

EVALUATION DEPARTMENT



REPORT 10/2015



Photo: Ken Opprann

Evaluation of Norwegian support
to capacity development

Annex 5: Overview of how the report responds to the Terms of Reference

Annex 5 Overview of how the report responds to the Terms of Reference

The evaluation questions and focus areas	Main Report Sections and Sub Sections				
	4.1 Results of Norwegian Support to Capacity Development	4.2 Relevance of Norwegian Support to Capacity Development	4.3 Design and Delivery of Norwegian Support to Capacity Development	4.4 Norway's capacity to Support Capacity Development	4.5 Characteristics of Success and Lessons for the Future
Evaluation Questions					
1) How can a generic theory of change for support to capacity development be formulated that would enhance the effectiveness of support to capacity development?					
2) What is the relevance of the strategies and initiatives for support to capacity development? e.g. do they primarily aim at improving capacity to manage aid programmes, versus aiming at more general improvement of capacity in a sector or an institution?		4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3 4.2.4			
3) To what degree are the capacities to manage capacity development processes– e.g. change management competencies, incentives, procedures, guidance, management – effectively in place and adequate among the donor agencies and partner institutions?				4.4.1, 4.4.2, 5.1	
4) How have strategies and interventions been designed to fit with context-specific factors such as specific institutional dynamics or the social, cultural, political and legal environment, and to contribute to influencing factors external to the institution(s), such as demand and accountability mechanisms? To what degree are strategies based on evidence on how support to capacity development has worked elsewhere?			4.2, 4.3.1, 4.3.2		
5) How do representatives of the partner institutions and/or other stakeholders in partner countries perceive the donors' role in capacity development, and what do they think is the appropriate role of donors in future capacity development?	No data from sample				
6) How has results-orientation and results-based management approaches been applied in CD support, and how have they contributed to learning and improved effectiveness?			4.3.2		
7) To what degree have interventions achieved the planned results at outcome level, and to what degree is there a correlation between the interventions, and observed improvements in capacity of the partner institutions in more general term?	4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3				
8) What are the possible unintended effects of support to capacity development?	No data from sample				
9) Did the interventions represent efficient use of money in contributing to CD			4.3.4		

The evaluation questions and focus areas	Main Report Sections and Sub Sections				
	4.1 Results of Norwegian Support to Capacity Development	4.2 Relevance of Norwegian Support to Capacity Development	4.3 Design and Delivery of Norwegian Support to Capacity Development	4.4 Norway's capacity to Support Capacity Development	4.5 Characteristics of Success and Lessons for the Future
10) What characterises those strategies and interventions to support capacity development, which seem relatively more effective, compared to those that seem relatively less effective?					5.1, 5.2
11) Under which circumstances, for which aspects of capacity and for which specific inputs may donor support to capacity development be appropriate and effective? Are there situations where the agencies should refrain from being involved in capacity development, and/or modalities and approaches they should no longer apply?					5.1, 5.2
Focus Areas					
i. The relevance and opportunity of a "best fit" approach for support to capacity development, well adapted to specific intra- and inter-institutional dynamics and the wider context.	4.2.2		4.3.1		
ii. Within the "best fit" dimension, the appropriateness and the legitimacy of external (donor) involvement in different dimensions of capacity development, and whether some processes may be so complex and demanding that the ability of donors to add value is limited.	Insufficient data from sample				
iii. The merits of looking beyond the supply side of public sector institutions to foster broader accountability relations or other types of collaboration with e.g. civil society, private sector, media or oversight institutions.	Insufficient data from sample				
iv. How a results-focused approach to aid for capacity development can serve to improve learning and accountability among aid agencies in the future.			4.3.2		