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Executive Summary

Review Objectives

This review was carried out between October and December 2011, with the objective of:

- Providing an assessment of DCA’s follow-up of the recommendations from the latest reviews and annual negotiations;
- Analysing DCA’s performance in relation to partnership, with a special focus on documentation of results and the capacity of DCA to implement key areas within their international assistance.

The findings, conclusions and recommendations in this report are provided as an input into discussions between DCA and MFA around the Humanitarian Framework agreement and to contribute to a mutual learning process.

Limitations

The review was carried out very rapidly and should at best be taken as a snapshot of DCA during the last five years. The information presented is based on a literature review and discussions with staff in DCA HQ, and partners and staff in North-West Kenya and South Sudan. Meetings were held with MFA staff in Copenhagen, and Danish embassies were also interviewed. We accept overall that in such a short space of time it is challenging to get to more than a version of the truth based on a variety of opinions and views. We hope this report serves to continue important dialogue between the two parties.

DCA is an organisation that has:

- Humanitarian and development policies which contribute to MFA strategies.
- Common interests with MFA reflected in an investment in rights, advocacy, networking, nurturing civil society and a commitment to working in fragile situations.
- An organisation-wide commitment to working with the ACT Alliance to influence international agendas.
- Effective fundraising and management capacity of donor funds. Despite the global financial crises an increase in income of 25% has been achieved. Funds from MFA have been stable during this period.
- A policy framework and procedures to guide its work, that are subject to reviews and evaluation.
- A focus on growing and striving to improve its internal systems.
- DCA responds flexibly to use resources available. For example an ambitious organisational development policy for partners was down-scaled in 2009. It is now being piloted in a reduced number of countries to generate learning for the organisation on how to proceed in the future.
Recent changes in DCA policies.

In recent years DCA structure and systems and procedure have developed in several areas:

- Decentralisation has allowed increased country-level management authority.
- New internal communication systems have been developed to ensure programme coherence and organisational unity.
- An upgraded finance system has been rolled out at country level involving both change management and capacity building. The system is now up and running, and offers the prospect of efficiency gains.
- Active engagement in the ACT Alliance, with some countries now operating joint programmes and others sharing ACT offices.
- The review observes that the DCA is still working through the implications of decentralisation and is continuing to work on joining different initiatives across the organisation to ensure that practice reflects the intention of policies.

Areas requiring further attention

The review finds that the following areas require further attention:

- Sharpening and clarifying policies

  Key policies tend to be broad, for example the Humanitarian policy does not clearly express the unique selling point of DCA in assisting vulnerable communities. Although such broad policies allow a degree of flexibility in implementation it can mean that investment is scattered. In general these broad policies would benefit from greater use of targets, milestone and benchmarks to provide strategic direction and markers for monitoring.

- Clarity on the unit of programming. There is a need for greater clarity on the unit of programming; is it programme themes or country? It is the view of the team that country-driven programme design has the potential to produce more contextually relevant programmes. It should be acknowledged that this may result in a shift away from the five thematic programmes being applied in all countries. The needs may be different in each country.

- Stronger links between the various systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation

  Systems are in place for planning, and monitoring and evaluation. These are often focused at project or programme themes and reporting tends to focus on implementation rather than results. There is need for DCA to focus on improving their reporting against targets and showing what changes have been achieved. This could usefully include country-level achievement rather than focusing on thematic programmes. The joining up of financial with programme monitoring data would be mutually beneficial in terms of making better finance and programme management decisions.

- Improving system for follow-up and internal accountability on reviews and evaluations

  The Partnership Added-Value Evaluation carried out in 2009 has been followed up in some areas, but not fully. The key recommendation, that the policy should be reviewed to provide for a more transparent approach that recognises that there is not “a one size fits all” approach to partnership, has not been implemented.
The recommendations endorse existing plans in DCA for policy review and in addition provide guidance on key areas to address:

1. A new DCA Humanitarian and Food Security policy in 2012 should include:
   - A clear statement of DCA’s future niche, and explain how it will operate along the broader continuum of emergency–recovery–development.
   - The integration of ROI and Humanitarian Mine Action Programmes.
   - A future humanitarian partnership agreement between DCA and MFA should include agreement on: Priority countries and regions facing protracted crises, in which DCA should focus in the future with MFA’s support.
   - For each of these countries/regions, the funding to DCA from the MFA should be based on a three-year (country/region) strategy, with a results framework, indicating its programme goals and how these will be achieved, and how exactly DCA intends to work with the ACT Alliance in these countries.
   - This results framework should include some simple “benchmarks” by which the implementation of these strategies can be assessed and which will be mentioned in reporting to the MFA.

2. For the Partnership policy review planned for 2012 a new policy should include:
   - Clear definition of the range of partners and different types of relationship.
   - Identification of mechanisms for partners to input into DCA strategies and policies.
   - Clearly stated stages of partnership and also reasons for ending a partnership.
   - As above this policy requires a results framework with agreed targets against which progress can be monitored at country and global level.

In relation to DCA management the following recommendations are made:

3. Communication with MFA:
MFA and DCA should agree milestones and formats for following up mutual agreements to improve accountability.

Generally communication needs to be improved between MFA and DCA.

4. Decentralisation and programme approach:
DCA should clarify its unit of programming – countries or regions – and reflect on how this fits with thematic programme approach.

5. The M&E system needs to function more holistically to improve overall accountability. This includes:
• Linking and integrating programme monitoring with the Vision and Plan reporting systems.
• Improving use of financial reporting to enhance efficiency across organisation.
• Increasing and improving the use of tools for measuring strategy and programme performance, (target, milestones, indicators etc) across the organisation and with partners.
• Fundamental to this is increasing the capacity of partners to assess and report on outcomes.
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1. Introduction and background to the review

This review was carried out on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) as part of their process to assess DCA’s capacity in relation to humanitarian and civil society work and as an input into discussions related to DCA’s application for a Humanitarian Framework.

MFA and DCA are partners for both development and humanitarian work. Since 1991/2, DCA’s development activities have been guided by a framework agreement for a strategic partnership with MFA which prescribes regular thematic reviews. During the period 2006-2011 the average annual support from MFA to DCA was DKK198m, and this has tended to be split 60:40 between development and humanitarian support. In this same period DCA has increased its support from other donors, mainly EU sources. In 2007 DCA set ambitious targets for 37% income growth by 2010, and despite the financial crises an increase of 25% has been achieved. DCA has traditionally had a strong support base and private funds form a significant funding base. In 2010 32% of DCA’s funding came from private sources.

The current arrangement is that MFA provides framework funding to DCA for support to civil society in developing countries. The framework funding allocated (under the 2010 Danish Finance Bill) was DKK 115m. The total disbursement in 2010 from MFA to DCA for development assistance amounted to approx. DKK128m. DCA humanitarian assistance work is currently funded on an annual basis from two primary sources: DKK10m for Rapid Response in humanitarian crises and between DKK 50-70 million for emergency and protracted crises on the basis of appeals and awards. In 2010, the total amount DCA received from UM was: DKK 215million4 and up to Dec. 2011: DKK184m5. MFA’s Strategy for Humanitarian Action 2010-15 forms the basis for these grants. In total, the above long-term development and humanitarian funding represented approximately 41% of DCA’s total turnover in 2010.

The Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action 2010-2015 explains that the MFA wishes to introduce Partnership Framework Agreements with selected humanitarian partners. These agreements aim to provide greater funding predictability and flexibility in return for better planning and clearer performance targets. These agreements will be the subject of annual dialogue between DCA and MFA. The current application for DCA is for 2012. In addition a humanitarian partnership is expected to reduce transaction costs and numbers of contracts, which will in turn alleviate some of MFA capacity constraints. Overall MFA expects to reduce the number of partners and as such it wants to be sure that the smaller partner group have the capacity to deliver on MFA strategies. For DCA the expected benefit would be less time spent on preparation of concept notes each year which will enable them to address more strategic issues with MFA. There is also further potential benefit to the partners, who could benefit from multi-annual cooperation agreements, on which a more systematic approach to capacity building could be based.

In December 2011, MFA will discuss a strategic humanitarian agreement for 2012 with DCA. MFA will use this review as an input to the Partnership Agreement decision making process as

---

1 The full review team was: Sara Methven (INTRAC), Hugh Goyder (INTRAC), Lars Udsholt Capacitate, Thomas O’Brien Kirk.
3 See Finance Annex II table 6 and 7 for full details.
4 2010: approx. DKK 128m for development and DKK87m. for humanitarian.
5 As approx. DKK 124m for dev. and DKK 60m. for humanitarian)
this is a requirement to provide a basis for the agreement and future dialogue on organisational development.

This is the second capacity assessment of DCA. The first was in 2000. Three previous thematic reviews have been conducted including:

- 2002/3 Development focusing on operationalisation of rights based approach
- 2006 Organizational decentralization, HIV and AIDS

1.1. Purpose and objectives of evaluation

The purpose of this thematic review (as defined in the Terms of Reference) is to:

- Provide an assessment of DCA's follow-up of the recommendations from the latest reviews and annual negotiations;
- Analyse DCA’s performance in relation to partnership with a special focus on documentation of results and capacity of DCA to implement key areas within their international assistance.

These findings will be used as:

- An input to preparation of a Partnership Agreement in the humanitarian field;
- The basis for a mutual dialogue and learning process for DCA and MFA.

1.2. Review methodology

The assessment methodology was presented and accepted 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.

To carry out this rapid capacity assessment of DCA, the following methods were used:

**Literature Review:** a review of ‘grey’ literature from both MFA and DCA focusing on policies and reports on practice internal and external reviews and audits (see bibliography in Annex 4).

**HQ Interviews and focus groups** with key actors within DCA and MFA HQs focused on: key DCA policies and strategies, structures, procedures and processes for delivering on these as well as recent thematic reviews and subsequent follow up by DCA (List of people met in Annex V).

**Country visits** to assess operationalisation of key DCA policies and strategies. Meeting with DCA staff, DCA partners and, where possible, ACT Alliance members, MFA embassy staff and other key stakeholders. This included a short 4 day visit to Kenya, to accompany a visit by the DCA Humanitarian advisor and programme manager to Kakuma ROI programme. Meetings were held with Danish Embassy staff and LWF partner and UNHCR. The longer field visit (1 week) to South Sudan included discussions with partners, ACT Alliance members, other non-

---

6 A final version of this was not fully agreed and as such it was not feasible to look at follow up..
7 The depth of this visit was limited due to time constraints and also heavy rainfall and regional flooding which affected access to programme areas and reduced time in the field.
8 See list of people interviewed in annex iv.
government agencies and attendance at an ACT meeting. The finance reviewer was accompanied by a DCA staff member.

**Partner focus group meeting in Uganda:** this was added to the overseas visits to complement the field visits which focused more on humanitarian assistance and ROI.

**In-Country Feedback:** before leaving Juba, the RT provided preliminary feedback with relevant DCA staff to share findings. Informal email feedback was provided to Kenya Embassy staff as their office was closed when the team returned to Nairobi.

**Consolidating and analysing data** the RT met at various stages in the field work and conducted HQ interviews. The team met to share and analyse findings and prepare for feedback to DCA and MFA.

Finally a feedback and validation meeting with DCA and MFA and report produced

1.3. **The review process**

The review TOR was discussed by DCA and MFA, and a final draft TOR agreed in August 2011. The tendering process took place during August-September and in mid October INTRAC was informed of their success. MFA convened an initial meeting MFA, DCA SMT representatives and the review team (RT); a second meeting with DCA was used to plan the field visits as prescribed in the TOR. An inception report and work plan was presented and agreed in early November. Data gathering in DCA HQ and field visits took place in November with visits to South Sudan and North West Kenya. An additional meeting with some DCA civil society partners in Uganda was fitted into the team leader’s other commitments.

The team met at the end of November to jointly review the finding, analysis and agree recommendations. These were presented to MFA and DCA on 30th November. A short debrief report was delivered to MFA to be used in discussions with DCA on 1st December. This was a rapid review and as such findings and recommendations are appropriately focused on the higher level of DCA’s operations and capacity.

**Review constraints**
The RT acknowledges there are limitations in this exercise. It was undertaken in a rather compressed period of time. Secondly, normally in such a review the team would draw up some sampling criteria, on the basis of which a shortlist of focal countries would be drawn up. In this case, however, the locations for field work in North West Kenya and South Sudan were pre-selected. MFA agreed to an additional partner meeting which allowed for a focus group discussion but not a full review of their country programme.

Overall it is hoped that the findings of this review, which has drawn broad conclusions and recommendations from a limited amount of data, will resonate sufficiently with views of MFA and DCA.

The report contains some observations on how DCA might do things differently – where these are not stated as recommendation it is because they are suggestions and are not considered central to the current assessment.

The aim of our recommendations is to enable the forthcoming discussions and facilitate the shift to a more strategic engagement which both parties want. We hope our work provides a foundation for a new phase in their partnership in the field of humanitarian assistance.
2. The Review Findings

2.1. Organisational Capacity

2.2.1. Correspondence between MFA’s policy framework and DCA’s policy priorities

In its support to organisations like DCA, MFA is guided by their strategic framework and guidelines, notably the “Strategy for Danish Support to Civil Society in Developing Countries” (published in December 2008) and the “Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action 2010-2015” (published in September 2009). Both of these strategies call for the Ministry to work with external stakeholders, not least Danish NGOs, in addressing strategic objectives and working towards accomplishing the overall goals.

The Civil Society Strategy (CSS) establishes nine strategic goals against which the coherence of the DCA’s policy framework can be assessed.

1. Promotion of a vibrant and open debate nationally and internationally
2. Promotion of a representative, legitimate and locally based civil society
3. Promotion of capacity development, advocacy work and networking opportunities
4. Promotion of focus on rights
5. Promotion of flexible and relevant interventions in fragile states and situations
6. Promotion of civil society support in Danish bilateral and multilateral assistance
7. Involvement of Danish civil society organisations in development assistance
8. Collaboration with other stakeholders
9. Focus on goals and results

Likewise the humanitarian strategy presents the following six strategic areas:

1. Vulnerability
2. Climate change and natural hazards
3. Protecting conflict-affected populations
4. Coordinated, principled and informed humanitarian action
5. Strengthening partnerships
6. Focus on results, innovation and communications

There is overall coherence between MFA’s and DCA’s policy framework and operations. In relation to the Civil Society Strategy, DCA offers a strong profile with regard to rights, networking and fragile situations whereas its humanitarian efforts span various fields covered by the humanitarian strategy. (This is considered in more detail below.)

DCA has maintained a stable and positive collaboration with MFA as documented by minutes from annual consultations 2006-11. Likewise, a DCA assessment of follow-up to recommendations of the 2006 Danida review report illustrates that major issues have been addressed. However the RT considers that establishing a framework for following up such reviews and annual consultations would increase mutual accountability.

2.1.2. Evolution of DCA policy framework 2006-11

In 2006-7 DCA policy framework evolved consistently as shown in Figure 1 below. A series of new policy papers were launched in 2006-08. In the subsequent years the emphasis has been on operational guidelines and more procedures. The relative stability of the policy framework has allowed more attention to implementation. Likewise staff members are in general well
informed about policy frameworks and relevant guidelines. DCA appears to have avoided the tendency in NGOs to try and show relevance by constantly developing new policies without addressing implementation. The RT considers it an important achievement that DCA management and staff have been able to focus on policy implementation measures.

There appears to be general agreement on how these various papers relate to one another, or in other words, the policy hierarchy as depicted in Figure 2 below. This review was not able to make a global assessment of the implementation of these policies. The visit to South Sudan provided an example of how the humanitarian policy is operationalised and the visit to Kakuma provided an opportunity to see how the ROI policy is operationalised.

Figure 1    DCA Policy Framework 2006-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Partnership</em></td>
<td><em>Political Space</em></td>
<td><em>Humanitarian Assistance Policy</em></td>
<td><em>Anti-Corruption</em></td>
<td><em>Organisational Development GL</em></td>
<td><em>Quality Management</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Right to Food</em></td>
<td><em>Climate Change GL</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Staff Code of Conduct</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>HIV and Aids</em></td>
<td><em>Microfinance GL</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Rights based commitment</em></td>
<td><em>Procurement Manual</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Gender Equality</em></td>
<td><em>Regional policy</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Evaluation</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This diagram does not show policies which are under review or in-development.*
Reviews of key policies take place; the Partnership Policy was reviewed in 2009 and the political space policy in 2011 (with a new version of the policy expected by February 2012). A combined review of humanitarian assistance policy and the right to food policy is planned for 2012.

These review processes show that DCA pays attention to maintaining and enhancing the relevance of its overall policy framework. However, as argued further below, the quality of policies could be improved by paying more attention to defining what constitutes DCA’s niche to avoid too generic objectives and approaches which may resemble similar positions taken by other like-minded organisations.

Policy adjustments have also been triggered by financial considerations in particular in response to lower then estimated growth targets in part due to global financial crisis. Examples of this flexibility are:

- The closure of DCA office in Russia
- DCA entered into a strategic ACT partnership with NCA and CAID in Zambia and Guatemala.
- Down-scaling of ambitious OD policy to a Guideline, and subsequent decisions to pilot in counties where there is a request and the Regional offices can fund.

These examples show how DCA responds to changing circumstances. The shift to a demand driven approach to OD is seen as appropriate. The initial OD plans were perhaps rather ambitious. In spite of these shifts, the RT believes that OD related interventions are
characterised by occasional and rather piecemeal capacity building efforts and that there is still room for improvement at the level of OD and capacity building efforts undertaken by the respective regional offices. This is given further consideration below in the partnership section.

This illustrates the importance of maintaining a watching brief on operationalisation in line with policy intention, to ensure that even when adjustments are made the overall purpose is upheld. The 2009 partnership evaluation, recommended a policy review. The evaluation and review are discussed in more detail below in the section on partnerships (2.3). A policy review has not taken place which raises questions about internal accountability and management focus.

2.1.3 Decentralisation in DCA

During 2006-11 DCA has continued to decentralise operations from headquarters in Copenhagen to regional offices in Asia, Africa and Central America. This has resulted in increasing programmatic discretion for regional offices and more distinct management responsibilities of regional representatives. Corporate aims for staffing structure and competencies in regional offices are in place. This process has further stimulated: improvements in programme management; more informed designs of new interventions and enhanced engagement with partners.

Decentralisation initiatives have been complemented by decisions in 2009 to limit the number of regional offices managed by DCA (see above), and a growing commitment to the ACT alliance. Systems and structures put in place to promote further decentralisation enabled promising joint programme decisions in Kyrgyzstan, Cambodia and Zambia. In Kyrgyzstan, DCA has been able to draw on ACT alliance partners for joint advocacy as well as common programming in response to threatening human rights violations. These are seen as positive indications of the benefits of decentralisation and opening up to new ways of working.

As with all new initiatives, new challenges emerge through the processes of decentralisation and increasing harmonisation with ACT Alliance partners:

**Lines of communication with MFA are at times unclear**, which risks hampering MFA-DCA relations. This relates to both responsibility for technical and substantive reports and less formal discussions regarding programme progress and the sharing of relevant intelligence with appropriate MFA units. Partly this is explained by MFA’s own decentralised structures (e.g. South Sudan operations being managed from the representation in Addis, ROI being managed partly by Addis (Jonglei), partly by Nairobi (Kakuma), and partly by MFA Copenhagen and more political issues relating to South Kordofan handled by MFA in Copenhagen). Despite the relative complexity of lines of communication, DCA should invest more in ensuring effective communication with MFA.

To date decentralisation is characterised by a physical shift of management authority from Copenhagen to regional offices. This allows DCA to engage more closely with partners in its focus countries, and thematic partner platforms are part of this. DCA programming remains characterised by five global themes with coordination and supervision of the five DCA programmes vested with DCA HQ. The intention is to roll out regional strategies outlining the rationale and aims for DCA geographical priorities. Currently reporting is done by regional offices on the five global themes. As regional offices are set to further establish and streamline their operations it appears important to resolve potential tensions emerging from the two rather discrete programming logics: thematic programmes and country programmes.
DCA’s decentralisation is arguably driven by a ‘regional focus’ with a select group of countries being managed out of 11 regional offices in Africa (5), Asia (4), Middle East (1) and Central America (1). As yet DCA programmes and overall strategic direction continue to be shaped by thematic programming at the level of individual countries, e.g. DCA maintains a regional office in Kampala in Uganda, yet that office is largely running a programme within Uganda. The regional office in New Delhi on the other hand is managing a growing portfolio of interventions in South Asia (notably Nepal and Bangladesh) with national satellite offices having been established to safeguard local operations. The India regional office is the only DCA representation with a distinct regional outlook and programming modality.

DCA acknowledges that there is a need for greater clarity on the various units of programming. This report is not suggesting that these are in opposition to each other but finds a lack of clarity about what DCA expects to achieve at regional and country level. The distinction is beginning to emerge: regional focusing on cross border, environment issues through regional Disaster Risk Reduction work, while also acknowledging that each country a national contextual analysis which takes into account responses by ACT Alliance members as part of a country programme. This is work in progress and at this time DCA does not have country strategies per se.

Regional programming and management demand quite complex management systems and staff competencies. Likewise, the majority of current and potential partners work on local or national issues with only a small number having a discrete focus on regional (i.e. cross-border) interventions and advocacy. The current terminology and messages in the regional policy paper are not yet reflected in the partner portfolio.

2.1.4 M&E systems for programme policy

DCA has an M&E system for overseeing and informing programme efforts across the organisation. The system is designed with its starting point in the five thematic policy areas of DCA. Several positive changes have been driven by the M&E system:

- The completed shift from a project to a programme approach. Ensuring a generally consistent programme focus even in the context of multiple funding sources.
- Improving project and programme management by gathering data on progress in individual operations.
- Use of monitoring information, to adjust project and programme design and implementation.

Improving overall M&E is understood to be a work in progress in DCA. Areas for attention include:

- Insufficient emphasis on performance management and reporting results. It does not systematically stimulate reflections on the effectiveness of interventions.
- The feedback loop is within individual programmes, which misses the larger context of the particular programme policy area.
- Apart from Lessons learnt in the Global Monitoring Report (GR) there is limited emphasis on promoting cross-organisational learning across programme themes and across regional offices.

- The recently introduced annual Global Report (GR) aims to present what DCA is achieving at a global level. The current format struggles to do this as there are no global goals against which to assess achievement. DCA is in the process of developing a
Global Strategy, against which the GR should report. A draft of the new strategy was shared during the review. The current version does not clarify operational aims nor use indicators which could be used as a basis for assessing programme performance.

- SMT has consistently worked on putting in place an overall corporate planning framework in the form of the Vision & Plan (V&P) reporting system, with the first covering 2006-10. A second V&P paper was finalised in spring 2010 covering 2011-15. The goal of this document and DCA’s senior management is to promote unity in programmatic focus across an organisation operating in diverse and complex environments. The new V&P framework includes a set of ‘organisational goals’ which intend to complement DCA global goals as reflected in the diagram below. As such V&P provides a relevant unifying framework for DCA corporate aims and objectives providing an informative and easily accessible overview. However, it is not immediately clear how the global and organisational goals reinforce each other.

Figure 3   Vision and Plan Goal 2011-15

The V&P is an effective communication tool for internal and external stakeholders. However, it is less useful as a tool to guide corporate management focus on performance and results due to the **lack of overall indicators and targets**. Moreover, it is not obvious how the Vision & Plan document relates to M&E systems for programme management. The new V&P for 2011-15 is an improvement but it could be enhanced by clearly spelling out corporate targets.
• Joining up all the systems is important. This includes strengthening the link between M&E systems for programme policy and DCA’s financial management systems. Without these links there are limits to efficient resource prioritisation based on assessments of cost-effectiveness.

The Regional policy was adopted in 2008, and DCA is working towards regional and country strategies. There are regional and country papers currently available for Middle East & North Africa, Southern Africa, Cambodia, South Sudan and Sudan and South Asia. DCA has regional and country draft strategies for all focus countries. However, as stated above reporting tends to be on thematic programme reporting with limited country and regional level reporting being produced. In this case it is difficult to assess achievements of set targets across individual country and regional programmes. **As there is increasing emphasis on results across the sector and in MFA. DCA needs to be clear about what targets it is setting itself and its partners, at what level (geography and or thematic) and how it will report on results.** This is as important for partners in relation to their governments as it is to DCA and MFA. This should be central to discussion with MFA in the future.

Furthermore, it remains a challenge to determine how much monitoring and reporting should be undertaken outside of DCA’s focus countries, such as in ACT countries, in programme countries etc. As argued further below the ROI support for the Kakuma camp in Kenya is a relevant case in point: Kenya is neither a focus country, nor a programme country for DCA; yet, the organisation receives MFA funding for an initiative managed by LWF and supported through the DCA regional office in Juba, South Sudan. While regular progress reporting is being produced and compiled by relevant DCA entities it does not feature in corporate reporting, e.g. on the homepage or in the Global Report. In the absence of a regular regional report emerging out of the Juba office one is left with project level reporting.

### 2.1.5 Management systems

DCA’s organisational structure was changed in 2006 (replacing the 2004 set-up) and again in 2010. Three main features emerge from these changes:

DCA placed a growing emphasis on fundraising, notably global funding from institutional donors but also on reviewing how fundraising and information work in Denmark interact.

Advocacy has changed from being part of corporate communication to being integrated within the International Department from 2010.

The structure reflects the consistent push for decentralising programme management from HQ to regional offices (cf above).

During 2006-11 senior management has focused on a selected number of issues:

- Promoting corporate values and policies across the organisation to enhance organisational cohesion and unity;
- Clarifying and strengthening the role and management responsibilities of Regional Representatives;
- Putting in place the Vision & Plan framework (2006-2010 and 2011-15) providing an overall policy and management framework for DCA;
- Putting in place measures to support the Financial Growth Strategy adopted in 2007;
- Promoting a high level of DCA engagement with ACT (see separate section below).

These initiatives are seen as relevant and effective for enhancing corporate identity and programming. Similar investments to promote cohesion through regular communication
between regional offices and headquarters, supported by bi-annual meetings of Regional Representatives in Copenhagen, regular exchanges between programme officers within each of the five thematic policy areas and frequent teleconferences among relevant staff have also been effective.

There remain some challenges within the current structure, which although not requiring urgent attention are mentioned here for DCA to reflect on:

**Division of Humanitarian and Development portfolios:**
The International Department is managed by an International Director supported by a Humanitarian Director and a Development Director (both of whom form part of the SMT). This organisational split between Humanitarian and Development is used to allocate management responsibilities of regional offices, according to whether these are considered more ‘humanitarian’ focused in their operations or more ‘development’ oriented. This division may be sub-optimal and constrain DCA’s efforts to provide efficient support for partners and operations moving along the emergency-recovery-development continuum. DCA rightly perceives its relevance as being measured by being able to provide effective responses to partner needs. As these needs – as also acknowledged by DCA itself – often shifts along the emergency-recovery-rehabilitation-development continuum the existing organisation structure may constrain an effective use of DCA competencies when responding to partner needs.

**Humanitarian Mine Action as a separate entity:**
In DCA as well as in a number of other INGOs Mine Action stands-out as an entity in its own right and defined as separate programmes. To some extent this can be said to reflect funding streams. MFA and other back donors have funded Mine Action separately from other humanitarian support. This organisational split carries the risk of offering limited synergy with other relevant DCA interventions in terms of programme modalities and geographical coverage.

**Clarity on lines of responsibility and accountability in decentralised management:**
DCA places emphasis and devotes substantial resources to enhancing communication and collaboration by means of meetings of relevant stakeholders, e.g. the bi-annual meetings with Regional Representatives. While such efforts are helpful in promoting organisational unity and cohesion this could be enhanced with more consistent follow-up to discussions and decisions taken.. Recent efforts to clarify responsibility for following up are noted and this assessment encourages further efforts to ensure effective communication and enhanced accountability for the benefit of DCA stakeholders across the organisation.

### 2.1.6 Recommendations

**Communication with MFA**
DCA and MFA should agree a format including milestones for monitoring follow-up to mutual agreements such as annual consultations and review recommendations to improve mutual accountability.

Generally communication needs to be improved between MFA and DCA.

**Decentralisation and programme approach**
DCA should clarify whether DCA’s primary programming operational modality is a country or a region (as suggested by the Regional Policy paper).
The current approach indicates that countries are the main unit of analysis and intervention for DCA and partners. Increased decentralised decision making implies more local discretion to set priorities and develop a programme profile according to country level needs assessments, including dialogue with relevant stakeholders rather than a mandatory 5 themes per country. In this context:
DCA could consider reviewing current approaches and management systems in regard to its global thematic programmes.

M&E
The overall M&E system needs to be made to work holistically. To achieve this it is recommended that:

- Existing programme monitoring systems are more clearly integrated in to the Vision & Plan reporting system.
- DCA should consider how to improve the use of financial reporting to enhance efficiency across the organisation.
- Broadly the organisation should begin to put in place tools for measuring performance using targets, indicators and milestone more clearly on policy operationalisation and programme strategies. The forthcoming Global Strategy is a good place to start this.
- Fundamental to this will be on-going and increased efforts to improve partner capacity to assess and report on outcomes and impact (see below)

2.2 Financial Management

In 2010 DCA’s income was more than DKK500 million and this is expected to increase to DKK526 million in 2011. During 2007 to 2010 DCA aimed to increase their income by 37% and despite the financial crises an increase of 25% has been achieved. In terms of total DCA support, 40% was spent on development support and 39% on humanitarian support in the period 2007-2010. (More financial details are available in the Financial Management Annex II).

The key financial management questions in the TOR are seen as:

1. General adequacy of financial management: planning and budgeting; accounting and reporting, monitoring and analysis; control and auditing and

2. DCA’s compliance with MFA requirements: performance audits; dealing with anomalies and time registration.

2.2.1 General financial systems and management

Since 2009 DCA has focused on up-grading the financial management and supporting systems. These are now up and running. The financial management systems and processes in DCA, Head Office and Regional Office, are assessed to be adequate and of good quality. At the same time it is recognised that the new system offers potential efficiency gains which are not as yet fully realised.

Planning and budgeting
DCA budgets for the coming year in September-November. This is referred to as the anchor budget; it is updated twice a year, by a bottom-up budget revision process during April to June and by a year-end prognosis in September-October. DCA budgets are budgeted for a full year.

---

period and not subdivided, e.g. into quarters\textsuperscript{11}. To improve the budgeting process and at the same time comply with ECHO recommendations DCA is considering introducing quarterly budgeting in 2012. This is positive, as it will allow for better budget-control and follow-up. When organisations use quarterly budgeting it is common for them to adopt a system of rolling budgets which allow more responsive budgeting and follow-up.

Accounting, reporting and monitoring:
The DCA Maconomy system can be used to institutionalise a more analytical and systematic financial management. The new financial system offers the opportunity to improve reporting, analysis and ultimately financial management. Using key indicators and ratios to can be used to compare finance across programmes\textsuperscript{12}. This can help make informed choices about resources utilization and resources required. An example of a ratio to use is found in the FM-Appendix II. In most organisations, the use of key indicators and analysis tends to result in efficiency improvements.

Control and auditing:
DCA currently relies on external auditor to check DCAs extensive internal control procedures. Internal audit is a normal requirement expected by ECHO. For an organisation of the size and complexity of DCA, financial management would be strengthened by establishing an internal audit function. This would provide useful information on coherence between strategies and spending, to the Board.
On a practical note, some of the resources DCA is currently using for internal control could be part of a new internal audit function, thus reducing the additional costs.

The introduction of Maconomy in 2009 supports the decentralisation of finance in line with recommendations in the previous review of DCA. The new system significantly improves DCA’s ability to provide up-to-date financial management information. Over and above the new finance system other organisation-wide initiatives\textsuperscript{13} such as: organisational development, finance team restructuring and staff capacity building is gradually resulting in better quality work and improved communication between Head Office and Regional Offices.

Alignment with partner finance systems is being tackled pragmatically and positively. Partners can use their own accounting package and system provided the setup, handling of vouchers; procurement etc. meets back-donor requirements. The partners receive support from DCA to improve financial management. This could be understood as guaranteeing partners’ compliance but it is appreciated as support to improving financial management in general.

Creating a stronger link between accounting and reporting could benefit from more systematic linking of activity based plans and budgets. Although systems and procedures are working well in DCA offices, it is noted with some concern that the accounts and bank reconciliation in DCA Regional Office, Juba, was not up to date at the time of field visit. According to DCA, the accounts have been brought up to date by the time of this report\textsuperscript{14}. This should be seen in the light of the Danish external auditor reporting a case of delayed accounting in Malawi. Up to date accounting and bank reconciliation are among the first steps in detection of misuse of funds.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{11} More details on DCA budgeting and reporting FM Appendix II.
\textsuperscript{12} Examples in the FM-Appendix II
\textsuperscript{13} More details in the FM-Appendix II
\textsuperscript{14} See FM-Appendix II for further details of Juba visit report.
DCA’s Danish external auditor is working well with DCA and DCA has utilised the same auditor for some years. Notwithstanding the good collaboration, the RT recommends the external auditing contracts to be based on competitive bidding with regular intervals as a way of ensuring efficiency and value for money. In line with this recommendation, DCA is planning to initiate competitive bidding in 2012.

2.2.2 Compliance with MFA
There are key financial management issues which are integral to the MFA way of working and these were reviewed from the perspective of:
- Relevance and usefulness of local performance audits.
- Dealing with anomalies
- Time registration.

Performance audits
In the context of framework agreements performance audits are found to add little value. The costs and effort often override the benefits. To improve the audit process, DCA’s Danish external auditor has introduced a more qualitative and cost efficient approach to local performance auditing. This was introduced through training of local auditors since 2008 as part of the decentralisation process. Yearly programme accounts are audited by DCA’s programme auditors abroad\textsuperscript{16}. These provide both the basis of framework accounts and constitute the audited project accounts. At the end of 2010 all projects had approved audited accounts.

Dealing with anomalies:
DCA has made significant efforts: developing policies and procedures and training staff about fraud and corruption. The comprehensive policies and procedures on anti-corruption are published on the DCA website. This implied transparency on cases of fraud and misuse of funds is commendable.
An example from the S Sudan country visit shows how important it is to reinforce policies procedures and training. The DCA staffs interviewed on this subject were familiar with the policies etc. but were less clear about what actions should be taken in suspicious circumstances.

Time registration system as applied in DCA
The Mconomy system is well used and can cover multi-donor projects. DCA pioneered the systems design, which is also used by the Norwegian sister organisation. The setup includes a lot of data regarding time registration, but does not include any specification or details on types of work, which is normally part of a time registration systems. As a result management cannot get reports on what type of work staff performs. It also means that the details on types of work performed cannot be audited directly. This implies that the current system design is insufficiently detailed compared to the MFA Administrative checklist, as detailed below.

The DCA time allocation is based on two categories of work: eligible and ineligible. The MFA framework procedures list a range of work tasks that are eligible\textsuperscript{17} for payment outside the administration fee. DCA’s system does not specify type of work. As a result the MFA Administrative Checklist and DCA systems are not fully compatible. It is important to acknowledge the need to balance accountability with manageability in such systems. Increasing sub-categories would mean greater complexity in the system but on the positive side improve

\textsuperscript{16}Audit Book page 285 – 289, Framework accounts for 2010
\textsuperscript{17}MFA Administrative Checklist of 19-04-2010, examples in par. 6.
transparency and accountability to MFA and also provide DCA senior management with some useful management information on how resources are spent.

The comparative advantages and disadvantages should be included in discussions between the two parties and a satisfactory solution found. In general, this type of dialogue should take place during system design.

2.2.3 Financial Management recommendations:

To improve financial management it is recommended that DCA improve their use and analysis of financial information and link this to programmes wherever possible. Several of the recommendations included here are in line with existing DCA plans and therefore their implementation should be faster. With this in mind, DCA should be able to address all recommendations in 2012, or at least with partial implementation started.

1. Changes to financial management systems and processes, which should lead to better financial management information:

- 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 and plans.
- DCA should consider introducing an Internal audit function 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 Juba office.
- The external audit should be based on regular competitive bidding.

2. DCA and MFA standards should be part of the regular meetings/dialogue between the two parties.

- Performance audits
In the context of framework agreements the use of local performance audits could be reduced.

- Dealing with anomalies:
Depersonalising and reinforcing training would be helped by stating visibly in office the steps to be taken in cases of suspicion of fraud or abuse. Detailing what to do and who to talk to.
Systematic Financial Risk analysis should be upgraded and integrated in standardised Partner profile.

- Time Registration
The lack of information on types of work performed compared to other supplementary information available should be discussed, detailing comparative advantages and disadvantages, in the negotiation between MFA and DCA and a reasonable solution found.

2.3. Working with Others: Partnership and the ACT Alliance

2.3.1. Partnership: policy and practice

---

18 Framework organisations could, in be exempted from local performance audits as these organisations are under closer supervision by Danida compared to other organisations receiving single grants.
DCA developed a partnership policy in 2006 and this is central to its programmes in all areas:
- Development:
- Humanitarian Assistance
- Mine Action
- Regions of Origin Initiatives (ROI).

Partnership values are expressed in diakonia (service) and koinonia (common effort or partnership). DCA commitment to partnership is equally visible in programme themes and approaches:
- Political space
- The right to food
- HIV and AIDS
- Cross-cutting issues such as Rights Based Approaches and Gender Equality.

Organisational goals in Vision & Plan (2011-15) refer to “ensuring strong, equal effective international partnerships and strengthening the ACT Alliance”. DCA aims to develop close long term relationships expressed in partnership agreements rather than tied to projects. This is strongly in line with the MFA Civil Society Strategy and the partnership elements of the Humanitarian Assistance Strategy.

In 2009, an evaluation: “DCA partnership-any added value?” was commissioned and the DCA management response broadly endorsed its findings and planned actions for 2010. This evaluation found that partners and back donors valued DCA’s:
- flexibility
  - context based decision-making
  - support for institutional capacity
  - support for finance and fundraising activities.

A key recommendation was to revise the partnership policy. The added value report further identified five key areas for improvement which continue to be relevant.

1. Take partnership to the next level: closer to the intentions of partnership policy
2. Monitor the portfolio: composition vs. strategy
3. Develop individual OD rather than generic capacity building approaches
4. Coordinate partner approaches with other funders
5. Make more effort on partner advocacy

At the end of 2011 DCA reports that while some actions have been taken, this was at a slightly slower rate than expected due to:
- management focus on internal restructuring;
- an organisation-wide focus on building the ACT Alliance
- the change of International Director.

The partnership policy has not yet been reviewed. DCA accepts that more can be done to improve their partnership approach and the review is planned for 2012.
The following sections use recommendations from the 2009 report and reports on changes completed by DCA to date. This report’s recommendations are based on areas where change is still required. A summary of this is found in a table in Annex III.

- Taking partnership to the next level
- To achieve DCA policy commitments to longer term non-project based partnership the Added Value Evaluation (AVE) suggested that DCA carries out internal reflection and dialogue with some of their existing partners to agree: what long term partnerships might look like;
- mechanisms for mutual monitoring of partnership;
- processes for greater transparency about strategic direction.

As a review of the partnership policy has not yet taken place there is still a lack of clarity about how relationships with partners are expected to change and progress over time. Neither are there any clear provisions for ending the partnership or exit strategies. Most partners continue to work with renewable cooperation agreements based on project periods of 3-5 years. When partnerships do end it tends to occur because of poor performance or change of programme strategy at country level.

In each regional programme there are 1-3 partners with partnership agreements which is small in relation to the overall numbers of partners. There is a need to be clear about potential differences between the aims of longer term partner relationships and project based agreements. Although the current policy gives great emphasis to stable long term partnerships the current reality on the ground is somewhat different and is likely to remain so.

**Monitor the partnership portfolio:** The AVE recommended that the shape of the partnership portfolio should be monitored beyond the partner contribution to programme aims. Such an approach would aim to balance country/regional portfolios by including other factors such as a balance between types of organisations:
- secular and Christian
- type of work, e.g. service delivery, advocacy policy, etc.
- size and capacity mix
- absorption capacity (how big can an organisation grow?).

Within the decentralised structure the Regional Representatives are responsible for shaping their partner portfolio in relation to programme objectives.

The monitoring by SMT and regional representatives is not yet seen as strategic management of the partnership portfolio across regions and globally. An entry point for such work would require DCA to define and issue clear guidance on partnership steps or graduation and adopt different strategies for different types of partner.

In relation to the above points DCA HQ needs to do more to guide, target, measure or monitor shift towards the partnership agreements which are at the foundation of partnership policy and do the same on portfolio management.

The planned review of partnership policy should extend to include greater clarity on developing a portfolio and this is in turn is linked to a strategy for partner development.
Individual OD rather than generic capacity building approaches. The AVE recommended that DCA shifts from generic programme oriented technical capacity building to a more individual, needs assessment and tailor-made approach. As has been explained above (see 2.1.2) it was necessary and appropriate for DCA to reduce the scale of implementation of the OD policy due to financial constraints. Currently OD is being piloted in selected countries with a reduced number of partners with support from PPU. Learning from this will be used to inform future strategies in this area. Step Zero of the 6 step programme approval process is used to carry out organisational assessments of partners and may be useful in future should the OD programme expand.

In practice for the majority of DCA partners capacity building continues to be through generic training, and on-going support. The approach is based on improving partner capacity to contribute to the programme. For existing partners, recent DCA capacity building has been through training on the following technical areas:

- Rights Based Approach (RBA)
- Project Cycle Management and reporting (PMER)
- Gender
- HAP
- ISO 9000 for Mine Action
- Financial management.

Much of this training helps partners to become DCA and donor compliant as well as improving partner capacity.

The partners met during the review, in Uganda particularly, valued support provided on improving financial management. This support included assessment (profiling) and planned follow-up training followed by direct support to implementation, and annual internal audits used to assess improvement and identification of new or on-going needs.

The finance assessment in this review suggests that the initial assessment should be extended to include a more detailed financial management analysis which should include analysis of risk and solidity. Overall the on-going support was appreciated by organisations as it up-graded their systems.

DCA is working with partners to improve project cycle management and their skills in monitoring and evaluation and reporting. The Global Report acknowledges that progress has been made here but there are still challenges in reporting on outcomes. Not surprisingly, due to the time scale annual programme report narratives tend to focus on inputs and to some extent outputs with less attention to outcomes and impact.

This is a challenge for many organisations working with civil society partners. However it is one which DCA must begin to address for their own accountability as well as that of their partners in civil society whose legitimacy may also be questioned. This must be approached intelligently to avoid partnership only being about the achievement of results. There also needs to be an acceptance that some that in some areas of work, such as: advocacy; community behaviour change; or conflict reduction, it is not easy to measure outcomes in relatively short funding periods. However there are some areas of work such as service delivery and some humanitarian work where tangible results can be achieved.
An example to illustrate this was found in an evaluation of the ROI in Burundi and Kibondo implemented by LWF and other partners. This evaluation talks about targeting 3000 vulnerable people from host and returnee communities but does not clearly state what changed or the scale of change by group or by gender. These are basic facts on which accountability and learning can be based. Capacity to measure change is also a foundation stone of organisational sustainability.

Working with partners on results based reporting is important to DCA not least as it has a knock on effect in DCA reporting right up to the Global Report. This GR reflects a challenge faced by many INGOs of how to show aggregated achievements and results across the organisation in a way that is clear and meaningful to a wide audience. DCA accepts that the GR format and process will be continually reviewed.

The AVE provided recommendations on how DCA could add more value as a partner. Despite funding constraints and personnel changes DCA continues to work on improving their partnership approach. The overall recommendation that the policy should be reviewed remains valid and this should be a priority for DCA. In addition to these recommendations, more attention to bringing partners on in their management of results and reporting is clearly a priority in the current climate.

### 2.3.2 Partner Platforms

DCA Partners are expected to participate in DCA programme thematic partner forums. The 2011 Global Report shows the three main purposes of partner platforms as:
- OD/capacity (dealt with above)
- Information and experience exchange
- Joint advocacy.

In some countries shared partner forums are being introduced to focus on cross programme synergy and in others partners are included in programme steering committees. Furthermore Christian partners are also members of the ACT Alliance fora (to be considered in more detail below). In such a short review it is not feasible to thoroughly assess the added value of such platforms not least as evaluations tend to focus on programmatic achievements and less on process.

The AVE recommended that DCA support greater visibility of partners in international and national advocacy with more systematic linking between partners and national agendas. There are changes here, largely facilitated in part through partner involvement in ACT campaigns. DCA is able to provide examples of partners contributing to evidence-based advocacy:
- Land Grabbing report,
- Shrinking Political Space
- Local to Global Protection project.

DCA recognises that where evidence is used for national and international advocacy the feedback to partners is not always thoroughly done. This increased engagement with ACT Alliance advocacy initiatives is seen as positive. The expectation is that the 2011 move of the Global Advocacy and Strategy Unit (GAS) into International Development will make a difference to creating better global links and feedback loops on advocacy\(^{19}\).

\(^{19}\) Would the partnership approach be better served if this was described as G.A.S.P (to include partnership?)
DCA is mindful of the risk of proliferation and creation of parallel networks. A well-known coping strategy is for local CSOs to send more junior staff to these meetings, which in turn reduces meeting effectiveness. There are circumstances where DCA partners could be involved in 2-3 DCA related fora in addition to other local civil society networks\textsuperscript{20}.

Networking is an important and useful tool, but too much of a good thing is not necessarily efficient or effective. Platforms help to create an identity for DCA partners and are a vehicle for training etc. The Global Report states these should aim to increase synergy. What the outcomes of such a synergy would be is not clearly defined and this is something that each platform might discuss.

As a general rule DCA should regularly reflect on whether all that it is doing with partners adds value, for both partners and for DCA. The 2009 review suggests a mechanism through which partners can feed into DCA performance assessment, and this may be worth revisiting. Likewise, setting out benchmarks for effective partner platforms and monitoring outcomes of these platforms rather than numbers of meetings etc. would help to focus debate on how platforms can be more useful to all stakeholders.

2.3.3. DCA & the ACT Alliance

DCA has made a strong commitment to and investment in, the ACT Alliance: its Secretary-General sits on its Governing Board, and DCA staff are involved in various working groups, for example joint research and training development, in which both the costs and benefits to DCA are evenly balanced. However the Alliance in its current form has only been in place since 2010, and there are bound to be initial challenges.

The Alliance extends both DCA’s (& the MFA’s) ‘reach’, allowing them to support humanitarian responses through special ACT Appeals in areas where DCA does not work. In principle, joint appeals can have lower transaction costs and achieve a higher international impact than a series of individual appeals. Other long-term cost savings are arising through the use of shared office compounds and facilities in 11 country offices. The benefits appear greatest where ACT joint programmes can be agreed such as in Zambia. A DCA decision to close the Lusaka office prompted regional office management to prepare for joint programming with CA and NCA in a future Zambia programme managed by NCA. In Cambodia, DCA agreed with Christian Aid (UK) that Christian Aid will channel its Cambodia funding through the DCA programme. Such examples are encouraging and demonstrate the synergy between DCA decentralisation and harmonisation with Alliance members.

As stated above ACT partners have increased a focus on global advocacy. As ACT is a relatively new structure at country level it is too early to identify strong results from its advocacy activities, and it is beyond the Terms of Reference for this report to assess this in full. The potential of joint rather than individual agency advocacy is clear. To achieve this it will be important to retain the long term support of its member agencies (both in terms of funding and senior management time). For instance the ACT alliance recently published a report on Shrinking Political space and this report was used in the recent Aid Effectiveness Forum in

\textsuperscript{20}Uganda partners met were asked which networks they were involved in and on average each organisation was in four.
Busan, and it is has also been very active in advocacy on climate change leading up to the COP 17 Conference in Durban.

Normally advocacy campaigns have to have clear messages and specific demands to be successful and, as argued below, at least in Sudan different ACT members have very different views on what kind of advocacy response, if any, the Alliance should make to the current civil war in South Kordofan. Although there were disagreements about tactics between different Alliance members, DCA has been able to undertake some advocacy work on this issue together with LWF and the MFA.

Country level ACT forums are an interesting idea, but at least in the countries visited (S. Sudan & Uganda) they are still emergent and their members are relatively unsure about how the different partners can best work together: for instance, although the Ugandan context is on the whole a development one, a major ACT activity was appealing for victims of landslides. DCA’s documentation suggests that in other countries like Malawi and Nepal these ACT Forums are better established. As stated above DCA is mindful of overlaps between networks and it would be helpful for country ACT Forums to clarify their exact ‘niche’ and value added. This review could not cover the degree to which DCA’s ‘secular’ partners who cannot join ACT feel a sense of exclusion: DCA is well aware of this challenge, and prefers to have a combination of partners both inside and outside of ACT.

As regards DCA’s co-operation with ACT there are various levels of co-operation possible between ACT members. The first level, the sharing of office space and other facilities, as in Juba and many other countries, is relatively straightforward; the next level is joint action to promote and finance an ACT forum (South Sudan for example has joint financing of an ACT Coordinator); The second level currently includes joint trainings and in the case of South Sudan joint contingency planning, sphere training, procurement, gender and RBA. There are then further possibilities, to run a Joint Appeal as was done successfully in South Sudan, or to undertake combined programming with other ACT alliance members, as in Cambodia and Zambia. The latter are good examples of the overall intention; however, in the case of Zambia, which is now managed by Norwegian Church Aid, a risk identified by DCA staff was that DCA may not continue to support ongoing fundraising efforts as they will not be able to report on turnover. Overall it will be important for DCA to assess overtime the cost to DCA of supporting ACT against the benefits received by DCA’s partners and the communities they support. The current DCA push towards increased integration would benefit from some agreed benchmarks against which performance could be measured.

DCA has an ACT taskforce and an ACT coordinator to coordinate DCA inputs to ACT, and the DCA General Secretary is a member of the ACT governing body. All this involves an investment of staff time and other resources at a time when DCA is trying to reduce its staff in Copenhagen. At the Country or Regional Office level there is a relatively high “opportunity cost” for senior staff as time spent working to support the development of the Alliance may be at the expense of time spent with partners or other stakeholders: however many DCA partners are themselves ACT members and will benefit from a stronger ACT Alliance. The key to the future of the Alliance is the degree of commitment to it of its best-resourced members, and at least in South Sudan and Uganda it is not yet certain that sufficient commitment exists: while DCA is very enthusiastic about the Alliance, other members are more cautious and are concerned about losing their individual identities. Also at least one donor, DFID, makes it a condition of their support to Christian Aid in Juba that it attends cluster meetings in its own right.

The following case illustrates well how the costs and benefits are balanced in Alliance work.
DCA was the lead agency for the ACT Appeal for S. Sudan in 2010/11 aimed at pre-positioning Non-Food Items to meet the needs of returnees and other IDPs. This appeal is successful on a number of grounds:

- It raised $1.3m, 90% of its target (unusual for ACT Appeals)
- It showed the added value of joint Alliance working: with international ACT members as lead partners at state level, and some local partners responsible for delivery.
- Estimated saving of $150,000 through joint procurement of NFIs achieved through getting better prices from suppliers.

DCA raised 40% of the funding for this appeal. Contributions from some other similarly sized ACT members were rather modest: for instance, Christian Aid gave only $20,000. The procurement and distribution was a huge burden for DCA for which it was not compensated. Although some members were not happy about taking a secondary role, none of them was prepared to be the lead agency for the 2011 Appeal. This appeal has only raised 20% of its $3.5m target. It is technically being run by ACT in Geneva, taking a 3% overhead charge. There is no lead agency, no joint action on the ground and donors are earmarking their contributions to particular agencies.

In addition the ACT Alliance in Juba is not yet acting jointly in cluster level representation: a rotating system for attendance at cluster meetings was tried, but has been given up. Given the number of UN ‘clusters’ in Juba (some of which have been further divided into ‘sub-clusters’) it would make sense for the Alliance at least to arrange some broad division of labour reflecting the sectoral interests of each agency rather than relying solely on the ACT coordinator to attend all meetings.

Given DCA’s prominent role in the ACT Alliance we recommend it should do more advocacy to increase the extent of joint action and to better understand why some members, at least in South Sudan, appear reluctant to become fully engaged in joint Alliance appeals: the current role of the Geneva Secretariat, and the quality of its leadership, may also need to be addressed. Some of the problems lie with donors, and ACT is probably unlikely to undertake more joint appeals in S Sudan without clear guidance from Head Offices to prioritize joint action, and more encouragement of this by donors.

### 2.3.4 Conclusion on DCA working with others

The 2009 Partnership AVE’s recommendations are still valid especially as a guide on how DCA can refine and be more strategic in it partnerships. The main recommendation to revise the partnership policy is endorsed in this review. Recently DCA has focused more on closer collaboration and alignment with ACT Alliance members. This is leading to more harmonised country programmes and standard approaches to partners, but this does not necessarily include alignment with all partners. There are teething problems in joint fundraising and some aspect of joint appeals.
The above mentioned initiatives show DCA committed to working more closely with others for strategic gains, albeit not always clearly defined. DCA is keen to express these relationships as a journey. What is slightly less clear is whether all local NGO partners have a shared destination. The limited number of partnership agreements indicates that DCA is still contemplating the depth of relationships they want and need to achieve their mission and objectives.

Since the partnership policy was developed in 2006, things have changed: aid architecture; funding modalities; decentralisation in DCA; a commitment to the ACT Alliance; and an increasing requirement on organisations to not only show they make a difference but also to show the quality and quantity of difference. DCA needs to increase this focus results in their partnerships. DCA feedback is that the partnership policy will be revised in the period 2012-13. A revised policy should reflect that DCA needs different types of arrangements with others for different purposes. This must be better articulated to ensure more accountable and transparent horizontal and vertical relationships. In the medium term it will be important for DCA to articulate more formally how it approaches working with others in the ACT Alliance and back donors.

The organisation-wide focus on HAP compliance has resulted in an increased focus on downward accountability: partners to beneficiaries and to some extent from DCA to partners. A new partner policy would be able to reflect this more strategically. Similarly the investment in ACT is tending toward increased accountability to ACT members especially in the agreements for country level joint programmes.

**2.3.5 Recommendation on working with others:**

1. **Partnership recommendations**

1. DCA should develop a new partnership policy.

A key principle is the need to show transparently that partners may (or may not) graduate through different types of relationships with DCA. DCA can be guided by the recommendations from 2009 Added Value Evaluation as the key areas identified remain relevant:

The revised policy should show how DCA:

- Defines the purpose of partnerships
- Categorises 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 in DCA’s strategy formation, as well as policy development and review.

2. Regional Representative should agree and report on targets for their partner portfolio and develop country or regional strategies for development. DCA HQ should review this from a global perspective.
3. 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.

4. In ROI, DCA should provide greater support to LWF in assisting it to implement different approaches to community development and how to use RBA in community work with host communities and capacity building of local organisations. To initiate this, DCA may find it appropriate to pilot with one or two programmes and then use the learning from this to set up an organisational approach.

5. 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.

2. Capacity building recommendations

1. To function as an effective capacity building partner DCA must:
   - Define the aim(s) of their capacity building work for different types of relationships
   - Develop a menu of capacity building: from training through to organisational and system development
   - Carry out regular reviews of partner capacity changes and needs assessments.

2. In relation to general areas where more capacity development is required by partners are:
   - Capacity for outcome and impact monitoring and reporting
   - Continuous cycle of financial management support.

3. ACT Alliance recommendations

On the basis of recent experience in Juba, DCA needs use its influence within the ACT Alliance to encourage Alliance members to:
   - Ensure future appeals are conducted jointly whenever possible;
   - Continue to work through ACT Regional forums (ACT Nordic and ACT Europe) as well as other channels to try to mobilise more explicit support from key donors to future joint ACT Alliance Appeals.
   - During discussions on humanitarian framework DCA should agree with MFA how it will monitor and report on MFA funding used for ACT Appeals outside DCA’s normal areas of operations.
2.4. **DCA’s Policy and Practice in Humanitarian Assistance and Global Standards**

2.4.1. **Overall strategic coherence between MFA and DCA**

This section considers the extent to which there has been overall policy coherence between the MFA’s humanitarian strategy and that of DCA, and also how this policy is implemented on the ground, using South Sudan as a case study.

MFA’s humanitarian strategy (2010-2015) is comprehensive and stresses the need for ‘connectedness between humanitarian, recovery and development interventions. It argues for ‘a holistic approach, including long-term development efforts, diplomacy, security and justice in addition to humanitarian action’. The strategy has a strong focus on advocacy, rights, gender issues, and ensuring that aid gets to the most vulnerable, and it also emphasises the need for improved data gathering, contextual analysis and needs assessment as well as for more investment in preparedness and early recovery. In relation to focal areas, the strategy emphasises the importance of people’s right to food and protection, especially in conflict areas. Mine Action is semi-included by means of a reference to its inclusion via the separate Mine Action Strategy 2006, which provides for advocacy on clearance and more relevantly in this context, linking Mine Action to peace and confidence building in post-conflict recovery.

The MFA Humanitarian Strategy puts a strong emphasis on linking relief, recovery and development (LRRD) and shows a commitment to working in partnership, in countries suffering protracted conflict. Many other donors have far narrower definitions of what constitutes ‘humanitarian’ assistance, and impose conditionalities requiring humanitarian grants to be spent in a limited time period. An example of this more flexible approach is the Regions of Origin Initiative (ROI), which aims to meet the needs of displaced people in protracted crises with funds which can bridge the gap between pure humanitarian action and development interventions. These projects are premised on the need to find context-specific durable solution for displaced and host communities. There is an explicit regional focus to such programmes, which reflects the nature of forced migrations.

DCA’s current humanitarian strategy is very broad and emphasises the following ways of working:

- Provision of sustainable relief and rehabilitation with a special focus on food crisis response
- Advocacy for increased humanitarian space and access to assistance/protection
- Partner/ACT implemented assistance based on local community needs and capacities
- Linking relief, rehabilitation and development, including disaster risk reduction
- Gender issues addressed at all stages of DCA-supported emergency interventions
- Conflict sensitivity is an integrated part of DCA humanitarian assistance
- A strong focus on accountability towards beneficiaries.

Within this broad strategy DCA has specific objectives to reduce suffering and deprivation, protect livelihoods, to involve disaster and conflict-affected women, men and children in planning and monitoring activities, to build up partners’ capacities and to undertake advocacy.

Mine Action in DCA has a separate strategy and stand alone programme framework, although the fact that it has been included in the Humanitarian Assistance Framework application suggests that it is moving towards greater integration.
In relation to geographic synergy, DCA has 13 focus countries, and these include a number of countries that are often described as “fragile states” as they suffer from long term conflicts. These countries represent 3 out of the 7 focus countries for MFA - S. Sudan, Burma, and Gaza/W.Bank. DCA’s designation, in its Global Report of 15 countries as “humanitarian response countries” is inherently problematic as so many other needs exist as well, and DCA’s work in these countries is not usually limited to humanitarian interventions. Likewise this does not reflect the need for flexible responses by Mine Action work. Currently the overlap between DCA, Mine Action and MFA are along the Burmese /Thai borders and in Sudan. Regions of Origin programmes appear to operate with a different logic, which is responsive to the needs of migrants and host communities. This responsive funding modality aims to bridge a gap for migrant and host communities to cope with transition. The ROI modality does also not fit in well with the concept of focus countries.

None of this should be a problem as long as all agreements between DCA and the MFA clarify that “humanitarian” covers a full spectrum of interventions in protracted crises ranging from immediate relief to recovery of livelihoods and agriculture, to peace building, re-integration of IIPDs and refugees, and capacity building of local authorities with the potential for Mine Action to contribute to immediate relief, peace building and longer term development.

At the conceptual level, therefore, there appears to be strong consistency between the strategies of MFA and DCA, and this synergy is supported by DCA’s strong commitment to international standards in humanitarian work, as discussed below. DCA’s commitment to working through local partners on a long term basis is especially important strategically at a time when many other INGOs either prefer to work operationally, or only offer local partners very short term sub-contracts for humanitarian operations. The next section will review the extent to which DCA has been able to implement this strategy, with particular reference to South Sudan.

### 2.4.2. Implementation of the Strategy

Coverage of vulnerable people

This section reviews the extent to which DCA is able to reach the most vulnerable people in Sudan/NW Kenya. In general the scale and scope and number of rights holders reached by the South Sudan programme and NW Kenya (ROI) are hard to establish. DCA’s proposal to MFA requesting DKK 14m for 2012 suggests that the agency will through its partners reach ‘6,800 Returnee and resident community pupils (and their teachers) attending primary schools., 4,320 Farming households, and 1,080 Fishery group members’. What is less easy to establish is first the relative vulnerability of this target population: in one sense they may all be vulnerable, but one would hope that DCA’s partners would by now be able to pinpoint particular groups of those people most at risk, their specific vulnerability, and what kind of interventions will be used to assist them. This is an issue raised by DCA’s own advisors, and DCA inform us that these details will be included in future proposals.

Secondly, given the difficulties of working in South Sudan in relation to difficulties of access, spasmodic conflicts, and continuing movements of refugees, ideally, DCA should be able to say what proportion of this target population their partners have been able to reach in practice, and what the major outcomes have been. The 2010 Global Report suggests that DCA reached

---

21 While DRC is a priority country for DCA it is not selected as a priority country for MFA; conversely Pakistan is a priority country for MFA’s assistance to protracted crises, but is not a focus country for DCA.

335,000 people in South Sudan but no breakdown of this figure between partners is included in the GR.\textsuperscript{23} At present the “feedback loop” between planning and budgeting, monitoring implementation, and then preparing an adjusted plan based on the previous year’s experience may well exist but it is not very clearly documented: this weakness in outcome monitoring is acknowledged in DCA’s recent draft strategy for South Sudan.

As stated above DCA’s reach is potentially extended greatly by the ACT Alliance, as the membership operates in 125 countries. However in practice DCA aims to limit funding to trusted partners who can offer high standards of reporting and M&E. During this review concern was expressed by MFA about whether DCA would be able to maintain the same quality-assured reporting when it supports ACT Appeals outside its focus countries. We understand from DCA that there is an ACT Alliance initiative to define and improve reporting standards for partners outside DCA’s focus countries.

In South Sudan it is difficult to generalise about vulnerability. The great majority of the population is vulnerable, either to food insecurity, conflicts from a wide variety of sources, both external, and internal, and very poor services, especially in health and education. The various UN/NGO ‘clusters' and INGOs tend mainly to focus on the needs of the IDPs and returnees from North Sudan, estimated in November 2011 at around 380,000. However there is a concern that the estimated 1.8m of the population who are not returnees but who are chronically food insecure may have even greater needs. DCA aims to cover both returnees and the settled population through its partner-focused programmes in Eastern Equatoria and Jonglei states.

With the recent division of Sudan confirmed in July 2011, and the consequent inaccessibility of the border states of Blue Nile and South Kordofan from Juba, the overall size of DCA’s programme in South Sudan is reduced. Therefore it is considering opening up a programme in a third state, and at present it is in touch with 4 new possible partners.

As stated in DCA’s internal Mid Term Review (2010) a ‘lack of DCA own funding for testing new partners is a challenge’ which could worsen with the current dip in DCA’s income from supporters. Though ideally DCA should finance this kind of work from its own funds, given the need to scale up the programme, and the fact that DCA has a rigorous procedure for partner approval, it would be useful if, during discussion on the multi-year framework contract, to establish if MFA could allow some frame funding to be used for this purpose – not only in S. Sudan but possibly also in other fragile states. This should be prioritised as it can be seen as the “investment capital” for DCA’s future work in S. Sudan.

Another way in which DCA could increase its coverage is for DCA to encourage its partners to work more with their natural allies at county and state level, with greater input to relevant state level cluster meetings where these exist. This is pursued by partners in Jonglei and Eastern Equatoria as well as by DCA seconded staff and Program Area Facilitators. During this review we were not able to establish the extent to which this strategy is being followed. Both DCA and its partners are well aware of the importance of this kind of co-ordination, but in some states this state-level co-ordination is made more difficult by local insecurity or poor road communications, which make land travel difficult.

**Mine Action** as a programme is found to be working on clearance in areas where most development impact is likely; for example clearing farmers’ fields or access routes in post

\textsuperscript{23} The 2010 Annual Report for S. Sudan provides some partial data on the numbers of people reached by different interventions.
conflict environments such as Angola. The approach embraces capacity development of partners – in a very technical way using the ISO 9000 standards as a benchmark. The demands of this work should not be underestimated; however there is a general sense within DCA that despite efforts to link to development and to lesser extent humanitarian actors, integration needs to be taken more seriously. This should be visible in strategy and operationalisation. In the latter case it is critical to ensure that post conflict confidence building and development in communities takes place. Mine Action experiences similar challenges in reporting on results – over and above square meterage cleared – life has got better but by how much? DCA is developing an impact measurement tool. If this work is more integrated into humanitarian and development approach it will face the same imperative to show outcomes. There is certainly room for increased synergy on development of effective impact monitoring tools for all programmes. With more predictable funding there is more time available to invest in development of these tools.

2.4.3 International Standards and Quality Certification
At the operational level there are now a wide variety of international standards which assist humanitarian agencies, e.g. the Red Cross Code of Conduct, Sphere Standards, and the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP). As regards the Red Cross Code, the provision of the code that “aid will not be used to further a particular political or religious standpoint” poses challenges for all humanitarian agencies including DCA given the current conflict in South Kordofan.

It is not possible for a relatively rapid Review of this type to prove the extent to which DCA conforms to Sphere standards, but DCA has been training its staff so that they themselves can become Sphere trainers, and partners are then introduced to Sphere standards during the project inception phase. DCA staff are on the Sphere board.24

As regards the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership, DCA has put much investment into becoming “HAP-compliant”: this has been helpful and has been appreciated by partners. At the time of this review, DCA’s humanitarian work was undergoing a full audit from HAP: the report was not available to the Review Team but DCA has already completed a lengthy self-assessment process, and the HAP auditors have confirmed the finding of this self-assessment that DCA was broadly compliant with HAP standards.25 Although HAP compliance is now the “industry standard” (achieved now by a total of 83 local and international NGOs26) this does not in itself mean that DCA’s humanitarian operations are necessarily more effective than they were before: the key issue for DCA to monitor and report on in relation to its humanitarian operations should be its effectiveness and impact when it is responding both to protracted crises and other emergencies: however compliance with HAP standards requires that an agency is more responsive to beneficiary concerns, which in itself indicate greater effectiveness in humanitarian programming.

2.4.4 Use of other funding sources
DCA appears successful at mobilising other funding sources in addition to the MFA for its humanitarian work. The areas of growth appear to be the EU (including ECHO): in Sudan, which
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24 DCA is also encouraging a move to merge the SPHERE and HAP initiatives which would be helpful given the proliferation of international standards.
25 e-mail from HAP Auditor Ester Dross (06/12/11)
26 Communication with HAP Auditor Ester Dross (06/12/11) since then membership has been posted on their website www.hapinternational.org
is the largest country programme in terms of expenditure EU funding in 2010 represented 20% of total expenditure, while it was as much as 38% in Ethiopia.27 The level of EU funding is important as both a performance and a capacity indicator as the EU imposes rather stringent reporting requirements and it usually requires considerable investment by DCA in capacity building before a partner is able to meet the required reporting standard. As regards other sources of finance, accessing funding from the Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) in South Sudan is highly competitive, but DCA has been able to access CHF funding for its partner CDS in Eastern Equatoria State.

2.4.6 The Regions of Origin Initiative

In the MFA’s humanitarian strategy the aim of the ROI is ‘to meet the challenge of displacement-related needs in protracted conflicts where appropriate international assistance falls in a grey zone between humanitarian action and development interventions…..The initiative’s purpose is to provide a bridge between humanitarian and development assistance’. DCA is one of four Danish NGOs receiving ROI funding in South Sudan together with the UNHCR.

The 2010 ROI Evaluation concluded that the wider objectives as noted above for the ROI were in danger of being lost. The reason given in this evaluation was that:

‘The ROI projects are part of the overall country programmes, but are presented as separate projects for funding purposes under the ROI umbrella. Other activities are funded by other donors (incl. Danida) from other channels. So, seen from the partners’ side the ROI programme becomes more of a funding source for their own country programme than a ROI programme that they share with each other in a complementary manner within a larger programme framework.’

This review also emphasised the need for DCA to scale up its ROI-funded livelihoods programme implemented through the partner Church & Development (C & D) in Jonglei; to increase its capacity to undertake more conflict analysis and peace building, and proposed that in future the ROI should be planned on a multi-year, rolling basis rather than the current annual planning cycle.

Our review came to broadly similar conclusions. In Kakuma in NW Kenya the work in the host community appeared to be relatively small scale and in some cases of questionable durability, with limited links to other actors, both governmental and non-governmental agencies. The ROI programme is currently implemented by LWF, who would benefit from greater engagement with DCA on working developmentally communities including, where feasible rights-based approaches, which serve to link communities to local authorities and entitlements. A good example of the work in Kakuma is found in the cattle-branding programme which is done jointly with Kenyan government department and can be seen as a starting point for a relationship between cattle owners and government bodies. In addition the provision of inputs to community income generation activities should aim to be based on locally available goods and such groups should be encouraged to take increasing responsibility for group organisation and management. Currently one of the small income generation activities, beadwork uses materials not easily obtainable in NW Kenya and is producing items which struggle to compete in a very competitive high quality national market.

One component of the ROI which DCA could strengthen is the regional synergy in particular sharing information between Kakuma in NW Kenya, where many South Sudanese took refuge during the long conflict, and Jonglei, the state from which many of these refugees came. It is unclear the extent to which DCA’s partner, LWF, which works on both sides of this border either collects, analyses, and shares this kind of information, or provides regular updates to DCA. Likewise learning from experience with refugee and host communities could be more widely shared within the region, for example in Dadaab camp.

South Sudan is a very tough environment in which to operate, and partners tend to need a greater level of support than in many other countries. It is therefore difficult to maintain a wider, regional perspective for a Juba base, and the RT was uncertain about whether Juba is the appropriate site for what DCA describes as a ‘regional’ office. From the feedback session held at the end of this review the RT understands that DCA is well aware of this problem, and is considering locating at least some staff back in Nairobi. This presents an opportunity to revisit the value DCA can add to the ROI programme implemented by a large, well established NGO such as LWF. DCA is currently encouraging LWF to adopt a clearer partnership approach and DCA can share its considerable learning on this as well as on community development mentioned above.

A broader issue here is the need expressed above for DCA to have greater clarity on the difference between a “country office” and a regional office, and not to lose sight of the need for a regional office to maintain a broader analysis of its whole region and ensure strong learning between partners working at country level. Currently DCA may not be making sufficient use of the opportunities presented by the ROI programme for a broader contextual understanding of refugee movements in this region.

2.4.7 DCA’s humanitarian work in other areas
Since the field visits were limited to NW Kenya and Juba, it is difficult for the RT to reach any conclusions about DCA’s work outside these areas. But the 2009 MFA Monitoring Study of the work undertaken by Danish NGOs including DCA in support of Burmese refugees came to broadly positive conclusions, and also makes a strong case for the MFA to offer a longer term humanitarian funding ‘window’ for this type of protracted crisis. The report in addition raised questions about the “added-value” of DCA. The findings from this review indicate that DCA should identify what it intends to contribute to such partnerships, review regularly and also ensure that this contribution is included in the reporting to funders.

2.4.8 DCA in relation to UN Clusters and the CAP process.
In South Sudan DCA is an active member of both the Protection and Food Security clusters, as well as Security Cluster, Peace and Reconciliation and some sub-clusters. The Protection cluster in Juba used to be under-resourced, but it has recently become more effective and is now co-chaired between UNHCR and the Programme Coordinator for the Norwegian Refugee Council, which also receives funding from the Danish MFA. DCA plays a positive role in both these clusters and encourages its partners to participate as they can in cluster meetings in Eastern Equatoria and Jonglei states. As noted above, DCA has already received one grant from the UN’s Common Humanitarian Fund for CDS in E. Equatoria: there is currently uncertainty about the exact design and scope of the 2012 CHF as this will be the first year that this pooled fund has operated independently from Khartoum. DCA registers its projects under the UN CAP process, which is an essential first step to receiving any UN funding, as well as being a condition for MFA funding in situations of protracted crisis.
2.4.9 Conclusions

As a humanitarian actor, DCA has a focus on protection, and food security, which is influenced by its partners and their appreciation of local needs. There are advantages in this, as it leaves great flexibility to its staff in regional offices; but it is becoming increasingly important for all humanitarian agencies to show their distinctiveness as compared to the ever increasing number of humanitarian actors: for instance there are an estimated 180 NGOs currently working in Juba, though not all of these will be involved in humanitarian operations. Neither the 2008 Humanitarian Assistance Programme Policy nor the draft regional strategy for the Juba Regional Office (October 2011) are very clear about what is DCA’s “distinctive offer” as a humanitarian player beyond its strong commitment to working through local partners.

While in broad terms DCA existing humanitarian strategy is still relevant, a number of areas require review:
- The extent to which DCA plans to work through the ACT Alliance in future humanitarian operations; and if so how it will ensure sufficiently high standards of monitoring and reporting to satisfy the MFA;
- Whether or not DCA needs to increase its focus on any particular aspect of humanitarian work beyond its current relatively broad focus on food security and protection issues.

In addition it would be very helpful for DCA to review the lessons it has learned in its humanitarian operations, especially those in protracted crises in the last six years and ensure that any revised strategy reflects these lessons.

In the context of South Sudan and NW Kenya the major advantages of a multi-year HFA would be to:
- Provide greater security to DCA and partners about future funding streams and enable more strategic planning and outcome monitoring. This is consistent with the good practice recommended by the Good Humanitarian Donorship Consortium that donors should ‘explore the possibility of reducing, or enhancing the flexibility of, earmarking, and of introducing longer-term funding arrangements’.
- Increase efficiency and effectiveness in implementation. Many parts of South Sudan are inaccessible in the rainy season (from June-November): if funding is delayed, this in turn slows down construction projects.
- Use staff time more effectively for strategy rather than annual application to MFA in the last quarter of each calendar year.

Recommendations for Humanitarian Assistance

During 2012 DCA plans to review and update its 2008 Humanitarian Assistance Programme Policy and linked policies on food security. The new strategy should aim to integrate both the ROI and Humanitarian Mine Action Programmes and identify DCA’s future niche as well as spell out how it will operate along the broader continuum of emergency-recovery-development.

A future humanitarian partnership agreement between DCA and MFA should include agreement on:

- priority countries and regions facing protracted crises in which DCA should focus in future with MFA’s support: we do not specify the exact number of countries to be

---

covered by this agreement as this was not discussed during this review and will depend on the levels of funding DCA can access from other donors.

- For each of these countries/regions, the funding to DCA from the MFA should be based on a Three year (country/region) strategy, with a results framework, indicating its programme goals and how these will be achieved, and how exactly DCA intends to work with the ACT Alliance in these countries.

- This results framework should include some simple “benchmarks” by which the implementation of these strategies can be assessed and which will be mentioned in reporting to the MFA.

### 3. Conclusion and key areas for improvement

DCA is a large organisation that has focused on implementing policies and improving its systems in recent years, aiming to maintain unity while working through decentralised approaches, partnerships and driving a greater position on the world stage for the ACT Alliance. Although financial growth is generally positive it has not reached the hoped-for levels. In this context DCA is seen to be managing well. They have pursued opportunities via ACT to share offices and in some cases joint programmes, and have revised some implementation strategies (OD for partners) to avoid raising expectations which cannot be met. As DCA proceeds with a new global strategy it is important for them to articulate what is the difference DCA really wants to make. This should also be reflected in strategies that show what distinct offer DCA is making to humanitarian and development actions.

The current climate amongst multi-lateral and bi-lateral donors is to encourage organisations to be clear about the changes they want to see and articulate this with a clear results framework. DCA has a plan to improve their organisational capacity to capture and report on results. For this to be successful partner capacity must be improved. Future Global Reports should improve the presentation of outcomes and impacts in their presentation against targets.

It is important for organisations to revisit their policies and reflect on practice and move forward on the basis of improving clarity about what can be done and what it is likely to achieve. DCA’s feedback that new policies for Humanitarian Assistance, Partnership, Food Security and Political Space will be developed in the period 2012-13 is endorsed.

When developing policies it can be tempting to make them as broad as possible, both to allow a response to all contexts and to attract donors. However such an approach leaves organisations a little vulnerable as they do not have a niche in which they can invest, specialise and add value. The existing Humanitarian policy has been useful to DCA but is in need of review, as stated above; a lot has changed in the field of humanitarian work, in particular in relation to linking longer term solutions. In any global organisation the reality is potential drift between practice and policy in implementation. This is already happening with DCA’s partnership policy. Whilst this can be seen to be responsive to changing environment, it also reduces transparency and accountability on delivering policies.

Decentralisation has made already complex channels of communication less clear and this is evident in some of the DCA and MFA communication. Although it might be easy for DCA to
comply with the stricter demands of EU funds, DCA’s more informal communication with MFA is critical and more attention is necessary both in Denmark and overseas.

In this context the recommendations below are intended to help guide both DCA and MFA discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanitarian Assistance recommendations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This review endorses DCA’s plan to review and update its Humanitarian and Food Security Policies in 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During this process it will be important to include agreements on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint definition by DCA and MFA on the priority countries and regions facing protracted crises, in which DCA should focus in future with MFA’s support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For each of these countries/regions, the funding to DCA from the MFA should be based on a three-year (country/region) strategy, with a results framework, indicating its programme goals and how these will be achieved, and how exactly DCA intends to work with the ACT Alliance in these countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These results frameworks should include some simple “benchmarks” by which the implementation of these strategies can be assessed and which will be mentioned in reporting to the MFA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Communication with MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA and DCA should agree milestones and formats for following up mutual agreements to improve accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally communication needs to be improved between MFA and DCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Decentralisation and programme approach</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current approach suggests that countries are the main unit of analysis and intervention for DCA and partners. As efforts continue to increase local decision making it is likely that programmes should be based on management discretion to set priorities and develop a programme profile according to country-level needs assessments and strategic dialogue with relevant stakeholders, rather than requiring countries to cover all five themes. In this context:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DCA could consider reviewing current approaches and management systems in regard to its global thematic programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Overall the M&E system needs to be made to work holistically.

To achieve this it is recommended that:
- Existing programme monitoring systems are more clearly integrated into the Vision & Plan reporting system.
- DCA should consider how to improve the use of financial reporting to enhance efficiency across the organisation.
- Broadly the organisation should begin to put in place tools for measuring performance; using targets, indicators and milestones more clearly on policy operationalisation and programme strategies. 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).

5. Financial Management

5 a) Overall it is recommended that DCA improve their use and analysis of financial information and link this to programmes wherever possible.

5 b) 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 and MFA standards

5 c) Performance audits
In the context of framework agreements the use of local performance audits could be reduced.\(^{29}\)

5 d) Dealing with anomalies:
Depersonalising and reinforcing training would be helped by public notices explaining what to do in cases of suspicion of fraud or abuse. Detailing what to do and who to talk to.
Financial risk and solidity analysis should be integrated in standardised Partner profile.

5 e) Time registration
The comparative advantages and disadvantages must be discussed in the negotiation between MFA and DCA and a reasonable solution found.

\(^{29}\) Framework organisations could, in be exempted from local performance audits as these organisations are under closer supervision by Danida compared to other organisations receiving single grants.
6. **Partnership**

6 a) DCA should develop a new partnership policy.

A key principle is the need to show transparently that partners may (or may not) graduate through different types of relationships with DCA. DCA can be guided by the recommendations from 2009 Added Value Evaluation as the key areas identified remain relevant:

The revised policy should show how DCA:
- Defines the purpose of partnerships
- Categorises 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.

6b) Regional Representative should agree and report on targets for their partner portfolio and develop country or regional strategies for development. DCA HQ should review this from a global perspective.

6c) 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.

6d) In ROI, DCA could support improvements in LWF understanding of community development approaches, how to use RBA in community work with host communities and capacity building of partners. To initiate this, DCA may find it appropriate to pilot with one or two programmes and then use learning to set up an organisational approach.

6e) 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.

7. **Capacity building recommendations**

7 a) To function as an effective capacity building partner DCA must: Define the aim(s) of their capacity building work for different types of relationships
Develop a menu of capacity building: from training through to organisational and system development

Carry out regular reviews of partner capacity changes and needs assessments.
7b) In relation to general areas where more capacity development is required by partners are:
Capacity for outcome and impact monitoring and reporting
Continuous cycle of financial management support.

8. **ACT Alliance recommendations**

On the basis of recent experiences in Juba, DCA needs to 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 operations.
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Thematic Review and Capacity Assessment of DanChurchAid
with a special focus on
Partnerships in Development and Humanitarian Assistance

Background
In accordance with the Strategy for Danish Support to Civil Society in Developing Countries thematic reviews of the framework organisations will be undertaken to enhance the professional dialogue between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and these organisations. The last thematic review of DanChurchAid (DCA) was undertaken in 2006. As reflected in the Civil Society Strategy there are new challenges for civil society actors in terms of the aid effectiveness agenda including greater emphasis on results-orientation and documentation, tendencies to restricted space for operation in a number of countries, and interventions in fragile states and situations to mention a few. Danish civil society organisations increasingly operate in new ways with international and within global networks and alliances to achieve better programme cooperation, division of labour and harmonisation of interventions. It is in this context that the theme of Partnerships has been chosen for the thematic review of SCD which will also incorporate the humanitarian portfolio of the organisation as described below.

While all working with development cooperation, some of the framework organisations also implement humanitarian activities in accordance with the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action (2010-2015). With the humanitarian strategy MFA has initiated a process of strengthening Danish humanitarian support by revisiting, consolidating and focussing priorities, modalities and partnerships. In this context MFA has introduced the objective of establishing strategic partnerships with selected partners, including UN organisations, international organisations, and experienced and effective NGOs. The overall aim is to give implementing partners higher funding predictability and operational flexibility in exchange for better planning and clear performance targets against the priorities of the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action, as well as allowing for a stronger focus on quality and delivery from partners. Further, it is anticipated that the revision of the Humanitarian Strategy, particularly the introduction of strategic partnerships, will decrease transaction costs for MFA, thereby also addressing potential capacity challenges for the Ministry by reducing the overall number of partnerships.

A considerable portion of Danish Humanitarian Funding is allocated towards long-term humanitarian operations in protracted emergencies and crises. Concurrent with the introduction of strategic partnerships, Danida is also in the process of developing a more clearly defined geographical prioritisation of such protracted emergencies and crises. This will result in direct Danish funding of humanitarian action in protracted crises becoming focused on much fewer countries compared to previous practice. Further, a more coherent approach to choice of sectors, clusters and thematic interventions will be introduced.
In accordance with the humanitarian strategy, partners are selected primarily based on their adherence to humanitarian standards and codes of conduct, their ability to reach and engage vulnerable beneficiaries in all phases of their activities, past performance, cost effectiveness as well as their strategic position in the global humanitarian system, in a specific thematic field or in a particular geographic area.

The strategic partnerships are guided by Partnership Framework Agreements (PFAs). So far, partnerships have been initiated with UNICEF, UNFPA, the Danish Refugee Council and the Danish Red Cross. Similar arrangements are currently being negotiated with DanChurchAid and Save the Children (Denmark). In the case of the Danish NGOs, the agreements are accompanied by in-depth assessment of their capacity for programme management and their relevance vis-a-vis the Humanitarian Strategy in order to ascertain their eligibility as partners.

Partnerships in general have been selected as the theme for this review. The theme will serve as a focus for the assessment and a way of concretising DCA’s capacity as a development and humanitarian actor. Similarly, the field study is not intended to provide a complete picture of how DCA works with partnerships in development and humanitarian assistance. Rather it will serve as an example allowing for a more in-depth study of selected DCA activities in practice, and providing an opportunity to look into issues such as the management tools, financial instruments and quality assurance.

a. Presentation of the organisation
DanChurchAid 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 2010 of around DKK 530 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. Together, they make up one of the world’s five largest NGOs. 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.

As for development activities, 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 115 million per year. The development activities under the framework agreement are currently mainly concentrated in nine so-called focus countries. South Sudan is one of those focus countries. Other active grants financed by development funds are five grants for the NGO Pool for Innovative Initiatives for Women in Africa and against HIV and AIDS, as well as a minor governance project.

As for humanitarian grants, DanChurchAid is receiving on an annual basis the following grants:

- DKK 10 million to respond quickly to emergency humanitarian crises
- Between 50 to 70 million for emergency and protracted crises based on appeals and concept notes and the Regions of Origin programme

DCA is currently negotiating a humanitarian partnership agreement with MFA.

b. Partnerships according to DCA
“Very important and decisive during the next years will be the development of our international alliance: the ACT Alliance. It is evident that several problems (and crises) are global and best handled by global organisations and means; that international advocacy is necessary in order to fight poverty and done most effectively through international alliances; and there is increasing demands for efficiency and harmonization in development aid.” (Extract from DCA framework application submitted in September 2009).

Another extract from DCA’s 2009 submission of application: “The third important challenge to DanChurchAid’s international work is to develop and strengthen our collaboration with partner organisations in the south. As stated it is decisive to strengthen our and our partners’ accountability towards the target groups among the world’s poorest and most marginalised people. The fact that we have been certified by Humanitarian Accountability Partnership means that we have come a long way – also compared to our sister organisations – but there are still important challenges to work with purposely in the years to come.

Add to this a need for new model for collaboration in the light of demands for harmonization and accountability. Together with a number of our core partners we must head toward new phases of the partnership and find new partner models – budget support and partner contracts – which can increase efficiency, the local accountability and commitment and effectiveness of the work. As stated in the evaluation of our added value in the partner collaboration we must move towards new and strategic partnerships. Simultaneously we must strengthen capacity building of our partners both regarding rights based development and in professional, financial and administrative areas. We must make ourselves useful and indispensable in a world in which the partners in South increasingly apply for global aid assistance themselves and develop their own national fundraising initiative. Once again an increased professional capacity is required.

With the creation of the ACT Alliance we will meet new challenges in creating the right balance between church based organisations and other organisations (some secular and some with point of departure in other religious communities). Here we may experience tensions between the attempt to carry through professionally strong programmes and the wish for strengthened cooperation with church based organisations. On the other hand, a strengthened cooperation with the church based organisations is precisely one of our most comparative advantages. The future will offer new kinds of partnerships as well. Not least with private enterprises in both South and North. They may be strategic innovation cooperation, market based solutions, micro-finance and lots of other private – public cooperation.”

c. Conclusions from Thematic Review 2006

A capacity assessment (development) of DCA was carried out in 2000, and a thematic review (development) in 2002/2003 focusing on the operationalisation of DCA policies especially with regard to the rights based approach. The latest thematic review (development) of DCA in 2006 focused on organizational decentralisation and HIV and AIDS with a field study in Zambia. The main recommendations and the follow-up from DCA can be seen in the Reference Documents.

Objectives

The general objectives of the thematic review are to:

Provide MFA with an assessment of DCA’s follow-up of the recommendations from the latest reviews and annual negotiations.

Analyse and assess the organisation’s performance in relation to the themes chosen for the thematic review with special focus on documentation of results and capacity of DCA to implement key areas within their international assistance.
Provide an input to preparation of a Partnership Agreement in the humanitarian field. Provide a basis for a mutual dialogue and learning process for DCA and MFA.

Outputs
An inception report, incl. specification of TOR for the field trip.
A debriefing report, not exceeding 4 pages excluding annexes.
A review report, not exceeding 25 pages, excluding annexes.

Scope of Work
The review will consist of a desk study, consultations with DCA and MFA headquarters in Copenhagen, field visits to South Sudan and North Western Kenya, and debriefing meetings at field and headquarter level. It should be noted that adjustments to the scope of work can take place based on discussions following an inception note from the consultants.

As for the overall organisational capacity the review will include, but not necessarily be limited to, assessment of the following dimensions – in relation to development as well as humanitarian assistance:
The adequacy of the organisational structure, available human resources and management systems seen in relation to the totality of activities to be performed in general and in relation to the management of the framework agreement with MFA and humanitarian funding from MFA in particular.
The adequacy and quality of general financial management systems and processes (e.g. budgeting, monitoring, accounting and reporting).

  The reporting and accounting set-up at headquarters and in the field, related to MFAs' requirements. The relevance and usefulness of the local performance audits produced according to MFA guidelines based on the findings from both headquarter study and field visits.

Quality and availability of policies and procedures for actions in case of anomalies or suspected abuse of funds shall be assessed, including analysis and assessment of actual handling of such situations. The time registration system applied at headquarter and fields.

evaluation system, including quality, timeliness and ability to follow-up on reviews and evaluations and feedback information/results back through the organisation. Systematisation of experience and lessons learnt in the form of good practices, policy papers, guidelines, etc. Use of M&E-derived information in advocacy and capacity building of partners.
The relevance and use of indicators (impact and outcome) and documentation of results and processes.

Operationalisation of good practices and the approach to and dialogue with partners in this regard.

Use of good practices in advocacy, including forming and influencing national and international policies and strategies.

Coordination and collaboration with other donors and peer organisations (NGOs, bilateral and multilateral agencies) internationally, in DK and in programme countries.

Competence development of staff, both at headquarter and regional offices.
As for the assessment in relation to **partnerships**, the review will include, but not necessarily be limited to, analyses of the following dimensions – in relation to development as well as humanitarian assistance:

- Assessment of ACT’s policy framework and management structure under implementation.
- Assessment of the role of DCA in this new architecture.
- Assessment of DCA’s advocacy among ACT partners for DCA and Danish development policies and best practices.
- Assessment of 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.
- Assessment of the extent to which ACT partners undertake joint interventions.
- Assessment of DCA’s Partnership Policy and its overall implementation.
- Assessment of screening and selection of local partners.
- Assessment of the degree to which DCA and local partners work out individual implementation plans for partnership development, capacity strengthening, financial and organisational sustainability.
- Assessment of DCA’s use of exit strategies for partnerships in the field.

As for the assessment in relation to **Humanitarian Assistance**, the review will include, but not necessarily be limited to, analyses of the following dimensions:

- Assessment of the coherence and relevance of the organization’s strategic frame to that of the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action, for instance:
  - Adherence to the guiding principles for Humanitarian Action
  - Ability to reach vulnerable people
  - Ability to reach people affected by crisis
  - Focus on protection
  - Ability to contribute to bridging the gap between relief and development
  - Relevance and willingness to administer funds from other humanitarian budgets e.g. pooled humanitarian funds under the Strategy for Danish Humanitarian Action.
  - Assessment of the coherence and relevance of the organization’s strategic frame to that of the Strategic Framework for the Regions of Origin Initiative.
  - Assessment of the coherence and relevance of the organization’s strategic frame with objectives and priorities of Denmark’s for protracted emergencies in priority countries (i.e. Afghanistan, Pakistan, Ethiopia, Burma/Thailand, Gaza/the West Bank, Somalia and Sudan) for instance:
    - Adherence to geographic priorities,
    - Adherence to sector priorities
    - Adherence to thematic priorities
    - Ability to contribute to strategic and operational analysis and planning within MFA
  - Assessment of relation to UN cluster coordination approaches and consolidated appeal systems
  - Application of formal quality certification systems (HAP, ECHO and others) and their usefulness.

**Method of Work**

A desk study will analyse key documents related to organisation, strategy, management systems and country programme for South Sudan. Based on that, the team will – in the inception report - finalise a description of the approach and methodology related to the field study. The field study will be carried out as a way of assessing in practice how the
methodological issues, policies and strategies have been implemented. A financial inspection will also be included. Following the field study, debriefing meetings will be held at country level and in Copenhagen.

The approach will include:
The team will review relevant documents, and meet and interview core staff, partners and governing bodies.
The team should work with DCA and MFA in the process of discussing and analysing the selected theme and outline the methodology and time schedule for the field study which will include field visits to South Sudan and North Western Kenya.
The team will debrief at country level with DCA country teams and key stakeholders, relevant government representatives and other partners, and in Copenhagen with DCA management and MFA.
The team will present and discuss their draft findings and conclusions related to partnership, humanitarian assistance and financial/organisational management at a workshop with participation from DCA and MFA after the field trips.

The thematic review should be undertaken in a way that ensures a continuous dialogue during the process. A representative from DCA may participate in the field visits as a resource person.

Consultants
The organisation of the team’s work should be specified and explained clearly in the tender.

In connection with the tender evaluation, each proposed team member apart from the team leader will be given a weight in proportion to the duration of the proposed input. Therefore, a personnel assignment chart must be included in the technical tender with a clear indication of amount of person months/weeks proposed allocated to each specialist.

The review team shall consist of a team leader for three expert team members.

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. The team leader is responsible for the team’s reporting to and communication with MFA (HUC), and for the organisation of the work of the team.

Areas of competencies required by the review team as a whole include organisational capacity analysis, incl. financial and human resource management issues, as well as extensive experience regarding development and humanitarian assistance. The team must have a knowledge of relevant Danish strategies and aid modalities, incl. the Strategy for Danish Support to Civil Society and the Humanitarian Strategy. At least one team member must be fluent in Danish in order to access all relevant documentation.

More specifically, the team should cover the following competencies (where nothing else is specified at least three references should be given):

Qualifications of the team leader:
General experience:
Relevant higher academic degree, preferably in social or political science
A profile with major emphasis on either a) development issues or b) humanitarian aid with preferably 15 years or more of relevant professional experience from development cooperation
At least three references as team leader for multi-disciplinary teams
Specific experience:
Excessive experience in assessments of development and humanitarian assistance (minimum five references)
Proven capacity to lead, plan and report on similar complex assignments (SM)
Solid experience with capacity analysis, incl. institutional and management issues
Good knowledge of development policies and strategies, including those relating to the Danish Civil Society Strategy and partnership issues and/or of humanitarian assistance, including good donorship principles, vulnerability, protection, UN appeal and cluster system, disaster management, protracted crises, early recovery, demining etc.
Work experience in the area of civil society and/or humanitarian assistance. (This might include review/evaluation work, providing technical support, or working with implementation).
Experience from the region and language:
Working experience from the Horn of Africa
Fluency in English

Qualifications of the team members (to be covered by one or both of the proposed team members and/or the team leader):
General experience:
Relevant higher academic degree
A profile with major emphasis on either a) development issues, or b) humanitarian aid, or c) financial management (or a combination of these three areas).
A minimum of 10 years of relevant professional experience from development cooperation

Specific experience:
Good knowledge of Danish and relevant international development and humanitarian policies, strategies and support modalities, in particular relating to humanitarian assistance, civil society and partnerships
Good knowledge of capacity building issues, incl. institutional analysis and management
Solid accounting and financial management experience
Experience from the region and language:
Working experience from the Horn of Africa
Fluency in English

Timeframe
The overall time schedule for the assignment is:
Preparation and HQ study: Mid October 2011
Field study: End October – Mid November 2011
Debriefing and Workshop: End November 2011

Background documentation
Reference is made to the latest Thematic Review Report is from 2006. Other background documentation may be found on DCA and MFA web pages or requested by the consultants as needed.

**Annex II Finance Supplement**
Introduction to DCA Finances
DCA is one of the larger Danish NGOs supporting with development and humanitarian aid. In 2010 DCA for the first time passed a total income of more than DKK 500 million, in total DKK 527 mio. This level of income is budgeted to continue in 2011, similarly with DKK 527 mio. The total income from 2007 to 2010 was targeted to increase by 37% and despite the financial crises an increase of 25% was achieved. Despite the achievement, DCA has reconsidered the targets of 2012 and is adjusting downwards. The budget for 2012 is not publicised yet, but income is lower compared to the targets set in 2006. The private donations have remained more or less constant in recent years and not grown, as targeted. This is further detailed below-Appendix, Table 1 and 2.

The DCA expenditure has over the last 4 years had 40% for Development support and 39% for Humanitarian support, information and fundraising of 9% and Secretariat and other cost at 12% of total expenditure, see details in Table 3. Geographically DCA’s average support in 2009 and 2010 per continent has the relatively largest share to Africa, 55% of all humanitarian support, incl. mine actions, 39% of all development support. This is followed by Asia with the similar figures of 25% and 27%, as shown in detailed below Table 4.

In 2006 the target was set to of keep DCA’s administrative costs below 10%. This target has been achieved up to now and 9,8% is budgeted for 2011, detailed in Table 5.

Of the total DCA income in 2007 - 2010, an average of 42% was from Danida. In 2011 the Danida support to DCA is expected to drop to 187mil from DKK 211-215 mil in 2009-10. The average support from Danida has over the last 10 years been DKK 184 million per year. Over the last 10 years, the average humanitarian element has been 33%. This is further detailed in FM-Appendix, Table 6 and with the split in MFA votes in Table 7.

DCA is financially sound and in total has its own capital of approximately DKK 46 million as at end of 2010. This was after an operational deficit of DKK 2 million in 2010. DCAs reserves and capital base is assessed adequate to ensure DCA the necessary financial weight to handle the increased volume of support without cash-flow challenges.

Supplementary Information:
DCA funding base
DCA has managed to diversify its funding base, as detailed below, and the private funding amounts on average one third of funding in recent years:

Table 1, DCA income 2007-10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCA income details:</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Avg. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danida, as per DCA accounts</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU funding</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Internat. Donors</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private funding etc.</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income, mio DKK</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The latest revised budget for 2011 has a total income similar to 2010 but with less Danida funds than in 2010 while there are more from EU sources.

---

30 Latest Budget Revision figures for 2011.
DCA’s targets set in 2006 of reaching a total income of DKK 700 million by 2012 is likely to be postponed to 2015. The actual progress in terms of increasing total income is still impressive as shown in below.

Table 2, DCA target of 2006 compared to actual income 2007-10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income, 2007-12 budgeted</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Income</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation:</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For DCA, it was difficult to budget when income fluctuations happened as part of the world-wide financial crises. This had a negative impact on DCA similar to its sister organisations. The fluctuations meant that late 2009 when DCA was revising its forecasts, the income was budgeted to fall to a level of DKK 487 mio. DCA did succeed in improving its income for 2010 but the general trend is reduced un-earmarked funds. The un-earmarked funds are crucial for DCA as it allows the organisation to handle support and expenses beyond what donors are willing to fund. The decentralisation process is one of the areas where expenses were higher than expected.

How DCA uses its funds:

In terms of overall expenditure, development support is the highest, directly followed by humanitarian support if this includes the mine action projects. In total the two types of support account for almost 80% in average, as detailed below:

Table 3, DCA’s total support and cost 2007-10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure details</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Avg. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns, Fundraising</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat cost and others</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure, mio DKK</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result for the year</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The revised 2011 total budget is in line with 2010. In 2012 DCA budgets for increased development support, to a total of DKK 239 mio, and similarly decreased humanitarian support.

Areas of Support:

Africa receives the largest share of DCA support. Averagely in last two years, Africa accounts for 55% of humanitarian, including mine action projects, and 39% of development funds, as detailed below:

Table 4, Total DCA Support allocated geographically and by type 2009-10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCA Support details:</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Humanitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---


35 From above 5.
Support costs:
DCA’s target of keeping the administrative cost below 10% has been achieved throughout the last 5 years, despite 2009 being close. With a revised budget of 9.8%, the expectation is that it will remain on target for 2011.

Table 5: Comparative trend on DCA’s Administrative Cost 2006-10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Avg. %</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Avg. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>9,69%</td>
<td>9,96%</td>
<td>8,50%</td>
<td>8,70%</td>
<td>9,40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Danida support to DCA
This table is based on MFA disbursement figures, it shows some fluctuations over the last 10 years, as detailed below:

Table 6: MFA disbursement to DCA in types of support over the last 10 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development support</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian support</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Danida support</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% development</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% humanitarian</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above information can be supplemented to show the funds from which MFA allocates support. The Framework Agreement is by far the largest.

Table 7: MFA disbursement to DCA according to Votes over the last 10 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06.11 The Danish Foreign Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.32 Bilateral Assistance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.33 Via Private Organisations (NGOs)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.38 Multilat. Ass. Other Initiatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.39 Humanitarian Assistance</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MFA to DCA</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To avoid misunderstandings: The disbursement per year from MFA may vary compared to DCA’s figures for the same year. This is due to differences in accounting principles between DCA and the MFA.

Finance department structure:
DCA HQ financial management changed from one unit to two units in 2006, when a group of financial controllers formed a new Programme Finance Unit (PFU). The idea was for the PFU to use a more holistic approach, following the projects from start to end. In Mid 2011 the secretariat was separated into two units, one for Human Resources and General Secretariat and one for Finance and Administration headed by a new Director of Finance. Currently the Financial management is in the process of strengthening the teamwork by establishing three teams: Africa, Asia and the rest of the World. The emphasis on more flexible teams is expected to simplify communication between Head Office and Regional Offices and at the same time increase efficiency and quality of work.

Organisational development is supported by capacity development at Head Office and in the Regional and Country Offices. One aspect of the capacity building is to have two locally based regional finance officers working as a pilot for two to six months in Head Office Finance. The aim is that such officers will be in a better position to support their regional colleagues and to provide information and knowledge from the regions to Head office.

In addition to the above, Regional and Country offices have been upgraded in terms of financial management capacity. In relation to finance, the decentralisation process has resulted in almost all daily administrative project issues being handled by locally employed finance officers in the Regional Offices. They deal with project planning, project implementation and closure of projects as well as accounting of the Regional Office. They are supported and quality assured by Financial Coordinators in PFU and controllers from DCA Finance, working within a specified geographical area.

The RT supports the on-going efforts towards a more teamwork-oriented mode of work in finance.

Finance systems
The accounting aspects of Maconomy are well developed and working well. The aim for future improvements is to acquire a Human Resource module in 2012 and a logistics module in 2013. The planning and budgeting process includes an anchor budget, a revised budget and an annual prognosis. The anchor budget is completed in September-November for the following calendar year. This is followed by a revised budget developed in April-June. Late November the annual prognosis is worked out and presented to the Board.

Reporting is done monthly with a finance report to the Treasurer and the Chairperson of the Board. From 2012 it is planned to have a quarterly consolidated report to all Board Members and to introduce rolling budgets. The RT supports these improvement, as indicated in the recommendations.

Examples of key indicators and ratios used to illustrate variances.

The below table focus on Programme cost in relation to Regional Office cost in 2009 and in 2010.

The Regional Office variance between 2009 and 2010 is based on an average for South Sudan, Uganda and India:

Table 8, Analysis of variance over time in selected ROs 2009 to 2010:

36 For better comparison, the below figures exclude DCA’s own unmarked funds used for non-eligible time, tables 8 and 9.
ROs in South Sudan, Uganda and India, avg:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009 avg. RO</th>
<th>2010 avg. RO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office running costs, Regional and Country Office</td>
<td>1.003.683 28%</td>
<td>1.028.210 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and Regional staff costs</td>
<td>1.163.182 33%</td>
<td>1.841.015 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expat staff costs</td>
<td>1.367.400 39%</td>
<td>1.689.553 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total office and salary costs RO</td>
<td>3.534.264 100%</td>
<td>4.558.779 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Project Support, ex. Elig. time &amp; adm.</td>
<td>30.597.905 86%</td>
<td>32.621.411 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Time RO based staff</td>
<td>1.993.572 6% 2%</td>
<td>2.889.453 8% 484.129 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Time non RO based staff</td>
<td>573.782 2% 0%</td>
<td>484.129 1% 68.268 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Time not split between HQ and RO</td>
<td>68.268 0% 38%</td>
<td>136.924 0% 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Expenses ex. adm.</td>
<td>33.233.527 100%</td>
<td>36.131.916 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Fee</td>
<td>2.179.291 6%</td>
<td>2.329.888 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Expenses incl. adm.</td>
<td>35.412.817 100%</td>
<td>38.461.804 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Time RO based staff</td>
<td>1.993.572 79%</td>
<td>2.889.453 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary not covered by eligible time</td>
<td>537.009 21%</td>
<td>641.116 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary costs RO (local+regional+expat)</td>
<td>2.530.581 100%</td>
<td>3.530.568 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Salary Costs RO</td>
<td>3.534.264 100%</td>
<td>4.558.779 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Project Support, ex. Elig. time &amp; adm.</td>
<td>30.597.905 90% 90%</td>
<td>32.621.411 88% 88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total turnover ex. eligible time and adm.</td>
<td>34.132.169 100% 100%</td>
<td>37.180.189 100% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Salary Costs RO</td>
<td>3.534.264 100%</td>
<td>4.558.779 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Time RO based staff</td>
<td>-1.993.572 -56%</td>
<td>-2.889.453 -63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net office cost</td>
<td>1.540.692 44%</td>
<td>1.669.326 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income via Administration Fee</td>
<td>2.179.291 100%</td>
<td>2.329.888 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net office costs</td>
<td>-1.540.692 -71%</td>
<td>-1.669.326 -72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration fee left for HQ</td>
<td>638.599 29%</td>
<td>660.562 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio: Project exp./Regio. Setup</td>
<td>9,4 7,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio: Proj.Exp./Net Reg. Setup</td>
<td>21,6 21,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To illustrate the ratio calculation in Tables 8 and 9, the same colours are used: Yellow for Total Project Expenses (without any administration cost) in DKK per DKK used for Office and Salary Cost in the RO. This means that for every 9,4 DKK spent on projects, 1 DKK has been spent in administration for 2009 and in 2010 the project expenses was fallen to 7,9 DKK for every DKK spent on office administration.
Green is used for the similar figures but now with Net administrative cost. Here the cost involved for eligible time performed by RO based staff is deducted in the ROs’ administrative cost. Thus referring to net administrative cost in relation to amount of total project expenses. When taking the eligible time of RO based staff into consideration, the total Project Expenses (without any administration cost) in DKK per DKK used for net Office and Salary Cost in the RO the ratio is constant from 2009 to 2010, DKK 21.6.

This means that for every one DKK spent on net office administration, 21.6 DKK has been spent on projects. The devolution of capacity to ROs has enabled RO based staff to contribute more eligible time and thereby maintaining the net administrative cost on projects in 2009 and 2010.

Table 9, Analysis of variance in selected ROs with average figures from 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Offices, avg. 2009 and 10</th>
<th>RO South Sudan</th>
<th>RO Uganda</th>
<th>RO India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DKK ‘(1000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office running costs, RO and Country Office</td>
<td>1.104 27%</td>
<td>699 18%</td>
<td>1.245 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and Regional staff costs</td>
<td>1.585 38%</td>
<td>1.307 34%</td>
<td>1.615 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expat staff costs</td>
<td>1.422 35%</td>
<td>1.841 48%</td>
<td>1.323 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total office and salary costs Sudan</td>
<td>4.111 100%</td>
<td>3.846 100%</td>
<td>4.183 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Direct Project Supp., ex. Elig. time & adm. | 29.479 86% | 25.178 84% | 41.369 86% |
| Eligible Time RO based staff              | 2.496 7%    | 2.335 8%   | 2.756 6%   |
| Eligible Time non RO based staff          | 483 1%      | 468 1,60%  | 595 1%     |
| Eligible Time, not split between HQ and RO | 16 1%    | 44 1%      | 253 1%     |
| Total Project Expenses RO ex. adm.        | 31.051 100% | 28.024 100% | 44.974 100% |
| Administration Fee                        | 1.777 5%    | 1.920 6%   | 3.067 6%   |
| Total Project Expenses RO incl. adm.      | 32.827 100% | 29.943 100% | 48.042 100% |

| Eligible Time RO based staff              | 2.234 74%    | 2.335 74%  | 2.756 94%  |
| Salary not covered by eligible time       | 773 26%      | 813 26%    | 182 6%     |
| Salary costs RO (local+regional+expat)    | 3.006 100%   | 3.147 100% | 2.938 100% |
| Office and Salary Costs RO                | 4.111 13%    | 3.846 13%  | 4.183 9%   |
| Direct Project Supp., ex. Elig.Time & Adm. | 28.283 87%  | 25.178 87% | 41.369 91% |
| Total turnover ex. eligible time, adm.    | 32.393 100% | 29.024 100% | 45.552 100% |

| Office and Salary RO Costs                | 4.111 100%   | 3.846 100% | 4.183 100% |
| Eligible Time RO based staff              | -2.234 -54%  | -2.335 -61% | -2.756 -66% |
| Net office cost                           | 1.877 46%    | 1.512 39%  | 1.426 34%  |
| Income via Administration Fee             | 1.777        | 1.920      | 3.067      |
| Net office costs                          | -1.877       | -1.512     | -1.426     |
| Administration fee left for HQ            | 100          | 408        | 1.641      |

**Ratio**: Project exp./Regio. Setup

|                |    7.55 |    7.29 |    10.75 |
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In general, several years of data are required to show a trend when using ratios to analyse cost and relative performance or variance in efficiency. This will be possible after having used the Maconomy system over more than two years, as the longer period will make trends in ratios more visible.

In Table 9, the difference in ability to disburse Project support by RO cost is significant. Likewise Table 9 shows the huge gap between the selected ROs in allowing DCA Head Office to remain part of the Administrative Fee.

The value of ratios, as exemplified above, show the value of linking and analysing different data in the Maconomy system, here: time, areas of work, eligible hours and cost. To ensure continuous improvement of DCAs financial management, other ratios and key-figures can similarly be analysed and refined from the DCA system.

South Sudan Regional Office visit.
In the Regional Office in Juba, regular financial monitoring and follow up by DCA Head Office takes place. This is seen in a Travel Report of August 2011 which included suggestions on ways to increase efficiency by developing a better division of labour in the Regional Finance Team, with more training in Maconomy and more emphasis on quality assurance and teamwork. These efforts were being implementation during the visit.

The accounting system and procedures are in general adequate but the setup appears vulnerable in times of changes beyond the control of the Finance Team in the Regional Office. South Sudan has introduced a new currency and the introduction of this was foreseen in the above-mentioned Travel Report. However, when carrying out the financial inspection, the Financial Management Consultant was surprised to learn the up to date accounting was awaiting currency arrangements, in connection to the introduction of South Sudan’s own currency by 1st September 2011, in the Maconomy system to be made from DCA Head Office. Likewise the latest bank reconciliation was from end of September 2011. The delays in accounting and reconciling at the Juba office and the delays in proper follow-up from DCA Head Office highlight that procedures are not adequate and should be tightened.

During this visit, most of this had been rectified with all cash bookings and reconciliation of cash holding in the Regional office up to date and verified without registering any problems. The accounting of bank transactions and the bank reconciliation was completed to end of October, also without registering any problems except no final adjustments in Maconomy regarding introduction of the new currency had been done.

The booking of bank transactions had been delayed partly due to staff leave and partly due to the currency adjustments in Maconomy. Staff leave should not delay up to date accounting and control. It is anticipated that the necessary currency changes and subsequent accounting and reconciliation is undertaken at the earliest opportunity. The finance team was working on this as at the end of the RT visit in Juba. DCA has since confirmed that accounts have been brought up to date by the time of completing of this report.

Financial Monitoring Checklist (FMC):
In DCA, FMC is an important internal control tool, which has improved and organised budget follow up and subsequently reduced the workload during annual accounts. The FMC is system checking projects by each budget unit, four times a year. The FMC covers most issues related...
to handling of finances in DCA e.g. follow up on actual against budgets, follow up on time registration correctness, follow up on wrong entries, follow up on project information in Maconomy, etc. According to DCA, the existing tool is planned will be streamlined in 2012 and new components may be added.

Capacity building of finance staff in DCA and within DCA’s partners

The finance staff met in DCA have demonstrated good financial management capacity and dedication to their work. The continuous updating of staff capacity is found positive, both regarding DCA finance staff and indirectly the finance staff working in partner organisations.

Capacity building is on-going in Juba and needs to continue and probably intensified. The Regional Office Programme staff appears to work well with finance staff for the benefit of capacity building and follow up with Partners.

DCA works with many different partners and this requires a wide and complex knowledge on both financial and programmatic issues. The DCA sees capacity building as an important part of DCA’s added value to programme work. For smaller NGOs focus is on the basic issues and for partnerships with larger international NGOs, DCA can add specialized knowledge like procurement training, fund raising, especially re. EU, and training in Sphere Standards.

In selecting partners, DCA is finding it necessary to balance the collaboration with smaller and less strong partners with some more capable partners, like LWF. This approach allows DCA to focus its resources and capacity building on the smaller NGO partners and still uphold a sizable level of programme support.

In the capacity building efforts, DCA strives to encourage interaction and support amongst the partners. E.g. in Uganda one International NGO has done procurement on behalf of a small local NGO in the DCA program. In general DCA’s experience is that the partners in many ways benefit from each other and an added value in the DCA program design is to make this possible.

The local NGOs appreciate the financial management capacity building received from DCA. With the DCA systems and procedures gradually being better integrated in the Regional Offices, more time should be available for supporting the partners’ capacity building. This is positive as some local partners find the DCA systems and procurements rules demanding and difficult to follow. The call for continued training and further support to achieve good financial management in Partner organisations is underscored by external auditors and recognised by the Partners. On the same note it is recognised by the RT that DCA is striving to simplify procurement and other procedures whilst at upgrading its efforts to capacitate the local Partners.

To illustrate the relative size of the partners collaborating with and visited by the RT, the following approximate income was provided by the Partner NGOs met in Juba.

Table 10, Relative size of DCA Partners, and DCA’s importance to them in %:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Partner NGOs:</th>
<th>(DKK 1.000)</th>
<th>2011 Budget:</th>
<th>DCA %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income for Partner A:</td>
<td>3.012</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income for Partner B:</td>
<td>6.207</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income for Partner C:</td>
<td>7.250</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Partner to DCA:</td>
<td>26.033</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above also illustrates the schedule of taking on new partners normally involves starting with DCA only and gradually enabling the local NGO to take in other international partners. Thus gradually reducing the role of DCA and once the NGO has capacity to stand on its own.

It is noted that the local NGO partners feel unsecure about funding would probably benefit from a longer term agreement on funding, based on continued performance according to agreement. This could also strengthen capacity building by promoting longer term plans and more structured efforts by the partners. In relation to performance, the longer term collaboration agreement has to go hand in hand with continued Partner performance in terms of good financial management and reporting. Possibly, the general trend in the DCA Regional Office in Juba concerning longer term collaboration agreements has been too slow in this respect.

The DCA Finance Officer is involved in screening local partners. It appears that NGOS with relevant programmes and knowledge of the area are not strong in financial management. To some extent the need for adequate financial management is in South Sudan is overcome by taking on qualified Kenyan finance staff and by Partners having their finance done by Logistics and Finance Officers based in Nairobi. It is acknowledged that depending on a separate finance office far from the area of operations involves lengthy communication and slow follow-up and most of the local Partners met expect to move the finance functions to their head office in South Sudan.

The transfer of office may for a period hamper the financial management capacity of the Partners, as will the call for South Sudanese Finance staff in the NGOs. On a longer term this is considered advisable for the sustainability of the Partner NGOs, despite the need for further upgrading of local finance staff. Here DCA is likely to play a crucial role.
### Annex II Partnership Supplement

**Summary of DCA response to the Partnership - Any Added Value? Evaluation Report 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Policy outlines vision and ambition of DCA approach to partnership</td>
<td>Acknowledges the key recommendations Partnerships to the next level and A review of partnership policy to be approved by April/May 2010. ACT cooperation will be integral to changes</td>
<td>Several other initiatives have taken place in the International Department of DCA which contribute to improved management but not directly on partnerships as yet: The follow up the findings of the COWI Added Value evaluation on this point has progressed but not in the timeframe described in the report. Policy is the same</td>
<td>Accept that DCA focus has not been specifically on partnerships during this period and a change of International Directors contributed to slowing of process: however overall the findings and recommendations remain relevant to some degree. Some initiatives are happening but dialogue and process for taking partnership to next level is still not clear. Policy review recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Key areas for change</td>
<td></td>
<td>No new policy as yet Sept 2011 management discussion of need of increased management focus on partnership and use of OD guidelines.</td>
<td>Partnerships tend to use renewable cooperation agreements and full partnership agreements are not the norm. No established targets on for number of partnership agreements which DCA would like to meet strategies. It is not clear whether long term partners have or will be involved in the discussion of what next level partnerships might involve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2006 Policy outlines vision and ambition of DCA approach to partnership

- Tallies with D CSS on partners as main implementing agents; partners should participate in international and national networks; efforts to ensure partners secure funding from other sources and in relation to Humanitarian Action Strategy: strategic partners with a focus on increasing vulnerable groups capacity to deal with shocks and climate change

### 5 Key areas for change

- Take partnership to next level through dialogue with partners on what this means for example: Feedback mechanisms/joint monitoring; Partnership and agreements beyond project funding Increased transparency about strategic direction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner portfolio and identity- growth and balance between Christian based and secular organisations to ensure absorption capacity: monitor development and communicate changes: Adopt criteria for partner selection and categorisation</th>
<th>Important and necessary, Development Director to follow up</th>
<th>Regional Representatives do this in relation to programme objectives. Regular monthly discussions with SMT in DCA HQ</th>
<th>The question of portfolio management is done on basis of programmes. This does not fully address issues of categorisation of types of organisations and graduation through a partnership continuum or types of capacity needs and absorption capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building: Tailor made for partners as part of long term capacity building plans</td>
<td>Set up OD task force in 2010 to improve tools and guidelines for OD</td>
<td>Funding challenges in late 2009 resulted in down-scaling of ambition on Organisational Development. Policy was adjusted, and OD guidelines (April 2010) produced, which are in use. HQ guidance is that 1-2 partners in each region should receive focused OD support. DCA India, DCA Palestine, and DCA Sudan are piloting OD processes guidelines and receive support from PPU. OD task force was stopped in Dec. 2009 The coordination with other ACT organisations is happening through joint programming such as Zambia and Cambodia: more on administration and reporting than joint OD</td>
<td>Reasonable adjustment made relative to broad and ambitious commitments to OD. The current pilot, documentation and learning are critical to showing how DCA can deliver appropriate capacity building (in some cases OD) to overall portfolio. The drive and strategy remains a bit unclear – feedback the pilots will be useful to help reflect on the overall approach to capacity building. Shifting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider options for technical capacity building through networks inside and outside DCA</td>
<td>Coordination and alignment with other sister organisations especially ACT. Regional strategies for future ACT coordination to be coordinated by Country coordinators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner advocacy and platforms: primarily platforms are useful for need to establish feedback mechanisms to</td>
<td>Need to establish feedback mechanisms to</td>
<td>Within ACT alliance DCA inputs: &quot;land grabbing&quot; report,</td>
<td>Attempts to increase visibility of advocacy through the ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme implementation with potential to become national advocacy</td>
<td>Increase partner visibility</td>
<td>International advocacy networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More systematic link to national agendas</td>
<td>Encourage best practice shared across partners and beyond.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partners on international advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New international advocacy should build on advocacy goals of partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>report on Shrinking Political Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local to Global Protection project. These projects, involved lengthy documentation, and input from partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May still be true that it is difficult to keep partners updated/aware of the outcome/impact of these campaigns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SK, Sudan advocacy work and G4S advocacy campaign are activities which came about due to DCA partners pushing for immediate action. There may be a clearer feedback mechanism to partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From early 2011 DCA Advocacy Unit (now called Global Advocacy and Strategy Unit - GAS) is based in International Department. This should increase DCA’s partners’ links to DCA/ACT advocacy at DK/International level, including strengthening feedback mechanisms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alliance on the whole as well as other discrete research work such as “shrinking political space” but awareness that the communication and dissemination and use of these pieces of work can still be improved – DCA aware of the potential for agenda and time competition for all the platforms etc at country level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many DCA partners are also actively involved in other advocacy work with each other which does not get reported on by DCA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GR reveal that partner platforms activity focus less on the joint advocacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting of best practice? More strategic approach is likely now that GAS has been established and advocacy is part of International development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Accounting Sheets, Financial Reports

**Date:** Various  
**Author:** DCA Maconomy Printouts

## Travel Reports

**Date:** Various  
**Author:** DCA Finance Staff

## DCA Sudan-Kenya Office Audited Annual Reports

**Date:** Various  
**Author:** PFK Kenya for DCA

## DCA Juba Office Audited Annual Reports

**Date:** Various  
**Author:** PFK Kenya for DCA

## DCA Internal Finance Documents, working descriptions, Partner Profiles and others

**Date:** Various  
**Author:** DCA

## Guidelines and Policy Statements

**Date:** Various  
**Author:** DCA papers

## Audit Instruction and Questionnaire

**Date:** Various  
**Author:** RSM Plus, Danish External Auditors (to Local Auditors)

## Time Registration Manuals and Guidelines

**Date:** Various  
**Author:** DCA for Internal use

## Various Home Page documents, incl. reporting on anomalies and Complaint Reports

**Date:** Various  
**Author:** DCA Home Page for Public use

## Maconomy Manual, International Programmes and Projects

**Date:** 2011  
**Author:** PFU, DCA

## Maconomy Manual, Additional Information, Financial Coordinators HQ

**Date:** March 2011  
**Author:** PFU, DCA

## Accounting Manual for DCA Regional Offices

**Date:** January 2011  
**Author:** DCA

## Procurement Manual, 3rd Edition

**Date:** September 2008  
**Author:** DCA and Rambøll Management
# Annex IV People met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birgitte QvistSørensen</td>
<td>International Director DCA</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrik Stubkjær</td>
<td>General Secretary</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Bo Larsen</td>
<td>Dir of Strategy and Organisation</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Henry</td>
<td>Humanitarian Director</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaus Løkkegaard</td>
<td>Development Director</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anders Hess</td>
<td>Head of Human Resource and,</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitte Krogh</td>
<td>Senior advisor HR</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carsten Trier Høj</td>
<td>ACT coordinator</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ole Brauer</td>
<td>Regional Coordinator</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sudan/Uganda/Malawi,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jørgen Thomsen</td>
<td>Regional Coordinator Asia and</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Rask</td>
<td>Advisor, Rights Based Commitment &amp; Political Space</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Rosenkilde</td>
<td>Advisor Political Space</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steffen Rasmussen</td>
<td>Advisor on Organisational Development and Food Security</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uffe Gjerding,</td>
<td>Head of Global Advocacy and</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard MacCormac</td>
<td>Head of Humanitarian Mine Action</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signe Noermose</td>
<td>HMA project officer</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Skov Hansen</td>
<td>HMA project officer</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilie Bjørnskov</td>
<td>Head of Program Policy Unit</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signe Borker Bjerre</td>
<td>Programme Documentation advisor</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsebeth Gravgaard</td>
<td>Policy Advisor Gender Equality; HIV + AIDS</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Thorup</td>
<td>Director of Finance</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majken Hansen</td>
<td>Head Program Finance Unit</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pia Larsen</td>
<td>Head Finance &amp; Accounts</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anja Villaume</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Søren Rasmussen</td>
<td>Financial Coordinator</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilie Bjørnskov-Johansen</td>
<td>Head of Programme Policy</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maja Gram</td>
<td>Anti-corruption Officer and Financial Coordinator</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grethe Rosenberg Nørgaard</td>
<td>Procurement Officer, Strategy</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pia Birgitte Andersen</td>
<td>Accounts Assistant, Time reg.</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Ringgaard</td>
<td>Adviser Humanitarian Response Unit/Programme Policy Unit</td>
<td>DCA, Head Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCA Staff Overseas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Sekyewa</td>
<td>Uganda Programme Coordinator</td>
<td>DCA RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Kibuku</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>DCA, RO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization/Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adede</td>
<td>Programme Area Facilitator FS</td>
<td>DCA, RO South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Yangi Abina</td>
<td>Programme Area Facilitator Hum</td>
<td>DCA, RO South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uliksh Hasanaj</td>
<td>Security &amp; Proc. Officer</td>
<td>DCA, RO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odak BFR Odak</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
<td>DCA, RO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adede</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>DCA, RO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margret Sunday Badaru</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Adm. Assistant</td>
<td>DCA, RO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rashida Mercy Lumayo</td>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>DCA, RO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Torp Møller</td>
<td>JPO Global Funding</td>
<td>DCA, RO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzamil Sebi Abubakor</td>
<td>Program Area Facilitator</td>
<td>DCA, RO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lujana Alexander</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>CDS, DCA Partner NGO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayelom Merhonnen Adane</td>
<td>Field Coordinator</td>
<td>CDS, DCA Partner NGO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Mugo Murugomi</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
<td>CDS, DCA Partner NGO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Wargui Ndingu</td>
<td>Admin. &amp; Logistics Officer</td>
<td>CDS, DCA Partner NGO, Kenya Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagwa Musa Konda</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>NRRDO, DCA Partner NGO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Ogello</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
<td>NRRDO, Partner NGO, Kenya South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bullen</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator</td>
<td>C&amp;D NGO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Giita</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
<td>C&amp;D, NGO, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakesh Rajphandari</td>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>LWF, Intern., Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Njeri Makumi</td>
<td>Deputy Finance Manager</td>
<td>LWF, Intern., Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henning Dam Nielsen</td>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>LWF, Intern., South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Dent</td>
<td>Chartered Acc. and Partner</td>
<td>Ian Dent and Co., Juba, Khartoum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Imperio</td>
<td>CPA and Audit Manager</td>
<td>Ian Dent and Co., Juba, S. Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Kimundu</td>
<td>Audit Manager Certified Public Acc</td>
<td>PKF, Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumesh D'Cruz</td>
<td>Audit Supervisor, Certified Public Acc</td>
<td>PKF, Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmy Langat</td>
<td>PC Turkana project</td>
<td>LWF Kakuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins Otieno</td>
<td>Education Coordinator K-RAP</td>
<td>LWF Kakuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erenius Nakadio</td>
<td>PO Vet/livestock</td>
<td>LWF Kakuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Nyamandi</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>ACT Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtendere Mphatso</td>
<td>Cluster Co-ordinator, Food Security &amp; Livelihood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Norton</td>
<td>Programme Manager,&amp; Co-Lead, Protection Cluster</td>
<td>Norwegian Refugee Council, South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wondimu Girmai</td>
<td>Senior Operations Officer</td>
<td>UNHCR SO Kakuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Nyakecho</td>
<td>Programme Officer Governance</td>
<td>Ug. Joint Christian Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Tumwebaze –</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Uganda Debt Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odaro Jude Tadeo</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>Uganda Debt Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Seenkima</td>
<td>Director RACOBAO</td>
<td>Rural Action CBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MFA Copenhagen and Embassy Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin Poulsen</td>
<td>Head Of Team Civil Society</td>
<td>Dept For Humanitarian Action, Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Charlton Christensen</td>
<td>Head of Section</td>
<td>Team Civil Society, MFA, Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Andersen</td>
<td>Head of Section</td>
<td>Humanitarian Action, MFA, DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans-Henrik Christensen</td>
<td>Head of Section, Finance</td>
<td>Dept. of Quality Assurance, MFA, DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Riemer</td>
<td>Senior Humanitarian Advisor,</td>
<td>HUC MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Thomsen</td>
<td>Regions of Origin Advisor</td>
<td>HUC MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanne B Elmelund Gam</td>
<td>Security Policy</td>
<td>MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Fenton</td>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>Royal Danish Embassy, Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellen Gesare Bonuke</td>
<td>Asst. Programme Officer-Somalia</td>
<td>Danish Embassy, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betina Gollander-Jensen</td>
<td>Counsellor Development</td>
<td>Danish Embassy, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule for Thematic Review and Capacity Assessment of DanChurchAid Oct-Dec 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>Wks</th>
<th>October 44</th>
<th>31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Oct-</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inception report to</td>
<td></td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>DCA/MFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCA/MFA document</td>
<td></td>
<td>delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>November 45</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCA/MFA monitoring</td>
<td>Lodwar</td>
<td>Lodwar</td>
<td>Lodwar</td>
<td>Lodwar</td>
<td>Lodwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debrief</td>
<td>Lodwar Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW Kenya &amp; Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lodwar Return</td>
<td>to Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lodwar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lodwar Return</td>
<td>to Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCA HQ meetings and MFA (SM &amp;LU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MFA Meetings TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>November 46</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>Juba field visit</td>
<td>continued</td>
<td>continued</td>
<td>continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and preparation for Juba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>field visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCA HQ meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and MFA (SM &amp;LU)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings TBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>November 47</td>
<td>21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>23&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continued/ meet</td>
<td>debrief with Juba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Rep</td>
<td>stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HG/TOK travel to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM Uganda: Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>group development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>partners Kampala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>November 48</td>
<td>28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review team analysis</td>
<td>Final interviews with</td>
<td>Feedback to DCA and MFA</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of findings</td>
<td>DCA (if required)/</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>preparation for feedback</td>
<td>to MFA</td>
<td>report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>December 49</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>report writing</td>
<td>submission to MFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MFA/DCA report comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>December 51</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>