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Preface

This report presents the third output under the Evaluability Study of Sida’s Approach to Democratization in Different Contexts (see terms of reference (ToR) in Annex 1). Sida in May 2020 commissioned FCG and Tana Copenhagen in partnership with the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) and D-Arch to undertake a comprehensive evaluability study of Sida’s democratization support. Three distinct outputs form the combined evaluability study: (i) a mapping of research and donor approaches to democratization providing learning of how democratization can be approached, (ii) a mapping of research and donors’ approaches to assessing the status and progress of democratization providing learning for such assessments and (iii) a feasibility study of evaluating Sida’s democratization support.

The Evaluation Team consisted of Erik Bryld (team leader), Agnes Cornell and Harry Blair (both sub-team leaders), Nadia Masri-Pedersen (senior evaluator) and Charlotte Bonnet (junior evaluator). The Final Report was quality-assured by Susan Tamondong, whose work was independent of the evaluation team. Léonie Borel and Kelsey Welham provided project management support. The report has been professionally proofread by ProofreadingServices.com.

The authors would like to thank all Sida staff interviewed and involved in this study. They invariably exhibited patience and willingness to answer our many questions at length, and they were most helpful in pointing us to useful documentation.
Sida is considering undertaking an evaluation of its support to democratization. This report presents the findings outlining the feasibility of such an evaluation and provides recommendations for evaluation criteria, scope, questions and methodology.

The object of the feasibility study is Sida’s support for democratization. This was defined by the team together with Sida as consisting of Sida’s combined country-level portfolio contribution to democratization. In practice, this means that the study focused not only on Sida’s country-level democracy support but also on how other sectors contribute to democratization objectives. In line with Sida’s policies, the study was undertaken from the perspectives of people living in poverty and with emphasis on gender equality and support to sub-populations. The study also considered the feasibility of evaluating the democratization support in countries with different regime types.

The feasibility study assessed evaluability in principle, in practice and in terms of utility to Sida. A theory-based approach was applied to assess whether an evaluation would be able to identify Sida’s theory (ies) of change for democratization, which could be used as the basis for an evaluation. The team identified the different evaluability parameters from which Sida’s theories of change and overall approach to democratization could be derived and what data were available at the different levels. These covered parameters pertain to Sida’s agency level, strategy level, operationalisation and theory-in-use. The same approach was used to identify the evaluability of Sida’s approach to assessing the status and progress of democratization in a given country.

In total, the team had access to more than 800 documents and interviewed 30 Sida staff members from head office to embassy level. Three countries were selected for a more in-depth analysis and formed the basis for the proof-of-concept section of the study. Fundamentally, the proof-of-concept tested whether there existed the information needed at the country level to apply the suggested evaluation questions and methodology.

The feasibility study found that an evaluation is feasible in principle and in practice but with caveats. The study found that Sida does not have a uniform definition of democracy and democratization against which to evaluate. There are, however, agency-level elements which contribute to an understanding of democratization, which builds on the human rights-based approach and the perspectives of people living in poverty. This is close to what in the mapping of donor approaches to democratization is labelled
political inclusion.\footnote{See separate report of the evaluability study: Cornell, A (2021): Mapping of democratization support, by FCG, ODIO and Tana Copenhagen for Sida, p 36} This \textit{de facto} definition is thus regarded as democratic inclusion and is broader than the definition of democracy used in the academic literature.

The team found that there were ample data available at portfolio level that an evaluation could use and that knowledgeable staff are available and have information complementing the written documentation. There is also a strong evidence track pertaining to gender equality in democratization that can be assessed. The data and evidence are not as strong when it comes to support to specific sub-populations. The team also found that the broad understanding of democratization can be assessed if written documentation is combined with interviews of Sida staff. The team furthermore found that there is strong awareness of the type of regime supported (e.g. authoritarian or free). It is, however, not feasible to assess a pattern in the support that would allow for a statement that there was one approach to Sida’s democratization support vis-à-vis a specific regime status. An evaluation will therefore need to look at multiple countries to capture the variance of theories of change across contexts.

The proof-of-concept exercise furthermore illustrated that it is feasible to combine elements of a theory of change at the sub-portfolio level and use them to reconstruct a country-portfolio theory of change for democratization, which in turn can be used in an evaluation. It also proved that data are available, even if they vary, to allow the evaluation criteria suggested by the team to be assessed.

Based on the findings, the team recommends that the four OECD-DAC evaluation criteria should be applied in an evaluation: relevance, coherence (internal and external), effectiveness and impact. In addition, the team suggests adding a learning category to allow for a lessons-learned assessment of Sida’s approach to democratization. The report includes 2-5 specific sub-questions for each criterion which are designed to provide an overall response to the evaluation criteria, as well as specific questions pertaining to gender, sub-populations and the application of the Sida approach according to regime type.

Based on the data available, the evaluation criteria and the suggested evaluation questions, the team suggests that an evaluation use a theory-based evaluation approach combined with contribution analysis. The feasibility study also proved the feasibility of undertaking a large assessment like this remotely and suggests that undertaking large parts of the eventual evaluation online with assistance from local experts in the case-study countries should be considered. In terms of the methods used, the team found that there is a need to reconstruct portfolio-level theories of change requiring the use of theory of change workshops in addition to key informant interviews, focus group discussions, validation workshops and desk analysis.
The team also identified opportunities for increasing the learning aspects of an evaluation and utilisation and use workshops and engagements with informants as points of learning. This could be included in the design of the evaluation.

In terms of scope, the evaluation found that the lack of one coherent democratization approach requires that an evaluation use multiple case studies. It is suggested that a minimum of six portfolios/countries are included in the assessment, covering different regime types as well as different dimensions of poverty. Finally, an evaluation should consider a ten-year perspective with attention to current tools and approaches to ensure the learning of current practices, and focus on countries where Sida’s financial (or strategic) footprint is significant in order to allow contributions to be documented.
1 Introduction

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This feasibility study presents the third output under the Evaluability Study of Sida’s Approach to Democratization in Different Contexts (see terms of reference (ToR) in Annex 1). In May 2020, Sida commissioned the FCG and Tana Copenhagen, in partnership with the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) and D-Arch, to undertake a comprehensive evaluability study of Sida’s support to democratization. Three distinct outputs form the combined evaluability study: (i) a mapping of research and donor approaches to democratization that provides the learning of how democratization can be approached; (ii) a mapping of research and donor approaches to assessing the status and progress of democratization that provide the learning for such assessments; and (iii) a feasibility study of the evaluation of Sida’s democratization support. The feasibility study will first assess whether an evaluation is feasible, then provide inputs to the evaluation criteria, questions and possible methodologies. This report presents the findings of the third output: the feasibility

1.2 OBJECTIVE AND APPROACH

The overall purpose of this study is to assess the feasibility of an upcoming full-scale evaluation of Sida’s approach to democratization in different country and regional contexts, as well as on a global level. Evaluability is defined in accordance with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC)² as ‘[t]he extent to which an activity or project can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion’, and the team will examine evaluability in the three dimensions of:

1) Evaluability ‘in principle’, as seen in the quality of Sida’s theories of change to democratization;

2) Evaluability ‘in practice’, as seen in the availability of data to assess Sida’s democratization support in espoused and as theory-in-use;

3) The utility and practicality of the final evaluation to Sida, e.g. how can the evaluation be designed to provide the needed information to Sida to enable learning.

In terms of approach, the team applied a theory-based approach to all three output studies in this assignment. The theory clarifies the assumptions relating to the context and is a way of mapping out the logical sequence of an initiative as seen by Sida or

another portfolio from input to outcome; it also provides a framework for assessing democracy level and change.

The feasibility study has sought to identify whether and how Sida’s theories of change for democratization are espoused, as well as in-use, and how Sida’s assessment of democratization effects can be identified in an evaluation with emphasis on gender equality and the perspectives of people living in poverty. In practice, gender and sub-populations were part of the parameter assessments and included in the evaluability difficulty indicator. Key features to assess is whether there is data on gender and sub-populations in Sida’s implicit or explicit theories of change and assumptions at country level and whether there is information on gender and sub-populations in objectives and indicators. The team will assess where there is data related to gender.

The feasibility study has assessed the theory of change at the Sida country-portfolio level. This theory of change is identified and influenced by Sida at three levels:

1) **Sida (agency) level.** Identified in the ToR as: guidance from ‘Sida’s unit for Policy Support with Lead/Policy Specialists in the area of Democracy and Human Rights including Freedom of Expression/ICT (TEMA), as well as a dedicated unit for global support to Democracy and Human Rights (DEMO). In other words, the theories of change identified in strategy input documents and from interviews with these units will be considered.

2) **Strategy level.** The country strategies adopted by the government of Sweden. The theory of change is elaborated upon using inputs from the strategy proposal developed by Sida to inform government decisions on country, regional and global co-operation strategy. (The strategies are also informed by overall political priorities beyond the Sida inputs.)

3) **Operationalisation and theory-in-use level.** This concerns the operationalisation plan developed by Sida and the actual implementation as identified in the reporting (not individual interventions, but may include specific sectors).

As this is a feasibility study, the team has assessed whether there are theories of change and their evaluability implications rather than describing the theories of change explicitly, although elements are present in the proof-of-concept section to provide clarity on what can be found.

Finally, the team understands from the terms of reference that the object of the feasibility study is Sida. We understand that Sida’s work is guided by Swedish government policies and strategies, which will be taken into account as well, but also that the object of the evaluability study is Sida’s approach and theories of change. As per the terms of reference, funding for democracy through the Ministry for Foreign Affairs is thus not part of the evaluability assessment, nor of the final evaluation, nor is the Ministry for Foreign Affairs itself.
1.3 SIDA’S APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT

As a government agency, Sida works towards the overall objective of Swedish development cooperation: namely, to create opportunities for people living in poverty and under oppression to improve their living conditions. Support to democratic development dates back to the 1970s and was notably influenced in 2003, by a Government bill for *Shared Responsibility: Sweden’s Policy for Global Development*\(^3\). This policy proposed that two perspectives permeate all parts of the policy: a rights perspective (which later evolved into the human rights-based approach) based on international human rights conventions; and the perspective of people living in poverty. These perspectives should be infused in all policies\(^4\), global discourse and development cooperation and have since shaped and characterised Swedish support to democracy. Other important policies later followed with (i) the 2013 Policy for Global Development and (ii) the 2016 Policy framework for Swedish development cooperation and humanitarian assistance and (iii) the 2016/17 Government Communication on Human Rights, Democracy and the Principles of Rule of Law in Swedish Foreign Policy.

The perspectives mentioned above should specifically ensure that the United Nations (UN) Universal Declaration of Human Rights form the basis for said aid and that democracy and gender equality strengthen and safeguard these rights. People living in poverty are seen as active agents and should be actors in addressing any lack of freedom, security, resources, opportunities or power they may face. Democracy and human rights are essential for providing people living in poverty and under oppression with respect to power, voice and choice to improve their living conditions.

As presented in the 2016 Policy Framework, a new development agenda was established in 2015, in connection with the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. This meant linking poverty reduction efforts to all three dimensions of sustainable development — economic, social and environmental.

In light of these policy-agenda developments and in efforts to strengthen its poverty focus and its contribution to Agenda 2030, in 2017 Sida launched a conceptual framework, *Dimensions of Poverty*, for understanding poverty in multiple dimensions\(^5\). This framework conceptualises what is known as ‘the five perspectives’ — Sida’s current approach — which integrates the original perspective of people living in poverty and the human rights-based approach, which were adopted by parliament, adding to them three thematic perspectives which were introduced by the Government in the 2016 Policy framework for Swedish development cooperation and humanitarian assistance: the conflict, gender-equality and environmental and climate perspectives.

---


\(^5\) This conceptual framework further developed Sida’s 2002 Policy *Perspectives on Poverty*, which emphasised a multidimensional and context-specific approach to poverty.
All five perspectives should be considered in the analysis, planning, implementation and follow-up of Swedish development cooperation. The main tool for this analysis is the Multi-Dimensional Poverty Analysis (MDPA) framework. In addition to the five perspectives, the framework presents an approach to understanding poverty along four dimensions: 1. Resources; 2. Opportunities and choice; 3. Power and voice; and 4. Human security. The four dimensions assist in identifying the main ways poverty manifests and how it is experienced by people living in poverty. The four dimensions also help identify groups of people living in poverty and the particular needs of sub-populations.

As by Sida, the human rights-based approach specifically means regarding human rights and democracy as fundamental to development. It includes four principles based on the normative framework of human rights: non-discrimination, participation, transparency and accountability. It furthermore involves focusing on individuals and groups who are discriminated against, excluded and marginalised, so that all people, regardless of gender, age, disability, ethnicity, religion or other belief, sexual orientation or transgender identity or expression can enjoy their human rights. Combined with the perspectives of people living in poverty, this means that the situation, needs, conditions and priorities of poor women, men and children will be the point of departure for fighting poverty and promoting fair and sustainable development.

1.4 THE OBJECT OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY: DEMOCRATIZATION

The team has focused on approaches to democratization from the perspectives of people living in poverty and the gender equality perspective. Like ‘democracy’ itself, ‘democratization’ is a somewhat vague and amorphous word that gives rise to differing interpretations. The word has a teleological thrust, implying movement towards a condition of democracy, but in practice it is often used to denote or describe a condition at a given point in time rather than an ongoing process occurring across time.

When attempting to measure democracy or democratization, most analysis from academics, think tanks and donors focuses on points in time, as with the many indices that have been crafted (e.g. Polity IV, Freedom House, the Economist Intelligence Unit, the World Bank and recently V-Dem). For example, most of the analysis in the journal Democratization deals with the state of democracy in country X or Y, the effects of a donor programme in a particular country or sector (e.g. rule of law) and the like. By contrast, our remit has been to look at whether and how it is feasible to assess how Sida and its partners support a democratization trajectory and how Sida assesses efforts to promote democratization, especially in terms of portfolio impact over time.

‘Democratization’ is seen in the evaluability study as the movement or trajectory of a political system at any level towards a more advanced state of democracy or deepening democracy. Donors try to support such movement; partners try to push it faster and deeper and academics try to understand it and suggest ways to engage with it more effectively. Note that democratization in most cases involves several processes
occurring simultaneously at different levels in society with, e.g., progress at the local level and setbacks at the national level. It is also a non-linear and contested process centred around the power dynamics in the country targeted.

Democratization approaches are not just about improving the situation, however; they are also often used to safeguard the *status quo* and avoid backsliding. There is much research on how democratic breakdown is prevented and how donor support can potentially prevent democracy from backsliding (or negatively affect the democratization trajectory at any level in society). Research shows different results depending on whether we examine democratization or democratic backsliding: i.e., support for democracy can prevent democratic backsliding but has no effect on democratization (defined as democratic transition – see also separate report on mapping of democratization support). The team has, therefore, in the two mapping exercises of the evaluability study, also looked at these trajectories, including the efforts aimed at preventing backsliding and how these goals influence the theories of change of donors and research.

The approach to democratization may involve multiple sectors, not just the support provided to the democracy sector (as defined in accordance with OECD-DAC purpose codes). What is key is that the approach to democratization enhances the inclusion of girls, boys, women and men, as well as specific sub-populations, in the democratic processes in a country and that their human rights are upheld.

The feasibility study and the two mapping studies focus on the contribution to democratization from a country portfolio theory of change perspective. The portfolio comprises the entire donor engagement in a country that contributes to democratization. It thus includes direct democracy support as well as support to other sectors and related activities that contribute to democratization from the perspectives of people living in poverty.

**Figure 1 - Democratization portfolio**

![Diagram of the Democratization Portfolio with overlapping examples]

**Portfolio overlap examples**

- A. Civic instruction in schools*  
- B. Public health programs in local councils  
- C. Farmer cooperatives  
- D. Common property resource management  
- E. Welfare, food rations, relief managed by local councils*  
- F. Bureaucratic training*  
- G. Democracy & Human Rights support**

*Sector has direct overlap with DRR. Other sector overlap only with Democratization.  
**What could be in some cases fall outside democratization portfolio may be e.g., capacity development for improved procurement.
To provide a visual understanding of the object of the study, the team has developed Figure 1, which illustrates an example of the democratization portfolio at the country level.

Note that the figure does not take into consideration factors such as support to rights-holders versus duty-bearers, nor does it specifically refer to sub-populations or gender. These other dimensions have additionally been included in the portfolio assessment as well. The feasibility study assessed democratization with a focus on gender equality perspective in order to conclude the extent to which a final evaluation can assess gender equality and empowerment of sub-populations as a result of Sida’s democratization approaches.

Democracy and democratisation from the perspectives of people living in poverty and a human rights-based approach is the goal to which the theory of change (or the donor approach at the country-portfolio level) will contribute. The portfolio focus means that none of the studies will include an assessment of individual interventions or projects.

The feasibility study included three case countries, which serve as ‘proof-of-concept’ countries to get feedback on the proposed methods and to test their evaluability. The countries chosen were Bangladesh, Ethiopia and Ukraine. These countries were chosen by the evaluation steering group based on the criteria outlined in the inception report.

### 1.5 DATA COLLECTION APPROACH AND DATA COLLECTED

The feasibility study has focused on Sida’s head office policy level, strategy level and operational level. Sida is governed through a system of internal and external accountabilities that influences how portfolios are decided upon and how theories of change (both implicit and explicit) are developed, as presented in the background section to this report. Figure 2 below includes the stakeholders who were interviewed for the feasibility study.
The embassy level was represented by the embassies of Sweden in Bangladesh, Ethiopia and Ukraine. A total of 30 key informant interviews were held with Sida staff from the head office and country levels (see list in Annex 3), in addition to regular meetings with the steering group for this study. More than 460 documents were mapped, ranging from global to country level and covering the entire strategy cycle (see Annex 2 for a list of documentation). A large proportion of the documents were found on OpenAid or by contacting Sida’s archives. In addition, a theory of change workshop was held with the embassy in Ukraine. Finally, initial findings were validated through an online validation workshop with 18 Sida staff on 25 November 2020 to ensure that the study would be used. An eventual evaluation will need to go beyond Sida staff and include other stakeholders, such as other donors, resource persons, implementing partners and beneficiaries from government and civil society.
2 Feasibility study findings

2.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE FINDINGS

In the following sections we present the availability of data and their evaluability by Sida in line with the detailed methodology outlined in the inception report.

As mentioned in the ‘Methodology’ section, evaluability is ‘[t]he extent to which an activity or project can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion’. Overall, as is evident from the findings presented in this chapter, the team found that Sida’s democratization approach can be evaluated with caveats:

1) In terms of evaluability ‘in principle’, as seen in the quality of Sida’s theories of change to democratization. The team found that it was feasible to identify and reconstruct Sida’s theories of change for democratization, though these differ according to context, political priorities and embassy staff informed priorities;

2) In terms of evaluability ‘in practice’ as seen in the availability of data with which to assess Sida’s democratization support in espoused and as theory-in-use. Sida has a significant amount of data available, which will allow for the tracking of theories of change and some results;

3) The utility and practicality of the final evaluation to Sida. The team found that, while there is not one overall Sida democratization approach, there are elements of this that Sida can learn from across country portfolios.

To assess the evaluability and level of difficulty of undertaking an evaluation, the team has identified the different parameters of Sida’s policy framework and actual support (i.e. theory-in-use). Each parameter is concerned with a level of influence on the theory of change from the agency to the operationalisation levels. The presentation of the findings is grouped according to these parameters to provide a systematic overview which feeds into the assessment of the difficulty (see also the difficulty indicators in the Proof-of-Concept section).

In the following, we first present evaluability findings related to Sida’s democratization approach against the individual evaluability parameters. We then present the findings specifically related to the evaluability of Sida’s approaches to assessing democratization status and progress. The structure of the findings’ presentation is that each parameter is identified in a box with specific parameter questions. The findings

---

6 EBA’s recent study on democracy support also identifies that Sida democracy support can be assessed. (This report includes elements of democratization as well.) See the evaluability study mapping on assessing democratization for more details or go to: https://eba.se/current/demokratibistand-har-det-effekt/
related to this box are then outlined. A summary of the evaluability findings is presented in Chapter 3.

2.2 EVALUABILITY OF THE DIFFERENT PARAMETERS OF SIDA’S DEMOCRATIZATION SUPPORT

In the following, we assess data availability and quality against the individual evaluability parameters. For each parameter, we assess the level of evaluability, which will then inform the overall assessment of evaluability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter 1</th>
<th>Evaluability parameter questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Swedish Government policies and strategies influencing Sida’s democratization work | - What guidance is provided to approaches for democratization from Swedish government policies and strategies?  
- Is it feasible to identify the inputs to theories of change from this guidance?  
- Is there information on sub-populations as well as gender in the policies/strategies? |

In terms of the Swedish government’s influence on Sida’s priorities and theories of change for democratization, the team found that this is evident in three ways:

1) The government of Sweden launches global policies that affect Sida’s work. Of particular significance has been the feminist foreign policy, and the more recent drive for democracy initiative, as well as the 2016 policy on democracy and human rights. Sida has for decades had a strong gender focus, but interviews and strategy documents show that the emphasis on gender and women’s empowerment penetrates sub-policy-level documents (as seen in the next sections) and was also referred to by nearly all interviewees. The Drive for Democracy is also well aligned with previous Swedish engagements but is not often referenced in interviews or strategies. The influence of the policies is traceable in particular for the feminist policy in terms of the strong focus on gender in the strategies and reports assessed and as confirmed by interviewees. The Drive for Democracy emphasis is evidenced in the continued high focus on democracy support in the country strategies and in

---

7 See: [https://www.government.se/government-policy/feminist-foreign-policy/](https://www.government.se/government-policy/feminist-foreign-policy/)
8 See: [http://www.swemfa.se/drive-for-democracy/](http://www.swemfa.se/drive-for-democracy/)
10 Sida has decades of focusing on gender equality. Parliament adopted gender equality as an additional goal of Swedish development cooperation in 1996: [https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/arende/betankande/jamstalldhet-som-ett-nytt-mal-for-sveriges_GJ01UU18](https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/arende/betankande/jamstalldhet-som-ett-nytt-mal-for-sveriges_GJ01UU18)
the emphasis on civil society in the support for democratization, according to interviewees.

2) The government of Sweden drafts and approves country strategies, which guide Sweden’s engagement in the individual countries (see Parameter 3 below). Interviews and strategy-input documents show that the strategies are significantly dependent on Sida’s advice and inputs (see Parameter 3 below as well). According to interviewees, the strategies rarely differ from Sida’s contribution to them (as also evidenced by the documentation). What has become more significant lately, however, according to interviewees, has been the strong government emphasis on civil society in the strategies.

3) Finally, according to interviewees, the government of Sweden provides guidance regarding the countries in which Sida cannot work directly with the national government or takes political decisions to disengage with governments. The examples provided include Cambodia and Myanmar. The choices are case by case and do not, for instance, include all authoritarian regimes, as Sida can as an example still work directly with the government of Rwanda. According to interviewees, Sida can still support the UN’s or the World Bank’s engagement with said governments, which provides Sida with the needed arm’s length.

Assessment: The government policy level does not provide guidance on theories of change but sets some broad framework parameters that Sida must follow. In this case, gender equality and support for civil society were identified, as well as the instruction on which authoritarian regimes Sida should refrain from engaging with. An evaluation may look into how these parameters influence Sida’s impact in a given context. In terms of sub-populations and gender, the most significant framework condition set by the government of Sweden is the emphasis on gender equality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter 2</th>
<th>Evaluability parameter questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sida agency level</td>
<td>- What guidance is provided to approaches for democratization from Sida policy specialists and management?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democratization theories of change</td>
<td>- Is it feasible to identify theories of change from this guidance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is there information on sub-populations and gender in the policies/strategies?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study found that there is no one Government of Sweden policy or Sida strategy guiding Sida’s democratization work,11 nor an actual formulated Sida theory of change for democratization. There are however multiple documents informing democratization.

11 From 2006, the GoS clarified that the GoS would take the decisions on policy and strategy that would govern Sida, e.g. that Sida should not develop its own policies/strategies.
work.\textsuperscript{12} The inputs to the theory of change are most explicit in the five perspectives which Sida follows (of which two were adopted by the Parliament)\textsuperscript{13}, in particular three stand out from the research\textsuperscript{14}:

1) The perspectives of people living in poverty. This builds on a poverty understanding of four dimensions, (resources, opportunity and choice, power and voice, and human security). The poverty perspective is identified through the application of the Multi-Dimensional Poverty Analysis (MDPA) used to identify target groups, societal wealth distribution and power relations (target groups which thus should include sub-populations). The tool includes elements beyond those related to democratization, as well as human rights elements.

2) The Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) is an approach anchored as a Sida policy and evidently resonates with all Sida staff interviewed. It is also one of the perspectives which is understood as contributing to democratization beyond the democracy and governance sector. Several interviewees pointed to the HRBA as being close to equivalent to Sida’s democratization approach.

3) Gender equality is another area which is mainstreamed across Sida’s portfolio and contributes to OECD-DAC’s broader definition of governance, which has a specific focus on gender equality.

Without clear uniform definitions of democracy or democratization in Sida documents, the team also looked into Government of Sweden documents related to democracy (none of these are related to democratization as understood in the defining section in this report agreed with Sida). These have a range of priority areas covering most of the governance portfolio aligned with OECD-DAC’s definition. Key though is the strong focus on human rights throughout the policies. These documents thus provide priority guidance but not a specific reference to how to meet the goals of the assumptions underlying the approach taken. Note that the Government of Sweden and Sida’s lack of a uniform definition or democratization or democracy (and lack of categories of definitions) are not unusual as the team identified in the assessment of other donor’s theories of change for democratization. See the separate report under this evaluability exercise on mapping of democratization support. This report highlights that ‘no explicit or centrally formulated theories of change are spelled out in donors’ approaches to democratization’\textsuperscript{15}.

\textsuperscript{12} The evaluation unit point to the following in particular: Political Institutions (SIDA3969en) - Participation in Democratic Governance (SIDA3968en) - Good Governance (SIDA2845en) - The Legal Sector (SIDA3790en) Furthermore, a summary of the four methods reports was published in 2003; Digging Deeper (SIDA2950en). Note however, that none of the interviewees when asked to define democracy or democratization referenced these or Government of Sweden documents or policies.

\textsuperscript{13} HRBA and perspectives of people living in poverty.

\textsuperscript{14} This does not mean that the two remaining elements pertaining to environment and conflict are not relevant. They were however less explicitly related to democratization in desk reviews and interviews.

\textsuperscript{15} Cornell, A (2021): Mapping of democratization support, report by FCG, ODI and Tana Copenhagen for Sida, p 36
In addition to the formal guidance, the team also found that there is guidance from Sida policy advisors in terms of policy advice upon which countries also draw.

The team found that, while there is no specific policy or strategy having a uniform or a range of definitions of democratization or democracy theories of change, Sida interviewees did identify traits of democratization. Close to all interviewees would not immediately define democracy or democratization and several questioned whether Sida had a specific approach. However, all interviewed perceived the HRBA and gender elements as being key Sida contributors to democratization. Several also specifically referred to freedom of expression of public sector reform processes. This broad understanding of what democratization among Sida staff is also reflected in the Swedish country strategies where, as an example, Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights (SRHR)\(^\text{16}\), quality and non-discriminatory public service delivery and efficient public administration\(^\text{17}\) fall under the category of ‘democracy’. Combined, at the policy level it is evident that Sida’s democratization understanding and approach is more about inclusivity than strict democracy as defined by scholars in this field and as identified in the evaluability study mapping of approaches to democratization. This is in line with the first major category of approaches identified among donors supporting democratization pertaining to political inclusion of different groups in terms of participation, representation and abilities to influence policies.\(^\text{18}\) However, while this seems to be the core of Sida’s approach when interviewing staff members, Sida’s democratization theories of change are broader than this definition as is also evident in the theory of change elements identified in the proof-of-concept countries (see further below).

**Assessment:** There is not one Sida approach to or theory of change for democratization at the Sida head office level that an evaluation can assess. There are, however, elements that contribute to a theory of change at the portfolio level in the form of Sida and Government of Sweden perspectives, and the HRBA and gender-equality focus that can be traced by an evaluation. In terms of sub-populations and gender, the MDPA can guide staff and thus inform the targeting of the Sida support.

---


\(^{17}\) Results Strategy for Sweden’s Reform Cooperation with Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans and Turkey, 2014-2020.

\(^{18}\) Cornell, A (2021): Mapping of democratization support, report by FCG, ODI and Tana Copenhagen for Sida
### Parameter 3: Evaluability Parameter Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Evaluability parameter questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Country strategy level (formal government of Sweden country strategies, Sida inputs to strategies)** | - Is it feasible to identify the priorities and theories of change from the government of Sweden’s country strategies?  
- Is it feasible to identify theories of change and assumptions from Sida’s inputs to the country strategies?  
- Do the strategies and Sida’s inputs pay specific attention to approaches and assumptions related to enhancing democratization for girls, boys, women and men, as well as sub-populations?  
- Do the strategies and Sida inputs relate to the type of context/country classification? |

An evaluation will assess the portfolio level, and the country strategies will provide the framework for Sida’s engagement at the portfolio level. An assessment of Sweden’s country strategies shows that it is feasible to ascertain results at the overall sector level, against which an evaluation can assess. The country strategies are also very broad, however, without reference to specific baselines or indicators against which progress could be assessed.

The strategies provide contextual descriptions which explain (at least part of) the development challenges faced in a given country (see also the specific democracy assessment of country strategies in Annex 6). The strategies are short, five-page documents, with very broad descriptions, which allow for a great deal of flexibility in the actual funding prioritisation. Theories of change are only implicit in the strategies assessed, as problems and results can be identified, but no pathway for reaching the results are explained in detail. There are also very few assumptions identified with which an evaluation can work (as an example, the regional strategy for Eastern Europe has selected elements of a theory of change in some sub-portfolio areas but not at the full portfolio level, while the Ethiopia country strategy has almost no theory of change elements (see also Proof-of-Concept in Section 4.5).

For all the country strategies assessed, however, democracy and human rights support is a key feature, with contextual descriptions, goals and sub-goals. The team, however, found little evidence of a reflection upon other sectors’ support to democratization. All country strategies have mainstreamed different levels of gender (some in all sectors, others specifically in the democracy sector). All strategies, however, made limited reference to sub-groups beyond the occasional reference to children and youth.

Sida’s inputs to the country strategies (‘strategiunderlag’) are more comprehensive and have a broader reference to context and goals. Some have explicit theories of change for the individual sector, though few explicitly reference assumptions (see example in box below).
Example of explicit theory of change in Sida documentation at the sub-portfolio level

Om förändringsaktörer har stärkt kapacitet att verka för transparens, ansvarsutkrävande och ökad medvetenhet i samhället om grundläggande demokratiska principer och mänskliga rättigheter, och om transparenta mekanismer för ansvarutkrävande och ansvarstagande ger möjlighet för rättighets- och ansvarsbärare att föra dialog, skapas bättre förutsättningar för demokratisk samhällsstyrning och respekt för de mänskliga rättigheterna.

Source: Underlag till strategi för Sveriges utvecklingssamarbete med Bangladesh, Sida Generaldirektören 1 September 2020, p 3

In most cases, however, the team was able to identify causalities at the sector level that could be assessed (see Proof-of-Concept section). The team found that these often include women and occasionally sub-groups, though few sub-groups beyond youth.

Example of fragments of theory of change in Sida documentation

Sidans huvudförslag syftar till ökad demokratisering och rätttrygghet, ett bättre investerings- och företagsklimat samt stärkt miljömässig hållbarhet. Därför förväntas Sverige bidra till ökad motståndskraft för i första hand kvinnor och barn, genom bättre förutsättningar för socialt och miljömässigt hållbara och rättighetsbaserade försörjningsmöjligheter.

Source: Resultatförslag för utvecklingssamarbete med Etiopien 2014-2018, p 1

The Sida inputs all show strong awareness of the type of regime supported (e.g. authoritarian or free). It is, however, not feasible to assess a pattern in the support that would allow for a statement that there was one approach to Sida’s democratization support vis-à-vis a specific regime status.

Assessment: The Swedish government strategies are not detailed enough to enable an extraction of a theory of change that could serve as a basis for an evaluation. There is simply not a statement that describes how Sida foresees outputs leading to results. The Sida inputs to the strategies, however, provide pieces of information that can become core parts of a reconstructed theory of change that could be evaluated.
In terms of operationalisation plans, an evaluation can build on the plans, as well as the inputs to the plans. The operationalisation plans themselves vary significantly in their detail and content. All plans assessed have a strong focus on poverty, and some have sub-portfolio theories of change that provide guidance for the embassy’s prioritisation. As an example, the Ethiopian operationalisation plan has a detailed analysis of the context, such as the challenges of a lack of access to information, and identifies detailed priority areas, such as supporting space for independent civil society.  

The operationalisation plan for Ukraine is also very specific on disbursements and partners prioritised with detailed funding allocations.

The operationalisation plans (and the ‘strategiunderlag’) are supported by the country-level MDPAs and other more specific analyses (such as gender or power analyses). The MDPAs provide a detailed contextual overview, highlight inequalities and identify power relations which contribute to poverty. The MDPAs assessed do not provide solutions but rather identify Sida target groups, including sub-populations.

Assessment: Together with the Sida ‘strategiunderlag’, the operationalisation plans and the MDPA can provide elements to the theory of change at the portfolio level from which an evaluation can assess the espoused theory of change of Sida’s democratization plans in a country.


So far, the assessment parameters have been concerned with the espoused democratization support as prescribed in policies, strategies and supporting documents. An evaluation will also have to assess the actual support — the theory-in-use — which may differ from the espoused documentation.

The strategies’ broad nature leaves Sida with much room for embassy-level decisions on support as well as adaptive programming. The interviews confirmed the high level of decentralised decision-making, leaving actual support within the policy and strategy framework to the head of cooperation and staff at the embassy level. For embassies where cooperation is not delegated this flexibility is then available for the relevant Sida units.

Changes made during implementation (adaptability) require looking beyond strategy input. Sida’s own system of reporting consists of annual strategy reports as well as complete strategy reports (requested by the Government of Sweden). These provide a broad overview of the progress against the strategy objectives via a traffic-light indicator system. The team found that the strategy suggestions and reports in many cases (but not all) include baselines and reporting against overall indicators. They provide a sub-portfolio assessment of how the embassies assess progress over time. Some of the reports also have elements of theories of change at the sub-portfolio level (see Proof-of-Concept section). Reporting includes reference to support for gender equality across sectors and occasional reporting on children, though not on many other sub-populations.

Another way of tracking theory-in-use is by analysing data from OpenAid. While details can be difficult to distil, the data do provide an overview of the type of partner chosen by Sida for a specific portfolio. Of the three partner countries assessed in the feasibility study, the team, for instance, could assess that between 28% and 46% of the funding had been channelled through multilateral partners in the three countries over the last five years (see Annex 5 for overview of funding channels). This information, as an example, can provide subjects for a possible evaluation: (i) that multilateral support is a core element in the portfolio prioritisation which an evaluation will need to take into account when assessing decisions taken on funding channels, and (ii) that much of this is channelled through joint funds, which can make an assessment of Sida’s contribution more challenging.

Finally, all three countries assessed had knowledgeable staff with long-term experience in the country. These staff members were able to reflect on the portfolio decisions and adaptability needed to inform an evaluation. Furthermore, the majority of staff members interviewed from other sectors had clear reflections on the contribution of the other sectors to democratization, thereby supplementing the limited reflection found in the strategies and reports. This reflection in particular concerned the HRBA-related

---


22 This finding is based on interviews with Sida staff and document review. Note the recent evaluation of HRBA in Swedish development cooperation (Sida 2020) suggests that the understanding of what an application of HRBA entails is uneven among Sida staff.
considerations with specific reference to improved participation, accountability and transparency of the public administration in a given sector.

In terms of theory-in-use, Sida staff also pointed to the operational part of Sida’s support as influencing the effectiveness of its democratization support. According to the interviewees, the aid-management framework of Sida’s development support improved democratization results. 23 Specifically, the following Sida traits were mentioned:

- The flexibility of Sida funding and Sida’s willingness to adapt to changing needs;
- Sida’s long-term partnerships, which enable partners to provide the long-term engagements required for results leading to democratization;
- The reliance on partner inputs for adaptability, and partners’ understanding of the context.

**Assessment:** It is possible to track Sida portfolio changes through available documents and interviews. It is also possible to assess Sida’s ability to adapt to changes (i.e. the process theory of change). Sub-population theory of change elements are difficult to identify from the documentation, and the high percentage of Sida aid channelled through multilateral organisations may pose a challenge to identifying Sida’s specific footprint in terms of democratization, but it does provide inputs to identifying Sida’s approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter 6</th>
<th>Evaluability parameter questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sida learning (agency, strategic, operational levels)</td>
<td>- Is there documentation showing reference to learning in Sida documents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is there reference to an adaptation of lessons learned in the democratization approach design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is there information on internal reporting between Sida departments and Swedish missions abroad related to learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are there Sida interviewees who can reflect on learning processes at Sida?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of learning, the team found that Sida staff have many reflections on learning needs and opportunities, though the concept was discussed by most interviewees in relation to formal learning exercises. The team found, however, that there is documented learning in the form of:

---

23 The effectiveness of Sida’s flexible approach is also documented in several evaluations. See among others Bryld, E. et al. (2019): Evaluation of Sida’s Support to Peacebuilding in Conflict and Post-Conflict Contexts – Synthesis Report, Sida evaluation, 25 March.
• Formal learning through strategy-development processes, quality-appraisal processes (at the contribution level), mid-term reviews, evaluations (mostly contributions and global and regional strategies) and specific competence development (training and online courses)
• Informal learning through HR/DEMO working groups, hubs and networks and the rotation of Sida staff among embassies and head office (most interviewees had had several postings)

The evaluability assessment found that in many cases, e.g. mid-term reviews and/or updated MDPAs, the learnings are reflected in strategy reports and that there is a basis for assessing adaptability based on learning as part of an evaluation.

Assessment: There is a great deal of awareness about learning and learning challenges in Sida, which allows for further assessment by an evaluation of data on learning that can be extracted through desk assessment and interviews.

2.3 EVALUABILITY OF SIDA’S DEMOCRATIZATION ASSESSMENT

The evaluability of Sida’s assessment of democratization covers Sida’s:

1) Internal discussions and analysis of trends,
2) Strategy inputs to and analyses of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs,
3) Assessments used to identify interventions and goals (and eventually change logics/theories of change),
4) Multi-Dimensional Poverty Analysis.

The team applied an approach to its study of the evaluability of Sida’s status and progress approach similar to the one it used in the study of the evaluability of Sida’s democratization support. Note that much of this information is presented in the previous section (Section 2.2), so in the following section we present only the new data relevant to the assessment parameters. Instead of an assessment for each parameter, a combined assessment is provided at the end of the section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter 7</th>
<th>Evaluability parameter questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical aid management guidelines</td>
<td>- Are there methodologies outlined for assessing democratization in Sida’s technical/management documents (or the individual components’ contribution to democratization)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major tool that links up to the democratization portfolio is the MDPA tool which has the five perspective integrated. This is broader than democratization, but the approach does provide details on assessing power relations and linkages to key democratization parameters, such as voice and accountability. HRBA issues are also assessed in all countries covered by this study, but while there are policies and sector-
specific guidance on what HRBA is and how to apply it, the assessment of the human rights situation is not performed using a specific methodology (beyond the human rights elements of the MDPA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter 8</th>
<th>Evaluability parameter questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sida inputs to policy processes (Sida agency level)</strong></td>
<td>- Are there references to democratization assessments’ methodologies or indices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are there references to the type of context and key stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are there references to gender and sub-populations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is there information available at the head office on internal discussions within Sida about assessing democracy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team did not find Sida to have specific methodologies for assessing Sida’s support to democratization. There are, however, contextual analyses across Sida’s documentation from strategy inputs to MDPAs and annual strategy reports, which assess context and democratization issues. Often (but not always) these refer to indices and research as background documentation. The MDPA provides the perspectives of people living in poverty, including the status of elements of democratization, such as voice and power. (See details in Annex 4 for an overview of Sida’s references and sources used in key documents in three Sida countries.)

### Examples of indices used in Sida MDPAs:

- Global multidimensional poverty index (MPI)
- Rule of Law Index from the World Justice Project
- Corruption Perception Index (Transparency International)
- Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey World Bank
- World Development Indicators
- Index of Fragile States
- Global Peace Index 2019
- UNDP’s Human Development index (HDI)

*See Annex 4 for details.*
Input to country strategies comes (as reflected in Section 2.2) from Sida’s input to the strategies — the strategiunderlag. These describe the context and status of democratization but are not accompanied by sources/references in the latest strategy periods (see Annex 4). As mentioned, the MDPAs that inform the strategy process and the theory-in-use also refer to elements of the status of democratization.

In terms of internal discussions regarding democratization status and progress, these are well articulated in the interviews with Sida staff. There are no minutes or documentation of such reflections. These are instead included in the annual strategy reports and mid-term reviews.

As highlighted under the theory-in-use parameters in Section 2.2 above, Sida produces a range of reports which assess progress at the country-portfolio level. These first and foremost include the annual strategy reports, which provide an overview of progress against strategy objectives with a traffic light indicator system as well as in several cases baselines and reporting against overall indicators. There are detailed contextual analyses as well as sub-portfolio assessments. Some of the reports have elements of theories of change at the sub-portfolio level (see Proof-of-Concept section). Reporting
includes reference to Sida support to gender equality across sectors and occasional reporting on children, though not on many other sub-populations.

In addition, Sida conducts mid-term reviews and occasional evaluations on which to draw. The mid-term reviews assessed are comprehensive and reflect upon gender and elements of the theory of change. Reference to sub-populations differ across the samples.

*Assessment:* Data on Sida’s democratization status assessment are strong compared to other donors. Data on the portfolio-level progress of democratization can be traced in progress reports, but the full portfolio level (beyond democracy support) needs additional evaluation to assess its progress. Combined, we have the elements required to undertake an evaluation.
3 Summary of evaluable findings

3.1 WHAT CAN BE EVALUATED?

The assessment has found that there are sufficient data and staff knowledge available to allow for an evaluation of Sida’s democratization efforts. The evaluable findings are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluability</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant amount of data at portfolio level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable and available staff to inform evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong evidence track in documentation of gender equality in democratization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements of theory of change identifiable at different levels but require combining these elements to provide a portfolio-level theory of change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of how Sida operates in different regime types but not ‘one’ Sida approach according to regime type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited evidence of democratization support from non-DEMOS sectors in documentation but strong overview of contribution from Sida staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida undertakes many projects jointly or multilaterally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida’s approach is more about inclusivity than strict democracy as defined by academics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No clear Sida definition of democracy and democratization at policy or strategy levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined, there are sufficient data to allow an assessment of progress and results against reconstructed theories of change at the country-portfolio level, but the lack of one unified Sida definition of democratization (which could then be applied in different versions) requires an evaluation of several countries and country portfolio approaches. An evaluation will need to look at how the Sida elements contribute to democratization, exemplified across different contexts.

The team also found that there are sufficient data available to assess gender specifically. It will be more challenging to assess the support to specific sub-populations, as these are often poorly described in the different contexts. An evaluation will need to look at how the Sida portfolio elements contribute to democratization for gender equality and sub-populations exemplified across different contexts.
The lack of a uniform definition of democratization and the strong Sida emphasis on the HRBA elements of democratization means that an evaluation will need to track results more openly than is needed when using academic definitions of democracy. That means looking beyond the democracy portfolio into other sectors as well. Furthermore, the fact that much of the support is joint and multilateral requires tracking selected results as a contribution rather than an attribution.

Finally, the portfolio-level emphasis makes attribution a challenge. The fact that there is not one single policy also means that there are differences across portfolios irrespective of their contextual similarities. There will thus be limitations to how general the findings of an evaluation can be.

### 3.2 LIMITATIONS FOR AN EVALUATION

The feasibility study has shown that undertaking an evaluation is feasible. There are, however, limitations to what the evaluation will be able to conclude that an evaluation will need to consider. These include, but will not be limited to:

- Attribution versus contribution: Sida is one of many players operating in the countries evaluated, and changes in the democratization context will depend not only on the many donors but also on internal politics and outside influence. The same applies for Sida’s contribution to gender and specific sub-populations. The methodologies suggested will be able to provide an assessment of Sida’s contribution to changes but will not be able to attribute changes directly to Sida.

- The many different theories of change and the country-portfolio level have commonalities but also differ. For instance, Sida is not uniform in its approach to all authoritarian regimes. Consequently, generalising and extrapolating findings from the individual country level to Sida overall will be challenging. This underscores the importance of covering multiple countries and settings in the evaluation. This is also likely to identify patterns related to Sida’s de facto democratization definition pertaining to inclusivity and approaches around this, again related to HRBA.

- The portfolio-level approach makes it difficult to document specific results. The portfolio covers many projects and interventions, and using the portfolio as the level of analysis may challenge the ability to identify a contribution to specific results. It may, therefore, be necessary to relate the portfolio to the sub-portfolio results as well and then combine these results to draw a conclusion about overall country-portfolio-level findings.
4 Recommendations for evaluation criteria, questions and methodology

In the following pages, we outline the suggested evaluation criteria and questions (Section 4.1), methodology (Section 4.2), method (Section 4.3) and evaluation scope (Section 4.4) in light of the findings presented in Chapter 3. Finally, we map the key findings against the major evaluation criteria in the Proof-of-Concept section (Section 4.5).

4.1 SUGGESTED EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

We have identified the evaluation criteria and developed the evaluation questions based on the evaluability findings.

The evaluation criteria are aligned with and use the definitions of OECD-DAC as elaborated in the updated 2019 criteria. The focus of the evaluation will be — as per the ToR for the evaluability study — on the results of, suitability of and rationale for Sida’s different approaches to democratization in different contexts.

The evaluation questions have been designed to align with the evaluation criteria. Each criterion includes up to four sub-questions to make the evaluation manageable. All questions have been formulated to ensure clarity and minimise ambiguity. In addition to the OECD-DAC criteria, the focus on utility has resulted in the team’s developing specific questions on lessons learned. Where relevant, the team have included questions specifically pertaining to gender equality and sub-populations.

Note that the two mapping exercises (see separate evaluability reports) have identified multiple approach to support democracy and democratization and to assess status and progress of democracy and democratization. The reports do not identify that there are best practices but highlight the nuances of donors (and researchers) in how democratization is assessed and supported. The reports do provide background for understanding and can be used to inform the comparability of Sida. However, democratization assessment and support are so complex and varied that it is not feasible as such to benchmark against other donors, but instead to learn in terms of variation.

Based on the framework of the democracy evaluation provided as part of the ToR for the evaluability assessment and the evaluability findings, the team recommend that the final evaluation focus on the following criteria:

- **Relevance.** To be effective, the support will need to be aligned with the needs and capacity of the stakeholders and people living in poverty (this should
include relevance to the needs identified in the country MDPAs as well as identified HRBA related needs.) From a relevance perspective, the support will also need to be balanced among the different stakeholders according to the context and the political economy — this is relevance to the context (of rights holders and duty bearers alike). The theory of change of Swedish support will thus need to relate to the political economy (see mapping of assessing democratization support). An evaluation will thus need to assess whether Sida is able to identify political-economic traits, stakeholder needs and develop a relevant theory of change. Finally, of course, the relevance must assess the alignment with Sida’s policy objectives. The evaluability findings show a strong track record documenting the contextual assessments, goals and elements of theories of change. There is thus ample data to allow for the overall relevance to be assessed. This includes relevance vis-à-vis gender equality. Areas where relevance findings will be more challenging include identifying relevance against sub-populations where these have not been identified. Furthermore, without a uniform democratization definition an assessment will need to take into consideration the plethora of definitions and theories of change applies in the countries supported. However common traits can be identified which the evaluation can focus on such as the five perspectives that can be used as the basis for an assessment of policy relevance.

• **Coherence.** As is evident in the mapping exercise on the democratization theories of change and as reflected in some of the Swedish policies and strategies, democratization may be advanced through sectors other than just democracy (though this seems to be more outspoken with Sida than with most other donors as per the mapping of democratization report). This also implies that there is a risk that democratization support can be jeopardised by support in other sectors (e.g., if sectoral support to the health sectors does not promote the devolution of services, as supported through decentralisation support schemes). Consequently, the coherence of the Swedish support (internal coherence) should be assessed. Similarly, its consistency with other donors’ support (external coherence) will also be included as a criterion. The evaluability finding shows that there are significant Sida data on areas supported, thus allowing for an assessment of coherence. Where written documentation is weak, such as in cross-sector support for democratization, an evaluation may draw on theory-in-use data and Sida staff interviews.

• **Effectiveness.** Effectiveness is included to ensure that the evaluation assesses whether the Swedish theories of change assumptions may be confirmed and thus whether they contributed to achieving their objectives at an overall as well as a sub-population level. The evaluability study showed that there is sufficient evidence to reconstruct elements of theories of change to be used for an effectiveness assessment. These, however, will need to be developed and validated further with the units responsible for the countries assessed be they embassies or at Sida head office. Furthermore, there are significant data on
progress, although they will need to be triangulated by secondary and primary data, including interviews. The only caveats will be how extensively an evaluation will be able to assess sub-population effectiveness in Sida countries where these target groups have not been clearly identified in strategies and operationalisation plans. However, interviews show that sub-populations can be identified and while Sida is not always reporting on progress against sub-populations there is in some instances statistical evidence available to allow for assessing progress from which Sida can learn.

- **Impact.** The longitudinal nature of the evaluation and the fact that it covers multiple countries and portfolios will allow for the evaluation to assess impact over time. There are, of course, limitations to this, as is evident from this feasibility study and explained in greater detail below. However, an evaluation will also look into how Sida itself assess impact of the democratization support and thus is able to identify longer term effect of its applied theories of change to enable adaptability of democratization programming.

As is evident, two criteria have been left out: **efficiency** and **sustainability**. Efficiency falls outside the immediate frame of the democratization evaluation as presented in the evaluability assessment ToR. As the evaluation will cover the portfolio level across multiple countries over several years, it is doubtful whether any meaningful evidence can be identified that can provide sufficient extrapolation to allow for lessons learned on efficiency.

Sustainability has not been included because the support is provided at the portfolio level across countries, and it is therefore difficult to assess the basic parameters of sustainability in terms of institutional carry-over and budgetary concerns. Instead, the team focuses on the assessment of impact, as this will also provide evidence of whether the results achieved by the Sida support have long-term effects and thus are **de facto** sustainable.

Based on the evaluability feasibility study findings and the criteria outlined above, we suggest that the following evaluation questions be considered as applied in the final democracy evaluation:

**Relevance:**
- Does Sida’s assessment of democratization status and democratization enable informing relevant theories of change for democratization (including specific democratization portfolio support related to sub-populations and gender)?
- Has Swedish democratization support been designed and implemented in ways that fit the context and the political economy (of rights holders and duty bearers alike)?
- Have Swedish theories of change regarding democratization support conformed with the needs and priorities of people living in poverty in the countries supported? Have they conformed with the needs and priorities of both girls and boys, and women and men, as well as the relevant identified sub-populations in the countries supported?
• Has the Swedish democratization support been implemented in alignment with the objectives of the Government of Sweden polices and country strategies and Sida operational plans?

Coherence:
• Are Sida’s theories of change for democratization coherent at the policy, strategic and operational levels? And are they coherent across departments, unit and embassies?
• Are Sida’s assessment of democracy status and progress coherent at the policy, strategic and operational levels? And are they coherent across departments, unit and embassies?
• Has Sida support to democratization been internally coherent across the country portfolio in different country contexts?
• Have Sida’s explicit and implicit theories of change for democratization at the country-portfolio level been aligned with Sida’s theory-in-use?
• Has Sida’s theory-in-use for democratization been externally coherent with the democracy support of other donors in the targeted countries?

Effectiveness:
• Have Sida’s applied democratization theories of change (including the extent to which Sida has decided to work with the state regime or not) been effective in meeting Sida’s country-portfolio-level democratization objectives across different types of state regimes (the evaluation may focus on democratization progress as well as ability to prevent democratization backsliding)? And if so/not, why? Are there differences in effectiveness across types of state regimes?
• Have Sida’s applied theories of change for democratization been effective in furthering gender equality, women’s empowerment and an improved the democratic situation for the targeted sub-populations? Are there differences across types of state regime? And if so/not, why?
• How has Sida’s aid management framework (including the results-based management approach) affected the effectiveness of Sida’s democratization support at the country-portfolio level?

Impact:
• What has been the overall impact of Sida’s development assistance on democratization at the country level (by type of state regime)?
• What has been the overall impact of Sida’s development assistance on democratization as related to gender equality and the inclusion of sub-populations in democratization processes (by type of state regime)?

Learning:
• How does Sida assess progress as well as overall impact of its applied democratization theories of change? Can Sida learn from the assessment of democratization support of other donors (as identified in mapping 2: Approaches to assessing status and results)?
• To what extent did Sida design and adjust its democratization theories of change support based on past results and lessons learned?
• To what extent is Sida ensuring the sharing of lessons learned in democratization across agencies, departments and units in Sida? Can it be improved?

The evaluation should provide specific recommendations for improving 1) Sida’s democratization performance related to all phases of the programme cycle, from identification of support to implementation, results assessments and learning approaches, and 2) Sida’s methods for assessments of democratization and democracy.

4.2 SUGGESTED METHODOLOGY

The team have assessed different methodologies in light of some of the key parameters, thus establishing the framework for the evaluation, including:

1) A methodology that can be applied across different contexts;
2) A methodology that takes into consideration the need to span a full portfolio covering multiple contributions and across multiple sectors;
3) A methodology that can assess Sida’s contribution (as attribution will be a challenge) to complex theories of change across the individual country portfolios, including the supportive effects at country level of global and regional support;
4) A methodology that can single out contributions to gender equality and sub-populations;
5) And finally, a methodology which is best suitable from a learning perspective. The methodology should be able to not only explain what has worked where, but also why. This will require that the methodology goes beyond results but looks into and explains causalities as well.

The suggested methodology includes an overall approach (including confirming that the evaluation should be theory-based), as well as specific related methodologies, which can be applied to map Sida’s theories of change and theory-in-use and document the relevant results. An evaluation like this will require measuring multiple outcomes against different levels of theories of change (global, regional, country and sub-population) and the links among these.

An overview of the possible methodologies and their advantages and disadvantages are presented in the table below.25
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In summary, the team recommends that an evaluation combines a theory-based approach with contribution analysis to best capture the complex nature of the evaluation.

### 4.3 APPLYING A THEORY OF CHANGE APPROACH FOR THE DEMOCRATIZATION EVALUATION

The approach suggested relies on the use of Theory of Change (ToC). ToC is a reflection tool and a results-focused approach that describes the logical change pathways that are embedded in development programming and very applicable in complex portfolio setting such as the global Sida democratization portfolio. The approach is concerned with overall outcomes and synergies between various strands of an intervention or a portfolio.\(^\text{26}\) The ToC approach allows the evaluator to evaluate portfolios even when strategies are less concise or specific. As Weiss states, theory of change ‘…concentrates evaluation attention and resources on key aspects of [a] program… [and]… facilitates aggregation of evaluation results into a broader base of theoretical and program knowledge…’\(^\text{27}\) The ToC basically explains why and how a programme, or in this case a portfolio, works.

**What are Theories of Change?**

- ToC is always context-related, but also reflects beliefs or hypotheses about how change occurs. In the case of Sida, the feasibility study clearly showed that the theory of change cannot be derived only from the strategies but need to be extracted from the embassy level or head office unit decision-makers as well.

---


Through ToC based evaluations, these hypotheses can be tested and validated/disproved in relation to the context concerned.

- ToC clarifies the assumptions relating to the context and asks the question ‘given this set of conditions, the following effect(s) can be expected from this input because of XYZ’. Again as explained in the proof of concept section this can be derived and constructed from desk reviews combined with interviews of Sida decision-makers.

- Similar to the logical framework approach, ToC is a way of mapping out the logical sequence of an initiative from input to outcome. However, an important difference is the focus placed on the contextual conditions and the assumptions about how change takes place.

The ToC approach in many ways allows for identifying context, support provided, assumptions behind this support and confirming whether this rationale holds. By mapping each of these aspects, the ToC approach is a learning tool which clearly describes cause and effect and not only the result of the Sida democratization portfolio. The contextual outset and causality link allows for alternative findings to emerge and avoids the pitfall of thinking that change evolves around the intervention evaluated only.

The ToC part of the suggested evaluation methodology (accompanied by contribution analysis to enable enhanced learning opportunities) is based upon the assumption that Sida had an understanding, or expectation, of what its portfolio (in full or in part) were expected to achieve in terms of change, and what Sida’s assessment of the preconditions for change were (i.e. the assumptions). Therefore, the assumption confirms or rejects the ability of the Sida ToC to be effective. In a situation where the ToC is not explicit – which is the case across the countries assessed in the feasibility study, the theories of change (as there are evidently several mutually enforcing Sida ToCs at country level) then become the baseline against which the Sida portfolio is evaluated.

As was found in the proof of concept exercise (see further below), the team was able to assess the extent to which the assumptions for the Sida (implicit) theories could be identified, and thus whether the causality link of the Sida support can be confirmed and whether objectives are met.

Depending on the decision made by Sida on the longitudinal nature of the evaluation, the team may need to apply a theory-based timeline approach. If the evaluation covers multiple strategy periods, ToCs may be identified for major strategy periods and/or periods of significant contextual relevance in the given country. Using the timeline

---

28 Assumptions are the necessary conditions for change, or the underlying conditions or resources that need to exist for planned change to occur. Assumptions underpin the different levels of the ToC and link them together, i.e. for activities to result in outputs certain assumptions need to be in place. The same applies for why outputs lead to outcomes and outcomes to impact.

29 See also Valters, C (2015): Theories of Change – Time for a radical approach to learning in development, ODI paper.

approach, the multiple theories of change can then be mapped and assessed against different aspects including: (i) the contextual events in the period; (ii) their explicit and implicit targeting of key democratization drivers in the country; and (iii) engagements by other development partners. The timeline approach thus provides an overview of Sida’s ability to respond to the democratization context in a relevant and effective manner. See Figure 3 illustrating how this approach may take shape.

**Figure 3 - The time-line theory-based approach**

![Time-line theory-based approach diagram]

The individual projects and programmes supported in a country all have their own implicit or explicit theory of change. But there is not an overarching explicit Sida theory of change identifiable from the documentation only. To facilitate the use of the theory-based approach, an evaluation will have to reconstruct *de facto* ToCs for the period covered by the evaluation. An evaluation will therefore have to retrospectively articulate the pathways through which Sida sought to produce positive change in the given country during the period evaluated.

A very first go at identifying elements of ToCs are identified in the proof of concept section. The full evaluation will have to undertake a more extensive process of articulating retrospectively the portfolio levels ToCs based on:

1. Evidence from existing documentation on Sida’s support; and
2. A ToC workshop, interviews and focus group discussions with key Sida staff at relevant units and embassies.

Another advantage of the ToC approach is that it allows the evaluation to also dive into elements of the ToC which are identified as particularly important for democratization change in the given country. Based on this it is possible to extract if focusing on e.g.
specific target groups, thematic areas or certain modalities were in particular effective vis-à-vis confirming ToC assumptions.

The ToC approach is not a panacea as such and does come with limitations. However, it is difficult to argue against its usefulness if used properly and there is no significant body of academic or development related publications criticising the ToC approach. The limitations are arguably:

Reconstructing a ToC in a situation where there are no clear results framework or clear justification of the support gives the reader the impression that Sida has a clear internal understanding of the portfolio’s objectives and how these would be reached. In reality, however, the processes around prioritisations will often be less structured. The ToC is always a simplified overview of the support which allows for evaluation of change. The ToC does not, however, cover all the nuances of the support provided. It does however allow to provide more nuances as compared to other evaluation tools.

The reconstructed ToC allows for an organisation to be evaluated against overall objectives and intervention logics. This requires that the reconstructed theory builds on data and interviews that reflect the ToC. Therefore, another limitation is to agree on the reconstructed ToC, which may be disputed as results emerge from an evaluation. Thus, the evaluation will need to work to ensure a strong element of buy-in to the theories of change through interviews and a ToC workshop. Nevertheless, even if tested there is always a risk that the close involvement of the people evaluated in the ToC development ‘leaves [evaluators] open to criticism with regard to their objectivity’. However, the close relationship in the ToC development process is needed to enable the evaluator to properly ascertain an understanding of the object of evaluation.

For the ToC approach to be useful it will need to rely on a solid evidence base to avoid ‘selection’ of evidence (as is a risk in the application of most evaluation tools), which can create a misleading sense of security about the level of critical analysis. This thus underscores the importance of using the full documentation available to undertake the ToC development. And again, this highlights the importance of adding contribution analysis to the suggested ToC to provide a more thorough analysis of the causality and the ‘how’.

4.4 SUGGESTED METHODS

As is evident from the findings above (and the proof of concept section below), there are large amounts of data available from Sida that can inform the evaluation of Sida’s
objectives and contribute to the development of theories of change. What is also evident from the findings is that these will need to be supplemented by interviews with Sida staff. In addition, an evaluation will need to identify and assess secondary written information and interview other donors, recipient governments, implementing partners and resource persons. The methods need to reflect this mix. Furthermore, the methods need to provide a basis for learning for Sida and its partners.

The team was asked to look at options for the remote implementation of a possible evaluation of Sida’s support to democratization. The evaluability study was conducted fully remotely and thus provided a good basis for assessing the feasibility of this. Sida staff were generally responsive and available for interviews. The feasibility study showed that the following methods can be applied online:

- Individual interviews
- Focus group discussions (particularly for a smaller number of selected interviewees)
- Theory of change workshops
- Learning and validation workshops
- Access to a significant amount of data (supported by Sida head office as well as embassy level archives)

The team members have furthermore documented in the two other mapping studies under the evaluability study assignment that non-Sida interviewees are ready to engage in online interviews as well. Based on these findings, the team assess that the bulk of the interviews can be undertaken online.

There will also, however, be a need to engage local-level resource persons and government officials, which are likely to require direct engagements as well, or cases where the meeting (even if online) will need to be arranged in person. It is therefore suggested that national experts in the selected countries be part of the evaluation to ensure this outreach.

The methods should also take into consideration learning opportunities. This can be ensured across the method application:

a) The start-up meeting and the inception report should include discussions on utility and participation to ensure that the evaluation is implemented in a way that ensures learning for Sida at the head office and embassy levels. Part of this should be a discussion on methods application to ensure utility.

b) The theory of change workshops should include a broad representation of embassy staff and be designed to allow for reflection on the portfolio, which the embassy can also use for further programming.

c) The validation workshops should also serve as learning events. This may include the introduction of breakout groups to discuss findings and feed into recommendations (as was tested in the evaluability learning and validation workshops).
4.5 SCOPE OF EVALUATION

An upcoming evaluation will need to be designed so that it makes the best use of the data available as identified in this evaluability study and has a scope that allows for the extrapolation of findings beyond the individual country portfolio. This affects the number of countries to be covered, as well as the time period and scope in terms of the evaluability of different parameters. The following scope is recommended:

- The lack of one single Sida definition of democracy and democratization necessitates an evaluation at the country-portfolio level. This can then link to Sida head office level guidelines and government of Sweden policies on democratization;
- The multiplicity of theories of change from country to country requires multiple countries with different regime types. It is suggested that this includes a minimum of six case countries covering at least three different regime types (this may, as an example, include authoritarian countries where Sida is working directly with the state and countries where Sida is not in a position to work directly with the state);
- Countries should cover multiple poverty and HRBA dimensions to assess Sida’s approach relative to MDPA and HRBA assessment variations;
- The country focus should be on those with whom Sida is a significant partner (in terms of financial contribution) to allow a minimum of contribution identification (there may be exceptions to this if Sida can identify a country where major influence have been achieved with less funding);
- To ensure learning from present approaches and take into consideration data availability, the team suggest that an evaluation look back at the last ten years. Of particular interest will be where new tools, such as the MDPA, have been applied (2016-2020).

4.6 PROOF-OF-CONCEPT

To provide a proof-of-concept, we have tested the development of theories of change for three countries and their possible data-availability link to the suggested evaluation criteria. The following steps have been taken:

- Identification of whether it is feasible to identify a theory of change for the country, including possible assumptions overall as well as a theory of change for gender and sub-populations;
- Identification of theory-in-use and data availability vis-à-vis the suggested evaluation criteria at the overall country level as well as for gender and sub-populations;
- Identification of whether the methods applied are feasible (see above).

With no single overall Sida theory of change for democratization (though with components of one), an evaluation will need to identify country-portfolio-level theories

---

34 Note, that in autocratic contexts, access to data is likely to be limited for confidentiality reasons and an evaluation will need to relate to this limitation when designing the approach.
of change. For the same reason, we are suggesting that an evaluation undertake theory of change workshops in each country. All three proof-of-concept countries were offered a theory of change workshop as part of the evaluability study, and Ukraine accepted this offer.

**Ukraine**

The first of the three countries subject to proof-of-concept assessment is Ukraine. The assessment was based on a desk review of existing information, individual interviews with selected staff members and a theory of change workshop.

The theory of change workshop in Ukraine revealed that it is challenging to identify a complete portfolio theory of change but that there is ample information from the embassy-sector experts and the Sida head of cooperation to piece together theories of change that when combined provide an overview of the portfolio.

Unlike the other proof-of-concept countries, Ukraine does not have its own country strategy, but Sida’s support to it is based on the regional Swedish strategy for Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans and Turkey. The Sida input to the strategy is also very regional, with limited specific reference to Ukraine. These documents provide some overall regional contextual reflections and overall Sida regional goals but contribute only limited input to a Sida Ukraine democratization portfolio theory of change.

There are, however, Sida Ukraine documents that can provide some inputs. The embassy in Ukraine has produced a one-page overview brief aligned with the MDPA but not a full MDPA report. The brief provides a basic analysis of poverty dimensions and thus identifies possible target groups. The most explanatory documents, however, are the strategy plans for Ukraine and the in-depth strategy report. The three strategy-related reports all have sections labelled ‘theory of change’, though these reflect neither assumptions nor an explicit cause and effect between Sida’s support and the expected results. It is, however, feasible to track elements of an overall theory of change. At an overall portfolio level, the in-depth strategy report explains that the focus in Ukraine is on supporting the reform processes and that the major assumption is that ‘this will lead to a positive development in Ukraine that will be beneficial for all, including people living in poverty’. The same report also reflects on how internal and external pressure has been instrumental in moving the reform process forward, which is well aligned with the significant support to civil society identified in the reports.

The theory of change, however, is still flawed if it is developed based only on the available documents. This underscores the importance of interviews and workshops to

---

35 *Resultatförslag för reformsamarbetet med Östeuropa 2014-2020.*
37 *In-depth Strategy Report of Ukraine Implementing the Results Strategy for Sweden’s Reform Cooperation with Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans and Turkey, 2014-2020 (n.d.)*
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the ability to fully grasp the underlying thinking. A number of key theory of change ‘change logics’ also came up in this process. These include:

- A strong focus on other sectors’ contribution to transparency, accountability and inclusion. As an example, this includes private-sector contribution to economic development, which will then lead to a growing middle class that will demand enhanced democratization;
- Support to public administration and the rule of law in the environment sector would allow people to take action towards improving the environment;
- Public administrative reform would increase access to public services and a more inclusive public sector.

In terms of gender, Sida staff in the workshop strongly emphasised gender in terms of economic empowerment. The strategy reports had a strong emphasis on reducing gender-based violence as well as the need to ensure lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender/transsexual and intersex (LGBTI) rights. There were not, however, substantial theory of change elements in the document or interviews related to LGBTI issues, and an evaluation would need to examine this further.

In terms of sub-populations, the emphasis from a theory of change perspective was on enhanced access to services and inclusivity in decision-making processes for all. Part of the theory of change is concerned with civil society’s promotion of LGBTI rights.

The elements of the theory of change were based on a number of assumptions identified by Sida staff and which an evaluation would need to verify. These include:

- Government willingness to accept change, reform and that civil society together with the international partners could motivate this reform;
- That an increasingly wealthy middle class will prioritise demands for enhanced democratization;
- That civil society is representative and inclusive in their advocacy work;
- That the reform processes actually lead to improved efficiency of the public sector and allow for enhanced improvements in transparency, accountability and participation;
- That implementing partners are able to identify and support the women, men and sub-populations in most need of support.

The list of assumptions is not conclusive, and an evaluation would need a more thorough assessment as well as a theory of change validation exercise conducted together with the embassy in Kiev.

The following table shows data availability and evaluation difficulty vis-à-vis the individual evaluation criteria for Ukraine.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation question type</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Evaluability indicator (0 = not evaluable, 10 = fully evaluable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>Relevance to Sida partner countries</td>
<td>There are substantial amounts of analysis of the country situation in strategy-related Sida reports. There is also solid reporting on what is funded in annual reports and through OpenAid. These also include clear priorities and goals, which can be assessed against country policies and an independent assessment of needs.</td>
<td>10: question evaluable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance to sub-populations and target groups</td>
<td>The (currently) reconstructed theory of change has limited reflection specifically upon gender and sub-populations. There is, however, reference to explicit gender-related goals, including gender-based violence (GBV), and some sub-goals related to LGBTI and internally displaced persons (IDPs). Interviews show strong reflections on gender and gender results, but this is less explicit when it comes to sub-populations.</td>
<td>7: question evaluable with some limitations to data availability and quality. Particularly with regard to sub-populations, the team will have to rely on external data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
<td>Internal coherence</td>
<td>Operational plans and strategy documents provide a solid overview of Sida priorities enabling cross-sectoral assessment. Reporting, however, is sector-silo-oriented and will require interviews to supplement written documentation. It is also feasible to track HRBA and gender global priorities in country-level documentation. There is strong internal knowledge among Sida staff on sector contributions to democratization and internal coherence</td>
<td>9: question evaluable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External coherence</td>
<td>Sida provides significant funding through joint initiatives, as is well documented. Bilateral initiatives are also well documented in strategy reports and OpenAid.</td>
<td>10: question evaluable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Effectiveness overall</td>
<td>A theory of change can be identified in part and in full, and the causality of this can be tracked using strategy reports in terms of Sida’s own assessments. This will need to be accompanied by an assessment of available third-party data and interviews.</td>
<td>9: question evaluable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness for gender and sub-populations</td>
<td>There are data on specifically gender-supported projects and to some extent reference to gender in other sectors. Interviewees are strong at reflecting upon gender. Data on sub-populations limited as well as reflections on this as well.</td>
<td>6: question partly evaluable. Significant additional data collection is needed to properly assess the evaluation question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Impact overall and for target groups
Theory of change and assumptions can be identified. Impact likelihood can thus be assessed by confirming or rejecting assumptions. Furthermore, Sida has been supporting many of the same interventions for long periods, allowing for the assessment of parts of a theory of change through evidence results.

8: question evaluable with some limitations

| Learning | Learning in strategy process and from implementation | Strong reporting on progress and reflection on portfolio changes in strategy reporting allow for desk assessment. In addition, interviewees with long-term experience in the country have reflections on Sida actions. Assessing cross-country learning and experience sharing will require interviews, as they have not been documented. | 8: question evaluable with some limitations |

Ethiopia

Developing a theory of change for Ethiopia is slightly more challenging than for Ukraine. In principle, the mid-term review\(^{39}\) undertook a theory of change exercise with the embassy, but the result does not describe the causality between activities and results, nor the underlying assumptions supporting this causality. The country strategy\(^{40}\) itself also lacks the theory of change elements outlined. The country strategy does, however, explain the overall context and objectives, which can serve as pointers for an evaluation.

Elements of the theory of change can, however, to some extent be pieced together from the remaining reports, though final assumptions and causalities will need to be extracted from a full theory of change workshop with the embassy. The MDPA does provide an overview of the potential target groups but does not include recommendations for actions. There are elements of theory of change in the strategy reports as well. The 2017 strategy report is strong on results, and some sub-portfolios refer directly to a theory of change, such as target 2.3, which explains how enhancing civil-society capacity will increase civil society’s engagement in advocacy for transparency, accountability and human rights. There is also some reference to gender, though the human rights-based approach is not mainstreamed across sectors. This shows that even the broad policy directions from Sida head office are not always stringently followed (arguably also as a consequence of Ethiopia’s past unwillingness to allow donors to engage in human rights issues). The same accounts largely for the 2020 strategy report. Note also that this does not relate to other sectors’ contributions to democratization.

In the input to the results for 2014-2018, development cooperation with Ethiopia is stronger than the other documents when it comes to referencing support targeting


gender equality and selected sub-populations, including youth and children. In addition, in this document civil society and religious institutions are identified as agents of change, and some of the causalities are discussed.

As is evident, reconstructing the theory of change to allow for evaluability will require engaging with the staff at the embassy. The interviews show a strong understanding of the elements that contribute to a theory of change. This includes, e.g., the emphasis on the role of free media and the use of multilaterals. An evaluation will need to work with these elements in a workshop to finalise the full theory of change of the support by linking the activities with the assumptions underlying the country-strategy goals.

In the following table we show data availability and evaluation difficulty vis-à-vis the individual evaluation criteria for Ethiopia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation question type</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Evaluability indicator (0 = not evaluable, 10 = fully evaluable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>Relevance to Sida partner countries</td>
<td>There are substantial amounts of analysis of the country situation in strategy-related Sida reports. There are also a previous power analysis (political-economy analysis), a conflict analysis and solid reporting on what is funded in annual reports and through OpenAid. These include clear priorities and goals that can be assessed against country policies and an independent assessment of needs.</td>
<td>10: question evaluable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance to sub-populations and target groups</td>
<td>The reflections on sub-populations outside the MDPA are limited in most of the documents. There are, however, some reference to explicitly gender-related goals, including gender-based violence (GBV). Interviews show strong reflections on gender and gender results.</td>
<td>5: question partly evaluable. Will require the significant use of non-Sida documentation and interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
<td>Internal coherence</td>
<td>Operational plans and strategy documents provide a solid overview of Sida priorities enabling cross-sectoral assessment. Reporting, however, is sector-silo-oriented and will require interviews to supplement written documentation. It is feasible to track elements of HRBA and gender global priorities in some of the country-level documentation. There is strong internal knowledge among Sida staff on sector contributions to democratization and internal coherence</td>
<td>8: question evaluable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## External Coherence

| External coherence | Sida provides significant funding through joint initiatives, as is well documented. Bilateral initiatives are also well documented in strategy reports and OpenAid. | 10: question evaluable |

## Effectiveness

### Effectiveness overall

| Effectiveness overall | It is anticipated that a full theory of change can be identified by combining existing documentation with interviews and workshops. This will need to be accompanied by assessing available third-party data and interviews. | 7: question evaluable |

### Effectiveness for gender and sub-populations

| Effectiveness for gender and sub-populations | There are some data on specifically gender-supported projects and to some extent reference to gender in other sectors. Interviewees are strong at reflecting upon gender. Data on sub-populations and reflections on this are limited as well. | 6: question partly evaluable. Significant additional data collection needed to properly assess evaluation question |

## Impact

### Impact overall and for target groups

| Impact overall and for target groups | If the assumption holds that a theory of change and assumptions can be identified, then the likelihood of impact can be assessed by confirming or rejecting these assumptions. Furthermore, Sida has been supporting many of the same interventions for long periods, allowing for an assessment of parts of a theory of change through evidence results. | 7: question evaluable with some limitations |

## Learning

| Learning in strategy process and from implementation | Strong reporting on progress and reflection on portfolio changes in strategy reporting allow for desk assessment. In addition, interviewees with long-term experience in the country have reflections on Sida actions. Assessing cross-country learning and experience sharing will require interviews, as they have not been documented. | 9: question evaluable with some limitations |

## Bangladesh

As the only country of the three proof-of-concept countries, Bangladesh has explicit theories of change for the individual targets of the country programme formulated in the input to the 2021-2025 country strategy but not at an overall portfolio level. The theories of change explain higher-level causalities, but do not, however, include assumptions. The text from the strategy inputs also have specific elements of a theory of changes relating to multiple areas, such as the importance of the capacity development of institutions to enhance their transparency and accountability or their

---
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attention to service delivery to women. The theory of change covers the new strategy period and thus not the period subject to evaluation.

For the last six years, starting with the 2014-2020 country strategy, the findings mirror those of the two previous countries in terms of strong results identification in strategy reports and particularly strong reporting of support to gender equality. In addition, there are some references to Rohingya refugees and workers as target groups. As in the other countries, the MDPA does not provide guidance on actions but does identify target groups and context related to them.

There is not a strong focus on other sectors’ contribution to democratization in the documentation, though there are reflections on, e.g., land rights in the environmental-sector support and women’s rights in the private-sector support. Interviews show a strong awareness of other sectors’ contribution to democratization among staff.

As with the other countries, a process including a theory of change workshop and individual interviews is needed to complete a portfolio-level theory of change.

In the following table we show data availability and evaluation difficulty vis-à-vis the individual evaluation criteria for Bangladesh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation question type</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Evaluability indicator (0 = not evaluable, 10 = fully evaluable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Relevance to Sida partner countries</td>
<td>There are substantial amounts of analysis of the country situation in strategy-related Sida reports. There is also solid reporting on what is funded in annual reports and through OpenAid. These also include clear priorities and goals, which can be assessed against country policies and an independent assessment of needs.</td>
<td>10: question evaluable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance to sub-populations and target groups</td>
<td>There is strong reflection on gender in all the documentation and also across the portfolio. There is some attention to children, workers and refugees but limited links to democratization. Interviews show strong reflections on gender and gender results.</td>
<td>8: question evaluable with some limitations to data availability and quality on sub-populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>Internal coherence</td>
<td>Strategy inputs and strategy reports provide a solid overview of Sida priorities, enabling cross-sectoral assessment. Reporting, however, is</td>
<td>8: question evaluable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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sector-silo-oriented and will require interviews to supplement written documentation. It is feasible to track elements of HRBA and gender global priorities in some of the country-level documentation.

There is strong internal knowledge among Sida staff on sector contributions to democratization and internal coherence.

| External coherence | Sida provides significant funding through joint initiatives, which is well documented. Bilateral initiatives are also well documented in strategy reports and OpenAid. | 10: question evaluable |

**Effectiveness**

| Effectiveness overall | It is anticipated that a portfolio-level theory of change can be identified by combining existing documentation with interviews and workshops. | 8: question evaluable |
| Effectiveness for gender and sub-populations | There are some data on specifically gender-supported projects and gender in other sectors as well as interviewees who are strong at reflecting on gender. There are some data on sub-populations. | 7: question evaluable but requires additional data collection |

**Impact**

| Impact overall and for target groups | If the assumption that a theory of change and assumptions can be identified holds, then likelihood of impact can be assessed by confirming or rejecting assumptions. Furthermore, Sida has been supporting many of the same interventions for long periods, allowing for an assessment of parts of a theory of change through evidence results. | 7: question evaluable with some limitations |

**Learning**

| Learning in strategy process and from implementation | Strong reporting on progress and reflection on portfolio changes in strategy reporting allow for desk assessment. In addition, interviewees with long-term experience in the country have reflections on Sida actions. Assessing cross-country learning and experience sharing will require interviews, as they have not been documented. | 9: question evaluable with some limitations |
Sida has been considering whether to undertake an evaluation of its democratization support as well as the feasibility of such an evaluation. This study has found that evaluating Sida’s democratization approach is feasible in terms of evaluability ‘in principle’, as seen in the quality of Sida’s theories of change to democratization; ‘in practice’, as seen in the availability of data to assess Sida’s democratization support as espoused and as theory-in-use; and feasible in terms of the utility to Sida and the practicality of such an exercise.

The fact that Sida does not have one uniform definition of democracy and democratization or one uniform approach to supporting democratization means that an evaluation needs to be broader in scope to cover Sida’s multifaceted portfolio-level approaches to democratization in different contexts. This is to cover the elements that do seem to be alike across the Sida portfolio, namely the understanding of democracy pertaining to inclusivity and the application of a human rights-based approach, with emphasis on gender and with support provided from the perspectives of people living in poverty.

The feasibility study’s findings and the testing of the evaluation questions in the proof-of-concept exercise have shown that Sida has solid data available to allow for the reconstruction of theories of change that can be evaluated. The theory of change in most cases includes gender equality but not always other sub-populations. An evaluation will thus need to rely on non-Sida primary and secondary data as well. We did, however, find that Sida has knowledgeable staff that can explain the strategic and adaptability decisions made during strategy operationalisation and input to theory of change discussions and that these can provide a solid basis for an evaluation.

It is also very likely that an evaluation can establish results at a sub-portfolio level. Attribution at the portfolio level is more challenging, though elements can be identified (e.g., improved legislation for gender equality; improved accountability and participation in public service delivery). The sub-portfolio elements can be accumulated to provide general findings at a portfolio level, which can inform Sida’s future democratization approaches.

The team concludes by recommending that an evaluation be designed that is inspired by the evaluation criteria and questions in this report and uses a theory-based evaluation approach, possibly combined with contribution analysis. They furthermore conclude that an evaluation may be largely conducted remotely, with assistance from local experts in the case-study countries.
Finally, the team identified opportunities for heightening the learning aspects of an evaluation through the use of workshops and engagements with informants as points of learning. This could be included in the design of the evaluation.

The team therefore recommends that Sida moves ahead with designing the terms of reference for an evaluation of Sida’s democratization support.
Annex 1 - Terms of Reference
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1. Introduction

Sida has strong directives to support democratization in its partner countries as well as to strengthen democracy through support at regional and global levels. The democracy support at these three levels is interconnected and meant to be mutually reinforcing at country level. Implementing these directives can be a challenging and sensitive task given that Sida often operates in complex contexts. The task involves decisions related to how the entire country programme/portfolio should be managed to further democracy, create synergies between sectors and handle trade-offs to avoid possible negative effects. This means that the choice of channels, the level of involvement with the state and/or other change agents as well as how democracy support and support in other sectors contribute to democratization are important considerations. Democracy is Sida’s largest thematic area¹ - just over a quarter of all funds disbursed, which is almost twice the average of the world’s largest donor countries within the OECD.

The Swedish engagement in democracy support has increased significantly² over time. From 112 MUSD, 16% of Sida’s budget in 1998 to 870 MUSD, over a quarter of the budget in 2018. Also, the focus of the interventions has changed significantly. To see how well Sida has adapted to this increased focus, fast growth and change of the sector, Sida intends to conduct an evaluation assessing Sida’s approach to democratization relative to the experiences and best practices available.

Sida regularly performs a number of strategic evaluations in areas deemed important for the organization. The strategic evaluation plan for each period is decided by the Director General with support from Sida’s management team. For 2020, one of the strategic evaluations expected to be initiated is an evaluation of Sida’s approach to democratization in different contexts.

An evaluation of Sida’s approach to democratization is also included as part of the proposed actions in Sida’s response³ to the Letter of Appropriation 2020, where Sida is tasked to make an inventory and report back to the Swedish Government on Sida’s work on democracy in development cooperation⁴.

It is stated in the strategic evaluation plan 2020 that an evaluability study shall be undertaken prior to a decision on the proposed full-scale evaluation. This document is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for this evaluability study.

2. The proposed full-scale evaluation.

This is a short description of the proposed full-scale evaluation of Sida’s approach to democratization in different country and regional contexts, as well as on global level.

¹ Democracy is defined in terms of OECD DAC’s sector code and includes e.g. human rights, gender equality, the rule of law and public administration.
² Government letter in response to looking through and developing the work on democracy in development cooperation, 2019, and Study on Sida’s Support to Public Administration & Institutional Capacity Development 2003-2015: Perspectives, Evidence and Lessons Learned, 2016
³ https://www.svs.se/satssliggen/regleringsbrev/?RBID=20271
⁴ Government letter in response to looking through and developing the work on democracy in development cooperation, 2019
2.1 Users
Primary intended users:

- Sida’s networks for Democracy & Human Rights and Freedom of Expression & ICT as well as
  policy experts and program managers.
- Sida’s board and management.
- Operational Departments at Sida’s head office, including the geographical departments, the
  Unit for Democracy and Human Rights (DEMO), the Unit for Civil Society Support
  (CIVSAM) and the Unit for Capacity Development (KAPAME), as well as Swedish Missions
  abroad working with development cooperation.

Secondary intended users:

- The Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs.
- The Swedish Parliament.
- Institutions and organizations engaged in democracy support, and in other thematic areas, as
  intermediaries or implementors of Swedish democracy support, with a focus on Sida’s partners.

Other users:

- International institutions and organizations engaged in democracy support, as intermediaries or
  implementors and in other thematic areas.
- OECD/DAC Governance Network.
- Like-minded donors and philanthropists.

2.2 Use

- Increased knowledge of Sida’s approaches (direct and indirect) to democratization in different
  contexts.
- Input to improvement/development of the operationalisation and programming of strategies for
  Swedish Development Cooperation.
- Input to Sida’s strategy proposals to the Swedish Government, where democratization is a
  proposed strategy goal.
- Contribute to learning and development as well as internal consistency in democratization work
  within Sida at different geographical and organizational levels as well as coherence in Sida’s
  methods, theory and assessments related to this work.
- Support for communication and dialogue with cooperation partners and the general public.
- Part of Sida’s response to the assignment in the annual letter of appropriation related to the

2.3 Tentative areas of interest for the proposed full-scale evaluation

This is a short overview of the current thinking on relevant areas of interest for the proposed full-

scale evaluation. Please see also sub-chapter 3.3 on aspects of change logic and theory as well as

assessments of democratization that will be considered.

2.3.1 Theory and Logic

- Comparing Sida’s different approaches to democratization in different country contexts as well
  as on regional and global levels (the logic Sida uses and the theory behind it) with approaches
  used by other donors and in academic research. This should include a discussion on the
  suitability and, if deemed feasible, results of Sida’s approach as well as recommendations
  on potential improvements. On regional and global levels, the focus is primarily on the
  supportive effect for democratization support at country level.
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- Analyzing and assessing rationality and coherence of the theoretical and methodological approaches, including concepts and definitions used at different levels and departments/units within Sida as well as Sweden’s Missions abroad. Furthermore, analysing and assessing Sida’s logical/theoretical approach for evaluating/choosing different implementing partners and the partners’ approach.

- As part of this issue the question on how internal learning between departments/units/Swedish missions abroad can improve has a high focus.

- Espoused theory relative to theory-in-use (what we say we do compared to what is actually done). When evaluating interventions, implementation failure should be distinguished from theory failure.

2.3.2 Assessment

- Sida assesses the quality, level and change of democracy in partner countries as well as on aggregated regional and global levels continuously. This is done both as part of a context analysis at country, regional and global level for the purpose of policy discussions as well as part of planning and assessing strategy-, program- and portfolio- results. Since Sida’s target groups are often subsets of the population, assessments of effects must be disaggregated into relevant population segments. The proposed full-scale evaluation should compare Sida’s (and co-operating partners’) approach when assessing levels and changes of democracy with approaches used by other donors and in academic research. This should include a discussion on how the results feed back into the programs as well as Sida’s learning and method development. It should also include a discussion on the suitability of Sida’s approaches for assessment in different contexts and for the different purposes discussed above as well as recommendations on potential improvements.

- Discussing if using different methods and metrics would significantly alter the perceived outcomes in Sida funded programs and projects (contributions).

3. The assignment

3.1 Purpose of the Evaluability study: Intended use and intended users

This is an evaluability study in preparation for a proposed full-scale evaluation of Sida’s approach to supporting democratization in its partner countries, through interventions and partnership on national, regional and global levels. The purpose of the evaluability study is to assess the evaluability of Sida’s approach to democracy support and to development cooperation in other thematic areas and sectors supporting democratization. The evaluability study should also provide recommendations on methodology and methods as well as suggest relevant evaluation criteria and questions given the intended use of the proposed full-scale evaluation. The focus shall be on the underlying logic and theory used by Sida, the applied change theories1. See 2.3.1.

In addition, the evaluability study shall address the evaluability of the methods used by Sida to assess the situation, progress and results in the sector. See 2.3.2.

1 Change logic/theory is used here and in the rest of the document as a generic term and not a specification of any specific school of thought. It is meant to include the logic explaining which (chain of) actions are assumed to lead to which results as well as the theory behind these assumptions
Conclusions and recommendations from this evaluable study will provide input to Sida’s Evaluation Unit’s (UTV) decision on whether to proceed with the proposed full-scale evaluation. The tender is expected to include suggestions on how to make the process inclusive with for example workshops for discussing recommendations on how to conduct the proposed full-scale evaluation with optimal result. It is expected that the tender will suggest a progress reporting structure on a biweekly basis that keeps UTV current on the findings of the evaluable study. These reports are to be used as input to UTV’s parallel planning of the proposed full-scale evaluation.

The results from this evaluable study shall also provide input/data to the proposed full-scale evaluation, described above. The evaluable study is expected to compile two mappings including analysis within the areas of change logic/theories and assessment methods (see 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 below). These mappings shall be made available as two separate reports forming a base for Sida internal discussions and learning. Primary intended users of the mappings are the networks of Democracy & Human Rights and Freedom of Expression & ICT, including policy specialists and operational staff. As part of the process of compiling these mappings it is expected that tenders will propose one seminar/workshop for each mapping based on early findings and that the input from these seminars/workshops are allowed to have a large impact on the final analysis and mappings. It is also expected that tenders will include one learning seminar for each mapping where the results are presented and discussed.

The evaluable study is to be designed, conducted and reported to meet the needs of the intended users and tenderers shall elaborate in the tender how this will be ensured during the process.

3.2 Scope of the Evaluable Study

It is expected that the scope of the evaluable study shall be discussed in the tender. It is also expected that different alternatives for the scope of the evaluable study shall be further elaborated by the evaluator in the inception report with a discussion on pros and cons for the alternatives.

3.3 Objective of the Evaluable Study

3.3.1 Feasibility of the proposed full-scale evaluation

The proposed full-scale evaluation will focus on two main areas, both of which will be discussed more in detail below.

The question on how internal learning between departments/units/missions abroad can improve has a high focus.

(A) Sida’s change logic/theory, including how Sida assesses partners’ change logic/theory and

(B) Sida’s assessment of the quality, level and change of democracy in a country.

The first objective of the evaluable study is to assess the feasibility of the proposed full-scale evaluation with regards to availability of information/data for these two areas (A and B), as well as suitable methodology and methods for data collection. The evaluable study is expected to include a thorough discussion and recommendations on methods both for data collection as well as for evaluating (A) and (B) along the areas of interest discussed in section 2. The evaluable study is expected to include recommendations on the scope of the proposed
full-scale evaluation. Since the proposed full-scale evaluation would be rather demanding both regarding availability of data and methodology the tender is expected to show an understanding of the issues. When possible, methods prioritizing a larger sample by using desk studies, remote interviews etc. should be used instead of field trips.

To provide some reality feedback on the proposed methods, the report is expected to include a small scale “proof of concept” collection of information/data from a representative selection of sources (to be defined during the inception phase but not more than four cooperation countries).

The feasibility study should include proposals and discussions on scope, selection criteria regarding countries and interventions, data and suggestions on evaluation criteria and evaluation questions. This should include a discussion on how the change logic/theory and assessment methods used by Sida and its cooperation partners (data from point A and B below) can constructively be related/compared to the mappings from objective 3.2.2 and 3.3.3 below.

The tender should include a proposal on a debriefing workshop/seminar where the results relevant for the proposed full-scale evaluation can be discussed.

A) Sida’s change logic and theory as used and/or referenced to explicitly and implicitly within Sida or by an implementing partner.

The proposed full-scale evaluation is expected to include an extensive mapping of the change logic and theory (if any) used by Sida (or if relevant, it’s implementing partners) at different levels within Sida. This includes specifying the underlying logic (cause and effect relationships) of Sida’s democracy support including what resources and activities are expected to produce what results as well as the underlying theory on causality (why are these activities expected to produce these results). The theoretical superstructure should be limited to what is relevant for understanding the assumed causation in the chain of logic described. The theoretical mapping should include the commonly recurring theme - if and how donors should engage with non-democratic governments and, a discussion on the potential effects on democratization from donor involvement in other thematic areas and sectors. How can involvement within different sectors of a donor portfolio interact to support the goal of strengthening democracy? How can involvement through different channels interact to support democratization?

This is proposed to be done at three levels of analysis within Sida. The levels overlap in some cases and it is expected that a working division for the feasibility study will be agreed on in the inception report.

1. **Sida (agency) level.** Sida has a unit for Policy Support with Lead/Policy Specialists in the area of Democracy and Human Rights including Freedom of Expression/ICT (TEMA), as well as a dedicated unit for global support to Democracy and Human Rights (DEMO). Analysis at this level frequently focuses on policy and aggregated trends.

2. **Strategy level.** Approximately every fifth year a new country and regional strategy governing Sida’s work in each partner country is drafted and adopted by the Government of Sweden. This is done in two steps. First, a strategy proposal is elaborated by Sida which is by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs to inform government decisions on country, regional and global co-operation strategies which govern Sida’s work.

3. **Operational and intervention level.** When a new strategy is launched, the relevant Sida department/unit or Swedish mission abroad
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drafts an operationalization plan. A change logic and theory is an explicit part of the operationalization plan. Individual interventions are then initiated or in the case of already existing interventions they are either terminated or continued as deemed relevant for the new strategy. This is usually handled by the relevant country offices or regional departments.

The focus is both on espoused theory: What does Sida’s representatives communicate? How does Sida argue in strategy proposals? What does Sida units or Swedish missions abroad say or write in intervention documentation, as well as on what is actually done?

Note that the focus on change logic and theory should be on use relevant to Sida’s mission on democracy support and human rights with a focus on people living in poverty/people who are poor⁴.

B. Current assessment of democratization in Sida

Sida assesses the situation and progress of its strategy goals and programs/interventions related to democracy promotion at least yearly. In addition, there is a continuous general discussion on the state of democracy and freedom related to our partner countries among programme officers, thematic experts and policy specialists. The study should assess the feasibility of evaluating the suitability of the assessment methods used by Sida. This should be done at different levels preliminary suggested below but to be agreed on during the inception phase.

- Usage in Sida internal discussions/analysis of the aggregated trends (i.e. ‘shrinking democratic space,’ ‘democratic backsliding’, ‘autocratization’).
- In Sida internal assessments of goals/targets/progress for interventions and strategy goals.
- In Sida internal country analysis (i.e. Multi-Dimensional Poverty Analysis, MDPA).

3.3.2 State of the art thinking on change logic and theory for democracy promotion

International democracy support among OECD/DAC donors has remained fairly stable as share of donor budgets over time, 7% 1995 versus 10% today. Growing aid budgets however have increased the actual amount spent in the sector by almost 4 times to 12.5 billion USD (2017). During this time the focus of democracy aid has shifted substantially, and several new sub sectors/focus areas have been introduced. We can hope that 35 years of donor and partner experiences as well as academic endeavours have generated some valuable insights into what works well and what works less well in different contexts.

The second objective for the evaluability study is to compile a mapping of the current thinking among donors, partners and academics in the area of change logic and theory. Note that the same focus on practical use and limitations on theoretical superstructure as in the section above should apply here.

The mapping should relate to (but not be limited to) the following issues:

⁴ For a more stringent definition of poverty see Sida Multi-Dimensional Poverty Analysis primer which, in addition to economic resources define a number of other (for Sida) relevant dimensions.
Discussions on change logic and theory should, if relevant, also include information on existing criticism and areas of contestation of the logic/theory and if relevant, proposed alternatives.

The definition of democracy support should include democratic political institutions and processes, human rights, the rule of law, well functioning public administration and institutions, including state building.

Discussions on the potential effect on democratization from donor involvement in other sectors than democracy support. How can involvement within different sectors of a donor portfolio interact to support the goal of democratization? How can involvement through different channels interact to strengthen democracy?

Comparison of bilateral support to strengthen democracy versus support through multilateral or international organizations.

The discussion should include the commonly recurring theme if and how donors should engage with non-democratic governments. This issue should be considered in all of the questions above.

Include a discussion on Effect versus Cost/Resources versus Risk for change logic/theories discussed where risk includes inherent risks of failure to reach the expected outcomes, risk of adverse effects as well as risks for backlashes in the political sphere in the donor or partner country, including security risks faced by partners.

Democratization processes are complex processes driven by factors to a large extent outside the influence of international development actors, something the logic and theories guiding democracy support must account for. We expect the mapping to use a systems perspective in categorizing the area in a way relevant for addressing complex processes, but the tender should tentatively outline the suggested approach.

Sida’s work on strengthening democracy also takes place in many different contexts. It also works with many different approaches, most of the time overlapping. The tender should suggest how the mapping can relate to and include such factors in a constructive and comprehensible way including:

- Can we find a pattern of methodological/theoretical differences based on some categorization of context?
- Can we find a pattern of methodological/theoretical differences based on some categorization of within population target segments?

This mapping should be presented as a stand-alone deliverable (document and presentation) suitable to use as a basis for discussions and learnings. As part of the process of compiling the mapping, it is expected that the tender will include one seminar/workshop based on the early findings and that the input from this seminar/workshop is allowed to have a large impact on the final analysis and mapping. It is also expected that the tender should include a learning seminar after the conclusion of the study where the mapping will be presented and discussed.

3.3.3 State of the art for assessment of the state and change of democracy in developing countries

In order to analyse the state of democracy in our partner countries as well as assess to what extent the intended results of democratization support has been realized, one has to define both the intended results as well as be able to assess the state and change of democracy in a given context. Given the large number of actors as well as the varying contexts, the expected result
of democracy support will vary. Also, the unit of analysis will vary from the state down to different segments of the population.

The third objective for the evaluability study is to compile a mapping and discussion of the current thinking among donors, partners and academics on how to define and assess the levels and changes in the democratization processes of a country as well as its different sub populations. In particular with a focus on how to assess the results of democracy support as well as support through other thematic areas at strategy-, program- and portfolio level (formative as well as summative). Sida’s main target group is people living in poverty/people who are poor within their partner countries so there should be a focus on that sub population in addition to gender. The focus should not be on making a list of yearly indexes but rather on more “analytical” methods. We expect the tender to include a first, tentative suggestion on how to approach this task and a more detailed specification in the inception report.

This mapping/discussion should be presented as a stand-alone deliverable (document and presentation) suitable to use as a basis for discussions and learning. As part of the process of compiling the mapping, it is expected that the tender will include one seminar/workshop based on the early findings and that the input from this seminar/workshop will be allowed to have a large impact on the final analysis and mapping. It is also expected that the tender should include a learning seminar after the conclusion of the study where the mapping will be presented and discussed.

Questions are expected to be developed in the tender by the tenderer and further developed during the inception phase of the evaluability study.

3.4 Approach and methods for the Evaluability Study

It is expected that the evaluator describes and justifies an appropriate evaluability study approach/methodology and methods for data collection in the tender. The evaluability study design, methodology and methods for data collection and analysis are expected to be fully developed and presented in the inception report.

Limitations to the chosen approach/methodology and methods shall be made explicit by the evaluator and the consequences of these limitations discussed in the tender. The evaluator shall to the extent possible, present mitigation measures to address them. A clear distinction is to be made between evaluability study approach/methodology and methods.

A gender responsive approach/methodology, methods, tools and data analysis techniques should be used.

Sida’s approach to evaluation is utilization-focused, which means the evaluator should facilitate the entire evaluability study process with careful consideration of how everything that is done will affect the use of the evaluability study. It is therefore expected that the evaluators, in their tender, present

i) how intended users are to participate in and contribute to the evaluability study process and

ii) methodology and methods for data collection that create space for reflection, discussion and learning between the intended users of the evaluability study.

In cases where sensitive or confidential issues are to be addressed in the evaluability study, evaluators should ensure a design and process that do not put informants and stakeholders at risk during the data collection.

---

3 For a more stringent definition see Sida Multi-Dimensional Poverty Analysis primer which, in addition to economic resources define a number of other (for Sida) relevant dimensions of poverty as well as integrates the five perspectives, e.g. perspectives of people living in poverty, a human rights based approach (rights perspective) and a gender equality perspective.
collection phase or the dissemination phase. The evaluators will be requested to sign confidentiality agreements with Sida.

4. Organisation of evaluability study management

This evaluability study is commissioned by Sida’s Evaluation Unit (UTV) at the Department for Operational Support. Which also, together with the networks for Democracy & Human Rights, Freedom of Expression & ICT, relevant policy specialists and operational staff involved in programming are the intended users. Representatives from UTV together with representatives from relevant units within Sida has formed a steering group, which has contributed to and agreed on the ToR for this evaluability study. The steering group is a decision-making body. It will approve the inception report, the final report of the evaluability study, the mappings and evaluate the tenders. The steering group will participate in the start-up meeting of the evaluability study, as well as in the debriefing/validation workshop and the two mapping workshops where preliminary findings and conclusions are discussed.

5. Quality of the Evaluability Study

All Sida’s evaluations shall conform to OECD/DAC’s Quality Standards for Development Evaluation\(^5\). The evaluators shall use the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation\(^6\). The evaluators shall specify how quality assurance will be handled by them during the process.

6. Time schedule and deliverables

It is expected that a time and work plan is presented in the tender and further detailed in the inception report. The evaluability study shall be carried out between June 2020 and February 2021.

The table below lists key deliverables for the process. Alternative deadlines for deliverables may be suggested by the consultant and negotiated during the inception phase.

Workshops will be held in Stockholm. Meetings under point 6 will be virtual. Other meetings will be in Stockholm if deemed feasible by Sida, otherwise virtual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Deadlines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Start-up meeting (virtual)</td>
<td>Steering group and evaluators</td>
<td>2020-06-17 13:00-16:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inception meeting in Stockholm or virtual</td>
<td>Steering group, evaluators and reference group</td>
<td>End of August.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, Sida in cooperation with OECD/DAC, 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TERMS OF REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Comments from intended users to evaluators</td>
<td>Comments from Sida during inception meeting and in writing after inception meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Approval of inception report</td>
<td>Steering group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Data collection, analysis, report writing and quality assurance including bi-weekly update meetings/discussions with the steering group as a basis for their work on the ToR for the proposed full-scale evaluation.</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Workshop as part of input to mapping on change logic/theory (see 2.3.1)</td>
<td>Evaluators, steering group as well as relevant participants invited by the steering committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Workshop as part of input to mapping on assessment methods (see 2.3)</td>
<td>Evaluators, steering group as well as relevant participants invited by the steering committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Debriefing/validation workshop (meeting)</td>
<td>Evaluators, steering group, reference group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10. Draft evaluability study report  
- Feasibility study  
- Mapping change logic/theory  
- Mapping assessment method | Evaluators | Beginning December |
| 11. Comments from intended users to evaluators | Steering group | Mid December |
| 12. Final evaluability report | Evaluators | Mid or end January |
| 13. Seminar Feasibility study | Evaluator, UTV, Steering group. | End January or beginning February |
| 14. Workshop Mapping change logic/theory | Evaluators, relevant Sida personnel | February, Steering group decides preliminary date during inception phase. |
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TERMS OF REFERENCE

15. Workshop Mapping assessment methods
   Evaluators, relevant Sida personell
   February, Steering group decides preliminary date during inception phase.

The inception report will form the basis for the continued evaluability process and shall be approved by Sida before the evaluability study proceeds to implementation. The inception report should be written in English and cover evaluability issues and interpretations of evaluability questions, present the evaluability study approach/methodology (including how a utilization-focused and gender responsive approach will be ensured), methods for data collection and analysis as well as the full evaluability study design. A clear distinction between the evaluability study approach/methodology and methods for data collection shall be made. All limitations to the methodology and methods shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed. A specific time and work plan, including number of hours/working days for each team member, for the remainder of the evaluability study should be presented. The time plan shall allow space for reflection and learning between the intended users of the evaluability study.

The final report as well as the two mappings (see 3.2, point 2 and 3) shall be written in English and be professionally proof read. The final reports should have a clear structure. The executive summary should be maximum 3 pages. The evaluability study approach/methodology and methods for data collection used shall be clearly described and explained in detail and a clear distinction between the two shall be made. All limitations to the methodology and methods shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed. Findings shall flow logically from the data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions should be substantiated by findings and analysis. Findings, conclusions and recommendations should reflect a gender analysis/an analysis of identified and relevant cross-cutting issues. Recommendations and lessons learned should flow logically from conclusions. The report should be no more than 35 pages excluding annexes (including Terms of Reference and Inception Report) while a target for the two mappings should be discussed and agreed on during the inception phase. The evaluator shall adhere to the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation10.

The evaluator shall, upon approval of the final report and mappings, insert them into the Template for Sida Studies in Evaluation11 and submit them to Nordic Morning (in pdf-format) for publication and release in the Sida publication data base. The order is placed by sending the approved reports to sida@nordicmorning.com, with a copy to Johan Kiessling as well as evaluation@sida.se. Write “Sida Studies in Evaluation” in the email subject field. The following information must be included in the order to Nordic Morning:

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

10 Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, Sida in cooperation with OECD/DAC, 2014.
11 The template will be provided by Sida.
7. Evaluability study team qualification

In addition to the qualifications already stated in the framework agreement for evaluation services, the evaluation team shall include the following competencies:

1. Extensive knowledge and experience of democratization support in different contexts, including developing, transitional and conflict and fragility affected countries.
2. An active researcher at consultant level PhD with expert knowledge of the research area democratization processes in different contexts, including developing, transitional and conflict and fragility affected countries.
3. An active researcher at consultant level PhD with expert knowledge of assessment methods of democratization (situation, levels and results).
4. Extensive experience of other donors' democratization support (processes, assessment methods, theories of change etc), including bilateral, multilateral, European and non-European donors.
5. Extensive experience of at least 5 assignments of evaluating democracy support.
6. Documented knowledge and experience of utilization-focused evaluation and participatory evaluation processes.
7. Extensive facilitation and communication skills.
8. Extensive experience of leading learning workshops.
9. At least one team member must have an excellent command of Swedish.

Please note that the consultancy firm/consortium, including separate members of a consortium carrying out the evaluability study, may not qualify for tendering for the full-scale evaluation due to potential conflicts of interest.

A CV for each team member shall be included in the tender. It should contain a full description of relevant qualifications and professional work experience.

It is important that the competencies of the individual team members are complimentary. It is highly recommended that local consultants are included in the team if appropriate.

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

8. Financial and human resources

The maximum budget amount available for the evaluability study is 1 800 000 SEK.

The contact person at Sida is Johan Kiesling, VERKSTÖD/UTV. The contact person should be consulted if any problems arise during the evaluation process.

Relevant Sida documentation will be provided by the Evaluation Unit, VERKSTÖD/UTV.

Contact details to intended users will be provided by the Evaluation Unit, VERKSTÖD/UTV.

The evaluator will be required to arrange the logistics for bookings, interviews, preparing visits including any necessary security arrangements. Meetings and workshops with Sida will be prepared in collaboration between Sida and the evaluator but the evaluator has the overarching responsibility for the organization.
9. Annexes

Annex A: List of key documentation

Regeringskritikelse till svar på att inventera och utveckla arbetet med demokrati i utvecklingssamarbetet, 2019 (references to important research can be found in the paper)

Sidanskrivelse som svar på Regleringsbrevsupdrag om Krympande demokratiskt utrymme, 2017


SADEV, Demokratisk utveckling och ökad respekt för mänskliga rättigheter – resultat av svensk bistånd, SADEV report 2012:1


Andersen et al., Supporting State-Building for Democratisation? A Study of 20 Years of Swedish Democracy Aid to Cambodia, EBA Rapport 2019:03

Swedish Aid in the Era of Shrinking Democratic Space – the Case of Turkey, EBA Rapport 2018:06

European Partnership for Democracy, Democracy Abroad: Different European approaches to supporting democracy, 2019, [link]

European Partnership for Democracy, Review of European Democracy Support, An Executive Summary of Findings and Recommendations, June 2019, [link], accessed 2020-03-27


To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2018.1479693, accessed 2020-03-27


Annex 2 - List of documentation

**Sida Agency Level**

**Swedish Government Policy Framework for Swedish Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Assistance**


**Annual Letters of Appropriation(2016:2020)**

  
  2016: ud2016/20546/iu
  2017: ud2017/20467/iu
  2018: ud2018/20984/iu
  2019: ud2019/18461/iu
  2020: ud2020/08919/iu
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To access Documents older than 2016: https://www.esv.se/statsliggaren/regleringsbrev/?rbid=18127

**Documentation for Decision / Basis for new Sida Strategies (2015:2020)**


**Democracy and Human Rights Portfolio**

Global Strategies Within Democracy or Sectors Contributing to Democracy


2015: Ärendenummer: 16/000565


2016: Ärendenummer: 16/000297


2016: Ärendenummer: 16/000340
2017: Ärendenummer: 17/000606
2018: Ärendenummer: 18/000239


2016: Ärendenummer: 16/000297.


2016: Ärendenummer: 16/000297
2017: Ärendenummer: 17/000760
2018: Ärendenummer: 18/000456
2019: Ärendenummer: 19/000617
2020: Ärendenummer: 19/001533


2019: Ärendenummer: 19/000302
2020: Ärendenummer: 20/000065.


**Management Guidelines**

Sida. (2007). *Strengthening Sida Management for Development Results*

**Operationalisation Plans for Strategy**


Annual Strategy Reports (Global)

Sida Thematic Briefs

**Global Evaluations**


**Sida’s Annual Reports**


**Sida’s Regional Strategies**


**Sida Guidelines and Tools**

**Power:**


**Gender:**


**HRBA:**
Sida. (2014). *HRBA and Democratic Governance*.

**Poverty:**
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Peace And Conflict:

Environment:

Evaluation:

Budgets and Disbursements
  *February 2020: Diarienummer: 20/000446.*
September 2020: Diarienummer: 20/001248.
2017: Diarienummer: 17/000358.
2018: Diarienummer: 18/000447.
2019: Diarienummer: 19/000288.


Other
Blamey, A And Mackenzie, M. (2007). ‘Theories of Change and Realistic Evaluation - Peas in a Pod or Apples and Oranges?’.
Earl, S Et al. (2001). Outcome Mapping: Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs IDRC.


Sida. (N.D). *Bilaga 1 Resultatredovisning - Exempel På Uppnådda Resultat För Några Av De Större Multi-Bi-Insatserna.*


**Focus Countries: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Ukraine**

**Swedish Government Country Strategy**

**Documents Identified Bangladesh**

**Documents Identified Ethiopia**

**Documents identified Ukraine**
Sida underlying Strategy Input to Strategy Adopted by the Swedish Government

Documents identified Bangladesh


Documents identified Ethiopia


Documents identified Ukraine


Operationalisation Plans for Strategy and Yearly and Suggestions for Indicators (Country-Level)

Documents identified Bangladesh

**Annex 2 - List of Documentation**


**Documents identified Ethiopia**


**Documents identified Ukraine**


Sida. (2016). *Verksamhetsplan För Ukraina 2017*


**Government Instructions for Strategy Inputs (Underlag)**


**Documents Identified Ethiopia**


**Documents Identified Ukraine**


**In-Depth Strategy Reports**

**Documents Identified Bangladesh**


**Documents identified Ethiopia**


**Documents identified Ukraine**
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Annual Strategy Reports

**Documents identified Bangladesh**


- 2016: Ärendenummer: 16/000565
- 2017: Ärendenummer: 17/000352


**Documents identified Ethiopia**


- 2015: Ärendenummer: 14/000768
- 2017: Ärendenummer: 16/000112
- 2018: Ärendenummer: 18/000619
- 2020: Ärendenummer: 19/001376

**Documents identified Ukraine**


**Country Reports And Analysis**

**Documents identified Bangladesh**

Documents identified Ethiopia

Documents identified Ukraine

Outcome Assessments And Results Analysis
Documents identified Bangladesh

Country Evaluations
Documents identified Bangladesh

Documents identified Ethiopia

Documents identified Ukraine
Selected Programme And Project Evaluations

Documents identified Bangladesh

Documents identified Ethiopia

Documents identified Ukraine

MDPA Analysis

Documents identified Bangladesh

Documents identified Ethiopia

Power Analyses

**Documents identified Ethiopia**

**Conflict Analysis (where developed)**
**Documents identified Bangladesh**

**Documents identified Ethiopia**

**Documents identified Ukraine**

**Sub-Population Analyses**
**Documents identified Bangladesh**

**Documents identified Ethiopia**
Humanitarian Crisis Analysis. (2020). *Ethiopia*
Gender Analyses

Documents identified Ethiopia

Documents identified Ukraine
Grb Project. (N.D). Gender Responsive Budgeting in Ukraine Project.

Other

Documents Identified Bangladesh
Sida. (2012). Reality Check Bangladesh 2011 – Listening to Poor People’s Realities About Primary Healthcare And Primary Education – Year 5.

Documents identified Ethiopia

**Documents Identified Ukraine**


## Annex 3 - List of Persons Consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Unit/Department/ Embassy at Sida</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christine Johansson</td>
<td>Counselor/Deputy Head of Mission Head of Development Cooperation</td>
<td>Embassy of Sweden in Dhaka, Bangladesh</td>
<td>November 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iryna Skaliy</td>
<td>National Programme officer</td>
<td>Democracy and Human Rights Portfolio, Embassy of Sweden in Kiev, Ukraine</td>
<td>October 30\textsuperscript{th}, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Prusakov</td>
<td>National Programme Officer</td>
<td>Environment, Climate and Energy, Embassy of Sweden in Kiev, Ukraine</td>
<td>October 30\textsuperscript{th}, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Åkerlund</td>
<td>Lead Policy Specialist Peace and Security</td>
<td>Policy Support Unit, Department for International Organisations and Policy Support (INTEM), Sida, Stockholm</td>
<td>October 28\textsuperscript{th}, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena Reuterswärd</td>
<td>Policy Specialist Education</td>
<td>Policy Support Unit (INTEM), Sida, Stockholm</td>
<td>October 28\textsuperscript{th}, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annika Nordin Jayawardena</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Swedish Mission, Head of Development Cooperation</td>
<td>Embassy of Sweden in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia</td>
<td>October 28\textsuperscript{th}, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin Borovic</td>
<td>First Secretary/Team Leader &amp; Programme Manager and Team Leader</td>
<td>Governance, Gender Equality, Human Rights, Bilateral Development Section &amp; Governance Support in Embassy of Sweden in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia</td>
<td>October 28\textsuperscript{th}, 2020 and November 10\textsuperscript{th}, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Department/Unit</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla Redner</td>
<td>Strategy Coordinator, Senior Program Manager</td>
<td>Democracy and Human Rights Unit (INTEM)</td>
<td>Sida Stockholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffan Smedby</td>
<td>Head of Unit</td>
<td>Democracy and Human Rights Unit (INTEM)</td>
<td>Sida Stockholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Danielsson</td>
<td>Head of Unit</td>
<td>Eastern Europe Unit, Department for Europe and Latin America (EUROLATIN)</td>
<td>Sida Stockholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birgitta Jansson</td>
<td>Thematic advisor on democracy and Human Rights</td>
<td>Eastern Europe Unit, Department for Europe and Latin America (EUROLATIN)</td>
<td>Sida Stockholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göran Holmqvist</td>
<td>Director of Department</td>
<td>Department for Asia, Middle East and Humanitarian Assistance (HUMASIA)</td>
<td>Sida Stockholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Kurosz</td>
<td>Russia Coordinator Program Specialist</td>
<td>Eastern Europe Unit, Reform Cooperation Unit, Department for Europe and Latin America (EUROLATIN)</td>
<td>Sida Stockholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Karefelt</td>
<td>Policy Specialist Freedom of Expression/ICT</td>
<td>Policy Support Unit (INTEM)</td>
<td>Sida Stockholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Andersson</td>
<td>First Secretary</td>
<td>Environment and Climate Change Embassy of Sweden in Dhaka, Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Guittet</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Cooperation and Coordinating the Humanitarian Support</td>
<td>Development Cooperation Section Embassy of Sweden in Dhaka, Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Department/Unit</td>
<td>Contact Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annika Törnqvist</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>Private Sector and Environmental Aspect for Strategy Embassy of Sweden in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia</td>
<td>November 16th, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Holmertz</td>
<td>Head of Unit</td>
<td>Asia Unit Department for Asia, Middle East and Humanitarian Assistance (HUMASIA) Sida Stockholm</td>
<td>October 22nd, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Ericsson</td>
<td>Policy Specialist Human rights and democracy</td>
<td>MENA Unit Department for Asia, Middle East and Humanitarian Assistance (HUMASIA) Sida Stockholm</td>
<td>October 22nd, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas Johansson</td>
<td>Senior Advisor Democracy and Human Rights</td>
<td>Asia Unit Department for Asia, Middle East and Humanitarian Assistance (HUMASIA) Sida Stockholm</td>
<td>October 22nd, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin Sverkén</td>
<td>Head of Unit</td>
<td>Support Unit for Justice and Peace, Department for Africa (AFRICA) Sida Stockholm</td>
<td>October 22nd, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anders Emanuel</td>
<td>Policy Specialist Democracy and Human Rights</td>
<td>Support Unit for Justice and Department for Africa (AFRICA) Sida Stockholm</td>
<td>October 22nd, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malin Ericsson</td>
<td>Programme Manager/Specialist in Democracy and Human Rights</td>
<td>Support Unit for Justice and Peace Department for Africa (AFRICA) Sida Stockholm</td>
<td>October 22nd, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikael Boström</td>
<td>Policy Specialist</td>
<td>Department for Africa (AFRICA) Support Unit for Justice and Peace Sida Stockholm</td>
<td>October 21st, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulrika Åkesson</td>
<td>Lead Policy Specialist Environment and Climate Change</td>
<td>Policy Support Unit (INTEM/TEMA) Sida Stockholm</td>
<td>October 28th, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position and Office</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annika Moqvist Uggla</td>
<td>Senior Policy Adviser Democracy and Human Rights</td>
<td>Policy Support Unit (INTEM/TEMA)</td>
<td>October 28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tove Goldmann</td>
<td>Senior Advisor Environment and Climate (support Burkina Faso, Mali, DRC)</td>
<td>Department for Africa (AFRICA)</td>
<td>October 28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viveka Carlestam</td>
<td>Policy Specialist Civil Society</td>
<td>Unit for Civil Society Support (PARTNER)</td>
<td>November 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmi Nure</td>
<td>National Program Office</td>
<td>Climate and Environment Embassy of Sweden in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia</td>
<td>November 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehana Khan</td>
<td>Senior Program Officer</td>
<td>Gender Equality, Human Rights and Democracy – Development Cooperation Section</td>
<td>November 19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annual Strategy Reports

- Overall, the recent annual strategy reports state their sources more clearly than the old ones. In all reports, ID of the project is provided. For example, it is mentioned “e.g: SDR Projekt ID 52170019: Updatering från november 2018”. There is no list of reference in ALL reports, but mostly reference program made in partnership with organisations and other international organisations. References of statements/claims/numbers. No clear reference list. Here is an overview of the main sources used:

  - Index/Indices/Indicators:
    - Transparency International; The World Justice Projects; Absence of Corruption Index* Ranking; World Press Freedom*; Human Development Index; UNDP Human Development Indices and Indicators
    * Do not mention the source of this index (developed by themselves; other source)

  - Programmes (Sida cites/mentions the partnerships of programs they supported - however it is rarely referenced as a SOURCE/CITATION. These mentions are used to discuss how things have improved or not after supporting this specific program or partnership):
    - ChT Conflict Prevention, Recovery & Peacebuilding, UNDP Bangladesh Human Rights Program, TIB – BIBL; BWLA; UN Women, Centre of Excellence in Ready Made Garment Sector, Bangladesh Global Deal Project, HPNSDP, Urban Health 51060002, Plan International Bangladesh, UNFPA, Ain O Salish Kendra, Asia Foundation, Bangladesh Statistics Bureau.

  - Reports/Analysis: (ONLY IN THE 2018 REPORT)
    - World Bank country report and other reports (impact assessments); IMF Country report and other reports; Global Gender Gap; reports from Sida; UNICEF data; analysis from Human Rights Watch and other research report; ICNL; Transparency International; OHCHR; Statistics Bangladesh, Reports from UNFPA; UN Women, Plan International; Foundations, Labour Force Surveys; UNHCR.

  - Data Statistics
    - BSI analysis tool; Sida statistics, Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (in collaboration
      with UNFPA for example)

  - Others (very rarely):
    - Cite articles from the Bangladesh Constitution  
    - Cite journal articles (local ones)

### MDPA

- Overall, references used for the democracy/power relations and other contextual issues are often from international organisations such as UNICEF, UNDP, World Bank (reports, index & indicators), Human Rights, Amnesty International. Data also comes from the official statistical institute from Bangladesh (e.g. Education) and surveys are realised in collaboration with international institutions (e.g. UNICEF). Indexes are widely used through the report. Use some reference from Sida and SMFA, but it is still rare. No clear reference list. Here is an overview of the main sources used:

  - Index/Indices/Indicators:
    - the Global Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI); Rule of Law Index from the World Justice Project; The Rule of Law Index 2019; Corruption Perception Index (Transparency International); WB Development Indicators; Government of Bangladesh and UNICEF (2019). Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2019; World Bank World Development Indicators 2017; Index of Fragile State; Global Peace Index 2019: Measuring Peace in a Complex World, Sydney.

  - Reports/Analysis:
    - IMF, World Bank (reports; assessments - such as poverty assessments); Government of Bangladesh, The Economist, UNDP (country profile); UNHABITAT, OPHI; World Bank, Overseas Development Institute Report on local governance, decentralisation and corruption, report from the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs; BBC articles, Reporters Without Borders, ICNL, Freedom House report, Transparency International (reports and survey), Sida reports; World Bank report; Centre for Policy Dialogues; Daily Star, ADB Assessments, World Bank Website, UNODC News, Transparency International, Ministry of Finance Bangladesh, UNICEF, Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics; Amnesty International, ILD, Oxford Internet Institute, Human Rights Watch, UNICEF, UNDP.

  - Surveys:

  - A few Academic Journals:
    - Author used a couple times: Rahman, H.Z. & Hossain, M; Khan et al. (2016); Asadul Islan & Russel Smith (2016);

### Country Strategies

- Overall, no sources were used for all the country strategies (no reference to reports, or programs or index).

- Strategy for Sweden’s Regional Development Cooperation in Asia and the Pacific Region (2016-2021) - NO SOURCES USED.

- Country Stratgy for Development Cooperation with Bangladesh Jan. 2002-Dec.2005 - NO SOURCES USED. Only mention surveys in the text (such as: “surveys carried out by UNICEF and the ILO show that…” (however not referenced) or the World Bank “According to the World Bank, Bangladeshi researchers…” (however not referenced).

- Samarbetsstrategi för utvecklingsarbetet med Bangladesh januari 2008 – december 2012 - SAME AS PREVIOUS NO SOURCES USED.

Results strategy for Bangladesh 2014-2020 NO SOURCES USED.
## SIDA’s Use of Sources and References – Bangladesh, Ethiopia and Ukraine

### Annual Strategy Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>MDPA</th>
<th>Country Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative Africa, Annual Report 2014-2015</td>
<td>MDPA 2019 ANALYSIS: Overall, a mix of everything, from academic journals to indices. Reference list clearly stated at the end (easy to find).</td>
<td>For one of the strategies, mention a few indicators, but they are not referenced or detailed. Mention international organisations as being present, but it is also not referenced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sida/UEWCA CSO Support Program Yearly | **Academic Papers:**  
- Abink, Jon, 2006. Ethnicity and Conflict Generation in Ethiopia: Some Problems and Prospects of Ethno-Regional Federalism  
- Ayalneh Bogale, Konrad Hagedorn, and Benedikt Korf, 2005. Determinants of poverty in rural Ethiopia  
- Fite, Megersa, Dugasa, 2014. The Ethiopia’s Legal Framework on Domestic Violence against Women: a Critical Perspective in International Journal of Gender and Women’s Studies  
- UNDP Human Development Index and Indicators Statistical Update  
- UN gender-related development index (GDI)  
- World Development Indicators (2001)  
- UNDP Human Development Index for 2002.  
| - World Development Indicators (2001)  
- UNDP Human Development Index for 2002.  

**Indices/Indicators:**  
- The Global Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI)  
- UNDP. 2018. Human Development Indices and Indicators Statistical Update  
- UNDP Human Development Index and Indicators Statistical Update  
- MDPA 2019 ANALYSIS: Overall, a mix of everything, from academic journals to indices. Reference list clearly stated at the end (easy to find).  
- Academic Papers:  
  - Abink, Jon, 2006. Ethnicity and Conflict Generation in Ethiopia: Some Problems and Prospects of Ethno-Regional Federalism  
  - Ayalneh Bogale, Konrad Hagedorn, and Benedikt Korf, 2005. Determinants of poverty in rural Ethiopia  
  - Fite, Megersa, Dugasa, 2014. The Ethiopia’s Legal Framework on Domestic Violence against Women: a Critical Perspective in International Journal of Gender and Women’s Studies  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Strategies</th>
<th>For one of the strategies, mention a few indicators, but they are not referenced or detailed. Mention international organisations as being present, but it is also not referenced.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ethiopia January 2003 – December 2007:  
- UNDP Human Development Index for 2002.  
- UN gender-related development index (GDI)  
- World Development Indicators (2001)  
- Mention these indicators but do not reference them, or go into the details. Otherwise mention international organisation such as UNDP being very present. |
| Strategy for Sweden’s development cooperation with Ethiopia 2016–2020 | NO SOURCES USED. |
- UNDP Human Development Index for 2002.  
- UN gender-related development index (GDI)  
- World Development Indicators (2001)  
- Mention these indicators but do not reference them, or go into the details. Otherwise mention international organisation such as UNDP being very present. |

**Reports:**  
- Ethiopian 2016 Human Rights Report  
- International Labor Office, 2018. Women and Men in the Informal Economy:  
- IMG Country Report No 15/300  
- The global gender gap report 2016. In World Economic Forum  
- Sida, 2015. Women and land rights, Gender toolbox in brief  

### Ethiopia

- Sida/UEWCA CSO Support Program Yearly  
- Women and Youth Economic Empowerment Project  
- Annual report of the SIDA financed Majang Project for the implementing period of January 01, 2015 – December 31, 2015  
- IF C Ethiopia MDI Investment Climate Program Progress report July- December 2015  
- HODECOVA end of 2015 progress report.
Annual Strategy Reports | MDPA | Country Strategies
--- | --- | ---
Reports from 2015-2017-2018-2019:
Mention a lot programs Sida supported or partnered with; there is a good base of indicators for the 2015 survey. Only used a few times surveys.

Index/Indices/Indicators (MOSTLY ONLY FOR THE 2015 REPORT):
- The degree of fulfillment of requirements for in-depth free trade area - European Integration Index (EAP Index.eu);
  Assessment of Sector Reform (EAP Index.eu); Ease of Doing Business index, World Bank Indicator; Quality of Business Administration (EAP Index.eu); The degree of anti-corruption (EAP Index.eu); Independent legislation (EAP Index.eu);
  World Justice Project Rule of Law Index; CSO sustainability Index (USAID); Democracy Index, Nations in Transit (Freedom House); Media Free Index (EAP Index.eu); Freedom House Freedom of the Press Index; REX Media Sustainability Index; The degree of respect for human rights (EAP Index.eu); The degree of non-discrimination of LGBTQ people (ILGA-Europe Rainbow Index); UNDP Gender Equality Index Value; Global Gender gap index (World Economic Forum); International Gender Gap Index.

Programs mentioned (same as for Bangladesh regarding how they are mentioned - number but no reference list):

Reports:

2019 report: Cite Statistics from UNFAP, UN, NDI + OSCE-led survey on violence against women "Well-being and safety of women".

Overall, for all country strategies for Ukraine, there is no mention of index, indices or indicators, and no sources are used and/or referenced.

Country strategy for Swedish development cooperation with Ukraine January 2005 – December 2008: NO INDEX/INDICES/INDICATORS CITED AND NO SOURCES USED.

Strategy for development cooperation with Ukraine January 2009 – December 2013: NO INDEX/INDICES/INDICATORS CITED AND NO SOURCES USED.

Results strategy for Sweden’s reform cooperation with Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans and Turkey 2014 – 2020: NO INDEX/INDICES/INDICATORS CITED AND NO SOURCES USED.

Reform Cooperation in Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans and Turkey – a summary of Sweden’s strategy for 2014-2020: NO INDEX/INDICES/INDICATORS CITED AND NO SOURCES USED.
Annex 5 - Sida funds by channel to Ethiopia, Bangladesh and Ukraine

ETHIOPIA:
Percentage of Sida’s Funds (2015-2020) Channeled Through
(from OpenAid.se)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIDA CHANNELS</th>
<th>AMOUNT SEK</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral Organisations (not marked as democracy / governance support)</td>
<td>1.379,12 Billion SEK</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral Organisations (marked as Democracy / Governance support)</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other channels (not marked as democracy / governance support)</td>
<td>1.589,23 Billion SEK</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other channels (marked as Democracy / Governance support)</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BANGLADESH
Percentage of Sida's Funds (2015-2020) Channeled Through
(from OpenAid.se)

- Multilateral Organisations (not marked as democracy / governance support)
- Multilateral Organisations (marked as Democracy / Governance support)
- Other channels (not marked as democracy / governance support)
- Other channels (marked as Democracy / Governance support)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIDA CHANNELS</th>
<th>AMOUNT SEK</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral Organisations (not marked as democracy / governance support)</td>
<td>887.4 Million SEK</td>
<td>47.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral Organisations (marked as Democracy / Governance support)</td>
<td>127.44 Million SEK</td>
<td>6.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other channels (not marked as democracy / governance support)</td>
<td>584.26 Million SEK</td>
<td>31.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other channels (marked as Democracy / Governance support)</td>
<td>262.46 Million SEK</td>
<td>14.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Multilateral Organisation: 1.010.4 Billion SEK
Total Not Multilateral Organisation: 846.72 Million SEK
UKRAINE
Percentage of Sida’s Funds (2015 - 2020) Channeled Through
(from OpenAid.se)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIDA CHANNELS</th>
<th>AMOUNT SEK</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral Organisations (not marked as democracy / governance support)</td>
<td>380.62 Million SEK</td>
<td>28.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral Organisations (marked as Democracy / Governance support)</td>
<td>5.5 Million SEK</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other channels (not marked as democracy / governance support)</td>
<td>247.81 Million SEK</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other channels (marked as Democracy / Governance support)</td>
<td>690.69 Million SEK</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Multilateral Organisation: 386.12 Million SEK
Total Not Multilateral Organisation: 938.5 Million SEK
### Annex 6 - Country strategy document mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Democratization reference</th>
<th>Democratic sub-themes identified</th>
<th>Reference to gender</th>
<th>Reference to sub-population</th>
<th>Reference to cross-cutting issues</th>
<th>Identification of key stakeholders</th>
<th>Assessment of ToC</th>
<th>Assessment of past results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRC</strong></td>
<td>2015-2019</td>
<td>Specific objectives focusing on human rights, democracy and gender equality</td>
<td>Rule of law - Women's rights - Civil society - Public administration</td>
<td>Gender equality part of specific objective</td>
<td>Children - Youth</td>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>Media - Democratized governments - Civil society (including cultural institutions, women's groups and youth groups)</td>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>Only broad policy with multiple intentions. Few elements of actual ToC. Only clear reference to background analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethiopia</strong></td>
<td>2018-2022</td>
<td>Specific objectives focusing on human rights, democracy and rule of law</td>
<td>Human rights - Reconciliation - Politics - Civil society - Women's rights - Media - Public administration</td>
<td>Women's part of objective</td>
<td>Youth and IDPs referred to as target groups</td>
<td>Environment part of strategy but not linked to democracy</td>
<td>State - Women's organizations - EU - G5 Sahel</td>
<td>Only broad policy with multiple intentions. Few elements of actual ToC. Only clear reference to background analysis.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberia</strong></td>
<td>2014-2016</td>
<td>Specific objectives focusing on human rights, democracy and rule of law</td>
<td>Rule of law - Capacity public administration - Women's rights - Civil society</td>
<td>Women's part of the human rights objective</td>
<td>Youth are mentioned</td>
<td>Women's part of the human rights objective</td>
<td>Civil Society and media - Women's organizations - EU - Liberia</td>
<td>Very broad reference to Burundian fears. Only few elements of ToC.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somalia</strong></td>
<td>2018-2023</td>
<td>Specific objectives focusing on human rights, democracy and rule of law</td>
<td>Human rights - Rule of Law - Civil society</td>
<td>Women's part of objective</td>
<td>Children and IDPs referred to</td>
<td>Environment part of strategy but not linked to democracy</td>
<td>Private sector - Women's rights - Civil society</td>
<td>Only broad policy with multiple intentions. Few elements of actual ToC. Only clear reference to background analysis.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sweden</strong></td>
<td>2016-2020</td>
<td>Specific objectives focusing on human rights, democracy and gender equality</td>
<td>Rule of law - Women's rights - Civil society - Public administration</td>
<td>Gender equality part of specific objective</td>
<td>Children - Youth</td>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>Media - Democratized governments - Civil society (including cultural institutions, women's groups and youth groups)</td>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>Only broad policy with multiple intentions. Few elements of actual ToC. Only clear reference to background analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- **DRC** has a general introduction to situation in DRC including some democratic challenges. No reference to background analysis.
- **Ethiopia** is very broad policy with multiple intentions. Few elements of actual ToC. Only clear reference to background analysis.
- **Liberia** is very broad policy with multiple intentions. Few elements of actual ToC. Only clear reference to background analysis.
- **Somalia** is very broad policy with multiple intentions. Few elements of actual ToC. Only clear reference to background analysis.
- **Sweden** is very broad policy with multiple intentions. Few elements of actual ToC. Only clear reference to background analysis.

**References:**
- Complex issues. Few elements of actual ToC. Only clear reference to background analysis.
- Very broad policy with multiple intentions. Few elements of actual ToC. Only clear reference to background analysis.
- Very broad policy with multiple intentions. Few elements of actual ToC. Only clear reference to background analysis.
- Very broad policy with multiple intentions. Few elements of actual ToC. Only clear reference to background analysis.

**Key Stakeholders:**
- The EU - Civil Society - State - Private sector - Women's organizations - Liberia.

**Cross-cutting Issues:**
- Human rights - Gender equality - Youth - Refugees - Youth groups - Local communities - Children.

**Other Issues:**
- Women's rights - Human rights - Rule of law - Transparency surrounding trade in conflict minerals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Specific objective focuses on:</th>
<th>COUNTRY STRATEGY DOCUMENT MAPPING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>2016-2020</td>
<td>Strengthened democracy and gender equality, and greater respect for human rights</td>
<td>- Specific objective focuses on strengthened democracy and gender equality, and greater respect for human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rights of women</td>
<td>- Gender equality and respect for human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young People</td>
<td>- Participation in the peace process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthened peace and reconciliation mechanisms</td>
<td>- Women’s participation in peace processes and peacebuilding and statebuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Human rights</td>
<td>- Human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Security</td>
<td>- Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Conflict resolution</td>
<td>- Conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rule of law</td>
<td>- Rule of law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Political process and promote accountability</td>
<td>- Political process and promote accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Gender equality and respect for human rights (women and children)</td>
<td>- Gender equality and respect for human rights (women and children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Civil society</td>
<td>- Civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Multinational and international peace and security-building measures</td>
<td>- Multinational and international peace and security-building measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- FBA</td>
<td>- FBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- State</td>
<td>- State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2016-2020</td>
<td>Strengthened democratic implementation of the peace agreement</td>
<td>- Sub-objective: Strengthened democratic implementation of the peace agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to transitional justice and human rights</td>
<td>- Access to transitional justice and human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Social dialogue</td>
<td>- Social dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rule of law</td>
<td>- Rule of law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Capacity of regional and local authorities</td>
<td>- Capacity of regional and local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation of women and youth in the peace process</td>
<td>- Participation of women and youth in the peace process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human rights defenders</td>
<td>- Human rights defenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Women’s organisations</td>
<td>- Women’s organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Children</td>
<td>- Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Afro-Colombians</td>
<td>- Afro-Colombians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthened capacity in public institutions and civil society</td>
<td>- Strengthened capacity in public institutions and civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Human rights</td>
<td>- Human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- EU</td>
<td>- EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Civil society</td>
<td>- Civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- State</td>
<td>- State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Women</td>
<td>- Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>2017-2021</td>
<td>Improved opportunities for participation in democratic and peacebuilding processes</td>
<td>- Sub-objective: Improved opportunities for participation in democratic and peacebuilding processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity in public institutions</td>
<td>- Capacity in public institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Better condition of civil society</td>
<td>- Better condition of civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Participation of women in democratic and peacebuilding processes</td>
<td>- Participation of women in democratic and peacebuilding processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Inclusive peacebuilding and statebuilding processes</td>
<td>- Inclusive peacebuilding and statebuilding processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender equality as a goal in itself</td>
<td>- Gender equality as a goal in itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- IDPs</td>
<td>- IDPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Other ethnic groups and religious minorities</td>
<td>- Other ethnic groups and religious minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Children</td>
<td>- Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Human rights</td>
<td>- Human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Corruption</td>
<td>- Corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Authorities and institutions</td>
<td>- Authorities and institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Women’s participation</td>
<td>- Women’s participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- EU</td>
<td>- EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- UN</td>
<td>- UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Iraqi diaspora</td>
<td>- Iraqi diaspora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>2017-2021</td>
<td>Strengthened public administration and accountability</td>
<td>- Specific objective that focuses on strengthening democracy, improved gender equality and greater respect for human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce corruption</td>
<td>- Reduce corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reparability and accountability in public institutions</td>
<td>- Reparability and accountability in public institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Capacity of civil society</td>
<td>- Capacity of civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Effective institutions at local and central level</td>
<td>- Effective institutions at local and central level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Women’s political and rights knowledge</td>
<td>- Women’s political and rights knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender equality as a sub-objective (and pre-requisite)</td>
<td>- Gender equality as a sub-objective (and pre-requisite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young people</td>
<td>- Young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Older people</td>
<td>- Older people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parentless households</td>
<td>- Parentless households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditions for gender equality and human rights</td>
<td>- Conditions for gender equality and human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Access to and respect for sexual and reproductive health rights</td>
<td>- Access to and respect for sexual and reproductive health rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Support to independent media</td>
<td>- Support to independent media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Strengthening monitoring and defence of human rights</td>
<td>- Strengthening monitoring and defence of human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reduced discrimination and improved accountability</td>
<td>- Reduced discrimination and improved accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish ministry of foreign affairs</td>
<td>- Swedish ministry of foreign affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>2015-2019</td>
<td>Strengthened democracy, improved gender equality and greater respect for human rights</td>
<td>- Specific objective that focuses on strengthened democracy, improved gender equality and greater respect for human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More transparent and democratically governed public Palestinian authorities</td>
<td>- More transparent and democratically governed public Palestinian authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom of expression</td>
<td>- Freedom of expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective accountability mechanisms</td>
<td>- Effective accountability mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political influence of women corruption</td>
<td>- Political influence of women corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender equality as a key starting point</td>
<td>- Gender equality as a key starting point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women and children with disabilities</td>
<td>- Women and children with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>- Human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Conditions for the provision of basic health services</td>
<td>- Conditions for the provision of basic health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Preserving Palestinian identity and heritage is central to state-building</td>
<td>- Preserving Palestinian identity and heritage is central to state-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Palestinian Authority</td>
<td>- National Palestinian Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>- EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very broad policy. Few elements of ToC. Strengthened capacity of public institutions will strengthen the capacity for administration of natural resources.</td>
<td>- Very broad policy. Few elements of ToC. Strengthened capacity of public institutions will strengthen the capacity for administration of natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General assessment of the democratic situation, general issues are pointed out.</td>
<td>- General assessment of the democratic situation, general issues are pointed out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No assessment of past results.</td>
<td>- No assessment of past results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name of groups and actors are stated.</td>
<td>- Name of groups and actors are stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No assessment of past results.</td>
<td>- No assessment of past results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No assessment of past results.</td>
<td>- No assessment of past results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No assessment of past results.</td>
<td>- No assessment of past results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Specific objective</td>
<td>Strengthen democracy and gender equality, and greater respect for human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>2015-2020</td>
<td>Strengthened democracy and gender equality, and greater respect for human rights</td>
<td>Women are part of the objective: - young girls - human rights + child’s rights - opportunities for young women and girls to take decisions regarding their sexuality and reproduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>2020-2024</td>
<td>Strategy promote democratic development in Russia and contribute to strengthened freedom of experience and greater respect for human rights and the rule of law</td>
<td>-strengthened capacity among civil society - increase knowledge about human rights - increase knowledge on gender equality and work against discrimination - work against corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2018-2022</td>
<td>Human Rights, democracy and the Rule of Law</td>
<td>- Improved rule of Law - increased transparency - accountability: - women’s and girl’s human rights - civil society - Rule of Law - Public administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>2015-2019</td>
<td>Strengthened democracy and gender equality, and greater respect for human rights</td>
<td>- Strengthened civil society to promote participation and accountability, peace and reconciliation and respect for human rights - free and impartial media - Strengthened capacity of Rwandan society to promote greater equality of human rights, focus women and girls - political pluralism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluability Study of Sida’s Approach to Democratization in Different Contexts

This report presents the feasibility of evaluating Sida’s support for democratization, and provides recommendations for evaluation criteria, scope, questions, and methodology. Support for democratization includes Sida’s combined country-level portfolio contribution to democratization. The study assesses evaluability in principle, practice, and utility to Sida. A theory-based approach was applied to identify Sida’s theory(ies) of change for democratization, as well as a proof-of-concept. This study found that an evaluability is feasible in principle and practice but with caveats. There is no uniform definition of democracy and democratization. However, agency-level elements allow for an understanding of democratization. There is ample data available at the portfolio and staff level. The report recommends the use of the four OECD/DAC evaluation criteria as well as a theory-based evaluation approach combined with contribution analysis. Portfolio-level theories of change should be reconstructed through workshops, KII, focus group and desk analysis. Finally, the study recommends the use of multiple case studies to capture the variance of theories of change across context.