

Annex F: Lines of enquiry and sources

Key focus of evaluation questions	Sources of findings to answer the EQ	Information sources, methods of research and analysis, and outputs	Other enquiries relevant to answering the EQ
EQ1: What are the main results of Danish funding for climate change mitigation since 2013?	Evaluations of Climate Envelope (CE), non-CE and DEPP grant projects in Ethiopia, South Africa and Vietnam.	<p>Project evaluations based on methods used by <i>Evaluation of Danish-Nepalese Development Cooperation, 1991-2016</i> (Caldecott <i>et al.</i>, 2017), and other reports since, including the presentation of evidence to support scores for: (a) design quality based on reconstructing the theory of change (i.e. what the designers hoped to achieve, why, and by what means) and the assumptions that link cause and effect (i.e. the defensibility of all the assumptions using evidence or reasonable inference, and transparent judgements on the plausibility and strength of links between them); and (b) performance, drawing on contextual analyses, programme documents, completion reports, summative evaluations, and interviews, with evidence compiled and presented to support scores on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relevance (responsiveness to needs, policies and strategies of the partners); • efficiency (sound management and value for money, including consistent patterns in management, governance, capacity or relationships); • effectiveness (contributions to achieving specific purpose, including quantitative data or proxies on GHG emission reductions, or contributions to enable systems to deliver reduced emissions, from renewable energy and/or energy efficiency measures and/or other sectors such as waste, transport, construction, organic farming, forestry and other LULUCF); • impact (wider and longer-term effects, including strategic changes): • sustainability (changes in policies, laws, regulations, systems, forums, , fiscal arrangements, businesses, benefit sharing, environmental trends, incentives, new ideas, etc.); • partner satisfaction (ownership, accountability and enthusiasm in partner organisation); • coherence (synergy and avoided interference with the plans and actions of other actors); • replicability (reason to expect lessons learned to improve actions in the future or elsewhere); and • cross-cutting themes (rights, peace, governance, gender and social 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portfolio analysis. Output: integrated within the Inception Report. • Critical review of the strategic objectives of development cooperation. Output: integrated within the Inception Report. • Critical review of the guiding principles for the Climate Envelope. Output: integrated within the Inception Report. • Critical review of the monitoring and evaluation systems used by the institutions concerned: DEPP, ESMAP, IEA, GCF, Verdens Skove, and those responsible for CE grants and sector programmes - Danida, embassies, consulting firms. Output: integrated within the Final Report.

Key focus of evaluation questions	Sources of findings to answer the EQ	Information sources, methods of research and analysis, and outputs	Other enquiries relevant to answering the EQ
EQ1 continued.	Sector programme evaluations of ESSP in Indonesia and SSCs in Ethiopia and Indonesia.	<p>inclusion, environment).</p> <p>Output. Each analysis to yield a stand-alone report on the grant project portfolio, including: (a) a description of the portfolio in each country, including its context, design and partners; (b) a timeline of actors, actions and external events; (c) text on strengths and weaknesses based on the evaluation criteria; (d) text on contributions to thematic changes; (e) text on challenges and adaptive responses; (f) contribution stories based on ‘before and after’ scenarios; (g) lessons learned for stakeholders and the SDGs; and (h) conclusions and recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline and content of the sector programme and Danish involvement with it. • Design quality assessment as above, based on analysis of the theory of change and assessment of assumptions, drawing on design documents and interviews. • Performance assessment by evaluation criterion at sector programme level as above, with particular attention to relevance, impact, sustainability and replicability, drawing on contextual analyses, programme documents, completion reports, summative evaluations, and interviews. 	
EQ1 continued.	Investigative assessment of energy transition contributions to ESMAP and IEA.	<p>Output. Each analysis to yield a stand-alone report on the sector programme, including: (a) a description of the portfolio in each country, including its context, design and partners; (b) a timeline of actors, actions and external events; (c) text on strengths and weaknesses based on the evaluation criteria; (d) text on contributions to thematic changes; (e) text on challenges and adaptive responses; (f) contribution stories based on ‘before and after’ scenarios; (g) lessons learned for stakeholders and the SDGs; and (h) conclusions and recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline and content of energy transition policies, preparations and investments, and Danish involvement with them. • Critical review of independent evaluations of ESMAP and IEA. • Review of documents related to the Danish contributions to ESMAP and IEA. • Interviews with selected knowledge-holders among ESMAP and IEA staff 	

Key focus of evaluation questions	Sources of findings to answer the EQ	Information sources, methods of research and analysis, and outputs	Other enquiries relevant to answering the EQ
EQ1 continued.	Investigative assessment of core contributions to GCF and Verdens Skove	<p>and Danish officials, and other observers (NGOs, consultants, project staff, beneficiaries, etc.) through cascade sampling.</p> <p>Output. Each analysis to yield a ‘light’ assessment of the outcomes of the support provided and evidence-based proposals for how to enhance the work of each organisation in supporting the energy transition and reducing fossil fuel use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline and content of policies and activities by GCF and Verdens Skove, and Danish involvement with them. • Critical review of independent evaluations of GCF and Verdens Skove. • Review of documents related to the Danish contributions to GCF and Verdens Skove. • Interviews with selected knowledge-holders among GCF and Verdens Skove staff and Danish officials, and other observers (NGOs, consultants, project staff, beneficiaries, etc.) through cascade sampling. <p>Output. Each analysis to yield a ‘light’ assessment of how Danish climate change mitigation concerns and priorities are reflected in the initiatives funded through the partners, in the case of GCF in light of the 2019 <i>Forward-looking Performance Review</i>, and in the case of Verdens Skove with particular focus on low carbon development, citizen engagement and advocacy in climate change mitigation.</p>	
EQ2: How has climate change mitigation funding responded to the aims and needs defined by developing countries in their NDCs?	Review of NDC mitigation priorities in Ethiopia, South Africa, Indonesia and Vietnam.	<p>Review of NDCs (www4.unfccc.int/sites/NDCStaging/Pages/All.aspx) to identify mitigation priorities in Ethiopia, South Africa, Indonesia and Vietnam.</p> <p>Output. Descriptive analysis of NDC mitigation priorities in each country, including an assessment of the relevance of NDC priorities to national needs in each case.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider lessons from the relationship between NDC priorities and Danish actions in the four countries, and what they have to teach about the relationship between NDC priorities and donor actions in general. Output: integrated within the Final Report.
EQ2 continued.	Project evaluations of CE, non-CE and DEPP grants in Ethiopia, South Africa and Vietnam (relative to NDC	<p>Compare findings from project portfolio evaluations with NDC mitigation priorities in Ethiopia, South Africa and Vietnam.</p> <p>Output. Critical analysis of the relevance of the project portfolio to NDC mitigation priorities in each case.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider whether NDCs alone are adequate guides to

Key focus of evaluation questions	Sources of findings to answer the EQ	Information sources, methods of research and analysis, and outputs	Other enquiries relevant to answering the EQ
EQ2 continued.	<p>priorities).</p> <p>Sector programme evaluations of ESSP in Indonesia and SSCs in Ethiopia and Indonesia (relative to NDC priorities).</p>	<p>Compare findings from sector programme evaluations with NDC mitigation priorities in Ethiopia and Indonesia.</p> <p>Output. Critical analysis of the relevance of the sector programme to NDC mitigation priorities in each case.</p>	<p>the distribution of mitigation investment between countries, or whether some other criteria for emissions reduction potential should be used.</p> <p>Output: integrated within the Final Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider whether the focus on renewable energy and energy efficiency in the CE is adequate to address emission-reduction opportunities, or whether some other thematic or sectoral targets should be considered. Output: integrated within the Final Report.
EQ3: How has climate change mitigation funding contributed to transformational change and the SDGs? EQ3 continued.	<p>Contribution stories and best practices relevant to transformational change and/or the SDGs, and somehow linked to Danish grant-funded projects and sector programmes in Ethiopia, South Africa, Indonesia and Vietnam.</p> <p>Contribution stories and best practices relevant to transformational change and/or the SDGs, and somehow linked to Danish contributions to</p>	<p>Identify and research candidate contribution stories and best practices based on 'before and after' scenarios and areas of excellence in design and performance contained in the project portfolio and sector programme evaluations, where these are potentially attributable in whole or part to Danish support.</p> <p>Output. Integrated within the reports of the project portfolio and sectoral programme evaluations under EQ1.</p> <p>Identify and research candidate contribution stories and best practices based on 'before and after' scenarios and areas of excellence in institutional performance, where these are potentially attributable directly or indirectly to Danish contributions to the institutions concerned.</p> <p>Output. Integrated within the investigative assessments of each institution</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the reputations of other international organisations as potential alternative or additional partners with Denmark in seeking transformational change. Output: integrated within the Final Report. Consider what other ways may exist, 'going beyond business as usual' for Danida to contribute to global transformational change. Output: integrated within the Final Report. Define the theory of change

Key focus of evaluation questions	Sources of findings to answer the EQ	Information sources, methods of research and analysis, and outputs	Other enquiries relevant to answering the EQ
EQ3 continued.	<p>ESMAP, IEA, GCF and Verdens Skove.</p> <p>Identify best practices in transformational change and/or the SDGs arising from the work of ESMAP, IEA, GCF and Verdens Skove, regardless of Danish involvement.</p>	<p>under EQ1.</p> <p>Identify and research candidate contribution stories and best practices based on 'before and after' scenarios and areas of excellence in institutional performance.</p> <p>Output. Integrated within the investigative assessments of each institution under EQ1.</p>	<p>for mitigation financing developed in 2015-16, examine its 'fitness for purpose' and propose changes as appropriate. Output: integrated within the Final Report.</p>
EQ4: What are the main lessons learned from climate change mitigation funding?	Findings to emerge from all lines of enquiry	<p>Critical review of all findings, with validation through team consensus, knowledge-holder interviews, comments on drafts, and approval by the client.</p> <p>Output. integrated within the Final Report.</p>	Formulate prioritised recommendations based on all findings from all sources. Output: integrated within the Final Report.