which interventions or combination of outputs best achieved these outcomes? • What unintended outcomes resulted from HR programming, and how may that affect future strategies? 	<p>Denmark has been most effective in promoting the human rights agenda, when Denmark has used its good standing and reputation to promote and enhance initiatives together with trusted and credible partners or/and likeminded developed and developing countries</p> <p>Denmark's support is acknowledged as predictable and transparent with room for flexibility in order to address windows of opportunities and catalyse Denmark's influence and impact</p> <p>Denmark is capable of working with state, non-state actors and CSO at the same time through different engagements</p> <p>Danish support becomes less visible and effective in larger countries with large donors and inefficient donor coordination</p> <p>Capacity building of local partners and ownership has shown as being the effective to achieve outcomes and impact</p>	<p>Danida/MFA documentation</p> <p>Case studies</p> <p>Interviews</p>
Q7: What is the value added of the various channels and modalities and how do they interact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What other opportunities could exist for Denmark to better promote impact level change in terms of respect for human rights standards? • What value has the Danida interventions added, which have not been achieved by other donors' support? 	<p>The Danish model with focus on partnerships, local ownership and support to state and non-state actors and with engagement of Danish CSO, non-state actors and government is key to Denmark's position and possibility to influence and impact at national, regional and global level</p>	<p>Programme documentation</p> <p>Analysis of multi-lateral partnerships.</p> <p>Case studies</p>