

Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix

OECD Category	PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS QUESTIONS
Relevance	
1. Internal Alignment	<p>1a. How well does the project fit within Denmark’s climate change portfolio objectives (as set out in the intervention logic)?</p> <p>1b. Is there a project log frame, intervention logic or other intervention logic that explicitly links project outputs to wider Danish climate objectives?</p> <p>1c. Does the project support the delivery of wider Danish development objectives?</p>
2. External Alignment	<p>2a. Did the project respond to a specific demand or need identified by recipient countries or partners?</p> <p>2b. What is the evidence of consultation with partners and/or end beneficiaries in the design and funding of the project?</p> <p>2c. How does the project respond to the international agenda on climate change (mitigation/adaptation), including funds being new and additional?</p>
Efficiency	
3. Reducing Costs	<p>3a. What was the financial or economic rationale for choosing management structures and implementation modalities? What other options were considered?</p> <p>3b. Have envisaged project resources (financial, technical) been made available during implementation and deployed according to plan, and if not why?</p> <p>3c. Is there evidence of Value for Money (VFM) assessment in programme design and implementation? If so, summarize the results.</p>
4. Maximizing synergies:	<p>4a. Is project administration and delivery integrated and aligned with other Danish development finance (<i>e.g.</i> country programmes, Poverty Frame/Poverty Frame to share costs or avoid duplication)?</p> <p>4b. Has the project maximized delivery opportunities by aligning with other non-Danish programmes or institutions?</p> <p>4c. What benefits has alignment brought in terms of efficiency and cost control?</p>
Effectiveness	
5. Delivering Results:	<p>5a. Does the project have an effective monitoring and evaluation system that can identify and report results over time?</p> <p>5b. How effective has project been in achieving its expected outputs and outcomes? Provide examples of results where possible.</p> <p>5c. What have been the key success factors and barriers to achieving envisaged outputs and outcomes? Have there been any external factors (both positive and negative)?</p>
6. Mobilising resources:	<p>6a. To what extent has the project sought to mobilise additional public or private sector finance (both national and international)? Has it been successful?</p> <p>6b. Has the project engaged with the Danish public or private sector (in terms of leveraging expertise, technology or partnerships)? With what success?</p> <p>6c. To what extent has the project sought to mobilise 3rd party expertise or technology outside of Denmark (<i>e.g.</i> south-south)? If so, has it been successful?</p>
Impacts	

7. Contribution:	<p>7a. Does the project have systems for effective ex-post monitoring and reporting of project impacts?</p> <p>7b. Can the project demonstrate that the planned impacts have been or are likely to be achieved within the expected timeframe? Provide examples.</p> <p>7c. What are the key (potential) barriers to achieving the desired impacts (<i>e.g.</i> institutional, policy, political, economic)?</p>
8. Attribution/ Influence:	<p>8a. How significant has been the Danish role in mobilising the project and helping it to achieve the expected results (<i>e.g.</i> sole funder, project initiator, partnership facilitator)?</p> <p>8b. Where other partners have been involved, can the Danish contribution to the project be considered greater (<i>e.g.</i> as a cornerstone investor, design influencer, active partner) or smaller (passive donor) than its pro-rata share of resources contributed?</p> <p>8c. Have there been any significant external/non-project factors that might contribute to achieving the project impacts (<i>e.g.</i> changes in policy or finance). Summarize.</p> <p>8d. How influential has Danish climate change funding been in norm setting and in guiding policy development?</p>
Sustainability	
9. External	<p>9a. What evidence exists that that the project outcomes and impacts will be sustained beyond the supported period?</p> <p>9b. How effectively has the project been able to create systemic and transformative change for the longer term (<i>e.g.</i> policies, finance, and markets)? Provide examples.</p> <p>9c. In addition to direct project beneficiaries, are a wider set of stakeholders likely to benefit from the project outcomes once completed? If so, who and how?</p>
10. Internal	<p>10a. How effectively has the project been able to capture lessons learned to inform course correction and future programme design? How effectively have the project outputs influenced institutional capacity? Provide examples.</p> <p>10b. Has the project used a knowledge management/communication strategy to transfer project lessons and best practices to the wider Danish climate community, including mainstreaming into development cooperation?</p> <p>10c. What potential lessons and opportunities have arisen from the project, which might be considered for future climate change funding from 2014 onwards?</p>