

Appendix 5: Evaluation Matrix

Table: Evaluation matrix

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Data sources	Limitations and risks
1. What efforts and interventions have been undertaken by Sweden to implement and further the localisation agenda within its humanitarian work? What does this imply for Sweden's interpretation of the agenda? More specifically: what problem does Sweden search to deal with in applying the agenda?			
1.1 To what extent has Sweden attempted to clarify its understanding of localisation and how it can contribute?	<p>Clear definition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence and perceptions that Sweden has attempted to define localisation. • Evidence and perceptions that Sweden has made efforts to communicate its understanding of localisation internally and externally. • Evidence that Sweden has used its influence/connections with others to promote and encourage clearer and more aligned understanding of localisation. <p>Clear strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that Sweden has made efforts to articulate strategies for what it is trying to achieve vis-a-vis localisation of its humanitarian assistance. • Evidence that Sweden has policies, structures (eg. Task Teams) and supporting guidance for implementation of its strategies on localisation. • Evidence that Sweden has supported and encouraged its partners to produce clear and aligned strategies on localisation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review to identify definitions, strategies, commitments and objectives. • Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of documents clarifying Sweden's definition of localisation and its strategy, commitments and objectives. • Key informants are willing and able to share information on Sweden's strategy efforts.

<p>1.2 To what extent has Sweden sought to increase the quantity and quality of its funding to local and national actors in humanitarian contexts?</p>	<p>Policy commitments and administrative/bureaucratic changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of policy commitments and practical changes to increase the quantity and quality (quality can be defined as eg. timely, predictable, multi-year, flexible, inclusive of overheads, transparent, etc) of <u>direct funding to local and national actors</u>. • Evidence of policy commitments, direct influence, and practical changes to increase the quantity and quality of <u>indirect funding</u> to local and national actors <u>via intermediary organisations</u>. • Analysis of the political and legal operational environment in Sweden and the extent to which it allows Sida and MFA to provide more direct quality funding to local and national actors. • Evidence and perceptions of efforts to overcome bureaucratic and legal constraints hindering Sida and MFA from funding local and national actors directly and providing quality funding. • Evidence and perceptions that Sweden has used its influence among other donors to encourage changes in the quality and quantity of funding to local and national actors. <p>Transparency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of efforts by Sweden to increase the transparency (appropriate tracking) of its pass-through funding to downstream partners/local actors through Pooled Funds, MFA's core-funded partners and Sida's programme-funded partners. <p>Willingness to adapt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptions that increasing the quantity and quality of funding to local and national actors is a priority for Sida and MFA. • Perceptions and evidence of Sweden's willingness to change the current model of bilateral donor humanitarian funding to allow for more resources to go to local and national actors (factors to consider: appetite for risk, willingness to make smaller-scale investments, shifting from an international intermediary to a local intermediary funding approach, consortium of local and national actors, etc.) • Perceptions that intermediary organisations receiving Swedish funding (UN/INGO) are willing and able to pass more funding to local and national actors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial data to establish a baseline of Sweden's direct (and to the extent possible, indirect) funding to local and national actors. • Document review to identify commitments and practical changes to increase funding to local/national actors, and commitments to ensuring accountability to affected populations (AAP) within Swedish-funded interventions. • Online survey. • Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of granular financial data, particularly for passthrough funding. • Availability of shareable documentation on Sweden's funding policies and practices. • Key informants are willing and able to share evidence and perceptions on Sweden's funding policies and practices.
---	---	---	--

<p>1.3 To what extent has Sweden sought to promote the active leadership and influence role of local and national actors in humanitarian contexts?</p>	<p>Promotion of the active leadership and influence of local and national actors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence and perceptions of Sweden’s direct efforts to promote and enable the active leadership, participation and voice of local and national actors in strategic and operational discussions at the global and country levels. • Evidence and perceptions of Sweden’s role in encouraging, incentivising, and supporting its international grantees to promote the leadership and influence of local and national actors in coordination and decision-making forums at country and global level. • Examples or case studies of Sweden’s approach to promoting the influence of local and national actors. <p>Contextual factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the contextual factors affecting local and national actors from leading/participating in humanitarian action eg. repressive, weak or corrupt national governments; complex relationships with NSAs; insecurity for local actors in particular)/ lack of access; and complex power dynamics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders. • Online survey. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informants are willing and able to share perceptions.
<p>1.4 To what extent has Sweden sought to improve its partnerships with local and national actors?</p>	<p>Improving direct partnerships:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence and perceptions of Sweden’s efforts to partner directly with local and national actors. • Analysis of the political, legal and bureaucratic operating environment in Sweden and the extent to which it allows Sida and MFA to partner directly with local and national actors. • Evidence and perceptions of efforts to overcome bureaucratic and legal constraints hindering Sida and MFA from partnering directly with local and national actors. • Perceptions of the extent to which efforts to promote engagement with/accountability to affected populations are actively considered as part of Sweden’s approach to localisation. <p>Improving partnerships overall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence and perceptions of Sweden’s prioritisation, clarity of expectations, and overall support for better/more equal partnerships between international organisations and local and national actors. • Examples of Sweden using its funding and influence to simplify and harmonise due diligence, assurance, reporting and risk management approaches between international and local/national actors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders. • Online survey. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of shareable documentation on the political, legal and bureaucratic operating environment in Sweden regarding partnerships with local and national actors. • Key informants are willing and able to share perceptions on Sweden’s partnerships (and those of its international grantees) with local and national actors.
<p>1.5 To what extent has Sweden supported the development of</p>	<p>Capacity development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptions of Sweden’s prioritisation and overall support for institutional capacity development between international organisations and local and national actors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders. • Online survey. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of documentation on capacity development between international organisations

<p>strong and sustainable institutional capacities of national and local actors</p> <p>1.6 To what extent has Sweden sought to produce and contribute to relevant knowledge products and evidence on localisation and by local actors?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of Sweden's requirements and/or incentives for capacity development between international recipients of Sweden's funding and local and national actors. • Examples of existing/emergent direct forms of support by Sweden to support capacity development of local and national actors. 		<p>and local and national actors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informants are willing and able to share perceptions on Sweden's requirements and incentives for capacity development.
	<p>Researching localisation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence and perceptions of Sweden's direct and indirect support for the generation of learning and research on localisation. <p>Localising research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence and Perceptions of Sweden's direct and indirect support for the production of evidence generated in the 'Global South'. • Analysis of the contextual factors affecting local and national actors from generating research and evidence eg. lack of resources, political factors such as repressive regimes, insecurity, lack of in-country capacity, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review to identify Swedish-funded knowledge products and evidence on localisation. • Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders. • Online survey. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of documentation on Sweden's support for research and evidence on localisation. • Ability to attribute indirect support for local research to Sweden's support
<p>2. What results have these interventions led to and how can such outcomes be explained? More specifically: what factors enable or hinder the furthering of the localisation agenda within Swedish humanitarian work?</p>			
<p>2.1 To what extent is Sweden's strategy for contributing to the localisation agenda understood and shared by other key actors?</p>	<p>Understanding of Sweden's approach to localisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence and perceptions of a shared understanding across Sida, MFA and partners regarding Sweden's commitments and objectives on localisation. <p>Alignment of localisation approaches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the alignment of Sweden's objectives and approach to localisation with localisation efforts of other key actors. • Perceptions that Sweden's contribution to localisation complements that of other key actors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review to identify definitions, strategies, commitments and objectives. • Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of documents clarifying Sweden's definition of localisation and its strategy, commitments and objectives. • Key informants are willing and able to share perceptions on Sweden's approach to localisation.
<p>2.2 To what extent has the quantity and quality of funding for local and national actors increased as a result of Sweden's actions?</p>	<p>Quantity of funding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of an increase in the volume and proportion of indirect funding to local and national actors through intermediary organisations and funds (noting that none of Sweden's funding is currently provided directly to local and national actors). • Evidence of an increase in the number of local and national organisations receiving passthrough funding from Sweden via intermediary organisations and funds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial data on FTS, OECD DAC platform. • Financial data provided directly by Sida, MFA and recipients of Swedish funding. • Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders. • Online survey. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of granular financial data, particularly for passthrough funding. • Key informants are willing and able to share financial data. • Key informants are willing and able to share evidence of and opinions on quality funding.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence and perceptions of Sweden's leverage to encourage/require international recipients of its funding to pass on more funding to local and national partners. 		
	<p>Quality of funding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of improvements in the effective passthrough of quality funding to local and national actors through intermediary organisations and funds (quality can be defined as eg. timely, predictable, multi-year, flexible, inclusive of overheads, transparent, etc.). Evidence of more transparency of Sweden's humanitarian contributions, including passthrough funding from international organisations to downstream partners/local actors. Perceptions that the efforts of Sida and MFA have led to positive changes in the quantity and quality of direct and indirect funding to local and national actors. 		
2.3 To what extent has Swedish influence contributed to greater local and national leadership/participation in coordination mechanisms and policy discussions?	<p>Local and national leadership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence and perceptions of Sweden's prioritisation and support for the leadership, participation and influence of local and national actors in humanitarian leadership, coordination and policy-making mechanisms, both nationally and internationally, including local women-led organisations, organisations representing persons with disabilities, and those representing other marginalised people. <p>Constraints on local and national leadership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of the real and perceived constraints preventing local and national actors from taking on leadership roles and participating in coordination mechanisms/decision-making bodies/events/publications eg. lack of time and resources, language issues, remoteness, , travel/visa constraints, willingness of international organisations to make space, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review of general literature on localisation to identify constraints. Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Availability of documentation on local and national leadership/participation in coordination mechanisms. Key informants are willing and able to share perceptions on local and national leadership/participation in coordination mechanisms.
2.4 To what extent have partnerships with local and national actors improved as a result of Sweden's actions.	<p>More partnerships with local and national actors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of an increase in the number and diversity of partnerships between Swedish-funded organisations and local and national organisations. e.g., big/small LNAs, capital city based and remote LNAs, etc. <p>Better partnerships with local and national actors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a shift from project-based to strategic partnerships between international Swedish-funded organisations and local/national partners. Perceptions (particularly those of local and national actors) that partnerships between Sweden's international grantees and local and national actors have become more in-depth, genuine and equitable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review of partnership documents between Sida/MFA and recipients of Swedish funding. Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key informants are willing and able to share evidence of and opinions on changes to partnerships between international and local/national organisations.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of Sweden and Swedish-funded organisations making efforts to simplify and harmonise due diligence, assurance, flexibility, reporting and risk management approaches for their local and national partners. 		
	<p>Engagement with affected communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceptions of fuller and more influential involvement of crisis-affected people in what relief is provided to them and how (as a higher-level result of localisation efforts) as a partial result of Swedish influence and funding. 		
2.5 To what extent has the capacity of local and national actors improved as a result of Sweden's actions?	<p>Overcoming capacity constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence and perceptions of Sweden's awareness of the real and perceived capacity constraints of local and national actors to respond to emergencies. <p>Support for capacity development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceptions of more effective support for strong and sustainable institutional capacities for local and national, state and non-state actors as a result of Swedish requirements, support, influence and incentives. e.g., mentorship, peer learning more than training, etc. Perception of collaborative capacities between LNAs and intermediaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review of partnership documents between Sida/MFA and recipients of Swedish funding. Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Availability of documentation on the capacities of local and national actors. Key informants are willing and able to share perceptions on the capacities of local and national actors.
2.6 To what extent has there been increased uptake of knowledge and learning on localisation , in part because of Sweden's support?	<p>Uptake of research on localisation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence and perceptions of increased uptake of learning and research on localisation supported by Sweden, including knowledge products developed in the 'Global South' Evidence and perceptions of increased power and profile of local and national researchers to influence the humanitarian research agenda, produce research, and achieve effective uptake of that research, as a result of Swedish support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders. Online survey. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability and willingness of key informant to comment on research and evidence on localisation.
<p>3. What lessons can be learned for future efforts to further the localisation agenda?</p>			
3.1 Overall, to what extent have Sweden's efforts and interventions contributed to advancing the Grand Bargain localisation agenda?	<p>Overall sense of progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceptions that Sweden has made progress according to its own strategy and objectives on localisation (to the extent that they exist - see EQ1.1). Perceptions that Sweden's efforts have either directly or indirectly (through its funding, experience and influence) contributed to advancement of the Grand Bargain's localisation agenda. Perceptions of Sweden's awareness of the enabling and hindering factors regarding localisation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key informants are willing and able to share perceptions on both positive and negative experiences on localisation.

3.2 What lessons can be learned for Sweden and others to inform future efforts to further the localisation agenda?

- Examples of steps taken by Sweden to capitalise on opportunities and overcome barriers to advancing its own strategy on localisation and the Grand Bargain's localisation agenda.
- Analysis of the extent to which it is possible to isolate Sweden's actions on localisation from those of the wider international community (particularly from other Grand Bargain stakeholders) to identify Sweden's contribution.

Good practice and learning from experience:

Examples of successful and unsuccessful attempts (and the reasons behind these) by Sweden and its partners to:

- Articulate and align definitions, objectives and approaches to localisation.
- Provide more and better funding to local and national actors, including an understanding of the bottlenecks and how they may be overcome.
- Promote the leadership, participation and influence of local and national actors in humanitarian leadership and coordination mechanisms.
- Build stronger partnerships with local and national actors, as well as identifying the bottlenecks to building stronger partnerships and taking steps to mitigate them.
- Recognise and build on the capacity of local and national actors.
- Ensure greater participation of affected communities in what relief is provided to them and how.

Replicating good practice:

- Suggestions for how to replicate successful efforts by Sweden and other actors to promote localisation, and ways to avoid repeating patterns of behaviour that prevent progress.
- Examples of good practices learnt during the Covid-19 pandemic and other specific crises on the important role of local and national actors in humanitarian action that can improve the localisation work of Sweden and other actors.

- Global and country KIIs with internal and external stakeholders.

- Key informants are willing and able to share perceptions on both positive and negative experiences on localisation.
-