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Executive Summary

Results: DCA general produces good results in its programming, both ‘on the ground’ and in national and international advocacy. In development there is an increasing focus on rights, concurrent with and in synergy with support to improved livelihoods (through Right to Food Programmes) mainly for disadvantaged, rural populations. Results are evident in influencing national policies on civil society, and in addressing access to resources, policies concerning rural development and other fields. DCA and partners have taken a leading role in linking relief, recovery and development. This linking is not easy to manage, but DCA has succeeded mainly through work with partners obtaining the right capacities and clever funding and fund allocation methods.

DCA partners, supported actively by DCA, are often successful in local advocacy, also under difficult circumstances. DCA itself is highly active internationally on issues of political space, human rights, climate change and others, often in collaboration with partners in ACT or APRODEV.

Important and strategic humanitarian results are being achieved with vulnerable people being targeted and reached. Overall, DCA humanitarian actions appear to be delivered in accordance with stated goals and objectives and the work under the Humanitarian Partnership Agreement with Danida is implemented in accordance with the agreed thematic and geographic focus areas. The Partnership funding plays a key role in DCA response capacity and in ensuring additional important humanitarian funding to increase impacts. Capacity of DCA to address humanitarian action is well developed at Head Office level and Regional/Country Office levels.

DCA actively takes part and engage in coordinated activities within humanitarian action. DCA implementation of cross-border assistance in conflict situations is an important contribution to protection of people in need. DCA development of cash transfers and involvement with HAP and Sphere are important contributions to improved implementation of humanitarian action.

In Humanitarian Mine Action, DCA has achieved significant results, which have a positive impact on the lives of conflict affected people. DCA work within HMA is increasingly focused on promoting realistic, people-centred work on Mine Risk Education, Victim Assistance and Survey. DCA has developed an approach for more community-based and development oriented Humanitarian Mine Action, while retaining capacity in certified mine clearance.

Accordance with Danish policies, and use of DCA’s own policies and strategies: There is good level of consistency between the DCA objectives and goals for development and humanitarian action and the Danish objectives and goals expressed in the Strategies for Civil Society and for Humanitarian Action.

Management of programmes: DCA increasingly erases the previous columns of programme types, which is in line with recommendations from previous reviews. The focus is now on country programmes, which will make it possible better to exploit synergies, so apparent in the reality of the target groups. So far DCA maintains a commendable level of knowledge and experience within the previous programme areas and on crosscutting issues. The procedures and systems for management of programmes are well developed and mainly well applied, but are also time-consuming. This appears unavoidable with the multitude of donors and their incongruent requirements. DCA is still unable to provide results-based management, and for example link
financial and outcome (or even output) reporting. There is work underway to fill this gap as an important step towards improving efficiency and effectiveness.

**Monitoring.** DCA is as good as or better than Danish peers in monitoring and reporting on results, but still many elements are reduced to ‘head-counts’ (of e.g. participants) or reporting of illustrative cases. This should be improved in order to contribute better to transparency and to result-based management. The basic step in monitoring of field activities is by partners. Here the principle of participation is frequently not applied, which leads to loss of accuracy and usefulness of the process and results. DCA is encouraged to work with partners on improving this. DCA’s reporting system is tied to the LFAs and this way largely underreports on results achieved through the way DCA implements, i.e. in application of the PANEL principles.

**Organisational management:** A committed and proactive council and a professional and highly competent board lead DCA. Both collaborate well with the director general and the management team. DCA capacity for strategic and day-to-day management is based on a good collaboration between the DCA-Partners, Regional Offices, the Head Office and the DCA Governing Bodies as well as highly committed and capable staff. DCA actively supports capacity building in partners that so wish. DCA has good financial management with adequate systems and procedures. The timeliness in Reporting and in general Financial Management demonstrates a well-established organisation, which does not yet apply a system or a set of procedures for risk management.

**Partnerships:** Partners execute most DCA activities. Partnerships are often long-term and DCA realises its own PANEL principles in work with partners, which is highly appreciated. Increasingly DCA works with partners of novel types, such as networks or social movements. These put different demands also on DCA and its roles in support of local CS and even financial management systems. The new DCA partnership policy is strategic and well-developed and it is implemented in the field.

**Efficiency and effectiveness:** DCA has undertaken and is still in the process of increasing effectiveness and efficiency. There is still much opportunity for improvement by involving these considerations in choice of and continued interaction with partners of various types. Part of the outcome hereof is assessment of the share of funding reaching beneficiaries. DCA is through the review embarking on development of tools for this. Considerations about benefits obtained from the funds and the associated support, as well as sustainability of the benefits should be added. Participation as well as the quality of local CS are key to sustainability.

**HRBA:** DCA maintains a clear focus on HRBA, in modes of operation where transparency and accountability is actively pursued; through application of HAP standards and DCAs own PANEL principles. This finds expression in work with partners, where elected representatives of national partners are now affiliated members of DCA board and where collaboration with all types of partners is increasingly equal and participatory, as well as transparent and accountable, in line with the new partnership policy and in accordance with DCAs fundamental values.

**Popular foundation:** DCA maintains and expands popular foundation, consisting of church-based groups, youth groups, volunteers and others. DCA is actively developing and implementing communication strategies for various segments of the population and enjoys wide recognition and substantial economic contributions from the public in Denmark. In this way, and through active participation (and sometimes initiation) of public debates, DCA plays a key role in the dialogue with the public on development issues.

**Financial management:** DCA has good financial management systems and procedures, and the DCA partners met by the review express a high degree of appreciation. The review has highlighted some areas in need for a more focused attention: Ability to attract and retain financial staff at
Regional level; Decentralising more to the capable Regional Office/Country Offices; Efficiency and effectiveness and results-based monitoring and reporting, including performance indicators and link to finance. Work in these areas is in progress but they still need more attention.

Follow-up on recommendations from last review:

DCA has met major recommendations from review in 2011, except regarding the development of results-based-management, which is in progress and the use of risk assessment and risk management. Within the new partnership policy work is still outstanding on identifying different common, partner types.

Recommendations resulting from present review:

1. Partnerships: In the continued strategic development of partnerships, the review recommends to include in the partnership agreements issues of joint long-term goals, pathways of change, sustainability, and considerations of effectiveness and efficiency.

It is recommended DCA identifies common traits and change pathways for groups of typical partners and apply these in descriptions of and in support to partners.

It is recommended to ensure further development of modalities for how to work with a range of non-traditional partners, including: association-type partners, activist partners, other constituency partners, and more transient movements partners. The modalities should include more flexible ways to support new type of partners that do not have strong management.

2. Linking relief, recovery and development (LRRD): The review recommends that DCA further develop a guideline for how to undertake the work related to LRRD.

The review recommends that DCA seek to increase reporting across the programmes on progress within the area of LRRD. This includes LRRD-related activities and approaches in relief, DRR, CCA, and right to food work as well as advocacy.

3. Flexibility of funding when operating cross-border and inside countries: The review recommends that DCA utilise opportunities for flexibility in humanitarian funding from Danida to the crisis in South East Myanmar and apply funding inside country and cross-border in accordance with DCA context analysis of the situation. Continuation of a mix of cross-border and inside country humanitarian support is deemed necessary for the coming years.

The review recommends that DCA utilise the flexibility in applying humanitarian funding from Danida inside country and cross-border if deemed necessary in other crises and if based on thorough context and situation analysis.

The review recommends that opportunities to promote longer-term commitments in humanitarian funding from Danida to prolonged crisis are further discussed and developed.

4. Integration of Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA)/Safer Communities with DCA programmes: The review recommends that DCA continue integration of HMA/Safer Communities into the overall work and structure of DCA and into country strategies, while retaining accreditation and ensuring access to funding for HMA from a broad range of donors.

The review recommends that DCA seek opportunities for funding the development aspects of HMA/Safer Communities (Mine Risk Education, Victims Assistance, Surveys – work on Safer Communities) through the development funding, in line with funding to DRR.

5. Effectiveness and efficiency: As part on the work on improving effectiveness and efficiency, the review recommends that DCA complete the work initiated on how to estimate shares of funding used for
management and implementation and how much that ‘reaches the ground’, and that further testing of a workable system are implemented with a view of wider application within DCA.

The review recommends that DCA programme monitoring system is developed to include practical and workable solutions to results documentation, linking outcome and financial aspects and measuring of benefits at rights holders’ level. This also involves measuring sustainability (and specifically participation and strength of local CS as main elements of sustainability), measuring effects of capacity development and advocacy, measuring the effects on DCA legitimacy and the use of participatory monitoring methods.

6. Risk Management: The review recommends DCA further design and establishes a coherent set of procedures for risk assessment and management and addressing risks. This includes identification of areas of potential risks in diverse aspects; such as financial, implementation, partner collaboration (including work with commercial partners).

7. Financial systems and procedures: The review team recommends that DCA financial systems and procedures are simplified and seek a faster system for funds transfer to partners especially those without full-fledged management.

8. Financial management: The review team recommends that DCA increase efforts to attract and retain financial staff at Country/Regional level; especially the Financial & Administration Coordinator is crucial.
1 Introduction:

1.1 Background and implementation of the review

DanChurchAid (DCA) is rooted in the Danish National Evangelical Lutheran Church and is among the large relief- and development NGO in Denmark with an annual turnover in 2012 of around DKK 560 million. The organisation was established in 1922. It worked originally in the field of humanitarian assistance, but has increasingly engaged in development activities as well.

DCA applies a multilateral as well as a bilateral mode of operation in its implementation of its development programmes and activities. Lutheran World Federation (LWF) and World Council of Churches (WCC) are the key multilateral partners of DCA. DCA is a part of the ACT Alliance (Action by Churches Together) – an alliance that consists of more than 140 churches and humanitarian organisations across the world. ACT Alliance works with development, humanitarian assistance and advocacy in more than 120 countries. ACT is the most important of the many alliances and networks to which DCA belongs. The Alliance was established in 2010, and in the same year, the Secretary General of DCA became a member of the ACT Board.

DCA was among the first Danish NGOs to enter into a framework agreement with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1991/92. The framework allocation is now part of the annual Finance Act, and currently amounts to DKK 123 million per year. The development activities under the framework agreement are currently mainly concentrated in ten so-called focus countries. Other active smaller grants financed by Danida development funds include a total of four grants for the NGO Pool for Innovative Initiatives, for Women in Africa, and for interventions against HIV and AIDS.

In accordance with the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action (2010 - 2015) Danida has established Humanitarian Partnership Agreements (HPAs) with 8 Danish NGO's. DCA was one of the first humanitarian partners. The aim of the strategic partnership is to give the implementing partners higher funding predictability and operational flexibility in exchange for better planning and clear performance targets against the priorities set in the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action. The partnership is focussing on Humanitarian Mine Action, Food Security/resilience, Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Relief Items. DCA revised its policy for humanitarian action in 2013.

The Humanitarian partnership agreement is mentioned in the finance bill and constitutes DKK 63 million annually, furthermore DCA has applied for various emergency grants (humanitarian crisis response) and in 2013 has been granted 20 million DKK for activities in the Sudan / South Sudan and 3,9 million DKK for activities in Syria.

1.1.1 Conclusions from previous review and capacity assessment

The previous review of DCA had a focus on partnerships and covered both humanitarian and development cooperation. The overall conclusion showed that DCA’s partners appreciated cooperation with DCA, incl. DCA’s flexibility, context-based approach, support to capacity development, and concrete support to financial management and fund raising.

Among the recommendations can be mentioned that the review pointed to the need for revising the partnership policy and provide for a more transparent approach that recognises that there is not a “one size fits all” approach for partnership while being clear on DCA’s specific strengths and competencies (added value). It also recommended strengthening DCA monitoring and follow-up of the support to capacity development, incl. in the area of partners’ reporting on results. The review recommended that policies would benefit from greater use of targets, milestones and benchmarks to provide strategic direction and markers for monitoring.
The review recommended a revision of DCA’s humanitarian policy. A strategic framework for DCA’s support in humanitarian programmes and projects was developed in 2013. DCA programme staff use the policy when developing country specific strategies and assessing projects.

1.1.2 Conclusions from last framework negotiations incl. any follow-up

A follow-up plan to review recommendations was submitted by DCA and up-dated in January and September 2013. The latest framework negotiations were held in December 2013 and showed progress on a number of review recommendations, incl. strengthening of partnership relations, ACT cooperation, country focus, monitoring and evaluation and revision of policies (DCA Partnership Policy, DCA Right to Food Policy and DCA Humanitarian Action Policy).

1.1.3 Objectives of the review

The overall objectives of the review is to assess the capacity of DCA especially on the delivery of results on long term development and humanitarian interventions and the linkage between them, through a variety of partnerships- this will be done by:

- Analysing and assessing the performance of the organisation at head office level as well as in the field in terms of delivering results through partnerships in humanitarian action, mine action and civil society collaboration.
- Providing a general assessment of DCA’s current financial and organisational capacity to operate humanitarian and development programmes under the MFA framework and the humanitarian partnership agreements, incl. an assessment of the organisation’s follow-up of the recommendations from the latest review.

1.2 Presentation and discussion of the methodology used

The assessment methodology was developed during inception phase. The aim was to gather data from a variety of sources, people and paper, and triangulate these. The intention was to be as participatory as possible in the hope that interviews would encourage individual and organisation-wide reflection on key issues in the review. The following methods were used:

- Literature Review: a review of reports, minutes from meeting, and policy documents from both MFA and DCA focusing on policies and reports on practice internal and external reviews and audits (see bibliography in Annex 3).
- Head Office Interviews and focus groups with key actors within DCA and MFA, including a mini-workshop prior to the field visit, focused on, partnerships, policies, management (including financial), advocacy, humanitarian assistance and HMA.
- Country visits to assess operationalisation of key DCA policies and strategies. Meeting with DCA staff, DCA partners and, where possible, ACT Alliance members and other key stakeholders. This included a six-day visit to Cambodia. A shorter (four days) visit to Myanmar, to which was added three days at the Thai-Myanmar border, included discussions with international and national partners, ACT Alliance members, UN agencies, and other non-government agencies. Before leaving the visited countries, the review team provided preliminary feedback with relevant DCA staff to share findings.
- Consolidating and analysing data. The review team met at various stages in the fieldwork and conducted head office interviews. The team met to share and analyse findings and prepare for feedback to DCA and MFA. Finally, a feedback and validation meeting was held with MFA and DCA based on the draft report, and a final report produced.
In this present report, the review team attempts to present finding and recommendations as clearly as possible. In order to do so the points from terms of reference have been grouped into four main points under heading 2; ‘Findings’. This follow the division developed for Inception Note and Mission Preparation Note. In order to ease the use of the report, the text under each of 2.1- to 2.3 is subdivided into ‘development’ and ‘humanitarian’.

2 Findings

2.1 Activities implemented and results obtained

2.1.1 Development

Danida funding. For 2014 DCA received DKK 123 million under the framework agreement with Danida. This figure has been quite stable for the past 13-14 years (See Annex 8). In addition very substantial funding is obtained from various sources, not least EU.

Results achieved. The review could confirm results described in the annual programme reports from Cambodia and Myanmar in the cases where direct observation or triangulation through peer or meeting with diverse partners were possible (with the overall caveat concerning monitoring, see 2.4.3). This includes important results in Cambodia such as the campaign against the draft Access to Information law (which would limit access) or the draft Law on Management and Use of Agricultural Land. There were strong concerns that the latter could be used as legal cover for land grabbing. Through small, activist partners DCA Regional Office/Country Office (Regional Office/Country Office) in Cambodia supports the popular movement against a major destabilising and antagonizing tendency, i.e. rampant land grabbing. This is showing strong signs of having positive effects, in concert with international-level advocacy facilitated by ACT/DCA. Also in Cambodia DCA and partners play continued active roles in the general activation of the population, especially the youth, in the aftermath of last year’s fraudulent elections. In Myanmar DCA partners, with peers, were able to convince the government to change a draft association law to become much more welcoming in terms of CS and popular participation. Also in Myanmar two DCA partners are the two leading CSOs in the government’s formulation of a new policy for rural development. The strategic planning committee included the directors of the two partners and the draft strategy for rural development and poverty reduction was highly influenced by the DCA partners and CSOs at large, and reflects a pro-poor, pro-farmer and people centred approach. In many respects, the development thinking behind the strategy follows the approach of CSOs with a focus on participation and local ownership over the development process.

DCA thus, with its partners, actively ensure that civil society in the global South has the space and capacity to gain influence to combat poverty and inequality, promote human rights as well as sustainable development in an accountable, inclusive and transparent manner, in particular in favour of poor and excluded groups. DCA and partners actively support expansion and use of the arena between the state, the market and the family/household in which people can debate and take individual and collective action to promote change or issues of shared interest. Especially the ‘Active Citizen’ programmes aim at this, and other programmes (Right to Food, and Sexual and Reproductive Rights) increasingly move into this arena as well.

Advocacy and active citizens. DCA is actively developing and applying advocacy towards its goals. In terms of advocacy DCA has developed (2013) a clear strategy for which initiatives to support: 1; The theme is directly related to DCA’s Programmatic priorities, 2; DCA partners are able and willing to cooperate directly or indirectly, and 3; DCA Head Office can make a difference – i.e. in DK, at the European or global level. The specific themes and form of advocacy are decided jointly with partners. In some international and national cases, the World Council of Churches or national
churches (e.g. in Malawi) have issued pastoral letters in direct line with a popular advocacy effort. The World Council of Churches actively support a rights-based agenda, by providing theological analysis that supports such an approach. At international (European, EU) level, many activities are conducted through APRODEV (e.g. on land rights). In terms of active citizenship, both Cambodia and Myanmar showed mainly very positive results. One example, concerning information on commune-level public planning and management was less impressive, but this is general for this kind of activity in Cambodia, where donors are withdrawing from this field and government appears to gradually be rolling back the gains.

Linking development and humanitarian action. DCA promotes Linking Relief, Recovery and Development (LRRD) in its humanitarian action and its development activities. LRRD is promoted by ensuring that development work, where relevant, builds on experience from humanitarian work, by ensuring that humanitarian work is done in ways that lays the foundation for later recovery and development work, and by direct implementation of a significant number of DRR projects addressing community resilience against disasters and promoting a resilient development in food security. Overall, DCA has a balanced support to humanitarian and development programmes and projects. The linkages between humanitarian and development activities have over the last years increasingly been included in the specific programmes and projects of DCA. The work on LRRD is focused within the area of food security, and aspects of LRRD are now increasingly included in the related humanitarian and long-term development work on food security. DCA promotes humanitarian actions, which builds resilience and links to longer-term development, this includes supporting food security in ways that save lives and promote local production and markets. DCA works (from humanitarian and/or development funding) in the recovery phase focuses on promoting agricultural practises and disaster resilience that are further stimulating local sustainable agricultural production and markets. In Cambodia, DCA has worked with four major partners that are involved in development as well as in humanitarian work, and DCA has actively promoted that such partners are working with development and humanitarian in ways that are linked. Specifically, in Cambodia in 2013, DCA implemented DRR activities reported to reach more than 170,000 beneficiaries in 365 communities and including training and support in increased community resilience in food security, support to commune level resilience and disaster planning, and support to national level planning and advocacy for disaster and resilience planning. A budget of around DKK 3 million from a range of donors was spent on DRR activities. The review assessed a few of the DRR supported activities in the field and found that community members and commune councils had been supported directly and had increased their disaster resilience capacity and developed more resilient food security strategies.

Disaster Risk Reduction and right to food. Regarding results in traditional food security, the country reports provide ‘numbers trained’ and less on outcomes or sustainability of training and sustainability of results. Such results are clearly there, but reporting is limited. During field visits very positive examples of support for Village Savings and Loans and agricultural improvement were observed. Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) has been scaled up and are now included in most of the right to food work of DCA. DCA implements an increasing number of DRR projects. The DCA-supported DRR work addresses resilience of communities through improving disaster response planning and through improving the resilience of agricultural production in disaster prone areas. This is addressing some of the root causes of vulnerability and the review finds that this contributes effectively to LRRD.

Links between disaster resilience, climate change adaptation and food security work. In addition to the importance of DRR work in LRRD, there are also important aspects of Climate Change Adaptation (CCA), which are closely linked to DRR and to LRRD. DRR and CCA are often in practise rather similar in its focus on building resilience of communities and in ensuring sustainable
and resilient food security and livelihoods activities among the communities. Right to food work promoting sustainable agriculture, also focuses on building resilient communities and are closely linked to DRR, CCA and LRRD. DCA shows strong results of international and national (in partner countries) advocacy on climate change, where DCA and partners in several cases have had success in influencing policies and in supporting the development of statements of governments to COP meetings. When looking at field implementation, climate change is mainly focused on community or household level activities for adaptation (in line with the right to food policy), and with less focus on mitigation, which mainly falls outside DCA thematic areas. Several of the geographical areas (e.g. Cambodia, Karamoja, South Sudan) in which DCA partners implement are drought-prone and contain large landscapes in which rainwater easily run off. This provides an opportunity for DCA and partners to step into the realm of landscape level rainwater harvesting and aquifer replenishment, i.e.- more strategic climate change adaptation, clearly containing advocacy elements. DCA accounts for its own carbon footprint, and purchases offsets.

Promoting LRRD in work with CSO partners in-country. LRRD is also promoted in the selection of national and local CSO partners and in the way that DCA works with their specific national and local CSO partners in implementing projects. Emphasis is put on working with partners that in specific geographic areas have capacity in long-term development as well as in humanitarian response. In engaging with such partners DCA stresses the necessary linkages between humanitarian action and long development. In this way linkages are created between the humanitarian and development work of specific partners. DCA also supports their national and local partners in developing such capacities. Moreover, when addressing humanitarian response, DCA primarily works with partners that have capacities for supporting longer-term resilience of communities. Some partners are not normally involved in linking humanitarian and development work in ways that empower and build resilience with communities. This applies specifically to some of the faith-based partners, who are more used to providing humanitarian hand-outs. Here DCA has a continued role to play in working with partners on supporting their ability and approaches in addressing the linkages between humanitarian and development activities.

The review recommends that DCA seek to increase reporting across the programmes on progress within the area of LRRD. This includes LRRD-related activities and approaches in relief, DRR, CCA, and right to food work as well as advocacy.

Results reporting. The tools and instruments for reporting according to results-based-management are still rudimentary (and further development represents a host of challenges, see further in 2.4.7) Within the current reporting standards there is, if anything, a tendency towards underreporting. This is because reporting is bound to outcomes expected in projects or programmes, while important outcomes are produced through the ways DCA and partners implement these and relate to each other and to ‘beneficiaries’.

2.1.2 Humanitarian

Results in humanitarian action. DCA humanitarian action is overall in the range of DKK 150 million yearly and is applied in around 15 countries (varying from year to year). Longer-term crises as well as sudden disasters are addressed. Important and strategic humanitarian support is being reported and documents show that vulnerable people are targeted and reached. DCA obtains support to

---

1 See, for example; http://www.cultureunplugged.com/documentary/watch-online/play/12858/Landscape-for-Rainwater and http://environment.nationalgeographic.com/environment/freshwater/1/lessons-from-the-field-rainwater-harvesting-in-bhiware-bazaar-india/
humanitarian action from a range of different sources including through a partnership agreement with MFA. DCA implementation of humanitarian actions under the Humanitarian Partnership Agreement with MFA is well managed and implemented in accordance with the agreed thematic and geographic focus areas of the partnership agreement and important results in support of people in need are documented. Overall, DCA humanitarian actions appear to be delivered in accordance with stated goals and objectives.

Results achieved on the ground. In the countries visited by the review team, DCA has provided humanitarian support four times during the last four years to people affected by floods. This was reported as being an important contribution to the specific humanitarian operations. The response has been targeted at the most vulnerable flood victims and has included shelter and cash transfers. It has been implemented through partners that are also partners for long-term development and it has been coordinated with the ACT Alliance members and through the cluster systems. In Cambodia it has been implemented in accordance with DCA humanitarian response plan, whereas in Myanmar such a plan is still to be developed. The humanitarian assistance delivered has been in line with the stated goals and objectives of DCA in the two countries. Results in humanitarian mine action are assessed in section 2.1.3.

Capacity in humanitarian action. Capacity of DCA to address humanitarian action is well developed at Head Office level and Regional Office/Country Office levels. At both levels there are experienced staff dedicated to address humanitarian action. Regional Office/COs, in areas where the country context makes humanitarian capacity relevant, have or are in the process of developing response plans to address the various humanitarian situations in the respective countries. It is assessed to be important that DCA has a humanitarian response capacity at the various levels of the organisation and the review supports that DCA continues to ensure this capacity. In a case like Myanmar, the humanitarian response capacity of DCA is not fully developed and would benefit from the planned DCA process of developing a specific strategy and capacity for response to disasters and crises.

Use of policies and guidelines. The review found that DCA humanitarian policies and guidelines are known and used at various levels in DCA and in the collaboration with partners. Relevant technical support/guidance have been provided from Head Office to Regional Office/COs and partners. Sharing of humanitarian action experience and learning across the organisation appears to be taking place and promoted.

Role of humanitarian action in DCA. Humanitarian action as well as development assistance forms key parts of DCA’s organisation and values. Being able to work in both fields is an important part of the way DCA makes the organisation relevant for beneficiaries, partners and donors. Partner organisations (both international and national, intermediary-type) interviewed express appreciation of DCA being able to address development as well as humanitarian action.

Integrating development and humanitarian action. DCA seeks to apply an integrated approach to development and humanitarian action in an increasing number of focus countries where both development and humanitarian actions are relevant. This is found to be a sound development. In the countries visited during the review, it is clear that implementation of humanitarian actions constitutes a crucial and integrated part of the work of DCA. When addressing major sudden onset humanitarian disasters, which are outside the normal geographical working areas of DCA and its partners, the opportunities to focus on linking humanitarian and development actions are more limited than when collaborating in development and humanitarian activities with the same partner. Still, by stressing working through local organisations and emphasising their full participation and their linkages to local communities, DCA is contributing to more sustainable outcomes of the relief operations and in this way they are promoting integration and synergies.
Funding under the MFA partnerships agreement. The humanitarian funding from Danida forms a central part of DCA humanitarian action. The funding of the partnership agreement for 2013 is DKK 63 million covering prolonged disasters, regions of origin initiatives, humanitarian mine action and relief fund. In addition, DCA in 2013 received in from Danida DKK 24 million in various grants to address emergencies. Previous years also included comparable levels of emergency funding received by DCA. The partnership funding is projected to be the same for each year from 2014-16. With a total DCA spending on humanitarian action and humanitarian mine action of around DKK 250 million (2012 figures), the Danida funding constitutes around 30% within the humanitarian field of activities. However, the Danida funding gives a high degree of continuity, flexibility and also quick response opportunity (emergency relief/response fund), which facilitates that DCA can support those in need and also mobilise a range of other humanitarian funding including ACT appeals and ECHO funding. In this respect, the review found that Danida humanitarian funding to DCA has a strong multiplier effect in terms of reaching those in need.

Cluster approach, consolidated assessments and appeals. DCA actively takes part and engages in coordinated activities within humanitarian action. DCA is an active partner within the ACT Alliance and the collaboration and coordination, which is undertaken within the Alliance, ensures that humanitarian support to beneficiaries is better coordinated and hence more effectively delivered. Within the ACT Alliance consolidated assessments and appeals are undertaken and implemented. LWF is an important international DCA partner within the ACT Alliance. LWF, in times of crisis when no ACT appeal is in place, fundraises directly from DCA. ACT Alliance members including DCA participate in various national cluster arrangements in the respective countries. Within the national cluster coordination systems, the respective members of the ACT Alliance will to a varying degree represent the other alliance members. In the two countries visited, DCA took an active and recognized role in its collaboration within the ACT Alliance and in the national humanitarian response coordination mechanisms and cluster system. The cluster approach and donor coordination within the humanitarian action appear to have increased effectiveness and improved results.

Coordination of humanitarian assistance in Myanmar. In Myanmar specifically, the mechanism for coordinating humanitarian efforts are supported by OCHA (Humanitarian Country Team) and by UNCHR (South East Consultation Meetings). DCA participates in both. The Humanitarian Country Team seems to be relatively effective in promoting a cluster approach and improving coordination of humanitarian action inside Myanmar. The ACT and DCA participation in the Humanitarian Country Team is clearly important. The South East Consultation Meetings on the other hand is not able to address coordination issues on IDPs and refugees in the South East. The issues of coordination among organisations with access from the border and from inside have not been possible to solve, and due to the still fragile situation, no organisations are interested in sharing information. It seems that the long-term nature of the refugee/IDP situation and the way that organisations have worked with different strategies and partners for a long time, does not provide a context, where coordination and information sharing are facilitated.

Understanding of complex humanitarian situations. DCA humanitarian assistance is often provided in complex situations, where it can be difficult to understand the needs and required responses. DCA puts significant effort into understanding the contexts it operates under and, in areas where they have longer-term presence, able to undertake good quality analyses of humanitarian situations and the needed humanitarian responses. Overall, the review finds that DCA, in their focus countries, has good contextual understanding of the humanitarian situations. Specifically, DCA demonstrates good understanding of the indeed very complex situation in Myanmar, where a very long conflict has raged between the central Myanmar government and the ethnic groups in the vast border areas. DCA has cleverly decided to provide support from inside as well as from across the border.
to the troubled South East of the country. This has given DCA a unique position to contribute to the promotion of dialogue between the various border-based and inside-based organisations involved with activities in support to the people of South-East, a position that DCA seems to be using effectively.

Changes in humanitarian contexts. In many of the complex humanitarian situations that DCA operates within, the context have changed and are likely to continue to change, sometimes in ways that are not possible to predict. Currently, the different stakeholders assess the situation in Myanmar very differently and the situation appears fragile with no guarantees that the initial ceasefire agreements will lead to lasting peace. Likewise, the situation in other DCA countries of operation such as amongst others Sudan/South Sudan, Syria is also very difficult to predict. With the current modality of support within the Danida partnership agreement, there is a reasonable level of flexibility in terms of themes and areas that can be supported, but opportunities for applying thematic flexibility that can be further adapted to rapidly changing contexts would be useful to investigate further.

Provision of cross-border humanitarian assistance. DCA has provided cross-border assistance for several years in a number of crisis situations where humanitarian access has not been possible from within the respective countries. Specifically, the cross-border assistance from Thailand to vulnerable people in the south-east of Myanmar has been going on for several years and experiences from this operation has been utilised in other situations. A current DCA cross-border operation to alleviate the desperate humanitarian situation in South Kordofan, Sudan is also a key activity and a unique way of ensuring access to people in need. The review found that the cross-border assistance in Myanmar/Thailand have been and continues to be relevant, it is effectively implemented, and it reaches a lot of people that would otherwise not be reached. DCA cross-border support works with a number of highly committed partners with good access and with a good focus on delivery, empowerment and monitoring. Cross-border assistance is now focused on mine risk education, victim assistance and non-technical survey. With a growing number of areas in the World, where there is no or very restricted humanitarian access, the DCA experience and competence in cross-border operations with partners are valuable and likely to be applied in an increasing number of areas. Knowledge about cross-border assistance can be considered to be among the DCA area of excellence.

Provision of a mix of cross-border and inside country humanitarian assistance in the context of Myanmar. Provision of cross-border support is necessary in situations where humanitarian access is not possible, but there will also be situations where cross-border support and support from inside a country will need to be balanced according to the situation in different parts of a conflict area, this applies specifically to the situation in Myanmar. DCA is assessed to have applied a balanced view with regards to the situation in Myanmar. And with the very dynamic context in the border areas, the review finds that flexibility in application of humanitarian funding from cross-border and from inside Myanmar should be aimed at to ensure the best-adapted assistance. During the review, it was clarified that overall humanitarian funding from Danida to South East Myanmar is allocated to alleviate the prolonged crisis in the area and it can be used from inside the country as well as from cross-border. The review finds that it is important that the funding in practise is being utilised in a flexible way under one overall funding pool. The situation in the area calls for this and it is believed that DCA will be able to make sound judgements on where the funding would be best applicable. Opportunities for DCA to use part of the Danida humanitarian funding (apart from the emergency response funds) inside Myanmar in order to further promote development of better response strategy and capacities would also be useful in order to ensure further DCA relevance in the humanitarian field. Although, the situation is specific to Myanmar, other crisis situations are likely
to require the same type of flexible approach to inside-country and cross-border humanitarian action.

The review recommends that DCA utilises opportunities for flexibility in humanitarian funding from Danida to the crisis in South East Myanmar and apply funding inside country and cross-border in accordance with DCA context analysis of the situation. Continuation of a mix of cross-border and inside country humanitarian support is deemed necessary for the coming years.

The review recommends that DCA utilises the flexibility in applying humanitarian funding from Danida inside country and cross-border if deemed necessary in other crises and if based on thorough context and situation analysis.

Context for cross-border and inside country support. The current situation in the border areas of Myanmar calls for continuation of cross-border assistance in the coming years, and it is not guaranteed that the ceasefires will lead to peace and full access from inside Myanmar. Therefore maintaining humanitarian support to Myanmar ethnic communities including the IDP’s and refugees in a balanced way from across border and from inside until risks inside Myanmar becomes much reduced, is found to constitute the best protection of people in need.

Vulnerability and support to IDPs and refugees. Overall, DCA works on protection of the most vulnerable in range of different humanitarian actions. A review of the various DCA supported projects/actions shows that DCA supports initiatives that are targeted at protecting the most vulnerable. In several countries DCA are providing humanitarian support to IDPs and refugees. DCA’s work on “Local to Global” has improved the understanding of the context of protection for IDPs and refugees, which clearly shows that locally implemented protection activities plays a central role in protecting the vulnerable.

Support to Burmese IDPs, refugees and host communities. The support that DCA provides to Burmese refugees through TBC along the Thai-Burma border is of significant value, and although the DCA financial contribution is relatively limited to the overall refugee operation, DCA has a strong involvement in the governing bodies of TBC, and therefore also a major stake in the relatively successful refugee camp operations under TBC. DCA is, through HMA, livelihood promotion, and previously also health interventions, involved in supporting IDPs and returning refugees in the SE of Myanmar. The situation in terms of refugee and IDP return is still largely unsettled and few refugees have returned, but working on preparing for return is highly relevant. DCA focuses on mine risk education and supporting livelihoods from both inside and from the border and they are targeting both IDPs, refugees and communities affected by conflicts including host and future host communities for returning refugees and IDPs. This is found to be a sensible focus ensuring relevant support to refugees, IDPs and host communities.

Cash transfer programming. DCA works on improving the delivery within humanitarian actions. An important part of that has for the last five to six years been the work that DCA has done on developing cash transfer programming. DCA Global Strategy stresses that it will increase use of cash programming in the activities, DCA has a guideline for cash transfer programming, and DCA now have cash transfer programmes in around half of its humanitarian projects. DCA participates in the Cash Learning Partnership and has been proactive in promoting experience exchange in terms of use of cash transfers in humanitarian situations. The movement towards using more cash transfers rather than in-kind support is positive and the review finds that it is a more sustainable and effective way of providing humanitarian support. DCA application of cash transfer programming creates better results.

HAP membership and certification. DCA is a member of Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) and certified under HAP. DCA plays an active role in HAP and have chaired the board of
directors of HAP. The internal organisation of DCA has benefitted from the HAP membership and the certification process under HAP. DCA has as a result, strengthened its accountability framework, clarified its commitments, and increased transparency. Development of a proper complaints mechanism is a result of HAP certification. HAP reviews and HAP re-certification processes are seen as a useful tool to ensure continued focus in the work of DCA. HAP is addressing humanitarian as well as development activities and can by applied to both types of organisations. DCA actively works with partners on promoting HAP standards and benchmarks. This is also found to be useful as a way of promoting accountability and it has led to a higher level of accountability towards beneficiaries. Since HAP and its associated benchmarks is rather demanding, it should be noted that there is need to apply different levels of requirements to different types of partner organisations (See 2.3).

Participation in Sphere, application of Sphere standards. DCA participates actively in the Sphere project and has chaired the Sphere Board since 2011. DCA utilises Sphere standards and indicators in its humanitarian operations and promotes Sphere standards with its partners. Sphere standards and indicators are a useful tool in setting standards for humanitarian action. Sphere indicators (i.e. for water, for food security etc.) are, however, often significantly higher than the humanitarian support possible to provide or relevant in the given local context. Although DCA has promoted training in application of Sphere standards and indicators, and have stressed that indicators are not necessarily possible to meet, there is some frustration among some DCA humanitarian partners of only being able to provide assistance that is significantly lower than the indicators. This is illustrated by a case in Cambodia, where some of the humanitarian partners were only able to provide households hit by floods with a cash transfer of 60 USD per month per household, which is less than 20% of the cash equivalent of 2100 kcas/person/day given as the indicator/guidance for nutritional requirements in Sphere. Still, the support was highly appreciated and needed, but the partners felt that the high Sphere indicators where not realistic, were perceived as ever increasing, and provided disincentives for them in their work. Other cases with high discrepancies between water allocations realistically achievable and Sphere indicators of daily water needs were also cited. DCA should continue to provide additional guidance to partners on application of Sphere standards and indicators and continue to make it clear that standards and indicators should not be used to hinder humanitarian assistance that is needed and relevant even if it is provided at a level lower than the indicators.

Core Humanitarian Standards. DCA has participated in the on-going process for developing Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS), where the aim is to combine the standards of HAP, People in Aid and Sphere in order to promote a more unified standards system. This process is deemed very important and the role of DCA has been and continues to be valuable for the process.

2.1.3 HMA

Scale and funding of HMA in DCA. Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) is one of the focus areas of DCA. Funding to HMA constitutes around 25% of the total funding of DCA. Of the DKK 63 million Danida Partnership agreement funding, DKK 12.5 million is budgeted in 2014 to go to HMA in four countries. This is an increase from around DKK 9 million allocated to two countries in 2013. Danida provides around 10% of the total funding to HMA. The rest of the funding is obtained from a variety of sources including donors and donations. DCA has active HMA projects in 8-9 countries.

Status and involvement of DCA in HMA. DCA is an accredited HMA organisation and has a strong name and good opportunities for accessing HMA funding. DCA participates actively in the work of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and in the Cluster Munitions Coalition
(CMC). DCA sits on the shared board of ICBL-CMC, and undertakes strategic work on international advocacy related to HMA. The advocacy work is really of key importance.

Organisation and focus areas of HMA. HMA is organised differently from other DCA programmes, in the sense that HMA is a DCA own-implemented programme. Although, HMA is organised as a directly implemented DCA programme, there is an increasing use of implementation through partners. This modality ensures a much wider reach of the activities. Generally, there has also, during the last number of years, been a clear development within HMA to focus more on Mine Risk Education (MRE), Victim Assistance (VA) and non-technical mine/UXO surveys – or the development-type aspects of HMA - and less focus on actual land mine clearance. Considering the significant costs involved in international standard mine clearance, there is no doubt that the development towards further emphasis on MRE, VA and surveys has ensured that DCA creates more results and is supporting more people. DCA work within HMA is focused on promoting realistic, people-centred work on MRE, VA and Survey. This aspect of HMA is crucial and needs continued promotion.

Integrating with other DCA programme areas. HMA activities within DCA have also been through a process of increasing integration with other programme activities of DCA. In some countries, HMA is closely integrated with the Regional Office/COs and the country strategies. The nature of the development-type aspects of HMA is so that it gives a lot of sense in many types of conflict areas to integrate it with other aspects of longer-term development and active citizenship support. Longer-term development in land mine affected areas is closely linked with effective HMA in the form of MRE, VA survey. These development-type aspects of HMA also address resilience and empowerment of communities, which are essential aspects promoting longer-term development process. The review finds that the process of integrating HMA into the general work and strategies of DCA should be continued and emphasised. The inclusion of it into the country strategies and capacities of the Regional Office/COs should be promoted in DCA focus countries where mine risks and small-arms violence are significant.

Promoting Safer Communities. The DCA approach to HMA is more than addressing mine risks, it is more broadly about making people safe, improve their access to resources and their freedom of movement, and involve them throughout in finding and implementing sustainable solutions to the challenges they face. This is described in the DCA approach to Safer Communities, which aim to address the context of communities affected by conflict and armed violence. The review finds that this is an important development of the HMA concept, a development that will create more sustainable results for people at risk. With this concept, there are important synergies created between HMA, recovery work, and longer-term development. This work constitutes an important contribution to LRRD. Opening for opportunities of accessing funding from the development frame to work on Safer Communities including work on MRE, VA and survey in specific relevant areas would promote integration. The development of further integration of HMA into the DCA programme approach and strategies should however not hinder that DCA are able to continue as a HMA accredited organisation that can attract significant funding from a wide variety of donors; the current structure with a separate HMA unit within DCA is likely to be the most effective in ensuring this. Continuation of the work on ensuring synergies between HMA, humanitarian action and long term development should be prioritized, and the review team believes that such synergies are given due emphasis in DCA and can be promoted even with HMA organised as a separate unit.

HMA in Myanmar. Specifically, the work on HMA in Myanmar is focused solely on MRE, VA and surveys. No mine clearance has been done and DCA does not expect to get involved in mine clearance here. DCA works through (national, mainly intermediary and donor-funded) partner organisations and ensures that training is given and quality is maintained. DCA has maintained a strong continuity in the work with partners on HMA and this has led to significant results.
Outreach is very significant with more than 100,000 people directly involved in training on MRE and with VA and surveys reaching a significant number of conflict-affected communities. Documented linkages between MRE and reduced mine accidents can be established. DCA has developed a very extensive database on HMA in the SE of Myanmar, the database is being used by partners in getting overview of activities and documenting progress. DCA is acknowledged as a key organisation in terms of MRE and participates actively in the MRE Technical Working Group. DCA works inside and border-based and has been able to facilitate good linkages between work going on in these two areas. The achieved results are in line with the stated goals and objectives of the HMA support in Myanmar.

2.2 Strategies and policies and their implementation

2.2.1 Development

DCA’s overall vision, goals and strategy. DCA’s overall vision, goal and strategy are well in line with Danida’s CS strategy in that it has the dual focus on poverty reduction and promotion of human rights. It works with a broad range of CS groups, such as civil society organisations (CSOs), community based organisations, community groups, trade unions, business associations, cooperatives, faith-based organisations, informal groups, social movements, online activists, academia, think tanks, international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) and media.

Strategies’ sensitivity to local diversity. The text of active citizenship and right to food policies are not overly occupied with ethnic or social diversity. They state the need to work with ethnically diverse groups and the most disadvantaged sections of society. In the Active Citizenship policy ethnicity is mentioned as a potential area of conflicts, which DCA and partners will seek to remedy. This appears as an unnecessary omission, e.g. of the Danish strategy on support to indigenous peoples and their rights. It may also be considered a weakness, not least in highly diverse countries such as Myanmar whose many conflicts have ethnic aspects closely linked to control over resources. This is recognised in the DCA country strategy in a sentence that ‘The peace process needs ethnic inclusion’, but not further mentioned in the strategy how to address this. The review assessed diversity among DCA and partners staff and found no glaring problems. In Cambodia, all DCA staff is Khmer, but DCA works mainly in areas of the country where this group is almost exclusive. In Myanmar, the DCA staff is quite diverse and some main partners were highly diverse in staff ethnic and religious composition.

Implementation of DCA partnership policy. The new partnership policy is clearly reflected in the way DCA works with its partners. The partnership policy is known, understood and used at the level of implementation. The process of formulating the policy has been quite inclusive and key partners have a sense of ownership and commitment towards the policy. The policy itself does not contain description of its updates, but it appears evident that it has inspired a comprehensive set of learning processes, which may call for revisions within a relatively short span of years. Not least application of the concept of constituency partners and experiences gathered in working with networks could be relevant. DCA’s new partnership policy also emphasises support to constituency partners. The attention to constituency partners is well in line with the Danida CS strategy’s emphasis ‘Promote a representative, accountable, and locally based civil society working according to the principles of participation, accountability, non-discrimination and transparency with regard to its target groups/beneficiaries.

Right to Food and Active Citizenship Policy. The Right to Food policy has a stronger (than previous) focus on the rights of communities to resources, information, market access and access to safety nets and other forms of social protection. It thus has strong synergies/overlap with the active citizenship policy. These are increasingly found in implementation, even if it from the field visits
appears that some, long-standing partners may be challenged in shifting from more traditional sectoral approaches. On the other hand, some new activities around e.g. land rights have a very strong HRBA element. The Right to Food policy is often implemented in project-mode, even if most projects are part of longer-term programmes. The Active Citizenship policy is much concerned with participation in governance and establishing clearer links between political governance and economic governance work, particularly around the equitable use of national resources for poverty reduction. The DCA policies are well in line with the Danish CS strategy, which states: Promote the rights to association and assembly, enabling environment as well as create more invited space for civil society’s participation in national legislation, cooperation and decision-making processes; national and local policy making; social dialogue and the distribution of resources.

LRRD. So far elements of LRRD is included in various DCA strategies, while the subject itself is covered in a matrix, describing the different phases and appropriate actions during each. DCA is encouraged to develop a strategy paper or a guideline for practitioners on how to link the different phases in practical management (not least funding and work with partners) and field implementation.

The review recommends that DCA further develop a guideline for how to undertake the work related to LRRD.

Implementation of policies. The Active Citizenship policy deals with participation and governance somewhat isolated from people’s and communities’ daily life, challenges and efforts to claim or uphold rights. This seems to lead to implementation that sometimes addresses rights and participation in rather abstract fashion. This policy, likewise, is often implemented in project mode. Some partners, mainly long-standing and church-based, reportedly have difficulties in reaching beyond communities of their own faith. DCA is aware of this and it is being addressed, in concert with the reluctance of mainly the same partners to adopt a human rights’ based approach. In both policies, there appears to be less than optimal considerations of the synergies between them. When working with immediate right to food issues, most activities will foster the strengthening of active citizens and communities will soon engage in issues of right to resources, information, participation and market access, among others. It is advised by the review that the country programmes continues actively to exploit these synergies and address even stronger the weaknesses of some partners in moving beyond pure service delivery and in applying a HRBA. In country programming, and implementation of country programs, DCA may also seek to minimize (as far as donors allow) the use of traditional project implementation and seek to use more flexible ways that also strengthen active involvement of ‘beneficiaries’ (turning these into active citizens), e.g. through increased use of peer-to-peer capacity building, experience exchange in networks of local, active citizens, participatory monitoring etc.; i.e. through maximum participation.

2.2.2 Humanitarian

Humanitarian objectives and goals. DCA global goals as expressed in the Global Strategy 2014-17 include the work on strengthening the right to a life in dignity and thus the right to humanitarian assistance and protection. This is further expressed in the DCA Policy on Humanitarian Action 2013-2018, where DCA’s overall humanitarian action policy goals focuses on the ability of vulnerable people to enjoy equal access to accountable humanitarian assistance in disasters and conflicts as well as on recovery and increased resilience of vulnerable people against disasters and conflicts. This is implemented through the specific goals of providing equal access to humanitarian assistance to all affected people; engagement of vulnerable and marginalized groups in decision making related to their life situations; ensuring duty-bearers address risks and provide timely
assistance and protection; and ensuring transparent and accountable interventions that build local capacity.

**Links to Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action.** The Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action has the objective to save and protect lives, alleviate suffering and promote the dignity and rights of civilians in crisis situations; as well as to initiate recovery, build resilience to and prevent future crises. The Strategy is implemented through meeting the immediate and early recovery needs of those affected by natural disasters and armed conflicts, and promoting disaster risk reduction, prevention and resilience of the affected people. There is good level of consistency between the DCA objectives and goals for humanitarian action and the Danish objectives and goals expressed in the Strategy for Humanitarian Action. The DCA Policy on Humanitarian Action and the Danish Strategy for Humanitarian Action both build on and fully integrate the Good Humanitarian Donorship principles so implementation of the policies will also ensure adherence to the principles. A number of themes stressed in the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action are, as expected, not prioritised in the DCA Policy on Humanitarian Action, they include: Supporting international architecture for DRR; Supporting regional and international conflict preventions initiatives; Supporting global efforts in promoting humanitarian access and responsibility to protect; and Promoting international guidelines for humanitarian-military coordination.

**Overall implementation of policies.** DCA progress reporting related to humanitarian action gives a picture of activities being implemented in support of the Policy of Humanitarian Action. The specific projects implemented are on the basis of equal access providing humanitarian assistance to disaster and conflict affected people. Recovery and building resilience of vulnerable people is being supported.

**Implementation of policies on the ground.** Specifically, in the countries visited during the review, it was found that DCA Humanitarian Policy was known, understood, and followed by Regional Office/Country Office staff and by the key partners in humanitarian action. Humanitarian interventions in the two countries have been provided to a number of disasters (flooding) and to pro-longed crisis in conflict affected parts of Myanmar. Equal access to humanitarian assistance have been aimed at in the operations and promoted by DCA. With some of the faith-based partners, there have been situations with a tendency to prioritize support to their constituency. DCA has actively addressed this to ensure equal access. The interventions have also focused on recovery and building resilience and have promoted linkages to longer-term development. Affected communities have been involved in decision-making through assessments and in implementation of the humanitarian action. The interventions have been done in coordination with other stakeholders and duty-bearers, and the role of duty-bearers to address risks and provide protection has been promoted. Accountable and transparent delivery in the interventions have been aimed at, but some of the partners in humanitarian action still have to improve on their implementation of accountability measures in such operations.

### 2.2.3 HMA

**Humanitarian Mine Action objectives and goals.** Strengthening the right to protection against the negative effects of landmines, cluster munitions and other explosive remnants of war is one of DCA key goals as expressed in the Global Strategy 2014-17. Further, DCA activities within HMA subscribe to the overall goals and objectives of the DCA Humanitarian Action Policy. Specifically, the DCA approach to Safer Communities (2014) has been developed in order to guide DCA work within HMA. Safer Communities activities includes demining, survey, mine risk education, armed violence reduction and victim assistance. The approach is to focus HMA work on people, community risks and access to resources. Further, the importance of working through local partners and ensuring capacity building of local organizations is stressed. Community
empowerment, resilience and participation are at the core of the approach, and the linkage of HMA to development and other DCA programme objectives is promoted.

**Linking to Danish Humanitarian and Mine Action Strategies.** The DCA objectives of HMA and the approach to Safer Communities are in line with the strategic direction of protecting conflict affected people as expressed in the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action. Further, it is in line with the Strategy for Denmark's Support to Mine Action (2006), specifically related to the focus on the multiple aspects of mine risk education, victims assistance, survey, demining, partnerships and building local capacity.

**Implementation of policies.** Overall with DCA, HMA has developed towards increased focus on the holistic approach to Safer Communities including small arms reduction and on the development-type aspects of HMA such as of mine risk education, victims assistance and survey. More activities are implemented through partners and focus on local capacity building. Still a good number of the projects are directly focused on land mine clearance and the development towards implementing the Safer Communities approach is work in progress. Generally, the HMA activities are in line with DCA policies related to HMA. Specifically, in Myanmar, the DCA activities are implemented well in line with the HMA policies and the approach to Safer Communities. DCA’s HMA activities are here implemented through partners and they have a focus on building community resilience and local capacities. Focus is on mine risk education, victim assistance and survey. The issue of armed violence reduction in a situation of ceasefire after decades of armed struggle, where weapons are plentiful, has been analysed, but currently not found to be a major issue affecting the ethnic communities in SE Myanmar. Experiences of working with HMA for an extended period of time in Myanmar have informed DCA policies and approach to safer communities.

The review recommends that DCA continue integration of HMA/Safer Communities into the overall work and structure of DCA and into country strategies, while retaining accreditation and ensuring access to funding for HMA from a broad range of donors.

The review recommends that DCA seek opportunities for funding the development-type aspects of HMA/Safer Communities (Mine Risk Education, Victims Assistance, Surveys – work on Safer Communities) through the development funding, in line with funding to DRR.

### 2.2.4 Gender

**Gender policy and gender considerations.** DCA partners implement many activities on gender issues, mainly empowerment of women. Its policy (2011) on gender equality appears to be well implemented in most activities. Gender consideration is an early step (1A) in project identification/approval process in the PPM. The monitoring system of DCA records gender-disaggregated data. The HAP standard includes strong consideration on non-discrimination, including gender-based discrimination, and is well adhered to. In several partner countries DCA partners show good results in advocacy for gender issues, at the level of national legislation.

**Gender implementation in the field.** The field review in a few cases observed that ‘pure’ women empowerment projects seem to have less effect than activities where gender equality is part of an integrated approach to address more general livelihoods issues. This is recognised by DCA in a highlighted example in the Right to Food policy, which also in general addresses issues of gender imbalance and ways to address them. The Active Citizenship Policy prescribes that DCA will prioritise partners with the necessary gender equality and human rights expertise on participation issues and is very clear on furthering gender equality in all aspects of participation in public life and governance.
2.2.5 Environment

Environment. Climate change is an issue on the checklist for new projects (step 1 in PPM) while broader environmental issues are not. For Right to Food types of projects, general environmental issues are indirectly touched upon in the strategy when rights of communities to management of local resources are stressed. Apparently there is an underlying assumption that such management will be environmentally sound and sustainable. While this is often the case, some glaring exceptions are known. DCA may wish to avoid risks in this field. The DCA focus on low-external input sustainable or even organic agriculture will go a long way towards this. Still, some practices in water management (such as provision of wells in dry areas) may not be environmentally sound, without mitigating measures. The Active Citizenship policy does not mention environmental issues or natural resources. It appears that environment and natural resource conflicts – which are likely to increase steeply - are allocated to the Right to Food policy, which seems to be an important omission. With the increasing adoption of integrated country strategies this will become less of an issue.

2.3 DCA work with partners

2.3.1 Partnerships in implementation

Type of partners and work of partners. DCA implements all activities (except global advocacy and work in Denmark) through partners, and works with a large and diverse set of partners. Traditionally these have been mainly ‘professional’ CS-organisations, which would undertake advocacy and provide services and capacity building to beneficiaries, be it in contexts of Right to Food, HIV & AIDS or Active Citizenship. A common trait among these partners is, that they act ‘on behalf on’ and ‘in support of’ beneficiaries among rights holders, e.g. common citizens, and that they seek to attract donor funding for their operation. Common capacity development goals from DCA towards this partner type have typically focused on project development, technical capacity, implementation and activity/financial management as well as activity/financial reporting. One strong motivation has been to ease collaboration of these intermediary partners with INGO’s and build a certain independent capacity to attract and obtain donor funding, based on technical capacity and solid organisational management. In later years, DCA has developed partnerships to include more immediate, citizen-based (‘constituency’) organisations either as groups of activists, voluntary associations of fishermen, farmers or workers, or larger networks which may include all of the above in addition to various other organisations.

Non-traditional partners. These partners have different goals and opportunities than traditional, intermediary, NGO partners. They may aim at building long-term stable and increasingly powerful, but membership-based organisations, such as trade unions or farmers’ organisations. Or they (such as loose activist networks) may be relatively transient in nature, with no aims of acquiring solid management structures and committed mainly to single causes. So even within this group, termed ‘constituency’ partners in the DCA partnership strategy, there are substantial differences. The ‘association’ type of partners is mainly emerging though efforts of people themselves and sometimes eased about through efforts of some of DCA’s intermediary-type partners, especially within the Right to Food programmes.

Strategic partnerships. So far DCA seeks strategic partnerships, mainly among the intermediary partners, and emphasize movement towards stronger application of HRBA principles and practices with these partners. The move towards strategic partnerships (100 partners for change) is on track within DCA and is a sound strategic development in terms of modalities of operation within DCA. Collaboration with more transient and ‘loose’ types of organisations is also rapidly growing in pace
and volume. DCA procedures are not always well suited for this collaboration and some creativity is required at regional office level to manage these partnerships.

**Working with constituency partners.** While the clarification of the concept of constituency partner is still under development, the DCA emphasis on working with constituency partners is highly significant, as it is unusual for INGO but of critical importance for development of CS in partners’ countries. Some of these partners are networks. Networks come in various sizes and forms. Larger networks often may define their own management structures. Smaller ones, especially those concerned with ‘hard’ advocacy (e.g. on land or other resource rights) may have organisational forms that do not fit with a traditional partnership approach. DCA is commended for supporting such organisations and encouraged to seek best ways of supporting them, without imposing heavy management requirements.

**DCA relations to partners.** Partners uniformly praise their partnerships with DCA for being equal and participatory. This is a major contribution towards advancement of civil society in partners’ countries as it promotes a cultural shift (in many countries) from traditional patron-client relations in general and instrumental relations between most INGOs and local counterparts. It is a major (albeit largely unreported) result of DCA work and clearly an inspiration for national partners. The partner group’s active participation in DCA board meetings and involvement in strategic discussion and development of policies (e.g. the partnership policy itself) is an element herein. In the longer term this is also a mechanism that may help DCA maintain its relevance as a Northern NGO working mainly in the Global South. DCA has started considerations about this issue.

**Use of partner platforms.** Partner platforms, consisting of national partners within a programme in the countries, serve as fora for dialogue between partners (incl. DCA). The platforms are strongly involved in the development, monitoring, mid-term review and evaluation of programmes. At the same time they bring about some synergies between partners. Some national partners become increasingly busy servicing many of their other international partners and attention to DCA fora may slip, if not DCA continuously updates their relevance. This is sometimes done with introduction of thematic discussions, often introducing new ideas, concepts or information. This is a commendable use of the fora.

**Partnerships in humanitarian action.** DCA is working with partners in humanitarian action in accordance with the DCA partnership policy and in the same way as partners in long-term development. DCA is primarily implementing humanitarian action through national partners with whom they have been working together in development projects or in longer-term humanitarian actions. Generally, DCA is promoting that their humanitarian partners are participating in the joint assessments and in the implementation of joint appeals. Specifically, this has been the case with DCA partners in connection with the humanitarian response activities in Cambodia and Myanmar, where local partners have participated and influenced the assessments and appeals. This was reported to create better results and have benefitted the sustained involvement of local partners.

**Partnerships in HMA.** Implementation of HMA is partly done directly by DCA, typically in the case of the highly technical and certified area of mine clearance, and partly done through national partners, typically when it is about the development-type aspects HMA. The specific partnerships that DCA has entered with organisations working in SE Myanmar are focused on MRE, VA and surveys. These partnerships have been long-term and are valued due to the equality, trust and continuity promoted in the partnerships.

**DCA and partner advocacy.** DCA in partners’ countries actively supports partners in advocacy. This spans from mainstream advocacy such as e.g. participation in policy development, over more activist stands on laws that seek to limit political space (e.g. in Malawi, Cambodia, Myanmar) to hard advocacy against e.g. illegal land grabbing. DCA balances its obligation to raise critical issues
with political acumen and demonstrate willingness to support partner staff in danger of persecution by repressive regimes.

*Developments in partnerships relations and content.* DCA in its global strategy states that it will maintain a strategic dialogue with its partners, that will include reflections, which go beyond project cooperation and also focus on longer-term perspectives for the partnership, organizational status and plans for organizational development. Such developments are likely to take different paths, according to the aim and nature of the partnerships. Possibly DCA will find it useful to work with partners (DCA as facilitator) on identifying likely change pathways (Country context, diverse) for partners, that will lead to results in what the Danish CS policy describes as ‘Contribute to the development of a strong, independent, vocal and diverse civil society as a prerequisite to long-term poverty reduction; respect and protection of human rights; and the promotion of equality, democracy and sustainable development’. It is likely that this work may lead to identification of common traits in these pathways, or maybe even crystallization of a small number of archetypes. In these cases the future collaboration between DCA and partners on partnerships development may become more systematic and easier to manage.

*Application of effectiveness considerations in partnerships.* The concept of effectiveness is absent in partnership considerations and criteria. This is regrettable, as application of these concepts can have very positive effects on partnerships, their sustainability and support to ensure lasting results for the poorest and most marginalized groups, as is the policy’s stated goal. See more about this in section 2.4.7.

In the continued strategic development of partnerships, the review recommends DCA to include in the partnership agreements issues of joint long-term goals, pathways of change, sustainability, and considerations of effectiveness and efficiency.

It is recommended DCA identifies common traits and change pathways for groups of typical partners and apply these in descriptions of and content of support to partners.

It is recommended DCA to ensure further development of modalities for how to work with a range of non-traditional partners, including: association-type partners, activist partners, other constituency partners, and more transient movements partners. The modalities should include more flexible ways to support new type of partners that do not have strong management.

2.3.2 *ACT Network collaboration*

*Participation in ACT policy framework and management structure.* The Action by Churches Together (ACT) Alliance has more than 140 members organisations in North and South, and with the majority being South organisations. DCA has since its inception in 2010 been a leading member of ACT and represented on its board. DCA participates in most of the ACT thematic working groups and DCA participates actively in the development of ACT policy frameworks and structures. The secretary general of DCA chairs the board of Association of World Council of Churches related Development Organisations in Europe (APRODEV). APRODEV is closely linked to the ACT Alliance in Europe. In DCA focus countries, DCA collaborates through the Regional Office/COs closely with ACT members organised in country ACT Forums.

*ACT collaboration in advocacy.* Joint international-level advocacy work has been further developed, in particular with regard to climate change, where DCA has taken a leading role both within ACT and in terms of supporting national partners and governments in focus countries. This has mainly been
in the form of ‘silent diplomacy’, which is difficult to report. ACT also coordinates positions in relation to the UN post-2015 development framework. In a positive example of inter-church collaboration ACT has produced a joint report with its catholic peer, CIDSE on political space for CS. The work of APRODEV, as mentioned earlier, is another positive example of ACT collaboration on advocacy.

**ACT collaboration in long-term development.** In terms of direct cooperation among ACT members on development activities, this has proven somewhat difficult. Structures, constituencies, and members’ focus areas in development make such more programmatic collaboration difficult. It has mostly been achieved when few ACT member organizations have worked together on specific projects, which is now happening in most DCA focus countries. In Cambodia, Christian Aid and DCA implement a joint programme, obviously to mutual benefit. In Myanmar, several ACT partners share an office, which bring considerable benefits in terms of synergies, information exchange and cost reductions. Further strengthening of the collaboration within the ACT Alliance is being planned and promoted with possible common ACT Alliance country strategies. This will contribute further to the aid harmonisation agenda. ACT Alliance is, however, not developing towards a global cooperate structure, and DCA has anyway no plans to join such global cooperate structures.

**ACT collaboration in humanitarian action.** Cooperation and coordination of humanitarian response within the ACT Alliance is undertaken better and more effectively than in long-term development. Within the ACT Alliance, consolidated assessments and appeals are undertaken and implemented and joint ACT disaster response planning is developed in several countries. ACT members are jointly also participating in the national level processes for coordinating humanitarian aid. The collaboration on humanitarian action within ACT is an important contribution to the aid harmonisation agenda as expressed in the principles for Good Humanitarian Donorship. Within the ACT Alliance, specific LWF appeals are also made and they also constitute an important funding source in responding to crises.

### 2.4 Capacity of DCA to implement programmes and manage the funding from MFA

#### 2.4.1 DCA “areas of excellence”

Based on the above, the review assesses that DCA has several strong areas, with good results. These include HMA, and within this Mine Risk Education (MRE); LRRD, where DCA is succeeding in managing the support to transition from relief to development, through managerial ingenuity and persistence, aided by flexibility in Danida funding and own funds. In these areas, as well in the work on Right to Food and Active Citizenship, in the innovative use of cash transfers in humanitarian relief, as well as the cross-border support in conflict areas, very good results (mixed with a few less good) are found. Specific areas of excellence of DCA are assessed to include MRE, LRRD, Cash Transfers, Cross-Border Assistance and Advocacy on Rights on national and international levels.

To the review however, the area of partnerships with national partners of various types stands out as an area of excellence special for DCA. In its practising of partnerships DCA goes a long way in realising its own PANEL principles, in ways that only few INGO’s are able to do. It does so, in ways that may appear cumbersome and leading to results in less direct ways than strict ‘implementation through partners’. This persistence is commendable as it obviously leads to more sustainable results.
2.4.2 Programme implementation

Move towards country programmes. The previous review, as well as the subsequent review of DCA Right to Food policy, strongly recommended dissolution of the columns of individual, thematic programmes and further integration between the various themes. DCA has initiated a process of programming at country level, which – together with the revised policies - goes a long way towards this goal. Staffs are still allocated with specific responsibility for each theme, and for crosscutting issues. The latter is in regional offices usually in addition to responsibility for a main theme. This appears wise, as it is needed to keep up with considerably technical development within each theme. The country strategy and Regional Office/Country Office structures serves as a way on ensuring integration among the thematic specialisations. At Head Office level it is now planned that the monitoring visits to the regional offices and partners will be coordinated so several themes can be covered concurrently and in a more integrated manner. This should be implemented and further developed.

Partner support and learning. Partners are generally very pleased with the support the receive from programme officers, and also with the efforts of DCA to facilitate peer learning among national partners, both within country and in selects cases at regional level. This practice should be extended, as much as possible, as it is a great tool in building national and regional civil society. This is one example of achieving good, but frequently un-claimed (see 2.4.7) results through the way things are done.

Staff capacity. DCA staff at all levels is found to be highly skilled, professional, and experienced in working with development and humanitarian programmes. Staff appears committed, focused on promoting rights, and dedicated to their work. The staff is a strong asset to DCA.

2.4.3 Monitoring system

Monitoring system development. DCA has made valiant efforts at building-up a system for comprehensive results monitoring. The annual Global Report is a major effort and a good tool for informing the broader public and some donors. The monitoring system is, however still largely unable to link financial and outcome monitoring with some way to go before it can answer the question of what is produced at what costs.

Difficulties. The unquestionable difficulties in measuring outcomes of less-tangible activities such as advocacy or capacity building have been only tentatively addressed. Only individual cases are reported, e.g. of successful national advocacy in relation to specific laws. Going deeper into outcomes in these fields might require quite sophisticated (and costly) surveys, which are probably not justified, except in exceptional cases. DCA is however, advised to develop simple, yet robust and transparent tools for documenting the outcomes and benefits of such activities. A key element of benefits is their level of sustainability. The social aspects of sustainability may be proxy-assessed by participation and trust. The review team has provided DCA with the tool called ‘participation ladder’ (see Annex 10), which allows scoring of participation. This may be useful in monitoring.

Monitoring guides and templates in DCA. The draft DCA monitoring guideline (2014) suggests a system, where DCA receives data from implementing partners and amalgamate these for use in global and other reporting. As learned from review field visits, it appears partners report by sending staff to collect data from activities and then submit. This, very typical approach, may be described as ‘audit type monitoring’. While this may sometimes be needed as part of supervision, it is often applied or perceived as control, which has several negative effects on the monitoring itself and on effectiveness. It also disagrees with the principle of participation.

Participatory monitoring. DCA is encouraged to work with national constituency and intermediary partners on adopting participatory monitoring (especially for activities that involve communities
and other beneficiaries quite directly). Participatory monitoring increases quality of data (as the ones collecting data are interested in their use and know the local context very well); provides information for immediate use in local management and/or evidence-based advocacy towards local authorities or businesses; increase knowledge and skills of those participating and if peer-to-peer collaboration is applied, it can directly help build local civil society at community level and at higher levels.

2.4.4 Organisational management

History and values in the work of the organisation. DCA is closely affiliated with the Danish Lutheran church. In its Vision and Plan, DCA expresses its core values: ‘DanChurchAid works from a Christian philosophy of life and man, based on the understanding that all human beings are God’s creation and therefore valuable, equal and share the same fundamental rights. This view of human nature is the basis of the rights-based approach of DanChurchAid’s work’. One of the values presented here (equality) is directly used in the PANEL values, as is the rights. Non-discrimination is ‘covered’ by the words about all human beings being created by God.

Governing structures. DCA has double-layer governance, with a council consisting of members representing the popular foundation and a professional board, which reports to the council. Both are directly involved in strategy development, and the board now affiliates members of the partnership group. The review assessed the composition of council and board and found both to represent the needed commitment, range of skills and experiences as well as excellent network within Denmark and internationally. The board and the secretary general has established good rapport and are able to act decisively on longer term issues as well as in situation requiring rapid response, such as humanitarian response or political crisis. The international department has established a leadership group, which clearly provides sufficient and timely action and development.

DCA and partner management. DCA capacity for strategic and day-to-day management is based on a good collaboration between the DCA-Partners, Regional Offices/Country Offices2, the Head Office and the DCA Governing Bodies. The day-to-day management of activities is vested with the partners and DCA invests a lot of efforts in developing the capacity of (especially traditional and typical) partners, both in terms of day-to-day management and in terms of strategic organisational development. The partners are implementing the projects and programs in close collaboration with the local target groups. National partners and the regional offices undertake the process of project planning, budgeting, implementation, reporting, monitoring and follow-up. They form the foundation for all activities (except global advocacy and activities in Denmark) and based on this, the dialogue between the regional offices and Head Office ensures the appropriate level of coherence in activities, programs and the quality control.

Partner systems and procedures. There are elaborate systems and procedures in DCA (found within PPM) to guide the day-to-day management and to ensure that all aspects required by the back-donors are adhered to. With the diversity of funding in DCA, a lot of emphasis has to be on timeliness and quality of work. In this respect DCA benefits from having a long tradition of being a generally well-run organisation. DCA has offices in 11 focus countries3 and the Head Office in Denmark. Further to this, DCA is part of the ACT Alliance and often share office facilities, programmes and sometimes partners with other ACT-members. In some countries, like Myanmar, the mutual collaboration between the ACT-members based there is currently including financial management backup until the appointed Finance and Administration Coordinator has started. The

---

2 DCA previously was organised with regional offices and thematic programmes. Now gradually the focus is on integrated country programmes and country offices, but the terminology is not always used stringently.

3 As per the DCA Annual Report 2013, p. 5.
above implies that DCA is part of a “team” that enables DCA to overcome challenges beyond its “own” organisational capacity. This added strength is very visible in relation to day-to-day management but also includes elements of strategic management. Being part of the ACT-networking and being HAP-certified as well as working closely with a range of core back-donors involves DCA in a positive strategic process.

Risk management. DCA does not yet possess a system or methodology for assessing various kinds of risks. Procedures for risk management are in place in parts of the financial system (see 2.4.5) and extensive anti-corruption practices are in place. Risks are identified in individual projects and for example also in work with commercial partners, but a comprehensive survey of risks is not undertaken, e.g. in conjunction with quality assurance.

The review recommends DCA further design and establishes a coherent set of procedures for risk assessment and management and addressing risks. This includes identification of areas of potential risks in diverse aspects; such as financial, implementation, partner collaboration (including work with commercial partners).

Innovation. DCA Head Office actively supports innovation, sometimes with funds from Danida. The review has assessed the work on e-learning, local to global (on global lessons from local protection in humanitarian crises), cash-transfers, and transformation of mine clearance in direction of communities that are safer from arms and mines. All are excellent, and will be very useful for DCA as such, for its future work and recognition and e-learning even as a source of income outside the donor and donation type of income.

Security policy. Based on experiences of the review the DCA security policy is actively used functions well and is appropriate in scope and form.

Anti-corruption and complaints system. The anti-corruption and complaints reporting system within DCA is assessed to be adequate and covering the needed aspects for an organisation of the type and size of DCA. The complaints system on the DCA homepage provides so many details that a person reporting abuse often is quite easy to identify, not least for close colleagues. This may endanger or discomfort the person reporting and may deter others from submitting reports. It is advised to DCA to review the system and its ability to hide identities.

2.4.5 Financial management

The review team acknowledges that many areas mentioned for improvement are under consideration by DCA. Such DCA considerations are supported, but what is highlighted here shows the review team’s wish for DCA to give more attention and focus to the suggested areas.

Financial Management systems and processes. DCA has good financial management with adequate systems and procedures. The timeliness in Reporting and in general Financial Management demonstrates a well-established organisation. It is noted that Danida and other donors are satisfied and the DCA partners met, all express a high degree of appreciation. The external audits are positive and the checks made by the review team in collaboration with Danida’s quality assurance unit (KVA) were positively verified. The financial management systems and processes benefit from DCA’s experienced and qualified staff and management. The finance staff members hold a good range of financial qualifications coupled with experience from both Denmark and abroad.

Support from Head Office. The “flying” financial support option for Regional Office/COs has proven to be successful. During the visit to the Regional office in Cambodia, the review team noted clear improvements in finance and administrative functions compared to DCA Head Office-Travel-
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4 Inspiration may be found at: http://amg.um.dk/en/technical-guidelines/guidelines-for-risk-management/

5 Where DCA has initiated work on risk identification in a draft paper to the review.
Retaining financial staff. DCA seems to have difficulties in recruiting and retaining this staff and need to scale up efforts. Part of such efforts could be to let some of the postings be open regionally and to build in career options for key staff positions, i.e. the finance and administration coordinators. Another option for further improvement in staffing is to motivate staff towards further education. Some of the competent staff met expressed interest in more financial management education. It is viewed positively, that DCA in its financial management seeks to maintain a balance between strive for efficiency and effectiveness and maintaining staff dedication and innovativeness. If too much focus is on the control aspects of management, the other strong aspects could decline.

Challenges, DCA needs to increase efforts to attract and retain financial staff at Regional level, especially the Finance & Administration Coordinator is crucial. During the review team visits to Cambodia and Myanmar it was found that the F&A Coordinators are crucial for the Regional Office/Country Offices. Both the Regional Office/Country Office overall and the RR are to a large extent hinged on having good Finance and Administration Coordinators.

The review team recommends that DCA increase efforts to attract and retain financial staff at Country/Regional level; especially the Financial & Administration Coordinator is crucial.

Decentralisation. Similarly it seems likely that DCA would benefit from decentralising management more to the capable Regional Office/Country Offices, possibly with additional Regional support groups in areas where more capacity needs to be developed. This could improve networking between Regional Office/Country Offices and reduce the pressure on Head Office. This approach could include special emphasis and capacity made available to weaker Regional Office/Country Offices and it would promote better capacity utilisation throughout the organisation. DCA has started work in this direction and the review team supports a scale up of such efforts.

Efficiency and effectiveness. DCA has initiated a process to focus on efficiency and effectiveness and has stepped up its efforts to improve e/e both at Head Office and in the regional offices visited. Primarily it seems that the needed process has gained momentum over the past six months. This is commendable but the process would be expected to receive more focus and consistent efforts. As one indicator on e/e (in financial terms) the turnover per employee is often used. For the past years this has no changed significantly in DCA, as illustrated in Annex 8). Efficiency in terms of cost-consciousness is demonstrated in the organisation. DCA has increased cost-efficiency in various ways and particularly in tendering, including external audit, security, travel cost and the telephone system. Systematic improvement in efficiency and effectiveness has to go beyond Head Office and also involve/include the regional offices and the key partners. When recording progress in terms of e/e, it is important to monitor and measure performance realistically and consistently. Performance in DCA seems often to be viewed conservatively, probably somehow too modestly. DCA would benefit from systematically addressing the process and more proactively involving Head Office, regional offices and partners. Having alternative options in mind when planning and budgeting projects and activities and subsequently following up during and after completion are essential for consistent progress in efficiency. Simplifying systems and procedures is a constant strive when increasing efficiency, although donors require a lot and control is needed. Such efforts should include a faster system for funds transfer to partners. (Slow transfer does not necessarily
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6 The travel reports viewed appear well structured and fact focused.
7 DCA has initiated a pilot project to decentralisation at the Palestine regional office, which it intends to roll out to other regional offices in a non-“one-size-fits-all” manner. Similarly there are examples of regional office staff supporting other regional offices.
8 According to DCA Finance the annual cost reduction on the new telephone system is more than 800tkr.
promote effectiveness). An example is in the border-work (Myanmar-Thailand) where swift funds transfer is essential. The present system has created situations where approved activities were seriously delayed because funds did not arrive before the rainy season had started, thus delaying everything for half a year. So in order to promote e/e a more smooth transfer procedure, still with adequate controls, should be found in order to accommodate exceptions requiring special attention.

Administration costs. In terms of Administrative costs, DCA has managed to hold a small but steady decrease in the percentage used for administration. The admin cost ratio against total income has decreased from 10% in 2009 to 8.7% in 2013. This represents a positive trend and DCA expects this to continue. Supporting the relative decline in admin cost is a gradual increase in total income, reaching DKK 572 million in 2013, see Annex 8 Figure 1 for trends. At the same time it is noted that the admin percentage as published by DCA is considerably higher than the similar percentage allowed from Danida and other donors, at most 7% and normally less. In reality this implies that DCA is only capable of meeting their relatively higher admin percentage by adding from its un-tied income. Although DCA has plenty of room for continuing with its own relatively higher admin percentage, the review team sees this as a long-term latent risk. Therefore it is suggested to remain diligent in scrutinising the administrative cost and in continuing to expand overall income. Ways of calculating admin percentage varies from organisation to organisation and according to DCA they use a conservative approach. The review suggest the DCA calculation should be studied in detail in connection with an analysis of increasing cost-efficiency by decentralising part of the work to regional offices. Without entering into detailed calculations, it seems likely that DCA can gain from gradually utilising more of the talents in many of the regional offices. Such a process will have to be carefully planned and combined with extensive HRD in order to maintain the high quality of work characterising DCA.

Partners. The partners cater for the larger share of DCA funds utilisation and promoting partners to optimize efficiency and effectiveness would have a significant impact on DCA’s overall performance. Here it seems worthwhile for DCA to consider a reduction in the number of partners combined with grouping of the remaining partners in order to achieve a larger impact of structured capacity development efforts. The number of partners for each Regional Office/Country Office appears too large to be handled effectively. Examples of the challenges are found in regional offices. This is being discussed in DCA and the review supports a more simple and manageable approach. Furthermore there seems to be scope in grouping partners according to capacity and module the capacity building according to the grouping. This type of training could involve more use of peer support and be promoted by peer competition, both among partners and ROs. In this way, DCA would strengthen its ability to feed information and results back through the organisation and its partners as well as underscore the ability to capture lessons learnt.

Procurement. DCA has developed a full-fledged procurement system, with a comprehensive manual. It is recognised by all major donors. The system has proven its worth within DCA and DCA supports partners and peers, inside ACT and outside in applying the instruments. This has become a source of some income for DCA. On the other hand, such diverse requirements (reflecting the complicated nature of procurement) make the system complex and time consuming in application. To solve this problem the regional office in Myanmar had developed a condensed format to be used for smaller consultancies. This means that DCA had two systems in Myanmar and the condensed format did not even have any anti-corruption clause. It should be mentioned that additional systems might not meet donor requirements; even they may appear more operational.
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9 Additional elements of e/e are summed up in 2.4.7
10 This was corrected, during the visit of the review
**Anomalies:** DCA has an extensive system to handle suspicion on anomalies and a transparent strategy to deal with such problems. In general it seems that DCA and its staff are making positive efforts to minimise these challenges and meets Danida’s expectations in this area. According to DCA, anonymity is accepted in special circumstances in cases of substantial evidence and furthermore anonymous reporting can take place through a third party person. The review team considers anonymity for the informer to be a cornerstone in a good whistle-blower system.

**Financial risk management.** One aspect of financial monitoring is linked to partner profiles and these could gain from involving risk awareness and analysis. These could include identifying any sensitive areas to the partner or in relation to DCA. Both the partners and DCA would probably benefit from an open dialogue on this issue, as the risk assessment should go both ways.

**Results-based monitoring and reporting.** Results-based monitoring and reporting, including performance indicators and link to finance are in progress but still needs more attention. To make meaningful analysis and follow-up, money needs to be linked to something and preferably to something tangible. It is noted that DCA is working to link financial and programme information and management as required in the previous review. However, the progress has not been impressive in this area and, up to now the focus has been too much on Head Office. The need for improvements was noted in the previous review and although DCA has started the work and made improvements, there is an urgent need to step up efforts.

**Assessment of the Financial Monitoring system.** Financial monitoring in DCA constitutes several modalities, including the financial management reporting system, budget follow-ups, what-if analysis, systematic use of external audits, dialogue with partners and visits to partners on site at least twice a year. This is commendable and seems to work well except where the finance staff were unable to participate despite invitations from DCA programme staff and partners. This was the case in Cambodia where the Regional Office/Country Office due to heavy workload on low staff resources had not been able to participate as intended. Seen from the review team, such problems should be minimised if not fully avoided and this area should have more attention.

**Governing bodies in financial oversight.** In addition to the financial monitoring done within the DCA organisation by its staff and management, DCA has active governing bodies playing an essential part in overall financial monitoring and management. The Advisory Board holds representatives from a range of interest groups. The Advisory Board elects the main part of the Board of Directors, which also has a staff-representative and options for supplementing the members elected to cover areas of special skills needed. The Board of Directors meets approximately six times a year and in the biannual Advisory Board meetings, the Board of Directors are automatically participating. Between those Board of Directors’ meetings a Chairman-group meets informally when need arise. The group consists of the Board Chairman, the Vice-chairman and the Treasurer meeting the Secretary General and often the Director of Finance. The governing bodies play an essential part of financial monitoring at the strategic level. A team has been appointed to deal specifically with financial strategies and the finance-strategy team also discusses many of the financial issues discussed in this Report. The team members are the Chairman-group plus the Secretary General and the Director of Finance. The above-mentioned levels of financial monitoring and management of DCA appear to be well vested in the overall organisation set-up. The quality of strategic dialogue on financial monitoring is, as seen from the review team, of a commendable standard. In this way, the elected bodies of DCA play a vital part in monitoring and management based on voluntary work.

**Assessment of Funding Strategies.** DCA has managed to increase its funding in recent years and at the same time maintain diversity in funding sources. In 2013 Danida was the key funding source with 37% of total funding, see 87, Table 3 for details, followed by collections of 23%, International donors 19% and EU 15%. In terms of financial management, the diversity is positive and the
Global Funding Unit of DCA seems to work strategically and systematically, both from Head Office in Denmark and in the ROs, see Annex 8, Figure 2 for details in Danida support. The funding is linked to the pattern of funds utilisation and of all expenses in 2013, 42% was spent on Humanitarian Aid, 38% on development support, collection-cost and information covered 10%.

**Equity and financial solidity.** DCA is increasingly striving to improve equity and financial solidity. The organisation has experienced periodic challenges in its cash flow and has started to increase its financial solidity. The need for increase in equity falls in line with donor (EU) requests to increase solidity in view of future support. With this in mind, DCA has set a strategic target of achieving 12% equity compared to annual income and 20% compared to total balance sheet. This will add to the financial robustness of DCA and provide a strong financial base. At the same time it is noted that equity of this size is beyond most other Danish NGOs and beyond any specific Danida requirement. Due to its relatively high own un-restricted collections DCA can be expected to meet its equity target, see Annex 8, Figure 4 for details on collected funds. For 2014 the target is a surplus of 1 million DKK and with this level of annual increase, the equity ratio is expected to reach 11.8% compared to turnover and 19.5% compared to total balance sheet. DCA expects are to achieve the strategic targets every year in the planning period 2015-22. It seems important for DCA to carefully communicate its equity goal and the reasons behind the need for increased financial robustness. Otherwise the legitimacy of DCA could potentially be shaken if the equity increase is viewed as “too large”. DCA is formulating its equity-strategy well and probably the message is well taken and accepted by its stakeholders and supporters. This is mentioned here because a surplus in DCA 2013 of more than DKK 15 million is unusual in similar organisations. At the same time it needs to be stated explicitly that increased equity will strengthen DCA’s financial management and financial capabilities. Seen in this perspective, DCA could pave the way for other Danish NGOs to target financial robustness more decisively.

**2.4.6 Popular foundation**

**Affiliation with the Church.** The Danish Lutheran Church is the original, and still very solid, base of DCA. The DCA council and board have strong representation by clergy, representatives from church-affiliated organisations and church members. Churchgoers contribute significant (and quite flexible) funds.

**Stores:** DCA operates a large and well-known chain of second-hand stores, which is managed by a large group of voluntary staff. DCA consciously inform this group and involve the members actively in activities, which motivate and enhance their role as ambassadors. The shops also bring in significant funds.

**Recognition in Denmark.** DCA has a highly recognised name in the Danish public, especially in relation to emergency assistance (as it appears in the name of the organisation) and ‘hunger’. Recent innovative campaigns directed a people wanting to give meaningful presents have added to this, on the development side. Good collaboration with the Royal court ensures many messages reach very broad audiences.

**Work with consumers.** Even more recently DCA has opened new venue through collaboration with a major retail chain, which gives direct access to the ‘occasional consumer’. Other companies that provide funding as well as considerable exposure towards the public is the largest Danish dairy and a group of smaller companies committed to contribute in case of major disasters. DCA is aware of potential risks (such as becoming associated with a company that may employ child labour or similar) in collaboration with commercial companies and appears to manage this risk quite well.

**DCA work with popular foundation.** The work with the popular foundation is managed professionally and has strong vision. Currently a strategy for the coming years is under development. The
management of the national department has suggested DCA leadership to start providing support to international partners who may wish to build an own, stronger, national foundation. The review team welcomes this development, as it could contribute towards social and financial sustainability. DCA actively communicates with Danish youth through social media and other avenues and recognises that even more needs to be done in this field.

2.4.7 Efficiency and effectiveness – summing up

DCA has undergone, through own initiative, a LEAN process, seemingly with good results. It is now embarking on an ambitious, internal project on increasing efficiency. This concerns operations at Head Office.

Start on measuring the share that reaches beneficiaries: The review team initiated, with two regional offices, development of tools for assessing cost efficiency of individual projects (see Annex 9). This exercise showed different approaches, and does not yet include costs at head office level. It also includes mainly projects that have direct field implementation. Generally, one aim of following financial flows is to calculate how much of donor contributions that actually reach ‘the ground’. The simplest way is to take the gross project expenditure and subtract total administration at Head Office, Regional Office and partner administration level. This would yield quite low fractions that ‘reach the ground’. It is however, also a method that is too crude, especially for an organisation that not simply provides services and does not implement by itself, but rather live up to the CS strategy’s intentions about focusing on support to development of local civil society. In this case, a part of costs for programme officers (such as time used for support to partners) should be considered activity costs, as should a large share, related to field implementation, of partners’ costs. Even a share of most Head Office costs (except pure administration costs) should be assessed as ‘reaching the ground’. Part of the work of Head Office specialists is for example ‘monitoring visits’ or development of new concepts, both of which leads to improved implementation. The review, based on the limited data available (See Annex 9) and the observations and experience of the team, assesses that for DCA and partners, 60-80% of the donor funds ‘reach the ground’ in activities that are mainly implemented locally, in communities. Advocacy efforts - if well targeted and implemented – will lead to effects that benefit people ‘on the ground’. But of course, in in these cases attribution and establishment of cause-effect relations is especially difficult. DCA is advised to continue development of tools and methods for assessing the fraction of funds that reaches the ground, taking these considerations into account. The process should involve consideration of different views and approaches, and should be well documented and may best be organised as an internal project. In order to ensure transparency, the conclusions reached should include clear descriptions and rationale for all assumptions (e.g. fraction of a Right to Food Programme officer’s time in a regional office that ‘reaches the ground’) going into the calculations. DCA is also advised to calculate the shares of Danida funding reaching - all the way from head office, through regional/country offices - partners in various countries. It is advised to keep both the result and the process at quite simple, yet robust levels. There is ample possibility of overdoing this and spending too much effort on designing complicated systems, thus in fact reducing effectiveness and efficiency.

Cost/benefits: The above only concerns the distribution of funds on various activities and expenditure lines. Of even more significance for efficiency and effectiveness is the level of benefits obtained from the funds. This issue should be considered both in terms of immediate benefits and the sustainability (and possible cascading effects11) of the benefits. A key element of sustainability of social outcomes is the level of participation. The review team has suggested DCA to measure and

11 Such as growing benefits from local savings and loans groups or other forms of associations.
score participation levels by use of a participation ladder. It is also aware of methods to assess social sustainability of local groups.

As part on the work on improving effectiveness and efficiency, the review team **recommends** that DCA complete the work initiated on how to estimate shares of funding used for management and implementation and how much that ‘reaches the ground’, and that further testing of a workable system are implemented with a view of wider application within DCA.

The review **recommends** that DCA programme monitoring system is developed to include practical and workable solutions to results documentation, linking outcome and financial aspects and measuring of benefits at rights holders’ level. This also involves measuring sustainability (and specifically participation and strength of local CS as main elements of sustainability), measuring effects of capacity development and advocacy, measuring the effects on DCA legitimacy and the use of participatory monitoring methods.

**Under-reporting:** DCA underreports some results. This is an effect of how the implementation system (project and the like) and the monitoring system are set up. Currently it only monitors effects of planned activities. But DCA’s work has many effects through the way it is conducted, i.e. through practical use of the PANEL principles (See partnerships, in section 2.3). These effects should be included in estimates of benefits.

**Partnerships — key to increased efficiency:** The efforts to increase effectiveness have not yet reached partnerships and partner implementation in any systematic way. This should be remedied. It could be by including consideration on partner implementation effectiveness in partner identification and in partnership agreements and in working with the issues of sustainability/participation in partnership agreement and their continuous follow-up. (See further in 2.3)

### 3 DCA follow-up on latest review.

The previous review of DCA (2011) had a number of main recommendations to DCA. The table below shows these, as well as DCA follow-up:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations, 2011</th>
<th>DCA follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This review endorses DCA’s plan to review and update its Humanitarian and Food Security Policies in 2012.</td>
<td>DCA has produced new policies on Right to Food and Humanitarian Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA should clarify whether DCA’s primary programming operational modality is a country or a region (as suggested by the Regional Policy paper).</td>
<td>This has been clarified with the introduction and gradual phasing-in of country programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA could consider reviewing current approaches and management systems in regard to its global thematic programmes.</td>
<td>The new focus on country programming should go a long way towards this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing programme monitoring systems are more clearly integrated into the Vision &amp; Plan reporting system.</td>
<td>This integration will be implemented in next Vision and Plan cycle (from 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA should consider how to improve the use of financial reporting to enhance efficiency across the organisation.</td>
<td>DCA has initiated work on this, but it is still an area in need of improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadly the organisation should begin to put in place tools for measuring performance; using targets, indicators and milestones more clearly on</td>
<td>‘This has taken place in relation to global strategy/reporting. Indicators/targets are mainly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Policy Operationalization and Programme Strategies.</strong> The forthcoming Global Strategy is a good place to start this. Fundamental to this will be increasing partner capacity to assess and report on outcomes and impact (see below).</th>
<th><strong>Measuring quantities, not quality or sustainability. Still better performance measurements may be possible. The present report (review, 2014) provides some suggestions.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Overall it is recommended that DCA improve their use and analysis of financial information and link this to programmes wherever possible. Changes to financial management systems and processes: Budgets should be done on quarterly basis and possibly combined with rolling plans and budgets. Financial reports should include more analysis with clearer links to programme policies. Internal audits should be introduced, with a focus on strategy. Activity-based reporting, including financial reporting, should be strengthened and allow linking of activity reporting and financial reporting to improve documentation of results. DCA should tighten procedures, supervision and follow-up in the Juba office. The external audit should be based on regular competitive bidding. | **DCA has made improvements and started the process of linking performance to finance with results-based reporting. The organisation is aware that more attention and more work throughout DCA will be needed and this will include e/e considerations.** 
**Future donor requirements are likely to underscore the above need for improvements.** 
**On internal audit, DCA prefers to remain with the external auditor combining the duties.** 
**On the time registration system, DCA has agreed with Danida to maintain the system.** 
**DCA has taken the other aspects into account.** |
| **DCA should develop a new partnership policy.** The revised policy should show how DCA:  
* Defines the purpose of partnerships  
* Categorise the different relationships (through the definition of sub-categories of partnership relationships)  
* Identify how DCA will work differently with the different categories of partners by category, including reference to OD and capacity building.  
* Identify a range of agreements, which are used for different types of partnership.  
* Will include partners into DCA strategizing and policy development and review.  
A key principle is the need to show transparently that partners may (or may not) graduate through different types of relationships with DCA  
Regional Representative should agree and report on targets for their partner portfolio and develop country or regional strategies for development. | **This policy has been developed, in a process and with a result widely praised by partners.**  
**The policy does include the recommended elements.**  
**DCA has introduced partnership agreements for strategic partners, but there is a need for further differentiation/identification of partners and their likely development pathways**  
**The concept of ‘graduation’ has not been clearly defined and applied, as it was (rightly) found too simplistic.**  
**DCA still needs to develop differentiation of various types of partners.**  
**The need to be able to report on results is still an issue. This present review (2014) presents further inputs towards this process.** |
DCA HQ should review this from a global perspective.
In large contracted partnerships such as LWF, more systematic attention should be given to identifying the potential added value of DCA. This could be done via annual peer (partner) reviews of agreements, to ensure parties discuss respective performance and changing needs.
Improving the capacity of partners to report on results is a critical next step for DCA in their partnerships and this should be a focus in the short and medium term. DCA might consider selecting a partnership champion to ensure sufficient strategic attention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To function as an effective capacity building partner DCA must:</th>
<th>The partnerships agreements under development and implementation do this to some extent. It is expected that the process of regular updating of the agreements will further refine this.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define the aim(s) of their capacity building work for different types of relationships</td>
<td>It is found in the present review, that some types of partners should NOT be included in a ‘one size fits all’ capacity development process, e.g. on financial management and results reporting. Other solutions should be found, e.g. stronger and more flexible support from DCA or through another (mentor-type) partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a menu of capacity building: from training through to organisational and system development</td>
<td>The capacity for monitoring is still insufficient in some partners. It is recommended to introduce monitoring that is of optimal, local use; i.e. participatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out regular reviews of partner capacity changes and needs assessments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In relation to general areas where more capacity development is required by partners are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for outcome and impact monitoring and reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous cycle of financial management support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DCA needs use their influence with the ACT Alliance to encourage Alliance members to:
Ensure future appeals are conducted jointly whenever possible.
Continue consultations with the major institutional donors through ACT regional forums (ACT Nordic and ACT Europe) to ensure more explicit support from these donors to future joint ACT Alliance Appeals.
During discussions on the humanitarian framework DCA should discuss with MFA how it will monitor and report on MFA funding used for ACT Appeals outside DCA’s normal areas of operation.
## 4 Report Annexes.

### Annex 1 Items for Follow-up by MFA and DCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Follow up by</th>
<th>Milestones, proposed by review</th>
<th>Comments from DCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Partnerships</strong>&lt;br&gt;In the continued strategic development of partnerships, the review <strong>recommends</strong> to include in the partnership agreements issues of joint long-term goals, pathways of change, sustainability, and considerations of effectiveness and efficiency.&lt;br&gt;It is <strong>recommended</strong> that DCA identifies common traits and change pathways for groups of typical partners and apply these in descriptions of and in support to partners. It is <strong>recommended</strong> to ensure further development of modalities for how to work with a range of non-traditional partners, including: association-type partners, activist partners, other constituency partners, and more transient movements partners. The modalities should include more flexible ways to support new type of partners that do not have strong management.</td>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>By mid-2016 new and adjusted partnership agreements include presentation of joint long-term goals, pathways of change, sustainability issues, and consideration of effectiveness and efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>By mid-2016 DCA has developed tools to describe partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>By mid-2015, modalities for how to work with non-traditional partners have been further tested and developed and guidance made available within DCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Linking relief, recovery and development (LRRD)</strong>&lt;br&gt;The review <strong>recommends</strong> that DCA further develop a guideline for how to undertake the work related to LRRD. &lt;br&gt;The review <strong>recommends</strong> that DCA seek to increase reporting across the programmes on progress within the area of LRRD. This includes LRRD-related activities and approaches in relief, DRR, CCA, and right to food work as well as advocacy.</td>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>By mid-2015 a guideline should be available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>By mid-2015 cross-sectoral reporting on LRRD is further included in the country and global reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Flexibility of funding when operating cross-border and inside countries

The review recommends that DCA utilise opportunities for flexibility in humanitarian funding from Danida to the crisis in South East Myanmar and apply funding inside country and cross-border in accordance with DCA context analysis of the situation. Continuation of a mix of cross-border and inside country humanitarian support is deemed necessary for the coming years.

The review recommends that DCA utilise the flexibility in applying humanitarian funding from Danida inside country and cross-border if deemed necessary in other crises and if based on thorough context and situation analysis.

The review recommends that opportunities to promote longer-term commitments in humanitarian funding from Danida to prolonged crisis are further discussed and developed.

| DCA | By end-2014 DCA presents an updated context analysis including arguments for the allocation of humanitarian funding from Danida for the coming years inside country and cross-border to the crisis in the South East Myanmar. |
| DCA | In accordance with different crisis situations, develop context analysis presenting consideration for inside country and cross-border humanitarian assistance. Ensure development of project/programme proposals accordingly. |
| DCA and MFA | By end-2014 modalities for promoting longer-term commitments in humanitarian funding to prolonged crises are discussed and possibly including in future planning |

### 4. Integration of HMA/Safer Communities with DCA programmes

The review recommends that DCA continue integration of HMA/Safer Communities into the overall work and structure of DCA and into country strategies, while retaining accreditation and ensuring access to funding for HMA from a broad range of donors.

The review recommends that DCA seek opportunities for funding the development-type aspects of HMA/Safer Communities (Mine Risk Education, Victims Assistance, Surveys – work on Safer Communities) through the development funding, in line with funding to DRR.

| DCA | 2015 country reports document increased integration of HMA/Safer Communities into the relevant country programmes/programmes. HMA continues to attract constant or increasing level of funding. |
| DCA and MFA | By mid-2015 DCA negotiations with donors incl. Danida include opportunities for funding development aspects of HMA/Safer Communities in relevant prolonged crises situations from humanitarian as development funding. |
5. Effectiveness and efficiency
As part on the work on improving effectiveness and efficiency, the review team recommends that DCA complete the work initiated on how to estimate shares of funding used for management and implementation and how much that ‘reaches the ground’, and that further testing of a workable system are implemented with a view of wider application within DCA.

| DCA | By mid-2015 DCA reports document that testing has been undertaken of systems for estimating shares of funding used for management and used for implementation including how much that ‘reaches the ground’ at country level and by mid-2016 at global level. |
| DCA | By mid-2016, DCA can report that a system for measuring effectiveness and efficiency and documenting results has been tested and includes measurement of sustainability, beneficiary benefits and effects on DCA legitimacy. Participatory monitoring methods are included. By mid-2017 the system is being applied within DCA. |

6. Risk Management
The review recommends DCA further design and establishes a coherent set of procedures for risk assessment and management and addressing risks. This includes identification of areas of potential risks in diverse aspects; such as financial, implementation, partner collaboration (including work with commercial partners).

| DCA | By end-2015 DCA can document a functional system for risk assessment and management, covering all areas of main risks. |

7. Financial systems and procedures
The review team recommends that DCA financial systems and procedures are simplified and seek a faster system for funds transfer to partners especially those without full-fledged management.

| DCA | By mid-2015 documentation on financial systems and procedures show that simplification has been developed where relevant |

8. Financial management
The review team recommends that DCA increase efforts to attract and retain financial staff at Country/Regional level; especially the Financial & Administration Coordinator is crucial.

| DCA | 2014 country reports show that financial staff increasingly have been recruited and retained. |
Annex 2 Terms of Reference for the Review

Review and Capacity Assessment of DanChurchAid (DCA) with a special Focus on Partnerships in Development and Humanitarian Assistance

1. Background (HCP)
   a. Presentation of the organization

DanChurchAid (DCA) is rooted in the Danish National Evangelical Lutheran Church and is among the large relief- and development NGO in Denmark with an annual turnover in 2012 of around DKK 560 million. The organisation was established in 1922. It worked originally in the field of humanitarian assistance, but has increasingly engaged in development activities as well.

DCA applies a multilateral as well as a bilateral mode of operation in its implementation of its development programmes and activities. Lutheran World Federation (LWF) and World Council of Churches (WCC) are the key multilateral partners of DCA. DCA is a part of the ACT Alliance (Action by Churches Together) – an alliance that consists of more than 100 churches and humanitarian organisations across the world. ACT Alliance works with development, humanitarian assistance and advocacy in more than 120 countries. ACT is the most important of the many alliances and networks to which DCA belongs. The Alliance was established in 2010, and in the same year, the Secretary General of DCA became a member of the ACT Board.

DCA was among the first Danish NGOs to enter into a framework agreement with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1991/92. The framework allocation is now part of the annual Finance Act, and currently amounts to DKK 123 million per year. The development activities under the framework agreement are currently mainly concentrated in ten so-called focus countries. Other active smaller grants financed by Danida development funds include a total of four grants for the NGO Pool for Innovative Initiatives, for Women in Africa, and for interventions against HIV and AIDS.

In accordance with the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action (2010 - 2015) Danida has established Humanitarian Partnership Framework Agreements (PFAs) with 8 Danish NGO's. DCA was one of the first humanitarian partners. The aim of the strategic partnership is to give the implementing partners higher funding predictability and operational flexibility in exchange for better planning and clear performance targets against the priorities set in the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action. The partnership is focussing on Humanitarian Mine Action, Food Security/resilience, Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Relief Items.

DCA revised its policy for humanitarian action in 2013. The Humanitarian partnership agreement is mentioned in the finance bill and constitutes DKK 63 million annually, furthermore DCA has applied for various emergency grants (humanitarian crisis response) and in 2013 has been granted 20 million DKK for
activities in the Sudan / South Sudan and 3,9 million DKK for activities in Syria.

b. Conclusions from previous review and capacity assessment

The previous review of DCA had a focus on partnerships and covered both humanitarian and development cooperation. The overall conclusion showed that DCA’s partners appreciated cooperation with DCA, incl. DCA’s flexibility, context-based approach, support to capacity development, and concrete support to financial management and fund raising.

Among the recommendations can be mentioned that the review pointed to the need for revising the partnership policy and provide for a more transparent approach that recognises that there is not a “one size fits all” approach for partnership while being clear on DCA’s specific strengths and competencies (added value). It also recommended strengthening DCA monitoring and follow-up of the support to capacity development, incl. in the area of partners’ reporting on results. The review recommended that policies would benefit from greater use of targets, milestones and benchmarks to provide strategic direction and markers for monitoring.

The review recommended a revision of DCA’s humanitarian policy. A strategic framework for DCA’s support in humanitarian programmes and projects was developed in 2013. DCA programme staff use the policy when developing country specific strategies and assessing projects.

c. Conclusions from last framework negotiations incl. any follow-up

A follow-up plan to review recommendations was submitted by DCA and up-dated in January and September 2013. The latest framework negotiations were held in December 2013 and showed progress on a number of review recommendations, incl. strengthening of partnership relations, ACT cooperation, country focus, monitoring and evaluation and revision of policies (DCA Right to Food Policy and DCA Humanitarian Action Policy).

2. Objectives

The overall objectives of the review is to assess the capacity of DCA especially on the delivery of results on long term development and humanitarian interventions and the linkage between them, through a variety of partnerships- this will be done by:

- Analysing and assessing the performance of the organisation at head office level as well as in the field in terms of delivering results through partnerships in humanitarian action, mine action and civil society collaboration.

- Providing a general assessment of DCA’s current financial and organisational capacity to operate humanitarian and development programmes under the MFA framework and the humanitarian partnership agreements, incl. an assessment of the organisation’s follow-up of the recommendations from the latest review.
3. Outputs
- An inception note, which will serve as a presentation of the main issues to be addressed, as well as describing the methodology and work plan.
- A mission preparation note based on the desk study, interviews and focus group discussions with objectives and detailed work plan for the field visit.
- A debriefing presentation in Copenhagen to discuss the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations after the field trip.
- A review report, not exceeding 30 pages, plus annexes (max 5 pages per country specific report).

4. Scope of Work
The review will consist of document reviews, including the follow-up note agreed between DCA and the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Danida following the last review, interviews incl. a mini-workshop with headquarter staff during inception, two field studies, interviews with other relevant stakeholders, and debriefing meetings at field and headquarter level, as well as a presentation of the review report and recent relevant external reviews and audits of DCA, notably the HAP review and ECHO Audit. It should be noted that adjustments to the scope of work of these TOR can take place based on discussions following the mission preparation note prepared by the review team.

The review will cover both long-term civil society support as well as humanitarian assistance and the linkage between them. The theme chosen for the current assignment is partnerships (see also section g. below) with a starting point in the DCA partnership policy. The main focus will be on DCA’s partnerships with partners in the South, which may be ACT Alliance members, but the partnerships (alliance partners) with “northern partners” within the ACT Alliance and with other networking organisations will also be assessed. The review will document areas of strength and added value/mutual benefits and challenges arising from the different types of partnerships and how these have been incorporated into DCA’s strategic approaches.

Furthermore, the review will include aspects related to overall financial and organisational management at DCA headquarters in Copenhagen and the application of the systems in the field.

The review will thus include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:

a. Organisational context
- How does DCA’s history and values affect the work of the organisation?
- How do governing structures influence the organisation?
- Does DCA have any “areas of excellence” in which the organisations show particularly good results?

b. Strategic level
- To what extent is DCA’s overall strategic frame (vision, goals and strategy) relevant and
consistent with Danish political priorities, as expressed in the Danish Civil Society Policy and the Strategy for Humanitarian Action (in terms of geographic, sector and thematic priorities)? To what extent does it adhere to the guiding principles for Humanitarian Action?

- In light of the priority in Danish Humanitarian Action to the Linking of Relief and Recovery and Development (LRRD) agenda and the objective to increase resilience by addressing root causes of vulnerabilities, where is the focus of DCA's work, and what is the relative weight given to development / humanitarian interventions and possible linkages?
- How does the revised DCA humanitarian policy, the Right to Food policy and other relevant DCA policies support this? Are these policies interlinked, mutually supportive and actively applied in programming?
- How do DCA and partners use good practices in advocacy, including influencing the national policy of focus countries as well as international policies and strategies?
- Are DCA’s strategies sensitive to local diversity? And is the DCA approach adaptable to the local social and cultural context (social norms and traditional power; ethnic groups; local economic activities)?

  c. Operational level

- Does DCA have a clear operational programme approach consistent with its overall strategic priorities and within Danish priorities?
- In connection with field visits and taking into consideration available documentation and reporting identify and assess selected results achieved on the ground against stated goals and objectives.
- Keeping in mind the methodological difficulties related to attribution, (i.e. measuring direct effects and impact of one organisation’s work), what are DCA’s areas of strength and added value/mutual benefits in relation to specific measurable results on the ground?
- How does DCA, its partners and beneficiaries benefit from participation in international networks, incl. the ACT Alliance coordination structures, ad hoc interagency bodies etc?
- How does DCA influence international networks in which it is a member – in respect of advocacy positions, operational activities etc.?
- To what degree have gender, environment and climate change, and human rights and democratisation analysis been applied? In particular the review will address:
  - How does DCA apply the Human Rights Based Approach, and in particular
    - How are the Human Rights standards and the principles of the Convention, as well as the Danish HRBA “PANT Principles” (Participation, Accountability; Non-Discrimination and Transparency) being applied?
    - How does DCA work for increased transparency with respect to decision-making processes within the interventions?
    - Which accountability mechanisms does DCA make use of, and are these effective?
  - What mitigating strategies are in place to counter and adjust to challenges and risks?

Furthermore, the team will assess;

- The relation to the UN cluster coordination and consolidated appeal systems, management and coordination, in particular the coordination with other actors, including local partners. How
effective was the cluster approach implemented in the programmes in terms of ensuring donor coordination? What were the strengths, challenges and lessons learnt in regard to coordination amongst the various agencies, such as the Myanmar Partnership Group Meetings (OCHA), South East Consultations Meeting (UNHCR), MRE Technical Working group and the INGO Forum?

- The application of formal quality or certification systems (Sphere, HAP, ECHO and others) and their usefulness, based on the most recent assessment reports, i.e. ECHO Audit and DCA’s approval for fast track FPA.
- The Relevance and willingness to administer funds from other humanitarian budgets e.g. submitting proposals for special humanitarian funding (“NGO runder”), ECHO funding etc. The effectiveness in addressing the immediate and longer term needs of the beneficiaries. Did the service delivered meet the needs and rights of the beneficiaries, for example IDPs and Refugees? How were beneficiaries identified? Were the rights and special needs and interests of vulnerable groups - including women and children - addressed in any specific manner? How has the host/local community and civil society been involved?

**d. Organisational capacity**

- What is DCA’s capacity for strategic and day-to-day management?
  - Does DCA have the human resources and technical backstopping capacity necessary to implement the operational programmes, and flexibility to adjust to changing needs, incl. in the operational context?
  - Does DCA have system systems and procedures related to staff security in the field?
- What is DCA’s competence development plan for staff, both at headquarter and regional/country offices as well as for seconded programme staff? Is retention addressed?
- Has performance been achieved according to the resources allocated and administered in the most efficient and effective manner?
  - Does DCA have a solid and reliable results-focused monitoring system, (incl. relevant outcome and impact indicators,) where results are regularly tracked and reviewed by management and made available to the public?
  - How does DCA ensure learning and knowledge management, including from evaluations?
  - How does DCA understand the relation between relief and development and its translation into programmes? Does the development part of DCA learn and benefit from the analyses and results of the humanitarian part?
  - How have good practices been operationalized and what is the approach to and dialogue with partners in this regard?
  - What are the practical implications of HAP certification, including the focus on beneficiary accountability, and HAP’s role internally in the organization, including with regard to the complaints mechanisms?
  - At the operational level does DCA have a focus on protection and the ability to reach vulnerable people, women and children as well as “new vulnerables”?
  - How does DCA obtain and demonstrate synergies between humanitarian mine action, humanitarian action and long term development programming.

**e. Popular foundation**

- What is DCA’s profile in relation to the Danish public, and how is its popular foundation in
Denmark relevant to the character and scale of the organisation - exemplified by:
- Membership/Sponsorship base and segments
- Quantitative mobilisation of activists/volunteers
- Qualitative engagement of activists/volunteers
- Democratic engagement of popular base/constituency
- Other parameters which the organisation finds of importance and of relevance to its particular character and profile

f. Humanitarian Assistance

As part of the assessment of the above mentioned coherence and relevance of DCA’s strategic frame and humanitarian policy to that of the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action, the team will among others look at:

- The relation to the UN cluster coordination and consolidated appeal systems, management and coordination, in particular the coordination with other actors, including local partners. How effective was the cluster approach implemented in the programmes in terms of ensuring donor coordination? What were the strengths, challenges and lessons learnt in regard to coordination amongst the various agencies, such as the Myanmar Partnership Group Meetings (OCHA), South East Consultations Meeting (UNHCR), MRE Technical Working group and the INGO Forum?
- The application of formal quality or certification systems (Sphere, HAP, ECHO and others) and their usefulness, based on the most recent assessment reports, i.e. ECHO Audit and DCA’s approval for fast track FPA.
- The relevance and willingness to administer funds from other humanitarian budgets e.g. submitting proposals for special humanitarian funding (“NGO runder”), ECHO funding etc.
- The effectiveness in addressing the immediate and longer term needs of the beneficiaries. Did the service delivered meet the needs and rights of the beneficiaries, for example IDPs and Refugees? How were beneficiaries identified? Were the rights and special needs and interests of vulnerable groups -including women and children- addressed in any specific manner? How has the host/local community and civil society been involved?

g. Partnerships

DCA engages in partnerships with Southern civil society organisations as well as in networking relationships with other international organisations, notably within the ACT Alliance. Both should be explicitly addressed, however the primary focus will be on the former.

Assess general partnership strategies incl. regarding partnership selection and phasing out procedures.

- Elaborate on DCA’s mapping of partnerships in the selected countries, incl. number of partners and networking organisations, partnership duration, geographical and thematic area of cooperation, status of work done together, and future plans.
- Assess the relationship between DCA and partners and networking organisations, looking at formal roles and responsibility as well as informal roles and perceptions.
• In case of humanitarian partnerships assess if possible the partner’s ability to participate in, influence and benefit from consolidated assessments and the appeal process in the country of concern.
• Assess the approach to capacity assessment and capacity development of partners and networking organisations.
• Assess whether the nature of the relationships DCA enters into are clear, and whether there has been attention paid to moving away from instrumental approaches to ensuring that more of DCA’s work is done in support of partner-led agendas, focused on the needs they have identified.
• Asses the level of knowledge of partners about DCA, incl. how much mutual sharing and transparency there is on funding, choice of strategy and methodology. Do partner meetings in a country strengthen coherence and engagement with national policy?
• Assess whether the nature of the partnerships involves shared learning and formalised ways of identifying and improving good and poor practices.

Specifically in relation to DCA partnership with ACT, assess the specific role and added value of DCA in relation to among other:
• The role of DCA within the policy framework and management structure of ACT.
• DCA’s advocacy for DCA and Danish development policies and best practices, particularly as related to the two countries selected for the field study.
• DCA’s and ACT’s performance related to the aid harmonisation agenda including the issue of how far DCA contributes to the intentions of the Accra Declaration and Good Humanitarian Donorship.
• The extent to which ACT partners undertake joint interventions.

h. Financial Management

Based on Danida’s general requirements for Framework Agreements, the financial management aspects of the review should include, but not necessarily be limited to the following:

• Assess the adequacy and quality of general financial management systems and processes (e.g. budgeting, monitoring, accounting and reporting)\(^\text{12}\), incl. any measures for increasing cost effectiveness, time registration system applied at headquarter and country offices, internal control systems, handling of suspicion on anomalies, local performance audits etc.
• Assess the financial monitoring system, including quality, timeliness and ability to feed information/results back through the organisation, including application of lessons learned.
• Assess the fundraising strategies (both in Denmark and “external sources”), including the potentials and/or plan for achieving the required level of DCA’s own financial contribution.

\(^{12}\text{The review will not replace or duplicate the MFA’s periodic monitoring (“tilsyn”)}\)
5. Field visits

The 2014 review will include field visits which will look at development projects, humanitarian action and some humanitarian mine action support in Cambodia (primary focus development) and in Burma/Myanmar (primary focus humanitarian) and on projects implemented by DCA’s partners in the two countries. The review team will visit a limited number of projects and humanitarian actions implemented by DCA’s partners. Where possible, this part of the review will assess the link between DCA’s support to projects and humanitarian action in the field and DCA’s strategic work in general. The purpose of the visit to these countries is less to review specific projects and humanitarian actions, but rather to allow in-depth study of the implementation of selected DCA strategies, plans and activities in practice, including assessment of e.g. management tools, financial instruments, and quality assurance at country level. Project visits could be complemented by partner visits/consultations in their head office.

6. Organisation of Work

The Review will be organized in four phases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase(s)</th>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Inception</td>
<td>Meeting with Team leader in Copenhagen, to clarify methodology and division of labour. Preparatory desk study to analyse key documents, in particular as related to organisational and financial management of DCA, the selected themes, as well as the country programme. Based on this, the team will finalise a description of the approach and methodology related to the overall review, the field study, and the workshop. Initial interviews and consultations in Denmark.</td>
<td>Inception Note with critical issues identified for further analysis, including detailed work plan, and with a detailed methodology.</td>
<td>Mid May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Data collection</td>
<td>Workshop at DCA. Interviews with key informants in DCA, MFA and relevant resource persons.</td>
<td>Mission Preparation Note with objectives and detailed work plan for field visit</td>
<td>End May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Field visit</td>
<td>Assessing in practice how the methodological issues, policies and strategies have been implemented. Debriefing meetings at country level and in Copenhagen.</td>
<td>Debriefing Power Point with key findings and preliminary conclusions/recommendations</td>
<td>End June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Methodology
The detailed methodology will be developed together with the selected consultant based on the technical proposal of that Consultant. The methodology will put emphasis on validation of results, in particular in relation to the thematic focus for this review. Phasing of the analyses may be considered, so that for instance the input from the financial management consultant will take place during the first phase in order to be able address the questions from this analysis during field visits.

8. Consultants
A team of consultants, including expertise on

- Civil society organisational development, communication and advocacy
- Humanitarian assistance
- Financial management and programme administration

In case local consultants are employed they will be attached to the team before and during field visits.

The team leader may be either the Civil society organisational development, communication and advocacy expert or the Humanitarian assistance expert. The team leader should have a relevant educational background and extensive professional experience from assignments within developing and developed countries, incl. as team leader for multi-disciplinary teams with at least three references as team leader for multi-disciplinary teams. The team leader is responsible for the team’s reporting to and communication with MFA (HCP), and for the organisation of the work of the team.

All consultants should be familiar with Human Rights Based approaches to development and humanitarian assistance. All consultants should have experience with civil society strengthening, partnerships and advocacy. At least one team member must be fluent in Danish in order to access all relevant documentation.

Staff from HCP/MFA will join the team on the field trip (HCP staff as resource persons) at their own expense.

The Consultant’s proposal should contain relevant CVs as well as a proposal for a methodology, based on these terms of reference. The technical proposal for this assignment will carry a value of 90 % of the overall evaluation criteria. The technical proposals consist of a proposal for a
methodology as well as CVs of team members.

All CVs will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

**General qualifications.** Documented experience from capacity assessments of similar organisations.

**Adequacy for the assignment.** Documented experience from working with rights based civil society organisations with development and humanitarian perspectives. Experience in report writing.

**For the international experts on Civil Society Organisational Development, Communication and Advocacy this includes:**

At least 10 years of experience, including

- Experience from assessment of human rights-based international and national civil society organisations
- Experience with MFA systems and requirements in relation with grants to Danish framework organisations.
- Experience from capacity assessment of development/humanitarian organisations
- Experience in assessing financial management systems, procedures and reporting
- Experience with monitoring and evaluation systems and reporting
- Experience with organisational management, administrative systems and procedures.
- Knowledge of global trends in civil society support, including a Human Rights-Based approach to these issues
- Experience with civil society strengthening, partnerships and advocacy
- Experience with methodologies for assessing value-added within the context of mutual contribution among partners involved.
- Experience in assessing advocacy strategies
- Preferably experience from Cambodia and/or Myanmar

**For the international experts on Humanitarian Assistance this includes:**

At least 10 years of experience, including

- Proven experience with assessing humanitarian interventions and the coordination of humanitarian assistance.
- Track record of assessing humanitarian partnerships including relation between INGOs and local civil society organisations
- Solid experience with resilience building and Disaster Risk Reduction
- Experience from Cambodia and/or Myanmar
- Experience with transitions between humanitarian action and development cooperation
- Knowledge of Humanitarian Mine Action

**For the international expert on Financial Management and Programme Administration this includes:**

At least 10 years of experience, including

- Experience from assessment of human rights-based international and national civil society organisations
• Experience with MFA systems and requirements in relation with grants to Danish framework organisations.
• Experience from capacity assessment of development/humanitarian organisations
• Experience in assessing financial management systems, procedures and reporting
• Experience with monitoring and evaluation systems and reporting
• Experience with organisational management, administrative systems and procedures.

Consultants (company and team members) should document that they have no or have had no affiliation to DCA or their partners in the countries selected for field work, this includes former staff of DCA and former members of DCA Board.

9. Budget
The fee budget and reimbursable budget estimate should include among others:

• Work during weekends for the team during field trip.
• Funds for local transport; i.e. car rentals (4WD) from a reputable and safe company.
  Funds for project related expenses.

*The number of man days proposed is an estimate and may be adjusted to the requirements specified in the technical proposal of the selected consultant.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Approx. 90 working days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational development, communication and advocacy</td>
<td>CONSULTANTS to specify in proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXX days for planning, desk study, meetings in Cph and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXX days for work at DCA in Cph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXX days for field visits - incl. two days for travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXX days for reporting and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian assistance</td>
<td>CONSULTANTS to specify in proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXX days for planning, desk study , meetings in Cph and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXX days for work at DCA in Cph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXX days for field visits -incl. two days for travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXX days for reporting and feed back</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial management and programme administration</th>
<th>CONSULTANTS to specify in proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXX X days for planning, desk study , meetings in Cph and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XX days are for work at DCA and with auditors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXX days for field visits including days two for travelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXX days for reporting and feed back</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Timeframe**


11. **Background Documentation**

- DCA Framework Accounts 2012
- DCA programme policy for humanitarian action, 2013
- DCA Partnership Policy for International Co-operation, 2014
- Examples of partnership agreements (with INGOs as well as local NGOs)
- Partner Group ToR
- DCA HAP Review 2014
- ECHO Audit 2014
- DCA Programme Policies relevant for Myanmar and Cambodia
- DCA Programme Documents for Myanmar and Cambodia and the annual programme reports for those as well as internal reviews
- Partner Portfolio for Myanmar and Cambodia
- DCA (new)Country Policy (based on the former Regional Policy)
• External Evaluation of DCA Right to Food Advocacy
• DCA Internal Spot Check Report
• USAID review of DCA
Annex 3 Literature reviewed

Danida:

a) Danida Strategy ‘Right to a Better Life’
b) Strategies for Danish support to civil society, both the current and final draft of the future, and strategy for support to humanitarian activities
c) Thematic Review and Capacity Assessment of DanChurchAid- 2011
d) Current framework agreements with DCA, and annual negotiation notes on development frameworks, as well as the Resource Allocation (RAM) guidelines and overview of DCA accounts with MFA
e) MFA KVA’s report on DCA
f) Desk review of Danish framework organisations’ reports for 2011 (report on DCA)
g) Danida strategy for support to indigenous peoples.

DCA documents

h) Overall vision and plan, (2011-2015)
i) Global strategy
j) Statutes
k) Right-to-food-, humanitarian action, active citizenship-, partnership- and anti-corruption-policies
l) DCA Global report 2012
m) Country reports, 2013, Cambodia and Myanmar
n) DCA competence strategy, security manual and security policy.
o) Competence Strategy for DanChurchAid
a) (2013)
b) Paper on career development within DCA
c) Documents from DCA PPM (Project and Programme Manual) on Programme and Project Management (including financial and monitoring)
d) Documents on Humanitarian Action including manuals and guidelines (e.g. manual for cash grants)
e) Terms of Reference for DCA Partner Group
f) Framework accounts status for 2012
g) Documents on DCA Private Sector Initiatives and on Funding Trends 2011-2013
h) Documents on DCA LEAN process for increased efficiency
i) Concept Paper on Monitoring in DCA (March 2014)
j) Guidance Matrix on Linking Relief, Recovery and Development (LRRD)
l) Kommunikationsstrategi for Folkekirkens Nødhjælp
m) Documents relating to partners who the team will meet (in Cambodia and Myanmar):
o) Programme documents
o) Country strategy for Myanmar and programme strategies for Cambodia
o) Partnership overview files
o) Monitoring visit reports
o) Annual review report
o) Audit reports and Monitoring reports, 2013.

Other documents

n) HAP mid term review of DCA, 2013
o) USAID, 2013 Pre-award Review Report, on DCA
p) ECHO Audit Report (draft) on DCA, 2014
q) Promoting the right to food: Evaluation of DCAs Global Food Security Advocacy Program
r) Review of Cash Transfer Programming at Danish Church Aid, Tiare Cross, 2013
## Annex 4 People met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poul Møllerup</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>DCA Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Søren Christian Madsen (via Skype)</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>DCA Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrik Stubkjær</td>
<td>Secretary General</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birgitte Quist-Sørensen</td>
<td>International Director</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Henry</td>
<td>Humanitarian Director</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonas Noddekar</td>
<td>Development Director</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mads Klastrup Kristensen</td>
<td>Director of Communications</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth K. Butzbach</td>
<td>National Director</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Macher</td>
<td>Head of Prolog</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilie Winter</td>
<td>Head of PPA</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Rasmussen</td>
<td>Director of Finance &amp; ICT</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majken Hansen</td>
<td>Head of IFU</td>
<td>IFU, Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Johnson</td>
<td>Humanitarian Response Unit</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carsten Trier Høj</td>
<td>Senior Adviser, Partnerships and Organisational Development</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla Madsen</td>
<td>Senior Advisor; Partnerships, Org. Development &amp; Right to Food</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitte Dyhragen Husager</td>
<td>Senior Advocacy Adviser</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattias Söderberg</td>
<td>Senior Advocacy Advisor</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard MacCormac</td>
<td>Head of HMA</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henriette Gejsing</td>
<td>Corporate Fundraiser</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nils Carstensen</td>
<td>Senior Adviser, Local to Global</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Jon Sandvei</td>
<td>Project Manager; e-learning</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Halkjær</td>
<td>Financial Controller, HMA</td>
<td>DCA Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitte Marie Malmgaard Andersen</td>
<td>Financial Coordinator</td>
<td>IFU (Cambodia), Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Katrine de Hemmer Gudme</td>
<td>Financial Coordinator</td>
<td>IFU (Myanmar &amp; EU), Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanne Nymann Pedersen</td>
<td>Financial Coordinator</td>
<td>IFU (Office Running Cost, Asia), Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pia Birgitte Andersen</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>NFU (Time registration), Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britta Boie Jensen</td>
<td>ERP Coordinator</td>
<td>Secretariat, Head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iben Mørkedal</td>
<td>Budget Coordinator</td>
<td>IFU, Head office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Katrine Haahr Lorentzen  Global Funding Advisor GFU, Head office
Anders Koch Hess  Director of Human Resources and Organisation  Head office
Sara Uldael Jensen  Finance Controller IFU (South-Sudan), Head office
Peder Kristian Pedersen  Humanitarian Adviser HRU, Head office
Birgit Ziedoy  Administrator IFU, Head office
Natascha Linn Felix  Adviser, Anti-Corruption IFU, Head office

Cambodia
Betty Thøgersen  Regional Representative Regional Office
Kristine Rasmussen  Programme Coordinator Regional Office
Atine Miter  Global Funding Officer Regional Office
Miwa Bubosafi  ICT Project Coordinator Regional Office
Horn Kimhong  Programme Officer – Right to Food Regional Office
Ly Sunlina  Programme Officer – Active Citizenship Regional Office
Chiv YouMeng  Programme Officer – Active Citizenship Regional Office
Kristoffer Anhøj  Finance Officer Regional Office
Kim Sovanary  Finance and Admin. Officer Regional Office
Cheoung Yowoth  Program Officer Regional Office
Nop Polin  ECHO Consortium Coordinator Regional Office
Phung Sila  Program Officer (DRR) Regional Office
Preap Viyana  Finance and Admin. Officer Regional Office
Pilorge Naly  Director LICADO
Chan Vibol  Program Director LWD
Ek Chamroeun  Program Coordinator FACT
Phan Phorp Barmey  Program Manager A21
Snonn Samean  Chief of Commune Council, With six members of the Commune Council
Khut Nol  Village Chief
Vanng Chantrong  Village Chief

Myanmar
Allan Duelund Jensen  Regional Representative Regional Office
Mani Kumar  Programme Coordinator Regional Office
Chris Bath  Programme Coordinator (HMA) Regional Office
John Bainbridge  LGF Officer Regional Office
Aung Swe Myint  Programme Officer Regional Office
Tin Tin Mar  Programme Officer Regional Office
Nay Moo
Programme Officer
Regional Office
Mejeut Zaw
Prolog-Officer
Regional Office
Tha Zin Kyan
HMA Finance Officer
Regional Office
Farida Shue Sin Kyu
Finance Officer
Regional Office
Aye Aye Thet
Finance Assistant
Regional Office
Myint Kyaw
Finance Officer
Regional Office
Gabriel
Executive Officer
KBC (Karen Baptist Convention)
Naw Ju Paw
Director
KBC
Naw Javelin
Associate Director
KBC
Saw Tha Moo
Project Coordinator
KBC
Naw Ker Kaw Htoo
Treasurer
KBC
Naw Sheete Pavv
Assistant Treasurer
KBC
Saw Judith Min
Accountant
KBC
Saw Lar Thew
Cashier
KBC
Alan Smith
Policy Analyst
Foundation for Local Development
Rev. Matthew Aye
Co-founder, Director
KDN (Knowledge and Dedication for Nation-building)
Alan Saritt
Co-founder, Vice- Director
KDN
Saw Samuel
Operations Manager
KDN
New Hla Hla Maw
Finance Officer
KDN
Pansy Tun Thein (Daw Toe Toe Yi)
Executive Director
LRC (Local Resource Centre)
Bobby Ng
Chief Executive Officer
NAG (Network Activities Group)
Dr. Ohnmar Khaing
Coordinator
Food Security Working Group and DCA Partner Group
Ben Mascall,
Coordinator
INGO Forum
Simon Russell
Senior Protection Coordinator
UNHCR
ACT representatives
From LWF, Christian Aid, Diakonia, NCA, ICCO, Finn Church Aid
Chiang Mai, Thailand
Bjarne Ussing
Program/Office Manager, HMA
Country Office
Nora Allgaier
Database manager
Country Office
Suchawdee
Finance Officer
Country Office
Sutthikhanneng
Saw Steve
Chairperson
CIDK (Committee for Internally Displaced Karen People)
Saw Lah K’Paw Hloo
MRE member
CIDK
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saw Rally</td>
<td>Data Officer, MRE</td>
<td>CIDK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naw Ler Htoo</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>KTWG (Karen Teachers’ Working Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw Mu Htoo</td>
<td>MTT Coordinator</td>
<td>KTWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw Kolo Htoo</td>
<td>Director Educ. Assistance</td>
<td>KTWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nay Kaw</td>
<td>Food Security Coordinator</td>
<td>KESAN (Karen Environmental and Social Action Network)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Bu Htoo</td>
<td>Land &amp; Forest Resource</td>
<td>KESAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwa Mu Has</td>
<td>Financial Manager</td>
<td>KESAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 5 Timetable for Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 <em>Inception</em></td>
<td>Meeting of Team leader with MFA in Copenhagen, to clarify methodology and division of labour</td>
<td></td>
<td>28. April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparatory desk study and meetings in DCA head office (May 6-20)</td>
<td><em>Inception Note</em></td>
<td>22 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mini-workshop with DCA and MFA, to discuss initial observations and lay foundation for field work</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing results of the above processes and planning of work to be carried out during field visits.</td>
<td><em>Mission Preparation Note</em></td>
<td>27 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visits</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-8 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-12 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai-Myanmar border</td>
<td></td>
<td>12-14 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Debriefing in DCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>First draft report</em></td>
<td>26 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting w. DCA and MFA, to discuss draft report</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Final Draft Report</em></td>
<td>11 July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 6 Cambodia; Specific observations in Debriefing, June 7 2014

DCA Review
Debriefing (preliminary) in Phnom Penh
June 7, 2014

Why do we have this session?
• To reflect on learning
• To continue learning
• To seek the shape of a product
  Please comment, share information, views and ideas!
  We are aware that some recommendations here are the same you are already considering!

Results Achieved and Documentation (1)
• Capable organisation with capable and committed staff
• Good understanding of context and professional practices
• Good results in general
  – But more focus on sustainability.
  – Results are quite well documented - good attribution
  – Discuss level of funds that “Reaches the ground” AND include “results along the way”. Document
• Monitoring – more participation!
• Measure quality of local C3P
  – Document changes over time.

Results Achieved and Documentation (2)
• Also document the positive effects of ways you do things
  – Equal partnerships
  – Participatory practices
• Sometimes too modest in reporting
  – Big effects of small support
Results (3) Cross-cutting issues

- Strong on gender
- Democratization: In ways you work and in governance/advocacy
- Climate change / DRR: Strong on policy level and farm level.
  - Country needs focus on level between: e.g. strategic water/drought management; open for DCA and partners;

Results (4) Application of HRBA

- Generally very good
- PANEL: Is applied, in practice
- HAF/HAP: Leads to good focus on procedures and implementation.
- Participation: Is practised among partners, internally and within networks. ‘Unused potential’ among some partners?

Results (5)

- Focus and clarity of partner work with beneficiaries; need further dialogue
- Linking strategic deliveries and advocacy work – challenge in country programme development, and in practice
- Ensure emphasis on empowerment – linking to outside services (duty bearers’)

Results: Humanitarian work

- ACT - HRF, DCA positive effects. Good coordination, leadership, HRF works as cluster
- Danida emergency response funds: are central in securing other funds (ACT appeals, ECHO recovery funds)
- Use of Humanitarian Guidelines: good, and excellent support from DCA HQ
- SPHERE; need to discuss application of standards,
- Document use of targeting tools/process

Results: LRRD

- Addressed primarily through DRR work
- DRR work and CCA work - largely the same in Cambodia - closely linked to right to food work
- DCA/partners make LRRD work, even if funding structures are not conducive
- Good results in combining development/relief with same partners

Strategies and policies in plans and activities?

- Links to HQ and to policies and guidelines well developed
  - Partnership: Positive contribution to its development/implementation
  - Right to Food: Decent implementation. Sometimes good integration w. active citizenship – on the way to improve further
  - Humanitarian and Right to Food; Good synergy

Partnerships (1)

- Partnership relations: equality in practice; key area of DCA excellence
- Good humanitarian partners; forward looking; have contingency plans.
- Good work within ACT alliance and good work with networks
- Agreements – would be better with longer perspectives
- When revising portfolio: Consider efficiency, with sustainability.
- Keep open eyes for positive additions.

Partnerships (2)

- Realise the focus on constituency partners; work with them to become sustainable.
- Retain balance while focusing/revising portfolio.
- When revising portfolio: Consider government acceptance versus independent civil society
- And strengthen financial supervision; catch problems early.
  - Maybe group partners according to capacity; give targeted training and support
- Take a more proactive approach on sustainability
- Work on longer term agreements, with clearly defined ways of updating/amending/modifying, in the direction above.
Partnerships (3)

- Seek flexible ways to fund small, vulnerable partners (e.g. ART) without management overload: Contracts? Experiences from innovative project.
- Strengthen financial supervision of larger partners; catch problems early.
  - Maybe group partners according to capacity; give targeted training and support

Efficiency and effectiveness

- Apply e/e in consideration of partnerships and DCA’s work with partnership development (has started).
- RO has effectively seized on opportunities for other funding; Good use of Danida frame.
- Positive sharing of resources with CA, ACT partners.
- Use levels of participation as measure of efficiency (e.g. in application of steps...)
- And apply repeated considerations on e/e as process of improving results.

Management of funds and programmes (1)

Positive aspects noted: In general, the RO accounts and finance unit seems to be progressing with "flying" finance support from HO
- Some payments in relation to DCA Cambodia were verified;
- Finance staff appears fairly well educated and professional qualified.

Management of funds and programmes (2)

- Even with good staff, the pressure of deadlines etc. in financial and administrative work is high
- and the finance team do not have the capacity to participate in the partner visits with programme officers when called upon.
- Additional capacity should be mobilised on full time basis or consultancy/part-time input.

Management of funds and programmes (3)

Challenges:
- The number of Partners is a challenge to CO finance unit.
- Partners’ capacity development in finance could be improved, better structured and more efficient.
- Additional partner visits could prove useful in case of changes in partners organisational setup and when partner budgets are increased or when other aspects at the partner are significantly changed.

Management of funds and programmes (4)

- The number of partners should be reduced, - but with consideration as the number of partners open up for competition in efficiency and effectiveness.
- External Audit is essential for savings and loan groups, possibly this could be arranged with peer audit from different villages or student arrangements.

Management of funds and programmes (5)

- Strengthen coherence between Right to Food and Active Citizenship: It’s in the synergy effectiveness is found
- Become more programmatic; hand-in-hand with more strategic partnerships.
  - Seen in new country programme process
- When possible; shift standardised project implementation to ways that are more flexible and effective

Management of funds and programmes (6)

- Risk assessment and risk mitigation (?) Lessons learned: Good sharing among partners, maybe increased attention on catching good lessons and apply them?
- Future of regional migration
Advocacy
- Generally: Strong point of RO
  - Active citizenship: Strong
- Humanitarian advocacy: good
- In RIF: sometimes weak.
  - See about integration
- Well balanced combination of soft/hard advocacy
- Advocacy difficult to document; Try...

Context
- Increasing conflicts looming; Needs calm and leadership
- Try and build peace: proactively
  - PANT/PANEL - and Conflict resolution practical tools, with unique experiences, expand
- Help develop leaders (at many levels); who:
  - Enjoy trust
  - Reduce conflicts.
  - Are Visionary; for the country
  - Lead by example
  - Personalise PANEL

Partnerships (3)
- Seek flexible ways to fund small, vulnerable partners (e.g. ART) without management overload: Contracts?
  - Experiences from Innovative project.
- Strengthen financial supervision of larger partners: catch problems early.
  - Maybe group partners according to capacity; give targeted training and support

Efficiency and effectiveness
- Apply e/e in consideration of partnerships and DCA’s work with partnership development (has started).
- RO has effectively seized on opportunities for other funding. Good use of Danida frame.
- Positive sharing of resources with CA. ACT partners.
- Use levels of participation as measure of efficiency (e.g. in application of steps...)
- And apply repeated considerations on e/e as process of improving results.

Management of funds and programmes (1)
Positive aspects noted: In general, the RO accounts and finance unit seems to be progressing with “flying” finance support from HO
- Some payments in relation to DCA Cambodia were verified;
- Finance staff appears fairly well educated and professional qualified.

Management of funds and programmes (2)
- Even with good staff, the pressure of deadlines etc. in financial and administrative work is high
- and the finance team do not have the capacity to participate in the partner visits with programme officers when called upon.
- Additional capacity should be mobilised on full time basis or consultancy/part time input.
Annex 7 Myanmar and Border; Specific observations in Debriefing, June 12, 2014

DCA Review
Debriefing (preliminary) in Yangon
June 12, 2014

Results Achieved and Documentation (1)
• Capable and committed organisation with capable and committed staff
• Good understanding of difficult context and professional practices

Results Achieved and Documentation (2)
• Also document the positive effects of ways you do things
  – Equal partnerships
  – Participatory practices

Results (3) Application of HRBA
• Generally very good
• PANEL: is applied, in practice,
  – Partner equal relations with local communities sometimes an issue (development approach, charity)
  – HAF/HAP: Leads to good focus on procedures and implementation.

Humanitarian work
• Humanitarian response important part of DCA – Danida response funds important
• Development of further response capacity DCA/partner - Strategy
• Access to humanitarian partnership funds inside
• ACT collaboration with positive effects. Important DCA participation

Humanitarian Mine Action
• Important work on MRE and VA
• MRE key focus area – linked closely to community empowerment/development
• Present structures for HMA not supportive for integrated approaches
• Integrating HMA into the mainstream DCA implementation structure – continuity, access to core funding

Results: LRRD
• DCA addresses LRRD as key part of work
• Part of approach with partners in humanitarian response and development
• Important work on DRR (CMDRR)
• DRR, CCA, food security work: closely linked
• Important combining development/relief with same partners – further work on linkages with partners

Partnerships (1)
• Partnership relations: Equality in practise, is a key area of DCA excellence.
• Good partner portfolio, committed partners, important to reduce number of partners
• Good work within ACT alliance (also in development) and good work with networks
• When revising portfolio: Consider efficiency, with sustainability.
Partnerships (2)
- Seek focus on constituency partners; work with them to become sustainable. Also larger organisations.
- When revising portfolio; Retain balance and support independence of civil society

Partnerships (3)
- Seek flexible ways to fund small, vulnerable partners without management overload for them and you: Contracts, other ways?
- Partner agreements: Would be better with longer perspectives and analysis of likely change pathways and sustainability

Efficiency and effectiveness
- Apply e/e in consideration of partnerships and partner development (has started).
- RO has effectively seized on opportunities for other funding; Good use of Danida frame.
- Positive sharing of resources with ACT partners, Positive synergy
- Use levels of participation as measure of efficiency in activities (e.g. in application of PPM steps... ) ( Vide p.31 ss)
- And apply repeated considerations on e/e as process of improving results.

Management of funds and programmes (1)
Positive aspects noted: in general, the RO Finance Unit seems to be doing well and Partners appreciate.
- Selected payments in relation to DCA Myanmar were verified;
- Finance staff appears fairly well educated and professionally qualified.
- Programme and Finance work well together and demonstrate eagerness to engage in e/e and results-based reporting.

Management of funds and programmes (2)
Some challenges:
- Staff shortage: Additional capacity will come when the HMA Finance Officer returns from maternity leave in September and with the Finance & Admin. Coordinator now being hired.
- The RO has two sets of Service Contracts are used. The one used for smaller consultancies under the Danida Frame supported project verified does not meet all Danida requirements: No anti-corruption clause

Management of funds and programmes (3)
Challenges:
- Partners’ capacity development in finance could be improved, better structured and more efficient. Efforts are being made in RO, but grouping of partners could add.
- Some key partners seem over-extended and would benefit from direct organisational support to supplement longer term assistance.

Management of funds and programmes (4)
- The Management Letter indicates that the Finance & Admin Coordinator has been missed for some time and the lengthy recruitment process is regrettable.

Management of funds and programmes (5)
- Become more programmatic; hand-in-hand with more strategic partnerships. – Seen in new country programme process
- When possible; shift standardised project implementation to ways that are more flexible and effective
Management of funds and programmes (6)

- Risk assessment and risk mitigation (R)
  - Risks in: Finance, operation, context
  - Build into PPM?
- Lessons learned: Good sharing among partners.

Advocacy

- Generally: Advocacy is a strong point of RO
  - Active citizenship: Strong
- In RIF: sometimes weak.
- Good results at policy level
- Promising results at ‘field level’
- Advocacy difficult to document; Try...
Annex 8 Key financial indicators of DCA in the past years

Total turnover and % used for administration, past 15 years

Danida grants 2000-2013 (mio.kr.)
Annex 9 Preliminary calculations of funding allocation between administration and activities, from Cambodia and Myanmar Regional Offices

General on DCA and e/e, DCA has started a process to zoom in on e/e and to combine these efforts to improve reporting on results. This goes in line with the recommendations from the previous review and from the discussions DCA has had with Danida.

To improve effectiveness and efficiency requires there is a need to establish the current situation or level of performance in a measurable manner and then monitor progress. Here it is important for DCA to consider how they would like to be successful, in which areas of excellence do they see themselves. How would DCA prefer to measure and when do results signal the positive or successful achievements? With this in mind it is essential to focus on the process and secure a constant improvement of results.

The ways to measure improvements in e/e, including ratio “on what reaches the ground” will differ between organisations and type of activity and here DCA has an opportunity to bring up its own criteria for success. Doing this by involving the organisation at large will enhance the “ownership” of improvements in DCA and in so doing the process will be anchored in DCA management and staff. It is a challenging process but at the same time one key to lasting improvements.

However, up to now the main focus seems to have been on Head Office level and with some involvement of Regional Office/COs and partners. The RT supports these efforts to be intensified and to invite regional offices and partners to be much more involved in the improvement process. Taking an offset in the Danish State Auditors call for better reporting on what part of support actually “reaches the ground”, the RT discussed these challenges with the regional offices in Cambodia and Myanmar and the Chiang Mai office. The regional offices responded positively and through involvement of both programme and finance staff developed two innovative and quite different layouts

The review finds the process with the two Regional Office/COs very constructive and their results are presented below:

From Cambodia Regional Office

Dialogue on e/e, results and “reaching the ground”, in Cambodia. Cambodia analysed four case calculations on how much of the funds can be related to the beneficiaries. The analysis is done with four projects in the Right to Food Programme:

a) - BS (1010147-09) (Beneficiaries 80% Support 20%)
b) - PK (1010147-17) (Beneficiaries 67% Support 33%)
c) - LWD (1010147-21) (Beneficiaries 79% Support 21%)
d) - ADHOC (1010147-25) (Beneficiaries 76% Support 24%)

For project 1010147-17 (PK), the support costs are relatively higher than with the other partners. This is an issue that the regional office is discussing with the partner, and for the same reason DCA have not yet finalized the 2014 agreement with the partner.

Cross Cutting expenditures paid by DCA for the entire program are also allocated to the individual projects. This is done based on the Danida support to the individual project of the total partner spending in 2013 in the program. I.e. with project 1010147-09, BS received DKK 174.997 in support in 2013. This is 5% of the total partner spending (DKK 3.846.388) in the programme in 2013, so 5% of the cross cutting expenditures are allocated to the project.

In total, the four examples were defined to have 76% “reaching the ground” and 24% as support cost. This ratio is hinged on definition of what is included in support cost and on the type of projects selected. When in future combining all projects under the regional office and with an agreed definition of support cost, a more relevant ratio will be achieved.

13 The detailed calculations are not included in this Review-report.
In addition to discuss the ratio of “reaching the ground”, the exercise also demonstrated the need to carefully analyse the cost structure in the support provided. In DCA it would seem relevant to include the capacity development provided to partners as an essential part of what reaches the ground. This may not be the same for all projects but in relation to advocacy it is especially relevant. It needs to be added that other control elements has to ensure that the partners utilize the support efficient and effectively.  

From Myanmar regional office

Myanmar approached the challenge differently and the result supplements well into the dialogue. From the regional office in Yangon an early, and in the view of the review highly promising, attempt at a model for assessing efficiency and effectiveness was received.

It is reproduced below:

How to measure what goes directly to the rights holders  
&

Attempting to build a model for efficiency and effectiveness calculation

1. Background

DCA is currently undergoing a review of the DANIDA Frame Grant and a team of three consultants and a representative of MFA/DANIDA visited DCA Myanmar, June 8th – 12th.

In the TOR the consultants are asked to look into the issue of efficiency and effectiveness and the DCA Myanmar team was asked for examples of how DCA Myanmar is using these terms in our planning work (design/approval of proposals) and monitoring (measuring on the basis of partner reporting).

The dialogue with the consultants included a special session on the background to an increased focus on efficiency and effectiveness and our ability to work with these measurements to select proposals and document effect/outcome. International back donors are increasingly asking for hard-core figures to measure value for money (another way of explaining effectiveness/efficiency?). We already have experience with this as a clearly formulated parameter by international doners when they evaluate project proposals. This approach will increasingly be adopted by back donors such as DANIDA, but with greater flexibility for the NGOs to define an alternative way to calculate and document efficiency and effectiveness.

In their introduction to the review, the consultants underlined that it is a goal in itself to ensure that as much financial support as possible is passed on to the partners and subsequently to the beneficiaries or to the rights holders, which is our preferred term. Thus, it is also relevant to develop a model that can calculate the allocation of resources at the rights holder level vs. indirect costs.

Against this background the DCA Myanmar team: Farida (FO), Myint Kyaw (FO), Allan Duelund Jensen (RR), Mani Kumar (PC) and Chris Bath (PM) brainstormed with the consultants (lead by Thomas Kirk) to narrow down the issue and generate ideas for a DCA model. Farida and Myint Kyaw both presented two models for how to calculate direct and indirect costs based on budgets.

2 Task

Thomas Kirk asked DCA Myanmar to continue to work on the model and present this to the consultants by Monday June 16th. The exercise is an attempt to get ideas from DCA Myanmar to stimulate a process in DCA and to demonstrate the capacity of DCA Myanmar to give input to this process.

3 Models

Model 1: Rights holder/Duty bearer vs. Monitoring/Management/Adm. costs

When assessing a proposal how can we determine if there is a reasonable relation between the money spent on activities engaging directly with the rights holders and money spent on administration /management?

---

14 DCA’s external auditor, Deloitte, has stressed this in the detailed audit instructions: “Performance audit is concerned with the audit of economy, efficiency and effectiveness...”, with detailed definitions on page 2, Annex 2.
Knowing that many project seek to address the root causes of poverty and marginalisation we would also like to make the same calculation for projects that mainly address the duty bearers – how to do this?

We suggest that we look at projects from a rights based approach and distribute the costs according to the following main categories: Rights holders direct cost, rights holders support costs, duty bearers direct costs, duty bearers support costs, monitoring & evaluation costs and management & administration costs.

This will enable us to analyse a project and its budget from a rights based perspective and it gives a common language that both programme and finance staff will easily understand. Instead of using categories as “project costs” and “support costs” the proposed model will make it easier to have a dialogue with partners about the split in their budgets. It will enable us to have frank discussion with partners about the amount of money spent in direct interaction with rights holders and duty bearers. We agree with the point made by the consultants that we would like to see a significant proportion of the budget to go to the rights holders directly. We believe that the analysis will stimulate discussions with partners about participation and interaction with rights holders as a valuable development approach.

The idea of calculating “support costs” is to be able to measure the financial resources used to support the direct interaction with the rights holders as opposed to the purely management/administration costs.

We would also like to capture the DCA Myanmar costs and how these are distributed within and among projects. We will calculate the use of DCA staff time (and other DCA resources) on each project and the split of these costs in relation to direct engagement with rights holders, duty bearer related costs vs. administration/management costs. Staff costs according to time estimation including overheads + remaining DCA cost proportionally allocated to project according to their share of total turnover (including the Head Office support costs as per crosscutting budget).

There are, however, some difficulties in accurate including DCA Myanmar costs. As an example the costs of the five expatriates at the office are not included in the Regional Office 34 Myanmar budget but kept at Head Office. Thus, in the pie charts below, we have not been able to show the calculations including DCA costs, but this can be added later.

**Classification of costs:**

- **Rights holder direct costs:** Costs classified as cost for direct engagement with the rights holders or costs related to tangible results for the rights holders
  - Examples: Community organisation and facilitation, trainings, physical constructions, food/cash for work, livelihood support, resource centres, awareness raising, salaries of staff working with beneficiaries etc.

- **Right holder support costs:** These are cost supporting the above-mentioned activities
  - Examples: Capacity building and skills training of staff in direct engagement with rights holders, salaries of project staff (typically programme staff) when they prepare, plan, coordinate the activities for direct engagement with rights holders, travel costs, per diem etc.

- **Duty bearers direct costs:** Costs classified as costs for direct engagement with duty bearers to influence their decision making to the benefit of the rights holders
  - Examples: Seminars, meetings, campaigns (not the planning but the execution), communication aimed at duty bearers etc.

- **Duty bearers support costs:** Cost supporting the above-mentioned activities
  - Examples: Documentation, research, studies, campaign planning, general preparation, planning and coordination

- **Monitoring and evaluation costs (+ reporting?)**
  - Examples: Partner monitoring and DCA monitoring costs, evaluation costs, reporting costs etc.

- **Management/Administration costs:** Costs classified as costs related to general management of the project and a flat rate administrative overhead costs (when applicable).
  - Examples: Staff salaries of director, finance and admin staff and support staff, office rent and running costs, office supplies, bank charges, audit, fixed overhead costs etc.

We have tried to apply the above-described model to two projects and results are shown below. This exercise and the results only tells us something about the ratio between what goes to the rights holders
(often the term “the community” or “the field” is used) and what stays in the organisations (DCA and partners) in their offices so to speak (the consultants use the term “in the nice office buildings”). It tells little about efficiency and effectiveness at the output and outcome level although one could argue that there is an aspect of efficiency if DCA is able to channel a higher proportion of the money to the rights holders than others while at the same time achieving the same outputs and outcomes.

The ratio/percentage will certainly be useful when assessing proposals and can make more informed and evidence base decisions. Not only about how the partner allocate the money, but also where DCAs staff support to partners are used – or should be used – and at what cost. It will give valuable information on the level of active participation between the partner and the rights holders.

Model 2: Efficiency and effectiveness by measuring outputs and outcomes

Proposal analysis include questions such as relevance to DCA programme objectives, degree to which the PANEL principles are applied, project logic, crosscutting issues and methodological approach etc. We seek to establish to what degree the proposal is relevant and feasible.

Establishing levels of efficiency and effectiveness will add important assessment elements to the analysis by giving tools to determine whether the expected development outcome justify the costs and if the project is using the resources optimally. Different terms are used to describe what we are aiming at and it might be better to refer to value for money when talking about the purpose of efficiency and effectiveness in general terms throughout the organisation.

The diversity in the type of projects we support makes it difficult to produce comparable measure of what constitutes good value for money. Nevertheless, we need to get better at understanding what is driving our costs (and partners) and make sure that we are getting the desired outcomes at the lowest price. Costs, efficiency and effectiveness rates will vary based on the different contexts. This is evident when comparing DCA countries of operation, but also within the Myanmar context. The hardest to reach rights holders are more expensive to deliver development results to (generally) and we should not disfavour projects on that ground.

Being better at measuring, estimating and comparing costs and outcomes provides increased transparency and accountability allowing us to justify the funding decisions we make. When challenged we can with
confidence explain the decisions taken by documenting that we have adequately considered the costs and outcomes of what we do. We also need to use the data to manage our implementation and take corrective action where necessary. Ultimately, it all boils down to maximising reduction in poverty!

*Model of how to calculate efficiency and effectiveness*

**Establishing input costs**

The input costs are the costs of the partner budget and DCA costs allocated to the project as per model 1 described above.

Example:

EIDHR 2013 – 2014 project costs per contract budget: 368.625 €

DCA costs (not included in the budget): 30.000 € (as an example)

**Total project costs: 398.625 €**

**Establishing efficiency**

Cost split according to main outputs.

**150 Change Agents**

Project costs as per contract: 108.336 €

DCA costs (proportionally): 8.820 €

**Total: 117.156 €**  Cost per Change Agent: 781 €

**30 CBOs formed or strengthen and working on HR**

Project costs as per contract: 72.698 €

DCA costs (proportionally): 5.910 €

**Total: 78.608 €**  Cost per CBO: 2.620 €

**Three Advocacy Platforms**

Project costs as per contract: 187.591 €

DCA costs (proportionally): 15.270 €

**Total: 202.861 €**  Cost per Platform: 67.620 €

We do not have similar calculations for other projects, so we have nothing to compare with. But it is interesting that the costs of identifying and capacitate the change agents are so low compared with the other
costs in the project.

Establishing (cost) effectiveness

The fulfilment of objective of the project; to enhance the capacity of Change Agents and Civil Society Organisations to safeguard the human rights of marginalised groups during Myanmar’s democratic transition is difficult to measure numerically. How to give a figure that measures the effectiveness of a project that aims at social change / political change?

The project estimates that the final beneficiaries are 100,000 marginalised people in four ethnic regions of Myanmar whose voices will be more effectively represented in decision-making processes affecting their human rights and governance. We could use this to calculate cost effectiveness and the cost per final beneficiary will be 4 €. It is, however, highly speculative and it will be fair to argue that if the project is a success then the results will have a nationwide effect. Perhaps it will be more relevant to combine this figure with more independent assessments of the development in Myanmar during and after the implementation of the project.

Prepared by Allan Duelund Jensen, RR Regional Office Myanmar with input from Finance Team and Programme Team.

From the office in Chiang Mai the review received a good input, focusing on the share of funds reaching the ground, in line with the calculations from Cambodia. Chiang Mai office also added assessments of numbers of beneficiaries (which is less complicated in MRE than in many other types of activities)
Annex 10  The participation ladder


Passivity: People do not participate or only when told to do so.

Providing information: People provide information to questionnaires or interviews/meetings but have no say in the use of the information.

Consultative participation: People are consulted by external actors, the do however; not have any say in the use of the information.

Incentive-based participation: People participate (in meetings, interviews or activities) mainly because they receive incentives.

Functional participation: People form groups to implement activities designed by others. Their opinions are taken into account later, during implementation.

Interactive participation: Organized local groups participate in activity design, implementation and evaluation. This involves a progression towards local control and management.

Self-development: Organized local groups take the initiative, without expecting external input. External parties may provide advice or other support, as requested, acting as partners.