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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** *[max. 2 pages]*

# INTRODUCTION *[adapt as necessary if assignment is desk based]*

The mid-term review of the Programme/Project in *“Country”* was fielded during *“period”* with the aim of providing an independent assessment of the performance of the programme in accordance with DANIDA’s Aid Management Guidelines, in particular Guidelines for Country Strategic Frameworks, Programmes and Projects. The mid-term review among others includes assessment of results, progress, challenges, development in risk factors, and need for adjustments due to developments in the country *[thematic, regional]* context. See Terms of Reference (ToR) in Annex 1 for further description of the scope of work of the review.

The review mission included field trips to …….. which contributed to the work of the Review Team (RT). During the mission, the RT met with key stakeholders … (See list of persons met in annex 2). The review was carried out by *[names and designations of team members].* The RT would like to express its thanks to everyone met during the assignment, for allocating their valuable time for and sharing their knowledge and experience with the team.

This report presents the major findings and recommendations of the RT, based on the institutions and persons consulted during the visit and on the documents consulted prior to and during the visit. The proposals and recommendations provided in the report reflect the position of the RT alone. The views expressed may not necessarily be shared by the Management of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs/DANIDA or the Government of ……. .

*NB: The proposed areas for assessment below take point of departure in section* 5*.*3 *in Danida* [*“Guidelines for Country Strategic Frameworks, Programmes & Projects”*](https://amg.um.dk/bilateral-cooperation/guidelines-for-country-strategic-frameworks-programmes-and-projects) .

*Note: The mid-term review will assess progress against the 6 OECD/DAC quality criteria for Development Cooperation (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability). The criteria should be applied as an integral part across the proposed areas for assessment as relevant.*

*[Following sections should be adapted to whether the review concerns a bilateral development programme under a Country Strategic Framework, a stand-alone programme, earmarked multilateral contribution or a project]*

# The Programme/Project

* Overview of the Programme/Project

# CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND

* Political, social, economic and human rights developments relevant for the implementation of the programme/project including e.g. in relation to poverty reduction, human rights, gender equality, climate change, environment, green growth, the role of civil society etc.
* Major changes in political-economy and drivers of change.
* Assessment of changes in the donor landscape and possible implications for the programme/project.
* Assessment of developments in contextual assumptions and risks and assessment of whether these affect possible scenarios.

# assessment at programme level

* Assessment of the development in strategic linkages between the overall objectives as defined in relevant policy papers *[including in relation to a Country Strategic Framework, if relevant]* and the objectives at the programme level.
* Assessment of whether the overall theory of change at programme level is still valid and if changes in assumptions have occurred that influence the programme.
* *[Relevance will depend on nature of programme – for projects the point is assessed below]* OverallAssessment in relation to poverty orientation and target group considerations (Gender Age and Disability (GAD)); Leaving No One Behind (LNOB); Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA); and climate change and environmental considerations (targeting or mainstreaming).
* For programmes that target climate and/or environment as principal or significant objective, the assessment should consider relevant definitions, including for the Rio markers.
* Adequacy of aid modalities applied and manageability of programme.
* Assessment of the quality of the results framework at programme level (if relevant).
* General assessment of progress and results.
* Assessment of linkages to other Danish funded engagements and of whether adjustments in implementation strategy have taken place following the approach for Doing Development Differently (DDD).
* Overall programme organisation and management including MEAL.
* Assessment of disbursements and expenditures, as well as the relationship between physical and financial progress at programme level.
* Use and recommendation on unallocated and re-allocated funds.
* Progress in capacity development, including possible Danida advisors.

# Assessment at project level

*[If review concerns a stand-alone project, relevant points from section 4 above are incorporated with points below. For programmes that include several projects, key findings and summary of assessment of progresses at project level are presented under section 5 – more detailed assessments at project level may be presented in annexes, if needed]*

* Assessment of developments in relevant partner strategies.
* Assess whether the overall theory of change at project level is still valid and if changes in assumptions have occurred that influence the programme.
* OverallAssessment in relation to poverty orientation and target group considerations (Gender Age and Disability (GAD)); Leaving No One Behind (LNOB); Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA); and climate change and environmental considerations (targeting or mainstreaming).
* For projects that target climate and/or environment as principal or significant objective, the assessment should consider relevant definitions, including for the Rio markers.
* Assessment of project monitoring mechanisms and whether learning gathered during implementation is systematically applied in adjusting project implementation (DDD approach).
* Progress towards objectives and in relation to key indicators.
* Project management, including financial management.
* Assessment of disbursements and expenditures, as well as the relationship between physical and financial progress.
* Assessment of risks (programmatic and institutional).
* Assessment of sustainability and exit strategies.

**ANNEX 1**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**ANNEX 2**

**MEETING SCHEDULE AND PERSONS MET**

**ANNEX 3**

**SUMMARY OF REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS**

*[For instruction on filling in the table on* [*Summary of Recommendations see here*](https://amg.um.dk/bilateral-cooperation/guidelines-for-country-strategic-frameworks-programmes-and-projects)*]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of Programme/Project** |  |
| **File number/F2 reference** |  |
| **Appraisal report date** |  |
| **Council for Development Policy meeting date** |  |
| **Summary of possible recommendations not followed** **(to be filled in by the responsible unit)** |
| **Overall conclusion of the review** |
| **Recommendations by the review team** | **Follow up by the responsible unit** |
| **Bilateral Development Programme/Programme Level:** *[Insert heading for each recommendation as relevant related to RAM report heading e.g. ]* |
| *[Title]* |
| *[No.]* |  |
| *[No.]* |  |
| *[Title]* |
| *[No.]* |  |
| *[No.]* |  |
| *[Title]* |
| [No.] |  |
| [No.] |  |
| [Title] |
| *[No.]* |  |
| *[No.]* |  |
| **Project Level***[Insert heading for each recommendation as relevant]* |
| *[Title]* |
| *[No.]* |  |
| *[No.]* |  |
| *[Title]* |
| *[No.]* |  |
| *[No.]* |  |
| *[Title]* |
| *[No.]* |  |
| *[No.]* |  |
| *[Title]* |
| *[No.]* |  |
| *[No.]* |  |

I hereby confirm that the above-mentioned issues have been addressed properly as part of the (Mid-term) Review and that the review team has provided the recommendations stated above.

Signed in………………… on the ……..…………….……………

Review Team leader/ELK representative

I hereby confirm that the responsible MFA-unit has undertaken the follow-up activities stated above. In cases where recommendations have not been accepted, reasons for this are given either in the table or in the notes enclosed.

Signed in……………….….on the…………….….……………………………….

Head of Unit/Embassy
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**ANNEX 5**

**BACKGROUND ANALYSIS OF PROJECTS (IF NEEDED)**

**ANNEX 6**

*Additional annexes as relevant*