Central Evaluation of Conflict Sensitivity in Sida's Development and Humanitarian Cooperation

Annex list

Sida

Table of contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms

A	Assumption
CA	Conflict analysis
E	External factor
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FCDO	Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office of the United Kingdom
HDP	Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus
I	Impact
ILO	International Labour Organization
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
JPO	Junior Program Officer
LTO	Long-term outcome
MDPA	Multi-Dimensional Poverty Analysis
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning
MTO	Medium-term outcome
NATO	North-Atlantic Treaty Organization
O	Output
STO	Short-term outcome
ToC	Theory of Change
WBT	Western Balkans and Türkiye

Terms of Reference for the Central Evaluation of Sida's work with the conflict perspective

Date: 22 August 2023

1. Background

1.1 General information

The Swedish Government formulates Sweden's development cooperation framework and strategies. The objective of Swedish development cooperation is to create opportunities for people living in poverty and under oppression to improve their living conditions. Sida, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, is Sweden's main governmental agency responsible for Sweden's development cooperation. As other Swedish governmental agencies, Sida works independently within the framework established by the Parliament and the Government of Sweden, who decide on the financial limits as well as the focus and overarching content of the cooperation. Sida has four main assignments:

- Sida finances partners through fund disbursements or by sharing financial risks to mobilise further resources (for example with the guarantee instrument)
- Sida mobilises engagement and develops capacity
- Sida engages in dialogue for normative change and carries out global advocacy work
- Sida supports other actors with knowledge, information and statistics

For additional information, please visit Sida's website, www.sida.se

Every year Sida commissions central evaluations that are decided upon by the Director General, based on their overall strategic importance for Sida. This central evaluation is commissioned by Sida's Evaluation Unit at the Department of Operational Support in collaboration with the Department for International Organisations and Policy Support.

Sida's Evaluation Unit coordinates evaluation at Sida and has the ambition to promote a culture of learning and evaluative thinking that contributes to Swedish development cooperation of the highest quality. To ensure independence from operational and policy units and departments, the Head of the Evaluation Unit formally reports to the Director General with respect to central evaluations.

1.2 Sida's governance and work processes

Sida is governed by the Swedish government through its instruction, annual letters of appropriation, "Guidelines for strategies in Swedish development cooperation and humanitarian aid"[1], as well as the development cooperation strategies (strategies). In the instruction, the government instructs Sida to contribute to the achievement of the goal for

---

[1] Bilaga till regeringsbeslut UD 2017/21053/IU, s. 2-3

expenditure area 7 in the budget bill "to create preconditions for better living conditions for people living in poverty and under oppression".

Strategies are one of the government's instruments for the governance of development cooperation and humanitarian assistance[2]. They govern development cooperation implemented geographically in individual countries (bilateral strategies) or regions (regional strategies), through multilateral organisations, and in thematic areas (thematic strategies). Strategies are normally implemented during a five-year period and set out objectives for Swedish development cooperation and humanitarian assistance, i.e. what the cooperation will contribute to in a specific strategy period (strategy objectives). The government agency that is responsible for the implementation of a strategy drafts a proposal for the strategy. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs prepares a draft strategy based on the proposal, which is then adopted by the Government. The strategies govern the use of funds in each appropriation item in the expenditure area. There are currently 45 strategies that contains more than 400 strategy objectives in total to guide Swedish development cooperation and humanitarian assistance.

Sida has developed a framework for Multidimensional Poverty Analysis (MDPA), which captures Sida's view and approach to poverty, as well as tools and guidelines for strategy teams on how to conduct a MDPA. All operational and strategic decisions within the strategy process are to build on conclusions about multidimensional poverty in the MDPA. The MDPA contains an analysis of who is living in poverty, what that poverty looks like or how it is experienced within four different dimensions, as well as the structural causes to poverty in the development context. Most strategy teams have made a MDPA in their context.

Sida teams at Embassies of Sweden are responsible for most of the bilateral and regional strategies, while units at Sida's head office are responsible for some bilateral strategies and all thematic global strategies. The "Guidelines for strategies in Swedish development cooperation and humanitarian aid" instruct governmental agencies responsible for the strategies to operationalise the strategies by developing theories of change as well as a plan for implementation and monitoring. When a strategy is operationalised, a portfolio of contributions is developed, consisting of interventions implemented by partners. Contribution is the term used for an intervention or a project in Sida's contribution management process.

Sida's financing of partners through fund disbursements is managed in Sida's contribution management process. Sida has developed an IT application called Trac for contribution management. It is meant to guide Sida staff through the contribution management process and give support and guidance for assessments and documentation. Trac is based on and follows the Rule for managing contributions[3]. Sida's rule for managing contributions aims to ensure legitimate, efficient, coherent and results-based management of contributions.

2. The development perspectives at Sida

2.1 Introduction

According to the Swedish government's instruction to Sida[4], Sida's operations and activities should be based on five perspectives: the perspective of poor people on development; the rights perspective; the gender perspective; the environment and climate perspective, and the conflict

---

[2] Current strategies can be found here
[3] Internal Sida document, "Rule for Managing Contributions" dated 2018-06-20
[4] SFS 2015:378, Förordning om ändring i förordningen (2010:1080) med instruktion för Styrelsen för internationellt utvecklingssamarbete (Sida), SFS 2015:378 Förordning om ändring i förordningen (2010:1080) med instruktion för Styrelsen för internationellt utvecklingssamarbete (Sida) (lagboken.se)

perspective. This means that these five perspectives should be integrated in all Sida's operations.

At strategy level, the "Guidelines for strategies in Swedish development cooperation and humanitarian aid" emphasises that Swedish development cooperation shall be based on these perspectives and that they should be integrated into decision making, planning, implementation and follow-up of Sida's operations. Thus, all bilateral, regional, as well as thematic strategies must integrate the perspectives. Since the development perspectives are to be integrated into all development cooperation and humanitarian assistance, there are no explicit strategy objectives on the integration of the perspectives in the strategies.

Sida has developed a set of internal and external resources to ensure integration of the five perspectives. This includes *staff resources* in terms of policy specialists and advisors; *capacity building* through for example e-learnings (also available for partners); *toolboxes* with methodological support to staff and partners and external *helpdesk services* that can be used by all Sida staff at headquarters and Embassies. The helpdesk functions are multiyear agreements between Sida and suppliers with subject matter expertise, to assist Sida staff in integrating the perspectives into Swedish development cooperation. The helpdesks give support, on demand, by providing advice and strategic guidance on integration at policy, program and project level.

Sida has furthermore introduced *approaches to integrate the five perspectives in the MDPA*[5]. Sida's MDPA tool is currently undergoing revisions and a new version will be launched during 2023. The revision aims at making the MDPA more analytical, rather than descriptive, and provide more guidance around how conclusions from MDPAs can inform Sida's operationalisations of the government´s development cooperation strategies to a larger extent. The revised version of Sida's MDPA tool will also include changes as to how the development perspectives are integrated into the MDPA.

In the contribution management process, Sweden's partners are expected to apply the development perspectives to all project/programmes throughout the duration of their implementation, i.e. planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Each contribution should therefore be assessed and followed-up by Sida in relation to the five perspectives. To help the programme officers assess all perspectives, Sida has developed comprehensive *help-texts* for the assessment in Trac, i.e. texts explaining the questions and steps, to support the programme officers to assess a contribution. More detailed guidance can also be found in the toolboxes, such as in the Peace and Conflict Toolbox. Furthermore, in the dialogue with the partners implementing Sida-funded interventions, Sida has a possibility to ensure that the cooperation partners understand the perspectives and how they can be applied in the context of the cooperation partner.

---

[5] Sida, 2020-11-25, Gender equality and dimensions of poverty, https://cdn.sida.se/publications/files/sida62332en-gender-equality-and-dimensions-of-poverty.pdf, Sida, November 2020, The perspectives of people who are poor and dimensions of poverty, https://cdn.sida.se/app/uploads/2021/11/16104718/10205454_Poverty_Toolbox_People_Living_in_Poverty_and_Dimensions_of_Poverty_webb.pdf, Sida, November 2022, Human rights based approach and dimensions of poverty, https://cdn.sida.se/app/uploads/2022/12/13092114/10206700_Poverty_Toolbox_HRBA_web.pdf, Sida, March 2019, Environment & Climate Change and dimensions of poverty, https://cdn.sida.se/app/uploads/2021/11/16103839/10205454_Poverty_Toolbox_Environment_and_Dimensions_of_Poverty_webb.pdf, Sida, June 2018, An integrated conflict perspective and dimensions of poverty, https://cdn.sida.se/app/uploads/2021/11/16102620/10205454_Poverty_Toolbox_Conflict_Perspective_and_Dimensions_of_Poverty_webb.pdf

Sida uses OECD/DAC *policy markers* to track its contributions to specific policy objectives, as well as additional, *Sida-specific policy markers for some of the five development perspectives*. For each policy marker, contributions are classified using a scale of 0–2, where #2 represents 'principal objective', #1 'significant objective' and #0 'not targeted'.

The application of Sida's tools and systems to integrate the development perspectives throughout design, implementation, and monitoring of operations have been assessed in evaluations and other types of studies. They all point to some common challenges in integrating the perspectives into Swedish development cooperation and humanitarian assistance. One overall challenge is the complexity that the integration of the development perspectives adds to the strategy and contribution management processes at Sida. One study concludes that the amount of policies and guidelines steering these processes has led to a "mainstreaming fatigue"[6], while another evaluation states that Embassy staff and cooperation partners have reported that "[…] the demands on programme design and implementation to integrate multiple perspectives and analyses as per Swedish development cooperation policy mean that there is a risk that these get diluted and become box-ticking exercises."[7] In another evaluation, Sida staff called for broader context analyses where several perspectives are considered jointly to manage the multiple perspectives to be integrated into operations[8].

Another challenge identified in previous evaluations and studies concerning the mainstreaming of the development perspectives is the awareness of and knowledge about the development perspectives on part of programme officers, managers, and cooperation partners, resulting in the finding that "integration work is organised differently, […] based on individual perceptions of needs and goals"[9]. This implies it takes a certain level of competence to understand and apply each development perspective successfully and this varies among staff and partners. A third challenge is the difficulty for staff to distinguish between integrating the development perspectives into all development cooperation and working with them as thematic areas or sectors. The mainstreaming of a development perspective into an operation proves to be more likely if the operation has a principal or significant objective relating to the thematic focus of the development perspective.[10] Finally, earlier evaluations and studies also suggest that the mainstreaming of the development perspectives needs to be followed up to a greater extent and the results of the mainstreaming need to be monitored to a larger degree.

2.2 The conflict perspective at Sida

Sida's definition of conflict sensitivity and its distinction from peacebuilding
To Sida, the term 'conflict perspective' and conflict sensitivity are synonymous. Conflict sensitivity builds on the recognition that humanitarian assistance and development cooperation become part of the context and will have effects on it, for better or for worse. This means that interventions will inevitably impact on political and conflict dynamics regardless of whether

---

[6] Sida, 2019, "Greening Development Co-operation. Lessons from the OECD Development Assistance", https://cdn.sida.se/publications/files/sida62291en-greening-development-cooperation-lessons-from-the-oecd-development-assistance.pdf , page 42

[7] Sida, 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?", https://cdn.sida.se/publications/files/sida62333en-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.pdf, page 53,

[8] Sida, 2021, Internal review of Environment & Climate Integration in Practice. Final Report (not published), page 21

[9] Ibid., page 20

[10] Ibid. and Sida, 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?", https://cdn.sida.se/publications/files/sida62333en-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.pdf, page 61

they actively seek to influence these factors. With this comes a responsibility for all actors to take measures to minimise unintended negative impacts and maximise positive impacts on conflict dynamics within the intervention's sphere of influence.[11] This applies to all engagements, whether they are focused on directly addressing conflict or not. It applies to all sectors and thematic areas at local, national, regional, global levels and to different partners, such as civil society organisations, multilateral agencies, institutions and private sector actors. In its essence conflict sensitivity means the ability of an organisation to:

1. Understand the context;
2. Understand the two-way interaction between activities and context;
3. Act on that understanding to prevent or minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts on the peace and conflict context.

The *two-way interaction* means both how the context affects the intervention *and* how the intervention affects the context. Understanding how the context affects the intervention can be managed through *conflict analysis*[12] and through *risk assessment* and *mitigation measures* (focusing on security, financial risks etc). Understanding how the intervention affects the context requires *additional conflict analysis* and *conflict sensitivity analysis*[13].

Peacebuilding and conflict sensitivity are related but different concepts. Peacebuilding is *"a broad range of measures [...] which are explicitly guided and motivated by a primary commitment to the prevention of violent conflict and the promotion of a lasting and sustainable peace"*.[14] Peacebuilding actors work *on* conflict. Conflict sensitivity is about working *in* conflict in a responsible way and concerns all, regardless of thematic area.

Integrating the conflict perspective and its challenges
The integration of the conflict perspective largely follows the systems and routines described above. The perspective was added to the Government's instruction to Sida in 2015 and has since then been one of the five perspectives that should be integrated in Swedish development cooperation. Until 2015, it was not mandatory to assess the conflict perspective in the appraisal of contributions in Sida's contribution management system. In 2016/2017, the conflict perspective was included as a required assessment area in Trac. However, the level of details and how to treat the conclusions of these assessments still vary greatly (as explained in further detail below).

In response to this change in 2015, Sida conducted an internal mapping of its capacity to integrate the conflict perspective in 2016, which concluded that Sida has a "formal institutional desire to strengthen capacity and processes for supporting an integrated conflict perspective that is explicitly reflected in operational plans and related strategic priorities"[15]. The mapping also found that Sida increasingly addressed conflict sensitivity in operational plans, but to varying degree. The integration of the perspective was largely determined by individual

---

[11] A contribution's sphere of influence includes everything that the contribution can control or have some kind of effect on.

[12] Conflict analysis is a structured analysis to understand conflicts and risk of conflicts, which can take many different forms. The Do-No-Harm Approach focuses on a type of conflict analysis called "dividers and connectors analysis", which is helpful for understanding the conflict context in a specific programming context. For further details see the section on further recommended readings at the end of this technical note as well as Sida's technical note on conflict analysis.

[13] Conflict sensitivity analysis includes some form of self-assessment of an organisation's mission, vision, operational methods, etc., to understand ones role in the conflict context. It also includes analysing a specific programme's potential positive and negative effects on dividers and connectors in the programming context. For further details about conflict sensitivity methods and approaches, see the section on further recommended readings at the end of this technical note.

[14] OECD/DAC Issue Brief: Mainstreaming Conflict Prevention, Peace-building Overview, p. 1.

[15] Final report: Mapping of how Sida work's with an integrated conflict perspective, 2016.

knowledge and interest. Incorporating references to the perspective in guidelines and templates for strategic planning and implementation was suggested as a way of systematizing the approach.

Since 2015/2016, Sida has taken a number of measures to strengthen the integration of the conflict perspective in terms of human resources (Policy Specialists and Advisors), capacity building, methodological support, the use of conflict analyses and other relevant studies, etc. Since 2017, Sida has a Lead Policy Specialist on Peace and Security who is overall responsible for the conflict perspective together with the Senior Policy Specialist, both placed at the Policy Support Unit. Sida also has either policy specialists, advisors or focal points for the conflict perspective at most operational departments at headquarters and at some Embassies. In response to an evaluation of Sida's support to peacebuilding in conflict and post-conflict contexts, Sida committed to ensure sufficient staff resources and capacities for the thematic area 'peace and security', which also covers competences and resources in the conflict perspective. Some of these resources are gathered in Sida's hub on Human Security. This hub consist of seven members - one representative from each operational department plus the two Policy Specialists at the Policy Support unit. The purpose of the hub is to have a coordinated approach to the thematic area 'peace and security' and the conflict perspective.

In 2017, Sida launched its first peace and conflict toolbox, which includes methodological support to integrating the conflict perspective in Sida's operations – at strategy and contribution management levels. This toolbox was updated in May 2023, with a larger focus on conflict analysis guidance and following up on conflict sensitivity compared to previous tools. The same evaluation as quoted above concluded that Sida often considered the conflict perspective in the appraisal of peacebuilding contributions (which was the focus of the evaluation) but that Sida seldom follows-up on conflict sensitivity outcomes in terms of positive and potential negative effects on the peace and conflict context.

Since May 2023, Sida has an introductory level e-learning on integrated conflict perspective and peacebuilding. The course is mandatory for new Sida staff and recommended for all staff that do not have a basic knowledge of conflict sensitivity. Prior to this e-learning, Sida offered one to two face-to-face introductory level trainings per year at headquarters and has offered capacity-building workshops to units and Embassies on an on-demand basis. Sida sometimes also receives capacity-building requests from partners and has sometimes supported partners with workshops but does not have the resources to cover all needs. The newly launched e-learning will be made available to partners and a follow-up course is also planned.

At the strategy level, the conflict perspective has also been partly integrated into Sida's MDPA. The MDPA tool identifies 'lack of human security' as one of four poverty dimensions and the context analysis of the MDPA tool includes an analysis of the 'peace and conflict' context. This is not a complete conflict analysis but the tool includes key elements of a conflict analysis with focus on factors, actors and dynamics. The MDPA does not include a conflict sensitivity assessment in terms of reflecting on positive and potential negative effects on the peace and conflict context of Sida's on-going or planned strategic approach and direction. Sida often complements the MDPA with a conflict analysis. This can be done in several ways. Often the Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance is commissioned to conduct a desk-based conflict analyses, either for the whole country context, a specific geographic area or a specific thematic area that is targeted by an on-going or forthcoming development cooperation strategy. Some Embassies have also commissioned conflict analyses through other consultant services. Sometimes, Sida makes use of the conflict analysis of other likeminded actors, such as the EU. In a few countries, Sida has conducted system-based conflict analyses together with Folke Bernadotte Academy (FBA). These processes are often time-intensive and led by FBA, which has a stronger internal capacity to conduct conflict analyses compared to Sida.

At the contribution level, Sida's role is to assess the partner's institutional capacity to integrate the conflict perspective and the partner's contextual awareness and programme design. The

former is specifically important for contributions in thematic strategies, meaning when Sida provides core support or support to a global programme, fund or similar. Programme officers have access to several resources for making this assessment, including: the new e-learning, the toolbox, help texts in Trac as well as a peace and conflict advisor or focal point. Programme managers are recommended to document and motivate their assessment and to follow-up on weaknesses identified in the implementation phase. This could be made through agreement conditions, partner dialogue, field visits or other measures. Rejection or redesign of the proposal can be considered if the programme manager identifies significant conflict sensitivity risks.

As described above, Sida uses OECD/ DAC policy markers to track contributions to specific policy objectives and Sida-specific policy markers to measure the integration of thematic perspectives. For the conflict perspective, Sida uses a Conflict Prevention Policy Marker (a Sida-specific marker). However, the marker is designed to capture both the integration of the thematic area 'conflict prevention, peace and security' and conflict sensitivity. This makes it very difficult to follow-up on actual integration of the conflict perspective (i.e. conflict sensitivity). The marker shows that a total of 9 percent (same as previous year) of Sida's support in 2022 had both 'conflict prevention, peace and security' as a principle objective and an explicit conflict sensitive approach. These contributions are marked with as #2 - principle objective. 39 percent of Sida's disbursements in 2022 were marked with #1 – significant objective. These contributions could either be assessed to have 'conflict prevention, peace and security' as a secondary objective or a conflict sensitive approach. Since the policy marker considers both mainstreaming of the thematic area 'conflict prevention, peace and security' and conflict sensitivity, the policy marker may not give a true picture of the level of integration of the conflict perspective (conflict sensitivity). The policy marker can give an initial indication of the extent to which a contribution has been informed by conflict sensitivity but further data (including interviews) are needed to draw clear conclusions on these assessments. More than half of Sida's disbursements in 2022 were marked with #0 – not targeted for this policy marker. Sida needs to develop a clearer understanding of the different reasons for this. One reason could be that the perspective has been down prioritised in relation to other perspectives that might be regarded as more important in the given context and thematic focus of the contribution. Another reason could be that the programme manager has identified significant weaknesses in the partner's approach to conflict sensitivity and intends to follow-up on this during the implementation of the contribution.

In 2021, the Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance conducted a study on Sida's use of the Conflict Prevention Policy marker[16], which resulted in a much less optimistic picture of how well the studied contributions focus on conflict, peace and security in their programme objectives and how they integrate conflict sensitivity into their approach. A main lesson learnt from this study is that Sida's assessments and conclusions are not always well-documented in the partner's proposal, rather, Sida's programme managers use a lot of additional information in the assessment. To what extent this information should be documented is a constant challenge and is subject to bargain against other priorities. Many contributions, even those the Helpdesk has scored #0, may be conflict sensitive or making a targeted positive contribution to peace that is just not reflected in the documentation. However, it could also be the case that the Sida programme manager has been too positive in its assessment based on a general sense of knowledge of the partner that does not match its actual conflict sensitivity capacity.

Sida has increased its focus on the follow-up phase and would like to further develop its systems and routines for this. Sida's follow-up should focus on both processes and outcomes.

---

[16] Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance, Quality assurance of Sida conflict policy marker, 2021, Assignment Code: [SHD224].

With processes we mean weather Sida's and partners' systems and routines for integrating the conflict perspective are relevant and effectively implemented. With following up on conflict sensitivity outcomes, we mean identifying changes in the conflict context that Sida's and partners engagements have had (either positive, negative or no change). This will be a key focus of this evaluation.

3.   The assignment

3.1 Evaluation rationale

The expected results of integrating the development perspectives are described to varied degrees in Sida's guidelines and method support, but have not been subject to evaluations or studies. Previously conducted evaluations and Sida's internal reviews of the development perspectives have not included rigorous assessments of the effects of the integration of the perspectives, in terms of changes in the contexts where they are applied. Instead, the internal reviews and evaluations have focused on Sida's internal processes and management structures to enable the integration of the development perspectives. Hence, while Sida to a large extent has a well-developed understanding about how the integration of the development perspectives is to be done, there is a knowledge gap about the expected and unexpected results of the integration of the perspectives, including understanding the causal relationship from integration of the perspectives through to results for people living in poverty.

With regards to conflict sensitivity outcomes, there is a general scarcity, beyond Sida, of evaluations and analyses of how the integration of the perspective contributes to changes (either positive, negative or no change) in a given context, and how the interventions are adapted to the contexts[17]. Some internal and external information has been gathered with regards to Sida's and partners' processes, as described in section 2.2. However, conflict sensitivity outcomes – meaning changes in the conflict context that Sida's and partners' engagements have had (either positive, negative or no change) have never been evaluated in any detail.

The integration of the conflict perspective in Sida's operations has foremost focused on the contribution level. However, there is an increased agreement within Sida that the perspective also needs to be considered at the strategy level. This is essential since key strategic decisions and choices that are crucial for conflict sensitivity are taken at the strategy level. Examples of such strategic choices are thematic and geographic focus, general strategic decisions about partners, including partner selection criteria, and the development of theories of change. It is therefore very important to evaluate Sida's analysis at the strategy level throughout the strategy cycle, not least the operationalisation process. Sida needs to understand better how the peace and conflict dimension of the MDPA and separate conflict analyses inform strategic decisions, including in the operationalisation of strategies. There is also a need to enhance Sida's knowledge about the effects of integrating the conflict perspective and the intended and unintended positive and negative outcomes on the peace and conflict context that these efforts have resulted in.

3.2 Evaluation purpose: Intended use and intended users

The purpose of the evaluation is to increase knowledge and promote learning about the effects of Sida's operations on the peace and conflict contexts and in what way the operations have

---

[17] Rachel Goldwyn (CARE International UK) & Diana Chigas (CDA Collaborative Learning Projects),"Monitoring and evaluating conflict sensitivity. Methodological challenges and practical solutions", March 2013, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/3046 11/Mon-eval-conflict-sensitivity-challenges-practical-solutions.pdf

contributed to negative or positive impacts on peace and conflict dynamics. The intended use of the knowledge gained by the evaluation is to inform Sida on **prioritisation and management** of conflict sensitivity. In more concrete terms, the evaluation will:

1. Serve as input on how to integrate conflict sensitivity in the strategy process with key focus on operationalisation and implementation of strategies for Swedish development cooperation, including monitoring of results of the integration of the perspective.
2. Contribute to learning and development related to the integration of conflict sensitivity in both the strategy and the contribution management processes at Sida.

The **primary intended users** of the results and recommendations of the evaluation are:

- Heads of units and of development cooperation and programme managers at operational units at Sida and at Embassies of Sweden
- Thematic specialists and advisors in peace and human security at Sida

The **secondary intended users** are:

- Sida's cooperation partners
- Thematic specialists and advisors for the other development perspectives at Sida
- Sida's Director General and Deputy Director General
- Sida's board
- The Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Embassies

Other users are:

- International institutions and organisations engaged in development cooperation and humanitarian assistance as well as conflict sensitivity
- Other donors with whom Sweden cooperates

During the inception phase, the evaluator and the users will agree on who will be responsible for keeping the various users informed about the evaluation.

3.3 Evaluation objective: Criteria and questions

The objective of this evaluation is to evaluate the relevance, effectiveness and impact of Sida's operations in relation to conflict sensitivity in different contexts and formulate recommendations on how Sida can further prevent or minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts on peace and conflict dynamics in the contexts. The evaluation questions are:

Relevance
1) To which extent do the strategies respond to peace and conflict dynamics in the contexts, and continue to do so if circumstances change? *The evaluators are expected to consider how conflict sensitivity is integrated in Sida's strategy cycle, with key focus on the operationalisation of the strategies in the assessment of this question.*

Effectiveness
2) To which extent is the integration of conflict sensitivity in the implementation of the strategies contributing to outcomes? And if so/not, why? *The evaluators are expected to further elaborate and discuss intended outcomes of the integration of conflict sensitivity in the implementation of the strategies in the inception report.*

Impact

3) What is the overall impact of the integration of conflict sensitivity by Sida, Embassies of Sweden and Sida's cooperation partners? What has Sida contributed to? *The evaluators are expected to evaluate expected and unexpected, negative and positive results in the case study countries.*

The questions are expected to be developed in the tender by the tenderer and further refined during the inception phase of the evaluation.

3.4   Evaluation object and scope

The object of this evaluation is the integration of conflict sensitivity in Sida's operations and what results it leads to. Even though conflict sensitivity is mainly integrated in the management of contributions at Sida, the evaluation is not expected to draw conclusions about individual contributions. The focus will rather be on how the integration of conflict sensitivity at contribution level is affecting the overall strategy implementation. The evaluators therefore need to have sufficient knowledge of individual contributions to understand how they contribute to strategy objectives and overall portfolio development.

As explained earlier in these ToR, the development perspectives are to be integrated into all development cooperation and humanitarian assistance. Hence, there are no strategy objectives on the integration of the perspectives or theories of change developed for the integration of them in the strategies. The evaluators are therefore expected to further elaborate and discuss intended outcomes of the integration of conflict sensitivity in the implementation of the strategies in the inception report, including developing theories of change in relation to the integration of conflict sensitivity in each strategy. The descriptions of the pathways through which Sida has sought to minimise unintended negative impacts and maximise positive impacts on conflict dynamics in a given strategy context during the period evaluated will be used as a basis for analysis in the evaluation. The theories of change cannot be derived only from the strategies and strategy plans and reports, but need to be developed with input from Sida staff.

The time period covered by the evaluation will be suggested by the evaluators in the inception report. When setting the timeframe for the evaluation it will be important to keep in mind that evidence of impact can require longer timeframes.

The evaluation will be conducted in two phases. In the first phase, the evaluators will select at least nine strategies to answer the questions on relevance and effectiveness. Sida has elaborated criteria to ensure a broad representation of different types of contexts in the evaluation. The evaluators should apply these criteria to make a selection of relevant strategies to be included in the evaluation, and may also propose other relevant selection criteria if needed, in the inception report. The final selection criteria and selected strategies will be agreed with the intended users during the inception phase. The selection of strategies should include:

1. Bilateral, regional, and thematic strategies as well as the Strategy for Sweden's humanitarian aid provided through Sida
2. Strategies implemented in contexts with different levels of conflict and peacefulness (for bilateral and regional strategies)[18]
3. Strategies with and without strategy objectives with focus on 'peaceful and inclusive societies'
4. Strategies with different levels of disbursements marked with #0, #1 and #2 with regards to Sida's Conflict Prevention Policy Marker
5. Strategies with different implementing partner types and different funding modalities

---

[18] Sida has mapped the contexts of the bilateral strategies based on data from Uppsala Conflict Data Program, the list of fragile and conflict-affected situations by the World Bank Group, the Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project, and the Global Peace Index, please see annex A for further information.

The selection of strategies should include at least nine strategies including the Strategy for Sweden's humanitarian aid provided through Sida, at least one thematic strategy, at least one regional strategy and the rest bilateral strategies out of which three should be Ethiopia, Iraq and Tanzania.

In the first phase of the evaluation, the evaluators will collect evidence on the questions on relevance and effectiveness for the selected strategies.

Since the design of Sida's Conflict Prevention Marker is ambiguous in the sense that it both captures the integration of the thematic area 'conflict prevention, peace and security' and conflict sensitivity, it will be important to establish how the marker has been used and the reasons behind different assessments of interventions.

In relation to Sida's need to better understand how strategies respond to peace and conflict dynamics, it will be important to assess what types of conflicts Sida is considering in its analyses and if significant changes in the contexts have been responded to.

In the second phase of the evaluation, the evaluators will answer the question on impact by focusing on three case study countries that have been selected by Sida: Ethiopia, Iraq, and Tanzania. The three countries have been selected based on the second, third, and fourth selection criteria outlined above. They represent contexts with different levels of conflict and peacefulness according to rankings in different data bases. The bilateral strategies for Ethiopia and Iraq include strategy objectives with focus on 'peaceful and inclusive societies' while the bilateral strategy in Tanzania do not have any strategy objective within this thematic area. The interventions funded through the bilateral strategies and the strategy for humanitarian aid in these three contexts also demonstrate different levels of integration of the conflict perspective based on available data on Sida's Conflict Prevention Policy Marker. Sida has ensured that there is willingness and ability of the Sida teams in these countries to participate as case studies in the evaluation.

Each country will be subject to its own enquiry, i.e. all evaluation questions under the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, and impact will be answered for all case study countries, as well as an overall analysis of how the integration of conflict sensitivity contributes to long-term effects in the contexts, and how Sida's operations are adapted to changes in the peace and conflict context. The analysis at country level should primarily be framed around the bilateral strategy portfolio for each particular country, but should also take into account interventions implemented in the country which are included in the portfolio of the strategy for humanitarian aid. If relevant and deemed as feasible, the assessment of impact at country level can also take into account interventions funded through portfolios of the thematic and regional strategies selected in the first phase of the evaluation. The evaluators are expected to select relevant interventions/ contributions to assess impact during the inception phase.

4. Evaluation Design

4.1 Evaluation approach and methods

Sida's approach to evaluation is utilisation-focused, which means the evaluators must facilitate the entire evaluation process with careful consideration of how all aspects of the evaluation will affect the use of the evaluation. Therefore, the evaluation must be planned and conducted in ways to enhance the utilisation of both the findings and of the process itself, to inform decisions and improve performance. This approach entails close interaction between the

evaluators and users as well as other relevant stakeholders in the evaluation assignment. This interaction must continue throughout the entire evaluation process, from planning to implementation, to reporting and dissemination. An important component of this interactive, participatory approach is to enable joint knowledge creation between evaluators and the users of the evaluation. In Sida's view, this approach enhances learning during and after the evaluation process.

Please note that in line with Sida's utilisation-focused approach, the evaluation process should be adapted to major context changes if needed, to ensure that the evaluation always continues to serve the overall purpose/intended use.

The evaluation is to be designed, conducted and reported to meet the needs of the intended users. The evaluators shall elaborate in the tender how the needs of the intended users will be ensured during and after the evaluation process.

It is expected that the evaluators in the tender describes and justifies an appropriate evaluation design and methods for data collection and analysis, which are later to be developed in more detail and presented in the inception report. The inception report should therefore include an assessment of the evaluability of the evaluation questions as well as any resulting adjustments that need to be made to the evaluation design that was proposed in the tender.

The evaluators should suggest an evaluation design that can provide credible answers (evidence) to the evaluation questions using scientific methodologies, to ensure reliable conclusions and a high degree of transparency. Limitations to the chosen evaluation design and methods shall be made explicit by the evaluator and the consequences of these limitations discussed in the tender. The evaluator shall to the extent possible present mitigation measures to address them. A clear distinction should be made between the overall evaluation design and specific data collection methods. Assumptions underpinning the choice of evaluation design and methods should be outlined (e.g. availability of data), to reflect possible reasons that the design may need to be altered during the inception phase. A gender-responsive approach/methodology, methods, tools and data analysis techniques should be used[19].

The documentation of Sida's application of conflict sensitivity varies. Conflict sensitivity considerations can be implicit in both Sida's and partners' analyses and working methods. Therefore, gathering evidence in the form of tacit knowledge will probably be needed to capture Sida's practices to a full extent. This means Sida staff, partners and target groups can sometimes be the main sources of information.

In cases where sensitive or confidential issues are to be addressed in the evaluation, evaluators should ensure an evaluation design and process including the use of tools, that do not put informants and stakeholders at risk in any step of the evaluation process. A dialogue shall take place between the evaluators and the intended users throughout the assignment in regards to information security.

The methodological considerations to include in the tender are:

- How to facilitate process use, i.e. how to create space for reflection, discussion and learning with the intended users throughout the evaluation process
- How conclusions will be generalised beyond the observations and data generated during the evaluation, such as relevant sampling methodologies

---

[19] See for example the checklist for assessing gender-responsiveness of evaluations on page 36 in "Good practices in gender-responsive evaluations", Independent Evaluation Service) of the Independent Evaluation and Audit Services of UN Women good-practices-in-gender-responsive-evaluations-en.pdf (unwomen.org), page 33 in OECD (2021), "Applying evaluation criteria thoughtfully", OECD Publishing, Paris, and pages 20-55 in OECD (2023) "Applying a human rights and gender equality lens to the OECD evaluation criteria", Best Practices in Development Co-operation, OECD Publishing, Paris.

- How the assessment of the integration of conflict sensitivity at contribution level will inform analysis and conclusions about how the integration is affecting overall strategy implementation
- How evaluation questions will be operationalised, i.e. how they will be interpreted, assessed and measured
- How data will be collected and processed for each evaluation question as required by the chosen evaluation design
- How source criticism will be undertaken, including how potential risks will be identified and handled
- How data will be analysed, including how causality will be inferred
- How the Do No Harm principle will be ensured throughout the evaluation

4.2 Organisation of evaluation management

This evaluation is commissioned by the Evaluation Unit at Sida. The commissioner of the evaluation has approved these terms of reference and will approve the inception report and the final report of the evaluation.

Two bodies have been created to manage and advise the evaluation:

- The steering group (SG); with representatives from the Evaluation Unit and from operational and thematic units, will be the evaluation team's main counterpart throughout the evaluation. The steering group has a managing role and will provide feedback on all deliverables as well as be in continuous dialogue with the evaluation team to ensure the quality of deliverables
- The reference group (RG); will provide input at various specific points during the evaluation process and will participate when relevant in workshops. The reference group is composed by internal Sida staff (thematic and country experts as well management representatives) and external experts.

4.3 Evaluation quality

All Sida's evaluations shall conform to OECD/DAC's Quality Standards for Development Evaluation[20]. The evaluators shall use the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation[21] and the OECD/DAC Better Criteria for Better Evaluation[22]. When relevant, the evaluations shall use the OECD Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies[23] as well as the OEDC/DAC Evaluating Peacebuilding Activities in Settings of Conflict and Fragility: Improving Learning for Results[24].

The evaluators shall specify how quality assurance will be handled by them during the evaluation process

4.4 Time schedule and deliverables

---

[20] OECD (2010) *DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation.*

[21] Sida (2014) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management.*

[22] OECD/DAC (2019) *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use.*

[23] OECD (1999) *Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies.*

[24] OECD (2012) *Evaluating Peacebuilding Activities in Settings of Conflict and Fragility: Improving Learning for Results.*

The evaluation shall be carried out between **December 2023 – January 2025** and will include several phases with specific deliverables expected for each phase. The phases with deliverables are described below.

The inception report will form the basis for the continued evaluation process and shall be approved by Sida before the evaluation proceeds with the implementation. The inception report shall be written in English.

The inception report should also cover evaluability issues and interpretations of evaluation questions – and present the evaluation design based on this, while explaining any adjustments that need to be made to the evaluation design that was proposed in the tender. Methods for data collection and analysis, including an **evaluation matrix** should be included. A clear distinction between the evaluation design and methods for data collection and analysis shall be made. All limitations to the evaluation design and methods shall be made explicit, in addition to any remaining underlying assumptions. The consequences of these limitations and assumptions for the evaluation outputs should be discussed.

The inception report should describe how an utilisation-focused and gender-responsive approach will be ensured during the evaluation. The inception report shall include a **stakeholder analysis**, where stakeholders with a direct interest in the evaluation are identified (e.g. intended users, commissioners, implementers), as well as stakeholders with an indirect interest (e.g. those who will be influenced by the evaluation or are consulted – experts, right holders, etc). The different stakeholders' interest or value in the evaluation process, as well as their participation/ role in it, should be described. Furthermore, the report shall include a discussion about who has an interest in the success or failure of the object of evaluation being evaluated, and an analysis of how this might affect the evaluation. The inception report should therefore include a clear **description of stakeholder participation**. During the inception phase, the evaluation team and the steering group will agree on who will be responsible for keeping the users informed about the evaluation and how to ensure their participation.

The theories of change will need to be developed by the evaluation team during the inception phase. Any major underlying factors and assumptions will need to be described. These theories of change shall be developed in a participatory manner with relevant Sida staff at Sida's head office and Swedish Embassies.

A specific **time and work plan**, including number of hours/working days for each team member, for the remainder of the evaluation should be presented in the inception report. The time plan shall allow space for reflection and learning for the intended users of the evaluation.

During the data collection and analysis phase, the evaluators will implement the data collection and analysis plan developed during the inception phase. As mentioned above, an important component of Sida's utilisation-focused approach is to enable joint knowledge creation between the evaluators and the users of the evaluation. The evaluators therefore need to plan for and conduct **participatory workshops** with the users of the evaluation in a manner relevant to this particular evaluation.

The final report should be no more than 60 pages, excluding annexes. It shall be written in English. The report should be written in a plain, clear and unambiguous language. It should be easily understood by the primary users of the evaluation, as defined in these ToR, and the form of the report should be appropriate given the purpose(s) of the evaluation. It should have a clear structure and follow the format and instructions outlined in Sida's report template for central evaluations (see Annex C). To assure these goals the report should be professionally proof read.

The executive summary of the final report should be maximum of 5 pages. In the executive summary the most important information (e.g. key findings) should be presented as early as possible in the text. The executive summary should easily be understood by all intended audience(s), including both primary and secondary users. Hence, in terms of the accessibility

of the language, the requirements are higher for the executive summary than for the rest of the report.

The final report shall describe the purpose of the evaluation, specifically who will use the evaluation and for what. It should also describe how the utilisation-focused approach has been implemented during the evaluation. This includes how intended users have participated in – and contributed to – the evaluation process, and how evaluation design and methods for data collection have created space for reflection, discussion and learning between the intended users. Furthermore, the gender-responsive approach shall be described and reflected in the findings, conclusions and recommendations along with other identified and relevant cross-cutting issues as outlined in these ToR.

The evaluation questions addressed in the report shall be clearly stated and answered in the executive summary and in the conclusions. The report should include reliable, clear definitions of any classifications that are used when answering the evaluation questions, meaning that there is a clear description of under what conditions the object will be classified as belonging to a specific category (e.g. what it means to be "coherent", "relevant" etc in the evaluation context). The operationalisations should be valid, i.e. they should make sense in terms of what they are aiming to measure and it should be clear how they were applied to reach the resulting conclusions.

The report shall clearly describe the evaluation design in detail. This description can be added as an annex to the report with a short summary in the main narrative of the report. It should include:

- How the evaluation was adapted to the context
- How process use was facilitated, i.e. how space for reflection, discussion and learning with the intended users was created
- How evaluation questions were operationalised, i.e. how they were interpreted and measured
- How data was collected and processed for each evaluation question as required by the chosen evaluation design
- How source criticism was conducted, including how potential risks were identified and handled, such as possible biases of respondents, recall problems, and instances when the respondents could not be considered to be primary data sources. This also includes how the evaluation dealt with gathering evidence of the undocumented processes and practices of Sida's application of conflict sensitivity.
- How data was analysed, including how causality was inferred
- The limitations to the evaluation design and methods and the consequences of these limitations for each finding and conclusion
- How conclusions were generalised beyond the observations and data generated during the evaluation, such as relevant sampling methodologies
- How the assessment of the integration of conflict sensitivity at contribution level informed analysis and conclusions about how the integration affects overall strategy implementation and achievement of strategy objectives
- How the Do No Harm principle was ensured throughout the evaluation.

Evaluation findings shall flow logically from the data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions should be substantiated by findings and analysis, meaning each conclusion should be presented in a way that clarifies what evidence it is based on and how trustworthy that evidence is. This is particularly important in any instances of causal inference. Similarly, where findings are generalised beyond the evaluation object it should be made clear what the generalisation is based on and how trustworthy it is.

Findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned should be presented separately and with a clear distinction between them. Recommendations should flow logically from conclusions and be specific and directed to relevant intended users. It should be clear which recommendations are most important to address.

The final report annexes shall always include the ToR, the stakeholder analysis[25] and the evaluation matrix. The inception report should *not* be included in the final report annexes. However, major diversions from the assignment as outlined in these ToR, should be described in an "ex-post" evaluation design annex. Here the evaluators can copy or summarise relevant parts from the inception report and explain further adjustments that needed to be made to the overall evaluation design or specific methods during the data collection and analysis phase.

The final report annexes can also include evaluation management issues, e.g. who was consulted when and key meetings that were held. Lists of key informants/interviewees shall only include personally identifiable data if this is deemed safe and relevant (i.e. when it is contributing to the credibility of the evaluation) based on a case based assessment by the evaluator and the commissioning unit/mission abroad. The inclusion of personally identifiable data in the report must always be supported by written or otherwise recorded consent.

The evaluator shall, upon approval by Sida of the final report, insert the report into the Sida Evaluation layout template for central evaluations and submit it to Nordic Morning (in pdf-format) for publication and release in the Sida publication data base. The order is placed by sending the approved report to sida@nordicmorning.com, with a copy to Sida's Evaluation Unit (evaluation@sida.se). Write "Sida Evaluation" in the email subject field. The following information must always be included in the order to Nordic Morning:

1. The name of the consulting company
2. The full evaluation title
3. The invoice reference "ZZ980601"
4. Type of allocation "sakanslag"
5. Type of order "digital publicering/publikationsdatabas".

The evaluation brief shall be written in English and be professionally designed, laid-out, edited and proof read. The brief should be no more than 4 pages, have clear structure and follow the format and instruction in the Sida Evaluation Brief Template (to be provided by Sida), and be approved by Sida.

It is expected that a time and work plan is presented in the tender and further detailed in the inception report. The timing of any field visits, surveys and interviews need to be settled by the evaluators in dialogue with the intended users during the inception phase. The table below lists key deliverables for the evaluation process. Deadline for each deliverable will be suggested by the evaluators in the tender and negotiated during the inception phase.

Deliverables	Participants
1. Start-up meeting	SG and evaluators
2. Draft inception report	Evaluators
3. Written comments from intended users to evaluators on inception report	SG and RG
4. Inception meeting	SG, RG, and evaluators

[25] The stakeholder analysis can be excluded if there is a good reason to do so, e.g. where it includes sensitive information. If so, this should be discussed and agreed with Sida before delivery of the final report.

5.	Final inception report	Evaluators
6.	Data collection, analysis, report writing and quality assurance	Evaluators
7.	Debriefing/validation workshop	SG, RG, and evaluators
8.	First draft evaluation report	Evaluators
9.	Written comments from intended users to evaluators on first draft evaluation report	SG and evaluators
10.	Recommendations co-creation workshop	SG, RG, and evaluators
11.	Second draft evaluation report with recommendations	Evaluators
12.	Written comments from intended users on second draft evaluation report	SG
13.	Final evaluation report	Evaluators
14.	Evaluation Brief	Evaluators
15.	Seminar on evaluation conclusions and lessons	Staff at Sida HQ, Embassies, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, cooperation partners, other donors

4.5 Evaluation team qualification

It is envisaged that the evaluation is carried out by a team consisting of one team leader and 2-4 team members. It is recommended that junior team members are included where appropriate. It is highly recommended that the evaluation team includes members from relevant country contexts, as they often have contextual knowledge that is of great value to the evaluation. It is important that the competencies of the individual team members are complimentary and that the team is composed of both women and men.

The evaluators must be independent from the evaluation object and evaluated activities, and have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.

For more details about the team qualifications, please refer to the call for tender.

4.6 Financial and human resources

The maximum budget amount available for the evaluation is 3,500,000 SEK.

Invoicing and payment shall be managed according to the following: the consultant may invoice a maximum of 30 % of the total amount after approval by Sida of the inception report and a maximum of 70 % after approval by Sida/ of the final report and when the assignment is completed.

The contact person at Sida is Moa Chenon, senior evaluation advisers, Evaluation Unit, Department for Operational Support. The contact person should be consulted if any problems arise during the evaluation process. Relevant Sida documentation will be provided by the steering group.

etc.) will be provided by the steering group of the evaluation.

The evaluator will be required to arrange the logistics including any necessary security arrangements.

5. Annexes

Annex A: List of bilateral strategies and conflict indexes

Country	Type of context			
	UCDP[26]	WB-FCS[27]	GPI[28]	ACLED[29]
Ethiopia	War	Conflict	Low	Major war
Afghanistan	3 different state-based armed conflicts	Conflict	Very low	War
Zimbabwe	No armed conflict registered	Institutional & social fragility	Low	No
Iraq	State-based armed conflict (IS)	Conflict	Very low	War
Mozambique	State-based armed conflict (IS)	Conflict	Medium	Minor conflict
Guatemala	No armed conflict registered	No	Medium	No
Colombia	Two state-based armed conflicts	No	Low	War
Bolivia	No armed conflict registered	No	Medium	No
Cuba	No armed conflict registered	No	Medium	No
Bangladesh	No armed conflict registered	No	Medium	No
Kenya	State-based armed conflict	No	Medium	No
Liberia	No armed conflict registered	No	Medium	No
Mali	Two state-based armed conflicts	Conflict	Very low	War
DR Kongo	8 different state-based armed conflicts	Conflict	Very low	War
Palestine	4 State-based armed conflicts with Israel	Institutional & social fragility	Low	Minor conflict
Russia	War	No	Very low	Major war
Rwanda	Two state-based armed conflicts	No	Medium	No
Tanzania	State-based armed conflict (IS)	No	Medium	Minor conflict
Somalia	State-based armed conflict	Conflict	Very low	War
South Sudan	State-based armed conflict	Conflict	Very low	War
Uganda	State-based armed conflict (IS)	No	Medium	No
Zambia	No armed conflict registered	No	High	No
Myanmar/Burma	7 state-based armed conflicts	Conflict	Low	Major war
Burkina Faso	State-based armed conflict	Conflict	Low	Insurgency
Sudan	War	Institutional &social fragility	Very low	No

Annex B: List of key documentation

---

[26] Uppsala Conflict Data Program
[27] The list of fragile and conflict-affected situations by the World Bank Group, https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/69b1d088e3c48ebe2cdf451e30284f04-0090082022/original/FCSList-FY23.pdf, 2023-07-07
[28] The Global Peace Index, visionofhumanity.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/GPI-2023-Web.pdf, 2023-07-07
[29] The Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project, https://acleddata.com/, 2023-07-07

All evaluations published by Sida can be found at www.sida.se

Strategies for Swedish development cooperation can be found at www.regeringen.se

Recommended reading

Guidelines for strategies in Swedish development cooperation and humanitarian aid, bilaga till regeringsbeslut UD 2017/21053/IU

SFS 2015:378, Förordning om ändring i förordningen (2010:1080) med instruktion för Styrelsen för internationellt utvecklingssamarbete (Sida), SFS 2015:378 Förordning om ändring i förordningen (2010:1080) med instruktion för Styrelsen för internationellt utvecklingssamarbete

Sida, June 2018, An integrated conflict perspective and dimensions of poverty

OECD/DAC Issue Brief: Mainstreaming Conflict Prevention, Peace-building Overview

Sida, 2016, Final report: Mapping of how Sida work's with an integrated conflict perspective

Annex C: Data sheet on the evaluation object

Information on the evaluation object (i.e. intervention)	
Title of the evaluation object	Central Evaluation of Sida's work with the conflict perspective
ID no. in PLANIt	N/A
Dox no./Archive case no.	N/A
Activity period (if applicable)	2023-2025
Agreed budget (if applicable)	N/A
Main sector	Various
Name and type of implementing organisation	Various
Aid type	Various
Swedish strategy	Various

Information on the evaluation assignment	
Commissioning unit	Evaluation Unit, Department for Operational Support
Contact person at unit	Moa Chenon
Timing of evaluation (mid-term, end-of-programme, ex-post, or other)	N/A
ID no. in PLANIt (if other than above).	16449

Annex 2 – Evaluation matrix

	EQs	Sub-questions	Data collection tool and sources	Analytical approaches
Relevance	1. To what extent do the strategies respond to peace and conflict dynamics in the contexts and thematic areas, and continue to do so if circumstances change?	1.1. Did the Sida Unit/Embassy have a good understanding of the context or thematic area? Why? How? Was a separate conflict analysis conducted or did the MDPA or other analytical document include an analysis of peace and conflict dynamics as part of the strategy operationalisation and updated in response to changes in the peace and conflict dynamics? 1.2. What is the evidence that a conflict perspective has been integrated in the operationalisation of the strategy (e.g. commissioning of a conflict analysis, support from the helpdesk, portfolio level decisions such as geographic focus)? 1.3. What processes have been put in place to integrate the conflict perspective? Did the peace and conflict context change? 1.4. What adaptations (at contribution and strategy level) were taken to respond to the change in context? Were the changes made sufficient? 1.5. How were partners selected? How did the conflict sensitivity capacity of partners factor into that decision making? 1.6. Were conflict analyses conducted as part of contributions, where necessary (either by partners or with support from the Sida Helpdesk)? 1.7. Did adaptations at the strategy level result in adaptations at the contribution level and vice versa? If not, why not? Were changes made sufficient?	Documentation: ■ Country strategies, regional strategies, global thematic strategies, and Sida's strategy operationalisation documents, incl. plans and background documents ■ Sida's annual and multi-annual (in-depth) strategy reports, etc ■ MDPAs, conflict analyses, other analytical document and related documentation ■ Administrative documentation (decisions regarding procurement, HR, risk matrices) ■ Contribution documents (e.g. appraisals, conclusion on performance reports, completion memos, evaluations) ■ Partner selection and other relevant documents. ■ Other external documentation ■ Data on peace and conflict indicators Interviews: ■ Staff of selected Sida units and Embassies ■ Agreement partners for all nine strategies, other partners in case study countries ■ Other donors and/or experts for case study strategies Survey:	■ Theory-driven analysis ■ Conflict Perspective tool ■ Rubric: Level of adaptation, Strength of evidence

	EQs	Sub-questions	Data collection tool and sources	Analytical approaches
			▪ Sida programme managers, programme specialists, National Programme Officers (NPOs) and agreement partners in the nine strategies.	
Effectiveness	2. To what extent is the integration of conflict sensitivity in the implementation of the strategies contributing to outcomes? And if so/not, why?	2.1. What evidence exists for changes at the level of short-term, medium-term and long-term outcomes in the constructed ToCs for the nine selected strategies? 2.2. How reliable is this evidence? 2.3. What assumptions in the ToCs are in place? 2.4. What evidence exists for changes in peace and conflict dynamics as a result of implementation of Sida's strategy objectives? (either positive or negative, intended or unintended)? 2.5. What is the significance of these changes? 2.6. What are the key opportunities and barriers exist for achievement of desired outcomes and how could they be addressed? 2.7. To what extent is the application of the conflict prevention marker used for measuring integration of the conflict perspective? 2.8. Have contributions that have been assessed by Sida to lack a conflict perspective lead to any unintended negative outcomes? If not, what has helped mitigate negative outcomes? 2.9. Have contributions that have been assessed by Sida to be conflict sensitive been able the mitigate risks of doing harm and maximise positive outcomes on peace and conflict dynamics?	Documentation: ▪ Sida's annual and multi-annual strategy reports ▪ Contribution documents (e.g. conclusion on performance reports, completion memos, evaluations) ▪ Partner documentation ▪ Global, regional and thematic evaluations ▪ Other external documentation ▪ Data on peace and conflict indicators. Interviews: ▪ Staff of selected Sida units and Embassies ▪ Agreement partners for all nine strategies, other partners in case study countries ▪ Other donors and/or experts for case study strategies Focus Group Discussions (FGDs): ▪ Sida partners in selected case study countries ▪ Target community members in case study countries Survey: ▪ Sida programme managers, programme specialists, NPOs and agreement partners in the nine strategies.	▪ Theory-Driven Analysis ▪ Conflict Perspective tool ▪ Contribution Analysis ▪ Rubric: Strength of evidence
Impact	3. What is the overall impact of the integration of conflict sensitivity by Sida, Embassies of Sweden and Sida's cooperation partners?	3.1. Is there any evidence of change at the level of impact in the constructed ToCs for the case study countries? 3.2. How reliable is the evidence? 3.3. What assumptions in the ToC are in place? 3.4. What is the significance of these changes?	Documentation and data: ▪ Sida's annual and multi-annual strategy reports ▪ Contribution portfolio documents (e.g. conclusion on performance reports, completion memos, evaluations, travel reports, annual review meetings)	▪ Theory-Driven Analysis ▪ Conflict Perspective tool ▪ Contribution Analysis

EQs	Sub-questions	Data collection tool and sources	Analytical approaches
What has Sida contributed to?	3.5. What evidence exists for the contribution of Sida's, Embassy of Sweden's, and partners' to changes in peace and conflict dynamics (positive and negative) at this level? 3.6. What was the relative contribution of other development interventions and external factors? 3.7. What unintended effects – both positive and negative – of Sida's support can be identified? 3.8. What lessons can be learned from integrating conflict perspective for impact?	▪ Global, regional and thematic evaluations ▪ Partner documentation ▪ Other external documentation ▪ Data on peace and conflict indicators. Interviews: ▪ Staff of selected Sida departments and units ▪ Embassy staff in case study countries ▪ Sida partners in case study countries ▪ Other donors and/or experts for case study strategies FGDs: ▪ Sida partners in case study countries ▪ Target community members in case study countries Survey: ▪ Sida programme managers, programme specialists, NPOs and agreement partners for the case study strategies.	▪ Rubric: Strength of evidence, Significance of change, level of Sida's contribution

Annex 3 – Conflict perspective tool

The conflict perspective tool is meant to be flexible enough to be used for all nine strategies. As such, for each strategy some of the features may be revised or completely removed before application. The tool is composed of questions and sub questions, and matching indicators, and sources of evidence for each question. The indicators are not intended to be applied rigidly and quantitatively whereby fulfilment of all indicators is necessary for a certain factor to be in place. Rather the indicators are to be used as part of a holistic assessment, where the fulfilment of one or two factors may be enough to determine a certain element is in place.

"Relevant" in the questions below has two meanings. 1) the first is to enable us to tailor the question(s) to the context of each strategy. For example, some of these activities/actions and therefore questions may not be relevant in a country without conflict or with a low conflict context, such as Bolivia. 2) second, we will consider whether Sida had an accurate understanding of the context. This will be based on the perception of Sida staff themselves, partners, other donors, and comparison with some other conflict analyses and information on the peace and conflict dynamics.

"Team expert judgement" means that the experts in the team will use their expertise as part of the analysis to be able to consider available information and draw useful, relevant insights from the data. We define an expert as someone "broad and/or deep understanding and competence; has extensive knowledge, skills and practice experience"[1], so this will only be used by relevant members of the team. This is a level of competence that means judgement is based on a high level of expertise and critical understanding that allows an expert to be able to consider available information and reach conclusions quickly and without having to repeat a time-consuming analysis process. The added value is that is that it provides another element to be considered in weighing (or triangulating) the evidence and reaching conclusion(s). The team has experts with a deep knowledge of conflict sensitivity practices in different peace and conflict environments and thorough understanding of the peace and conflict dynamics in several of the countries under review. The legitimate use of experts (especially subject matter or local experts) is a well-known practice in program evaluation.[2] We have added it as an indicator in the tool below to be transparent, but it is not about drawing on new criteria and indicators, only to clarify our analytical process.

---

[1] This is based on ongoing work of quality assurer, Penny Hawkins.

[2] Entry in Michael Scriven, *'Evaluation Thesaurus'* (4th edn), 1991, SAGE Publications: EXPERTISE: The legitimate use of experts (especially subject matter or local experts) is a well-known practice in program evaluation.

One source of evidence is documentation. In this tool we have used 'analytical document' as an all-encompassing term to denote several different types of analyses used by Sida that we will review:

- Multidimensional poverty analysis (MDPA): primarily concerned with capturing how poverty manifests itself but also considers the conflict and peace context.[3]
- Gender analysis: focuses on analysing a gender equality situation in a given context and may include how this effected by peace and conflict dynamics.[4]
- Humanitarian Crisis Analysis: concerned with humanitarian situation and response.

They are not conflict analyses but may have relevant information and contribute to Sida's understanding of the peace and conflict dynamics. These analyses will not be held to the same standard as conflict analyses. The questions and criteria are intended to ascertain what information they contributed, and to be of a holistic assessment of whether Sida had a 'good enough' understanding of peace and conflict dynamics to integrate the conflict perspective to achieved desired outcomes and impact.

---

[3] Sida, *Multidimensional poverty analysis (MDPA):How to analyse poverty,* June 2024, https://cdn.sida.se/app/uploads/2024/06/13135253/62693_MDPA-How-to-analyse-poverty_WEB.pdf

[4] Sida, *Gender analysis – Principles and Elements,* March 2015, https://cdn.sida.se/publications/files/sida61853en-gender-analysis-principles-elements.pdf

EQ	ToC	Conflict perspective tool	Indicators	Source of evidence (Phase 1)	Source of evidence (Phase 2)
EQ1		Part A: Level of adaptation			
		1. Strategy: understanding of the context/thematic area			
EQ1.1	O	Did the Sida unit/Embassy have a good understanding of the context? How?	Perceptions of Sida and partners, for the non-case study strategies, Perceptions of Sida, partners, other donors, experts, others for the case study strategies Description of efforts to maintain a good understanding of the conflict Alignment of efforts with criteria set out in the Sida peace and conflict toolbox Evidence of participation in consultation/briefings on the context with partners for non-case study strategies Evidence of participation in consultation/briefings on the context with other donors, partners, experts for case study strategies Team's expert judgement	Interviews: Sida staff Survey: Sida staff, partners	Interviews, FGDs: Sida staff/Embassy/partners/others (donors, experts, individuals from target community etc) Documentation: External documentation related to specific area, other donor reporting, peace and conflict data
EQ1.1	O	Was a separate high quality conflict analysis conducted? (detailed criteria boxes below)	Perceptions of Sida, partners, Alignment with external conflict analysis Alignment with the Sida peace and conflict toolbox (captured in the sub-questions below) Team's expert judgement	Documentation: CA and related documents, external expert and donor documents Interviews: Sida staff Survey: Sida staff	
		Did the conflict analysis identify relevant conflict dividers and connectors?	Yes/no		
		Did the conflict analysis identify relevant conflicts and tensions (political, economic, gender relations, and socio-cultural, context)?	Yes/no		
		Did the conflict analysis identify relevant conflict causes, conflict drivers, sources of tension, and (potential triggers)?	Yes/no		

EQ	ToC	Conflict perspective tool	Indicators	Source of evidence (Phase 1)	Source of evidence (Phase 2)
		If relevant, did the conflict analysis identify the main institutions and actors relevant to the conflict(s)?	Yes/no		
		If relevant, did the conflict analysis identify the main actors'/stakeholders interests and incentive structures and ideas (goals, positions, capacities, and relationships)?	Yes/no		
		If relevant, did the conflict analysis consider how different identified groups (ethnic, religious, clan, faction, gender, sexual orientation etc.) are impacted by conflict on the lives of women, men, boys and girls are considered?	Yes/no		
		If relevant, did the conflict analysis consider how different identified groups (ethnic, religious, clan, faction, gender, sexual orientation etc.) can drive peace?	Yes/no		
		Did the conflict analysis identify opportunities for peace?	Yes/no		
		Does the conflict analysis reflect a variety of sources and voices (for example, covering conflict parties' perspectives, women's organisations, and local experts, gender, age, class, ethnicity)?	Number and variety of references in conflict analyses Consultations with a variety of perspectives as part of conflict analysis process Perceptions of Sida, partners,	Documentation: CA and related documents. Interviews: Sida staff, partners	Interviews, FGDs: Sida/Embassy/partners/others
EQ1.1	O	Did the analytical document include a high-quality analysis of the peace and conflict context? (criteria detailed below)	Perceptions of Sida, partners, Alignment with external conflict analysis or other documentation on peace and conflict dynamics Alignment with the Sida peace and conflict toolbox (captured in the sub-questions below) Team's expert judgement	Documentation: analytical document and related documents, external expert and donor documents Interviews: Sida staff Survey: Sida staff	
		Did the analytical document identify relevant conflict dividers and connectors?	Yes/no		

EQ	ToC	Conflict perspective tool	Indicators	Source of evidence (Phase 1)	Source of evidence (Phase 2)
		Did the analytical document identify relevant conflicts and tensions (political, economic, gender relations, and socio-cultural, context)?	Yes/no		
		Did the analytical document identify relevant conflict causes, conflict drivers, sources of tension, and (potential triggers)?	Yes/no		
		If relevant, did the analytical document identify the main institutions and actors relevant to the conflict(s)?	Yes/no		
		If relevant, did the analytical document identify the main actors'/stakeholders' interests and incentive structures and ideas (goals, positions, capacities, and relationships)?	Yes/no		
		If relevant, did the analytical document consider how different identified groups (ethnic, religious, clan, faction, gender, sexual orientation etc.) are impacted by conflict on the lives of women, men, boys and girls are considered?	Yes/no		
		If relevant, did the analytical document consider how different identified groups (ethnic, religious, clan, faction, gender, sexual orientation etc.) can drive peace?	Yes/no		
		Did the analytical document identify opportunities for peace?	Yes/no		
		Does the analytical document reflect a variety of sources and voices (for example, covering conflict parties' perspectives, women's organisations, and local experts, gender, age, class, ethnicity)?	Number and variety of references in analysis Consultations with a variety of perspectives as part of analysis process Perceptions of Sida, partners	Documentation: analytical document Interviews: Sida staff, partners	Interviews, FGDs: Sida/Embassy/partners/others
EQ1.1	O	Did Sida/the Embassy maintain an up-to-date understanding of the context, and the peace and conflict dynamics?	Description of ongoing efforts Evidence that relevant analytical document(s) are updated regularly evidence that yearly strategy plans and reports were up to date with the context	Interviews: Sida staff Survey: Sida staff, partners Documentation: CA and other analytical documents, strategy plans and reports.	Interviews, FGDs: Sida/Embassy/partners/others

EQ	ToC	Conflict perspective tool	Indicators	Source of evidence (Phase 1)	Source of evidence (Phase 2)
			Commissioning of helpdesk assignments on the context Perceptions of Sida and partners, for the non-case study strategies, Perceptions of Sida, partners, other donors, experts, others for the case study strategies Team expert judgement		
		2. Strategy: Conflict perspective tailored strategy operationalisation and plan			
EQ1.2, 1.3,1.5	STO	Was the strategy operationalisation and plan effectively tailored to peace and conflict dynamics (including the nexus between the conflict perspective and gender dynamics)? Why/why not? How?	Perception of Sida, partners for non-case study strategies Perceptions of Sida, partners, other donors, experts, others for the case study strategies Alignment with Sida's peace and conflict toolbox Team's expert judgement	Documentation: CA, other analytical documents, strategy operationalisation documents and reports Interviews: Sida staff, partners External: other donor, partners, and peace and conflict data on the conflict context	Interviews, FGDs: Sida/Embassy/partners/others
		If relevant, did the strategy operationalisation and plan reflect on and was tailored to root causes of the conflict, connectors and dividers as defined in the analysis of the context/thematic area? (e.g. portfolio; geographical distribution, composition, choice of partners, target community)	Alignment between CA, other analytical documents and strategy operationalisation Relevant conflict causes, structural drivers, connectors, dividers, and opportunities for peace are reflected in the documentation Perceptions of Sida Team's expert judgement	Documentation: Internal CA, other analytical documents, strategy operationalisation documents and reports External: other donor, partner, and peace and conflict data on the conflict context Interviews: Sida staff	Interviews, FGDs: Sida/Embassy/partners/others
		If relevant, did Sida/Embassy explicitly reflect on perceptions of the implementing partners by relevant stakeholders, including conflict parties?	Yes/No	Interviews: Sida staff, partners	Interviews, FGDs: Sida/Embassy/partners/others

EQ	ToC	Conflict perspective tool	Indicators	Source of evidence (Phase 1)	Source of evidence (Phase 2)
		If relevant, did the strategy operationalisation outline measures to prevent and mitigate identified conflict risks?	Evidence of a risk register or similar Perceptions of Sida	Documentation: Strategy operationalisation documents	Interviews: Sida/Embassy
		If relevant, did the strategy operationalisation identify and target opportunities to support positive change for peace (inclusion of different groups, participation of local partners, geographical target, delegitimising certain actors. etc.)?	Evidence of concrete opportunities identified Perception of Sida, partners for non-case study strategies Perception of Sida/partners/other donors/experts for the case study strategies Team's expert judgement	Documentation: Strategy operationalisation documents Interviews: Sida staff	Interviews: Sida/Embassy/partners/others
		If relevant, did the strategy operationalisation include decisions on how to interact with identified risks?	Evidence of strategy plans (written and unwritten) for risk interaction Perception of Sida Team's expert judgement	Documentation: Strategy operationalisation documents Interviews: Sida staff	Interviews: Sida/Embassy
		If relevant, did Sida unit/Embassy choose implementing partners that had the capacity to work with the conflict perspective? Where relevant, did it consider partners' capacity to work with the nexus between the conflict perspective and gender dynamics?	Partner's capacity detailed in appraisal Alignment with conflict sensitivity capacity as detailed in Sida's peace and conflict toolbox Perception of Sida, partners for non-case study strategies Perception of Sida, partners, other donors, experts for the case study strategies	Strategy operationalisation documents, appraisals Interviews: Sida staff, partners	Interviews, FGDs: Sida/Embassy/partners/others
		3. Strategy: Conflict perspective tailored strategy implementation and MEL			
EQ 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3,	STO	Was the strategy implemented in a conflict sensitive manner? Why/why not? How?	Perception of Sida, partners for non-case study strategies Perception of Sida, partners, other donors, experts for the case study strategies Evidence of incentive structures Evidence of leadership	Documentation: Strategy reports Interviews: Sida staff, partner Survey: Sida staff partners	Interviews: Sida/Embassy/partners/others
		What opportunities and challenges did Sida unit/Embassy face regarding the integration of the conflict perspective?	Evidence of documenting learning (written and unwritten)	Interviews: Sida staff Documentation: Written sources such as strategy reports, meeting minutes	Interviews: Sida staff, partner
		Are there any areas where Sida/Embassy staff would appreciate further support to be able to	Perception of Sida, embassy staff	Interviews: Sida staff	

EQ	ToC	Conflict perspective tool	Indicators	Source of evidence (Phase 1)	Source of evidence (Phase 2)
		better integrate the conflict perspective? If so, what?			
		Did Sida unit/Embassy generate and disseminate learning about the integration of the conflict perspective to improve outcomes and impact? Is there evidence that Sida unit/Embassy learned from lessons on the integration of the conflict perspective?	Evidence off processes and culture for adaptive management Evidence of learning (written and unwritten) Perceptions of Sida/Embassy/partners	Interviews: Sida staff Documentation: Strategy reports, learning material	Interviews: Sida staff, partners.
EQ1.3, 1.7, 2.1	MTO	Was the strategy plan and implementation adapted to respond to changes in the peace and conflict dynamics? Why/why not? How?	Description of changes in strategy plan and implementation/new strategy as a result of changes in conflict context (written and unwritten) Description of changes in implementation Perception of Sida, partners for non-case study strategies Perception of Sida, partners, other donors, experts for the case study strategies	Documentation: Strategy plans and reports, external documentation on peace and conflict dynamics Interviews: Sida staff Survey: Sida staff, partners	Interviews, FGDs: Sida staff and Ambassador, partners and others Documentation: Review of further contribution documentation, other donor reports, evaluations (if available)
EQ2.7	MTO	Did Sida unit/Embassy correctly and systematically use the conflict prevention marker to monitor the integration of the conflict perspective across the portfolio? Why/why not? How did they do this?	Correct recording of the policy marker in the contribution management system Description of how the policy marker should be applied Description of monitoring overall integration of the conflict perspective in the portfolio using the marker	Documentation: appraisals, Sida data Interviews: Sida staff, partners	
EQ1.7	MTO	Did these changes lead to changes at the contribution level (downstream)?	Description of changes (written and unwritten)	Documentation: strategy plan and reports Interviews: Sida staff, partners	Interviews: Sida staff, partners
		4. Contribution: Understanding of context/thematic area			
EQ1.5	STO	Did partners have a good understanding of the context? Why? How?	Perception of Sida, partners for non-case study strategies Perception of Sida, partners, other donors, experts for the case study strategies	Interviews: Sida staff, partners Survey: Sida staff, partners	Interviews: Sida/Embassy/partners/others

EQ	ToC	Conflict perspective tool	Indicators	Source of evidence (Phase 1)	Source of evidence (Phase 2)
			Quality of conflict analysis as evidenced by alignment with Sida peace and conflict toolbox (if available) Description of process taken to understand the context (includes variety of perspectives, based on reliable sources) Team's expert judgement		
EQ1.5	O	Did the partner maintain an updated understanding of the context/thematic area?	Frequency of updates to conflict analysis during contribution period and reasons why (written and unwritten) Evidence of ongoing efforts to maintain an up-to-date understanding of the context Perception of Sida, partners for non-case study strategies Perception of Sida, partners, other donors, experts for the case study strategies	Documentation: Conclusion on performance, Completion memo. Interviews: Sida staff partners	Interviews: Sida/Embassy/partner/other Documentation: Review of partner documentation
		5. Contribution: Conflict perspective tailored design and implementation			
EQ2.1, 2.2, 2.3	STO	Was the contribution designed in a conflict sensitive manner (including considering the nexus between the conflict perspective and gender dynamics)? Why/why not? How?	Perception of Sida, partners for non-case study strategies Perception of Sida and partners, other donors, experts target community, target community members for the case study strategies Contribution design was tailored to the root causes of the conflict, connectors, and dividers Evidence of risk mitigation measures Evidence opportunities for peace and social cohesion were identified Adequate budget for implementation of conflict perspective Team's expert judgement	Documentation: Contribution documentation Interviews: Sida staff partners	Interview, FGDs: Sida/Embassy/partners Documentation: Review of further contribution documentation.
EQ2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6	STO	Was the contribution implemented in a conflict sensitive manner (including considering the	Perception of Sida, partners for non-case study strategies	Documentation: Contribution documentation	Interview, FGDs: Sida/Embassy/partners/others

EQ	ToC	Conflict perspective tool	Indicators	Source of evidence (Phase 1)	Source of evidence (Phase 2)
		nexus between the conflict perspective and gender dynamics)? How?	Perception of Sida and partners, other donors, experts target community, target community members for the case study strategies Evidence processes for preventing and mitigating risk were implemented Evidence of maximising opportunities for peace and social cohesion (if possible) Evidence of appropriate monitoring and learning processes for CP integration Evidence of organisational learning on integrating CP Team's expert judgement	Interviews: Sida staff, partners	Documentation: Review of further contribution documentation, other donor reports, evaluations (if available)
		What opportunities and challenges did Sida unit/Embassy/implementing partner(s) face regarding the integration of the conflict perspective?	Perception of Sida and partners	Documentation: Contribution documentation Interviews: Sida staff, partners	Interviews: Sida/Embassy/partners
EQ1.7, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3	MTO	Did Sida/implementing partner(s) adapt the contribution to respond to changes in the conflict context? How?	Perception of Sida, partners for non-case study strategies Perception of Sida and partners, other donors, experts target community, target community members for the case study strategies Description of changes in strategy plan and implementation/new strategy as a result of changes in conflict context (written and unwritten) Description of changes in implementation	Documentation: Strategy reports Interviews: Sida staff Survey: Sida staff, partners	Interviews: Sida staff, partner, other donors, experts Documentation: Review of further contribution documentation, other donor reports, evaluations (if available)
EQ2.7	MTO	Did Sida unit/Embassy correctly and systematically use the conflict prevention policy marker to monitor the integration of the conflict perspective in this specific contribution? Why/why not? How did they do this?	Correct recording of the policy marker in the contribution management system Description of how the policy marker should be applied	Appraisal, Sida data, Statistics Handbook, Peace and conflict toolbox Interviews: Sida staff	
EQ1.7	MTO	Did these changes lead to changes at the strategy level (upstream)?	Description of changes (written and unwritten)	Interviews: Sida staff	Interviews: Sida staff

EQ	ToC	Conflict perspective tool	Indicators	Source of evidence (Phase 1)	Source of evidence (Phase 2)
					Documentation: Review of further contribution documentation, strategy reports and plan
		PART B. Contribution to long-term outcomes and impacts			
	LTO	**1. Long term outcomes**			
EQ2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.9		If any, what were the positive changes at the level of long-term outcomes in the ToC? Were there any unintended positive outcomes? How did these occur?	Evidence of positive outcomes (written and unwritten) Perception of Sida, partners, other donors, experts, target community members	Documentation: Conclusion of performance, completion memo, strategy report Survey: Sida staff, partners Interviews: Sida staff, partners	Documentation: further review of partner reports, further contribution documents, and review external documentation such as evaluations, data on peace and conflict trends, published expert analysis (if available) Interviews: Sida, Embassy, partners, target community, others
		Please see ToC and the detailed outcomes in relation to specific strategic objectives, e.g. conflict, peaceful and inclusive societies, poverty and inequality, governance, democracy and human rights, gender, climate, environment, natural resource management)			
		Distribution effects			
		Market effects			
		Legitimisation effects			
		Substitution effects			
		Theft/diversion			
EQ2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.8		If any, what were the negative effects at the level of long-term outcomes in the ToC? Were there any unintended negative outcomes?	Evidence of negative outcomes (written and unwritten) Perception of Sida, partners for non-case study strategies	Documentation: conclusion of performance, completion memo, strategy report Survey: Sida staff, partners Interviews: Sida staff, partners	Documentation: further review of partner reports, further contribution documents, and review external documentation such as evaluations, data on peace and

EQ	ToC	Conflict perspective tool	Indicators	Source of evidence (Phase 1)	Source of evidence (Phase 2)
			Perception of Sida and partners, other donors, experts target community, target community members for the case study strategies		conflict trends, published expert analysis (if available) Interviews: Sida, Embassy, partners, target community, other donors, experts
		Distribution effects			
		Market effects			
		Legitimisation effects			
		Substitution effects			
		Theft/diversion			
EQ2.9		If any, what pre-identified risks were realised? (e.g. conflict and tension risks realised that were foreseen by engaging with specific parties and judged to be 'acceptable' risks as part of achieving objectives)	Evidence of realised pre-identified risks (written and unwritten) Perception of Sida, partners for non-case study strategies Perception of Sida and partners, other donors, experts target community, target community members for the case study strategies	Documentation: Conclusion of performance, completion memo, strategy report Survey: Sida staff, partners Interviews: Sida staff, partners	Documentation: further review of partner reports, further contribution documents, and review external documentation such as evaluations, data on peace and conflict trends, published expert analysis (if available) Interviews: Sida, Embassy, partners, target community, other donors, experts
EQ2.3	A	Were the assumptions identified in the ToC in place?	Evidence for assumptions in ToC written and unwritten) Perception of Sida, partners for non-case study strategies Perception of Sida and partners, other donors, experts target community, target community members for the case study strategies	Documentation: conclusion of performance, completion memo, strategy report Survey: Sida staff, partners Interviews: Sida staff partners	Review of: Partner reports, further contribution documents, evaluations (if available) Interviews: Sida, Embassy, partners, target community members, other donors, experts
		For each of the identified outcomes: what was the significance of this change?	Narrative description		
		Low			
		Medium			
		High			

EQ	ToC	Conflict perspective tool	Indicators	Source of evidence (Phase 1)	Source of evidence (Phase 2)
	I	**2. Impacts**			
EQ3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6	I	Were there any changes in the peace and conflict dynamics (positive and negative) at the impact level (intended as per the Toc, or unintended)?	Perceptions of Sida/Embassy/others Evidence of positive or negative (written and unwritten) changes	N/A	External documentation related to specific area, other donor reporting, peace and conflict data Interviews: Sida, Embassy, Partners, others
EQ3.5, 3.7	I	In strategy x, could Sida be seen to have contributed to this impact?	Validated contribution stories across different strategic objectives Perceptions of Sida/Embassy/stakeholders	N/A	Triangulation of all sources
EQ3.3	A	Were the assumptions identified in the ToC in place?	Validated assumptions at all stages of ToC	N/A	Triangulation of all sources
EQ3.5	E	What external factors could have influenced these results?	Validated evidence of influential external factors	N/A	External documentation related to specific area, other donor reporting, peace and conflict data Interviews: Sida, Embassy, partners, others
		For the impact: what was the significance of this change?	Narrative description		
		Low			
		Medium			
		High			
		For the impact: What was the level of Sida's contribution	Narrative description		
		Low			
		Medium			
		High			

Annex 4 – Assessment scales

	Description	Poor	Sufficient	Good
1.Level of adaptation (EQ1)	Note that this needs to be aligned to the relevance for each strategy This rubric deals with the ability of the strategy to adapt to relevant peace and conflict dynamics within the country context or thematic area and the extent to which adaptations were made as a result of broader changes in the context and due to feedback between the strategy and contribution levels to respond to changes in the context.	- Sida/Embassy's strategy operationalisation plan and implementation reflects a reasonably good understanding of the context and how it will interact with the intended portfolio of contributions, but understanding of context is not updated regularly, and implementation is not suitably tailored to this context. - The integration of the conflict perspective, including relevant risks, is not monitored and there is no evidence of learning from implementation. - No changes are made based on significant changes in the broader peace and conflict dynamics or due to feedback between the contribution level and strategy level and vice versa to respond to changes in the context.	- Sida/Embassy's strategy operationalisation and plan reflects a reasonable and continuously updated understanding of the context and how it will interact with the intended portfolio of contributions. - Implementation is tailored accordingly, with potential negative effects being considered, but potential positive change for peace are not consistently identified. - Sida/Embassy monitored the implementation of the conflict perspective but did not consistently learn from implementation. - Some changes were made at strategy level as a result to changes in context, but not across the full portfolio as required. - Some changes due to feedback between the contribution level and strategy level and vice versa were	- Sida/Embassy's strategy operationalisation and plan reflects a good and continuously updated understanding of the context and how it will interact with the intended portfolio of contributions. - Both potential negative and positive effects are considered, including strategic interaction with identified risks. - Sida/Embassy monitored the implementation of the conflict perspective and learned from implementation. - Changes were made as a result of changes in context and as a result of feedback between the contribution level and strategy level and vice versa to respond to changes in the context.

		Low	Medium	High
			made to respond to changes in the context.	
2. Significance of change (EQ2)	Refers to observed increase/decrease in the outcome/impact	Whilst there has been some progress towards the intended outcome, this is lower than anticipated and it is not considered significant for bringing about large scale and/or sustainable change for peace and conflict dynamics in the given context or thematic area.	The outcome is somewhat important for peace and conflict dynamics in the given context or thematic area.	The outcome is important for peace and conflict dynamics in the given context or thematic area.
3. Level of contribution (EQ3)	Refers to the role that Sida, and importantly, its integration of the conflict perspective, has played in the impact. This is where we weigh internal versus external factors and consider whether assumptions in the ToC were in place. This is about Sida's effects on positive change for peace and in terms of lack of negative effects.	- The impact would have been achieved with or without Sida's contribution. - Many of the assumptions in the ToC were not in place. - External factors were the ones that supported achievement of the impact.	- Sida made a difference to the achievement of the impact, but not a significant one. - Some of the assumptions in the ToC were in place. - External factors played a greater role.	- Is unlikely that the impact would have been achieved without Sida's role, be it funding or dialogue. - Key assumptions in the ToC were in place. - External factors were less significant.
4. Strength of evidence (EQ1,2,3)	The way in which this rubric will be used, will depend on the data point. For some questions, it is a factual answer so it will not be used.	There is only one reliable source of evidence (internal to Sida) or external (from partners).	Evidence comes from more than one reliable external source (partner and more independent source) and can be externally validated.	Evidence comes from multiple reliable external sources and can be externally validated.

Annex 5 – Document list

Documents referenced

Published/grey literature

Barandun, P. and Joos, Y.. 2004. Gender- and conflict-sensitive program management. Bern: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation.

Brewin, M.; Magis, M.; & Johnson, B. 2022. Mid-term Evaluation of the Project "Capacity Building for Inclusive Land Administration and Management in Liberia" (ILAMP). Final Report, 23 November 2022. Monrovia: Liberia Land Authority and Lantmäteriet.

Escóbar de Pabón, S.; Arteaga Aguilar, W.; and Hurtado Aponte, G.. 2019. Desigualdades y pobreza en Bolivia: Una perspectiva multidimensional. La Paz: Centro de Estudios para el Desarrollo Laboral y Agrario (CEDLA).

Emminghaus, C., Wallisch, S., Gbaintor-Johnson, K.M., Klauke, J., Baldin, A., Hönig, T., Pokoo, J., & Schaefer-Kehnert, J. 2024. The Long and Winding Road: Evaluation of Swedish Long-Term Development Cooperation with Liberia (2003–2021) – EBA Report 2024:02. Stockholm: Expertgruppen för biståndsanalys (EBA). ISBN (print) 978-91-988279-6-5; (web) 978-91-988279-7-2.

Ganson, B.; Jamison, A. S.; and Henisz, W. J.. 2023. International Finance Corporation Projects and Increased Armed Conflict. SSRN (The Wharton School Research Paper). DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.4540583

Garred, M.; Booth, C.; and Barnard-Webster, K.. 2018. Do No Harm & Gender. Guidance Note. Cambridge, MA: CDA Collaborative Learning Projects.

Hemson, D., Mangones, S., Pinners, E., Bryan, A., Patterson, A., & Monschein, S. 2024. Water and Energy for Food (WE4F): A Grand Challenge for Development. Final Evaluation Report. June 28, 2024. Washington, DC: Dexis Consulting Group for USAID.

Lücking, K., M. Eppler und M.S. Heinelt (2021), Exit-Prozesse in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit, Deutsches Evaluierungsinstitut der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (DEval), Bonn.

Philipine Sutz, Amaelle Seigneret, and Mary Richard. August 2019. How local rules can promote inclusive land governance, in International Institute for Environment and Development: London. p.3.

Ryan, C. & von Alvensleben, J. 2024. Analysis of Conflict Dynamics in Liberia. Prepared for Folke Bernadotte Academy (Ref 24-0074). Groningen: University of Groningen.

Wallace, Marshall. 2014. From Principle to Practice: A User's Guide to Do No Harm. Cambridge, MA: CDA Collaborative Learning Projects.

Zicherman, N.; Khan, A.; Street, A.; Heyer, H.; and Chevreau, O.. 2011. Applying conflict sensitivity in emergency response: Current practice and ways forward (HPN Paper 70). London: Overseas Development Institute (ODI).

Government of Sweden documents

Government of Sweden. 2015. SFS 2015:378 Förordning om ändring i förordningen (2010:1080) med instruktion för Styrelsen för internationellt utvecklingssamarbete (Sida). Stockholm: Svensk författningssamling.

Government of Sweden. 2025. Förordning (2025:269) med instruktion för Styrelsen för internationellt utvecklingssamarbete (Sida). Paragraph 5:8. Stockholm: Svensk författningssamling.

Government Offices of Sweden. 2021. Strategy for Sweden's Development Cooperation with Bolivia 2021–2025. Stockholm. [verify: imprint]

Government Offices of Sweden. 2022–2026. Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development, 2022–2026. Stockholm: Government Offices of Sweden. [verify: exact imprint]

Project/internal documents

Berhanu Denu Consultancy Service. 2019. Multi-dimensional Poverty Analysis in Ethiopia.

Chronic Poverty Advisory Network (CPAN), Overseas Development Institute (ODI). 2021. Tanzania – Reflection on Multi-dimensional Poverty Analysis (4 February 2021). London: ODI.

Diakonia. 2023. Regional Programme Report on "I Believe, and I Defend".

Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance. 2024. *Analysis of the Responsiveness of the Swedish Bilateral Development Cooperation to the Conflict Context(s) in Myanmar*. Sida Helpdesk Report. Stockholm: Sida.

Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance. 2022. *Ethiopia Conflict Analysis*. Sida Helpdesk Report (SHD256), 7 October 2022. Stockholm: Sida.

Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance. 2021. *Quality Assurance of Sida Conflict Policy Marker*. Sida Helpdesk Report (Assignment Code: SHD224). Stockholm: Sida.

Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance. 2021. *Mapping and Analysis of Gender Equality and Nexus/Triple Nexus in the Myanmar 2018–2022 Development Cooperation Strategy*. Sida Helpdesk Report. Stockholm: Sida.

Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance. 2021. *Regional Conflict Analysis of the Western Balkans*. Sida Helpdesk Report, 29 November 2021. Stockholm: Sida.

Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance. 2020. *Update of the Conflict Assessment of Liberia (from 2015)*. Sida Helpdesk Report, 27 April 2020. Stockholm: Sida.

Islamic Relief Worldwide. 2023. *Conflict Sensitivity and Protection in Humanitarian Programming – Pakistan Country Report*. Birmingham: Islamic Relief.

Midgley, T. & Lemlemu, D. 2020. Assessing Integration of Conflict Sensitivity in the Iraq Portfolio. Sida Helpdesk Report (SHD121-3). London: Saferworld.

Norwegian Refugee Council. 2022. *Final Report: Peacebuilding Through Shelter in Eastern DRC*. Oslo: NRC.

Permerup, Maja. 2022. Travel Report: Liberia, 3–10 December 2022. Stockholm: Sida, Africa Department.

RRI (Rights and Resources Initiative). 2023. *Annual Report 2023*. Washington, DC: Rights and Resources Initiative.

Saferworld; Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance. 2021. *Regional Conflict Analysis of the Western Balkans*. Sida Helpdesk Report. London: Saferworld.

Saferworld et al., Actor mapping for peaceful and inclusive societies in the Western Balkans and updated conflict analysis, June 2024

Saferworld et al., North Macedonia Conflict Analysis, September 2021; Embassy of Sweden Belgrade, Serbia Conflict Analysis, January 2024

Saferworld et al., Albania Conflict Analysis, May 2021

Saferworld et al., Conflict Analysis of Bosnia and Herzegovina, November 2021

Saferworld et al., Kosovo Conflict Analysis, March 2021

Sida. n.d. Modifierad fördjupad strategirapport. 2025. Resultatrapportering för hela strategiperioden. Strategin för globalt hållbar ekonomisk utveckling 2022–2026. Ärendenummer: 25/000389. Stockholm: Sida.

Sida. 2016. Mapping of how Sida works with an integrated conflict perspective: Final report.

Sida. 2023. Terms of Reference for the Central Evaluation of Sida's Work with the Conflict Perspective (Section 2.2, p.9).

Sida n.d.. Strategy plan for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development2022–2026. Stockholm: Sida.

Sida. 2020. Multidimensional Poverty Analysis (Iraq). 2020. Multidimensional Poverty Analysis 2020 (09.09.2020).

Sida. 2022. Multidimensional Poverty Analysis (Iraq). 2022. Multidimensional Poverty Analysis Iraq 2022 (Working Paper, 13.04.2022).

Sida. 2022. Contribution Appraisal: Public Finance Transparency and Accountability Programme, 2022.

Sida. 2024. Operational Strategy (2024–2026). Stockholm: Sida.

Sida. n.d.. Sida's statistics handbook.

Sida. n.d.. Trac 7.0 helptexts (Stage 1, 2 and 3).

Sida. 2023. MDPA Tanzania (November 2023). Dar es Salaam: Sida.

Sida. 2019. Multidimensional Poverty Analysis: LIBERIA, February 2019;

Sida (Technical Support Unit). 2023. Integrated Conflict Perspective in Contribution Management – A Technical Note (April 2023).

Sida. Strategiplan för Liberia. 2021–2026. Strategy plans (2021–2023, 2022–2024, 2024–2026). Stockholm: Sida.

Sida. Strategirapport för Strategin för Globalt Hållbar Ekonomisk utveckling 2022–2026. 2024. Lägesuppdatering av strategigenomförandet per den 15 mars 2024, samt resultat sedan den senaste strategirapporteringen. Stockholm: Sida.

Sida. n.d. GLOBEC Theories of Change for Strategy Objectives 2, 4 and 9.

UNICEF Ethiopia. 2022. Cash-Plus Evaluation Report.

United Nations Tanzania. 2016. United Nations Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP II) July 2016 – June 2021. Dar es Salaam: United Nations Tanzania.

United Nations Tanzania. 2017. Kigoma Joint Programme: Executive Summary. Dar es Salaam: UNFPA Tanzania.

United Nations Tanzania. 2023. Kigoma Joint Programme Phase II (KJP II) – Programme Document. New York: UN Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) Office.

UNMAS Iraq. 2022. *Annual Programme Report*. Baghdad: UNMAS.

UNAMI. 2023. *Final Report on Electoral Assistance and Gender-Based Violence Mitigation*. Baghdad: UNAMI.

The Carter Center. 2023. *Evaluation of the Access to Justice Project – Liberia*. Atlanta: The Carter Center.

SLU Global. 2023. *AgriFoSe2030 Programme Impact Summary: Kenya and Burkina Faso*. Uppsala: Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences.

We Effect & TAWLA. 2024. *Final Evaluation Report – Parallel Land Tenure Support Programme*. Dar es Salaam: We Effect.

Electronic sources

www.sida.se/en/for-partners/methods-materials/peace-and-conflict-toolbox (accessed 11 August 2025)

https://analisisdeconflictos.unirbolivia.org/#productos (accessed 11 August 2025)

https://asiafoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Myanmar_Lessons-from-Foreign-Assistance-for-Peacebuilding-in-Myanmar.pdf (accessed 11 August 2025)

www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/rohingya-crisis-myanmar (accessed 11 August 2025)

https://acleddata.com/knowledge-base/acled-methodology-and-coding-decisions-around-political-violence-and-demonstrations-in-myanmar/ (accessed 11 August 2025)

https://cabinet.iq/en (accessed 11 August 2025)

Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, Uppsala Conflict Data Program: Turkey. https://ucdp.uu.se/country/640 (accessed 14 August 2025)

Strategy and contribution documents reviewed

Strategy	Documents reviewed
Bolivia	2019 CEDLA MDPA Book
Bolivia	AÌŠrsplan Bolivia 2016 151027
Bolivia	Bolivia 2016-2020
Bolivia	Bolivia 2021-2025
Bolivia	Bolivia_Strategiplan_2019-2021_Svenska_20181212
Bolivia	Strategiplan Bolivia 2021 (3 december 2020)
Bolivia	Strategiplan Bolivia 2022-2023 (2.12
Bolivia	Strategiplan Bolivia 2023-2024 oǐ˙versatt (28 november 2022)
Bolivia	Strategiplan Bolivia 2024 (11 dec
Bolivia	Strategiplan Bolivia slutlig 2020
Bolivia	Strategirapport-Bolivia-200315
Bolivia	Strategirapport-Bolivia-2021
Bolivia	Strategirapport-Bolivia-2022-23
Bolivia	Strategirapport-ar-1-Bolivia-2021-22.03
Bolivia	Strategy plan Bolivia 2021
Bolivia	Strategy plan Bolivia 2022
Bolivia	Strategy plan Bolivia 2023
Bolivia	Strategy plan Bolivia 2024
Bolivia	Strategy report Bolivia 2021

Bolivia	Strategy report Bolivia 2022
Bolivia	Strategy report Bolivia 2023
Bolivia	Verksamhetsplan Bolivia FINAL
Bolivia	!GRANT AGREEMENT_UNIR
Bolivia	!UNIR_Amendment_Signed_FINAL
Bolivia	2022 FAO Conclusion on Performance (15626)
Bolivia	220308_Simplified contribution_Sustainable Forrest PROFIN_KA
Bolivia	Amendment of agreement
Bolivia	Anexo B1 Proyecto ASDI
Bolivia	Appraisal Plan
Bolivia	Appraisal of Intervention (15626)_FAO new programme
Bolivia	Appraisal of Intervention (15755)
Bolivia	Completion Memo (13723)
Bolivia	Conclusion on Performance may 2024
Bolivia	Conclusion on Performance (13723)
Bolivia	Conclusion on Performance (15755)
Bolivia	Conclusion on Performance 20241024
Bolivia	Convenio Suecia firmado
Bolivia	Decision on Contribution (13723) (1)
Bolivia	Decision on Contribution (15080)
Bolivia	Decision on Contribution (15626)_FAO new contribution
Bolivia	Decision on contribution_PROFIN BID LAB
Bolivia	Documentation of Quality Assurance (simplified appraisal) (13723)
Bolivia	Documentation of Quality Assurance (simplified appraisal) (15080)
Bolivia	FAO Agreement Ecosystems Signed
Bolivia	INFORME NARRATIVO FAO_SUECIA
Bolivia	Informe Narrativo Anual ASDI_al 29-02-2024
Bolivia	Note to the File_Minor Amendment PROFIN (15080)
Bolivia	PRODOC MLV ASDI English
Bolivia	QAC Consortium
Bolivia	Statement on report 2023 (13723)2
Bolivia	Statement on report 2023 (15755) (1)
Bolivia	Statement on report Narrative and financial may24
Bolivia	T-QAC Minutes
Bolivia	TQAC Minutes - support VDSV 2022-2025
Bolivia	TQAC UNIR
Bolivia	UM2021_27158_LAPA-38 !!!Decision on Amendment of Contribution (13472)FINAL_FU
Bolivia	UM2021_44557_LAPA-31 First Amendment PROFIN Guarayos_signed 10371303_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_08595_LAPA-20 First Amendment FAO_EU Sweden Support_Signed 10550813_1_1 (1)
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-11 Appraisal of Intervention (15206)_CI Bolivia 2022-2025 8677663_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-15 Agreement_signed 8704437_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-15 Annex A_signed 8704438_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-15 Annex B_signed 8704439_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-15 Annex C_signed 8704440_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-15 Annex D_signed 8704441_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-15 Annex E_signed 8704442_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-3 T-QAC Minutes_CI Bolivia 'Mi Bosque-mifuturo' - signed 8411992_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-38 Statement on report - Narrative and Finacial reports (Dec2022-May2023) (10578857_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-4 Appraisal Plan (15206)_signed FU 8448172_1_1

Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-42 Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (15206) 10579122_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-45 1st Amendment CI Bolivia 10579145_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-45 Annex A_General conditions 10579146_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-45 Annex B_Budget 10579147_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-45 Annex C_ToR Audits 10579148_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-45 Annex E_UPDATED PRODOC-CI Bolivia 10579149_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-45 Annex F - Log Framework CI Bolivia 10579150_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-45 Annex G - Original Log framework CI Bolivia 10579151_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-45 Annex H - Eligibility of costs for EU 10579152_1_1
Bolivia	UM2022_25963_LAPA-51 Conclusion on Performance (15206) 10656612_1_1
Bolivia	UNIR_Appraisal of Intervention
Bolivia	UNIR_DECISION ON CONTRIBUTION
Bolivia	_ UM2021_27158_LAPA-1 aPROYECTO SUECIA (21 oct 2021) 8657952_1_1
Bolivia	_ UM2021_27158_LAPA-1 aPROYECTO SUECIA ANEXO 1 (21 oct 2021) 8657953_1_1
Bolivia	_ UM2021_27158_LAPA-1 aPROYECTO SUECIA ANEXO 2 (21 oct 2021) 8657949_1_1
Bolivia	_ UM2021_27158_LAPA-1 aPROYECTO SUECIA ANEXO 3 (21 oct 2021) 8657950_1_1
Bolivia	_ UM2021_27158_LAPA-1 aPROYECTO SUECIA ANEXO 4 (21 oct 2021) 8657951_1_1
Bolivia	_ UM2021_27158_LAPA-16 2022 Conclusion on Performance 9075507_1_1
Bolivia	_ UM2021_44557_LAPA-31 First Amendment PROFIN Guarayos_signed 10371303_1_1
Bolivia	_ UM2022_08595_LAPA-2 TQAC_FAO 8042516_1_1
Ethiopia	0606_F~1
Ethiopia	2024_Ethiopia_Humanitarian_Response_Plan_Feb_2024
Ethiopia	4CONFL~1
Ethiopia	ANNEX5~1
Ethiopia	APPRAI~1
Ethiopia	APPRAI~2
Ethiopia	APPRAI~3
Ethiopia	Annex 10
Ethiopia	Annex 12
Ethiopia	Annex 4 Peace Programme Evaluation Report 2023-01-27 (003)
Ethiopia	Annex 8 LPI Ethiopia Outcome Harvest 2022
Ethiopia	Annex E - Conflict Analysis_May8-2023
Ethiopia	Appraisal Plan (15581)
Ethiopia	Appraisal Plan (15731) - Stage 1
Ethiopia	Appraisal Plan PPt
Ethiopia	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (10382)
Ethiopia	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (10698)
Ethiopia	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (11223)
Ethiopia	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (12629)
Ethiopia	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (14180)
Ethiopia	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment
Ethiopia	Appraisal of Intervention (13519)
Ethiopia	Appraisal of Intervention (15581)
Ethiopia	Appraisal of Intervention (15731)

Ethiopia	Appraisal of Intervention 15544
Ethiopia	Appraisal of Intervention, final (10382)
Ethiopia	Appraisal of Intervention
Ethiopia	Bilaga till regeringsbeslut 2021-03-24, UD2021-04520 EN
Ethiopia	Bilaga till regeringsbeslut 2021-03-24
Ethiopia	CO60F3~1
Ethiopia	COBF29~1
Ethiopia	CONCLU~1
Ethiopia	CONCLU~2
Ethiopia	CONCLU~4
Ethiopia	Completion Memo (10382)
Ethiopia	Completion Memo CoS (13519)
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance for Handover - Act Church of Sweden
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance (10382) - 2021
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance (10382) 2017
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance (10698) - 2020
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance (10698) - 2021
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance (10698) - 2023
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance (11223) 2020
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance (11223) 2021
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance (11223) 2022
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance (13519) (2022)
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance (14180)
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance (15581) 2024
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance - Assessment of performance (10382) 2020
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance - Assessment of performance 2019
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance Year 1 (14180)
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance for 2023
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance for Church of Sweden 2020 (13519)
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance for handover_ June 2022
Ethiopia	Conclusion on Performance
Ethiopia	Eth Summative Evaluation - Final Report
Ethiopia	Ethiopia - Priority Humanitarian Response and Critical Funding Gaps
Ethiopia	Ethiopia Acut Food Insecurity
Ethiopia	Evaluation of Country Programme Support to UNFPA Unicef and UN Women_Niras 2022_Final report
Ethiopia	Evaluation-OHCHR-Programme-Ethiopia-with Mgmt Response
Ethiopia	FINALP~1
Ethiopia	FINAL_Side_Ethiopia Gender Review _ CLEAN
Ethiopia	Final Evaluation Report - SD Project
Ethiopia	Final MDPA report 2019
Ethiopia	Final SD and CSLA MTR report
Ethiopia	IRE_Project Application Ethiopia 2024
Ethiopia	In-depth strategy report Etiopia-2019_EN
Ethiopia	MDPA_2022_FINAL
Ethiopia	MTE of the Project Advancing Democracy and Accountability to ensure
Ethiopia	Management Response - Statement to the final Evaluation (10382)
Ethiopia	NCA-PM~1
Ethiopia	Project document
Ethiopia	Regeringsbeslut, Etiopien 2022-2026
Ethiopia	SHD230 CS training Ethiopia Bilateral and Africa Regional SIGNED OFF
Ethiopia	SHD253 LIWAY Strategy Note Assessment_SIGNED OFF

Ethiopia	SHD254 Review CSSP2 conflict peacebuilding strategy SIGN OFF correct rate RM (1)
Ethiopia	SHD256 Ethiopia Conflict Analysis FINAL
Ethiopia	SHD256 Ethiopia Conflict Analysis SIGNED OFF
Ethiopia	Sammanfattande resultatuppdatering - Handover Svenska Kyrkan 2019 (13519)
Ethiopia	Save the Children MTE Report Final
Ethiopia	Strategiplan Ethiopia 2023
Ethiopia	Strategiplan Etiopien 2022
Ethiopia	Strategiplan Etiopien 2023
Ethiopia	Strategiplan Etiopien 2024 EN
Ethiopia	Strategiplan Etiopien 2024
Ethiopia	Strategirapport Etiopien 2022 ENG
Ethiopia	Strategirapport Etiopien 2022
Ethiopia	Strategirapport-2016-Etiopien
Ethiopia	Strategirapport-Etiopien-200315
Ethiopia	Strategirapport-Etiopien
Ethiopia	Strategy Report 200315 en
Ethiopia	Strategy plan Ethiopia 2016
Ethiopia	Strategy plan Ethiopia 2017
Ethiopia	Strategy plan Ethiopia 2018
Ethiopia	Strategy plan Ethiopia 2019
Ethiopia	Strategy plan Ethiopia 2020
Ethiopia	Strategy plan Ethiopia 2021
Ethiopia	Strategy plan Ethiopia 2022
Ethiopia	Strategy report Ethiopia 2016
Ethiopia	Strategy report Ethiopia 2017
Ethiopia	Strategy report Ethiopia 2019, indepth
Ethiopia	Strategy report Ethiopia 2019
Ethiopia	Strategy report Ethiopia 2020
Ethiopia	Strategy report Ethiopia 2021
Ethiopia	Strategy report Ethiopia 2022
Ethiopia	Strategy report-2016-Etiopien _EN
Ethiopia	Strategy_for_Swedens_development_cooperation_with_Ethiopia _2022-2026
Ethiopia	Strategy_for_swedens _development_with_Ethiopia_20162020
Ethiopia	foÌ^rdjupad-strategirapport-Etiopien-2019-04-15
Humanitarian Aid	008927_21 Beredning av insats NRC HUM 2021-2025 2884478_1_1
Humanitarian Aid	01. AAR Assistance for Persons with Disabilities - Iran
Humanitarian Aid	01. ERR Bangladesh
Humanitarian Aid	02. AAR Better Learning Programme - Sudan
Humanitarian Aid	07. AAR Livilhoods and Education - Mali FRENCH
Humanitarian Aid	07. Eval Livelihoods - EU - Nigeria
Humanitarian Aid	09. Eval Multi Sector - GIZ -Nigeria
Humanitarian Aid	1. Accelerated Education Programme Kenya Multi Donor Ext
Humanitarian Aid	10. Education Programme South Sudan Multi Donor Ext
Humanitarian Aid	10462 - SMR
Humanitarian Aid	11. Emergency Education ECHO Ext
Humanitarian Aid	11841 - ATHA
Humanitarian Aid	14. Evaluation Report Iran INTPA Ext
Humanitarian Aid	15. Iran Cash Review EU Ext
Humanitarian Aid	16. Livelihoods Programmes in Iraq Multi Donor Ext
Humanitarian Aid	18. Mid-Term Evaluation Multi Country GFFO Ext
Humanitarian Aid	20. Pathways for Better Education Norad Ext
Humanitarian Aid	2019 Feb Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (10482)
Humanitarian Aid	2021 Report of the Swedish Red Cross IHA
Humanitarian Aid	2022 Report of the Swedish Red Cross IHA
Humanitarian Aid	2023 Report of the Swedish Red Cross IHA

Humanitarian Aid	21. Programme Evaluation Mali SDC & Norad Ext
Humanitarian Aid	22. Rohyinja Response Evaluation Bangladesh Ext
Humanitarian Aid	2nd Amendment to the Grant Agreement 2019-06-04
Humanitarian Aid	3 NRC Burkina Faso Integrated Programmes AAR 2021
Humanitarian Aid	3. Assistance to Vulnerbale Communities USAID Libya Ext
Humanitarian Aid	3rd Amendment to the Grant Agreement 2020-07-10
Humanitarian Aid	4 NRC Chad Nigeria ISoLT AAR 2021
Humanitarian Aid	5 NRC Colombia Cash Transfers Evaluation 2021
Humanitarian Aid	5. Cash and Voucher Assistance Uganda Multi Donor Ext
Humanitarian Aid	6 NRC Colombia COVID 19 Evaluation 2021
Humanitarian Aid	6. Creating Welcoming Schools Syria CO Multi Donor Ext
Humanitarian Aid	7. DG- Near Programming Syria EU Ext
Humanitarian Aid	8. Education Consortium Iraq BPRM Ext
Humanitarian Aid	9. Education Evaluation Colombia Norwegian Embassy Ext
Humanitarian Aid	ATHA - beredning, 2018-2019 2190501_1_1 2018-02-26
Humanitarian Aid	ATHA Annual Report 020118 - Period 1 February 2018 - 31 January 2019
Humanitarian Aid	Action Against Hunger_ HUM 2021-2025 - Appraisal of Intervention (14398)
Humanitarian Aid	Afghanistan HCA 2024
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal Plan FAO
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (10462) 2908480_2_1 2021-03-11
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (10462) 2950217_2_1 2021-06-04
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (10482)
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (10482) (1)
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (10482) (2)
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (11841) 2549932_2_1 2019-05-28
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (11841) 2794675_2_1 2020-10-03
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (14395) no 11
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (14395)_Amendment 2
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (14395)_amendment 1
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (14395)_amendment 10
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (14395)_amendment 3_skyddad
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (14395)_amendment 4
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (14395)_amendment 5
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (14395)_amendment 6
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (14395)_amendment 7
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (14395)_amendment 8
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (14395)_amendment 9
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (16112)
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment - UNRWA 2021 (10482)
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment 8
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Intervention (1)
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Intervention (16112)
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Intervention FAO
Humanitarian Aid	Appraisal of Intervention OCHA 2018-2022
Humanitarian Aid	Avtal mellan Sida och Harvard College_Advanced_Training Program 2018-05-21
Humanitarian Aid	AÌŠrlig finansiell rapport paÌŠ oÌˆvergripande nivaÌŠ - Svenska MissionsraÌŠdet 2645483 20200312
Humanitarian Aid	AÌŠrlig finansiell rapport, period 01 april 2018-31 mars 2019 2645482 20200312
Humanitarian Aid	AÌŠrsberaÌˆttelse 2019 - Tro paÌŠ en baÌˆttre vaÌˆrld 2897715 20210401

Humanitarian Aid	Beredning av insats - ICRC
Humanitarian Aid	Beredning av insats, HPCR_ATHA 2018-2019 2200547_1_1 2018-03 -05
Humanitarian Aid	Beredning av insatsaÌˆndring (10462) 2211094_2_1 2018-03-28
Humanitarian Aid	Beslut om ny insats SRK 2021-2025
Humanitarian Aid	Bilaga 1 Strategiplan HUM 2021-2023 - final
Humanitarian Aid	Completion Memo (10462) 3403245_1_1 2023Â10Â06
Humanitarian Aid	Completion Memo (11630)
Humanitarian Aid	Completion Memo (11841) 3085688_2_1 2022-02-16
Humanitarian Aid	Conclusion on Performance (10462)_ OÌˆverlaÌˆmnings-PM 3121694_2_1 2022-03-30
Humanitarian Aid	Conclusion on Performance (10482)
Humanitarian Aid	Conclusion on Performance (10482) (1)
Humanitarian Aid	Conclusion on Performance (14395)
Humanitarian Aid	Conclusion on Performance (14398)
Humanitarian Aid	Conclusion on Performance - Assessment of performance (10462) 2420130_2_1 2019-03-06
Humanitarian Aid	Conclusion on Performance - Summary of Results (10462) 2420131_2_1 2019-03-06
Humanitarian Aid	Conclusion on Performance 1 FAO
Humanitarian Aid	Conclusion on Performance 2017 2023
Humanitarian Aid	Conclusion on Performance foÌˆr oÌˆverlaÌˆmning 2018-07 2278578_1_1 2018-07-11
Humanitarian Aid	DRC HCA 2024
Humanitarian Aid	Designing conflict-sensitive interventions FAO
Humanitarian Aid	Diakonia IHL Global 2017-2019 - Application 2020
Humanitarian Aid	Diakonia IHL Global 2017-2019 - Appraisal 2017-2019
Humanitarian Aid	Diakonia IHL Global 2017-2020 - Annual Report 2018
Humanitarian Aid	Diakonia IHL Global 2017-2020 - Annual Report 2019
Humanitarian Aid	Diakonia IHL Global 2017-2020 - Annual Report 2020
Humanitarian Aid	Diakonia IHL Global 2017-2020 - Completion Memo 2017-2020
Humanitarian Aid	Diakonia IHL Global 2017-2020 - Conclusion on Performance 2017
Humanitarian Aid	Diakonia IHL Global 2017-2020 - Conclusion on Performance 2017-2020
Humanitarian Aid	Diakonia IHL Global 2017-2020 - End Report 2017-2021
Humanitarian Aid	Diakonia IHL Global 2017-2020 - Statement on report 2017
Humanitarian Aid	Diakonia IHL Global 2017-2020 - Statement on report 2018
Humanitarian Aid	Diakonia IHL Global 2017-2020 - Statement on report 2019
Humanitarian Aid	Ethiopia HCA 2024
Humanitarian Aid	Evaluation of FAOâ€™s contribution to the HDP Nexus management response
Humanitarian Aid	Evaluation of FAOâ€™s contribution to the HDP Nexus report pdf
Humanitarian Aid	Final report_ 16_001077-448 Humanitarian Report 2017-2022, SMC 3396316
Humanitarian Aid	Finalise Conclusion on Performance 2017 (10482)
Humanitarian Aid	FoÌˆredragnings-PM_HUM_NRC
Humanitarian Aid	HCA 2020 Ethiopia_Final
Humanitarian Aid	HCA 2020 Iraq FINAL
Humanitarian Aid	HCA Ethiopia 2022
Humanitarian Aid	HCA Ethiopia 2023 publicering
Humanitarian Aid	HCA Ethiopia Crisis 2021
Humanitarian Aid	HCA Iraq 2022
Humanitarian Aid	HCA Iraq Crisis 2021
Humanitarian Aid	HUM Strategirapport foÌˆr 2022
Humanitarian Aid	HUM Strategirapport foÌˆr 2023
Humanitarian Aid	HUM-strategiplan 2024

Humanitarian Aid	Harvard University SIDA Grant Issed Report 2750574_1_1 2020-31-01
Humanitarian Aid	Initial Submission to Sida HUM 2025
Humanitarian Aid	Laÿgesrapport 2017 (10462) 2199427_2_1 2027-07-07
Humanitarian Aid	MOPAN Assessment OCHA 2021
Humanitarian Aid	MOPAN_2024_FAO_Part1_corrigendum
Humanitarian Aid	Myanmar HCA 2024
Humanitarian Aid	NRC Evaluations 2022
Humanitarian Aid	NRC Evaluations 2023
Humanitarian Aid	NRC evaluations 2021
Humanitarian Aid	OCHA Apprailsal of Contribution Amendment 2019 (11630)
Humanitarian Aid	OCHA Appraisal of Contribution Amendment 2021 (11630)
Humanitarian Aid	OCHA Appraisal of Contribution Amendment 2022 (11630)
Humanitarian Aid	Oberoende revisors rapport 2022-11-16 3228769
Humanitarian Aid	Oberoende revisors rapport Bilaga 1 _ HUM finansiell rapport 2022-11-16 3228768
Humanitarian Aid	Planera beredning Bilaga 2190568_1_1 2018-02-13
Humanitarian Aid	Planera beredning, slutgiltig, Svenska Missionsraŝdet Humanitaÿr ram 2017-2019 1984515 2017- 01 -27
Humanitarian Aid	QAT Iraq
Humanitarian Aid	Revisionsrapport 2019 2897712 20201019
Humanitarian Aid	SHD106 Analysis of SIDA Humanitarian Assistance 2018_Annex1
Humanitarian Aid	SHD107 Analysis of SIDA Humanitarian Assistance 2018_Annex2
Humanitarian Aid	SHD108 Analysis of Sida Humanitarian Assistance 2018_Annex3
Humanitarian Aid	SHD109 Synthesis report Analysis of Sida Humanitarian Assistance 2018 SIGNED OFF
Humanitarian Aid	SHD112 Report on Integration of Conflict perspective in MDPAs_Sida SIGNED OFF copy
Humanitarian Aid	SHD113 Analysis of Sida Humanitarian Assistance in 2018 SIGNED OFF
Humanitarian Aid	SHD115 Collecting experience of Triple Nexus approach Part I_SIGNED OFF
Humanitarian Aid	SHD251 Review of the gender equality capacity in humanitarian partners SIGN OFF
Humanitarian Aid	SHD251 Review of the gender equality capacity in humanitarian partners SIGN OFF (1)
Humanitarian Aid	SMR review - 191030 final report submitted 2719827 20191030
Humanitarian Aid	SRC Full Application to Sida HUM 2022
Humanitarian Aid	SRC Full Application to Sida HUM 2023
Humanitarian Aid	SRC Full Application to Sida HUM 2024
Humanitarian Aid	Sida ATHA 2018 audit certificate Period February 1 2018 to January 31 2019
Humanitarian Aid	Sida Global Report Allocation 2023-VDEF_CorrectedOct24 (002)
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on NRC reports 2021 (narrative and financial) (14395) 3243769
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on annual narrative and financial reports 2017 (10482)
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on annual report SRK 2021 (14394)
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on report (10482)
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on report (budget and annual plan) (11841) 2020-06-30
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on report - SMC Humanitarian Programme 2017 (10462) 2412960_2_1 2019-02-20
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on report - SRK Annual Report 2022
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on report - UNRWA 2018 Narrative and Financial reports (10482)

Humanitarian Aid	Statement on report - UNRWA 2019 Narrative and Financial reports (10482)
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on report 2017-2019 (10482)
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on report Annual report 2022 3386081
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on report Annual report 2023
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on report FAO 2021
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on report FAO 2022
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on report FAO 2023
Humanitarian Aid	Statement on report_ Humanitarian Report 2017-2022, SMR HUM (10462) 3396800_1_1 2023Â10Â05
Humanitarian Aid	StaÌˆllningstagande paÌŠ finansiell och narrativ rapport inkl 3071000_2_1 2022-01-28
Humanitarian Aid	StaÌˆllningstagande till rapport 2021 (10482)
Humanitarian Aid	Strategy for humanitarian aid 2017-2020
Humanitarian Aid	Strategy for humanitarian aid 2021-2025
Humanitarian Aid	Sudan HCA 2024
Humanitarian Aid	WFP Conflict sensitivity mainstreaming strategy
Humanitarian Aid	Yemen HCA 2024
Humanitarian Aid	_ 002427_18 Beredning av insats, slutgiltig 2174900_1_1
Humanitarian Aid	_ 002427_18 Beslut om insats, ICRC appeals 2018-2020_ Operations 2174898_1_1
Humanitarian Aid	_ 020822_21 Beredningsplan_Appraisal Plan Islamic Relief HUM 2022-2025 2943727_1_1
Humanitarian Aid	_ 035532_17 Review report of ICRC 301117 2150799_1_1
Humanitarian Aid	_ 16_001231-158 Final Report UNRWA Emergency Appeal Evaluation 3340509_1_1
Humanitarian Aid	_ 16_001231-162 Completion Memo UNRWA agreement 2017-2022 (10482), May 2024 3528700_1_1
Humanitarian Aid	_ 17_001318-266 Completion Memo (11781) 3397158_1_1
Humanitarian Aid	_ 21_000845-187 Conclusion on Performance (15157) 3598466_1_1
Humanitarian Aid	joint_evaluation_and_audit_of_the_unrwa_gender_equality_strategy_2016-2022
Humanitarian Aid	~ 006765_22 Appraisal of Intervention WFP (15128) 3086509_2_1
Humanitarian Aid	~ 007917_22 Appraisal of Intervention UNICEF (15213) 3091079_2_1
Humanitarian Aid	~ 008232_23 Beredning av insats_Appraisal of Intervention CBPF (16112) 3287655_1_1
Humanitarian Aid	~ 008927_21 Beredning av insats NRC HUM 2021-2025 2884478_1_1
Iraq	ESMAP 2021-2024 Agreement
Iraq	ESMAP 2021-2024 Decision to update Agreement
Iraq	ESMAP 2021-2024 Decision
Iraq	ESMAP 2021-2024 Updated Decision
Iraq	ESMAP 2021-2024 updated Agreement
Iraq	FAO IRAK 2022-2026 ENHANCE CLIMATE RESILIENCE Decision
Iraq	FAO Iraq 2022-26 Agreement
Iraq	FoÌˆrdjupad strategirapport Irak 2017-21
Iraq	Fred extrakt v8
Iraq	IRAQ_1_swedens-strategy-for-development-cooperation-with-iraq-2017-2021
Iraq	IRAQ_2_strategy-for-swedens-development-cooperation-with-iraq-20222026
Iraq	Integration of conflict sensitivity Iraq_signed off (2)
Iraq	Iraq strategy reports summary 2019-21
Iraq	MDPA Iraq 15 mars 2022
Iraq	MDPA Iraq 9 Sep 2020

Iraq	MDPA-Iraq-2022
Iraq	Regeringsbeslut UD2016-21869-MENA
Iraq	SHD102 Iraq conflict analysis submitted signed off 2017
Iraq	SHD110 Mapping of the Sida MENA portfolio from a conflict perspective, redacted
Iraq	SHD121-3 Integration of conflict sensitivity Iraq 2020
Iraq	SHD236 Iraq conflict analysis validation SIGNED OFF
Iraq	SHD248 Operationalise Iraq Strategy SIGNED OFF
Iraq	Strategiplan Irak 2020-2022
Iraq	Strategiplan foÌˆr Irak 2019-2021
Iraq	Strategirapport Irak 2017
Iraq	Strategirapport Irak 2018
Iraq	Strategirapport Irak 2021
Iraq	Strategy plan Iraq 2022
Iraq	Strategy plan Iraq 2023
Iraq	Strategy plan Iraq 2024
Iraq	Strategy report Iraq 2022
Iraq	Strategy report Iraq 2023
Iraq	UNDP FFS Iraq 2018 - 2023 Agreement
Iraq	UNDP FFS Iraq 2018 - 2023 Decision
Iraq	UNFPA Country Programme Iraq agreement update
Iraq	UNFPA Country Programme Iraq decision
Iraq	UNFPA Country Programme Iraq, Amendment to the agreemwnt with UNFPA
Iraq	UNMAS Demining phase 2 Decision
Iraq	Underlag foÌˆr utarbetande 2017-2021
Iraq	WFP Irak 2023-2027 Agreement
Iraq	WFP Irak 2023-2027 Decision
Iraq	Water and Energy for Food (WE4F) 2019-2025 Agreement
Iraq	Water and Energy for Food (WE4F) 2019-2025 Decision
Iraq	underlag infoÌˆr 2017-2021
Iraq	~ 009303_17 Underlag foÌˆr utarbetande av strategi foÌˆr utvecklingssamarbete med Irak foÌˆr perioden 2009961_1_1
Iraq	~ 24_000697-3 JaÌˆmstaÌˆlldhetsintegrering av Irakenhetens insatser hoÌˆsten 2023 3497227_1_0
Iraq	14384 Final SIDA Evaluation Report -Oxfam 3308482_1_1
Iraq	14384 Appraisal of Intervention Oxfam Irak 2020-2022 (14384) 2791780_2_1
Iraq	14384 CoP Oxfam
Iraq	Appraisal of Intervention (14616)
Iraq	Beredning av insats (14376) I3RF
Iraq	Beredning av insatsaÌˆndring (11976)
Iraq	Beredning av insatsaÌˆndring (13497), ESMAP 2021-2024 3400425_1_1
Iraq	Conclusion on Performance (14616) (1)
Iraq	Conclusion on Performance (14616)
Iraq	ESMAP Beredning av insats, ESMAP 2021-2024 (13497) 2932563_1_1
Iraq	ESMAP Sammanfattande resultatuppdatering (13497) 3418569_1_1
Iraq	FAO 16047 Appraisal of Intervention 2022-2026
Iraq	FAO 16047 Conclusion on Performance 2023
Iraq	IMS - Appraisal of Intervention (16493) - juni -23
Iraq	Internews - 12796 CoP - 2019
Iraq	Internews - 12796 Completion Memo 2024
Iraq	Sammanfattande resultatuppdatering (14376) I3RF
Iraq	UNDP FFS Appraisal of Intervention
Iraq	UNDP FFS Conclusion on Performance (11829) 3332177_1_1
Iraq	UNMAS 14271 Appraisal of Intervention 2022-2026

Iraq	UNMAS 14271 Conclusion on Performance 2023
Iraq	UNW - Appraisal of Intervention - Juli -21 14267
Iraq	UNW Conclusion of Performance 14267 - Aug -22
Iraq	_ 029045_18 Bilaga 2, Beredning av insats, Irakiska parlamentet och civila samhaÌˆllet 2317711_1_1 12530
Iraq	_ 033138_22 Avslutspromemoria - IF, Irakiska parlamentet & civila_samhaÌˆllet (12530) 3199746_1_1 12530
Iraq	_ 033448_22 Sammanfattande resultatuppdatering (12530) IF, irakiska parlamentet och civila samhaÌˆ 3201183_1_1
Iraq	_ 18_001496-102 Avslutspromemoria (12527) 3439421_1_1 - Copy
Iraq	_ 18_001496-98 Avslutspromemoria (12527), Mercy Corps, StaÌˆrkt resilience i Ninewa Irak 3423303_1_1 - Copy
Liberia	160920_LSFRP_MC_Report_14
Liberia	Appraisal_of_Contribution_Amendment_(10051)
Liberia	Appraisal_of_Contribution_Amendment_(11788)
Liberia	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (13219)2023
Liberia	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (13219)
Liberia	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment (13219) 2024
Liberia	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment 2 to UNICEF (12970)
Liberia	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment ATJ (10051)
Liberia	Appraisal of Intervention, final (10051)
Liberia	Appraisal of Intervention, final (52090074)
Liberia	Appraisal of Intervention (11788)
Liberia	Appraisal of Intervention (14829)
Liberia	Appraisal of Intervention (16471)
Liberia	Appraisal of Intervention (2)
Liberia	Appraisal of Intervention (51240018)
Liberia	Appraisal of Intervention Lantmäteriet II (11699)
Liberia	Area2 presentation
Liberia	Area2 presentation May 2021
Liberia	CBS Evaluation report final
Liberia	Central appraisal Lantmäteriet final_16471
Liberia	Completion Memo (14829)
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance - Assessment of performance 2020 (52090074)
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance - Assessment of performance
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance - Summary of Results (1)
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (10051) 2021
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (10051) 2022
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (10051) 2023
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (10051)
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (11699) 2021
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (11699) 2022
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (11699) 2024 March
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (11699) Jan 2024
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (11788)2021
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (11788) 2022
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (11788) 2023
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (11788) 2024
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (12970) 2022
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (12970) 2023
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (12970)
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (51240018) 2021
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (51240018) 2022
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (51240018) 2023
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (52090074) 2021
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (52090074) 2023
Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (52090074)

Liberia	Conclusion on Performance (52090074) 2024
Liberia	Conflict Sensitivity presentation
Liberia	Evaluation Report_Strengthening Access to Justice in Liberia_TCC
Liberia	FINAL UNE Country Portfolio Evaluation_ Report 082318
Liberia	Final LSFRP EVALUATION Report
Liberia	Final Liberia SCD_041318 (005)
Liberia	Final Project Report PRCD 2
Liberia	Fördjupad-strategirapport-Liberia-2018
Liberia	Global thematic reporting_CP support 30 May 2022 (002)
Liberia	ILAMP Final Report - 241122 - MidTerm Evaluation
Liberia	InceptionReport_ILAMP_Liberia_Final
Liberia	LEON Final Evaluation Report_30 June 2021
Liberia	Liberia-PFMRISP Progress Report -Cleaned
Liberia	Liberia 2021-2025
Liberia	Liberia Strategy Plan 2022-2024, ENG
Liberia	Liberia strategiplan 2021-2023 reviderad
Liberia	Liberia strategiplan 2024-2026
Liberia	MDPA final version 4 Feb
Liberia	MTR Report_FINAL_20 April 2016 (002)
Liberia	MTR Report_With Annexes_LBR CO_ 28Sept 2023_Cleaned
Liberia	Mid-Term Evaluation 2015
Liberia	PFMRISP Project Report October 2021 Final
Liberia	PUB_Liberia20_A5_Sustaining-Peace
Liberia	RA2 Presentation Feb 2023
Liberia	Reconciliation mapping Ellen Swedenmark 2017
Liberia	SHD120 Updated Liberia Conflict Analysis_submitted
Liberia	Spontaneous VARs Assessment Report
Liberia	Strategirapport-Liberia-200315
Liberia	Strategirapport-Liberia-2021-2025-SLUTGILTIG
Liberia	Strategirapport-Liberia
Liberia	Strategirapport-for-utvecklingssamarbetet-med-Liberia-2021-20
Liberia	Strategirapport 2020 Liberia
Liberia	Strategirapport 2022 - skriv här
Liberia	Strategirapport 2023 – skriv här
Liberia	Strategy with Liberia 2016–2020
Liberia	The-Expert-Group-for-Aid-Studies-EBA_Report-2024-02-_P1-168-
Liberia	Thematic Support to UNICEF Country Programme Appraisal Plan (12970)
Liberia	Theory of change peaceful and inclusive societies
Liberia	Travel report Liberia December 2022_final draft
Liberia	UN Women Strategic Note Sweden Interim Report 30Jun2022 FINAL
Liberia	USAID Liberia Conflcit Assessment brief 2022
Liberia	USAID Liberia Conflict Assessment report 2022
Liberia	USAID Liberia conflict vulnerability assessment 2016
Sustainable Economic Development	Annex 1 Foi̇̂rai̇̂ndringsteori maÌŠl 3 mars 2023_3305930_1_1
Sustainable Economic Development	Fordjupad-strategirapport 2021
Sustainable Economic Development	Foi̇̂rai̇̂ndringsteori - MaÌŠl 4 - Handel 230404 DOX-versi_3305793_1_1
Sustainable Economic Development	Foi̇̂rai̇̂ndringsteori MaÌŠl 1 Sysselsai̇̂ttning_3300531_1_1
Sustainable Economic Development	Foi̇̂rai̇̂ndringsteori MaÌŠl 5 Livsmedelstrygghet_3300431_1_1
Sustainable Economic Development	Foi̇̂rai̇̂ndringsteori maÌŠl 2 Kvinnors ekonomiska egenmak_3301261_1_1

Sustainable Economic Development	GLOBEC Strategirapport aÌŠr 1 2022 final
Sustainable Economic Development	GLOBEC strategiplan 2023-2025
Sustainable Economic Development	GLOBEC strategiplan 2023-2025_3289810_1_1
Sustainable Economic Development	GLOBEC strategirapport foÌˆr 2023 final
Sustainable Economic Development	MaÌŠl 3 FoÌˆraÌˆndringsteori mars 2023 Dox_3305929_1_1
Sustainable Economic Development	MaÌŠl 6 - Social trygghet_3302683_1_1
Sustainable Economic Development	MaÌŠl 7 Inhemsk Resursmobilisering_3302675_1_1
Sustainable Economic Development	MaÌŠl 8 Finansiell stabilitet 1-3_3299735_1_0
Sustainable Economic Development	MaÌŠl 9 Digitalisering FT final_3300387_1_1
Sustainable Economic Development	Strategy plan 2018
Sustainable Economic Development	Strategy plan 2019
Sustainable Economic Development	Strategy plan 2020
Sustainable Economic Development	Strategy plan 2021
Sustainable Economic Development	Strategy plan 2022
Sustainable Economic Development	Strategy report 2018
Sustainable Economic Development	Strategy report 2019
Sustainable Economic Development	Strategy report 2020
Sustainable Economic Development	Strategy report 2020, extra
Sustainable Economic Development	Strategy report 2021
Sustainable Economic Development	Strategy report 2022
Sustainable Economic Development	Sustainable economic development 2018-2022
Sustainable Economic Development	Visuell foÌˆraÌˆndringsteori MaÌŠl 5_3300432_1_0
Sustainable Economic Development	strategy-sustainable-economic-development-2022-2026
Sustainable Economic Development	008714_23 Beredning av insatsaÌˆndring (14448) 3289538_2_1
Sustainable Economic Development	011100_21 Beredning av insats (14448) 2895366_2_1
Sustainable Economic Development	028758_20 Mid Review of IFAD 2737034_1_1
Sustainable Economic Development	037036_21 Beredning av insatsaÌˆndring (14448) 3015862_2_1
Sustainable Economic Development	16_000959-317 Sammanfattande resultatuppdatering (14448) 3590310_1_1
Sustainable Economic Development	Appraisal of Intervention (14589) ITC

Sustainable Economic Development	Appraisal of Intervention AgriFose
Sustainable Economic Development	Appraisal of Intervention FFF
Sustainable Economic Development	Appraisal of Intervention FFF_2
Sustainable Economic Development	Appraisal of Intervention ILC
Sustainable Economic Development	Appraisal of Intervention ITC tidigare avtal
Sustainable Economic Development	Appraisal of Intervention RRI
Sustainable Economic Development	Appraisal of Intervention STDF
Sustainable Economic Development	Appraisal of Intervention STDF tidigare insats
Sustainable Economic Development	Appraisal of Intervention WB Digital partnership
Sustainable Economic Development	Beredning av insats (15269)
Sustainable Economic Development	Completion Memo ILC
Sustainable Economic Development	Completion Memo ITC
Sustainable Economic Development	Completion Memo STDF tidigare insats
Sustainable Economic Development	Conclusion on Performance (11700) STDF
Sustainable Economic Development	Conclusion on Performance (61055000) FFF
Sustainable Economic Development	Conclusion on Performance ITC
Sustainable Economic Development	Conclusion on Performance WWB
Sustainable Economic Development	Decision on Contribution IFAD
Sustainable Economic Development	GB-TAP Appraisal of Intervention
Sustainable Economic Development	SHD065 Helpdesk report IFC 2018
Sustainable Economic Development	SIF 2023
Sustainable Economic Development	SIF23 Report version
Sustainable Economic Development	Sammanfattande resultatuppdatering (10951) IFAD
Sustainable Economic Development	Sammanfattande resultatuppdatering (12009) WB Digital
Sustainable Economic Development	Sammanfattande resultatuppdatering (13187) AgriFose
Sustainable Economic Development	Sum resultatuppdatering (RRI)_2018 3370613_1_1
Sustainable Economic Development	_ 18_000462-496 Beredning av insatsaÌˆndring (11976) 3420389_1_1
Sustainable Economic Development	_ 18_000462-510 Sammanfattande resultatuppdatering (11976) 3526051_1_1
Tanzania	AMDT REPORT 2023
Tanzania	ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT FOR 2022-2023 FY - FINAL
Tanzania	ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT FOR 2023-24 FY - Draft

Tanzania	Agreement Amendment of EMA Project
Tanzania	Annual Progress Report EDPG-DPs -2021-2022
Tanzania	Annual Progress Report EDPG-DPs -FINAL
Tanzania	Appraisal of Contribution Amendment AMDT (51170096)
Tanzania	Appraisal of Intervention, final (51170000)
Tanzania	Completion Memo (51170038)tanzania land tenure support programme 2015-2022
Tanzania	Completion Memo51170055Zanzibar legal services centre core support 2013-2017
Tanzania	Conclusion on Performance (12829)LHRC
Tanzania	Conclusion on Performance (14693)twaweza
Tanzania	Conclusion on Performance (15725)TGNP
Tanzania	Conclusion on Performance 2021-2022
Tanzania	Conclusion on Performance 2021-2022 (PSSN phase II)
Tanzania	Conclusion on Performance 2022 - 2023
Tanzania	Conclusion on Performance 2022-2023 (PSSN phase II)
Tanzania	Contribution Completion, final (51170082)CHRAGG
Tanzania	Delegated Agreement btn Sida and DFID
Tanzania	EMA PROJECT-ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT_October 2022 (002)
Tanzania	FINAL Programme Document for Sida DFID REF Support
Tanzania	FoÌˆrdjupad-strategirapport-2016-Tanzania
Tanzania	Inception report (PSSN phase II)
Tanzania	PASS Annual Narrative Report 2023_Final
Tanzania	PASS Conclusion on Performance 2024 (10154)
Tanzania	PSSN phase II annual report 2021-2022
Tanzania	PSSN phase II annual report 2022-2023
Tanzania	Program document PSSN II
Tanzania	REVISED ANNUAL PROGRESS and FINANCIAL REPORT 2022-23
Tanzania	SA REF II Original
Tanzania	Short list of contributions Tanzania 18102024updatedVCA
Tanzania	Statement on annual report 2021-2022 (PSSN phase II)
Tanzania	Statement on annual report 2022-2023 (PSSN phase II)
Tanzania	Strategiplan Tanzania 2020
Tanzania	Strategiplan Tanzania 2021
Tanzania	Strategiplan Tanzania 2022
Tanzania	Strategiplan Tanzania 2023
Tanzania	Strategirapport 2020
Tanzania	Strategirapport Tanzania 2020
Tanzania	Strategirapport Tanzania 2021
Tanzania	Strategirapport Tanzania 2022
Tanzania	Strategirapport-2017-Tanzania
Tanzania	Strategirapport-TANZANIA-190415
Tanzania	Strategirapport-Tanzania-2013-19
Tanzania	StrategirapportTAN2015
Tanzania	TZA UNDAP IIConclusion on Performance (51170098)
Tanzania	Tanzania 2020-2024 (Swedish)
Tanzania	Tanzania Sidas foÌˆrslag 2020-2024
Tanzania	Tanzania strategy report summary
Tanzania	sida62079en-end-of-strategy-evaluation-of-the-zanzibar-legal-services-centre 2017
Tanzania	sida62388en-tanzania-human-rights-defenders-coalition-mid-term-review
Western Balkans	Appraisal Plan 2017 original
Western Balkans	Conclusion on Performance - 2018 (11323)
Western Balkans	Conclusion on Performance - 2020
Western Balkans	Conclusion on Performance 2022
Western Balkans	Conclusion on Performance 2023

Western Balkans	Conclusion on Performance DRAFT 2024
Western Balkans	Conclusion on Performance Nov 2021
Western Balkans	018868-22 Final evaluation report of regional support to media - FoE in Eastern Europe ope 3137893_1_1
Western Balkans	Completion Memo (11655) approved
Western Balkans	approved Conclusion on Performance (11655) 2021
Western Balkans	assessment CRTA JZP 20180226
Western Balkans	2.03E+13
Western Balkans	Appraisal of Intervention (11)
Western Balkans	Conclusion on Performance 2020 Daniel
Western Balkans	Conclusion on Performance 2021-10
Western Balkans	Conclusion on Performance HRFT 2024-05-07
Western Balkans	Albania - mid term evaluation slut
Western Balkans	Appraisal of Intervention (15602) Final signed
Western Balkans	Conclusion on Performance (15602) _February 25
Western Balkans	Conclusion on Performance (15602)_July 2024
Western Balkans	Appraisal of Intervention (16760)
Western Balkans	Bilaga 3 - Annex B Project document
Western Balkans	Actor mapping for peaceful and inclusive societies in the Western Balkans and updated conflict analysis, June 2024
Western Balkans	North Macedonia Conflict Analysis, September 2021
Western Balkans	Serbia Conflict Analysis, January 2024
Western Balkans	Albania Conflict Analysis, May 2021
Western Balkans	Conflict Analysis of Bosnia and Herzegovina, November 2021
Western Balkans	Kosovo Conflict Analysis, March 2021

Annex 6 – Data collection tools

Interview guide: Sida staff

Instructions to interviewer: The interview guide for Sida staff covers Sida staff based in Sweden and posted to Embassies overseas. This group includes a range of perspectives, from programme officers to Heads of Development cooperation, from policy specialists in peace and conflict, to individuals focusing on other specialised themes. The guide will need to be tailored to each of these groups. The guide below focuses on the strategy level as this is the main focus of the evaluation. For staff connected to a specific contribution, you may need to delve deeper into that specific contribution. You can note down in advance if you think the focus should be on either and tailor accordingly. However, the level of involvement in the strategy process is likely to vary from staff member to staff member.

Introduction: Thanks for taking part in this interview, which is part of a central evaluation of Sida's integration of the conflict perspective, conducted by CMC and Verian. The aim of the evaluation is to increase knowledge and foster learning about the effects of Sida's operations and how they have contributed to positive or negative impacts on peace and conflict dynamics. The evaluation focuses on the relevance, effectiveness, and impact of the integration of the conflict perspective across Swedish development cooperation. This interview is part of our evaluation of strategy xx/contribution xx.

We will also be interviewing partners; this may include your partners. We will also be conducting a broader survey, which you will also be sent/have been sent.

If that is okay with you, I would like to record/transcribe our discussion so that we can capture all of your key points.

- Is it okay to record/transcribe the interview?
- Can we include your statements in the evaluation report? We won't use your name or your organisation's name and would just refer to your position and type of organisation, unless otherwise agreed.

Please note that we are completely independent of Sida and will make our assessment objectively. Please note that your answers are completely confidential. In the presentation of the results, no references will be made to individual people or organizations (unless you have provided a specific quote). Only the evaluation team will have access to the interview notes and recording, which is stored in compliance with European data legislation. As such, we encourage and welcome honesty and openness.

The interview will take approx. 45 min to an hour.

Interviewee details	
Position	
Unit/Department/Embassy	

Contribution and or strategy level (if known in advance)	

No.	Question	
1.	How long have you been with Sida?	
2.	How long have you been in this unit/Embassy?	
3.	What themes have you worked on?	
4.	What countries have you worked with or on?	
5.	How important is conflict sensitivity to your work? How does conflict sensitivity affect the way you work?	
6.	Based on your experience did you/Sida have a good understanding of the peace and conflict dynamics in the context you were working? • If yes, how was this achieved (for example, high quality MDPA/conflict analysis processes, knowledge of individual staff members)? Can you give examples? • If no, why not? Can you provide details?	
7.	What does the strategy process involve? • Who is involved?	
8.	Based on your experience, did you/Sida adapt effectively to peace and conflict dynamics as part of strategy operationalisation? • If yes, how was this achieved? Can you provide examples of measures you/Sida have taken to adapt to the context? (e.g. geographic and thematic composition of the strategy portfolio and partner selection.) • If no, why not? Were there any barriers?	
9.	Based on your experience, did you/Sida implement the strategy in a conflict sensitive manner? • Why do you say yes/no? Can you provide details?	
10.	Were the contributions that you were responsible implemented in a conflict sensitive manner? • Why do you say yes/no? Can you provide details?	
11.	How do you assign conflict prevention marker ratings (0, 1, 2) to new contributions? What is the decision based on? Do you/Sida use the conflict prevention marker to monitor the integration of the conflict perspective in your contributions?	
12.	Has the context changed during your time working in this country or thematic area? If so, how?	
13.	How have you adapted to these changes to ensure conflict sensitivity during implementation? • Why do you say yes/no? Can you provide details or example of adaptations? • How is adaption linked between the strategy and contribution cycles?	
14.	Is there any area you would appreciate further support to be able to better integrate the conflict sensitivity?	
15.	Could you share an example of how you/Sida prevented or mitigated exacerbating conflict/tensions due to your conflict sensitivity approach? What was the outcome?	

16.	Could you share an example of how you/Sida maximised opportunities for peace/social cohesion due to your conflict sensitivity approach? What was the outcome?	
17.	Were there any (intended or unintended) positive or negative changes in the peace and conflict dynamics in the context you worked?	
18.	Are there any other external factors that could have contributed to this change?	
19.	Do you/Sida generate and disseminate learning on the integration of the conflict perspective? Can you provide an example(s) of what you/Sida have learned on the integration of the conflict perspective, and this has been applied it?	
Perception of implementing partners		
20.	Did implementing partners staff have a good understanding of the peace and conflict dynamics in the context? • Why do you say yes/no? Can you provide details?	
21.	Did implementing partners design and implement contributions in a conflict sensitive manner? • Why do you say yes/no? Can you provide details?	
22.	Were implementing partners able to adapt to changes in the context? • Why do you say yes/no? Can you provide details?	

Interview guide: Implementing partners

Instructions to interviewer: The interview guide for Sida partners covers Sida's global partners and local partners. This group includes a range of perspectives, from individuals focusing interacting with Sida at global level, whole-of country level, or involved in direct implementation of contributions/projects in target communities. They may have different thematic focuses depending on the contribution. The guide will need to be tailored to each of these groups.

Introduction: Thank you for taking part in this interview, which is part of a central evaluation of Sida's integration of the conflict perspective, conducted by CMC and Verian. The aim of the evaluation is to increase knowledge and foster learning about the effects of Sida's operations and how they have contributed to positive or negative impacts on peace and conflict dynamics. The evaluation focuses on the relevance, effectiveness, and impact of the integration of the conflict perspective across Swedish development cooperation. This interview is part of our evaluation of strategy xx/contribution xx.

If that is okay with you, I would like to record/transcribe our discussion so that we can capture all of your key points.

- Is it okay to record/transcribe the interview?
- Can we include your statements in the evaluation report? We won't use your name or your organisation's name and would just refer to your position and type of organisation, unless otherwise agreed.

Please note that we are completely independent of Sida and will make our assessment objectively. Please note that your answers are completely confidential. In the presentation of the results, no references will be made to individual people or

organizations (unless you have provided a specific quote). Only the evaluation team will have access to the interview notes and recording, which is stored in compliance with European data legislation. As such, we encourage and welcome honesty and openness.

The interview will take approx. 45 min to an hour.

Interviewee details	
Position	
Organisation	

No.	Question	
1.	How important is conflict sensitivity to your work? How does conflict sensitivity affect the way you work?	
2.	Do you/your organisation have a have a good understanding of the peace and conflict dynamics in the context? • Why do you say yes/no? How do you maintain a good understanding? • (if relevant) Does this differ between strategic level and on the ground implementation?	
3.	Could you share an example of how you/your organisation prevented or mitigated exacerbating conflict/tensions due to your conflict sensitivity approach? What was the outcome?	
4.	Could you share an example of how you/your organisation maximised opportunities for peace/social cohesion due to your conflict sensitivity approach? What was the outcome?	
5.	From your experience were there any (intended or unintended) positive or negative changes in the peace and conflict dynamics in the context you worked?	
6.	What was your/your organisation's contribution to this change?	
7.	Are there any other external factors that could have contributed to this change?	
8.	Are there monitoring mechanisms and tools to learn from how you work with conflict sensitivity?	
Perception of Sida		
9.	From your experience did Sida have a good understanding of the peace and conflict dynamics in the context? • Why do you say yes/no? Can you provide examples?	
10.	From your experience does Sida work in a conflict sensitive manner? Is conflict sensitivity important to how Sida works? • Why do you say yes/no? Can you provide details?	
11.	From your experience is Sida able to adapt to changes in the peace and conflict dynamics? • Why do you say yes/no? Can you provide details or example of adaptations?	

Survey: Implementing partners

This survey is part of a central evaluation commissioned by Sida. The aim of the evaluation is to increase knowledge and foster learning about Sida's and its partners' work with conflict sensitivity and its effects (negative or positive) on peace and conflict dynamics.

The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Your responses will remain confidential and will only be used for evaluation purposes any data shared with Sida will be anonymised and at an aggregated level.

Please note that Verian and CMC are completely independent of Sida. By continuing with the survey, you consent to participate and for your answers to be processed by Verian/CMC in accordance with European data legislation. Participation is voluntary and you can decide to stop the survey at any time. If needed, you can pause your participation and continue later, as you can access the survey and your answers via the same link.

Thank you for taking the time to provide your valuable insights. We value your honest and constructive feedback.

Question 1

To what extent do you think Sida/the Embassy has demonstrated a robust understanding of the political and conflict context in relation to your Sida-funded agreement/project/programme?

1. To little or no extent
2. To some extent
3. To a very large or large extent
4. N/A

Please motivate your answer:

[text]

Question 2

To what extent do think that you and your organisation you have the time and resources to work in a conflict sensitive manner in your Sida-funded agreement/project/programme?

1. To little or no extent
2. To some extent
3. To a very large or large extent
4. N/A

Please motivate your answer:

[text]

Question 3

Have there been any changes to the political and conflict context that led to adaptations to your Sida-funded agreement/project/programme?

1. Yes, there were changes in the context that led to adaptations in in the agreement/project/programme.
2. No, there were changes in the context but that did not lead to any adaptations in the agreement/project/programme.
3. No, there were no changes in the context
4. N/A

Question 3a

Filter. If option 3.1:

Can you please explain how your Sida-funded agreement/project/programme was adapted in response to these changes?

[text]

Prefer not to answer

Question 3b

Filter. If option 3.2:

Can you please explain why adaptations were not made as a result of the changes to the political and conflict context?

[text]

Prefer not to answer

Question 4

Has the integration of a conflict sensitive approach in your Sida-funded agreement/project/programme resulted in any <u>positive</u> outcomes and impacts? *This includes successful measures to avoid harm.*
1. Yes
2. No, I am not aware of any such positive effects

If yes, please describe these results and how they were achieved:

[text]

Question 5

Has the lack of integration of a conflict sensitive approach in your Sida-funded agreement/project/programme resulted in any <u>negative</u> effects?
1. Yes
2. No, I am not aware of any negative effects

If yes, please describe these negative effects and what caused them:

[text]

Question 6

Are you, or have you been, involved as a partner in any other Sida-funded agreement/project/programme?

If not sure, please select the most likely option.
1. No, only this one
2. Yes, 1-4 other Sida funded agreements/projects/programmes
3. Yes, 5-9 other Sida funded agreements/projects/programmes
4. Yes, +10 other Sida funded agreements/projects/programmes
5. N/A

Question 7

Filter. If option 6.2-6.4:

Do you have any relevant experiences connected to the integration (or lack of integration) of conflict sensitivity in other Sida-funded agreements/projects/programmes that you have been involved in?

This could include successful or unsuccessful adaptations to implementation or positive or negative results.
1. Yes

2. No

If yes, please motivate your answer:

If the example mainly relates to a certain agreement/project/programme rather than in general, please mention which one.

[text]

Question 8

Filter. If option 6.1:

Do you have any recommendations for how to improve the integration of conflict sensitivity in your Sida-funded agreement/project/programme, or in general?

1. Yes
2. No, nothing further to share

If yes, please motivate your answer:

If the example mainly relates to a certain agreement/project/programme rather than in general, please mention which one.

[text]

Question 9

Please let us know if you have any relevant documentation or reports (e.g. evaluations or progress reports) to share that can provide further insights into the issues discussed above.

Please send to emily.deros@veriangroup.com or paste a link in the box below.

1. Insert link(s) **[text]**
2. Ok, I will share by email
3. I do not have anything to share

Survey: Sida staff

This survey is part of a central evaluation commissioned by Sida. The aim of the evaluation is to increase knowledge and foster learning about Sida's and its partners' work with conflict sensitivity and its effects (negative or positive) on peace and conflict dynamics.

The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Your responses will remain confidential and will only be used for evaluation purposes any data shared with Sida will be anonymised and at an aggregated level.

Please note that Verian and CMC are completely independent of Sida. By continuing with the survey, you consent to participate and for your answers to be processed by Verian/CMC in accordance with European data legislation. Participation is voluntary and you can decide to stop the survey at any time. If needed, you can pause your participation and continue later, as you can access the survey and your answers via the same link.

Thank you for taking the time to provide your valuable insights. We value your honest and constructive feedback.

Question 1

To what extent do you think Sida (as represented by your Unit/Embassy) have a robust understanding of the political and conflict context in the areas of your work?
1. To little or no extent
2. To some extent
3. To a very large or large extent
4. N/A

Please motivate your answer:

[text]

Question 2

To what extent do feel that you have the time and resources in your role to work in a conflict sensitive manner?
5. To little or no extent
6. To some extent
7. To a very large or large extent
8. N/A

Please motivate your answer:

[text]

Question 3

What, if any, internal or external resources have been useful for you to work in a conflict sensitive manner?
For example, resources provided by Sida as E-learning, Peace and Conflict Toolbox, Sida helpdesk on Human Security, support from Policy Specialist, colleagues in your Unit/Embassy or external advisory/consultant support, partner expertise/context knowledge

[text]

Prefer not to answer

Question 4

Have there been any changes to the political and conflict context that led to adaptations in contributions that you are responsible for?
If different answers apply to different contributions you have worked on, you can select all the relevant answer options.
5. Yes, there were changes in the context that led to adaptations in contribution(s).
6. No, there were changes in the context but that did not lead to any adaptations in contribution(s).
7. No, there were no changes in the context
8. N/A

Question 4a

Filter. If option 3.1:

Can you please explain how these contribution(s) were adapted in response to these changes?

[text]

Prefer not to answer

Question 4b

Filter. If option 3.2:

Can you please explain why adaptations were <u>not</u> made as a result of the changes to the political and conflict context?

[text]

Prefer not to answer

Question 5

Has the integration of a conflict sensitive approach in contributions that you are responsible for resulted in any <u>positive</u> outcomes and impacts?

This includes successful measures to avoid harm.
3.   Yes
4.   No, I am not aware of any such positive outcomes and impacts

If yes, please describe these results and how they were achieved:

[text]

Question 6

Has the lack of integration of a conflict sensitive approach in contributions that you are responsible for resulted in any <u>negative</u> effects?
3.   Yes
4.   No, I am not aware of any negative effects

If yes, please describe these negative effects and what caused them:

[text]

A.

Question 7

Do you have any relevant experiences connected to the integration (or lack of integration) of conflict sensitivity from your work on other strategies or contexts?

This could include successful or unsuccessful adaptations to implementation or positive or negative results.
3.   Yes
4.   No

If yes, please motivate your answer:

If the example mainly relates to a certain strategy/contribution rather than in general, please specify which one.

[text]

Question 8

Do you have any recommendations for how to improve the integration of conflict sensitivity in the regions/countries/thematic areas you work on, or in general?
3.   Yes
4.   No, nothing further to share

If yes, please motivate your answer:

If the example mainly relates to a certain strategy/contribution rather than in general, please specify which one.

[text]

Question 9

Please let us know if you have any relevant documentation or reports (e.g. evaluations or progress reports) to share that can provide further insights into the issues discussed above.

Please send to martin.nilsson@veriangroup.com or paste a link in the box below.

4. Insert link(s) **[text]**
5. Ok, I will share by email
6. I do not have anything to share

Annex 7 – ToCs for the non-case study strategies

This annex presents the Theories of Change (ToC) for the six non-case study strategies. These were discussed and agreed with the respective Embassies and units, drawing on strategy documentation. These were used to evaluate two evaluation questions:

- To what extent do the strategies respond to peace and conflict dynamics in the contexts and thematic areas, and continue to do so if circumstances change?
- To what extent is the integration of conflict sensitivity in the implementation of the strategies contributing to outcomes? And if so/not, why?

1. BOLIVIA

Introduction

This document presents Sida's approach to integrating the conflict perspective in the Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Bolivia for the period 2021-2025. It should be noted that there has been no explicit theory of change developed in the Embassy responsible for this strategy and there is also no Sida or Swedish government requirement to develop ToCs for the integration of the conflict perspective. The document does not present any intended impact and only outcomes where they are clearly detailed in documentation.

Bolivia has a long history of conflict, with numerous successful and failed attempts to take over the government by violent means. However, since 1989 Boliva has not experienced a violent conflict.[5]

Indicators of levels of conflict and peacefulness			
UCDP	**WB-FCS (2023)**	**GPI**	**ACLED (2022-2023)**
No armed conflict registered	NO	MEDIUM	Very LOW

The 2021-2025 strategy for development cooperation with Bolivia has three objectives: 1) human rights, democracy and the rule of law and gender equality, 2) environment, climate and sustainable use of natural resources, and 3) inclusive

---

[5] Department of Peace and Conflict Research, *'Bolivia'* in Uppsala Conflict Data Program, 2024
https://ucdp.uu.se/country/145

economic development.[6] The conflict prevention marker ratings for disbursements are as follows: marker 0 - 74%, marker 1 - 20%, marker 2 - 6%.[7]

Theory of change

Bolivia is not viewed as having an active violent conflict, nor is there requirement from the Sida nor the Swedish government to develop a general theory of change for the conflict perspective. As such, Sida addresses these issues in relation to individual contributions and areas, not in general at portfolio. There is some conflict tolerance in the portfolio. Conflict is viewed as a part of society and social processes, and that some of Sida's strategy objectives are on areas that may cause tensions in society (for example, work on gender equality, LGBTQI+ issues) which is an acceptable part of social change so long as conflict is non-violent and institutionalised.[8]

For the **INPUTS**, suitable organizational resources (capacity building, methodological support, training, guidelines), financial resources and human resources (policy specialists and advisors), should be in place at Sida HQ, at the Embassy, and with partners. Specifically in Bolivia, this involves individual programme officers that are responsible for its integration as is necessary in the contributions they manage. The team has access to the Sida Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance and the ability to request assistance from the Policy Specialists in the Hub on Human Security based in HQ to draw on as needed. As of yet, support has not been needed.

These inputs would then lead to and be converted into **OUTPUTS**, at the strategy level. In the case of Bolivia, Sida assess that it is sufficient for the contribution to implemented at a contribution level. Sida does take measures to understand the context as part of its work to fulfil the strategy objectives in Bolivia. The MDPA notes that there are several areas of underlying tensions in Bolivia. Where conflict ranges from "public statements and demonstrations – usually associated with marches and mobilizations – to moments of belligerence with escalations of state violence and violent confrontations between social groups"[9]. The MDPA states that these stem from inequalities in access, both to resources and opportunities and to participation and representation, which have different effects on the living conditions and social reproduction individuals, groups, and communities, depending on their position in the

---

[6] Government Offices of Sweden, *Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Bolivia 2021–2025,* 2021.

[7] Sida statistics uni, *'Sida Central Evaluation of work with the conflict perspective – Step 1',* February 2024.

[8] The MDPA notes that in the context of Bolivia "social protests are collective actions that accelerate - make visible and/or enhance - the development of conflictive socio-political processes (local, regional and national) of demands from society to the State for the fulfilment of its obligations and/or the expansion of rights." See Silvia Escóbar de Pabón, Walter Arteaga Aguilar, Giovanna Hurtado Aponte, *'DESIGUALDADES Y POBREZA EN BOLIVIA: Una perspectiva multidimensional',* 2019, p.23.

[9] Silvia Escóbar de Pabón, Walter Arteaga Aguilar, Giovanna Hurtado Aponte, *'DESIGUALDADES Y POBREZA EN BOLIVIA: Una perspectiva multidimensional',* 2019, p.22.

social structure, gender relations, and their interactions[10]. Sida does work with many of these issues, such as inequality and human rights, but not intentionally from the conflict perspective at the national level.

Assumptions: The MDPA's conflict and peace section is updated regularly, and Sida staff maintain a good understanding of the context that would enable them to change the strategy approach if the conflict context changed.

A **SHORT-TERM OUTCOME** is a strategy level analysis, operationalisation, plan, implementation, monitoring and reporting that reflect the two-way interaction between Sweden's strategy and Bolivian context and that strategy implementation is tailored accordingly. Sida has assessed that based on the context it is not necessary to work with the conflict perspective at the strategy level, and as such the effect on peace and conflict dynamics does not have a heavy weighting in the consideration of the interaction between Sweden's strategy objectives and the Bolivian context.

With this in mind:

- Sida staff monitor and evaluate the integration of the conflict perspective at contribution level as necessary.
- Sida staff correctly use and embed the conflict prevention marker in the Sida contribution cycles.
- Partners analyse the two-way interaction between the contribution(s) and context tensions and considers potential positive and negative on the peace and conflict context.

Assumptions:

- Sida staff are supported to verify that partners integrate the conflict perspective into Sida funded projects and programmes as needed.
- Partners are able and willing to integrate conflict perspectives into Sida funded projects and programmes as needed.

These outputs would then lead to and be converted into **MEDIUM TERM OUTCOMES** meaning that:

- As needed, partners continuously adapt contributions based on their understanding of the two-way dynamics between tensions and the contribution to prevent/minimise negative impacts and maximise positive effects.
- As needed, Sida staff and partners take steps to learn from monitoring and evaluation of the integration of the conflict perspective.

Assumptions:

- Sida and partners have appropriate MEL systems to allow for systematic follow up on the integration of the conflict perspective, if relevant.
- Sida and partners have appropriate processes and culture for adaptive management (this includes an open discussion on learning from failure and success as needed).

---

[10] Silvia Escóbar de Pabón, Walter Arteaga Aguilar, Giovanna Hurtado Aponte, '*DESIGUALDADES Y POBREZA EN BOLIVIA: Una perspectiva multidimensional',* 2019, p.xx.

A **LONG-TERM OUTCOME** is Sida's development cooperation in Bolivia does no harm in its implementation of contributions. No specific long-term outcomes of the integration of the conflict perspective at strategy level are identified by Sida. However, contributions under the first objective could be seen to prevent conflict. The evaluation team will also explore if there are unintended outcomes (both positive and negative) of Swedish development cooperation with Bolivia.

Strategic objective	Outcome	Assumptions
1: Strengthened conditions for democracy and increased respect for human rights and the principles of the rule of law	Without unintentionally exacerbating tensions, efforts contribute to: - Strengthening civil society, - Strengthening institutions (national and local institutions), - Strengthen democracy and respect for human rights. Thereby preventing violent conflict from occurring by supporting institutional, non-violent pathways for conflict resolution.	Partners have a strong understanding of national and local dynamics. Partners are willing to integrate CP throughout their contributions
2: Increased gender equality, including reduced gender-related violence and increased access to and respect for sexual and reproductive health and rights	Without unintentionally exacerbating tensions, efforts contribute to: - Strengthen violence prevention work to combat gender related violence and abuse without exacerbating tensions. - Strengthen the voices and capacity of women and LGBTI+ groups to prevent violence and to defend vulnerable groups without exacerbating tensions - Enable improved and safe political participation of women at municipal and regional level and to counter discrimination against women, indigenous peoples and LGBTI+ groups in all dimensions	A certain level of awareness of sexual and reproductive rights among the identified vulnerable/priority groups, and demands for gender equality and SRHR in general. Willingness of partners to implement their contributions in a conflict sensitive way.
3: Limited climate impact and strengthened resilience to climate change.	- Increase sustainable and long-term profitable production and development models based on sustainable value chains for organic products without raising conflicts over resource - Strengthen the national and local capacity to implement and follow up international agreements - Strengthen resilience in urban and rural areas and reduce the risk of negative consequences (eg for food production and water supply) through appropriate financial instruments.	The willingness of state actors to implement international commitments and open to alternative development models The willingness of government entities and civil society in the sector to cooperate

4: Strengthened conditions for sustainable management and sustainable use of natural resources, including preservation of ecosystems and biological diversity.	Without raising conflicts and tensions about resources among government agencies, CSOs and local groups: - Strengthen institutions so that they can coordinate, implement and monitor sustainable resource use - Local groups and environmental defenders must be given the opportunity to make their voices heard and have their rights respected. - Support the implementation of alternative sustainable models of economic development the Amazon and other vulnerable and biologically valuable areas	The willingness of state actors to implement international treaties and alternative development models, Political will to strengthen natural resource management agencies

Across strategic objectives
Absence of unintentional harm caused.
Other unintended (negative and positive) outcomes, such as: • legitimisation effects, • market effects, • substitution effects, • theft/diversion.
Missed opportunities.

The table below presents the contributions selected for review in the evaluation.

Contributions selected for review						
	Contribution title	**Start year**	**End year**	**Commitme nt amount**	**Conflict prevention marker**	**Agreement partner**
1	14719 - Alliance for Environmental and territorial rights of indigenous people in Bolivia	2021	2025	SEK 4,800,000	0	23000 - Developing country-based NGO
2	15080 - Sustainable forest use for livelihoods and biodiversity	2022	2025	SEK 98,762	0	23000 - Developing country-based NGO
3	15626 - FAO_Preservation of the Chiquitano and Amazonian ecosystems	2022	2026	SEK 8,525,000	1	41301 - Food and Agricultural Organisation
4	15755 - Support to Prevention of Gender Violence	2022	2026	SEK 24,500,000	0	23000 - Developing country-based NGO
5	15206 - CI Bolivia (2022-25): Forest conservation and biodiversity	2022	2026	SEK 1,550,000	0	21063 - Conservation International
6	13723 - DIAKONIA, Bridge 2022-2023	2022	2023	SEK 5 000 000	1	22000 - Donor country-based NGO
7	13472 - 2021-25 UNIR: BUILDING DEMOCRATIC AND PEACE CULTURES	2021	2025	SEK 11,300,000	2	23000 - Developing country-based NGO

2. HUMANITARIAN AID

Introduction

This is a theory of change (ToC) connected to the Swedish strategy for humanitarian aid. The Central Evaluation of Sida's work with the conflict perspective selected the strategy for humanitarian aid as one of the thematic and global strategies to be included in the evaluation. The Theory of Change and the evaluation include both the 2017-2020 and the 2021-2025 strategies for humanitarian aid.

The main objective of Sweden's humanitarian aid, as expressed in the two strategies under review, is to save lives, alleviate human suffering and uphold human dignity for the benefit of people in need who have been, or are at risk of becoming, affected by armed conflict, natural disaster or other emergencies. It is based on global humanitarian needs and humanitarian principles and standards, including international humanitarian law, and good humanitarian donorship.

The two main objectives are:

1) Improved ability to provide protection and assistance for crisis-affected people and
2) Increased capacity, effectiveness and efficiency of the humanitarian system.

Specifically for conflict sensitivity, the current strategy for humanitarian aid mentions that a conflict-sensitive approach is essential to humanitarian activities to ensure that activities do not exacerbate violent conflicts or causing increased tensions within or between groups. This is in line with the overall guidance from the Swedish government to Sida that the conflict perspective should be integrated across all the agency's operations. Sida's implementing partners are therefore expected to integrate conflict-sensitive approaches to all their humanitarian work in order to take account of external risks as well as risks of their own activities contributing to exacerbating the situation on the ground. Partners are also expected to adhere to the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence, and to embrace the concept of centrality of protection in their operations. These principles embody several aspects of conflict-sensitivity in humanitarian settings, and are designed to steer organisations in how they navigate conflict dynamics and relations with parties to the conflict, and mitigate risks to civilians in need. In the annual strategy reports, Sida is then reporting about how conflict sensitivity has been addressed.

Sida is implementing the strategy for humanitarian aid through long-term agreements with recognised humanitarian actors, which are re-confirmed on an annual basis. In the selection and assessment process, Sida checks for the prior experience and capacity in integrating conflict sensitivity in the implementation of humanitarian work. The work is then implemented in a number of pre-agreed countries, as well as in response to new humanitarian emergencies. For the conflict prevention marker applied to contributions funded through the strategy for humanitarian aid, the following averages were calculated for the period 2019-2023:

Conflict prevention marker	Share of disbursements average 2019-2023
0 - Not targeted to the policy objective	32%
1 - Significant objective	63%
2 - Principal objective	6%

Theory of change

The Theory of Change is a simplified, yet comprehensive description of inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impact of the integration of a conflict perspective in all work and financing throughout the strategy and contribution cycles, as well as the assumptions for those elements to be logically connected.

For the **INPUTS**,[11] suitable organisational resources (capacity building, methodological support, training, guidelines), financial resources and human resources should be in place at Sida and Sida's partners. This includes Sida's humanitarian team at HQ, and programme officers with a humanitarian focus at embassies or country desks. Specifically at the Humanitarian Unit at HQ, the integration of the conflict perspective is supported by policy specialists working on protection, international humanitarian law and access.

These inputs would then lead to and be converted into **OUTPUTS**,[12] at the strategy level, which in the case of the strategy for humanitarian aid means that Sida staff recognise the importance of understanding the context. Unlike with bilateral and regional strategies, there is no specific Multi-Dimensional Poverty Analysis (MDPA) for this thematic, global strategy, in which a section on conflict analysis would be included. However, Sida produces an annual Humanitarian Crisis Analysis for every country receiving humanitarian funding. This describes the drivers and consequences of the crisis, including conflict dynamics and protection risks facing civilians. At the contribution level, each agreement covers several different countries and contexts, which does not allow for detailed conflict analysis in the appraisals. However, at the global level, Sida's awareness is ultimately evident in the selection of implementing partners, in which previous experience and a dedication to including conflict sensitivity and protection in all work is a major decisive factor. Sida has multi-year long-term agreements with experienced humanitarian implementers. At the country-level and the humanitarian crisis these implementing partners then engage in, the implementing partners conduct humanitarian needs assessments, and Sida also draws on country-specific MDPAs and conflict analysis (where available) to decide on an annual partner selection for each country/humanitarian crisis and re-confirms its

---

[11] ASSUMPTIONS: Sida demonstrates consistent leadership and sustained commitment. Incentives and accountability for Sida staff and partners exist. Adequate financial and human resources are available.

[12] ASSUMPTIONS: Sida's understanding of the conflict perspective is promoted through dialogue with implementing partners and through selection criteria during multi-annual partner selection. Institutional systems are fit for purpose to integrate the conflict perspective.

cooperation on an annual basis. In case there would be any concern with operating in a conflict-sensitive way, or not following protection principles to the maximum extent possible and according to international humanitarian standards, Sida could decide not to fund a partner in a particular context in its annual allocation cycle.

SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES[13] of this understanding of conflict sensitivity are that Sida's humanitarian team reflect on the two-way interaction between the Swedish government's strategy objectives for the humanitarian strategy and conflict dynamics/tensions in each of the specific humanitarian contexts where the strategy and contributions are being implemented. Sida staff reviews the conflict perspective in the process of contribution management, e.g. through the allocation of conflict markers to each contribution. Sida's Implementing partners also reflect on the interaction between their humanitarian engagement and the context in which they engage.

Sida's humanitarian team also engages with implementing partners and emphasises the importance of the conflict perspective, protection mandate and humanitarian laws and principles. At the same time and e.g. in the context of the annual reporting for the strategy, Sida's humanitarian team monitors and evaluates the integration of the conflict perspective at strategy and contribution level globally (through Sida's systems, such as Trac) and through dialogue with implementing partners at the concrete context level. Sida expects, for example, that selected implementing partners conduct context analysis and keep (negative) resource transfers and risks in mind before and during humanitarian engagement. Partners' capacity and approach is also reviewed during the selection process of implementing partners.

MEDIUM TERM OUTCOMES include that Sida ensures it has an appropriate portfolio of partners in each country that work in a conflict-sensitive manner and are able to implement needs-based humanitarian activities and reach people in conflict-affected areas, without having a negative impact on protection risks or conflict dynamics. As part of the contribution management, Sida's humanitarian team and partners then continuously discuss conflict sensitivity and how it is applied in key contexts in the framework of the global partnership. Considerations around conflict sensitivity, as outlined in the strategy, also feed into Sida's annual selection of implementing partners at country level.

LONG-TERM OUTCOMES[14] - is that Sida's and partners activities do not exacerbate violent conflicts or cause increased tensions within or between groups. Another outcome is that effective conflict sensitivity within humanitarian assistance and protection leads to increased access, reach and impact. And a final

---

[13] ASSUMPTIONS: Re-confirmation of implementing partners (on an annual basis) takes into consideration partners' respect for humanitarian principles.

[14] ASSUMPTIONS: Implementing partners do not 'overload' the work with peacebuilding and conflict reduction concepts, as the focus is protection, IHL, humanitarian principles and being perceived as impartial.

long-term outcome is that implementing partners reduce the risk of violence and coercion against individuals or communities by, for example strengthening community self-protection and designing humanitarian activities to strengthen intercommunal cohesion. Furthermore, Sida and partner activities should contribute to positive resource transfers and **avoiding potential negative resource transfers**, such as:

- distribution effects, such as the targeting of humanitarian support being perceived as partial and the weaponization of aid,
- legitimisation effects, such as the politization of aid, and unbalanced staff recruiting,
- market effects, such as contributing to war economies,
- substitution effects,
- theft/diversion.

These outcomes would then lead to the overall **IMPACT** of the integration of the conflict perspective, including the following:

- The effective delivery of humanitarian assistance and protection facilitates the return to 'normal' in a post-conflict setting,
- Humanitarian mediation reduces violence and conflict by preventing localized disputes from triggering larger conflicts.
- Unintended positive impacts on peace and conflict dynamics take effect.
- The effective delivery of humanitarian assistance and protection reduces the impacts of conflict on a society.

The table below presents the contributions selected for review in the evaluation.

No.	Contribution	DAA Amount	Marker	Year
Contributions selected for review				
1	10363 - Diakonia IHL Global 2017-2020	207,000,249	0, 1, 2	2017-2022
2	10462 - Swedish Mission Council (SMR) Humanitarian frame 2017-2023	817,956,198	1	2017-2023
3	10482 - UNRWA agreement 2017-2022	948,000,000	0, 1	2017-2022
4	11630 - OCHA field coordination 2018-2022	1,806,374,181	0, 1	2018-2022
5	14399 - FAO HUM 2021-2025	1,228,508,207	2	2021-2025
6	11841 - ATHA (Advanced Training Program on Humanitarian Action) 2018-2019	54,000,000	1	2018-2019
7	14394 - Swedish Red Cross (SRC) Hum 2021-2025	1,780,362,918	0, 1	2021-2025
8	14395 - NRC's Humanitarian Programme 2021-2025	6,092,398,179	2	2021-2025
9	14398 - Action Against Hunger: HUM 2021-2025	4,376,876,398	2	2021-2025
10	15157 - Islamic Relief Humanitarian support 2022-2025	1,715,569,269	0, 1	2022-2025
11	11781 - ICRC Appeals 2018-2020: Operations	7,729,553,352	1	2018-2020
12	52040531 - Country Based Pooled Funds	9,148,500,000	1	2016-2023

3. LIBERIA

Introduction

This is a ToC for the integration of the conflict perspective connected to the Swedish strategy for Liberia, in the period 2021-2025.

Liberia presents a post-conflict context which includes the strategy objective "Strengthened conditions for sustainable peace and social cohesion". With regards to the conflict marker, an average of 49% of disbursements have conflict marker 0, 41% marker 1 and 9% marker 2 over the period 2019-2023.

Indicators of levels of conflict and peacefulness			
UCDP	WB-FCS (2023)	GPI	ACLED (2022-2023)
No armed conflict registered	NO	MEDIUM	VERY LOW

Theory of change

The Theory of Change is a simplified, yet comprehensive description of inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impact of the integration of a conflict perspective in all work and financing, as well as the assumptions for those elements to be logically connected. Assumptions are detailed under relevant headings.

For the **INPUTS**, organisational resources, human resources, training, and financial resources are in place at Sida HQ, at the Embassy and with partners. Specifically, in Liberia, this includes one programme officer, focused on Human Security, that supports the integration of the conflict perspective at the Embassy[15], through supporting other staff with advice and training[16]. The Embassy have also made use of the Help Desk[17] for conducting a Conflict Analysis and the Policy Specialist Peace and Security Policy Specialist with geographic responsibility for Africa at Sida HQ[18] for advice on contribution management. The Sida team also coordinates with FBA for in-depth and continuous conflict analysis.

These inputs would then lead to and be converted into **OUTPUTS**, at the strategy level which in the case of Liberia means that Embassy staff, and specifically the leadership (Head of Development Cooperation/strategy owner) understand the Liberian context by analysing the Liberian conflict dynamics and tensions. This would be evidenced by the development of a MDPA, which include an analysis of conflicts and tensions, and that high-quality conflict analyses are conducted and updated regularly, which considers dividers and connectors.

---

[15] Initial discussion with Johanna Suberu Svanelid

[16] Integrating the conflict perspective: what is conflict sensitivity. Presentation. N.d.

[17] SHD 120: Update of the conflict assessment of Liberia (from 2015), 27 April 2020;

[18] Travel Report. Liberia 3-10 December 2022. Maja Permerup. Africa Department

In the case of Liberia, the conflict analysis[19] and MDPA[20] specifically summarise conflict drivers to be complex and overlapping, but as boiling down to:

- Land disputes and mismanagement of natural resources
- Centralisation of governance, justice and security sector
- Corruption
- Inequality and widespread poverty
- Gender-based violence.

Other drivers are also mentioned, but these are the key ones identified and also mentioned in the strategic plans from 2021-2023, 2022-2024 and 2024-2026[21]. The 2024-2026 strategy plan notes the following connectors: working through local structures, increased capacity among relevant authorities to mitigate conflicts, the reconciliation process (if initiated), and civil society (especially women's groups).[22]

Assumptions: All stakeholders demonstrate consistent leadership and sustained commitment and make organisational, financial and human resources available, and ensure that there are incentives for staff to learn about the conflict perspective. Specifically, there needs to be sustained leadership at the Embassy, through the Head of Development Cooperation.

A **SHORT-TERM OUTCOME** is ongoing integrated strategy level analysis, operationalisation, plan, implementation, monitoring and reporting that reflect the two-way interaction between Sweden's strategy and Liberian conflict dynamics/tensions and that identifies the main conflict drivers and details how to tackle these through targeted contributions as part of the strategic objective Peaceful and inclusive societies, but also across the other strategic objectives by integrating the conflict perspective.

With this in place:

- Across the four strategic objectives (Human rights, democracy and the rule of law and gender equality; Peaceful and inclusive societies; Inclusive economic development; and Environment, climate and sustainable use of natural resources), the conflict perspective is integrated. The strategy plan from 2024 mention that 16 contributions within three strategic objectives other than Peaceful and inclusive societies contribute to peace building and have specific aims to target conflict tensions.
- Embassy staff take steps to maintain an updated understanding of the context and reflect on the understanding of the conflict dynamics/tensions, and what this means for strategy level decisions such as portfolio composition.
- Embassy staff assesses and selects partners that have the willingness and capacity to integrate the conflict perspective in their work.

---

[19] SHD 120: Update of the conflict assessment of Liberia (from 2015), 27 April 2020;

[20] Multidimensional Poverty Analysis: LIBERIA, February 2019

[21] Strategiplan för Liberia 2024-2026, dated 2023-11-xx; Strategic Plan for Liberia 2022-2024, dated 2021-12-02; Strategiplan för Liberia 2021-2023, dated 2020-11-11.

[22] Strategiplan för Liberia 2024-2026, dated 2023-11-xx

- The Embassy and their partners have a common understanding of the conflict perspective.
- Partners analyse the two-way interaction between the contribution(s) and conflict dynamics/tensions and considers potential positive and negative resource transfers.
- Embassy staffs' dialogue with partners emphasises the conflict perspective, including
- noting any concerns regarding partners' integration of conflict perspective in the risk register and taking these concerns up in an open dialogue.
- Embassy staff monitor and evaluate the integration of the conflict perspective, at strategy level and at contribution level. [23]
- Embassy staff correctly uses and embeds the conflict policy marker in the Sida strategy and contribution cycles.

Assumptions:

- The Embassy and partners have sufficient resources, in terms of financial and human resources, to integrate the conflict perspective.
- Embassy staff are incentivised and held accountable for the integration of the conflict perspective,
- Embassy staff have access to appropriate method support (the peace and conflict toolbox, and other learning resources) and advice from HQ and makes use of this support.
- Embassy staff make use of the Human Security Helpdesk, when required.
- Partners are willing, able to apply and have access to appropriate guidelines to integrate the conflict perspective
- Guidelines are applied and meaningfully tailored to the Liberian context.

These short-term outcomes would then lead to and be converted into **MEDIUM TERM OUTCOMES,** meaning that:

- Partners continuously adapt contributions based on their understanding of the two-way dynamics between conflict dynamics/tensions and the contribution to prevent/minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts.
- Embassy staff follow up on conflict perspective issues identified in the appraisal, through dialogue with partners.
- Embassy staff and partners take steps to learn from monitoring and evaluation of the integration of the conflict perspective with learning taking place both downstream (from strategy to contribution level) and upstream (from contribution to strategy level).
- The Embassy adapts the strategy and the strategy plan and its implementation, as and when required.

Assumptions:

---

[23] The Embassy supports several data collection initiatives that aims to increase understanding of the context, including SCORE, which measures social cohesion and reconciliation.

- Embassy and partners have appropriate MEL systems to allow for systematic follow up on the integration of the conflict perspective.
- Embassy and partners have appropriate processes and culture for adaptive management (this includes an open discussion around learning from failure and success)

A **LONG-TERM OUTCOME** of this is that Sida's development cooperation in Liberia is responsive to peace and conflict dynamics, mitigates risks of doing harm and contributes to conflict prevention and peacebuilding beyond its targeted peacebuilding contributions[24]. For all these, there is one key internal assumption: There has been an appropriate integration of the conflict perspective in contribution implementation, as detailed above, in terms of who the partners are, where and how they work to target specific conflict drivers, weaken dividers and strengthen connectors.

Specifically, this means that Sida and Sida's partners contribute to[25]:

Strategic objective	Outcome	Assumption
1: Human rights, democracy and the rule of law and gender equality	Decentralised governance and judiciary, without causing or exacerbating any existing divisions or tensions between groups. Achieved by working through local structures and increasing the capacity of public actors to mitigate conflicts.	External: Political will and stable government, good leadership at the Ministry of Internal Affairs, peaceful elections (2023), functioning and independent judiciary, financial resources for judiciary.
1: Human rights, democracy and the rule of law and gender equality	Decreased corruption and better management of public resources, without causing or exacerbating any existing divisions or tensions between groups. Achieved by working through local structures and increasing the capacity of public actors to mitigate conflicts.	Functioning and independent judiciary, establishes mechanism for accountability and control and that these have independent and well-functioning leadership.
3: Inclusive economic development	Increased equality of marginalised groups, particularly youth, without causing or exacerbating any	Increased state resources, consistent tax revenues.

---

[24] In the evaluation, we will consider specific outcomes and organize them under the typology of resources transfers: Legitimization effects, Distribution effects, Substitution effects, Market effects, Theft/diversion.

[25] These are mentioned as also being areas for the previous strategy period, as detailed in Fördjupad strategirapport för Sveriges utvecklingssamarbete med Liberia 2016-2020. Ärendenummer: 19/000497

	existing divisions or tensions between groups. Achieved by working with civil society, especially women's groups, including supporting the coordination of these groups.	
4: Environment, climate and sustainable use of natural resources	Improved management of natural resources, without worsening conflicts and tensions related to mismanagement of natural resources. Achieved by working through local structures and increasing the capacity of public actors.	Functioning land management (through the Liberia Land Authority), implementation of the Liberia Land Rights Act, development and implementation of the Alternative Dispute Resolution Bill.
Across strategic objectives	Other intended[26] or unintended (negative and positive) outcomes	

These outcomes would then lead to the overall **IMPACT** of the integration of the conflict perspective, means that Sweden's development cooperation in Liberia has prevented or mitigated negative impacts and maximised positive impacts. The specific goal targeted in the strategy plan is for all contributions to contribute to **individuals of all ages and genders have the power, voice, and resources to build sustainable peace and promote social cohesion.** The impact level is within the sphere of influence of Sida, but its contribution is one of many other contributions, external and internal to Liberia. It should be noted that the evaluation will not include this level for Liberia, as it is not subject to a case study in Phase 2 of the evaluation.

The table below includes the contributions selected for the evaluation.

Selected contributions						
#	Contribution	Start date	End date	Commitment amount	CP marker	Name of agreement partner
1	10051 - The Carter Center Access to Justice 2 and LEON	2017-07-07	2025-08-31	30,805,120	2	Carter Center
2	16471 - Support to Liberia Land Authority	2024-05-15	2027-12-31	30,000,000	0	Lantmäteriet
2	*11699 - Capacity Development in Land Administration*	*2019-02-01*	*2024-12-31*	*47,532,450*	*1*	Lantmäteriet
3	11788 - Enhancing Anti-Corruption in Liberia	2020-08-01	2024-09-30	13,377,000	1	CENTAL
4	12970 - Support to UNICEF Liberia country programme	2018-12-01	2026-06-30	40,000,000	0	UNICEF

---

[26] Possibly in the areas of transitional justice, gender-based violence.

5	13219 - UN Women Strategic Note 2020-2024	2020-01-01	2026-06-30	46,500,000	1	UN Women
6	14829 - ZOA & YMCA Community-based sociotherapy, Liberia 2021-2022	2021-04-01	2023-06-30	11,600,000	2	ZOA & YMCA
7	51240018 - Public Financial Management Capacity Building II	2019-12-01	2024-12-31	30,000,000	1	IBRD/
8	52090074 - Liberian Swedish Feeder Roads Project, phase 3	2017-04-27	2024-06-30	89,780,833	0,1	Cowater International Sweden AB MPW

4. MYANMAR

Introduction

This is the theory of change for the integration of the conflict perspective the Swedish government's strategy for development cooperation with Myanmar for the period 2018-2022 (extended to 23).[27]

Myanmar has experienced constant internal conflict since its independence from the United Kingdom in 1948. There has been continuous conflict between the central government and various ethnic armed groups seeking self-determination and rights for their respective communities. The 1 February 2021 military coup d'etat is an important milestone in the current conflict phase and catalysed the upswing in violence, with long-standing ethnic armed groups joining forces with the pro-democracy NUG (National Unity Government) to oppose the military regime.[28]

The Swedish government's strategy for development cooperation with Myanmar was developed for the pre-coup phase and underwent several changes to accommodate the dramatic change in the context. Nevertheless, the strategy objectives for the period remained consistent: 1) Human rights, democracy, the rule of law and gender equality, 2) peaceful and inclusive societies, 3) Equitable health, including sexual and reproductive health and rights.[29] The work under strategy objective 2 is premised on the aim of conflict transformation, whereby Sida and Sida partner's seek to contribute to the development of an inclusive, non-discriminatory, democratic Myanmar state and state institutions that would enable the conflict(s) to shift from the military to the civilian arena. All efforts to have a positive effect on conflict and peace dynamics should be viewed from this lens. The composition of the

---

[27] Government Offices of Sweden, *Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Myanmar 2018–2022,* 2018.

[28] Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, *Uppsala Conflict Data Program: Myanmar (Burma).* Accessed 08 2024. https://ucdp.uu.se/country/775

[29] Government Offices of Sweden, *Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Myanmar 2018–2022,* 2018.

portfolio with Myanmar in 2023 according to the conflict prevention marker is: 8% of disbursements have conflict prevention marker 0, 72% have marker 1, and 20% have marker 2.[30]

Indicators of levels of conflict and peacefulness			
UCDP	WB-FCS (2023)	GPI	ACLED (2022-2023)
7 state-based armed conflicts	Conflict	Low	Very high

Sweden's role in the donor landscape

Sida is a middle-sized donor in terms of funding in the donor landscape. However, Sweden has a unique position due to its principled approach of neither legitimizing the military's takeover of power nor resourcing its current government and therefore does not engage with the central government or state institutions. Sida works to improve coordination among likeminded donors support to peacebuilding and the democratic transition of Myanmar. Sida also works to influence the dialogue with the UN to improve transparency and accountability to the needs of the context. Sida leverages the EU as a platform to encourage fellow member states to be conflict sensitive and respond to the wishes of the Myanmar people.

Geographic focus of Sida's portfolio

There have been some changes to geographic composition during the strategy period:

- Pre-coup – The portfolio is spread across Myanmar and has included coordination efforts regarding the Rohingya in Bangladesh. At the beginning of the strategy period the focus was on the humanitarian crisis in the north Rakhine state, which included coordination and dialogue with the government on Rohingya refugees from Myanmar that found themselves in Bangladesh.[31] In addition several contributions were situated in the capital as they focused on institution-building and other associated activities as part of the hoped democratic transition.
- Post-coup - The portfolio is still spread across the country and includes funding to partners that are based in Thailand. Due to the military coup, Sida is no longer engaging with the central government and state institutions, and as such many of the contributions concentrated on strengthening national capacity at central and sub-national level have stopped. The underpinning logic for the geographic makeup of the portfolio is a combination of the needs targeted under the strategy, i.e. where initiatives are needed to secure equitable health, and where there are partners that have the capacity to implement the

---

[30] Sida Statistics Team, *Central Evaluation of Sida's work with the conflict perspective – Step 1,* 22 02 2024

[31] Sida, *Sammanfattad årsplan för genomförandet av strategin för Myanmar 2018*, 22 12 2017, p.1.

strategy objectives. These contributions are complemented by the global humanitarian strategy that addresses humanitarian needs in Myanmar.

Theory of change

The Theory of Change is a simplified, yet comprehensive description of inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impact of the integration of a conflict perspective in all work and financing, as well as the assumptions for those elements to be logically connected.

For the **INPUTS**, suitable organisational resources, human resources, training, and financial resources need to be in place at Sida HQ, overseas presences, and within partners. Specifically, for Myanmar, the section office in Yangon is responsible for the implementation of the strategy with Myanmar.[32] The integration of the conflict perspective lies under the supervision of the Head of the Development Co-operation and is the responsibility of each of the five programme officers, the administrator and the controller. The team have, as needed, requested support from the Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance and the Peace and Security Policy Specialist with geographic responsibility for Asia at Sida HQ [33] Examples of this include; *'Analysis of the Responsiveness of the Swedish Bilateral Development Cooperation to the Conflict Context(s) in Myanmar'* (March 2024), identifying suitable indicators for the peacebuilding portfolio in Myanmar (September 2016), and *'Mapping and analysis of Gender Equality and Nexus/Tiple Nexus in the Myanmar 2018-2022 Development Cooperation Strategy'* (10 March 2021). These inputs would then lead to and be converted into OUTPUTS. In the case of the Myanmar strategy, this means that Section Office staff recognise the importance of understanding the context and take steps to understand the Myanmar context by analysing the peace and conflict dynamics and potential triggers on a regular basis. This would be evidenced by the development of a MDPA as part of the strategy design process, and separate conflict analysis(es), and an ongoing assessment by the office of the peace and conflict dynamics. The conflict analysis should capture the conflict profile, identify potential dividers and connectors, and actor/stakeholder mapping.

According to the MDPAs and conflict analyses commissioned by Sida during the strategy period, conflict is pervasive in society and occurs at all levels, the current root causes at the national level include:

- ethno-national conflict over access to and control of political, economic, and securiy power,
- identify-based state policies of 'Burmanisation', political exclusion of non-Bamar identity groups, history of failed peace process, competition over land, natural resources and shadow economies,

Assumptions: All stakeholders demonstrate consistent leadership and sustained commitment to the integration of the conflict perspective and makes organisational,

---

[32] Sida, *Sammanfattad årsplan för genomförandet av strategin för Myanmar 2018*, 22 12 2017, p.1.

[33] Sida, *Sammanfattad årsplan för genomförandet av strategin för Myanmar 2018*, 22 12 2017, p.1.

financial and human resources available for implementation. Specifically, there needs to be sustained leadership at the Yangon section office, that incentivises staff to integrate the perspective.

The **SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES** are that Section Office staff reflect on their understanding of the conflict and peace dynamics and the potential two-way interaction between the operationalisation and implementation of the Swedish government's strategy objectives and the Myanmar context to tailor strategy proposal, and strategy operationalisation accordingly. The Yangon office integrates the conflict perspective in all of the three strategic objectives: *1) Human rights, democracy, the rule of law and gender equality,* and *3) Equitable health, including sexual and reproductive health and rights* to prevent and mitigate unintentionally exacerbating tensions and conflict whilst also maximising opportunities to do-good. The team also work directly on the peace and conflict dynamics under objective 2 *Peaceful and inclusive societies*.

Against this background:

- Yangon section office staff takes steps to maintain an up to date understanding of and reflect on the understanding of the conflict dynamics, and what this means for strategy level decisions such as portfolio and geographic composition, sectoral distribution, and choice of partners.
- Yangon section office staff assess and select partners that are willing and have a high capacity to integrate the conflict perspective in the implementation of the contributions under the three strategy objectives.
- The Yangon section office and their partners cooperation is based on shared values and have a common understanding of preventing and mitigating negative effects on the conflict and peace dynamics. Partners have shared values of inclusion, non-discrimination, and democratic norms and principles.
- Partners analyse the two-way interaction between the contribution(s) and conflict and peace dynamics, considering potential positive and negative effects (including resource transfers).
- Yangon section office staffs' dialogue with partners emphasises the conflict perspective, including noting any concerns regarding partners' capacity to integrate the conflict perspective in the risk register and taking these concerns up in an open dialogue.
- Yangon section office staff monitor and evaluate the integration of the conflict perspective, at strategy level, and at contribution level.
- Yangon section office staff correctly use and embed the conflict prevention marker in Sida contribution management.

Assumptions:

- The Yangon section office and partners have sufficient resources, in terms of financial and human resources, to integrate the conflict perspective as is relevant to their work.
- As needed, Yangon section office staff make use of the Sida peace and conflict toolbox, and other learning resources, such as the e-learning modules to support their work as relevant.
- As needed, Yangon section office staff make use of the Sida Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance.

- As needed, Yangon section office staff request advice from the Peace and Human Security policy advisors.
- Yangon section office staff are incentivised to integrate the conflict perspective.
- Partners are willing, able, and have access to appropriate guidelines (Sida and external sources) to integrate the conflict perspective.
- Sida and external guidelines are applied and meaningfully tailored to Myanmar's context.

This would then lead to and be converted into **MEDIUM TERM OUTCOMES at the level of partners**, meaning that:

- Partners continuously adapt implementation of contributions to prevent/minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts based on their ongoing understanding of the conflict dynamics. An example of efforts to maintain an ongoing understanding of the conflict context and implications for conflict sensitivity, is Sida partners attending a regular meeting under the auspices of FCDO to consider conflict sensitivity, amongst other topics.[34]
- Yangon section office staff follow up on any conflict perspective capacity issues identified in the appraisal, through dialogue with partners.
- Yangon section office staff and partners take steps to learn from monitoring and evaluation of the integration of the conflict perspective with learning taking place both downstream (flowing from strategy to contribution level) and upstream (flowing from contribution to strategy level) as is relevant to their work.
- The Yangon section office adapt the strategy operationalisation and its implementation in response to positive and negative changes in the peace and conflict dynamics.

Assumptions:

- The Yangon section office and partners have appropriate MEL systems to allow for systematic follow up of the integration of the conflict perspective.
- The Yangon section office and partners have appropriate processes and culture for adaptive management (this includes an open discussion on learning from failure and success).

The **LONG-TERM OUTCOMES** of this is that Sida's development cooperation with Myanmar is relevant and responsive to peace and conflict dynamics, prevents/mitigates risks of unintentionally exacerbating conflict and maximises opportunities for peace. Specifically, Sida and Sida's partners':

Strategic objective	Outcome	Assumptions (external)

---

[34] As noted in Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance, *'Mapping and analysis of Gender Equality and Nexus/Tiple Nexus in the Myanmar 2018-2022 Development Cooperation Strategy'* (10 March 2021). p.16.

Across all objectives	Across outcomes	• Security situation permits access. • MEL, including in hard-to-reach areas, is sufficient to adequately monitor success and failure and to adapt quickly.
Across all objectives	• Preventing resourcing or legitimising the military junta. • Preventing being perceived of bias towards the government or of facilitating military regime's control of service delivery and development assistance. • Efforts do not strengthen high risk groups (e.g. those at risk of militarisation).	• Possible to achieve strategy objectives without engagement with the military regime.
1: Human rights, democracy, the rule of law and gender equality[35]	Prevent and mitigate harm. To maxmise opportunities for positive effects on peace dynamics, efforts contribute to: • strengthening civil society and therefore their ability to participate in the peace process, and decentralisation and federalism processes. • strengthening the parallel government and therefore their ability to participate in the peace process, and decentralisation and federalism processes. • support to sustain and expand capabilities of local community-based organisations/networks and national civil society on the ground to mitigate local conflicts, tensions and risks to vulnerable groups. • Strengthen the capacity of CSOs and networks to become a strong, inclusive, and ethical civil society and that improve capabilities of governance actors to deliver services in more inclusive, accountable and unified manner to meet community needs in the short-	• Partners that do not work explicitly on peacebuilding are willing and have the capacity to maximise opportunities for positive effects on conflict and peace dynamics. • Civil society and parallel government maintain their popular base and are viewed as acceptable representatives

35 Government Offices of Sweden, *Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Myanmar 2018–2022,* 2018. p.3.

	term and to contribute positive peacebuilding in the long term.	
2: Peaceful inclusive societies[36]	Without unintentionally exacerbating conflicts, efforts contribute to: • Strengthen capacity to prevent violent conflict and ensure inclusive peacebuilding. • Improve participation and influence of women and young people in conflict management and peacebuilding. • Improve conditions for civil society to contribute to peacebuilding. Thereby having a positive effect on peace and conflict dynamics.	B.
3: Equitable health, including sexual and reproductive health and rights[37]	• Prevent and mitigate harm. C. To maxmise opportunities for positive effects on peace dynamics, efforts contribute to creating spaces for dialogue between groups on health and building intercommunal relations and trust.	• Partners that do not work explicitly on peacebuilding are willing and have the capacity to maximise opportunities for positive effects on conflict and peace dynamics.
Across strategic objectives, outcomes, and assumptions.		
Absence of unintentional harm caused.		
Other unintended (negative and positive) outcomes, such as: · legitimisation effects, · market effects, · substitution effects, · theft/diversion.		
Missed opportunities.		

These outcomes would then lead to the overall **IMPACT** of the integration of the conflict perspective, which means that Sweden's development cooperation in Myanmar prevents and mitigates negative impacts and maximises positive impacts on peace and conflict dynamics. **The main overarching goal of Sweden's international development cooperation with Myanmar is to create opportunities for people living in poverty and oppression to improve their living conditions.** The impact level is not part of the scope for this evaluation.

---

[36] Government Offices of Sweden, *Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Myanmar 2018–2022,* 2018. p.3.

[37] Government Offices of Sweden, *Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Myanmar 2018–2022,* 2018. p.3.

5. SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

This document presents Sida's approach to integrating the conflict perspective in the Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation in sustainable economic development for the periods 2018-2022 and 2022-2026. It should be noted that there has been no explicit theory of change developed in the unit responsible for this strategy and there is also no Sida or Swedish government requirement to develop ToCs for the integration of the conflict perspective.

GLOBEC administrates about 10% of Sida's total funds for development cooperation.[38] The current strategy has nine strategic objectives[39]:

Employment, market development and trade

1. Improved conditions for productive employment and decent work.
2. Strengthening of women's economic empowerment.
3. Improved conditions for sustainable and inclusive market and private sector development, and sustainable business.
4. Improved conditions for sustainable and inclusive international trade.

Food security, sustainable agriculture, forestry and fishing, and social protection

5. Improved conditions for food security, sustainable food systems, increased productivity and sustainability in agriculture, forestry and fishing, and strengthened ownership and tenure rights to land and natural resources.
6. Improved conditions for universal social protection.

Domestic resource mobilisation, financial stability, and digital transformation

7. Strengthened domestic resource mobilisation through effective tax systems and reduced corruption.
8. A resilient financial sector and increased financial stability.
9. Inclusive, equitable and sustainable digital transformation.[40]

With regards to the conflict marker, an average of 77% have marker 0, 23% of disbursements have marker 1 and 0% marker 2 over the period 2019-2023[41]. A variety of global and local partners are covered by this strategy, mainly multilateral institutions and CSOs. As it is a thematic strategy it covers global programmes, which are implemented in nearly 100 countries world-wide. The strategy is lead and implemented by Unit for Global Sustainable Economic Development (GLOBEC) at Sida.

---

[38] GLOBEC Strategy Report for 2023, p.6.

[39] These are very similar to the previous strategy period, although slightly renamed, reorganized and with different numbering.

[40] Annex to Government Decision of Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development 2022–2026 (UD2022/11292)

[41] Data from Sida statistics.

The approach to integration of the conflict perspective

For the **INPUTS**, organisational resources, human resources, training and seminars, and financial resources are in place at Sida HQ (including the peace and conflict toolbox and an e-learning. While Sida's lead and senior policy specialist for peace and security are placed at the same department as GLOBEC, the department does not have a structured system of advice and support on Sida's development perspectives (including the conflict perspective). Partners are also required to provide similar resources, funded through their Sida programmes or from other sources.

These inputs would then lead to and be converted into **OUTPUTS**, at the strategy level which means that Sida staff working on the implementation of the strategy understand the importance of integrating the conflict perspective and take steps to understand the conflict dynamics/tensions within specific thematic areas of the strategy. This is evidenced by the development of thematic analyses for specific areas of the strategy that includes an analysis of conflict dynamics.

The strategy level documentation identifies conflict risk for the strategy as a whole and for specific strategic objectives and thematic areas. There is some evidence of analysis of connectors and dividers. According to staff[42], this analysis draws on lessons learned from the previous strategy:

- In previous strategy for the period of 2018-2022, it is stated that violence and armed conflict are among the largest obstacles to economic and social development, and that development cooperation is an important part of conflict prevention.[43]
- An analysis of the conflict context presented in the 2021 Strategy report emphasized the devastating impact that conflicts have on poverty in all its dimensions.[44]
- The current strategy for the period of 2022-2026 emphasises how the last couple of years has shown the fragility of the economic development, where conflicts and the pandemic have had negative effects on almost all thematic areas in the strategy (except for the digital transition, financial inclusion, and social protection). [45]
- Corruption is seen as a key obstacle to development, exacerbating poverty, human rights, gender equality, environmental concerns, and labour conditions, undermining the legitimacy of the rule of law, and can increase societal tensions, violence, and conflict.[46]

---

[42] Meeting with True Schedvin, 18 July 2024

[43] Annex to Government Decision of Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation in sustainable economic development 2018-2022 (UD2018/09125/IU)

[44] GLOBEC Strategy Report over 2018-2020, in 2021

[45] GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development

[46] Annex to Government Decision of Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development 2022–2026 (UD2022/11292)

- The interaction between humanitarian aid, development cooperation and peacebuilding is seen as key to supporting increased resilience through productive and decent employment opportunities, food security, and social protection in conflict-affected areas and for migrants and refugees[47]
- The importance of employment for conflict prevention and peacebuilding as well as stability and security is recognised.[48]
- Strategy objective 2: It is recognised that a conflict analysis in all programmes related to women's economic empowerment is required to ensure that changes in social, economic, and political status do not lead to increased tensions/conflicts in society or gender-based violence.[49]
- Strategic objective 4:
  - It is noted that promoting the participation and perspectives of Sida's target groups can increase the opportunities for multilateral agreements to contribute to a more inclusive economic development and decrease tensions to help prevent conflict.[50]
  - Specific stakeholders could increase the role/impact of sustainable and inclusive in conflict
- Strategic objective 9:
  - There is potential to harness opportunities of digitalisation for Sida's target groups while mitigating risks around conflict[51]

Assumptions for these results to be achieved: All stakeholders demonstrate consistent leadership and sustained commitment and make sufficient organisational, financial and human resources available, and ensure that there are incentives for staff to learn about the conflict perspective. Specifically, these needs to be sustained leadership at the GLOBEC unit to allow this work to proceed.

A **SHORT-TERM OUTCOME** is a **strategy proposal, operationalisation, plan** that reflects on the two-way interaction between the main focus areas of the strategy and the conflict dynamics presented above and details how to tackle these through by integrating the conflict perspective across the strategy and for all contributions. The GLOBEC strategy plan for 2022-2026 notes that the integration of the conflict perspective in implementation is a priority.

There are also specific targets articulated for some prioritised actions, including for certain communication and dialogue plans:

---

[47] GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development
[48] Theory of Change for GLOBEC strategy objective 9
[49] Theory of Change for GLOBEC strategy objective 2
[50] Theory of Change for GLOBEC strategy objective 4
[51] Theory of Change for GLOBEC strategy objective 9

- Plans to further develop economic development in conflict areas together with FRED and DEMO units is noted.[52] This is mentioned in general and specifically in relation to strategic objective 9 (Inclusive, equitable and sustainable digital transformation).
- Plans to conduct dialogue on the conflict perspective and HDP nexus approach with FAO, ILO and IFAD to support synergies between humanitarian aid, development cooperation and peacebuilding as way to support increased resilience through productive and decent employment opportunities, food security, and social protection in conflict-affected areas and for migrants and refugees and to emphasise the importance of employment for peace building and stability and security[53]. This should be done through:

  o Annual meetings in relation to the organisation or operations
  o Planning and reporting sessions
  o Field trips, events and other dialogue opportunities
  o Dialogue via focal points
  o Through the JPO at ILO headquarters[54]

- Plans to conduct dialogue with World Bank/IFC and ITC with the aim to increase the capacity of partners to work with a conflict perspective and/or in conflict areas and to share experience and knowledge about the conflict perspective. This should be done through[55]:

  o Annual meetings in relation to the organisation or operations
  o Field trips, events and other dialogue opportunities
  o Dialogue via focal points

- Focus on integration of the conflict perspective in the area of private sector development[56]
- Sida staff monitor and evaluate the integration of the conflict perspective, at strategy level and at contribution level[57].
- Sida staff correctly uses and embeds the conflict policy marker in the Sida strategy and contribution cycles[58].

---

[52] GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development

[53] GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development

[54] GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development, Annex 4

[55] We understand that there has been discussions around IFC's lack of capacity for working in a conflict sensitive manner, stemming from work in Ethiopia that has been raised in global dialogue by Sida. This was raised by the Embassy in Ethiopia.

[56] Meeting with True Schedvin, 18 July 2024

[57] An increased focus on M&E is mentioned, but not clear if this includes monitoring of the integration of the conflict perspective (GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development)

[58] The strategy plan presents the proportion of contributions for the policy marker on conflict for the years 2021 and 2022.

It is also articulated in specific strategic objectives:
- Strategy objective 2: Include a clear conflict analysis in all programmes related to women's economic empowerment to ensure that changes in social, economic, and political status do not lead to increased tensions/conflicts in society or gender-based violence.[59]
- Strategy objective 4:
    o Further integrate the conflict perspective in the new trade strategies from the World Bank.
    o Promote the participation and perspectives of Sida's target groups to increase the opportunities for multilateral agreements to contribute to a more inclusive economic development and decrease tensions to help prevent conflict.[60]
    o Prioritising partners that contribute to the theory of change, including stakeholders that are able to strengthen the role and impact of sustainable and inclusive trade in conflict.[61]
    o When relevant, use trade as a tool for peace building in conflict areas. [62]

- Strategy objective 9: Harness the opportunities of digitalisation for Sida's target groups while mitigating risks around conflict, including:
    o A better understanding for the conflict perspective can strengthen digital transformations as it can strengthen the use of digital services and infrastructure in conflict affected and fragile contexts, including increase the understanding the perspective of "Do no harm" and what is means in the development of the digitalisation.[63]

Assumptions for these results to be achieved: Sida staff are appropriately **trained, incentivised and supported** to ensure and verify that Sida's selected partners have adequate capacities to effectively integrate relevant conflict perspectives into the projects and programmes that they implement with the financial support of Sida. This includes access to sufficient resources, in terms of financial and human resources, and to appropriate method support (the peace and conflict toolbox, and other learning resources) and advice from HQ and/or Human Security Helpdesk, making use of this support when required.

These outputs would then lead to and be converted into **MEDIUM TERM OUTCOMES** meaning that:

---

[59] Theory of Change for GLOBEC strategy objective 2
[60] Theory of Change for GLOBEC strategy objective 4
[61] GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development
[62] GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development, Objective 4 "operate in conflict environments"
[63] Theory of Change for GLOBEC strategy objective 9

- Sida and their partners have a common understanding of the conflict perspective and the knowledge and capacity of partners to work from a conflict perspective and/or in conflict areas has increased through dialogue with Sida. [64]
- Partners analyse the two-way interaction between the contribution(s) and conflict dynamics/tensions and considers how to prevent/minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts.
- Strategic objective 2: Conflict analyses that consider gender dynamics are conducted for all women's economic empowerment programmes
- Strategic objective 4:
  - o There is increased knowledge among development stakeholders regarding how **trade** can contribute to prevent conflict and crisis.
  - o There is increased participation of Sida's target groups (women, youth, migrants) in multilateral agreements related to trade and their perspectives are integrated.
  - o Stakeholders that are able to strengthen the role and impact of sustainable and inclusive trade in conflict are included in trade programmes.
  - o The conflict perspective is integrated into new World Bank trade strategies

- Strategic objective 9: Specific opportunities to increase use of digital services and infrastructure in conflict affected and fragile contexts are identified.
- Partners continuously adapt contributions based on their understanding of the two-way dynamics between conflict dynamics/tensions and the contribution to prevent/minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts.
- Sida staff and partners take steps to learn from monitoring and evaluation of the integration of the conflict perspective with learning taking place both downstream (from strategy to contribution level) and upstream (from contribution to strategy level).
- Sida adapts the strategy and the strategy plan and its implementation, as and when required

Assumptions:
- Partners are appropriately **trained, incentivised and supported** and **are willing** to effectively integrate relevant and locally adapted conflict perspectives into Sida funded projects and programmes.
- Suitable monitoring, evaluation and learning systems are in place that ensures that:

---

[64] GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development, Annex 4

    o Knowledge on monitoring systems adapted to conflict contexts and difficult environments are shared and tested where relevant.[65]

    o Experiences and knowledge on the conflict perspective and/or working in conflict areas is shared between Sida and partners[66]

  • Sida staff and partners are able to rapidly adapt their work as a result of changes in the context through the use of flexible financing and long-term non-earmarked support.[67]

A **LONG-TERM OUTCOME** of this is that Sida's development cooperation in sustainable economic development is relevant and responsive to peace and conflict dynamics, mitigates risks of doing harm and contributes to conflict prevention and peacebuilding. There may be intended and unintended outcomes of the integration of the conflict perspective. A few specific outcomes are mentioned in the documentation that can be seen as linked to the integration of the conflict perspective, as detailed in the table below. We also specify assumptions where articulated.

Strategic objective	Outcome	Assumption
Strategic objective 2	The potential for increased tensions/conflicts in society or gender-based violence as a result of support to women's economic empowerment is reduced.	Conflict analyses that consider gender dynamics are conducted for all programmes under strategic objective 2
Strategy objective 4	There is increased potential for international trade to decrease the vulnerability to crisis/conflict. [68]	Multilateral partner organisations have the capacity to operate in conflict environments[69] International systems, including trade, finance and financial flows, communications, and the internet, continue to operate across national borders and are not fragmented or diminished by protectionism, geopolitical divisions, or other events.
Strategic objective 9	Digital services and infrastructure are harnessed for use in conflict affected and fragile contexts	
All	The cooperation at the intersection of humanitarian, peacebuilding and	

---

[65] GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development, Objective 4 "operate in conflict environments" in Annex 3 - Unit's contribution to INTEM's VP 2023

[66] GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development, Annex 4

[67] GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development

[68] Theory of Change for GLOBEC strategy objective 4; GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development, in Strategic objective 4 - Improved conditions for sustainable and inclusive international trade

[69] Theory of Change for GLOBEC strategy objective 4

development cooperation is strengthened in the long-term, contributing to increased resilience through productive and decent employment opportunities, food security, and social protection in conflict-affected areas and for migrants and refugees[70]	

For this strategy, the evaluation will not include the **IMPACT** level and it is therefore not articulated.

The table presents the contributions selected for the evaluation.

Selected contributions

#	Contribution	Start year	End year	Commitment amount	Conflict prevention marker	Name agreement partner
1	11976 - Water and Energy for Food (WE4F) 2019-2025	2019	2025	67,500,000	1	USAID
2	61055001 - Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI) 2018-2021	2018	2025	65,190,364	0,1	Rights and Resources Institute Inc
3	14448 - GSMA 2021-2024	2021	2026	49,026,812	0	GSMA
4	15269 - WWB Women´s World Banking 2023-2027	2023	2027	60,155,000	0,1	WWB/Women's World Banking Inc
5	14589 - ITC 2022-2026	2022	2027	60,000,000	0	ITC
6	61050117 - ILC, International Land Coalition 2015-2019	2015	2022	26,000,000	1	ILC/International Land Coalition
7	10951 - IFAD Financing Facility for Remittances	2020	2027	60,000,000	0	IFAD
8	61055000 - Forest Farm Facility 2018-2022	2018	2025	145,600,000	0	FAO/Food and Agriculture Organization
9	12009 - WB Digital Development Partnership 2020-2023	2020	2023	37,500,000	0	WB
10	11700 - Standards and Trade STDF 2020-2023	2020	2024	40,000,000	0	WTO
10	61050088 - Standards and Trade Development Facility 2015-2018	2015	2020	20,000,000	0	WTO
11	16051 - Stockholm Internet Forum 2023	2022	2023	1,902,930	2	
12	12304 - IFC GBTAP - Green Bonds Technical Assistance Program	2018	2025	21,500,000	0	IFC
13	13187 - AgriFose Food Security Post 2015 fas II	2020	2025	60,000,000	0	SLU/Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet

[70] GLOBEC Strategy plan 2022-2026, Strategy for Sweden's global development cooperation on sustainable economic development

6. WESTERN BALKANS AND TÜRKIYE

Introduction

This is a ToC for the integration of the conflict perspective in the Swedish government's Strategy for Sweden's reform cooperation with the Western Balkans and Turkey for 2021–2027[71]. It is based on a review of key documents related to the strategy, and discussions with staff in the regional unit. There are seven units/foreign missions in total (one regional and six bilateral) that contribute to the implementation of the WBT strategy. It should be noted that there has been no explicit theory of change for the integration of the conflict perspective developed in the unit responsible for this strategy and there is also no Sida or Swedish government requirement to develop ToCs for it.

Since the fall of communism in Southeast Europe and the Balkan wars of the 1990s, the Western Balkans countries' development have been hindered by legacies of war and authoritarianism that continue to influence people's relations to each other within and between countries and still carry the potential to turn violent again.[72] Differing political positions towards regional architecture and processes, such as North-Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) accession and European Union (EU) integration and reforms, provide an additional layer of complexity and are reflected in internal polarisation. [73]

Since 1989, Türkiye has experienced the interstate, non-state and one-sided categories of organized violence, as defined by UCDP. The separatist conflict against the PKK (Kurdistan Workers' Party) in the country's south-east is the main internal conflict, though it notably endured a coup attempt from a faction within the Turkish Armed Forces in 2016. Türkiye has also intervened in the Syrian civil war intermittently from 2014-2020.[74]

The Swedish government's strategy for Sweden's reform cooperation with the Western Balkans and Türkiye (WBT) was previously part of a broader strategy that also included Eastern Europe (2014–2020). The WBT now has a separate strategy and an additional support area for "peaceful and inclusive societies". With this has come a greater consideration and elaboration of the "do-good" aspects of the conflict perspective at the regional level. The support areas for the period are:

- Western Balkans: 1) Human rights, democracy, the rule of law and gender equality, 2) peaceful and inclusive societies, 3) Environmentally and climate-resilient

---

[71] When this strategy was initiated Sida still used the name Turkey. When official documentation is referred to, we therefore use the name Turkey. Everywhere else we use the official name Türkiye.

[72] As noted in Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance, *'Regional conflict analysis of the Western Balkans'* (29 November 2021). p.5.

[73] As noted in Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance, *'Regional conflict analysis of the Western Balkans'* (29 November 2021). p.5.

[74] Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, *Uppsala Conflict Data Program: Turkey.* Accessed 09 2024. https://ucdp.uu.se/country/640

sustainable development and sustainable use of natural resources, 4) Environmentally and climate-resilient sustainable development and sustainable use of natural resources,

- Türkiye: Human rights, democracy, the rule of law and gender equality.[75]

Sida's strategy operationalisation plan notes that the work under support area 2 is premised on the consideration that expected results must be "realistic" and therefore change under this area is focused on preventing further negative developments in the short-term and "supporting actors who can make a positive contribution to reconciliation and conflict prevention in the long-term".[76]

The composition of the portfolio with Western Balkans and Türkiye in 2023 according to the conflict prevention marker is: 74% of disbursements have conflict prevention marker 0, 21% have marker 1, and 3% have marker 2.[77]

The geographic composition during the strategy period includes the countries of Western Balkans (covering Albania, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Serbia) and Türkiye. The WBT strategy guides Swedish development cooperation for both the regional level and the six individual countries, with equal relevance for both and without any prioritisation between the regional and country levels.

Theory of change

This Theory of Change is a simplified, yet comprehensive description of inputs, outputs, and outcomes of the integration of a conflict perspective in all work and financing, as well as the assumptions for those elements to be logically connected.

For the **INPUTS**, suitable organisational resources, human resources, training, and financial resources need to be in place at Sida HQ, overseas presences, and within partners. Specifically, for the WBT Strategy, there are seven units/foreign missions in total, each with allocated funds and a head/chief, that are equally responsible for integrating the conflict perspective. The teams have, as needed, requested support from the Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance and the Peace and Security Policy Specialist with geographic responsibility for EUROLATIN at Sida HQ[78]

These inputs would then lead to and be converted into **OUTPUTS**. In the case of the Western Balkans and Türkiye strategy, this means that Unit staff recognise the importance of understanding the peace and conflict dynamics at the regional level and take steps to understand and analyse the peace and conflict dynamics, and potential triggers on a regular basis. This would be evidenced by the development of a regional

---

[75] Government Offices of Sweden, *Strategy for Sweden's reform cooperation with the Western Balkans and Turkey for 2021-2027,* 2021.

[76] Sida, *Strategy plan for Sweden's reform cooperation with the Western Balkans and Turkey 2021-2027.* p.8.

[77] Sida Statistics Team, *Central Evaluation of Sida's work with the conflict perspective – Step 1,* 22 02 2024

[78] Sida, *Sammanfattad årsplan för genomförandet av strategin för Myanmar 2018*, 22 12 2017, p.1.

conflict analysis as part of the strategy operationalisation process, consulting the separate individual country conflict analysis(es) where available, and close cooperation with the bilateral teams regarding the interplay between national and regional peace and conflict dynamics. The conflict analysis should capture the conflict profile, conflict drivers, identify potential dividers and connectors, and actor/stakeholder mapping.

According to the conflict analysis commissioned by Sida during the strategy period, the current conflict drivers at the regional level[79] include:

1. The nexus of issues between nationalism, authoritarianism, corruption and state capture.
2. Rule of law, corruption and organised crime.
3. Unresolved divisions from past conflicts.
4. Socio-economic stagnation, unemployment and out-migration.
5. Public fear and apathy.
6. Challenges related to migration management that result in international reinforcement of problematic state security structures and expose migrants to abuse.
7. Harmful gender norms and gender inequality.
8. Religious tensions.
9. The role of external authoritarian players in undermining democratisation and peacebuilding.[80]

Assumptions: All stakeholders demonstrate consistent leadership and sustained commitment to the integration of the conflict perspective and makes organisational, financial and human resources available for implementation. Specifically, there needs to be sustained leadership within the seven teams and missions that incentivises staff to integrate the perspective. In addition, there needs to be a close cooperation and collaborative approach with the bilateral teams given the interconnected nature of peace and conflict dynamics in the region, and that contributions under the regional strategy may have components in individual countries of the region – that the bilateral teams may be better placed to provide insight on the respective national dynamics.

The **SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES** are that the Sida staff in the seven units/foreign missions under the WBT strategy reflect on their understanding of the conflict and peace dynamics and the potential two-way interaction between the operationalisation and implementation of the Swedish government's strategy

---

[79] A regional conflict analysis was commissioned, as well as individual conflict analysis for five countries within the WBT Strategy. Saferworld et al., Regional conflict analysis of the Western Balkans, November 2021. Saferworld et al., Actor mapping for peaceful and inclusive societies in the Western Balkans and updated conflict analysis, June 2024; Saferworld et al., North Macedonia Conflict Analysis, September 2021; Embassy of Sweden Belgrade, Serbia Conflict Analysis, January 2024; Saferworld et al., Albania Conflict Analysis, May 2021; Saferworld et al., Conflict Analysis of Bosnia and Herzegovina, November 2021; Saferworld et al., Kosovo Conflict Analysis, March 2021

[80] As noted in Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance, *'Regional conflict analysis of the Western Balkans'* (29 November 2021). p.5.; Strategy Report Albania 2022-2023; Strategy Report Bosnia and Herzegovina 2022-2023; Strategy Report Kosovo 2022-2023; Strategy Report North Macedonia 2022-2023; Strategy Report Serbia 2022-2023; Strategy Report Turkey 2022-2023.

objectives and the regional context to tailor strategy operationalisation and implementation accordingly. The seven unit/foreign missions under the WBT strategy integrate the conflict perspective in all of the four support areas for Western Balkans and in one support area for Türkiye to prevent and mitigate unintentionally exacerbating tensions and conflict whilst also maximising opportunities to do-good. The teams also work directly on the regional peace and conflict dynamics under support area 2 *peaceful and inclusive societies (except for Türkiye)*.

Against this background:

- Unit staff take steps to maintain an up to date understanding of and reflect on the understanding of regional peace and conflict dynamics, and what this means for strategy level decisions such as portfolio and geographic composition, sectoral distribution, and choice of partners.
- Unit staff assess and select partners that are willing and have the relevant level of capacity (this likely differs between countries) to integrate the conflict perspective in the implementation of the contributions under the strategy objectives.
- Unit staff and partners have a common understanding of the conflict perspective
- Partners analyse the two-way interaction between the contribution(s) and conflict and peace dynamics at regional or national level as relevant (this will depend on whether the contribution is aimed at the regional level or/also are implemented in a specific country(s)). They consider potential positive and negative effects (including resource transfers).
- Regional staffs' dialogue with partners emphasises the conflict perspective, including noting any concerns regarding partners' capacity to integrate the conflict perspective in the risk register and taking these concerns up in an open dialogue.
- Regional staff monitor and evaluate the integration of the conflict perspective, at strategy level, and at contribution level.
- Regional staff correctly use and embed the conflict prevention marker in Sida's contribution management process.
- Cooperation and input is sought from the bilateral teams as appropriate.

Assumptions:

- The seven units /foreign missions under the WBT strategy and partners have sufficient resources, in terms of financial and human resources, to integrate the conflict perspective as is relevant to their work.
- As needed, staff of the seven units/foreign missions under the WBT strategy make use of the Sida peace and conflict toolbox, and other learning resources, such as the e-learning modules to support their work as relevant.
- As needed, staff of the seven units/foreign missions under the WBT strategy make use of the Sida Helpdesk on Human Security and Humanitarian Assistance.
- As needed, staff of the seven units/foreign missions under the WBT strategy request advice from the Peace and Human Security policy advisors.

- Staff of the seven units/foreign missions under the WBT strategy are incentivised to integrate the conflict perspective.
- Partners are willing, able, and have access to appropriate guidelines (Sida and external sources) to integrate the conflict perspective.
- Partners have the capacity to analyse the interplay between their work and the peace and conflict dynamics of the context (this may be subnational, national or regional depending on the contribution and the partner's size and experience).
- Sida and external guidelines are applied and meaningfully tailored to the Western Balkans and Türkiye's context.

This would then lead to and be converted into **MEDIUM TERM OUTCOMES at the level of partners**, meaning that:

- Partners continuously adapt implementation of contributions to prevent/minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts based on their ongoing understanding of the conflict dynamics.
- Staff of the seven units/ foreign missions under the WBT strategy follow up on any conflict perspective capacity issues identified in the appraisal, through dialogue with partners.
- Staff of the seven units/foreign missions under the WBT strategy and partners take steps to learn from monitoring and evaluation of the integration of the conflict perspective with learning taking place both downstream (flowing from strategy to contribution level) and upstream (flowing from contribution to strategy level) as is relevant to their work. This learning also takes place with the bilateral teams.
- The seven units/foreign missions under the WBT strategy adapt the strategy operationalisation and its implementation in response to positive and negative changes in the regional and national peace and conflict dynamics.

Assumptions:

- The seven units/foreign missions under the WBT strategy and partners have appropriate MEL systems to allow for systematic follow up of the integration of the conflict perspective.
- Staff of the seven units/foreign missions under the WBT strategy and partners have appropriate processes and culture for adaptive management (this includes an open discussion on learning from failure and success).

The **LONG-TERM OUTCOMES** of this is that Sida's development cooperation with the Western Balkans and Türkiye is relevant and responsive to peace and conflict dynamics, prevents/mitigates risks of unintentionally exacerbating conflict and maximises opportunities for peace. Specifically, Sida and Sida's partners':

Strategic objective	Outcome	Assumptions (external)
Western Balkans		

1: Human rights, democracy, the rule of law and gender equality	• Prevent and mitigate harm. • To maximise opportunities for positive effects on peace dynamics, efforts focus on common areas of cooperation that can create open spaces for intercommunal, and or intercountry contact and foster trust in the long term. • Peer learning, transfer of best practice between countries. • Promotion of reforms required towards EU membership.	• Partners that do not work explicitly on peacebuilding are willing and have the capacity to maximise opportunities for positive effects on conflict and peace dynamics.
2: Peaceful inclusive societies	Without unintentionally exacerbating conflicts, efforts contribute: • To maximise opportunities for positive effects on peace dynamics, efforts contribute to prevent further negative developments in the short-term and efforts that can make a positive contribution to reconciliation and conflict prevention in the long-term. • Peer learning, transfer of best practice between countries. • Promotion of cooperation in sectors of mutual interest, such as cross-border trade.	
3: Environmentally and climate-resilient sustainable development and sustainable use of natural resources.	• Prevent and mitigate harm. • To maximise opportunities for positive effects on peace dynamics, efforts focus on common areas of cooperation that can create open spaces for intercommunal, and or intercountry contact and foster trust in the long term. • Peer learning, transfer of best practice between countries.	• Partners that do not work explicitly on peacebuilding are willing and have the capacity to maximise opportunities for positive effects on conflict and peace dynamics.
Türkiye		
1: Human rights, democracy, the rule of law and gender equality	• Prevent and mitigate harm.	The Qur'an burnings in Sweden and perception of Sweden, does not hinder or limit Sida and its partners to fulfil the strategy objectives.
Across all objectives		The Swedish government's political position as a member of the EU and NATO, and as supporting an EU accession pathway for the countries in the region, does not hinder Sida's

			ability to achieve the strategy objectives.
Across strategic objectives, outcomes, and assumptions.			
Absence of unintentional harm caused.			
Other unintended (negative and positive) outcomes, such as: · legitimisation effects, · market effects, · substitution effects, · theft/diversion.			
Missed opportunities.			

The table below presented the contribution sampled in the evaluation.

Selected contributions						
#	Contribution	Start Date	End Date	Type of organization	Country	Disbursed Amount
1	15085 - Translating the SDG Framework in BIH into Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, UNDP	2022-04-01	2026-06-30	41114 - United Nations Development Programme	Bosnia and Herzegovina	46100000
2	55120022 - Support to UN Women Moldova in SN 2016-2020 implementation.	2016-09-20	2022-06-30	41146 - United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women	Moldova	45800000
3	55100011 - OPC Serbia 2016-2023	2016-02-01	2023-12-31	22000 - Donor country-based NGO	Serbia	41000000
4	12071 - Improving Air Quality, SEPA	2018-11-21	2023-08-30	11001 - Central Government in donor country	Bosnia and Herzegovina	38400000
5	55100008 - CSO support in Serbia BOS 2016-2023	2016-10-01	2024-01-30	23000 - Developing country-based NGO	Serbia	33000000
6	11655 - CRTA: support to CSOs to promote democracy and EU integration	2018-03-01	2023-06-30	23000 - Developing country-based NGO	Serbia	31000000
7	13119 - Environment: Persistant Organic Pollutants, UNDP	2019-05-01	2026-06-30	41114 - United Nations Development Programme	Bosnia and Herzegovina	30607000
8	14519 - Improved state owned enterprises, WB	2021-05-01	2028-01-31	44001 - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (WB)	Bosnia and Herzegovina	30000000
9	12719 - One UN Joint Action in Human Rights in the Transnistrian region 2019-2022 (III)	2019-07-01	2023-09-01	41114 - United Nations Development Programme	Moldova	29089484
10	10222 - Core support EEF	2016-11-23	2021-05-31	23000 - Developing country-based NGO	Moldova	29000000
11	13162 - UN Women Strategic Note, UNW	2019-05-01	2025-11-30	41146 - United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women	Bosnia and Herzegovina	27138500

12	14597 - UNDP Framework Agreement 2022-2026	2022-09-30	2026-06-30	41114 - United Nations Development Programme	North Macedonia	27000000
13	55100005 - EISP, phase 2 Environmental Infrastructure Support Program	2016-05-09	2024-03-01	12001 - Central Government in recipient country	Serbia	24638164
14	55100006 - ENVAP 3, Environmental Accession Project	2016-09-01	2022-12-31	12001 - Central Government in recipient country	Serbia	23205683
15	55100015 - Kvinna till Kvinna Serbia 2016-2020	2016-06-01	2023-08-31	22000 - Donor country-based NGO	Serbia	21412592
16	12380 - Institutional cooperation - Cadastre	2018-12-12	2024-06-30	11001 - Central Government in donor country	North Macedonia	20399201

Central Evaluation of Conflict Sensitivity in Sida's Development and Humanitarian Cooperation

Purpose and use

This evaluation examines how Sida integrates conflict sensitivity across its strategies and operations, with the purpose of strengthening learning and improving how Sida's work affects peace and conflict dynamics.

Conclusion

It finds that conflict sensitivity is increasingly embedded in Sida's portfolio but applied unevenly across contexts. Stronger results emerge where analysis is continuous, partner capacity is high, and adaptation is proactive. Weak monitoring systems and inconsistent feedback loops limit learning and the ability to track outcomes or anticipate risks.

Recommendation

The evaluation recommends establishing minimum standards for conflict sensitivity across all strategies, ensuring regular context updates, strengthening monitoring, evaluation and learning systems with simple indicators, and proactively addressing recurring risks such as gender backlash, unequal targeting, and challenges linked to country exits.

Sida