# Annex 9: Evaluation Question Matrix

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the p local and national levels?	roject relate to the main objec	tives of the GEF focal area, a	nd to the environment and de	evelopment priorities at the
<ul> <li>Is the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Republic of Mauritius?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>In line with the national priorities mentioned in the UNDP Country Programme Document</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>UNDP Country Programme Document</li> <li>Project document</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with UNDP and project team</li> </ul>
• Is the project relevant to the GEF climate change mitigation area?	• How does the project support the GEF climate change mitigation area?	<ul> <li>Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF climate change mitigation area?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Project documents</li> <li>GEF focal areas strategies and documents</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>GEF website</li> <li>Interviews with UNDP and project team</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Is the project relevant to the Republic of Mauritius's environment and sustainable development objectives?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Is the project country-driven?</li> <li>What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design?</li> <li>What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?</li> <li>Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives</li> <li>Degree of coherence between the project and nationals priorities, policies and strategies</li> <li>Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Project documents</li> <li>National policies and strategies</li> <li>Key project partners</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>GEF website</li> <li>Interviews with UNDP and project team</li> </ul>

		of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?	•	design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria				
	Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local level?	<ul> <li>How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders?</li> <li>Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?</li> <li>Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?</li> </ul>	•	Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation	-	Project partners and stakeholders Project documents	•	Document analysis Interviews with relevant stakeholders
•	Is the project internally coherent in its design?	<ul> <li>Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project</li> </ul>	•	Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic Level of coherence	-	documents	•	Document analysis Key interviews

	<ul> <li>components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)?</li> <li>Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve Project outcomes?</li> <li>Whether gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation and in what way has the project contributed to greater consideration of gender aspects, (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc). If so, indicate how</li> </ul>	between project design and project implementation approach		
<ul> <li>How is the project relevant with respect to other donor- supported activities?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?</li> <li>How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Documents from other donor supported activities</li> <li>Other donor representatives</li> <li>Project documents</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>

	<ul> <li>that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?</li> <li>Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives</li> </ul>	•	<ul> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Data analysis</li> </ul>
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Effectiveness: To what exte	ent have the expected outcome	s and objectives of the projectives of the projectives of the projectives of the projectives and the projectives of the projective states and the pr	ct been achieved?	
<ul> <li>Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>See indicators in project document results framework and log frame</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Project team and</li> </ul>	team Interviews with
			reports	relevant stakeholders

	sustainability of the project?	<ul> <li>Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</li> </ul>		
• What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	<ul> <li>What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?</li> <li>What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?</li> </ul>		Data collected     Throughout evaluation	<ul> <li>Data analysis</li> </ul>
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Efficiency: Was the project	implemented efficiently, in-li	ne with international and nati	ional norms and standards?	
<ul> <li>Was project support provided in an efficient way?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?</li> <li>Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?</li> <li>Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</li> <li>Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</li> <li>Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</li> <li>Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</li> <li>Cost in view of results achieved compared to</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Project documents And evaluations</li> <li>UNDP Project team</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Key interviews</li> </ul>

<ul> <li>How efficient are</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>producing accurate and timely financial information?</li> <li>Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</li> <li>Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)</li> <li>Did the leveraging of funds (cofinancing) happen as planned?</li> <li>Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?</li> <li>Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?</li> <li>How was results-based management used during project implementation?</li> <li>To what extent</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>costs of similar projects from other</li> <li>organizations</li> <li>Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost</li> <li>Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)</li> <li>Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</li> <li>Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives</li> <li>Specific activities</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Project documents and</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Document analysis</li> </ul>
partnership	partnerships/ linkages	conducted to support	evaluations	<ul> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>

arrangements for the project?	<ul> <li>between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported?</li> <li>Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?</li> <li>What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?</li> <li>Which methods were successful or not and why?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>the development of cooperative arrangements between partners,</li> <li>Examples of supported partnerships</li> <li>Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</li> <li>Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</li> <li>Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</li> <li>Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts</li> <li>Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>UNDP</li> <li>Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>

• What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	<ul> <li>What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?</li> <li>How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc)?</li> <li>What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	Data analysis
<ul> <li>Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>See indicators in project document results framework and log frame</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project team and relevant stakeholders</li> <li>Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Documents analysis</li> <li>Interviews with project team</li> <li>Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</li> <li>What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?</li> <li>Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design</li> <li>Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</li> <li>Quality of risk</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Project documents</li> <li>UNDP, project team, and relevant</li> <li>stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>

<ul> <li>What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>project</li> <li>What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?</li> <li>What changes could</li> </ul>	mitigations strategies developed and followed	<ul> <li>Data collected throughout</li> <li>evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Data analysis</li> </ul>
	have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?			
Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Sustainability: To what externation of the second s	ent are there financial, instituti	onal, social-economic, and/o	r environmental risks to susta	aining long-term project
<ul> <li>Is the Project financially sustainable?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> <li>What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF grant assistance ends?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Is the Project environmentally and socially sustainable?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Document analysis</li><li>Interviews</li></ul>

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	<ul> <li>instance that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?</li> <li>Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow?</li> <li>Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?</li> </ul>			
To what extent the stakeholders will sustain the project?	<ul> <li>project outcomes?</li> <li>Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> <li>What is the risk for</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>

<ul> <li>Assess the likely permanence (long lasting nature) of the impacts</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Clarify based on extent: <ul> <li>a) verifiable</li> <li>improvement in energy</li> <li>intensity; and/or</li> </ul> </li> <li>b) through specified</li> <li>indicators that progress</li> <li>is being made towards</li> <li>achievement of project</li> <li>objectives</li> <li>c) regulatory and policy</li> <li>changes at regional,</li> <li>national and/or local</li> <li>levels</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Project documents</li> <li>UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
---	---	--	--	---