

UNDP / GEF



Terminal Evaluation PIMS 3786

Coping with Drought in Mozambique

Evaluation Matrix

Antonio.Cabo

04/10/2013

The Evaluation Matrix describes the questions and criteria of the terminal evaluation, the indicators of success and the information sources and analysis methodologies

PIMS 3786 Coping with Drought in Mozambique. Evaluation Matrix

Questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: how does the Project relate to the objectives of the UNFCCC and SCCF and to the development and adaptation priorities at local and national level for reduction of vulnerability in drylands in Mozambique				
Is the project relevant to the UNFCCC?	How does the project support the objectives of the UNFCCC?	UNFCCC priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design	Project document, NAPA UNFCCC focal point	Document analysis Individual interview
Is the project relevant to the SCCF?	How does the project support the objectives of the SCCF?	SCCF priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design	Project document SCCF programming framework GEF focal point	Document analysis Individual interview
Is the project relevant to the development and adaptation priorities of Mozambique?	How does the project support the development and adaptation priorities of Mozambique?	Degree to which the project supports national development and adaptation objectives	Project document Minutes of SC meetings Field visit reports PIR and other reports	Document analysis Individual interview
	Is the project country driven?	Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies	NAPA Government's Five Year Plan Strategic Poverty Reduction Action Plan	
	What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?	Appreciation of national stakeholders as to the relevance of project design and implementation to national realities and capacities	Strategic Plan for Agricultural Development Permanent secretary MICOA Other project stakeholders	
	Does the project take into account the institutional and policy framework in its design and implementation?	Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process		

		Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and SCCF criteria		
	Were the capacities of the executing institutions and its counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?	Conduct of relevant capacity assessments	Microassessment of executing agency Relevant stakeholders	Document analysis Individual interviews
Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local level?	How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders?	Degree of coherence between needs expressed by local stakeholders and project design and implementation?	District Strategic Development Plan Other local strategies and programmes Interview with key local stakeholders Interview with beneficiaries	Document analysis Individual interviews Group interviews
	Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?	Degree of involvement by local stakeholders in project design and implementation		
	Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders involved in project design and implementation?			
Is the project internally coherent in its design?	Are there logical linkages between expected outcomes, outputs and activities with the intended impact of the project?	Degree of vertical coherence between results levels and assumptions	Project document Project reports AWP Implementing agencies Executing agency	Document analysis Individual interviews
	Is the designed project duration enough to complete implementation?	Degree of coherence between project design and implementation approach		
Is the project coherent with	Is there additionality in the	Degree of coherence and	Government, CSO and	Document analysis

the interventions of other development partners?	SCCF intervention? Is there coordination and between the project and other interventions?	complementarity with other interventions by the government, civil society or international donors	international donor strategies, programs and plans Key stakeholders	Individual interview Group interview
Does the project provide relevant lessons for future interventions?		Coherence of the project's replication strategy	Project reports Key stakeholders	Document analysis Individual interview
Effectiveness: to what extent have the expected outcomes and objective of the project been achieved?				
Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?	Was the results chain correctly formulated with SMART outputs and outcomes? Were the assumptions robust and were well articulated?	Adherence to SMART criteria of project results and assumptions	Project document Relevant stakeholders	Document analysis
Is the project internally coherent in its design?	Are there logical linkages between expected outcomes, outputs and activities with the intended impact of the project?	Degree of vertical coherence between results levels and assumptions	Project document Project reports AWP Implementing agencies Executing agency	Document analysis Individual interviews
	Is the designed project duration enough to complete implementation?	Degree of coherence between project design and implementation approach		
Has the project achieved the expected outcomes and outputs?	1. Has the project contributed to adaptive capacity of farmers/pastoralist in Guijá	1. Adaptive capacity indicators (log-frame) 2. Use of meteorological	Project document and revisions thereof Monitoring data PIR and other reports Field visit reports	Document analysis Individual interview Group interview

	<p>2. Has the project set up an agricultural early warning system?</p> <p>3. Has the sensitivity of the farmers/pastoralist to drought been reduced?</p> <p>4. Have successful approaches introduced by the project been replicated?</p>	<p>information for agricultural decision-making</p> <p>3. Improved access to water sources</p> <p>4. Number of replication events</p>	<p>SC meeting minutes</p> <p>Key stakeholders</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p> <p>Implementing agency</p> <p>Executing agency</p>	
Does the project have a risk management strategy?	<p>Have the relevant risks and mitigation strategies been identified? Has the risk log been up-dated?</p> <p>How well has the mitigation strategy been implemented?</p>	Coherence, validity and feasibility of risks and risks mitigation strategies	<p>Project document and revisions thereof</p> <p>Monitoring data</p> <p>PIR and other reports</p> <p>Field visit reports</p> <p>SC meeting minutes</p> <p>Key stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Individual interview</p> <p>Group interview</p>
Has the project M&E system been efficient?	<p>Did the project design include a SMART indicator framework, with baseline and targets?</p> <p>Were enough financial/human resources provided for the implementation of the M&E system?</p>	<p>Quality of indicator design/modification of original indicator framework</p> <p>Extent to which monitoring information fed the indicators</p> <p>Degree to which the monitoring information was</p>	<p>Project document and revisions thereof</p> <p>Indicator framework</p> <p>Project reports</p> <p>PMU</p> <p>Key stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Individual interviews</p>

	<p>Was there any change in the designed M&E to improve its performance?</p> <p>Did the M&E information produced useful information for adaptive management?</p>	used to inform and adapt management		
Efficiency: has the project used its resources appropriately to produce the desired outputs				
<p>Were counterpart resources (funding, staff and facilities), enabling legislation and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?</p>		<p>Degree of commitment of resources</p> <p>Valid capacity assessment of counterpart institutions</p>	<p>Minutes of inception meeting</p> <p>Memoranda of Understanding</p> <p>Project document</p> <p>Project reports</p> <p>Key stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Individual interview</p> <p>Group interview</p>
<p>Was project support provided in an efficient way?</p>	<p>What changes have been made/ could have been made to improve the project performance?</p> <p>Did the administrative and financial system perform and deliver administrative services and disbursements efficiently?</p> <p>Was co-finance mobilized as planned?</p>	<p>Occurrence of changes to project design when needed to improve performance</p> <p>Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial resources</p> <p>Quality of results-based management reports</p>	<p>Project document</p> <p>AWP</p> <p>Project reports</p> <p>CDRs</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Individual interview</p>

	<p>Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</p> <p>Did the project implementation suffer significant delays?</p>	<p>Cost associated with delivery mechanism</p> <p>Adequacy of project choices to the geographical and political environment</p>		
Was the project strategy cost-efficient?	How do the project's solutions compare to similar SCCF projects or other projects implemented in similar settings?	Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compared to alternatives	Project documents CDRs Project reports Evaluation reports	Statistical analysis Document analysis Individual interviews
How efficient were the partnership arrangements for the project?	Were sustainable partnerships and linkages facilitated?	Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners and examples of supported partnerships	Project document Project reports Key stakeholders	Document analysis Individual interview
Did the project use local capacity/ resources in implementation?	<p>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</p> <p>□</p> <p>Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation</p>	<p>Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts</p> <p>□</p> <p>Conduct of capacity assessments</p>	Project documents Financial reports Project reports Key stakeholders	Statistical analysis Document analysis Individual interviews

	of the project? □ Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?			
Results: the positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention				
Has the project contributed to development changes?	Have there been any development changes in the project area? Were the results chain and assumption valid?	Changes have been observed The project strategy scenario is being realized and the assumptions were valid	Key stakeholders Project document Project reports Monitoring information	Direct observation Group interviews Individual interviews Document analysis
	Can the changes be attributed to the project?	Comparison with counterfactuals, i.e., areas with similar settings without project intervention	Grey literature Peer review literature Project evaluation reports Development partners	Document analysis Individual interviews
Has the project contributed to reduce vulnerability in the target populations?	Has the project contributed to increased adaptive capacity? Has the project contributed to reduce climate sensitivity?	Vulnerability indexes Adaptive capacity indicators	Vulnerability assessment Project reports Key stakeholders	Group interviews Individual interviews Document analysis
What was the catalytic role of the project	Has the project disseminated lessons	Evidence of effective dissemination of knowledge	Key stakeholders Project reports	Individual interview Group interview

	<p>learned or knowledge products?</p> <p>Has the project contributed to capacity building outside the project area?</p> <p>Has the project approach been scaled-up or replicated?</p>	<p>products</p> <p>Capacity building activities conducted with project resources or outputs</p> <p>Evidence of replication of the project approach in other areas</p>	<p>Knowledge products</p> <p>Project documents of interventions designed for similar settings and/ or objectives</p>	<p>Document analysis</p>
Sustainability: likelihood of the benefits of the intervention being delivered for an extended period after project completion				
Are the achieved results/ project benefits likely to continue after the end of the intervention?	<p>What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF assistance ends?</p>	<p>National strategies and budgets are going to sustain project benefits</p> <p>Programmes by development partners are going to sustain project benefits</p>	<p>National and local strategies, plans and programmes, including investment instruments, such as MTEF and budgets</p> <p>Strategies, projects and programmes of development partners</p> <p>Key stakeholders</p> <p>Development partner</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Individual interviews</p>
	<p>What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits</p>	<p>Local governments/ community organizations commitment to sustain project benefits</p>	<p>Local development plans and budgets, such as the Strategic District Development Plan</p> <p>Key stakeholders and beneficiaries</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Individual interview</p> <p>Group interview</p>

	to be sustained?			
	Are requisite systems for accountability, and required technical know-how, in place?	Local government/ communities with enough capacity to implement project benefits	Capacity assessments Project reports Key stakeholders	Document analysis Individual interview Group interview
	Can climate change impacts make adaptation measures introduced by the project not feasible?	Degree of uncertainty of climate change projections	Peer reviewed literature Grey literature Key stakeholders	Document analysis Individual interview Group interview