

Independent Evaluation of the Australian NGO Cooperation Program

DRAFT Key Issues Paper – January 2022

Key Issues Paper

1 Background

1.1 The Evaluation

Tetra Tech International Development has been engaged by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) to undertake an independent evaluation of the Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP) to:

- assess the efficiency and relevance of the ANCP modality, including the capacity of the ANCP to adapt and respond to emerging trends and issues in the international development and NGO sectors
- assess the effectiveness of the ANCP modality in facilitating Australian NGOs (ANGOs) and DFAT to achieve or contribute to development outcomes
- make recommendations for improvements to the management and the implementation of the ANCP in the context of the changing development and NGO sector policy and operating environment.

The evaluation is being undertaken between November 2021 and July 2022.

1.2 Purpose of the paper

The key issues paper is an inception document with the purpose to present the issues associated with each key evaluation question (KEQ). It is not intended as a comprehensive analysis of each issue but rather as a tool to indicate the scope, key fields of inquiry and inform analytical frameworks.

This analysis has been used to build on and refine the evaluation framework developed as part of the evaluation plan and which presents the evaluation questions, judgement criteria, evaluation methods and sources of evidence.

This draft paper provides a further opportunity for DFAT and its ANCP partners to give structured feedback on the issues associated with the evaluation through written submissions and focus group discussions (FGDs).

1.3 Data sources

The key issues paper has been developed by the evaluation team based on desk research and consultation with key ANCP actors, including:

Desk research

The evaluation team has undertaken a document search and preliminary desk review of key issues relating to the evaluation including:

- ANCP foundational documents and statistical information generated through the ANCP Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework (MELF)
- good practice in donor financing and the relationship between donors and NGOs globally
- trends in international development
- key DFAT and ACFID policy documents.

DFAT and Development Practice Committee (DPC) Consultations

Formative consultations with DFAT and the DPC to confirm an engagement strategy, ways of working and to understand the issues raised in consultations around the drafting of the evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR).

NGO Consultations

Preliminary discussions with ACFID and the DPC on key issues affecting the evaluation. A purposive sample of 30 NGOs was identified and invited to provide feedback on the scope of the evaluation and critical themes from an Australian NGO perspective. The sample included a mix of partner, full accredited and base accredited NGOs and the three focus group discussions (FGDs)¹ explored:

- emerging trends in the development sector and the impacts of these on the ANGO - DFAT relationship
- strengths and weakness of the ANCP modality in the face of these trends.

The evaluation team also reviewed NGO written submissions to DFAT on the draft ToR.

NGO partners will have a further opportunity to feedback on the draft key issues paper in January 2022 through a further three FGDs.

¹ Three focus groups were attended by 26 participants from 20 organisations.

2 Foundational elements informing the evaluation

Several issues (see Figure 1) apply to all or some of the evaluation questions, and act as foundational understandings and building blocks for developing the analytical frameworks and informing evaluation methods.

Figure 1: Foundational understandings



2.1 The ANCP Architecture

The ANCP mechanism is a complex and complicated system. It has a visible externally facing architecture, which includes processes for eligibility and accreditation, operations, monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) and communications. Each of these, however, rely on each NGO partner themselves having their own aligned systems that work across their international program portfolios in order to access and meet these requirements.

The wider each organisation's global footprint, the more complicated this system becomes as it relies on alignment of multiple systems across a network of international organisations (see Figure 2).

2.2 Value Proposition

DFAT's Effective Development Partners Statement² articulates what DFAT values in its relationship with NGOs, in particular:

- the ties NGOs build between Australian communities and communities and institutions across the region
- NGO's trusted relationships, local networks, and knowledge
- NGO's comprehensive understanding of local contexts, deep development expertise and sophisticated models
- NGO's established infrastructure and capabilities
- the visibility that NGOs provide to the Australian development program
- NGO's ability to mobilise public support and voluntary contributions for development
- NGO's focus on local capacity building and empowering local communities to manage their lives and livelihoods
- NGO's strong local partnership and approaches which strengthen local system and support locally led development and humanitarian responses
- NGO's reach into remote areas and fragile and conflict affected states

- NGO's role in contributing to an informed and engaged civil society, which strengthens governance and is a development outcome in its own right as it enables communities to play an active role in the development process.

Preliminary consultation with NGOs suggested that some of the things NGOs value in their relationship with DFAT through the ANCP are:

- ability to engage in policy dialogue – though it was noted that the space for dialogue has significantly diminished over the last 7 years
- organisational strengthening that comes about through the accreditation process
- flexibility in funding
- an entry point into the broader DFAT network, including thematic areas and posts.

The Theory of Action set out in Section 2.5 provides some hypotheses for how ANCP enables DFAT and NGOs to leverage these values. These will be expanded through further consultation and tested through the evaluation process.

2.3 The Changing Development Context

Formative consultations with DFAT, a selection of its ANCP partners, ACFID and the desk study have surfaced several factors that are driving change in the development context, and which impact development actors and their ways of working (see Figure 3).

Given the breadth of these issues our analysis will focus on what these issues mean for the relationship between DFAT and NGOs in the delivery of ANCP and inform recommendations of any changes that need to be made to the ANCP objectives or modality to responds to these changes.

² [Working with Non-government organisations \(NGOs\): Effective Development Partners Statement | Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade \(dfat.gov.au\)](#)

Figure 2: ANCP architecture



Figure 3: Current issues disrupting development



2.4 Good practice and trends in NGO financing

An assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the ANCP modality is best positioned within an understanding of current trends in good practice financing for civil society. Drawing on a range of sources including the Governance and Social Development Resource Centre (GSDRC)³, the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) Initiative⁴ and evaluations of donor modalities, key trends, and principles of good NGO financing models in development and humanitarian contexts include:

Figure 4: Principles of Good Practice NGO Financing



³ Governance and Social Development Resource Centre. "Civil Society Funding Mechanisms". Accessed online 7 January 2022 at <http://gsdrc.org/docs/open/hd633.pdf>

⁴ Good Humanitarian Donorship. "24 Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship". Accessed online 7 January 2022 at <https://www.ghdinitiative.org/ghd/gns/principles-good-practice-of-ghd/principles-good-practice-ghd.html>

2.5 Theory of Action for ANCP

The evaluation team has worked with DFAT to articulate how the ANCP delivery modality contributes to the outcomes and realise the value that each partner finds in the relationship. The hypotheses in this section will be refined through feedback and be tested through the evaluation process.

Figure 5 depicts how the ANCP delivery modality can be expressed separately from the ANCP Theory of Change (ToC). The rationale for doing this is to better understand how the modality itself contributes to the way activities are delivered and the outcomes achieved. It also recognises that there are some inherent benefits to the delivery model itself – for example the broader organisational capacity building that happens as a result of the accreditation process.

The focus on this Theory of Action (ToA), and of the evaluation more broadly, is on assessing the effectiveness of the delivery modality rather than testing the ToC for the program itself.

The remainder of this section will elaborate on how the ANCP activities and program features ‘activate’ the ToC – this effectively expands on the arrows Figure 5.

The following series of hypotheses seeks to articulate how the delivery modality influences activities and outcomes and will be refined and tested through the evaluation process.

How does the ANCP modality address issues in the Australian civil society landscape?

- Reliability of funding based on Recognised Development Expenditure (RDE) calculations longer term planning and programming.
- A non-competitive funding allocation process enhances collaboration between NGOs.



How does the ANCP delivery modality contribute to NGO activities and intermediate outcomes

The evaluation will test the extent to which the ANCP activities contribute to outcomes in line with Table 1.

Table 1: ANCP Activities

ANCP Activity	Relationship to activity/ intermediate outcome
Setting program policy and managing program risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation requirements around social inclusion and local capacity building lift the standards of practice in these areas • The accreditation process provides quality assurance for the activities funded through ANCP
Accreditation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible funding is used to pilot innovative approaches • Flexible funding is used to leverage other funds • Flexible funding is used to develop implementation models that can be delivered across different country contexts • Flexibility of funding means that ANCP can pivot to respond to emerging issues • ANCP projects complement and extend Australia’s bilateral and regional program and priorities
Grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smarty Grants enables DFAT to aggregate and analyse data across the portfolio • Requirements to disaggregate beneficiary data by gender and disability status promotes social inclusion
Monitoring and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual review workshops provide learning that is applied to NGO programs • Annual review workshops create connections between NGOs that are maintained • Findings from thematic and meta-evaluations are used to enhance NGO and DFAT practice
Purposeful knowledge sharing and mutual learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication raises awareness of the Australian Aid Program in-country • Communication raises awareness of the Australian Aid Program in Australia
Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation requirements around social inclusion and local capacity building lift the standards of practice in these areas • The accreditation process provides quality assurance for the activities funded through ANCP

Figure 5: ANCP Theory of Action





What are the structures and processes created by the ANCP modality?

- The longevity of ANCP has led to strong relationships between NGO's and DFAT's ANCP team.
- The predictability of funding helps ANGO's to commit to longer term relationships with in-country partners.
- Accreditation requirements have enhanced organisational systems and processes within ANGOs and across the sector.



How do the structures and processes created by ANCP activities contribute to ANCP program outcomes?

- Trusted relationships between NGOs and DFAT mean that issues can be dealt with proactively and effectively.
- Learning from ANCP programs is spread across NGO, between NGOs and between NGOs and DFAT.
- Partnerships through ANCP are leveraged through other parts of DFAT, in particular:
 - ANGOs provide DFAT posts, desks and thematic areas with local contextual knowledge.
 - ANGOs facilitate DFAT access to communities where they are working.
- ANCP Partnership between ANGO and local CSO improves the way that the CSO operates more generally – outside of ANCP funding.
- Long term partnerships between ANGOs and local CSO partners strengthen civil society in partner countries by sustainably building local CSO capacity.



What are the sustained benefits of the delivery model?

- The longevity of the program has enhanced NGO organisational capacity, beyond the ANCP program funding.
- Learning from ANCP and relationships with NGOs has enhanced DFAT policy and programming by anchoring it in contextual knowledge and understanding of local priorities.
- The non-competitive nature of ANCP funding has created sustainable networks and coalitions of NGOs.



How do the sustained benefits of the delivery model contribute to the ANCP goal and objective?

- Enhanced DFAT policy leads to more effective programming and delivery.
- Enhanced ANGO organisational capacity leads to better development programming for all ANGO activity.
- ANGO programming is more joined up and complementary as a result of collaboration between ANGOs.

3 Key Evaluation Questions

3.1 KEQ 1 The Modality

KEQ 1: Is the ANCP modality, including management, implementation, and funding arrangements 'fit for purpose' and how can it be improved?

This is the central question for the evaluation that addresses the efficiency, relevance and effectiveness of the ANCP modality in delivering against its objectives within the Australian development program.

All of the proposed key evaluation questions that follow contribute in some way to answering this question. As a result, the evaluation team have proposed that this question become KEQ 4, enabling a final summative analysis of the extent to which ANCP is future fit for purpose and the formulate recommendations based on the evaluation evidence surfaced through the treatment of the other KEQs (see Table 2).

1.1. How efficient are current ANCP management, implementation, and funding arrangements in delivering against the ANCP's program logic?

Efficiency is about delivering objectives in the least possible time and with the least possible resources.

In responding to this question, we will draw on both DFAT and NGO perspectives of the value proposition for ANCP (see section 2.2) and analyse this in relation to:

- The objectives of ANCP
 - Joint development objectives
 - DFAT objectives (engage with diverse civil society)
 - NGO objectives (funding certainty, position in Australian development program)
- The features of the ANCP modality that are designed to achieve them and how are these features support to achieve the objectives?
 - Management (in-house project management, annual reporting)
 - Implementation
 - Funding arrangements (RDE, annual funding cycles)
- The extent to which these features deliver the objectives in the least possible time and with the least possible resources.

1.2. To what extent have current arrangements enabled the ANCP to respond effectively to the changing international development and NGO context and how could they be strengthened to further facilitate responsiveness?

The evaluation will map what changes have been made or are being made in response to the contextual changes identified in 1.3 and consultations will assess the extent to which these changes position ANCP to be able to adapt to these challenges into the future.

1.3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the ANCP including the partnership and program management model compared to other major DFAT NGO programs such as Australian Humanitarian Partnerships Program (AHP) and Water for Women?

This question is intended, along with exploration of other donor modalities, to assist DFAT to make a comparative analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of different types of modalities for NGO funding that may be available to it.

To do this, DFAT needs to consider the relevance and efficiency of these models in delivering against ANCPs intended objectives. The analysis of selected models will therefore be undertaken in two parts:

1. What are these modalities trying to achieve and are these relevant to ANCP?

And if so:

2. The strengths and weaknesses of relevant models will be assessed using a criterion-based assessment framework that considers key parts of the system such as eligibility, accreditation, and due diligence; partnering arrangements; funding structure; program cycle - flexibility and adaptability; MEL, aid communications and public diplomacy.

This analysis will be underpinned and informed by the value proposition for DFAT - NGO engagement (see section 2.1) and principles of good practice in NGO financing (see section 1.4), and Partnership Theory.

It is important that the evaluation draws on models most relevant to ANCP's objectives. Water for Women and the AHP are multi-country thematic programmes, only now completing their first four-year terms. Neither have been evaluated as modalities and as such may not be the most relevant case studies. The evaluation will benefit from drawing on evaluative evidence of other DFAT-NGO partnership models such as:

- evaluations and analysis of funding modalities including the ODE evaluation of DFAT Facilities and the Review of NGO Funding in the Mekong; and
- historic models of DFAT- NGO engagement for example or evaluations of DFAT-NGO Cooperation Agreements (such as the Australia Middle East NGO Cooperation Agreement (AMENCA), Australia Afghanistan Community Resilience Scheme (AACRS)), and Strategic Partnership Arrangements (such as the DFAT Red Cross Humanitarian Partnership and the DFAT Asia Foundation (TAF) Partnership),

Our revisions to the KEQs (refer to Table 2) propose an amendment to the wording of KEQ 1.3 to enable this broader analysis.

1.4. What models of NGO funding and program management have other like-minded donors employed and what lessons can be learned from these?

DFAT and NGO partners are keen to learn from international experience and position the ANCP as a leader in donor- NGO funding.

The evaluation will explore several NGO funding modalities with similar objectives to the ANCP from:

- United Kingdom Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO)

- Norwegian Department for Development Cooperation (NORAD),
- Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)
- Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA)
- Irish Aid Civil Society Fund
- United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
- New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT).

To ensure consistent analysis, the assessment of donor models will be undertaken in two parts:

1. What are these funding arrangements trying to achieve and are these relevant to ANCP?

And if so:

2. The strengths and weaknesses of relevant models will be assessed using a criterion-based assessment framework that considers key parts of the system such as eligibility, accreditation, and due diligence; partnering arrangements; funding structure; program cycle - flexibility and adaptability; MEL, aid communications and public diplomacy.

3.2 KEQ 2: Monitoring Evaluation and Learning

KEQ 2. Is ANCP supported by robust and appropriate monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) processes?

ANCP MEL arrangements are an important part of DFAT's performance management framework and have the potential to influence DFAT's own priorities and those of partner organisations and the work that they do. It is important therefore that the MEL system drives positive behaviour and promotes shared learning and policy dialogue between DFAT and NGOs and within the NGO sector.

The evaluation will assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of ANCP MEL arrangements with consideration to the accountability needs of DFAT, and the multiple accountabilities faced by NGOs and their ability to bring evidence to development practice and policy. This will be done through two sub questions:

2.1. Does the current program logic adequately reflect the theory of change for the ANCP in the changing context?

The evaluation will draw on an analysis of key trends affecting the sector to understand how these affect development priorities and the relationships between DFAT and ANGOs as they pertain to the ANCP.

These will be mapped against the ANCP program logic to assess the extent to which it remains relevant and effective for delivering development outcomes in the changing context.

This process will also test the assumptions that underlie the ToC to assess whether they remain relevant and to consider what changes to the ANCP operational model (ToC and ToA) may be required to respond to these changing contexts.

2.2. To what extent do ANCP M&E processes and systems generate robust evidence about the results and drive learning, policy, and program improvement?

Understanding the results and long-term impact of development activities is important for accountability, and to drive learning and continuous improvement. In

considering the extent to which the ANCP MELF generates robust evidence about results, the evaluation will:

- describe the ANCP MEL processes and system and assess the extent to which these generate credible information
- assess how this evidence is or is not used to contribute to learning for program improvement, at the sectoral level and within DFAT
- assess how this evidence is or is not used for informing policy within DFAT.

The analysis will consider the extent to which information gained through the MEL system: generates robust evidence; drives learning, program and policy improvement.

3.3 KEQ 3: Trends

KEQ 3. What are the key trends and emerging issues in the NGO sector and international development context that may impact on the ANCP and how should DFAT and ANCP partners address these?

This field of analysis positions the evaluation as a future focussed piece of work by examining trends and their potential impacts on the DFAT - ANGO relationship and considers potential adaptations that may be required to ensure a continued and efficient ANCP modality.

3.1. What are the anticipated key trends in the NGO sector and in international development that will be most relevant to ensuring an effective ANCP program model over the next 10 years?

Desk review and formative consultations with DFAT and NGOs and have surfaced several trends (see Figure 3 in section 2.3) that are expected to drive change that will impact on an effective ANCP program model into the future.

We will describe how these issues (see section 1.3) are expected to affect the ANCP modality and relationships between DFAT and NGOs into the future.

3.2. To what extent is the ANCP modality and its objectives appropriate for the changing context?

This question requires an understanding of how each of these issues are likely to impact the NGO context, predict what changes to funding and operational contexts may be required and assess the extent to which the current modality is able to adapt to these changes.

This sub-question is strongly linked to the analysis of the efficiency and effectiveness of the ANCP modality and as a result we propose that this question is treated as a subset of KEQ 4 (see Table 2).

3.3. What opportunities and risks does this changing context present for ANCP and how can ANCP be adapted to be more relevant for the future?

Treatment of KEQ 3 and sub questions 3.1 and 3.3 are intended to frame the future context for ANCP in order to be able to present some possible future scenarios that will inform recommendations relating to possible adaptations to the ANCP.

The question is presented in two parts. The first part is a natural fit with KEQ 3.1 and enables a concurrent analysis of opportunities and risks presented by the shifting context.

The second part of the question however is best considered alongside analyses undertaken within other KEQs, specifically KEQ 1 which explores the efficiency of the ANCP modality. As a result, we propose that this question is amended in line with Table 2.

3.4 KEQ 4: Development Effectiveness and Impact

KEQ 4. How effective is the ANCP modality in assisting ANGOs to reduce poverty and promote sustainable and inclusive development?

This question relates to the ANCP effectiveness in achieving the Program Outcomes as articulated in the ANCP Program Narrative⁵:

“In Partnership, ANCP contributes to Australian Government and partner country priorities to reduce poverty and promote sustainable and inclusive development”.

The assessment of effectiveness provides an important foundation for the evaluation:

1. By acknowledging the achievements of DFAT’s ANCP partners.
2. Informing assessment around the value and potential of the modality as a tool for Australia’s development efforts.

The evaluation team propose that the current KEQ 4 and sub-questions become KEQ 1 enabling an up-front assessment of ANCP’s contribution to the Australian development program (see Table 2).

4.1. What are the major outcomes of delivering development through the ANCP?

ANCP is a large program that delivers against a wide range of outcome areas.

The evaluation will articulate high level results against the intermediate outcomes of the three pathways of the ANCP ToC as follows⁶



Outcome Pathway 1 ANCP Modality

There is some overlap between the outcomes in the ANCP Modality Pathway 1 and the KEQs. Treatment of this question provides an opportunity for the evaluation to highlight the architecture and key strengths and weakness of the modality that will contribute to the summative analysis of the efficiency of the modality (KEQ 1).



Outcome Pathway 2 Development Outcomes

Given the plethora of NGO and DFAT generated reports, this analysis will focus on an independent review and verification of DFAT consolidated reporting against the outcomes. Consultations with NGO partners. will look for evidence of results (intended and unintended) that are not captured in reporting against the TOC, as well as any related to the changing development context.

⁵ DFAT. “Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP) Program Narrative (August 2020). Accessed online 22 December 2021 at <https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/ancp-program-logic.pdf>

⁶ *ibid*



Outcome Pathway 3 Public Diplomacy

Assessment of Pathway 3 will consider both internal and external facing public diplomacy that is, how ANCP contributes to building Australian support for the development program and how it contributes to building people-to-people linkages in the countries where it works. This analysis will be framed around DFAT's Public Diplomacy Strategy⁷ and draw on wider understandings of public diplomacy through for example the DFAT Soft Power Review and experiences of Posts.

The evaluation will also consider how results and reporting have been affected by COVID-19 and the pivot to Partnerships for Recovery (P4R) as framing for our response to sub-question 4.2.

4.2. How has ANCP contributed to outcomes under Partnerships for Recovery?

ANCP partners are considered to have made a major contribution to P4R.

Joint COVID-19 indicators were finalised in August 2020 to allow consolidated reporting across the ANCP⁸. ANGO's have been reporting against these indicators for the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 reporting periods and will continue to do so until the end of P4R. These 19 indicators spanning health security, water sanitation and hygiene (WASH), child protection, food security, gender equality and social inclusion, livelihoods and the private sector, have been integrated into ANCPs MELF and Pathway 2 of the ToC, and provide a quantitative snapshot of the reach of NGOs activities contributing to the COVID-19 response.

The evaluation will explore this further including by assessing the stated outcomes in reporting and through interviews/ focus group discussions with a cross-section of NGOs. Early evidence suggests that ANCP may be one of the most significant contributors to P4R, comparing favourably with other mechanisms supported through the development program. However, NGOs have raised questions around the impact on their other programming commitments to communities, and the need for funding to adapt and implement pre-existing programs. The evaluation will explore the process used to enable NGOs to pivot through ANCP to supporting P4R (the 'how'), the results achieved against the P4R framework, and the expected impact on the longer-term objectives and goal for the ANCP, which currently remains "ANCP progresses SDGs through supporting inclusive development, and open and transparent civil society".

The evaluation will draw on ANCP's meta-analysis of NGO reporting against P4R indicators and make a comparison with P4R outcomes achieved across DFAT overall to measure the contribution of ANCP partners. Noting that the indicators are all quantitative and represent a snapshot or cross-section of activities undertaken by NGOs in response to COVID-19, FGDs, and interviews with NGOs will also be used to explore qualitative aspects of results beyond outputs, as well as identifying areas of action and outcomes not captured through current reporting systems.

4.3. Does the ANCP modality contribute to or inhibit the impact of the program and what are the lessons for the broader Australian development program?

This question is about the outcomes of the ANCP modality itself, that is, the contribution of the ANCP mechanism to the delivery of development outcomes. As such it is a central question for the whole evaluation in that helps us also to consider whether better outcomes could be achieved if the modality were different and therefore make recommendations for change.

We propose therefore that this question is discussed early in the sequence of enquiry.

The evaluation will analyse the ANCP ToA (Figure 4) and hypothesis' outlined in section 2.4 to articulate how the ANCP modality and its associated systems triggers the development outcomes identified in sub-questions 4.1. and 4.2 by exploring:

- To what extent do the systems and operating requirements of ANCP facilitate or limit results? For example, what is the influence of DFAT policy and aid priorities on outcomes - e.g., climate change, gender and social inclusion (GESI) and the COVID-19 pivot; how does accreditation contribute to capability build and strong civil CSOs.
- Are ANGOs able to use ANCP funding to achieve their goals, or are they limited by the requirements of the modality, for example accreditation and RDE?
- How do these systems affect different partner typologies (base level, full level)?

4 Proposed Amendments to the ToR

Our exploration of the key issues indicates several areas of overlap across the KEQs.

Given the central focus of the evaluation on understanding the extent to which the ANCP modality is fit for purpose to the future context, and the contribution of evidence relating to development outcomes and the changing context are foundational to this analysis. The evaluation team propose a reordering of the KEQs as indicated in Table 2. Minor shifts in wording are also proposed across some of the evaluation questions to enable a sharper focus and greater clarity on the line of enquiry.

In proposing these changes, the evaluation team have planned for an approach and methodology that is responsive and methodologically rigorous to deliver the evaluation in a planned discrete and iterative process. This will assist in streamlining the presentation of evaluative evidence as findings for each question will sequentially scaffold the evidence base to build on with evidence for the next question.

The evaluation will draw evidence from existing reports and quantitative data, as well as review secondary qualitative data and collect primary qualitative data from identified stakeholders. Doing this will provide a more comprehensive picture and enable the evaluation team to triangulate findings in a robust way. This is part of Tetra Tech's progressive inquiry technique, that applies an approach whereby stakeholder engagement and emerging findings continually inform the evaluation approach and its ongoing refinement throughout the evaluation process.

⁷ DFAT. "Public Diplomacy Strategy". Accessed online 21 December 2021 at <https://www.dfat.gov.au/people-to-people/public-diplomacy/public-diplomacy-strategy>

⁸ Joint indicators apply to both ANCP and AHP NGO partners.

Table 2: Proposed Changes to the KEQs

Original KEQs	Proposed amendments to KEQs
<p>KEQ 1: Focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency of the ANCP modality • Summative <p>Is the ANCP modality, including management, implementation, and funding arrangements ‘fit for purpose’ and how can it be improved?</p>	<p>KEQ 1: Previously KEQ 4 Focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Effectiveness and Results - what have NGO partners delivered through ANCP • Foundational - contributes to the evidence base for later questions <p>How effective is the ANCP in assisting ANGOs to reduce poverty and promote sustainable and inclusive development?</p>
<p>1.1 How efficient are current ANCP management, implementation, and funding arrangements in delivering against the ANCP’s program logic?</p>	<p>1.1 (previously 4.1) What are the major outcomes of delivering development through the ANCP?</p>
<p>1.2 To what extent have current arrangements enabled the ANCP to respond effectively to the changing international development and NGO context and how could they be strengthened to further facilitate responsiveness?</p>	<p>1.2 (previously 4.2) How has ANCP contributed to outcomes under Partnerships for Recovery?</p>
<p>1.3 What are the strengths and weaknesses of the ANCP including the partnership and program management model compared to other major DFAT NGO programs such as Australian Humanitarian Partnerships Program and Water for Women?</p>	<p>1.3 (new) What are the features of the modality that contribute to or inhibit the delivery of outcomes?</p>
<p>1.4 What models of NGO funding and program management have other like-minded donors employed and what lessons can be learned from these?</p>	<p>KEQ 2: Previously KEQ 3 Focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance and Coherence • Efficiency • Foundational understanding - sets the scene <p>What are the key trends and emerging issues in the international development and NGO sector context which may impact on the ANCP modality and DFAT-ANGO relationships, and how might they be addressed?</p>
<p>2. Is ANCP supported by robust and appropriate monitoring, evaluation and learning processes?</p>	<p>2.1 (previously 3.1) What are the anticipated key trends in the NGO sector and in international development and their impacts that will be most relevant to delivering aid through the ANCP modality over the next 10 years?</p>
<p>2.1 Does the current program logic adequately reflect the theory of change for the ANCP in the changing context?</p>	<p>2.2 (previously 3.3) What opportunities and risks does this changing context present for ANCP?</p>
<p>2.2. To what extent do ANCP M&E processes and systems generate robust evidence about the results and drive learning, policy and program improvement?</p>	<p>KEQ 3. Previously KEQ 2 Focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency • Relevance and Coherence • Effectiveness • Builds on KEQ 2 <p>Is ANCP supported by robust and appropriate monitoring, evaluation and learning processes?</p>
<p>3. What are the key trends and emerging issues in the NGO sector and international development context that may impact on the ANCP and how should DFAT and ANCP partners address these?</p>	<p>New 3.1 (previously 2.1) Does the current program logic adequately reflect the theory of change for the ANCP in the changing context, and how does the modality support this?</p>
<p>3.1. What are the anticipated key trends in the NGO sector and in international development that will be most relevant to ensuring an effective ANCP program model over the next 10 years?</p>	<p>New 3.2 (previously 2.2) To what extent do ANCP M&E processes and systems generate robust evidence about the results and drive learning, policy, and program improvement?</p>

Original KEQs	Proposed amendments to KEQs
<p>3.2. To what extent is the ANCP modality and its objectives appropriate for the changing context?</p>	<p>KEQ 4: Previously KEQ 1</p> <p>Focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summative • Builds on all questions <p>To what extent is the ANCP modality, including management, implementation, and funding arrangements, appropriate to the changing context and how can ANCP be adapted to be more relevant in the future?</p>
<p>3.3. What opportunities and risks does this changing context present for ANCP and how can ANCP be adapted to be more relevant for the future?</p>	<p>4.1 (previously 1.1) How efficient are current ANCP management, implementation, and funding arrangements in delivering against the ANCP’s objectives in the changing context?</p>
<p>4. How effective is the ANCP modality in assisting ANGOs to reduce poverty and promote sustainable and inclusive development?</p>	<p>4.2 (previously 1.2) What are the features of good practice in NGO funding that are relevant to the current context?</p>
<p>4.1. What are the major outcomes of delivering development through the ANCP?</p>	<p>4.3 (previously 1.3) What comparative models of NGO funding and program management has DFAT employed and what lessons can be learned from these?</p>
<p>4.2. How has ANCP contributed to outcomes under Partnerships for Recovery?</p>	<p>4.4 (previously 1.4) What comparative models of NGO funding and program management have other like-minded donors employed and what lessons can be learned from these?</p>
<p>4.3. How does the ANCP modality contribute to or inhibit the impact of the program and what are the lessons for the broader Australian development program?</p>	<p>4.5 (new) What are the management implications for DFAT and the NGO sector, and what are the lessons for the broader Australian development program?</p>