

# Annex I: Assessment of modalities

Modality	Strong characteristics	Weaker characteristics	Other comments
<b>Climate Envelope</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The principles post 2016 provided strategic guidance for implementation</li> <li>• Has demonstrated potential for innovation (e.g. Adaptation Learning Programme in Kenya) at least in a few cases.</li> <li>• Able to support regional and global interventions/ programming i.e. beyond the country level</li> <li>• Has been used to start new climate change partnerships that are beyond the reach of bilateral funding</li> <li>• Has built on, and demonstrated the potential for, bilateral analysis and partnerships</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No guidance or strategy prior to 2016</li> <li>• Tends to lead to a project rather than programme approach</li> <li>• Envelope principles not fully adhered to in practice</li> <li>• There is an inherent institutional mitigation bias due to division of responsibility between ministries.</li> <li>• Limited involvement of Danish adaptation technical ministry (Ministry of Environment and Food)</li> <li>• Tendency in some countries to continue with existing partnerships and activities without an added value beyond what can be achieved through bilateral programmes</li> </ul>	
<b>Bilateral funding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enables a comparatively large-scale engagement where Danida is a major/influential donor in some sectors at least for the smaller countries</li> <li>• Long-term partnership is possible that tackles the root causes</li> <li>• Direct partnerships with governments at central but also local government and agency level</li> <li>• Provides an opportunity for promoting mainstreaming within sectors supported bilaterally especially through a sector wide approach (as in the water sector in Burkina Faso)</li> <li>• Based on a sound analysis and understanding of country context</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Danida a relatively small player in large countries</li> <li>• Limited embassy capacity to promote mainstreaming and adaptation and guide partners, especially outside environment, agriculture and water sectors</li> <li>• Tendency to continue with established approaches without adequate climate change focus</li> <li>• Limited opportunity for peer learning between countries</li> <li>• Limited financial capacity of partners to ensure post-intervention sustainability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to fund regional/global engagements (problematic for climate change adaptations issues that are transboundary)</li> </ul>
<b>Multilateral funding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a voice in processes with convening power</li> <li>• Makes use of technical and management expertise of the large funds</li> <li>• Strong fiduciary systems</li> <li>• Easy to oversee/manage – minimises MFA resource requirement</li> <li>• Regional and global programming possible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heavy and slow bureaucracy</li> <li>• Sometimes politicised</li> <li>• Less Danish visibility and influence on individual interventions</li> <li>• Often in practice, only weak links to embassies and Danish experiences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationship with/ influence on developing country governments</li> <li>• Opportunities for peer learning</li> <li>• Linking local-national-regional-global levels</li> </ul>
<b>NGO funding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long-term partnerships with local NGOs, community-based organisations and communities</li> <li>• Empowerment of communities and civil society and clear link to poverty reduction and resilience of vulnerable groups</li> <li>• Strong on advocacy and awareness-raising and citizen engagement</li> <li>• Technical and management expertise</li> <li>• Linking local-national-regional-global levels</li> <li>• Peer learning and replication (within the NGOs themselves)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring government ownership more difficult</li> <li>• Donor dependency</li> <li>• Limited financial capacity of partners to ensure post-intervention sustainability</li> <li>• Often small scale and difficult to replicate without additional projects.</li> </ul>	