

## Annex C - Methodology

This annex describes the evaluation process and the method use during the evaluation more in details. The evaluation process was divided into the following phases:



### Description of the evaluation process:

#### **Inception Phase (January to March)**

- Start-up meeting with MFA/Danida and the RDE;
- The proposed work plan had to be revised by the time of the start-up meeting with EVAL and the inception mission (IM) was postponed with some weeks on the request of the RDE in Maputo.
- Desk review of relevant documentation; sector programme documents provided by the MFA; Danish and Mozambican policies and sector, programme and project evaluation reports and reviews searched by the ET through the internet and y request to the RDE in Maputo;
- Design and implementation of Portfolio overview and analysis; drafting of the Portfolio Analysis report.
- Method development, including the elaboration of an Evaluation matrix and data collection instruments, work plans for the inception field mission and implementation field mission;
- Inception field mission (Maputo and Tete) including semi-structured interviews with governmental and non-governmental partners, focusing on-going or initiated contributions during the last 10 years and planning and coordination for the data collection during the implementation field mission;
- During the IM the work plan was revised a second time, on the request by EVAL and as a consequence of the delayed IM. It was decided that the national experts should attend the validation workshop with stakeholders in Denmark rather than the dissemination event, which was the original plan. EVAL also clarified that the apart from the elaboration of a briefing note and the debriefing session at the RDE at the end of the data collection during the implementation phase, the Preliminary Findings Paper was expected to be present relatively consolidated findings. As such it was to be seen as a draft of the findings chapter of the evaluation report. Consequently more days was allocated to this step and days were deducted from the draft evaluation reporting in the work plan.
- Preliminary agenda for the data collection phase;
- Reporting of the Portfolio Analysis and discussions on the report with ERG
- Method discussion on the Inception Report, including the Evaluation Matrix and data collection instruments with ERG;
- Development of an implementation note based on the recommendations by ERG for the implementation phase;
- Reporting and approval of inception report, including selection of sample, data collection instruments and eventual suggested limitations.

### **Data Collection Phase (March to May)**

- Final agenda for the data collection and the field mission;
- Implementation field mission including data collection and analyses; Maputo, Tete city and Changara District, Tete province, Nampula city, Ilha de Mocambique, Nampula province;
- Further data collection methods and adaptation by the ET after team discussion at the start of the data collection and if necessary, during the field visits;
- Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders (development partners), rights-holders and other development actors;
- Data collection for case stories through in-depth interviews and further desk review;
- ET internal work sessions and text production (debriefing note, field work findings, case stories);
- Debriefing session with the RDE;
- ET consolidates preliminary findings and conclusions once all consultations are done, in a preliminary findings paper, quality assured by Tana;
- Delivery of preliminary findings paper; main document and an extended version;
- Final production, quality assurance and delivery of three case studies;
- Validation session of the preliminary findings paper in Copenhagen, including discussions with ERG and EVAL;
- Final revision of the workplan;
- Written comments on the preliminary findings paper from EVAL, ERG and other stakeholders.

### **Analysis and Reporting Phase (May and June)**

- Portfolio analysis updated, development of the final version
- Case studies produced and quality assured;
- Draft report produced and quality assured;
- Submission of final Portfolio Analysis Report, Case studies and draft Evaluation Report;
- Dialogue on the draft final report with EVAL and ERG Key stakeholders provide comments on draft report;
- Edit of the draft version and the production of the final report;
- Dialogue on the final report with EVAL and ERG;
- Dissemination workshop in Copenhagen.

### **Principles for the data collection**

The evaluation mission has focused on central perspectives for the Danish development cooperation. Methods for data collection were transparent and clearly explained to all interviewees. The stakeholder approach was interactive, and all interviewed actors were informed of the purpose of the evaluation and how their information was to be used (including when principles of anonymity are applied). The summative purpose of the evaluation was explained and clearly state to all respondents that the evaluation was not looking at the possibilities of future Danish bilateral support. The evaluators based their approaches on gender sensitive methods and ensured that the principles of HRBA permeates the evaluation process and are put into practice also by the ET. All stages of the evaluation were carried out through a close dialogue with the key stakeholders.

### **Cross-cutting issues and perspectives**

The evaluation has considered all relevant perspectives and approaches applied by the Danish development cooperation, such as focus on poverty and social progress, stability, sustainable development and growth, gender perspective, HRBA, HIV/AIDS, environment and conflict perspective. Other cross-cutting issues and priority areas relevant to the specific sectors were identified

and integrated in the data collection instruments, as for example sexual and reproductive health and rights (SHRH) (health sector), accountability and corruption when assessing decentralization and public sector and justice reforms.

The HRBA principles are accountability, transparency, active and meaningful participation, non-discrimination, empowerment and linkage to human rights instruments. The evaluation explored how the first four principles have been integrated in programme objectives and design, and consulted stakeholders, as far as possible, on their perspective of the application of the HRBA principles in interventions with Danish support. The relation between duty-bearers and rights-holders were of importance in the assessment of initiatives and programmes that fall under the governance portfolio, but were only possible to discuss at a very overall level due to the time limitations. The Danish development cooperation was only guided by a HRBA policy from 2012, but the rights-based principles, both as end goals and as process-oriented practices how to put human rights into practice, have been integrated also in other development approaches and can to great extent be seen as aspects of (good) governance and human rights work. The ET stresses therefore that it is possible to discuss to which extent the different HRBA principles have been applied also before 2012.

### **Theory-based evaluation**

The evaluation has assessed what has been the specific Danish approach to the cooperation with Mozambique. A set of hypotheses about the role of the donors in general, and Denmark in particular, in the process of transition through different phases in Mozambique, have been tested against the desk review and the stakeholder consultations. The set of hypotheses are based on

- A context analysis of major political and economic processes over time;
- Conclusions and assessments of the main components of the Danish support made in the 2008 evaluation<sup>1</sup>;
- The objectives in the ToR for the evaluation and;
- Findings and discussions with the ERG and the Royal Danish Embassy (RDE) during the inception mission.

The evaluation from 2008 concluded that “There is great merit in Danida’s persistence and willingness to stay engaged with the same partners, sectors and issues over long periods.”<sup>2</sup> It also states that the Danish cooperation has been flexible and innovative in many senses.<sup>3</sup> In agreement with the ERG recommendations to the ET, the evaluation will explore how these dimensions describe Denmark as a development partner. Special attention will also be paid to Denmark’s response to the political context in which Denmark as a donor is operating in, and how the Danish cooperation has contributed to the state-building of the country.

The ERG suggested focus on the choices to support the separation of powers, decentralisation and PFM as components in the contribution to the state-building. These areas were suggested from an assumption of relative success and examples of strategic choices that have impacted the transition towards a more stable state. Other processes that are perceived to have had little or no effect on the development of the capacities of governmental institutions were thus not highlighted. Parting from assumptions on positive effects from the approaches and the strategic choices, the interviewees were asked to confirm, to variegate or problematize the assumptions. The basic hypothesis was that Danish support was important in critical processes of political and economic development in the country.

---

<sup>1</sup> Evaluation of Development Cooperation between Mozambique and Denmark, 1992-2006, 2008

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, Synthesis report 2008:129

<sup>3</sup> Synthesis report 2008, a summary of the concluding assessments on the sector programmes and the OECD/DAC criteria is available in the Evaluation 2008 in Annex 6.

The assumptions served as a basis for the interviews with the stakeholders on the Danish cooperation over time, in relation to specific supports (partnerships, modalities, sectors and focus) and were related to the aspects of progress and stability of state building a service provision and in response to different and changing needs (as defined both by duty-bearers and rights-holders).

<p><b>Assumption</b> <i>Denmark provides predictability support</i></p>	<p><b>Sub-questions</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The partners of the Danish cooperation have benefitted from the predictability of the support, enabling strategic planning and focus on long-term and complex processes.</li> <li>• The focus on aid effectiveness principles on alignment and harmonisation, including donor coordination, has enabled predictability of the support in accordance to GOM's development priorities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How have the long-term commitments affected the partner dialogue and the possibility to be a critical development partner to the GOM?</li> <li>• In the cases where Denmark phased out, how were the phase-out processes perceived by the partners?</li> <li>• How has Denmark followed up on earlier engagements and/or continued their engagement in sectors through new forms of cooperation?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Assumption</b> <i>Denmark has been an engaged and persistent partner</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Denmark has showed willingness to persist with its partnerships and aid modalities and to engage the partners in planning processes of the country programme and sector programmes. This has also been true in phasing out processes. Denmark has stayed put in situations of crisis, also when other donors have stopped their support.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Assumption</b> <i>Denmark has provided flexible aid modalities</i></p>	<p><b>Sub-questions</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aid modalities have been applied in a flexible manner responding to the needs of the partners.</li> <li>• The modalities have increased the possibility for the partners to adapt to changes and maintain services.</li> </ul>	<p>Have the support modalities been adjusted to barriers, resistance to change and/or new challenges?</p>
<p><b>Assumption</b> <i>Denmark has focused on state-building as an important approach</i></p>	<p><b>Sub-questions</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focus on capacity building and budget support has contributed to stronger institutions, a clearer division of powers and a more effective state to promote development (using as proxy poverty reduction)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the TA support and other forms of support to capacity development lead to institutional outcomes?</li> <li>• How has the PFM contributed to government responsiveness, effectiveness, accountability and trust?</li> <li>• Has the approach to state institutions been based on context analysis or external models of state building?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Was support to service delivery based on key concerns of state building and development, such as providing relevant answers/solutions to socioeconomic development challenges? Has service delivery contributed to state legitimacy? If so, how?</li><li>• To what extent was support to decentralization in line with the country political and development challenges and contributed to reduce poverty or improve democratic governance?</li><li>• To what extent was Danish support based on a HRBA and how effective was this approach in the programmes?</li><li>• How cross-cutting areas defined in Danish Programme documents – gender, HIV/AIDS, environment/climate change and human rights) provided a sound foundation to ensure that interventions contribute to promote human rights and sustainable development?</li></ul>
--	--