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Preface

This annual report aims at providing an overview of Sida evaluations in 2020 and present key observations and learnings from the evaluations. The purpose is to enhance effective development co-operation, as well as evaluation practice. We hope the report will facilitate the uptake of lessons learned, and inspire to further reading and reflections on what works, for whom, how and under what circumstances.

The Covid-19 pandemic affected us all and is still ongoing. Overall, the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the evaluations published in 2020 was limited, since the majority of them were carried out before March 2020. However, because of the pandemic, some evaluations were re-designed or postponed. Sida provided early evaluation guidance, and the evaluators managed to be flexible, using new techniques and methods that made it possible to evaluate even under these dire circumstances.

2020 was the first year with the new updated OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, adopted in December 2019. Further guidance on how to apply the criteria sensibly was developed in 2020, and Sida’s Evaluation Unit (UTV) contributed together with the Swedish Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA) to this work. Although not yet visible in the evaluations published in 2020, the updated guidance from OECD provides a backbone for evaluations of high quality and utility.

The annual report captures scope, main findings and lessons learned from Sida evaluations published in 2020. Sida’s approach to evaluation is presented in Chapter 1. Chapter 2 provides an overview of the 2020 evaluations, according to strategy, sector, context, etc. Evaluation methods and approaches, as well as the effects of covid-19 on evaluations at Sida, are also discussed in Chapter 2. The performance of the evaluated projects and programmes is analysed in Chapter 3. In Chapter 4, learnings in regards to the five development perspectives are summarised. A remark on the quality of the evaluations is provided in Chapter 5. Finally, based on the analysis of the previous chapters, some concluding observations on emerging issues and lessons are outlined in Chapter 6.

We would like to thank Asmita Naik, FCG Sweden, for her thorough analysis of the wealth of information provided in Sida’s decentralised evaluations and for identifying and compiling key learnings from them.

Sven Olander
Head of Sida’s Evaluation Unit (UTV)
Stockholm, September 2021
1 Introduction

1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE ANNUAL REPORT

The purpose of the annual report is to provide an overview of what and how Sida evaluates along with observations on emerging issues and lessons that can be used to strengthen evaluation at Sida and the effects of Sweden’s development cooperation. Sida will use the results of this annual report to strengthen the agency’s work with evaluation; as a tool in planning and follow-up of Sweden’s geographic and thematic cooperation strategies, and as a contribution to organisational learning.

The report covers evaluations published in 2020.¹

1.2 THE UNIT FOR EVALUATION – MANDATE AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Sida’s Evaluation Unit (UTV) is placed at Sida’s Department for Operational Support, to ensure independence from Sida’s operational and policy arms. UTV formally reports to Sida’s Director General in regards to central evaluations. UTV has the mandate to coordinate evaluations at Sida, promote evaluation capacity building and represent Sida in international evaluation fora for development cooperation. The unit is responsible for central evaluations of strategic importance, and provides evaluation method support and advisory services to Sida headquarter and Sweden’s foreign missions.

A substantial part of evaluation capacity building is devoted to internal activities aimed at contributing to an improved understanding of evaluation as a tool for learning and accountability within Sida, and, hence, higher quality evaluations and better use of evaluation results. During 2020 the unit received some 150 requests for support, relating to both Sida and partner commissioned evaluations. In 2020, the Sida evaluation handbook and method support was updated, to be in line with the revised OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. The UTV also provided guidelines on how to handle evaluation during Covid-19.

Evaluation capacity development may also include external engagement aimed at improving evaluation capacities in low income countries. Sida has long been a proponent of the need to strengthen evaluation capacities in partner countries. The global demand for capacity development within statistics and evaluation is increasing.

¹ Central evaluations are covered up to May 2021.
not least due to need to report on the SDGs. To that end, Sida supports a new Global Evaluation Initiative (GEI) led by the World Bank’s Independent Evaluation Group started. The support is managed by CAPDEV, with support by UTV.

1.3 EVALUATION AT SIDA

Evaluation plays a central role in results-based management and organisational learning at Sida. It provides an understanding of how and why certain results were – or were not – achieved, and if they were relevant and sustainable. It may also investigate if a project or programme led to unintended effects, and if it was implemented in a cost-efficient manner. Hence, evaluations contribute to well-informed decision making in projects, programmes and cooperation strategies that govern Sweden’s international development cooperation.

Evaluation at Sida builds on the principles and quality standards that have been developed by and agreed upon in the Evaluation Network (EvalNet) of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) in OECD. During 2020, revised evaluation criteria were established by OECD/DAC. The revised OECD/DAC criteria provide, as before, an important normative lens on what constitutes a successful development intervention, but have been adapted to provide greater clarity and a stronger connection to Agenda 2030 and a new criterion, ‘coherence’, has also been added.

Sida’s approach to evaluation is utilisation focused. In utilisation focused evaluation, emphasis is on the intended users of a specific evaluation and the intended use of the evaluation. The objective is not to evaluate everything, the goal is rather to have the right things evaluated at the right time and in the right way. In short, evaluations need to be relevant and fit for purpose if learning and evidenced based decision-making is to follow.

Sida has three categories of evaluations: central evaluations (previously strategic evaluations), decentralised evaluations, and partner led evaluations.

- The central evaluations are decided by the Director General and should be of strategic importance. They are identified and designed by UTV in collaboration with Sida’s departments, foreign missions, the Director General and the Senior Management Group. UTV makes an independent statement of the quality of the evaluations, including impartiality and reliability, when they are handed over for management response.

- The decentralised evaluations are commissioned by Sida units and foreign missions. UTV’s role is advisory and supportive. Although the responsibility for evaluation of Sida funded programmes rests primarily with the development partner, Sida may commission an external evaluation for accountability purposes, to meet learning needs, or due to limited capacity of the partner.
Partner led evaluations are commissioned and managed by Sida’s cooperation partners as part of their monitoring and evaluation systems.

Central and decentralised evaluations are published by Sida. Partner led evaluations are normally not published by Sida, but archived by Sida or foreign missions in accordance with the Swedish law on access to information.

Sida has a system for management response to evaluations that aims to ensure that evaluation findings are used to develop Sida’s organisational practice, to strengthen the effects of development cooperation and to contribute to transparency among stakeholders. The management response provides a management position and an implementation plan in response to an evaluation’s conclusions and recommendations.

To ensure transparency and independence from programme management and policy-making, evaluations are undertaken by independent, externally contracted evaluators. Sidas has a framework agreement for evaluation services which is a combination of a fixed ranking system and renewed competitive tendering. The services covered by the agreement are evaluations and other evaluation services. Ranked call-off procedures can be used up to a maximum contract value of 800,000 SEK, over that amount competitive tendering up to a maximum contract value of 2,000,000 SEK takes place. Evaluations of a contract value above 2 MSEK are procured in open, public competition.

Sida is obliged to use the framework agreement when procuring services covered by this framework agreement. Embassies are not obliged to do so, but may use the framework agreement. UTV meets with the framework agreement providers twice a year for follow-up dialogue on the agreement, and receive feedback from the consultants on the evaluation process. In 2020, the service providers included in the agreement were in ranked order: FCG Sweden, NIRAS and NCG.
2 What has been evaluated by Sida? An overview

2.1 CENTRAL EVALUATIONS

Three central evaluations were completed in 2020:

**Evaluation of the application and effects of a Human Rights Based Approach to development: Lessons learnt from Swedish development cooperation. What works well, less well and why?**

The evaluation finds that the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) has contributed to clarifying and strengthening support to and protection of human rights in Swedish development cooperation. The HRBA and its principles form a basis for long-term support to actors working for the development of open societies. It points to a number of results related to human rights and the application of the HRBA such as increased knowledge, increased participation, institutional reform etc. The evaluation also notes challenges with the application and that it varies depending on individual knowledge and understanding, and that it is not based on a comprehensive, general or institutionalised understanding.


The evaluation confirms that the Power Africa Project, mid-term, is well on its way to reach its set targets to mobilise 1 billion USD for fossil-free electrification. In addition, new approaches to energy sector development cooperation have been established within Sida, the partnership base has been broadened, and new methods for mobilising investments beyond development finance have been developed and applied. The evaluation concludes that the Power Africa Project’s organisational model, which has enabled innovative ways of working, is highly relevant for other areas of development cooperation at Sida. Furthermore, the evaluation provides a number of recommendations on how to scale the approach to further enhance its transformative impact on sustainable development.

**Evaluation of Sida’s model for bilateral research cooperation**

The purpose of this evaluation was to provide an overall assessment of the extent to which Sida’s model for bilateral research cooperation, its system approach and basic logic, contribute to research capacity in low-income countries. The programmes have reached many of their stated goals in terms of research capacity development (PhD graduates), an improved research environment (management and infrastructure) and outputs in the form of academic publications. At the same time, there is a set of common
challenges related to the extent to which the Sida model strengthen research of high-
quality, relevance to poverty reduction and the sustainability of the programme post-
Sida’s interventions. Building on evaluation findings and theories of institutional
design, the evaluation concludes that the Sida model has not given sufficient attention
to research groups and networks as agents of change. Such a focus would not only lead
to a different programme focus and dynamic, but also contribute to making the
programme more sustainable beyond Sida support.

In addition, an evaluability study on Sida’s approach to democratisation in different
cultures was completed early 2021. The study will inform a decision on a full-scale
central evaluation. UTV also completed an internal review on environment and climate
integration in Sida’s contributions to support the development of Sida’s new action
plan for environment.

The 2020 central evaluations are of strategic importance to Sida, in that they provide a
cluster with lessons from i) two important perspectives in Swedish development
cooperation (environment and human rights), and ii) modalities of support (research
coeoperation and innovative financing instruments/funds mobilisation in Power Africa).

are provided in Annex D. Planned and ongoing central evaluations are listed in Annex
E.

2.2 DECENTRALISED EVALUATIONS

The present annual report includes 23 decentralised evaluations that were published in
2020.ii The evaluation object was usually a programme or a project. In a few cases, the
evaluation concerned portfolios and in one case a strategy.iii

2.2.1 Evaluation type
The majority of the decentralised evaluations from 2020 constituted end-of-programme
phase/final evaluations, with a lesser number involving mid-term reviews (MTR)
(Figure 1). Two evaluations related to evaluations of Sida’s risk management
approaches (2020:5 and 2020:19) (Figure 1,’Other’.).

---

i For a full list see Annexes A & B.
ii The term ’portfolio’ here meaning ‘all contributions in a country strategy level, or all support to a
sector/strategy support area’. 
2.2.2 Strategy type
Depending on the strategy cycle and programme cycle, the number of evaluations within a sector or strategy naturally vary from year to year. In 2020, the decentralised evaluations addressed 14 out of 44 geographic and thematic strategy areas, including four thematic, four regional and six country strategies. Most evaluations targeted interventions in the Africa region (nine evaluations), followed by Eastern Europe, Western Balkans and Turkey. In the Asia & Pacific and Middle East & North Africa, only one evaluation was carried out, respectively. No evaluation addressed Latin America (Figure 2).
2.2.3 Sector type

The vast majority of evaluations carried out in 2020 regarded interventions in the sector of democracy, human rights and gender equality. The second and third most common sectors evaluated were market development, trade and employment, and sustainable infrastructure, respectively. Two evaluations were categorised as multi-sector; one...
concerned Sida’s risk management and the second covered various sectors (democracy, human rights and gender equality; market development, trade and employment; environment) (Figure 3).

**Figure 3: Number of decentralised evaluations per main thematic sector 2016-2020.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Sector</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict, peace &amp; security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy, human rights &amp; gender equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market development, trade and employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable infrastructure &amp; services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.2.4 Context**
Two-thirds of the decentralised evaluations involved development contexts, and a third of the evaluation was undertaken in development contexts that were affected by a humanitarian crisis.

**2.2.5 Aid type**
In terms of aid type, half of the 2020 decentralised evaluations concerned interventions financed by project funds, while a third of the evaluations involved interventions financed through core support. Two evaluations related to all aid types as they covered evaluations of portfolios (Figure 4).* 

---

*NB. Evaluations commissioned by partners and donors are not included, which means that the evaluation coverage of thematic sectors is larger.

† NB. Evaluations commissioned by partners and donors are not included which means that the evaluation coverage of the respective aid types can be larger.
2.2.6 Implementing organisation

The most common type of implementing partner of the evaluated interventions were non-governmental/civil society organisations, followed by public sector institutions (Figure 5). Only a few evaluations addressed interventions implemented by multilateral organisations, which is partly due to multilaterals being responsible for monitoring and evaluating their own activities.⁶

---

⁶ “Other” refers to think-tanks or for profit institutions and also includes universities and teaching institutions for 2016 and 2017. Evaluations commissioned by partners and donors are not included which means that the evaluation coverage of the type of implementing organisation can be larger.
2.2.7 Evaluation methods and approaches

All decentralised evaluations used a mixed methods approach (Figure 6) drawing on qualitative and quantitative data obtained through documentary review and interviews. Compared to 2019, there was a decrease in the use of field visits from 80% to about half of the evaluations in 2020. vii Most of the field visits included group meetings with national stakeholders and focus group discussions with community members alongside interviews. In two evaluations the team leader was unable to carry out regional field visits for security reasons.

Around half of the decentralised evaluations published in 2020 used online surveys and several used more specialised methods (marked as ‘Other’, Figure 6), such as contribution analysis, SWOT, Most Significant Change (MSC) and auditing methods of spot checking financial and administrative systems. Two evaluations (2020:9 and 2020:13) used a method called Forcefield Analysis, whereby stakeholders participated in a workshop to identify factors which helped or hindered the achievement of programme goals. One evaluation (2020:10) used a specialised tool for gender analysis known as Claudy Vouhé’s Gender Integration Quotient (QIG) (no longer widely available), in order to assess how well gender issues had been integrated into the programme.

Figure 6: Evaluation methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visits</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Discussions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of methodologies, theory-based methodologies and the use of theories of change to test evaluation hypotheses were referenced in virtually all evaluations. However, the degree to which the evaluations elaborate on theories of change varies. The terms of references usually refer to theories of change and most evaluation reports discuss this in the programme background and description. Some reports reference theories of change in a cursory way (e.g. 2020:7), while others develop the discussion further. A new theory of change may be developed as part of the evaluation’s conclusions and recommendations (e.g. 2020:14).

vii The term ‘field visits’ here implies that the international team leader visited the countries where the evaluated intervention was being implemented, and carried out face-to-face interviews and focus group discussions.
A utilisation-based approach was commonly referred to across evaluations. Participatory approaches are also frequently referenced where relevant, especially where an evaluation involved programmes delivered at community level, for example report 2020:6 about women’s political participation in Zimbabwe, or 2020:11 on child rights in Tanzania. By contrast, high level management evaluations, such as 2020:5 on risk management, did not refer to participatory approaches.

In terms of challenges, several evaluations noted lack of information and documentation to be a constraint, as well as the time and resources available to the evaluation. In a few cases, external factors such as political unrest or natural disasters (see section on Covid-19) impeded the carrying out of the evaluation.

### 2.2.8 Covid-19

As stated above, the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the evaluations published in 2020 was limited since the majority of them were carried out before March 2020. Figure 7 shows a timeline of completion for the evaluations published in 2020. Four out of the twenty-three evaluations published in 2020 report being affected by Covid-19 (2020:14; 2020:18; 2020:22 and 2020:23).

*Figure 7: Timeline completion of evaluations.*

The main impact seems to have been to stymie the commissioning of decentralised evaluations since the number of evaluations are down by almost a third compared to 2019. In response to the crisis, Sida’s Evaluation Unit swiftly developed guidance to support Sida units and Swedish embassies to continue evaluating interventions and ceasing opportunities to support learning from the response to Covid-19. Looking at the number of evaluations published so far in 2021, the pace of commissioning evaluations appears to have recuperated with twenty evaluations published during the first five months of 2021 (compared to thirteen evaluations published January – May 2019).
It is evident that field visits together with other face-to-face data collection methods have decreased substantially in evaluations conducted after March 2020. Further, there has been a shift to remote data collection to adapt to the pandemic.

Adapting and redesigning evaluations at the initial stages of the pandemic requested flexibility and ability to apply lessons learned. The shift to remote data collection has brought about an increased use of remote interviews via phone or online communication platforms, online surveys, virtual workshops, web-based focus groups discussions, and extended document review. The increased use of online platforms has raised issues around safeguarding of do-no-harm approaches. The evaluations conducted after March 2020 have furthermore adapted to travel restrictions by an increased involvement of national consultants. Where safety has allowed, local consultants have been taking on additional responsibility for field work.

Whilst Covid-19 affected evaluations were completed as planned and gathered sufficient information to make findings, the lack of face-to-face meetings with local and national stakeholders was a constraint. The evaluators note that substituting face-to-face with online interviews sometime made the evaluation work less effective. In some cases, it affected the quality of information available from in-country stakeholders in negative way (2020:14; 2020:18 and 2020:23).

2.3 Partner commissioned evaluations

In addition to the Sida commissioned evaluations, Sida’s partners commission evaluations of Sida financed programmes. Normally this is regulated in the specific agreement of the contribution. In order to get a better picture of what is being evaluated by Sida partners, and to assess quality and use of these evaluations, the UTV undertook a mapping of partner commissioned evaluations in 2020. The mapping indicates that probably over 100 partner commissioned evaluations are done yearly (the mapping found 75 evaluations in 2019, but some were not captured). A small sample was also studied to assess quality and use. Quality was assessed as fairly good, although varying. Utility was rated high by partners in particular, but also by Sida staff. Management responses had also been developed in relation to all of the evaluations in the sample. For further details, please see Sida Studies in Evaluation 2020:2.
## Table 1: Evaluations by OECD/DAC criteria and development perspectives

- ● the aspect in question is covered by the evaluation report
- T the aspect was requested to be covered in the terms of reference for the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publ. no.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>OECD/DAC Criteria</th>
<th>Sida Development Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-1</td>
<td>Final Evaluation of GESTERRA Capacity Building Programme on Land Management and Administration within DINAT</td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2</td>
<td>End Evaluation of Regional Project Impuls (Geo-Spatial Data Infrastructure)</td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
<td>●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-3</td>
<td>Evaluation of: Fostering Regional Cooperation on Transboundary Water Management in Palestine, Jordan and Israel implemented by MEDRC</td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-4</td>
<td>Evaluation of Children’s Dignity Forum</td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-5</td>
<td>Evaluation of Sida’s risk management of contributions</td>
<td>●●●●</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-6</td>
<td>Mid-Term Evaluation of the Strengthening Women’s Advocacy for Inclusive Governance (SWAG) Campaign, Zimbabwe</td>
<td>●T ●T ●T ●T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-7</td>
<td>Evaluation of FORUM-ASIA’s Performance and Achievements 2015–2019</td>
<td>● ● ● ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-8</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Reform Cooperation with Eastern Europe, Western Balkans and Turkey 2014–2019</td>
<td>● ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-9</td>
<td>Project Review of the Dairy Association of Zambia (DAZ)’s Digital Information Management System (DIMS) project</td>
<td>●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-12</td>
<td>Evaluation of Civil Development Agency (CiDA) and its Corporate Sustainability Platforms</td>
<td>●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-13</td>
<td>Evaluation of Sida’s regional core support (2014-2019) to the Eastern Africa Grain Council (EAGC)</td>
<td>●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-14</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Baltic to Black Sea Documentary Network 2017–2020</td>
<td>● ●T ●T ●T ●T ●T T ●T ●T ●T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-15</td>
<td>Utvärdering av demokratistöd genom svenska partianknutna organisationer</td>
<td>T T T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-16</td>
<td>Evaluation of Democracy Support through Swedish Political Party Affiliated Organisations - Part II: Methods for supporting women’s political influence</td>
<td>T T T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-17</td>
<td>Evaluation of Democracy Support through Swedish Political Party Affiliated Organisations - Part II: Methods for supporting women’s political influence – Annex A – Case Study Reports</td>
<td>T T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-18</td>
<td>Albanian Police Capacity Building: From repressive force to serve communities with trust</td>
<td>T T T T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-20</td>
<td>Evaluation of Jönköping International Business School’s (JIBS) collaboration with Sida partner universities in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique</td>
<td>T T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Swedish Resource Base</td>
<td>T T T T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2 WHAT HAS BEEN EVALUATED BY SIDA? AN OVERVIEW

| Year (2020-22) | Evaluation: Stimulating SME growth and enhancing market and economic development, Bosnia and Herzegovina | T | T | T | T | T | T | T | T |
| Year (2020-23) | Evaluation of the Sida-supported Education Program for Results (EPforR) 2014–2021, Tanzania | T | T | T | T | T | T | T | T |
| TOTAL (coverage of criteria in evaluation report) | 19 | 23 | 16 | 9 | 15 | 1 | 20 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 5 |
3 Key learnings on performance

3.1 APPLYING THE OECD/DAC EVALUATION CRITERIA IN ASSESSING THE MERITS OF THE EVALUATED INTERVENTIONS

Evaluation at Sida builds on the principles and quality standards that have been developed by and agreed upon in the Evaluation Network (EvalNet) of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) in OECD. Sida’s evaluation process uses OECD/DAC criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability) as the framework for analysis. The OECD/DAC criteria was used in all terms of references for the decentralised evaluations published in 2020. Most terms of references used the OECD/DAC criteria as a framework for organising questions. A few did not use the criteria, but rather posed questions which integrated the OECD/DAC criteria. In some cases particular criteria was prioritised, such as relevance or effectiveness.

As already mentioned, the OECD/DAC framework has recently been revised. The evaluations published in 2020 were to a large extent carried out before the new framework took effect. Hence, the criteria revision has only marginally impacted on the evaluations published in 2020.

This chapter provides a qualitative analysis of how the evaluated interventions perform in terms of OECD/DAC criteria. An overview of which evaluations have addressed the different OECD/DAC criteria, and to what extent these criteria are included in evaluation term of references, is provided in Chapter 2, Table 1.

Drawing out a picture of how well evaluated projects and programs perform is a challenge. The attention given to different criteria vary depending on the needs or knowledge gaps the evaluation was to address. Hence all criteria are not treated in the same manner in every evaluation. There are also differences in terms of when the evaluation was undertaken which affects the extent to which evaluations can provide answers to whether objectives are obtained. Further, there are differences in the quality of the evaluations and hence how strong conclusions are.

3.2 RELEVANCE – ARE THE INTERVENTIONS DOING THE RIGHT THINGS?

Relevance means the extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries’ needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances
change. Most decentralised Sida evaluations published in 2020 consider relevance (20/23). Overall, the interventions are assessed as relevant – the large majority even highly relevant (see Case 1). Only in three cases, does the evaluation suggest that the relevance of the evaluated intervention could be improved (2020:3; 2020:6 and 2020:15).

There are a number of learnings on what the evaluators found to be key to relevance. An important observation is that “downward” relevance, i.e. relevance in relation to target group needs, was only figuring in a few evaluations. While the revised criterion explicitly highlights this as a key feature of relevance, it seems clear that this is something that needs further attention by evaluators, as well as guidance from Sida. Another issue is that relevance is almost always assessed in relation to Swedish strategies and national polices in the partner country. While this may be of importance, relevance to target group needs, the development problem at hand, and thus the assumptions laid out in the programme logic or theory of change, shifting and evolving contexts and partners’ policies and strategic interests, may be of importance to assess.

### Case 1
Relevance: Extract from ‘Final Evaluation of GESTERRA Capacity Building Programme on Land Management and Administration within DINAT’ [2020:1]

> “The GESTERRA programme was highly relevant and well-conceived with a clear intervention logic. The primary focus on establishing capacity within the designated government institution to operate and maintain a national land information and management system was – and still is – a highly relevant priority. The dual focus on establishing institutional capacity in land administration and management at different levels combined with a focus on strengthening land governance through efforts to promote an inclusive policy debate at regional and national platforms responded well to the complexity of the challenges to be addressed. The GESTERRA activities have been relevant to GoM (Government of Mozambique) and supported national development strategies, policies and legislation. The efforts vested in the digitalisation of the national land cadastre system are important, as a proper land administration and management is a fundamental basis for overall land use planning and derived social and economic development. The focus on emission of DUATs [Land title document], which has been enhanced over the programme period with the launch of the Terra Segura programme, represents an important basis for the national land register and is therefore highly relevant to the government. However, whether the emission of DUATs corresponds to the actual and recognised needs of small-holder farmers – men and women – remains a question. Evidence from the evaluation has demonstrated that the full relevance of holding a DUAT is only affected when law enforcement in terms of securing title-holders’ access to rights and adequate information goes hand in hand with the title. It is also important to recognise the need for valorising the land, which will increase the relevance of the DUAT for the small holder. The legal framework which sustains women’s rights to land titles is relevant from a rights perspective, but still not fully enacted and often in conflict with customary practices and norms. The GESTERRA programme has been relevant to the policies on economic and social development and the country strategy of both donor.” [Page 55]

### 3.2.1 Key learnings on relevance
- **“Downward relevance” needs more attention.** Relevance in relation to target group needs figures only in a few evaluations. Relevance is strengthened by local ownership and undermined where local partners have different objectives.

- **Interventions should align to partner systems and culture.** Being aligned to national policies is seen as key to relevance by most evaluations. However, in order to be relevant, interventions must also align with the institutional structure and culture in the partner country.

- **Involve target groups and consider their needs.** Relevance can be increased through consultations with target groups. Consultation may take place in the
design phase and throughout the project cycle in order to be “doing the right things”.

- **Apply a system’s perspective.** A system’s perspective is key as relevance can be constrained by factors outside the project’s control.

- **Adapt to stay relevant.** The importance of remaining relevant through continuing flexibility and adaptation was highlighted by several evaluations.

### 3.3 COHERENCE – HOW WELL DOES THE INTERVENTION FIT?

Coherence addresses the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution. This new OECD/DAC criterion was not included in any terms of reference for the decentralised evaluations published in 2020. It was however added in one evaluation (2020:14). In that evaluation, the evaluator considered how far Sida funding overlapped with funding provided by others (see Case 2). Some other evaluations consider how the evaluated intervention fits with other initiatives under the relevance criterion, although they do not label this as coherence.

**Case 2**

“Although some of the B2B Doc partners (film festivals, producers, etc.) provide support to filmmakers such as funding, training and during festivals, no overlaps were reported. Instead, it was noted that the B2B Doc project targets different countries to those supported by others and is the only project that targets all five of the countries as a ‘group’. B2B Doc also focuses on building a range of skills amongst filmmakers – from the very start of the process until rough cut stage – whereas other projects focus only on some of the necessary skills or on a part of the filmmaking process. Most importantly, the project builds skills and capacity that allows filmmakers to participate in the activities of partners based in countries with more developed documentary filmmakers. As a result, filmmakers from countries that are not usually considered for such events are able to attend because of the skills and understanding they have acquired from B2B Doc and the project complements rather than overlapping with the support provided by others. [Page vi]

### 3.4 EFFECTIVENESS – ARE THE INTERVENTIONS ACHIEVING THEIR OBJECTIVES?

Effectiveness applies to the extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups. In 2020, all evaluations considered effectiveness. Some terms of references did not include effectiveness as a criterion, but the effectiveness aspect was nevertheless covered in the reports. All the evaluation reports found their evaluated interventions to be effective, despite identifying areas which need strengthening, and none judged their respective interventions to have failed (see Case 3).

Effectiveness may be used as a proxy for performance, since it involves assessing how far an intervention has met its objectives and achieved results. However, results may have been achieved in one area, while progress is lacking in another, which makes an overall assessment of performance difficult. Moreover, depending on the timing of the evaluation and its use, the evaluators may only assess the degree of effectiveness to date, meaning that the assessment may only consider outputs or intermediary outcomes,
rather than end results at the impact level. There are also methodological issues in some reports that affects the strength of the conclusions relating to effectiveness.

### 3.4.1 Key learnings on effectiveness

- **A holistic programme approach is more effective.** Holistic programmes which seek change from individual through to societal level are most effective.

- **Strategic, long-term approach with high level dialogue is key for effectiveness.** Lack of strategic, long-term approach is a constraint for effectiveness (e.g. 2020:6; 2020:21 and 2020:10). Long-term investment accompanied by high level dialogue both by implementing organisations, but also by Sida itself, is key to effective programming.

- **Good coordination promotes effectiveness.** The project’s or programme’s ability to coordinate with other players is crucial for effective programming. For example, the evaluation (2020:13) on the grain trade in East Africa commended the ability of the project to bring together both the private sector and governments in pursuit of a common goal. Other programmes were found to have inadequately collaborated with national government bodies and CSOs (e.g. 2020:1; 2020:6 and 2020:10) and this was cited as a constraint.

- **Effective programming requires local ownership.** The importance of ensuring local ownership for effective programming was highlighted in several evaluations. Participatory planning, implementation and follow-up facilitate effectiveness. Two evaluations (2020:18 and 2020:16) found that an inclusive approach which included local stakeholders in decision-making was a positive feature. It was also noted that the implementing organisation having a good understanding of the target groups was a key enabler to effectiveness (2020:7). Similarly, one evaluation found that inclusive policy debate platforms on land reform were important for capturing trends and opinions and informing changes in policy and law (2020:1). Another evaluation (2020:8) mentioned a juvenile justice programme in Albania, where the fact that a national strategy was in place, fully approved, costed and financed (at least to 65%) was crucial in ensuring national and local support. The evaluation highlighted the importance of Sida having a realistic understanding of the political commitment in a given context if it seeks to deliver effective programmes.
• **Good programme management, including continuous strategic oversight, is key to effectiveness.** Oversight of complex programmes requires a ‘next level’ management structure, which engages in debates at the policy level and can address critical programme management issues (e.g. 2020:1). Effective, consistent leadership and competent staff is necessary for effective programming (e.g. 2020:4; 2020:8 2020:11; 2020:13 and 2020:18).

• **The right expertise is crucial for effective programming.** Sida-funded programmes are often supporting areas of high technical complexity (e.g. 2020:2 and 2020:8). In those cases, the ability of programmes to bring the right expertise is crucial for programme effectiveness. For instance, the evaluation (2020:7) on human rights promotion in Asia concluded that the ability of the programme to bring first-hand experiences and voices of human rights defenders was key to its advocacy successes. Support provided through twinning arrangements with Swedish public sector organisations was found to be effective (e.g. 2020:2, 2020:8).

• **Lack of a comprehensive M&E framework impedes effectiveness.** Lack of systematic monitoring and documentation (e.g. 2020:3, 2020:4, 2020:6 and 2020:14); unrealistic or un-measurable targets (e.g. 2020:2, 2020:7, 2020:8 and 2020:18), and lack of specialist M&E staff (e.g. 2020:2 and 2020:14) are some examples. Further, there is a tendency in the interventions to focus monitoring on outputs and activities, as opposed to outcomes (e.g. 2020:6, 2020:8, 2020:16; 2020:17). The challenges of capturing intermediate and final outcomes (e.g. 2020:11) and defining attribution in terms of dissecting Sida’s contribution to a result from other factors (e.g. 2020:2; 2020:6, 2020:23) is noted by several evaluators. Finally, the M&E systems commonly fail to capture unintended consequences, especially negative ones.

• **Adaptive management facilitates effectiveness.** Programme flexibility in terms of the ability of a programme to adapt to changes is a facilitating factor (e.g. 2020:4, 2020:8 and 2020:11). The evaluation (2020:11) on a human rights advocacy programme in Tanzania found that the programme had successfully adapted its approaches to fit with the political climate.

• **External constraints may impede effective implementation.** External constraints are many and typically include systemic issues like lack of government commitment, gaps in policy/legislation, lack of effective justice system, inadequate national capacity, insufficient resource including donor support and pooled funding, political context, government restructuring/institutional instability/uncertainty of mandates, lack of external cooperation/dialogue coordination, corruption, societal attitudes, and economic situation.
3.5 EFFICIENCY – HOW WELL ARE RESOURCES BEING USED?

Efficiency is the extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way. Efficiency was considered in some two-thirds of all evaluation reports (16/23) and the efficiency criterion was specifically referred to in about half of the terms of references for the evaluations. The evaluation coverage of efficiency issue was very variable; with most comprising very limited discussion, but some covering many different aspects of efficiency in a comprehensive way (e.g. 2020:11).

The types of issues typically covered by evaluations under the efficiency head include: staffing (2020:9), monitoring and evaluation (2020:22), delivery timelines and delays, disbursement rates, budget design, management, administration and governance issues (2020:19 on cost/benefit of anti-corruption approaches), and coordination. Some of these issues overlap with issues discussed under effectiveness. Very few evaluations make a definitive judgement either way on the efficiency of evaluated programmes (e.g. 2020:1, 2020:6 and 2020:13).

**Case 4**

“Can the costs for the programme be justified by its results? According to EAGC profiling data, the total number of beneficiaries of the programme amounts to 215,318 farmers. The total financial spending in one year of programme implementation has been around 1.9 million USD. This means that the farmers are nominally served by the programme at a cost of around 9 USD each annually. Compared to other comparable programmes, this is considered a relatively low cost. Added to this, it is clear from programme reporting and confirmed by evidence provided by respondents at all levels, that it is a characteristic of the programme that it produces a large amount of different types of results and services at a variety of levels and to a large number of partner organisations; from improved livelihoods for smallholder grain farmers to policy influence at national and regional levels and through several platforms that serve its stakeholders. As evidenced by information received during interviews in the three countries visited, the programme has a high standing and a prominent presence in the region. In summary, the answer to the evaluation question is that the costs for the programme can be justified by the results.” [Page 18]

3.5.1 Key learnings on efficiency

- **A clear programme framework is crucial for efficiency.** In order to assess progress and thus efficiency, the financial and programmatic framework needs to be clear, including specific realistic targets and outcomes linked to budgets (e.g. 2020:1, 2020:7, 2020:11, 2020:13, 2020:16, 2020:20 and 2020:22). Evaluating strategies may be challenging when strategies are too broad and ill-defined in terms of objectives and geography (2020:15).

- **Good programme management promotes efficiency.** Administrative costs, organisational structure and spending affect programme efficiency. Maintaining reasonable costs through procurement (e.g. 2020:1 and 2020:3), transaction costs for project funds (2020:11), and keeping salaries reasonable (e.g. 2020:1; 2020:6 and 2020:11) are means to improved efficiency. Some evaluated programmes found ways of reducing administrative costs over the years by adapting practices (e.g. 2020:21), and there were some excellent examples of cost-efficiency (e.g. 2020:11 and 2020:13, see Case 4).
• **High level oversight is needed.** In order to improve programme efficiency, several evaluations call for high level oversight of strategy and performance. This implies better coordination between donors and implementing organisations, and among donors themselves (e.g. 2020:1, 2020:2, 2020:11, 2020:14 and 2020:18).

• **Efficiency is a long-term process.** Programmes which show improved efficiency in terms of management, financial reporting, or governance, indicate learning from previous reviews and audits, and note that this is a long-term process (e.g. 2020:1, 2020:3, 2020:4 and 2020:7). In some cases, core investment by Sida had made a difference to this aspect (e.g. 2020:3 and 2020:13).

### 3.6 Impact – What Difference do the Interventions Make?

Impact describes the extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects. Around a third of the decentralised evaluations addressed impact (9/23) (see Case 5). This was in line with the number of terms of references which required the impact criterion to be covered. Sometimes the criterion was expressly excluded from the terms of reference (e.g. 2020:23). One terms of reference had impact listed as a criterion, but removed it during the inception phase because it was too early in the process to assess impact (2020:3).

Impact occurs at multiple levels. All the evaluations which discuss impact seek to capture this multi-dimensional change. For instance, the evaluation on land reform in Mozambique, notes the significant contribution to the operationalisation of the Land Information and Management system (2020:1). The evaluation of the Tanzanian NGO Children’s Dignity Forum highlighted how Sida’s core support to the strategic plan of the NGO had transformed it into a pre-eminent national CSO, dealing with challenges of female genital mutilation, child marriage and teenage pregnancy (2020:4). The evaluation of the Baltic to Black Sea Documentary Network found impact in terms of freedom of expression, as film-makers were able to make films about controversial issues (2020:14). A number of impacts on policing in Albania was noted in the evaluation of the Albanian Police Capacity Building programme (2020:18). Finally, the evaluation of Sida’s regional core support to the Eastern Africa Grain Council (EAGC) identified impacts at multiple levels, from individuals through to institutions (2020:13).
**Case 5**


“In those areas where impact is observable and attributable, the foundations have been laid in periods prior to the current regional strategy and then consistently pursued in the current strategy – impact is most visible over a period of several strategy periods. This is particularly observable with respect to gender equality and progress made in this area, which precedes the strategy period by many years. This relates both to results at partner countries’ level, as well as in terms of bringing about change among other donors. Here, the impact has come about through a clearly discernible combination of financially contributing to relevant interventions (in the current strategy period increasingly through support to UN Women, for example in Moldova, and Ukraine, as well as continuing support to the UN in Georgia, but also to specialised civil society organisations) with consistent high-level policy dialogue (at ambassador level in the cooperation countries) with national counterparts and inside the donor community. On a more modest scale, and with considerable variety among partner countries, progress has also been made on LGBTI issues, where Sweden is also attributed a key role. Here more than on gender equality in general, there is somewhat of a risk that this remains a “Swedish” topic. While it is difficult to assign specific impact of Swedish core support to NGO, it has changed the dialogue among the donor community in partner countries.” [Page 29]

### 3.6.1 Key learnings on impact

- **Measuring impact is challenging.** The evaluators grapple with the challenge of assessing impact. One evaluation report (2020:2) remarks that the longer term impacts aimed at by the regional geo-spatial data sharing programme (improved public governance, increased transparency and economic development) cannot realistically be traced, but intermediate impacts in terms of changes in individuals (awareness and capacity) and changes in organisations (human resource capacity, organisational strategies, institutional structures) can be seen. As to the evaluation of strategies, measuring impacts over successive strategy periods is challenging, given the complexity of the donor landscape and the multitude of donors in operation.

- **A clear baseline is key for assessing impact.** A key aspect of measuring impact is the need for a clear baseline at the outset of an intervention. The end evaluation of the regional project on geo-spatial data infrastructure (2020:2) found that some important baselines had been captured, permitting the possibility to see visible change as a result of the programme. When evaluating strategies, suitable indicators and a uniform methodology need to be established at the outset, in order to capture impact at the end of the strategy period (2020:8).

### 3.7 SUSTAINABILITY – WILL THE BENEFITS LAST?

Sustainability signifies the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue. Sustainability was considered in just over half of the evaluations (14/23) and included in almost as many the terms of references (12/23) Most evaluations reported sustainable individual benefits, but not at institutional or societal level. Only a small number of evaluations found indications of good sustainability (e.g. 2020:4, see Case 6).
Case 6

“There are a number of sustainable outcomes that CDF has contributed to on individual and community levels, as well as on district and national levels by setting up formal protection structures. The Evaluation Team concludes that CDF has contributed to establishing permanent structures at the national and district level by e.g. training of police officers, advocating for amendments in the Law on Marriage Act, and helping to establish Protection Committees at regional and district level. CDF has also contributed to setting up structures with potential to be replicated, namely, learning platforms with government officials, informal meetings on community level, informal educational initiatives undertaken by men and boys to cascade knowledge, and information seminars for girls on where to turn to if they need help.” [Page 11]

3.7.1 Key learnings on sustainability

- **Local ownership is a key determinant for sustainability.** There are good prospects for sustainability where government ownership already exists prior to the intervention. Ownership may be manifest in the government’s institutional structures, systems and processes. Sometime, the intervention (programme, project) objective is already integrated into the plans of beneficiary institutions (e.g. 2020:2 and 2020:23).

- **Sustainability is too narrowly seen as financial sustainability.** Sustainability is commonly understood in the narrow sense of financial sustainability, rather than the effects of results produced, and their net benefit over time. Evaluators thus often cite the lack of resources and dependency on funding as a reason for low sustainability. For example, the evaluation on the statistical sector in Burkina Faso found a lack of resources and weak coordination as the main causes for the programme not being sustainable (2020:10). Moreover, sustainability is assessed as weak, because of lack of institutionalisation of the results obtained (e.g. 2020:3 and 2020:19).

- **Exit strategy is important to sustainability.** A sustainable intervention requires a developed exit strategy. For example, the evaluation on a dairy marketing programme in Zambia found there was potential for sustainability if the project had better developed and publicised an exit strategy, which would ensure that all participating groups and members were aware of their responsibilities in sustaining the benefits after project end and by clarifying all the costs that needed to be borne (2020:9).
4 Key learnings on the five development perspectives

4.1 FIVE PERSPECTIVES IN DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

4.1.1 Addressing the five development perspectives in evaluations
The policy framework for Swedish development cooperation and humanitarian assistance (Skr. 2016/17:60) states central perspectives that must be integrated in all Swedish development cooperation: the perspective of poor people on development, the rights perspective, a conflict perspective, a gender perspective and an environmental and climate perspective.

The five development perspectives are mentioned in most terms of references for the decentralised evaluations published in 2020 (19/23). Several evaluations incorporate cross-cutting issues as part of OECD/DAC criteria and questions, rather than as a standalone section in the terms of reference, i.e. the issues are integrated into the questions rather than listed under a separate heading. Where the development perspectives are mentioned in the evaluation questions, the majority cover gender equality (20/23). The human rights-based approach is referenced by less than half of the evaluations (10/23), and less than a third refer the poverty perspective (7/23). Climate and environment and conflict sensitivity are covered by a handful of the evaluations (5/23).

In this chapter, learning from how Sida’s five development cooperation perspectives are applied in Sida’s decentralised evaluations is unpacked. An overview of which evaluations have addressed the different development perspectives alongside which evaluation terms of references required these aspects to be covered, is provided in Chapter 2, Table 1.

4.2 POVERTY FOCUS
Around a third of evaluations (7/23) covered the poverty perspective. Only two terms of references expressly addressed a poverty focus in the evaluation questions (2020:2 and 2020:23). The poverty perspective is only considered in detail in a couple of evaluations where there is a direct bearing of the evaluated intervention on poverty. A couple of evaluations covered interventions which had a direct bearing on poverty, however the evaluation terms of references did not highlight this perspective (2020:9 and 2020:13).
4.2.1 Key learnings on poverty focus

- **Multi-dimensional poverty assessment.** The multi-dimensional poverty assessment (MDPA) approach adopted by Sida was reflected to a limited degree in the evaluations except those covering programmes in Eastern Europe (2020:2 and 2020:8), both of which found that MDPA was not being adequately integrated into programming. The evaluation of the portfolio under the reform strategy in Eastern Europe found that the MDPA was being used at regional level, but that country portfolios were weak on this point and the pro-poor dimension disappeared at project level (2020:8). The concept of multi-dimensional poverty (but not the MDPA tool) is referenced in a few other evaluations, for example the evaluation on statistics in Burkina Faso (2020:10).

- **Marginalised groups are hard to reach.** Although the intervention aims at improving conditions for people living in poverty, it may be challenging to reach the most marginalised (e.g. 2020:9).

4.3 HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED APPROACHES

Less than half of the evaluation reports (10/23) discuss human rights-based approaches (HRBA) (Case 7). A few (5) terms of references refer to human rights or human rights-based approaches. In some evaluations, the evaluated intervention is assessed thoroughly against human rights-based approaches, by taking a step by step approach to look at each key principle of participation, accountability, non-discrimination and transparency (e.g. 2020:7, 2020:9, 2020:11 and 2020:13).

---

**Case 7**


*“Have target groups been participating in project planning, implementation and follow up?* Farmers at all 8 selected MCCs acknowledged that there had been adequate sensitization about the DIMS project before implementation. However, their involvement during project implementation appears to have been weak. Some farmers expressed that their most immediate needs were not taken into account let alone being addressed. At Mpima MCC, dairy farmers expressively indicated that they would have preferred a needs assessment in which case they would have prioritized the completion of their dairy processing plant. Farmers at Magoye and Kayuni MCCs complained about lack of regular visits by field extension personnel and generally weak monitoring. Thus there has been insufficient level of participation in project planning, implementation and possible follow up activities. These findings, though anecdotal, may be good pointers for the DIMS to reassess the current situation and reorient, if necessary, the way they do business.

*Has anyone been discriminated by the project through its implementation?* Fisenge MCC is an all-female entity, by design. Male participation is limited to widowers or relatives of female members within the MCC. Men cannot ascend to leadership positions. Thus there is discrimination against men. The group was initiated by Heifer International, another organisation that focuses on the livestock value chain in Zambia, as a women’s project which they granted dairy cows. Members have preferred to maintain the female-only orientation because they feel they have more say and control over their operations than if they were in a mixed group.

*Has the project been implemented in a transparent manner?* In those MCCs that were serviced by MPS, there was seemingly a breakdown in communication between DAZ and the MCCs to inform them about what was happening and what remedies DAZ was taking to remedy the situation. Continuous communication is important in order to build and maintain trust between project staff and beneficiaries. At MCC level, there was some evidence of governance issues. In some cases MCCs were not able to discuss freely the status.

*Accountability mechanisms* at DAZ are available through Board oversight, donor monitoring and financial audits. These mechanisms are currently considered adequate. However, DAZ general operations – especially for cross-cutting areas such as gender and M&E – are sometimes intricately intertwined such that it becomes difficult to account for time for each part. For example, DAZ is generally interested in increasing milk yields per cow per day. The DIMS project might target specific activities to this end, but monitoring the milk yield trend is of interest to both the DIMS project and DAZ in general. Detailed time accounting on time sheets is one partial remedy but does not solve the problem of the staff being unsure of whether the work is done for DAZ or DIMS. [Pages 18-22]
4.3.1 Key learning on human rights-based approach

- HRBA is unevenly integrated in the evaluations. Some evaluations integrate HRBA well into the design of the evaluation even though human rights are not a direct objective of the evaluated intervention (e.g. 2020:2). On the other hand, some evaluations of projects focusing on human rights do less well at assessing HRBA explicitly, possibly because they view the whole evaluation report as being about human rights (e.g. 2020:4 and 2020:14). Of those evaluations which do not expressly refer to HRBA, the individual principles which are most referenced are participation and accountability (e.g. 2020:1, 2020:4, 2020:11 and 2020:6). The principles of ‘transparency’ and ‘non-discrimination’ are the least referenced.

- Downward accountability should be emphasised. The need to focus on downward accountability was emphasised in some evaluations. The evaluation on Sida’s risk management approaches found that the evaluated contributions could have benefited from enhanced downward accountability. By engaging the target groups/members in monitoring of the contributions, corruption and abuse of power could more easily be detected, as well as signs of doing harm (2020:5). Moreover, the evaluation of a youth programme in Tanzania, identified the good practice and impact made by a downward advocacy approach to human rights (2020:11).

4.4 ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE

The environmental and climate perspective was directly addressed only by a handful of evaluations (5/23). However, several other evaluations refer to the environment, but in a tangential descriptive way, rather than making findings. Only one terms of reference explicitly referred to climate change and the environment as an evaluation criterion (2020:7, see Case 8).

Case 8


“Environmental mainstreaming in Forum-Asia’s policy framework has far less progressed compared to gender mainstreaming. Forum-Asia has openly acknowledged its Environmental Impact Policy needs an overhaul. A review of Forum-Asia policy framework by the Evaluation team identified that in 2011 the organization formulated an Environment Impact Policy ‘in response to the requirement under the grant agreements with Sida’. The 2016-2022 Strategic Plan states that Forum-Asia shall recognise the right to a healthy and sustainable environment and under its thematic priority of a human rights based approach to sustainable development Forum-Asia commits to working in solidarity with environmental organizations and defenders to protect the environment and deliver climate justice. Interviewees reported that mid-November 2019 Forum-Asia conducted a Simplified Environmental Assessment linked to the development of a new programme proposal to Sida. A reading of the assessment document confirms an acknowledgement by the organization that its environmental impact policy needs to be completely reviewed and revamped, and that its capacity for environmental management – in terms of staff capacity, policies, guidelines, environmental management system – is limited. Environment also seems not mainstreamed in the organization-wide logical framework: No relevant results or indicators could be identified.” [Pages 43 – 45]

4.4.1 Key learning on environment and climate

- Environment and climate is integrated when directly linked with programme objectives. The evaluations show that projects and programmes are most likely to address the environment and climate perspective when there is a direct connection with the project/programme in question in terms of...
project/programme objective, for example the end evaluation of a regional project on geo-spatial data infrastructure and preparedness of natural disasters (2020:2).

- **Environment and climate is not always integrated, even when clearly relevant.** One concerning feature is that the environment and climate perspective is not necessarily being integrated into programmes where it is of direct relevance and where climate change is a threat to project beneficiaries. For example, evaluation on milk production in Zambia, found that while there were some outputs on environmental sustainability, there was a lack of capacity and a need to do much more (2020:9). Likewise, the evaluators of Sida’s regional core support to the Eastern Africa Grain Council found that climate change was mentioned by many stakeholders as having a negative effect on food production, livelihoods and health, and that farmers were trying to find ways of adapting to new climate and weather conditions, but that the programme lacked strategic direction and specific resources to address these issues (2020:13).

- **Integration of environment and climate issues may be stimulated by Sida.** Sida’s inclusion of the environment and climate perspective in its agreement with implementing organisations can have a stimulus effect. One evaluation report credited Sida for highlighting this issue and prompting the programme to cover it (2020:7). However, the evaluation of the Eastern Europe reform strategy and portfolio, noted that there were a number of missed and potential opportunities for further integrating environment and climate change in the strategy and portfolio (2020:8).

4.5 GENDER EQUALITY

Gender equality is discussed in most evaluations (20/23) and referred to as a question for the evaluation in about half of the terms of references (11/23) Gender equality is additionally discussed in another nine evaluation reports, where it was not part of the terms of reference. The degree of coverage varies considerably, with only less than half of the evaluations addressing the issue in sufficient detail to explain findings and the other evaluation reports having a limited discussion about the issue (e.g. 2020:2, see Case 9).
Case 9
Gender Equality: Extract from ‘End Evaluation of Regional Project Impuls (Geo-Spatial Data Infrastructure)’ [2020:2]

“The evaluation found that while there was a commitment to gender equality among project participants, there was a common view expressed in Skype and face-to-face meetings that the IMPULS project, with its high level and technical focus, did not bear directly on improvements to equality between the genders. Gender equality is a critical issue in land administration, an aspect which both the beneficiary countries and international partners have been focusing on for many years. Indeed, the BOs have other projects running simultaneously on gender equality, for instance, the CILAP project involves the development of an action plan for promoting GE in land administration and the development of GE integrity plans for BiH; another example is the Open Regional Fund for South East Europe project on Gender and Land Rights. However, the link between IMPULS and outcomes related to gender equality is not as tangible. At most, the project was recognised as a contributor to the debate, for instance, the project’s awareness raising activities along with those of other international partners and civil society groups was said to have helped the passage of laws on joint spousal property rights in certain countries. In terms of gender equality within the beneficiary organisations, again it seems the awareness was already there with a good gender balance already pre-existing the project. For example, some BOs have near 50 per cent or more female staff and in some cases, more women than men in top management positions. As such direct outcomes on gender equality cannot be much attributed to the IMPULS project.” [Page 47-48]

4.5.1 Key learnings on gender

- **A holistic gender approach is needed, engaging both men and women.** Engaging men in programmes on gender equality was highlighted in some evaluation reports. For example, a mid-term evaluation of the women’s advocacy initiative for inclusive governance campaign in Zimbabwe argued for a more holistic consideration of gender, particularly in terms of engaging men in a campaign for women’s political participation (2020:6).

- **Gender is monitored on output, not outcome level, and disaggregated data is lacking.** M&E systems tended to focus on outputs, as opposed to outcomes (e.g. 2020:1, 2020:2 and 2020:3). Some evaluators found that the lack of gender-disaggregated data made it difficult to document project/programme progress (e.g. 2020:1 and 2020:2). Data disaggregation without a project/programme gender strategy or gender action plan is not useful, as data is then collected in a vacuum, without understanding gender patterns or serving programme beneficiaries (2020:13).

- **Gender equality must be integrated in both policy and practice.** A number of evaluations noted gender progress at the level of social audits, guidelines and dissemination, but found operationalisation weaker. In some cases, a gender policy was lacking. For example, the project supporting documentary filmmakers in five post-Soviet countries, had not planned for gender integration, but assumed this issue would arise “organically” through the funding of human rights films in Eastern Europe (2020:14).

- **Gender equality challenges social norms.** Addressing gender equality is inevitably more challenging in environments where gender roles are strongly pre-defined. This was noted both in the evaluation on transboundary water cooperation programme in the Middle East (2020:3) and on dairy farming in Zambia (2020:9).
• **Intersectionality should be considered.** There is a need to consider intersectionality when integrating gender equality, i.e. the way in which different types of discrimination are linked and affect each other (e.g. 2020:7).

• **Sida is an important influencer on gender equality.** The priority given by Sida to gender equality comes out in several evaluations as having an impact on other partners (e.g. 2020:5 and 2020:7).

### 4.6 CONFLICT SENSITIVITY

The conflict perspective was covered in a handful of the evaluation reports (5/23). It was only referred to in one terms of reference. In that case, Sida was aware of the potential for differences between participants from different countries due to political relations (2020:14). The evaluations which considered the conflict perspective found the programmes acting in a way that promotes conflict sensitivity (e.g. 2020:7 and 2020:8). One programme in particular was centred around conflict sensitivity as a core objective, as it used water management as a tool of diplomacy (2020:3 on transboundary water cooperation programme in the Middle East) (see Case 10).

**Case 10**
Conflict sensitivity: Extract from ‘Evaluation of: Fostering Regional Cooperation on Transboundary Water Management in Palestine, Jordan and Israel implemented by MEDRC’ [2020:3]

“How to Use Water as a Tool for Peacebuilding in a Situation of Conflict Between Two or More Countries. Using the competences of its newly recruited team within conflict, peace and mediation, MEDRC has since 2017 adopted an approach that prioritises consultations with and/or visits to each of the core parties separately, in addition to joint meetings that take place in the context of trilateral coordination and executive committee meetings. This has allowed each core party to voice their preferences and concerns separately (e.g. themes or location of the workshop, relevant stakeholders to invite), identify constraints in good time and explore solutions that core parties are in agreement with within the overall challenges of the political context. In addition to the substantial time spent on mediation-like work in the organisation of these workshops, the strategy is to diffuse potential tension by having a larger crowd than the targeted parties. This is seen to build a stronger basis for a more enabling environment for interaction. At the same time, these workshops provide an international platform for all core parties to meet in a less formal setting while at the same time gaining new knowledge in topics that were flagged as being of interest by core parties.” [Pages 60, 29, 32]

### 4.6.1 Key learnings on conflict sensitivity

• **The risk management function could be strengthened.** Sida’s risk management framework includes tools which involve assessing whether proposed programmes pose the risk of doing harm or are conflict sensitive. However, the evaluation which looked at Sida’s risk management function concluded that this function could be strengthened and proposed a tentative framework which includes more contextual analysis of conflict sensitivity (2020:5).

• **Exploit synergies between perspectives.** Sida was found to influence implementing organisations in terms of their consideration of different development perspectives (e.g. the 2020:7 evaluation of a human rights promotion programme in Asia or evaluation 2020:8 which identified synergies between conflict sensitivity and gender equality issues).
5 Quality of evaluation reports

UTV regularly carries out quality reviews of decentralised evaluations, i.e. evaluations that are commissioned by Sida’s operational units and foreign missions. The internal quality review is based on the OECD/DAC evaluation standards. The purpose of these internal quality reviews is to improve and develop advice and method support to Sida and partners, as well as follow-up with the framework suppliers. Of the twenty-three decentralised evaluations published in 2020, fourteen were selected for internal quality review. All the framework suppliers were represented in the selection.

Most of the conclusions from the evaluation reports were backed up by evidence of such nature that they could be judged as reliable, although methodologies and data collection methods applied could have been further described. However, a few of these evaluations had, based on the information provided in the report about the methodology, methods for data collection and how well conclusions were backed by findings, issues that may put into question the strength of the conclusions. The quality is also dependent on limited time frames for the assignment, not the least the important inception phase, and sometimes an overload of questions to answer within that time frame and the given budget. It can be noted that many of these issues may be avoided by using the support and guidance available from UTV, for example the Sida Evaluation Handbook and the Sida Evaluation support pages for programme officers.

The following shortcomings are common to many evaluation reports. It is suggested that these should be addressed in future evaluations:

Many of the title pages lack sufficient information to make it possible to understand the objective and time frame of the evaluation. This information is probably self-evident for the programme managers directly involved in the evaluation object. However, as the evaluations are also intended for a broader audience this shortcoming pose an obstacle.

All evaluations included a summary that provided basic information. However, in quite a few instances, important information were lacking in the summary, including purpose and objective, as well as the time frame of the evaluation. Again, for readers directly involved in the evaluation, such as programme managers, this might not be a very big problem, but for a wider audience this makes it difficult to quickly assess the relevance of the report. Based on this it is recommended (a) to include keywords, and (b) briefly sum up information about the evaluation object and evaluation questions at an early stage in the text.
 Weak source criticism and insufficient handling of the representativeness of data was a common feature in the evaluation reports. In some cases source criticism and data representativeness is not much of a problem, due to the nature of the evaluation questions. However, in a few cases these problems pose questions to the reliability of at least part of the conclusions. Hence, UTV recommends that evaluators more carefully analyse the biases of the sources they use and undertake appropriate stakeholder mappings.

Only three of the fourteen reviewed evaluations had collected data from people living in poverty, or other similar groups, that could be considered the ultimate beneficiaries of the evaluated interventions. In many evaluations such information would not be very relevant given the nature of the intervention, or due to the nature of the evaluations. However, it could still be worthwhile to discuss if this source of data should not be more common.

In too many cases the presentations of methods used were too brief and thus lacking in transparency. The methods chapters tend to focus on the work schedule and methods for data collection, while the outline of the evaluation approach/methodology is too often undeveloped. Accordingly, we recommend that more attention is paid to describing the methodology in a transparent way. Without this information the reliability of the conclusions and hence the usefulness of the evaluation may be put in question even if the evaluators de facto applied appropriate methods.

Another related recommendation is ensuring that appropriate methods are applied to questions that are methodologically challenging. This is particular important when evaluations ask questions about results at outcome and impact level, as assessing effectiveness and impact requires methods that transparently handle causality in order to establish the contribution of the intervention to results at these higher levels.

In summary, the review yield a number of recommendations for future evaluations:

- Focus the evaluation on a few key evaluation questions
- Make sure that sufficient time and resources are set-aside to answer the key questions
- Make use of the support and guidance provided by UTV
- Make sure the title of the evaluation is complete and searchable
- Sum up information about the evaluation object and evaluation questions at an early stage in the evaluation report
- Describe the methodology in a more transparent way in the evaluation report
- Make sure that appropriate methods are applied to questions that are methodologically challenging (e.g. impact)
- Consider if it could be useful to collect primary data from people living in poverty
- Pay more attention to source criticism
Overall, evaluated Sida interventions perform relatively well, challenges relate more to achieving and sustaining long-term effects

The evaluated Sida interventions are overall considered relevant and effective, although evaluators provide a number of recommendations on how to strengthen these aspects. Results are visible across a wide range of sectors and countries in terms of building capacity, benefitting citizens, strengthening organisations and empowering civil society. Sida’s dedicated effort to promote specific issues, particularly gender equality, are clearly having an impact, showing that a clear prioritisation and messaging can make a difference.

The challenge lies in more systemic change which goes beyond the time span of Sida interventions, and in achieving final goals in terms of longer term impact and sustainability. While achieving such lasting change is inevitably difficult in countries which lack adequate economic resources and political stability, there is a key learning on the importance of long-term engagement coupled with high level dialogue and adaptive management practices as ways of achieving sustainable change.

Key points to strengthen Sida interventions

Key points which emerge across the analysis of both the OECD/DAC criteria and the five development perspectives in terms of strengthening Sida interventions are:

- the need to ensure ownership and downward accountability;
- better planning and strategising, taking in the local context;
- improved M&E systems during implementation focusing on objectives
- and better coordination and alignment at all levels.

Key points to strengthen evaluation

The analysis and quality review show that evaluation practices can be strengthened by:

- commissioning more focused evaluations that have just a few key questions;
- time in particular, but also budgets, need to be adequate for proper coverage of the evaluation questions;
- the relevance criteria should focus more on relevance to beneficiary needs, to context and of the intervention design;
- evaluation design/approach and methods needs to be better outlined and appropriate to assess more challenging questions about e.g. goal fulfilment and impact;
• setting up stronger monitoring systems, including baselines and theories of change, from the outset of the intervention, to enable evaluators to answer key questions, although evaluators should reconstruct objectives and theories of change when necessary.

Finally, UTV wishes to highlight that evaluation quality and utility can be improved by using the support available from UTV, for example the Sida Evaluation Handbook and the Sida Evaluation support pages for programme officers. The Handbook and support pages provide advice on many of the issues raised in this Annual Report, and are continually developed to improve evaluation practices. UTV also encourages Sida’s operational teams to continue to evaluate during the “new” normal of the Covid-19. As last year, UTV also encourages a greater use of evaluations to address strategic needs beyond the level of specific interventions, i.e. at the level of strategies and portfolios.
Annex A  Evaluation registry.  
Decentralised evaluations 2016-2020

A.1 EVALUATIONS PER STRATEGY

The table below shows evaluations published in the Sida Decentralised Evaluation Series in the period 2016-2020, organised per strategy (geographic and thematic). Summaries from the evaluations published in 2020 can be found in Annex B. All publications can be downloaded from www.sida.se/publications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018:24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bolivia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burkina Faso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016:17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity development, partnership and methods (including older strategies for Capacity Development and Collaboration / Capacity Development)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Middle East and Northern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional – Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights in Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Cooperation and research in development cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support via Swedish Civil Society Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Zimbabwe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020:6</td>
<td>Mid-Term Evaluation of the Strengthening Women’s Advocacy for Inclusive Governance (SWAG) Campaign, Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018:5</td>
<td>Evaluation of Programme Work Methods of The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:6</td>
<td>Desk Study of Sida’s Experience from Private Sector Collaboration – Final Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.2 EVALUATIONS PER SECTOR

The table below shows evaluations published in the Sida Decentralised Evaluation Series in the period 2016-2020, organised per main sector. Summaries from the evaluations published in 2020 can be found in Annex B. All publications can be downloaded from www.sida.se/publications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture and forestry</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018:24</td>
<td>The Evaluation of the Dairy Hub and Dairy Academy Development Project in Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:29</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Sida-USAID/DCA Guarantee to Zanaco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:7</td>
<td>Évaluation à mi-parcours du Programme de Gestion Décentralisée des Forêts (GEDEFOR II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:11</td>
<td>Evaluación del Programa de Reducción de la Vulnerabilidad de los Medios de Vida ante el Cambio Climático - Informe final (ENG: Evaluation of the Program for Reducing Vulnerability of Livelihoods to Climate Change - Final Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:15</td>
<td>Midterm Review of GESTERRA Capacity Building Programme on Land Management and Administration within DINAT - Final Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020:21</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Swedish Resource Base</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict, peace and security</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019:24</td>
<td>Evaluation of Parliamentary Forum on Small Arms and Light Weapons (PFSALW) 2014-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:9</td>
<td>The key role of ICTJ in the designing of Colombia’s complex Transitional Justice System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:2</td>
<td>Evaluation of Sida’s Support to Tostan (2010-2016) - Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:3</td>
<td>Evaluation of ITP 296 (Fred och Säkerhet i Afrika (Peace and Security in Africa PASA)) - Final Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democracy, human rights and gender equality</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020:02</td>
<td>End Evaluation of Regional Project Impuls (Geo-Spatial Data Infrastructure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:04</td>
<td>Evaluation of Children’s Dignity Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:06</td>
<td>Mid-Term Evaluation of the Strengthening Women’s Advocacy for Inclusive Governance (SWAG) Campaign, Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:15</td>
<td>Utvärdering av demokratistöd genom svenska partianknutna organisationer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:16</td>
<td>Evaluation of Democracy Support through Swedish Political Party Affiliated Organisations - Part II: Methods for supporting women’s political influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:17</td>
<td>Evaluation of Democracy Support through Swedish Political Party Affiliated Organisations - Part II: Methods for supporting women’s political influence – Annex A – Case Study Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:18</td>
<td>Albanian Police Capacity Building: From repressive force to serve communities with trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:4</td>
<td>Evaluation of the support to UNICEF to strengthen Child Protection in Abkhazia 2015–2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:7</td>
<td>Support to the Mid-Term Review in the DRC. Report Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:8</td>
<td>Support to the Mid-Term Review in the DRC. Report Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:9</td>
<td>Support to the Mid-Term Review in the DRC Multi-Dimensional Poverty Analysis (MDPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:14</td>
<td>Evaluation of UN Women Country Programme in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:17</td>
<td>Evaluation of IBON International and the CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:25</td>
<td>Evaluation of International Disability Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:26</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Sida-supported development cooperation with the Kenya Revenue Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:27</td>
<td>Evaluation of Twaweza Strategic Plan 2015-2018; programme support in Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:29</td>
<td>Midterm review of the SIDA core support to Kosovo Civil Society Foundation (KCSF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:31</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Improving Court Efficiency and Accountability of Judges and Prosecutors in BIH Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:33</td>
<td>End of Project Evaluation of the BBC Media Action Radio Waves &amp; Tikambe Projects in Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:1</td>
<td>Evaluation of the National Legal Aid Clinic for Women’s Access to Justice Programme in Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:5</td>
<td>Evaluation of Programme Work Methods of The Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:8</td>
<td>Mid-term Evaluation of Swedish government funded Civil Society Support through the AGIR II Programme in Mozambique 2014–2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:16</td>
<td>Evaluation of Swedish Civil Society Support in Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:23</td>
<td>Evaluation of four NGO implemented programmes in Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:4</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Sida supported RFSL projects “LGBT Voices” and “Rainbow Leaders” – Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:5</td>
<td>Evaluation of Sida Support to ECPAT International – Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:8</td>
<td>Revue Indépendante à mi-parcours du Programme de Gouvernance Locale Démocratique (GLD) Phase III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:14</td>
<td>Aggregating the results that arise from Sida’s investment in Tanzanian Civil Society in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:15</td>
<td>Evaluation of Core Support to Georgian Foundation for Strategic and International Studies (GFSIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:21</td>
<td>Evaluation of Swedish Support to the One UN in Albania for gender equality work 2012–2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:26</td>
<td>End of Strategy Evaluation of the Zanzibar Legal Services Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:31</td>
<td>Aggregating the results that arise from Sida’s investment in Tanzanian Civil Society in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Evaluation Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:34</td>
<td>Evaluation of 3rd Call off of civil society support through umbrella organisations 2013–2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:4</td>
<td>Evaluation of Union to Union – Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:9</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Swedish Core Support to the Human Rights Foundation in Turkey – Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:12</td>
<td>Evaluation study in support of the Mid Term Review of the Pro-Tax II project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:30</td>
<td>Évaluation finale du Programme d’Initiatives Locales d’Adaptation Durable aux effets des changements climatiques des communautés rurales vulnérables du Mali (PIL-ADCC Mali)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:16</td>
<td>Evaluation finale du ”Projet de Réduction de la Vulnérabilité des Petits Barrages aux Changements Climatiques (PRVPB-CC)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:18</td>
<td>Completion Evaluation of Sida Support to Environment and Climate Change Component of NREP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:33</td>
<td>End of Project Evaluation of the BBC Media Action Radio Waves &amp; Tikambe Projects in Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:26</td>
<td>Evaluation of Health Guarantee to Centenary Rural Development Bank in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:17</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Health Economics and HIV and AIDS Research Division (HEARD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Humanitarian aid</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:12</td>
<td>Evaluation of Sida Humanitarian Method Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:3</td>
<td>Evaluation of Sida’s Humanitarian Assistance – Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:13</td>
<td>Evaluation of Save the Children Sweden during Sida’s contribution to Save the Children’s humanitarian work 2013-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Market development, trade and employment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:09</td>
<td>Project Review of the Dairy Association of Zambia (DAZ)’s Digital Information Management System (DIMS) project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:12</td>
<td>Evaluation of Civil Development Agency (CiDA) and its Corporate Sustainability Platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:22</td>
<td>Evaluation: Stimulating SME growth and enhancing market and economic development, Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:6</td>
<td>Evaluation of ILO Road to Jobs (R2J), Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:10</td>
<td>Mid Term Evaluation of the Sida and USAID Loan Portfolio Co-Guarantee and The Mali Finance for Food Security and Women Entrepreneurs (FFSWE) programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:19</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Capacity Building for Improvement of Land Administration and Procedures in Bosnia and Herzegovina (CILAP project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:22</td>
<td>Evaluation of the project Confidence in Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:23</td>
<td>Evaluation of Organic Trade and Value Chain Development in East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:13</td>
<td>Evaluation of Swedish International Training Programmes (ITP); Quality Infrastructure – Technical Barriers to Trade (304) and Sanitary/Phytosanitary (305) 2013–2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:19</td>
<td>Mid-term Evaluation of Small-holder Agriculture Reform through Enterprise Development (SHARE) Project, iDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:21</td>
<td>Mid-Term Evaluation of “Regional Economic Integration through the Adoption of Competition and Consumer Policies in the Middle East and North Africa (COMPAL GLOBAL-MENA)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:22</td>
<td>Mid-term Review of the EMPOWER Private Sector Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:25</td>
<td>Mid-Term Review of the Project ‘Promoting Agriculture, Climate and Trade Linkages in the East African Community 2 (PACT EAC 2)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:28</td>
<td>Evaluation of the trade policy training centre in Africa (trapca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:10</td>
<td>Evaluation of the OECD’s ‘Sector Competitiveness Strategy’ Project in Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:11</td>
<td>Mid-Term Evaluation of the National Employment Programme, Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:22</td>
<td>Mid Term Review of the Agadir Technical Unit and the Swedish International Development Agency, Sida funded project “Support Quality Infrastructure in Agadir Countries”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:6</td>
<td>Desk Study of Sida’s Experience from Private Sector Collaboration – Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:16</td>
<td>Evaluation of the projects “Institutional Cooperation between the Department for WTO and Trade Defence at the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade of Ukraine and Swedish National Board of Trade” and “Trade Policy and Practice in Ukraine”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:20</td>
<td>Evaluation of Jönköping International Business School’s (JIBS) collaboration with Sida partner universities in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:1</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Sida supported research capacity building programme “International Foundation for Science”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:3</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Sida supported research capacity and higher education development program in Rwanda, 2013–2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:11</td>
<td>Evaluation of AAU’s Core Programmes and projects under the Core Programme 2013–2017, with particular focus on Sida’s institutional and program support 2013–2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:9</td>
<td>Evaluation of Swedish government research cooperation with Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique 2011-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:29</td>
<td>External evaluation of the Quality Assurance Systems of research and postgraduate training at Universidad Mayor de San Andrés (UMSA) and Universidad Mayor de San Simón (UMSS) in Bolivia, as well as the national system through Comité Ejecutivo de la Universidad Boliviana (CEUB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:30</td>
<td>Evaluación externa de los sistemas de garantía de calidad en materia de investigación y capacitación de posgrado en la Universidad Mayor de San Andrés (UMSA) y en la Universidad Mayor de San Simón (UMSS) de Bolivia, así como del sistema nacional mediante el Comité Ejecutivo de la Universidad Boliviana (CEUB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:10</td>
<td>Evaluation of Sida Support to TWAS, OWSD and GIS – Final Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainable infrastructure and services (e.g. water supply and management, sanitation, energy, urban development, waste management, transport)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020:1</td>
<td>Final Evaluation of GESTERRA Capacity Building Programme on Land Management and Administration within DINAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:3</td>
<td>Evaluation of: Fostering Regional Cooperation on Transboundary Water Management in Palestine, Jordan and Israel implemented by MEDRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:10</td>
<td>Mid Term Review of Symbio City Kenya. The sustainable urban development programme in Kenya – 2015-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:30</td>
<td>Review of Ratmalana/Moratuwa and Ja-Ela/Ekala Wastewater Disposal Project in Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:28</td>
<td>Evaluation of three projects on transboundary water management in the Middle East and North Africa region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:5</td>
<td>Evaluation of Sida’s risk management of contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:8</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Reform Cooperation with Eastern Europe, Western Balkans and Turkey 2014–2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:3</td>
<td>Evaluación de la relevancia e impacto del enfoque de la ASDI para fortalecer la resiliencia de los pueblos indígenas en las áreas rurales de Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017:35</td>
<td>Evaluation of Sida’s ITP approach for Capacity Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This annex includes brief presentations of decentralised evaluations published in the Sida Decentralised Evaluation Series in 2020. The evaluations are listed according to publication number. The reports can be downloaded from www.sida.se/publications.

2020:1  
**Final Evaluation of GESTERRA Capacity Building Programme on Land Management and Administration within DINAT**

The final evaluation of the Swedish-Dutch financed Land Management and Administration Capacity Building Programme – GESTERRA – in Mozambique was commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in Maputo (Sida). The programme was implemented from 2013 to 2019 in a changing institutional environment. It contributed to important land policy processes, including planning for an autonomous land management institution and decision to revise the legislative framework. It has established gender inclusive methodologies for land registration, supported the establishment of digitized land registration and strengthened the capacity at provincial level. Recommendations focus i.a. on further roll-out and decentralisation as well as securing an inclusive process in the coming revision of the legislative framework.

2020:2  
**End Evaluation of Regional Project Impuls (Geo-Spatial Data Infrastructure)**

This is a final independent evaluation of the IMPULS project which aimed to establish core national spatial data infrastructures (NSDIs) in the Western Balkan region with the ultimate goal of supporting e-governance, economic development and enhanced cooperation and transparency. This Sida-funded project was implemented by Lantmäteriet, the Swedish government mapping, cadastral and land registration authority in cooperation with the State Geodetic Administration of the Republic of Croatia (SGA) as the junior project partner. It was implemented over a five year period from 2014 to 2019 in six Balkan countries and involved eight beneficiary organisations. The evaluation found the project to be highly relevant, particularly in terms of helping to bring beneficiary countries into compliance with the EU INSPIRE Directive. The project was very ambitious and despite implementation challenges, it succeeded in delivering key outcomes which have laid the groundwork for a strengthened system of NSDI in the region.

2020:3  
**Evaluation of: Fostering Regional Cooperation on Transboundary Water Management in Palestine, Jordan and Israel implemented by MEDRC**

The main conclusions of the evaluation of the project were that: The objectives of MEDRC and the project are relevant but highly dependent on the external
context and the overall peace process. The project has promoted gender equality at activity level but outcomes have been more challenging to monitor and achieve. The project potentially contributed to improving technical cooperation through increasing readiness and confidence. Although the capacity development was appreciated and has become more efficient, it is still fragmented and not well enough linked to other processes. Achievement of the overall objectives will require continuous support.

2020:4 **Evaluation of Children’s Dignity Forum**
The Children’s Dignity Forum (CDF) is a Tanzanian civil society organization working to protect children, help them realize their rights and change attitudes towards women and children. In July 2016, the Embassy of Sweden/Sida decided to provide a core support to CDF for the implementation of its Strategic Plan 2016/17 – 2018/19. With the current agreement coming to an end, Sida commissioned an independent assessment of achieved goals, outcomes and outputs as established in CDF’s Results Framework for the period 2016–2019. The evaluation found that, overall, CDF’s Strategic Plan has contributed to CDF’s transformation into a pre-eminent national CSO dealing with challenges of FGM, child marriage and teenage pregnancy in Tanzania.

2020:5 **Evaluation of Sida’s risk management of contributions**
Sida’s cooperation partners. It was commissioned by Sida and covers contributions appraised in 2017 and 2018. The evaluation concludes that Sida’s risk management approaches are largely relevant and effective, especially the flexibility, the core support and the capacity strengthening consultancies. Areas of improvement include the need for more clarity and unity on Sida’s risk policy framework, more adaptability of agreement conditions, more joint engagement with partners in risk management and more focus on risks related to poor performance, limited local ownership and lack of downward accountability. The evaluation presents recommendations to Sida on how to move forward.

2020:6 **Mid-Term Evaluation of the Strengthening Women’s Advocacy for Inclusive Governance (SWAG) Campaign, Zimbabwe**
The Strengthening Women’s Advocacy for Inclusive Governance (SWAG) campaign began in 2017 and has been implemented all across Zimbabwe. The overall goal is to increase the participation of women in local and national governance processes by coordinating collective action, and to hold electoral and political actors accountable to women’s rights. The objective of this Mid-Term Evaluation is to establish the relevance of the campaign’s methods and how effective they are for achieving intended results. Overall, the evaluation finds that the campaign is perceived as highly justified considering the limited participation of women in politics, but there is scope for making it even more relevant to beneficiary needs and priorities. Due to shortcomings in monitoring, determining the results is difficult, but anecdotal evidence suggests that the campaign has contributed to changing perceptions about women’s ability to take
part in politics and given women a sense of increased confidence. The efficiency of the campaign has been mixed, with uneven financial delivery rate between central and provincial activities. The evaluation recommends that Sida support is extended to allow the consortium partners to present a joint and realistic strategic plan and budget for 2020-2023, with a plan for expanding outreach, an enhanced results framework and strengthened internal communication and coordination.


The purpose of this evaluation was to assess progress in the implementation of Forum-Asia’s strategic plan, to advise on how to strengthen its work and serve as an input to Sida’s decision on future support. Forum-Asia is a network organization established in 1991 working to promote and protect human rights through collaboration and cooperation with human rights organisations and defenders in Asia. The evaluation found that Forum-Asia is a highly relevant network for many key actors in the Asian human rights community. The most significant results have been achieved in the area of fostering an environment conducive for better human rights protection in Asia and Forum-Asia adds most value when focusing its efforts on issues best addressed at regional level and of direct relevance from a human rights perspective. Key recommendations included to strive to effectively and consistently draw the added value as a regional membership-based human rights organization and ensure that the organization can primarily focus on developing its human rights strategies and strengthening its programmes, while adjusting and improving its financial and management structures as necessary.

2020:8 **Evaluation of the Reform Cooperation with Eastern Europe, Western Balkans and Turkey 2014–2019**

This evaluation assesses the effectiveness and impact of Sida’s 2014–2020 Reform Cooperation Strategy in Eastern Europe, Western Balkans and Turkey, covering over 900 contributions within 16 results and 3 results areas: economic integration with the EU; democracy, human rights and rule of law; environment and climate change. Success factors include strengthening of public administration, institutional support to civil society, promotion of gender equality and leveraging of environmental investments. The main challenges to be considered for the next strategy concern results reporting, prioritisation and measures for poverty reduction. Overall, the strategy has been responsive to needs and results have been achieved, but consistent evidence of transformational impact is missing.

2020:9 **Project Review of the Dairy Association of Zambia (DAZ)’s Digital Information Management System (DIMS) project**

The review of the DIMS project was commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden, Lusaka. The objective of the project, which is funded by Sida, is to contribute to a viable and sustainable dairy industry by developing a digitized system for transactions and improved access to information and dairy farming inputs. The
review is based on information gathered through document study, field visits and interviews and meetings with beneficiaries and stakeholders. The main conclusion of the review is that while the DIMS system has been introduced, it is still in its infancy and needs to be complemented and further developed in order to become fully useful to the farmers, thereby creating incentives for its future financing. The review recommends continued support to the project.


Ce rapport présente les résultats de l’évaluation du soutien suédois au secteur statistique au Burkina Faso sur la période 2008-2017. Elle vise à mettre en évidence les principales réalisations, lacunes et défis clés avec pour objectif de contribuer au processus de planification d’un éventuel soutien futur. L’évaluation conclut que la collaboration visait à renforcer les capacités, notamment en termes de méthodologie statistique, technologie de l’information et compétences en anglais. En outre, l’évaluation montre que le rôle institutionnel a étéclarifié et renforcé, les statistiques des entreprises ont été améliorées et la diffusion de statistiques sur les indicateurs liés au genre et à l’environnement ont contribué à une meilleure compréhension de ces défis par les décideurs au Burkina Faso. La collaboration a cependant été retardée à plusieurs reprises par des facteurs à la fois internes (manque de stratégie, faible coordination) et externes (manque de priorisation gouvernementale du secteur, manque de ressources, faible coordination entre les acteurs, effets de la transformation de l’administration publique, mouvements sociopolitiques et défis sécuritaires).


This is an independent evaluation of Femina Hip and Hip Edutainment which sought to assess progress towards towards their Strategic Plan’s (2013-2017 extended to 2022) set outcomes and outputs, identify challenges, lessons learned and provide recommendations for future 5-year programme period. Femina Hip is a well-documented youth information and empowerment programme that aims to reach young people across Tanzania with critical knowledge and create forums for conversation. The evaluation covers the period 2013 to 2019. Overall the evaluation found the project to be relevant, efficient, effective, impactful, and largely financially and organizationally sustainable. The main upcoming task is to successfully transition from first to second generation leadership without jeopardising current credibility and undermining existing capacity. The evaluation provided several recommendations in this respect, including to prepare a transition and succession plan with systematic capacity and local leadership strengthening for 2020 to be discussed and approved by the Board.

2020:12 Evaluation of Civil Development Agency (CiDA) and its Corporate Sustainability Platforms

The project “Leadership for Sustainable Development in Georgia” is funded by Sida and implemented by Civil Development Agency (CiDA). The objective of
the evaluation was to assess the relevance and effectiveness of CiDA, its corporate responsibility platforms, and the promotion of Agenda 2030 among businesses in Georgia. As this was a baseline evaluation, the implementation of the project was not a major focus. The evaluation team, together with CiDA, considered the strengths and weaknesses of the current set up, and its future vision, mission and strategy, mainly through a set of structured workshops, which were a prominent element in the evaluation. Key stakeholders consulted considered CiDA’s work highly relevant and that it has done a lot to promote the SDGs. The evaluation included an institutional assessment which provides recommendations that CiDA should consider when developing the new strategy. Chief among these were the need to include SMART goals for monitoring key performance indicators, support from an external facilitator in the organizational restructuring process and incorporating the ability for CiDA to sell its services to support financial independence.


Building on a 2018 Mid-Term Review, this final evaluation of Sida’s regional core support to the Eastern Africa Grain Council (EAGC) assesses its achievements in terms of results, its potential to support the development of a structured grain trade in the region and its role for food security and poverty reduction. The evaluation focuses mainly on impact and potential scenarios for future support, and complements previous evaluation findings on effectiveness and sustainability. Swedish core support to EAGC has been provided since 2008 and ended in 2019. The evaluation team identified three realistic exit alternatives for Sida: providing no further funding; providing project support based on selected priority components of the EAGC portfolio; or providing core support to the implementation of the EAGC strategic plan. Based on overall positive findings and conclusions, the evaluation recommends that EAGC continue with the themes, activities and methodologies as reflected in their current strategic plan, but also develop strategic action plans in the areas of poverty orientation, climate action and gender. It is also recommended that Sida extend its core support to these activities.


The current report presents an evaluation of the Sida-supported Baltic to Black Sea Documentary Network (B2B Doc) 2017–2020. The project provides: Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. It aims to build partnerships between filmmakers in these countries and producers, film festivals and other decisionmakers in other countries; to build the capacity of filmmakers to produce high-quality documentaries of international appeal; and to contribute to greater democracy and human rights, including the right to freedom of expression and gender equality. The support provided is adjudged as highly relevant to the needs of filmmakers, activities have largely been effectively and efficiently implemented, and the project has contributed significantly to the ability of filmmakers to produce high quality documentary films, some of which
have won international recognition. However, while benefits are sustainable, the project is not currently sustainable without continued Sida funding.

2020:15 **Utvärdering av demokratistöd genom svenska partianknutna organisationer**

Swedish support through Party-Affiliated Organisations (PAOs) was initiated in 1995. The support should contribute to the development of well-functioning democratic multi-party systems and support sister parties or related political movements or organisations. This evaluation was commissioned to add knowledge, highlight lessons learnt and provide support for improvements based on an assessment of, firstly, the relevance and efficiency of the revised strategy, including the new funding mechanism, application process, and their broader implications for the second programme period, and secondly, the relevance and effectiveness of the methods used for supporting women’s political influence (WPI). This report accounts for Part I of the evaluation and is based on review of documents and interviews.

2020:16 **Evaluation of Democracy Support through Swedish Political Party Affiliated Organisations - Part II: Methods for supporting women’s political influence**

Swedish support through Party-Affiliated Organisations (PAOs) was initiated in 1995. The support should contribute to the development of well-functioning democratic multi-party systems and support sister parties or related political movements or organisations. This evaluation was commissioned to add knowledge, highlight lessons learnt and provide support for improvements based on an assessment of, firstly, the present strategy, the application process and the programming cycle, and secondly, the relevance and effectiveness of the methods used for supporting women’s political influence (WPI). In this report, the results of the second part of the evaluation are accounted for. The report is based on a global mapping of PAO methods and approaches to WPI and three case studies (Bosnia and Herzegovina and North Macedonia, Bolivia, and the Programme for Young Politicians in Africa (PYPA) and Empowering Women in Politics (EWIP) programmes), which are synthesised in this report.

2020:17 **Evaluation of Democracy Support through Swedish Political Party Affiliated Organisations - Part II: Methods for supporting women’s political influence – Annex A – Case Study Reports**

Swedish support through Party-Affiliated Organisations (PAOs) was initiated in 1995. The support should contribute to the development of well-functioning democratic multi-party systems and support sister parties or related political movements or organisations. This evaluation was commissioned to add knowledge, highlight lessons learnt and provide support for improvements based on an assessment of, firstly, the present strategy, the application process and the programming cycle, and secondly, the relevance and effectiveness of the methods used for supporting women’s political influence (WPI). In this report, the findings, conclusions and recommendations from the three case
studies conducted in Part II of the evaluation are presented. The case studies are Bolivia; Bosnia and Herzegovina and North Macedonia; and one that comprises the Programme for Young Politicians in Africa (PYP) and Empowering Women in Politics (EWIP) programmes.

2020:18  
**Albanian Police Capacity Building: From repressive force to serve communities with trust**

The object of the evaluation is the five year (2017–2020) programme “Strengthening Community Policing in Albania”, aimed at contributing to the democratic transformation of the Albanian State Police, from a repressive instrument to a service oriented institution trusted by citizens. The programmes’ overall objective is to expand the implementation by local police districts of community policing, a world-wide recognised approach by police organisations to improve relationships and cooperation with the general public. The programme’s second focus has been to combat and prevent the prevalence of domestic violence. The overall conclusion on is that the relevance of programme is well in line with the needs and priorities of the government. Community policing is a well-established concept in Albania. There is evidence of a contribution to behavioural changes of the police in the two pilot regions, Elbasan and Kukës. Albanian citizens have increased their trust in the police. The programme is implemented efficiently and has provided value in relation to invested economic and human resources. Coordination with other international donors could improve. The evaluators are positive to the idea that Sida through the Embassy of Sweden should of e third phase of the programme.

2020:19  

The evaluation report presents the efforts taken by the Embassy of Sweden in Uganda to prevent and identify corruption in development cooperation programmes, 2015-2019. It assesses the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the Embassy’s anti-corruption work as well as the impact on the Embassy and its agreement partners. The evaluation concludes that the Embassy’s efforts are highly relevant and very effective. It is argued that the effectiveness would benefit from a more scaled approach that distinguishes between different types and levels of misuse/mismanagement/corruption with corresponding courses of action. A scaled approach where sanctions are proportionate to the offence would allow more time and effort to be dedicated to vigorously pursuing clear-cut cases of fraud and corruption. It is noted that efficiency is enhanced by the Embassy’s increased focus on prevention, particularly when compared to the high costs of recovery of funds. To ensure sustainability there is a need to institutionalize the anti-corruption practices within the Embassy and at Sida. The team concludes that the increased focus on anticorruption has had an impact on both partners and the Embassy. Furthermore, the efforts of the Embassy in preventing corruption have led to better financial management amongst agreement partners.
2020:20  Evaluation of Jönköping International Business School’s (JIBS) collaboration with Sida partner universities in Ethiopia, Rwanda and Mozambique

The objective of this evaluation was to increase the understanding of if and how the collaborations between Jönköping International Business School (JIBS), and the Addis Ababa University (AAU), the University of Rwanda (UR), and the Universidade Eduardo Mondlane (UEM) in Mozambique, contribute to the objectives and modalities outlined in Sida’s policy and strategies for support to research cooperation. The Evaluation Team found that JIBS’ collaboration with AAU and UR were successful in increasing the amount of research generated by the partner universities, supporting PhD students, and the development of in-house PhD programs. An assessment of all the evidence collected leads the Evaluation Team to conclude that ownership of the collaborations has rested with JIBS to a significant extent. Recommendations focus on instituting a results-based approach to reporting to Sida at the proposal stage, as well as forming a proposal that is tailored to the partner universities’ needs and what JIBS can offer. Realistic outputs and outcomes should be established based on thorough due diligence and needs analysis.

2020:21  Evaluation of the Swedish Resource Base

Under the Strategy for Capacity Development, Partnership and Methods that Support the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Sida funds 11 different programmes focused on developing the Swedish resource base in relation to international development cooperation. The evaluation purpose is to provide Sida with input for strategic development of new programmes to meet the Strategy’s objectives. It is framed by three overarching questions that relate to relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency. The programmes are generally efficiently managed, but there is scope for improvements. Taken together, the portfolio of Swedish resource base programmes are generally relevant to strengthening the resource base. All have had positive or very positive effects on the career development of most participants and some participants have contributed to important change through their deployments. The resource base programmes focus on individuals gaining competences, but a lynchpin assumption is that these individuals share the knowledge and skills gained. Promoting institutional learning, exchange, and knowledge-sharing is the weakest aspect of the resource base programmes.

2020:22  Evaluation: Stimulating SME growth and enhancing market and economic development, Bosnia and Herzegovina

An evaluation of the Swedish supported “Small Business Act Project” focusing on the enabling environment for businesses and “Challenge 2.0 Project” providing direct support to small and medium enterprises found that both projects were relevant, on track to achieve the expected results and making important contributions through: strengthened policy and laws and, and access to catalytic finance for innovative and inclusive business ideas. The evaluation pointed to the need for greater coordination among donors, for closer
cooperation with the EU association efforts as well as prioritising continuity in the portfolio given the complexity of the institutional landscape.

**Evaluation of the Sida-supported Education Program for Results (EPforR) 2014–2021, Tanzania**

The current report presents a joint evaluation by Sida and the Government of Tanzania of the Education Program for Results (EPforR) 2014–2021, Tanzania. EPforR is supported by Sida, Department for International Development (DFID) and the World Bank (with the Global Partnership for Education and Korean International Cooperation Agency joining more recently). The overall objective of the EPforR is ‘to improve education quality in Tanzanian primary and secondary schools’. To achieve this objective, and following the Program for Results mechanism, EPforR has a range of Disbursement-Linked Results (DLRs), measured by a small number of Disbursement-Linked Indicators (DLIs) for each DLR. Funds are disbursed annually based on the successful delivery of agreed results, which funds may then be used by Government for anything within the education sector. Given that it is essentially incentivises Government to implement its own basic education policies and priorities, the support provided is adjudged as highly relevant to the needs in basic education in Tanzania. Although results vary across the DLRs, EPforR has generally been very effective, with aggregate annual performance ranging from a low of 69% in Year 1 to highs of 84% in Years 2 and 5. Focusing as it does on institutional development (with some individual capacity development for key Government staff), the programme has achieved a high level of sustainability of results, although the report notes that some results may not be sustainable without additional technical and financial support. Since Sida will soon begin a process to formulate future support to basic education in Tanzania, the report also includes recommendations for consideration by those formulating the new support.
The table below shows central (previously strategic) evaluations published by Sida between 2016-2021 (May). Summaries of the evaluations can be found in Annex D. The publications can be downloaded from [www.sida.se/publications](http://www.sida.se/publications).

### Joint Evaluation Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2020:1 | Greening Development Co-Operation: Lessons from the OECD Development Assistance Committee  
| 2020:2 | Greening Development Co-Operation: Sweden Report  

### Sida Evaluation Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021:2</td>
<td>Evaluation of Sida’s Model for Bilateral Research Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:2A</td>
<td>Evaluation of the application and effects of a Human Rights Based Approach to development: Lessons learnt from Swedish development cooperation. What works well, less well and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:2B</td>
<td>Evaluation of the application and effects of a Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA): Lessons learnt from Swedish development cooperation, what works well, less well &amp; why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:2</td>
<td>Evaluation of Sida’s Support to Peacebuilding in Conflict and Post-conflict Contexts – Bosnia and Herzegovina Country Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:1</td>
<td>Evaluation of Sida’s Global Challenge Funds. Lessons from a Decade Long Journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:3</td>
<td>Evaluation of Swedish Leadership for Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:1</td>
<td>Evaluation of Sida’s use of guarantees for market development and poverty reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:2</td>
<td>Utvärdering av ändamålsenligheten i Sidas arbete med insatshantering – Slutrapport (ENG: Evaluation of the extent to which Sida's contribution management system is fit for its purpose – Final report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sida Studies in Evaluation Series**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020:1</td>
<td>Evaluation at Sida – Annual Report 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020:2</td>
<td>Meta-study of Partner-led Evaluations 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:1</td>
<td>Evaluation at Sida – Annual Report 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019:2</td>
<td>Environment and climate change integration in Sida’s development cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018:1</td>
<td>Evaluation at Sida – Annual Report 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016:1</td>
<td>Evaluation at Sida – Annual Report 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This annex includes brief presentations of central (previously strategic) evaluations from 2019 until May 2021. They are listed according to publication number. The reports and short evaluation briefs can be downloaded from Publications | Sida.

### Joint Evaluation Series

#### 2020:1 Greening Development Co-Operation: Lessons from the OECD Development Assistance Committee

The OECD undertook a peer-learning exercise on environmental and climate mainstreaming in development co-operation to support OECD members. Central to the exercise was the extent to which the environmental dimension of sustainable development is managed and mainstreamed into the operations through policies, strategies, risk assessments, goal and result management and follow-up as well as through staff development. Sida, Canada, the European Commission and the European Investment Bank were examined and welcomed representatives from DAC, the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), Department for International Development (DFID), Switzerland, Austria, the EU and Canada. Lessons on environment mainstreaming were formulated around the five building blocks of i) strong policy commitment and leadership; ii) robust systems, processes and tools; iii) capacity and continuous skill development; iv) shared knowledge, learning and engagement; and v) well-supported country systems. **Originally published by OECD, 2019:** [https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/greening-development-co-operation_89ea74d7-en](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/greening-development-co-operation_89ea74d7-en)

#### 2020:2 Greening Development Co-Operation: Sweden Report

The OECD undertook a peer-learning exercise on environmental and climate integration in development co-operation to support OECD members. Central to the exercise was the extent to which the environmental dimension of sustainable development is managed and integrated into the operations through policies, strategies, risk assessments, goal and result management and follow-up as well as through staff development. Sida, Canada, the European Commission and the European Investment Bank were examined and welcomed representatives from DAC, the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), Department for International Development (DFID), Switzerland, Austria, the EU and Canada. The review found that Sida has a comprehensive framework for environmental measures that has enabled integration of the environment and climate into its main roles.
as financier, analyst and dialogue partner. It also noted that Sida is in a position to challenge and support international partners in raising their environmental ambitions. The review also concluded that there are major challenges for environmental integration in Swedish development cooperation. Among other things, it was noted that integration of environment and climate is predominant in the planning phase of contribution. For increased impact, more focus is needed in implementation.

Nine recommendations, with concrete proposals, were made in five main areas: mandate, system and process support, leadership and capacity, learning and dialogue. Originally published by OECD, 2019: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/greening-development-co-operation_89ea74d7-en

Sida Evaluation Series

2021:1


The purpose of this Mid-Term Evaluation is to provide a strategic assessment of the implementation and results of Sida’s Power Africa Project (PAP) as well an assessment of PAP’s organisational dimension and learning opportunities within Sida. The evaluation confirms that PAP, mid-term, is well on its way to reach its set targets. In addition, new approaches to energy sector development cooperation have been established within Sida, the partnership base has been broadened, and new methods for mobilising investments beyond development finance have been developed and applied. The evaluation concludes that PAP as an organisational model is highly relevant for other areas of development cooperation. Furthermore, the evaluation provides a number of recommendations on how to scale the PAP approach to further enhance its transformative impact on sustainable development.

2021:2

Evaluation of Sida’s model for bilateral research cooperation

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide an overall assessment of the extent to which Sida’s model for bilateral research cooperation, its’ System Approach and Basic Logic, contribute to research capacity in low-income countries. The programmes have reached many of their stated goals in terms of research capacity development (PhD graduates), an improved research environment (management and infrastructure) and outputs in the form of academic publications. At the same time, there is a set of common challenges related to the extent to which the Sida model strengthen research of high-quality and relevance to poverty reduction and the sustainability of the programme post-Sida’s interventions. Building on evaluation findings and theories of institutional change, the evaluation concludes that the Sida model has not given sufficient attention to research groups and networks as agents of change. Such a focus will not only lead to a different programme focus and dynamic, but also contribute to making the programme more sustainable beyond Sida support.
Evaluation of the application and effects of a Human Rights Based Approach to development: Lessons learnt from Swedish development cooperation. What works well, less well and why?

This report presents the findings, conclusions and recommendations from an evaluation of the application and effects of a Human Rights Based Approach in Swedish development cooperation from 2010–2019 to find out what has worked well, less well, and why? The evaluation included four country case studies (Albania, Cambodia, Colombia and Kenya), and was based on document review and interviews with key stakeholders during the period May 2019 to May 2020. The case study reports are included in Volume II of this evaluation. The evaluation finds that there is often no clear distinction in purpose – whether by Sida, embassies of Sweden or co-operation partners in-country – between applying a HRBA and putting advancement of human rights at the centre of work. The evaluation also finds that an important effect of Sweden’s application of a HRBA is that it has strengthened and clarified the country’s commitment to promoting and protecting human rights through international development cooperation. The application of the HRBA, and the enactment in practice of the principles of this approach has been the basis for principled, long-term support to actors who share the goal of promoting development towards a more open society.

Evaluation of the application and effects of a Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA): Lessons learnt from Swedish development cooperation, what works well, less well & why?

This report presents the findings and conclusions from four country case studies on the application and effects of a Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) in Albania, Cambodia, Colombia and Kenya. These country case studies form part of a larger evaluation, commissioned by Sida’s Evaluation Unit, which aims to systematise knowledge and learning and to generate lessons on what has worked well, less well and why, by understanding how and to what extent a HRBA is applied in Swedish development cooperation. The four countries were identified through a ‘most likely’ case selection strategy, oriented towards strategic HRBA efforts made in these countries. Data collection and analysis took place November 2019 – May 2020, drawing on document review, interviews with key informants and group discussions. Volume I contains the full evaluation report, which includes a synthesis of these case studies and presents recommendations for Sida’s future efforts in championing human rights through the application of a HRBA.

Evaluation of Sida’s support to peacebuilding in conflict and post-conflict contexts. Synthesis report and country reports for Bosnia and Herzegovina, Guatemala, Rwanda and Somalia

This report presents a synthesis of the findings from the evaluation of Sida’s support to peacebuilding in conflict and post-conflict contexts since the early 1990s. It has been commissioned by Sida and undertaken by Tana.
Copenhagen. The evaluation assesses Sida’s approach and support to peacebuilding at the strategic level and seeks to identify what has worked well and what has worked less well. To do so, it draws from four country evaluations of Sida’s support to peacebuilding in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Guatemala, Rwanda and Somalia. The evaluation finds that Sida’s support has been relevant to the general context in the four countries. While Sida has played an important role in supporting processes that have contributed to positive change and has managed to identify and utilise opportunities to support peacebuilding, underlying conflict factors remain and continue to undermine sustainable peace. The alignment of Swedish strategies and underlying Sida documentation to specific peacebuilding needs has been weak because, with some exceptions, it has failed to sufficiently target the key root causes of conflict. The report includes recommendations to strengthen Sida’s peacebuilding engagement.
Annex E  Sida’s Central evaluation plan 2021

Three evaluations of strategic interest to Sida have been commissioned in 2021. In addition, an evaluability study carried out in 2020, will prepare for a full-scale evaluation to be commissioned in 2022. The central evaluation plan is the result of a consultative process within Sida where evaluation plans from 30 operating units and embassies have provided a basis for discussions with directors and policy specialists. In addition to the central evaluations, some 30 decentralised evaluations are planned to be commissioned by Sida's operational units and embassies.

Planned evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sida’s approach to democratization in different contexts (2022)</td>
<td>Democracy and other sector support to democratization, country portfolio, change logic/theory, regime, relevance and impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ongoing evaluations (August 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term effects of support to basic education</td>
<td>Impact, sustainability, learning, modalities, system approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida’s support towards food security as part of a wider food system</td>
<td>Critical factors sustainable food systems, poverty, hunger, learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country programme support to UNFPA, UNICEF and UN Women</td>
<td>Financing modalities, development effectiveness, learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluations commissioned by Sida and Swedish Embassies are published by Sida and available for free from our publication database at [https://www.sida.se/English/publications/publicationsearch/](https://www.sida.se/English/publications/publicationsearch/).

For more information on evaluation at Sida, visit [https://www.sida.se/English/how-we-work/evaluation/](https://www.sida.se/English/how-we-work/evaluation/) where you can find evaluation briefs from major evaluations commissioned by Sida, download Sida’s guidelines and manual for evaluation and more. Sida’s Evaluation Unit can be contacted through [evaluation@sida.se](mailto:evaluation@sida.se)
Annex F Sources of information

**Information systems**
Sida’s internal planning system for contributions (PLANit)
Sida’s internal tool for result management and appraisal of contributions (Trac)
Sida’s publication database at [www.sida.se](http://www.sida.se)

**Reports**


Evaluation at Sida
Annual Report 2020

The purpose of the annual report is to provide an overview of what and how Sida evaluates along with observations on emerging issues and lessons that can be used to strengthen evaluation at Sida and the effects of Sweden’s development cooperation. The report covers 23 decentralised evaluations commissioned by Sida and foreign missions. The majority of these decentralised evaluations were project or programme evaluations. The evaluations were carried out within 14 out of Sweden’s 44 geographic and thematic strategies and concerned about half of Sida’s eleven main sectors. Three central evaluations of strategic importance to Sida were completed in 2020. The central evaluations concern Sida’s work with a Human Rights Based Approach, the Power Africa project and Sida’s model for bilateral research cooperation. They offer lessons of value for Sida’s ongoing change agenda to attain its vision and mission 2023. Brief summaries are provided for all evaluations – central as well as decentralised – completed and published in 2020.