

**Final  
Review cum Appraisal Report**

**Of the programme:**

**Decentralisation and Climate Change  
– A programme implemented by Sustainable Energy and partners in  
Mozambique, Kenya and Tanzania**

March 2019  
Report prepared  
by Nordeco

## List of contents

<i>List of Acronyms</i>	ii
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. <i>Objective and Scope</i>	1
1.2 <i>Background</i>	1
1.3 <i>Approach</i>	2
<b>2. Review – findings and analysis</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 <i>Contextual developments and the programme (Criteria 1 and 3)</i>	2
2.2 <i>Review of overall progress and performance of the programme</i>	2
2.2.1 <i>Theory of change, programme strategy, coherence and synergy (Criteria 1)</i>	2
2.2.2 <i>Progress towards meeting present programme phase results (Criteria 4)</i>	4
2.2.3 <i>Popular engagement and development education (Criteria 1)</i>	8
2.3 <i>Review of applicant and partner capacity</i>	8
2.3.1 <i>Implementation of recommendations from latest review/capacity assessment (Criteria 1), SE capacity and Partnerships</i>	8
2.3.2 <i>Results framework, M&amp;E, reporting and knowledge management (Criteria 3)</i>	10
2.3.3 <i>Financial resources, administrative capacity, budget and cost effectiveness (Criteria 2)</i>	11
<b>3. Appraisal of Concept Note – findings and analysis</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 <i>Strategic relevance</i>	11
3.1.1 <i>Strategic orientation (criteria 5)</i>	11
3.1.2 <i>Relevance of civil society partners and networking (criteria 6)</i>	13
3.2 <i>Programmatic approaches</i>	14
3.2.1 <i>Theory of Change and synergy (criteria 7)</i>	14
3.2.2 <i>Results framework and M&amp;E system (criteria 8)</i>	14
3.2.3 <i>HRBA (criteria 9)</i>	15
3.2.4 <i>Sustainability (criteria 10)</i>	15
3.2.5 <i>Financial resources and cost levels (criteria 11)</i>	15
3.2.6 <i>Popular engagement and development education (criteria 12)</i>	15
<b>4. Conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1 <i>Conclusions</i>	16
4.1.1 <i>Capacity Assessment of Applicant</i>	16
4.1.2 <i>Appraisal of draft Concept Note</i>	17
4.1.3 <i>Is applicant Program relevant</i>	18
4.2 <i>Recommendations</i>	18
4.2.1 <i>Programme management capacity</i>	18
4.2.2 <i>Finalization of concept note</i>	18
<i>Annex 1 TOR for the review cum appraisal</i>	20
<i>Annex 2 Programme of the RevApp mission</i>	26

## *List of Acronyms*

Cap/App	Capacity Assessment and Appraisal (in CISU process)
CISU	Civil Samfund I Udvikling (Civil Society in Development)
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DKK	Danish Kroner
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NDC	National Determined Contributions
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NRMC	Natural Resource Management Committee
PCC	Programme Coordinating Committee
PCP	Programme Communication Platform
Rev/App	Review and Appraisal (in CISU process)
SE	Sustainable Energy
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
TOC	Theory of Change
TOR	Terms of Reference

## Executive Summary

*A review and appraisal (RevApp) of the programme “Decentralisation and Climate Change – A programme implemented by Sustainable Energy (SE) and partners in Mozambique, Kenya and Tanzania” has been undertaken in March 2019, and the findings are presented in this report.*

*The overall performance of the programme is assessed to be satisfactory and in accordance with the agreed programme document. Results of the current programme phase are to a large extent on track. Achievement of objectives is seeing satisfactory progress. Kenya programme outcome achievement is progressing well and there is also satisfactory progress in achieving the Mozambique programme outcome. Outputs of the programme are being met. The programme works with issues, which usually take time to change, hence, impacts from the programme are typically seen over time. The programme contexts have seen important development impacting the programme, the programme partners have responded well to the contextual developments.*

*The strategic approach is assessed to be relevant and implementation of the programme is assessed to be largely in accordance with the formulated strategic approach. The Programme strategy is sound and supportive of effective resilience building including climate change adaptation among targeted local communities. The programme and its strategic approach is well in line with the Policy for Danish Support to Civil Society Policy including the aspects of promoting rights, strengthening of open debate, strengthening of locally based civil society, and advancing of capacity development, advocacy work and networking opportunities. The programme is creating impacts in its area of implementation and the activities are appreciated by the involved target groups including rights holders and duty bearers. The TOC of the programme is straightforward, easy to understand and relevant. Bringing in a broader approach to community capacity development would be helpful. The strategic choice of working with CSO closer to people and further based at decentralised levels is wise.*

*Coherence and synergy in the programme is good. Synergy and coherence between advocacy work and field implementation is good but also requires a constant follow up. The advocacy work in the programme is contributing positively to programme achievements, but also needs constant focus on clarity of roles and direction. Creating evidence, lessons learned and models is taking place in the programme, but also needs stronger emphasis on delivery of evidence. Lessons learned in laboratory/pilots need to work on realistic levels of support.*

*Mode of support to local groups and committees needs clearer agreements and could also further address capacity to undertake productive activities. Adaptation work and resilience building are important and contribute also positively to mitigation.*

*A human rights based approach is being promoted in the programme. Gender is being addressed seriously in the programme. Sustainability of the programme activities is found to be relatively good. The popular engagement and development education activities undertaken in Denmark are sound and undertaken at a satisfactory level.*

*The performance and capacity of SE as applicant is good. SE and partners have followed up and addressed most of the recommendations from the 2016 Thematic Review. SE is well placed as an organisation to implement the programme. Good understanding of how to work with climate change adaptation is found in the programme and among partners. SE has seen important strategic developments towards a broader climate action organisation. SE is well placed as an organisation to implement the programme.*

*Programme institutional set up and programme management are working well and there is good capacity to align, network and partner. Consortia are overall working well and peer learning within the consortium is taking place, however, clarifying roles and communication of plans and budget needs constant emphasis. The process consultant role is found to be useful. Partnerships in the programme as expressed through consortia are assessed as being of good quality and with important learnings being shared.*

*There are good capacities of partners and local civil society is overall being strengthened. There is good local and provincial/county ownership to the programme and involvement of stakeholders has generally been rather comprehensive.*

*The results framework of the programme is well developed and gives a good guidance to programme implementation. Country results frameworks give good guidance to consortium partner implementation. The M&E in the programme is good and reporting is good, but could include more on impacts and contribution to change. Using more participatory monitoring tools could be considered. Important evidence is being created, but there is a need for more systematic knowledge management.*

*Financial management and administration is found to be satisfactory. The budget of the programme is sound and it is likely that the budget will be utilised by the end of 2019. Cost effectiveness in the programme is considered to be relatively good.*

*Overall relevance of the next phase programme is expected and the strategic approach is sound. The strategic approach to working with decentralisation, resilience and climate change adaptation continues to be relevant and assessed as being an important contributor to*

*poverty reduction and upholding of rights of marginalised groups. The programme will continue to be relevant in relation to the Policy for Danish Support to Civil Society.*

*The next phase of the programme is assessed to be feasible and the support to a next phase is justified. Based on the presented concept note for the next phase, the appraisal recommends that a new phase of the programme is developed and subsequently presented for approval given that its development has taken into consideration the findings and conclusions in the RevApp.*

*Important results of the next phase are expected. The next phase will be a progression of the current phase, but will continue to work on the longer-term programme objective. Governance, rights, inclusion and advocacy are important aspects of the next phase. In order to address climate change adaptation it requires a broader addressing of resilience of communities. Including a broader scope for capacity development of communities would contribute to empowerment. The programme document would benefit from better defining communities and committees.*

*The strategic choice for the next phase of phasing out in Mozambique and phasing in in Tanzania is supported by the appraisal. Continuation of the consortium approach makes good sense. Evidence based advocacy focus on next phase is important but also requires further focus on tangible deliveries in terms of evidence and advocacy outputs.*

*There is significant relevance of the selected civil society partners and there is likely to be a continuation of the good partnership relations in the consortiums. SE capacity fits well with implementing the next phase and there is good capacity to align, network and partner.*

*A good TOC is guiding the current phase of the programme. For the next phase the TOC could be further developed to include promotion of target groups own capacities to manage their development. Good coherence and synergy of the next phase is foreseen. The results framework developed is assessed as being very useful and realistic and contributing to important achievements. A good Me&E system is to be applied for the next phase. Further development of participatory methods and of how impacts and contribution to change are being monitored would be useful.*

*A human rights based approach will also be applied also in the next phase. Overall, the sustainability of the next phase is considered to be good, and replication and advocacy activities of the next phase will continue to contribute to sustainability.*

*The budget size for the next phase is assessed as being realistic and cost levels are found to be relevant, and cost effectiveness is considered to be satisfactory. The popular engagement and development education activities planned for in the next phase in Denmark are sound.*

*In regards to the thematic issues specifically to consider in the RevApp process, it is concluded that the consortium model of implementation promotes peer learning and overall is an effective way of implementing the programme and of partnering with CSOs. SE has shown a good and relevant capacity to align, network and partner with civil society organisations. SE is clearly playing a key role in facilitating consortiums within the programme. The consortium model is relevant to pursue in the next phase of the programme.*

*Further, in relation to the other thematic issue to consider, it is concluded that the suggested phase out of Mozambique and the suggested phasing in of Tanzania is considered to be a useful and relevant next step to take in the programme.*

***In relation to the review, the following recommendations are presented:***

- *The review is recommending that the programme is further emphasising the requirements within the programme to deliver in terms of evidence, lessons learnt, best practises and models. Better milestones reflecting this need should be developed.*
- *The review team recommends that further clarity in agreements between the consortium partners and local groups are being developed and include performance criteria, deliverables, timing and deadlines.*
- *The review team recommends that the programme, in relation to the support to be provided to the different local groups of beneficiaries, initiate a process for ensuring additional capacity development on management of not only funding from outside but also of own development initiatives. Further considerations, on how to access future technical extension support in a sustainable way, needs to be given.*
- *The review team recommends initiating a process for further development of impact monitoring in the programme and in this way ensuring better considerations on how programme and partners are contributing to the desired changes at impact level. Consider and possibly start a process of including more participatory approaches involving target groups in monitoring of the programme.*
- *It is recommended that all partners in the respective consortiums are developing guidelines for how to address suspicion of financial mismanagement.*

***In relation to the appraisal, the following recommendations are made:***

- *The appraisal recommends that timing allocated to work with a consortium be increased from 5-6 years to 6-7 years.*
- *It is recommended that the programme and concept note give a further focus on addressing resilience of communities as this it better describing the broader approach needed in order to address climate change adaptation in the most relevant ways.*
- *It is recommended to include the support to development of capacities of communities to manage different community development initiatives in the proposed programme approach to community empowerment.*
- *It is recommended to provide better descriptions of how the programme during its implementation will ensure more tangible evidence and advocacy outputs.*
- *It is recommended to develop a TOC for the final concept note and in this TOC to include the aspects of communities own capacities to manage development and progress in community resilience.*
- *It is recommended to further develop the results framework to better include, in the outcomes and outputs, aspects of community resilience, community capacity, the process of getting clearer outputs in relation to evidence and advocacy and the inclusion of advocacy at multiple levels.*
- *It is recommended to continue with the current monitoring set up and to further develop the monitoring of impact and contribution to change. Further applying participatory methods in monitoring should be considered.*

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Objective and Scope

Vedvarende Energi/Sustainable Energy (SE) is together with CSO partners in Kenya and Mozambique implementing the programme “Decentralisation and Climate Change”. The programme is funded as part of the CISU programme funding modality. It is a two-year programme (2018-2019) under a bridge funding through CISU between a previous MFA funding to SE and the proposed new four (XX) years programme to be funded through CISU. Partners in Tanzania are expected to be part of a new phase of the programme. The current programme has a total budget of DKK XX million. As part of CISU’s standard procedures, the programme has to undergo a review of the current phase and an appraisal for a possible next phase of the programme. This report concerns the review and appraisal. Throughout, the headings in the report also refer to the twelve CISU assessment criteria 1-12 (found [here](#)).

The purpose of the review cum appraisal is twofold. One is to assess the current programme phase performance and the other is to appraise the concept note for the proposed new programme phase and provide recommendations on changes required in order to improve or change future strategies and activities. The review cum appraisal aims at:

- Extracting and assessing lessons learned in the current phase of the programme with a view to improving future activities as well as assessing documented performance and results achieved so far.
- Reviewing the applicant organisation's capacity in light of the new programme.
- Appraising the proposed new programme phase in order to assess the relevance and appropriateness of the proposed new programme phase in relation to its strategic relevance and programmatic approach.

The scope of work in accordance with the ToR (see annex 1) for the review cum appraisal includes the following overall areas, of which some will be addressed in relation to the review, namely: Contextual developments, overall progress and performance of the programme and applicant and partner capacity. And for the appraisal of the concept note, it includes an assessment of the proposed programme in terms of its strategic relevance and various aspects of the proposed programmatic approaches.

Specific issues to consider according to the ToR include an assessment of the approach to partnerships and peer learning in the programme, where the programme is being implemented in consortiums in the respective countries, as well as the country focus, where there, during the coming programme phase, is a proposed phasing out of collaboration with Mozambique and a phasing in of a collaboration with partners in Tanzania. Kenya is proposed to remain a partner country.

## 1.2 Background

The current programme is implemented in Kenya and Mozambique as well as with development education/engagement activities in Denmark. The programme seeks to mobilize vulnerable groups in the target countries affected one way or the other by ongoing climate changes. The programme development objective is “Climate change adaptation interventions are integrated into on-going development and governance processes and addressed locally through public and private investments benefitting vulnerable groups in Mozambique and Kenya. As a spin-off of programme results and experiences a contribution is made to a growing Danish public responsiveness to the unequal distribution of the negative effects of climate changes”.

The programme builds on a range of previous programmes implemented by SE and their partners over several years in Mozambique and fewer years in Kenya. SE is the applicant organisation in Denmark and programme implementation is with a consortium of five partner CSOs in Mozambique and a consortium of five partner CSOs in Kenya. The programme has taken a deliberate effort in working with partners that are based at decentralised levels in regions/counties in an effort to work with organisations that are closer to the real target groups. The programme has field development activities and advocacy activities in Sofala Region in Mozambique and in Kisumu and Homa Bay Counties in Kenya. SE and partners have developed a draft concept note for a possible new phase of the programme.

### 1.3 Approach

The review cum appraisal was undertaken in the period February/March 2019 and included work in Denmark and work in Mozambique. The work has included meetings with stakeholders in Denmark, document analysis, meetings and field visits in Mozambique. Debriefings have been undertaken and a review cum appraisal report has been produced. The review cum appraisal report has two major chapters one concerning the review (chapter 2) and one concerning the appraisal (chapter 3). An external consultant has undertaken the review cum appraisal, and the views and recommendations contained in this report are those of the consultant only. The review cum appraisal has been undertaken by Martin Enghoff, Nordeco, as consultant. The consultant would like to thank all the people met for their support and assistance, which greatly facilitated the process.

## 2. Review – findings and analysis

### 2.1 Contextual developments and the programme (Criteria 1 and 3)

**The programme contexts have seen important development impacting the programme, the programme partners have responded well to the contextual developments.** The programme is implemented in different countries with clearly rather different contexts. The programme context related to progress in decentralisation has seen significant delays in Kenya. This has impacted the opportunities around collaboration with decentralised authorities. Such collaboration and associated funding is slow but it develops. In Mozambique, the development of a new Forest Policy has the potential to impact decentralised revenues and rights of communities, something that the consortium partners are following closely and seeking to impact. The contextual development in relation to the operational environment for CSOs has in Kenya seen a continued development towards more restrictive room for manoeuvring when addressing human rights and towards concentration of funding to larger CSO. Whereas the first is not significantly impacting the CSOs in the consortium, the other is making funding for the individual CSOs increasingly difficult. Hence, joining in consortiums becomes the more important. In Mozambique, there has been no major changes in the CSO operational environment. In terms of climate change and new finances, there appears to be growing opportunities in Kenya for accessing adaptation funding from vertical adaptation finance sources. In Mozambique, the development in terms of Local Adaptation Plans with possible finance to follow is an interesting contextual development. Overall, SE and partners have managed to respond well to the contextual developments and are monitoring risks and assumptions on a continuous basis.

### 2.2 Review of overall progress and performance of the programme

#### 2.2.1 Theory of change, programme strategy, coherence and synergy (Criteria 1)

**TOC of the programme is straightforward, easy to understand and relevant. Bringing in a broader approach to community capacity development would be helpful.** The TOC of the programme is primarily concerned with the changes resulting from the approaches and type of support being provided to the communities by the authorities and CSOs. This, together with the changes in terms of the understandings of a climate related agenda, is expected to contribute to the vision of climate change adaptation interventions being integrated into the investment and governance processes and a growing responsiveness to the climate change agenda. The review finds that the TOC is useful and gives a good understanding of the changes that the programme is seeking to influence. It gives a good understanding of the linkages and of the assumptions made in order to move towards the vision and of what is being attributed to and contributed to by the programme. The TOC is clearly relevant. An aspect that, in view of the review team, is missing from the TOC is, however, the development of capacities of the target groups to manage development/natural resources. Building such local capacities, in addition to building target group capacities to receive and manage support/funding from authorities/private sector, is and should in practise part of the programme. This ought to be better reflected in the TOC. Further, this would also present a better understanding of how actual livelihoods of the target groups are being improved. Likewise, with more focus on building capacities of communities “to do”, the TOC progression from the level “Authorities’ approaches...” to the level of “Livelihoods improvement...” would also be somewhat easier to link.

**The Programme strategy is sound and supportive of effective resilience building including climate change adaptation among targeted local communities.** Overall, the programme strategy addresses

decentralised development and natural resource management issues that are relevant in relation to climate change adaptation and promotion of local livelihoods. The programme is about mobilising disadvantaged groups that are affected one way or another by climate change. The programme supports local communities and user groups in getting access to decentralised revenues and finance including natural resources and climate related financing for supporting community development and livelihoods. It builds capacities of communities to manage such financing and it has a strong emphasis on advocating for access to such financing. The programme has an emphasis on provision of different forms of local level capacity development, undertaking of advocacy and also provision of support to a range of pilot projects/strategic services. The review finds that there is a good balance between capacity development, advocacy and strategic services within the programme strategy. Overall, the review finds that the programme strategy is relevant and constitutes an important part of what is needed in order to mobilize communities.

The review finds that the overall activities implemented within the respective country programmes under the programme are relevant and contribute to the programme strategy. In Mozambique, seeking to support the NRMCs is clearly relevant in relation to promotion of rights to receiving financing from resource extraction, and in Kenya, provision of support to communities in order for them to be better able to benefit from decentralised funding opportunities is also very relevant.

As with the TOC, the review finds that it would be useful to have a further emphasis in the programme strategy on building communities capacities to manage development and natural resources in a broader sense. It is believed that in order to empower communities and to improve local livelihoods there is need to further include capacity development of communities to manage not just finance from government/private sector but also actual development and natural resource management activities. Actual support within the programme to management capacities of communities to act on their own is to some extent being provided, but it is not very clear in the programme strategy.

**Good understanding of how to work with climate change adaptation is found in the programme and among partners.** SE's understanding of what it takes to promote improved livelihoods of communities and climate change adaptation in the respective countries includes the need to work more broadly with development, governance and natural resources. The review team is fully supportive of this broader conceptualisation and approach to working with climate change adaptation for marginalised communities. Climate change adaptation has to be addressed broadly and integrated with the many other development challenges that communities are facing. Hence, the review would not support a process where only what in a strict sense can be called direct consequences of climate change are being addressed by the programme. Effectively, the programme is working with promoting resilience of local communities, where building resilience should be understood as addressing improved adaptation of local communities to climate change, to changes in natural resources, land use and agriculture as well as to changes in a wide range of governance systems associated with this. The review is supporting this de facto focus in the programme strategy on promoting resilience of local communities.

**The strategic choice of working with CSO closer to people and further based at decentralised levels is wise.** SE and the programme have decided to focus work directly with partners that are based on decentralised levels. This is so, even if some of these CSO partners naturally are weaker than centrally based CSOs. The decentralised CSO are often closer to the actual target groups and they are having a better opportunity for giving voice to the more marginalised citizens. The review finds that the strategic choice of working directly with the periphery is both important and worth pursuing to better address inequalities in opportunities and costs of climate change.

**Coherence and synergy in the programme is good.** Overall, the programme is found to have a reasonable level of coherence and synergy. Activities within the country programmes are coherent with the efforts on development education and engagement undertaken in Denmark, hence, the "Take climate action" activities in Denmark is linked with the respective country programmes. Within each of the country programmes there are good synergy among the partners in the consortiums and the activities undertaken within the respective country programmes are coherent. Outputs that are created within the programme are also assessed to be coherent and with important synergies among them. The country level coherence and synergy are assessed as being the most important. Although, there is a relatively good coherence thematically between the two country programmes, there is effectively limited coherence and synergy between the two different country programmes, although some coherence is created through the common PCP and the activities associated with this. SE has found that there would be limited value added from trying to link the two country programmes, this is so based on the way they

are formulated and implemented at present. The contexts and focus areas are too different in order to justify the costs associated with bringing the two programmes together. This judgement is found to be valid by the review team within the current programme.

**Synergy and coherence between advocacy work and field implementation is good but also requires a constant focus on clarity.** The synergy between the capacity development work, the advocacy work and the strategic services is generally found to be reasonable good, but also somewhat of a challenge to continuously ensure that advocacy work is building on evidence created through the capacity development and strategic services in the field. Although the strategy of having different partners working with advocacy and working with field implementation is fundamentally a useful strategy, it requires constant information flows and levelling of among the partners. And it requires that clarity in terms of what evidence that should be created is continuously emphasised. The budget tracking work and the work with the NDCs - funded through the additional funding but fully integrated into the programme – is very useful work. Constantly linking this to evidence from the field is needed.

**The SDGs are being addressed in the programme.** The programme work is relevant in relation to a number of SDGs, where goal 13 (Climate Action) and goal 7 (Affordable and clean energy) are in focus, but where goal 1 (No poverty), goal 5 (Gender equality), goal 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions), and goal 17 (Partnerships) also are stressed as part of the programme and clearly highly relevant within the programme work. Further, the goal 15 (Life on land) is found to be relevant in the way the programme is working with natural resource management. The programme's approach in relation to the highlighting the SDG contributions is found to be useful.

**Addressing poverty reduction is an important part of the programme.** The thematic and geographic focus of the programme is having a strong emphasis on poverty reduction. The programme is seeking to improve local livelihoods and local incomes. Addressing climate change adaptation is about building community resilience and here poverty reduction is central. Sustainable management of natural resources is closely related to poverty reduction.

**Overall, the programme has a sound focus on key aspects of the Danish Policy for Support to Civil Society.** The programme clearly promotes key aspects of the Civil Society Policy including contribution to:

- promotion of a vibrant, open debate nationally and internationally – through partners participating in the policy debate around climate/natural resource management, governance and financing
- strengthening of locally based civil society and promotion of an independent, legitimate and locally based civil society – through programme focus on strengthening partners and user groups that partners work with
- promotion of capacity development, advocacy work and networking opportunities – through supporting networking/consortium, a range of capacity development activities and with focus on advocacy support
- and promotion of rights – through working with rights based approaches and addressing rights of communities related to benefit from climate/natural resource finance and management

## 2.2.2 Progress towards meeting present programme phase results (Criteria 4)

**Results of the current programme phase are to a large extent on track.** There is good progress in achieving the results of the current phase of the programme. This applies to both countries and also in relation to the popular engagement in Denmark. Achievements are also positively influenced by the supported activities from previous programmes/projects.

The programme overall results framework has been translated into country LFAs. Each of the country programmes is addressing a specific outcome with outcome one being for Kenya and outcome two for Mozambique. Yearly workplans and budgets are developed for the programme and for each partner in their respective countries. The review has assessed progress in delivery in relation to the agreed workplan and budget and finds good progress largely in accordance to plans.

**Achievement of objectives is seeing satisfactory progress.** The programme objective primarily concerns integration in development and governance processes and financing of adaptation interventions that benefits vulnerable groups. The immediate objective concerns collaboration of communities and local authorities that improve local living conditions and create models for replication and which enjoy support from a qualified CSO

environment. There are no indicators for the programme level objectives and status of objectives are not reported on until end of the programme. However, the review does find that there is satisfactory progress towards these objectives. Adaptation interventions, as understood in a broad sense of resilience building, are being increasingly addressed in the target areas and the communities are accessing increasing financing in one form or another. Better collaboration between communities and local authorities is seen. Indications of benefits to communities and contribution to improved living conditions are seen in both countries. Input for models for replication are being developed although evidence created is not sufficiently clearly formulated. The capacity of the CSO environment has seen important improvements.

The programme objective also includes that programme results and experiences are used to influence a growing Danish public responsiveness to the unequal distribution of the negative effects of climate changes. This part of the objective is also assessed as having seen satisfactory progress through the popular engagement and development education work under the climate campaign “Tag klima ansvar” and linked with the work associated with the PCP.

**Kenya programme outcome achievement is progressing well.** The outcome for the Kenya programme is “Vulnerable populations in Kisumu and Homa Bay counties at risk of natural hazards caused by climate change are increasingly supported by policies and programmes sponsored through the devolution and climate change funds”. Focus in the outcome is that policies, programmes and finance are supporting vulnerable populations.

The outcome has two indicators, namely, “Duty bearers finance /actively support programmes and projects aiming at communities affected by results of climate change”. This indicator is showing good progress, with different levels of authorities increasingly being supportive towards local community initiatives related to climate change adaptation/resilience. Important policy-related progress has been seen especially in Kisumu. Further, the second indicator “A number of right holders’ prioritised climate adaptation plans are approved for funding by either County Government’s Committee or at ward and sub-county level” have seen important progress, with 12 local adaption plans developed, presented to authorities and with a number of the projects within the plans being funded from a variety of county-related funding streams although not yet from specific climate funding schemes.

**Satisfactory progress in achieving the Mozambique programme outcome.** The outcome for the Mozambique programme is “Knowledge is generated about the ability, effectiveness and efficiency of national and local tax and other revenue mechanisms from sustainable natural resource exploitation at community level to strengthen these and their adaptive capacities to ongoing climate changes. The knowledge is used to increase incomes in targeted communities and influence duty bearers to improve accountable and transparent distribution of benefits thereby contributing to higher community resilience”. Focus in the outcome is generation of knowledge on revenue mechanisms and use of this knowledge to increase community incomes and influence duty bearers to improve performance.

The outcome has two indicators, namely, “At provincial and district level, authorities show increased ability in securing a transparent processing of the 20 % tax revenue mechanism and at national level, showcases of malfunctioning have led to more awareness about the pitfalls in the mechanism”. This indicator is showing progress in terms of increasing transparent processing of the 20% tax revenue with improvement in the figures related to NRMCs receiving the revenue. National level showcases are increasingly being produced, but also needs further emphasis in order to create the desired awareness. The second indicator is “15 communities experience strengthened internal organisation and resilience through increased control over and income from sustainable natural resource management”, and is progressing well with the NRMCs being better capacitated and strengthened institutionally, but also with need for further emphasis on moving towards capacitating the NRMCs and communities to engage in management of the natural resources for added economic empowerment of the target groups.

**Outputs of the programme are being met.** The programme has five outputs that combined are contributing to the programme outcomes. Each of the output has 2-3 programme indicators, which then each are divided into country specific targets. Overall, the programme is demonstrating satisfactory progress in its achievement of the outputs.

The first output is “Target groups and local CSOs are empowered through capacity building, technically as well as organisational, via trainings and participation in projects within governance, environment and climate adaptation to act as ‘agents for change’ in the civil society”. The indicators are related to numbers of beneficiaries in the

different target groups. The review finds that the targets are being met in terms of numbers and that the numbers are showing a significant achievement in terms of gender with strong participation of women.

The second output is “Local authorities show increasing inclinations to support participatory development processes. This is made visible through engagement, official plans and budget allocations to environmental and climate change adaptation interventions at community levels”. The indicators show good progress in collaboration between communities, local authorities and CBOs and important positive changes in local authorities approach to working with communities. Collaboration with consortium partners has progress well. Plans and budget allocations relevant for local communities have increasingly been forthcoming and private sector collaboration established as planned.

The third output is “Gender concerns are mainstreamed in all activities”. The indicators and targets set for the output are being met with increased representation and participation of women in all activities in accordance with the set target of 40% increase. Planning and monitoring have seen major achievement in terms of gender sensitiveness.

The fourth output is “National, regional, and international fora and networks on environmental and climate change issues relevant for the objectives of the country programmes are established or joined and supported and SE’s long term partners demonstrate increasing ability to perform advocacy work”. The progress under this output is good in terms of contribution to policies, strategies and acts at the provincial/county level. National advocacy efforts are still limited but expected to increase. International efforts have been focused on the work with the PCP, which have created important cross programme and cross-country linkages.

The fifth output is “SE and partners establish innovative and constructive relationships leading to increased capacity, legitimacy and autonomy based on PANT principles”. The indicators and targets are being met with the consortiums increasingly functioning better and enjoying support from their partners, with increasing collaboration opportunities and funding autonomy of partners, and with PANT principles increasingly being addressed.

**Advocacy work in the programme is contributing positively to programme achievements, but also needs constant focus on clarity of roles and direction.** The programme has managed to do a significant amount of advocacy work and there have been many different achievements. Advocacy work includes a broad range of different activities and is organised in different ways. The advocacy work is addressing rights of rights holders as well as duty of duty bearers. Focus of the advocacy work has been on the decentralised level. Initial clarity in what the advocacy work entails has not been fully developed and levelled of among the consortium partners from the beginning. Hence, in Mozambique, it took a good part of the first year to understand what type of advocacy work was to be undertaken by the partner primarily assigned to advocacy (Livianingo). This is, however, now in place with an agreement on working at local, province and national level in that order.

**Creating evidence, lessons learned and models is taking place in the programme, but also needs stronger emphasis on delivery of evidence.** A fundamental part of the programme is about creating evidence for doing advocacy and for promoting replication and up-scaling of best practises. The review finds this part of the programme approach of significant importance and is supportive of the so-called laboratory approach within the programme. It should, however, be noted that creating evidence in a laboratory or pilot context, which can be used effectively for advocacy and scaling up, requires a very consistent and sharp focus on the requirements in terms of delivering evidence, lessons learnt, best practises and models. In this aspect, the programme has not been sufficiently focused and has not been clear enough in the requirements for creating (gathering, analysing and communicating) the evidence. Hence, it is not sufficiently clear what should be learned in the laboratory/pilots and what this should be used for. More demands for hands-on outputs in terms of lessons learned and best practises seem to be needed. Without such tangible outputs, the advocacy work has a tendency to become too general and with too little emphasis on what should be done and too much emphasis on what is lacking in delivery from various stakeholders.

Accordingly, the review is *recommending* that the programme is further emphasising the requirements within the programme to deliver in terms of evidence, lessons learnt, best practises and models. Better milestones reflecting this need should be developed.

**Lessons learned in laboratory/pilots need to work on realistic levels of support.** The programme is supporting relatively intense work with a select target group. This is most pronounced in the work with 15

NRMCs/communities within the Mozambique programme. In development and use of case stories and models for replication, it should be recognised that the current intensive support to target communities cannot be replicated one-to-one in models to be used for scale-up. All models/best practises for replication should, to the extent possible, be based on a premise with relatively limited direct support and backup to target groups, otherwise they do not represent realistic opportunities for scale up. Development of expensive and very work intensive models will not create convincing models for scale-up.

**Mode of support to local groups and committees needs clearer agreements and could also further address capacity to undertake productive activities.** When working with local groups, including the NRMCs in Mozambique, the review notes that some of the groups have been worked with, one way or another, for many years and that there is limited recognition of what the collaboration between the programme partners and the target groups entails and of what are the performance criteria and requirements. It is recognised that MOUs are established with the NRMCs and possible other local groups, but the review team finds that further agreements in terms of what will be delivered by the different partners and what timing is envisaged would be useful. This will also open up for an assessment if progress with specific groups is sufficient to continue the collaboration. The mode of collaboration with the local groups has focused on capacity to demand for, plan for and eventually utilise funding from revenues received from outside. As stated earlier, less focus has been on building capacities of local groups to manage various forms of development initiatives and local businesses. It is the view of the review team that future collaboration with the local target groups should also include more on capacities to actually manage development and business initiatives. Extension support to local groups in the future, needs also to be considered seriously and in ways that are likely to be sustainable.

The review team *recommends* that further clarity in agreements between the consortium partners and local groups are being developed and include performance criteria, deliverables, timing and deadlines.

The review team *recommends* that the programme, in relation to the support to be provided to the different local groups of beneficiaries, initiate a process for ensuring additional capacity development on management of not only funding from outside but also of own development initiatives. Further considerations, on how to access future technical extension support in a sustainable way, needs to be given.

**Adaptation work and resilience building are important and contribute also positively to mitigation.** The programme's work with specific local groupings, including the NRMCs in Mozambique, is regarded as of central importance for empowerment and for building local resilience including climate adaptation, sustainable natural resource management and other land based developments. This view is shared by many stakeholders including government stakeholders. Climate change in the target areas is real and is impacting the target groups and adaptation work is clearly important. The programme is promoting more sustainable management of resources and many of the natural resource based adaptation solutions are at the same time contributing to climate change mitigation. Even in a programme, where focus is on adaptation, the fact that such adaptation work at the same time is contributing to mitigation could be further stressed in the programme approach.

**A human rights based approach is being promoted in the programme.** The programme addresses a range of basic human rights including the rights to participation, rights to land and resources, rights to services and not least rights to decent livelihoods also in a reality with changing climate and a wide range of challenges in rural development. Inclusion of the poorest segments of the target groups in programme activities is being addressed and PANT principles are being promoted in the programme.

**Gender is being addressed seriously in the programme.** The programme addresses gender equity in most of its activities. Gender is mainstreamed as well as being addressed separately through especially some of the gender specialist partners in the consortium. Overall, the review finds that the programme is constructively emphasising gender in the programme.

**Sustainability of the programme activities is found to be relatively good.** The programme is being implemented with a continued view on creating sustainable solutions and overall programme sustainability is found to be good. The advocacy activities are contributing to sustainability. The work with local groups and with promoting their possibilities of getting access to financing for development is contributing to sustainability. The programme focus on working with consortiums is contributing positively to sustainability, and in the given context of working in relatively remote areas, it is assessed as being more sustainable than one to one partnerships models. Consortiums ensure participation of more CSOs, it builds complementarity and also possibilities for the

consortiums for applying for funding from other and increasingly demanding funding sources (where consortiums are often a requirement). Consortiums might not continue in the same way after the programme, but it is found that they will have a lasting impact on the participating partners.

### 2.2.3 Popular engagement and development education (Criteria 1)

**The popular engagement and development education activities undertaken in Denmark are sound and undertaken at a satisfactory level.** All in all, the popular engagement and development education activities of the programme are found to be sound and undertaken at a satisfactory level. SE is working with important climate action work in Denmark. The “Tag Klima ansvar” campaign is assessed as being an important and effective way of promoting popular engagement in addressing climate change challenges. SE has an important and increasing involvement of volunteers especially through “Young Energy”. There is a relatively good match between the international programme and the work in Denmark, with international activities providing information to the Danish activities. There seems, however, to be further opportunities for developing more inspiration between the grassroots work in Denmark and that within the international programme. Popular engagement and development education activities in Denmark are not captured as part of results framework of the international programme although part of the funding is coming from the programme. It is worth considering if this should be the case. The work with the PCP is a South-South and South-North information sharing/communication model. The review finds that it has had a positive impact on the popular engagement and development education activities in Denmark.

## 2.3 Review of applicant and partner capacity

### 2.3.1 Implementation of recommendations from latest review/capacity assessment (Criteria 1), SE capacity and Partnerships

**SE and partners have followed up and addressed most of the recommendations from the 2016 thematic review.** A Thematic Review of SE with focus on the Kenya programme was undertaken in 2016 as part of the procedures while SE was still a framework organisation with MFA. This thematic review is not like a CISU capacity assessment, but is as close as you get. The review had a total of eleven different recommendations. The recommendations have been addressed SE as follows: A revised LFA was developed. A revised SE strategy has been developed. Revisions of the Kenya programme document have been undertaken. A procedures manual with all underlying documents has been produced. Gender and HRBA relevant data collected and used and case studies undertaken. Partner strategy is part of SE strategy and links created with national/international partners. Advocacy linkages established and advocacy strategy developed. Financial management recommendations from MFA all followed up. A combined partnership manual developed and made available in Dropbox. Capacity assessment of partners is part of the partner manual and will be undertaken for future partners. Limited input has been produced from the Thematic Review in relation to the capacity of SE as an organisation, hence, the current RevApp, in this respect, only has limited points of departure in terms of assessing capacity of SE as an organisation. Overall, SE has undertaken satisfactory implementation of the recommendations from the last Thematic Review. An area, where the Thematic Review from 2016 proposed to have further emphasis was related to the increase in the alternative energy focus in the international work of SE including extending such facilities as the Danish “Energy Service” to the international programme. SE did not agree to this focus, as the needs in the target countries is much more on resilience and adaptation work and because energy development to a much greater extent today is being driven by the private sector. The review team agrees with the focus of SE and supports that SE only has a rather limited focus in the international programme on alternative energy promotion.

**SE has seen important strategic developments towards a broader climate action organisation.** SE has developed a Strategy (Strategi for Vedvarende Energy 2018-21) and an International Strategy for 2017-20. The strategies are stressing the move from a renewable energy organisation only to a renewable energy and climate action organisation. This is a development, which has been seen over the last four to six years. The strategies emphasize climate action including responsible production and consumption, addressing climate inequalities, promoting better climate policies including energy policies. Wanting to work with the more marginalised target groups, addressing global responsibility and emphasising governance are also key parts of the strategies. Within the organisation, the international work has gradually become more in focus, and there are increasingly closer links between national and international, although the national/international links are not so well described. The review finds that SE Strategy and the SE International Strategy are well developed and good guiding tools for the organisation.

**SE is well placed as an organisation to implement the programme.** SE is a strong civil society actor in Denmark with a focus on climate action and sustainable energy. It has a long history of operating in Denmark and has, as noted above, undergone important changes in its strategic focus although its name is still giving the impression of an organisation primarily working with alternative energy solutions. The review finds that adjusting the name of SE to include Climate Action – possibly “Sustainable Energy - Climate Action” could give significant added communication benefits for SE. SE is a member-based organisation with around 1500 members, it has a budget of DKK 17-18 million per year of which today around 70-80% are international programmes. Programme funding through CISU is around 50% of total organisation budget. SE is a democratic organisation with a General Assembly and a Board elected by the General Assembly. The Board is active meeting four to six times a year. The Board does address the international programme, but there is relatively limited overview of progress reported by the international programme to the Board, something, which could be considered to increase in the future. A total of 9-10 full-time employees, of which five are attached to international programmes, are working with the SE secretariat. SE has qualified staff dedicated to running the international programmes. It brings several of its capacities into the collaboration with partners in the international programme, and this brings important added value to the programmes. SE has a good number of volunteers involved with the work especially through “Young Energy”. SE is active in several CSO networks in Denmark and internationally. SE is well positioned to address the climate change agenda.

**Change from MFA to CISU has so far been smooth for SE.** SE was a framework organisation under MFA for years until a few years ago (2017), when SE, together with two other framework organisations, had its status changed to be managed under a CISU programme facility. Overall, the changes from MFA to CISU have not caused any major impact on the SE programme. The same budgets and the same division of budget posts are being applied now as before.

**Programme institutional set up and programme management are working well and there is good capacity to align, network and partner.** The programme institutional set up appears to be working well. SE is allocating the required resources and time to programme management in the form of the involved professional staff and there is good management oversight provided to the programme. The professional capacity of SE is good and well tuned into providing support to the programme work. Capacities in relation to analysing progress, issues and achievements appear to be of high standards. SE capacity to align, network and partner with civil society organisations is assessed as being good and it is found that SE is contributing to the strengthening of the partner CSOs mode of organising.

**Consortiums are overall working well and peer learning within the consortium is taking place. Clarifying roles and communication of plans and budget needs constant emphasis.** The programme is implemented through consortiums of CSOs in Mozambique and in Kenya. Different types of CSOs with different thematic focuses constitute the consortiums. The partners have over time increased their interest in working together in the consortiums. Overall, the consortium model is assessed as an effective way of implementing the programme. The outreach is good and there is a sound level of complementarity among the organisations. Peer learning is taking place within the consortiums and capacity development is promoted. Partnerships among the consortium partners appear to be good. Consortium capacities are assessed to be rather good. SE has been instrumental in promoting the consortium working model and this has required significant efforts. The consortium approach is also rather time consuming with rather demanding planning requirements. Information levels and openness in a consortium appear to be an issue that constantly needs addressing and where plans and budgets needs to be well communicated on a constant basis. Defining roles in the consortiums is also of significant importance and should constantly be revisited so that it is clear who does what with what outputs to be expected.

**Process consultant role is found to be useful.** A process consultant function has been introduced in the programme. Overall, the review finds that the process consultant role is useful and important in order to facilitate some of the processes necessary within the consortium. The role of the process consultant is found to be adding positively to the programme and to complement reasonable well the role of SE. Again, clarity in role and functions of the process consultant vis a vis SE and vis a vis the consortium needs to be communicated constantly.

**Partnerships in the programme, as expressed through consortiums, are assessed as being of good quality and with important learnings being shared.** The partnerships in the programme are of very different length and some have been developed significantly over the years and others being rather new and still in need of further development. The approach of the programme including the focus on consortiums has a good fit with the

respective partners general function as organisations. The PCCs has tended to improve consortium performance within the country programmes.

**Good capacities of partners.** Capacities of the partners within the consortiums are found to be relatively good, but of course also with significant variations in strengths and size. Partners together are found to cover well the various subject areas and constituencies that are relevant for the programmes. All in all, the various partners involved are found to be relevant and they appear to have relative good contact to their constituencies by being locally present and to have good access to authorities. The consortiums are also promoting this.

**Local civil society is overall being strengthened.** A key feature of the programme is strengthening of local civil society through their participation in the programme and their work in the consortium. It is assessed that local civil society is being strengthened; this applies to at the level of partners participating in the programme but also at the level of local community groups involved in the programme.

**Good local and provincial/county ownership to the programme.** It is assessed that there is a good ownership to the programme among the various local user groups. Likewise, government authorities are being involved and are interested in the work of the partners in the programme. The work is seen as contributing to development and implementation of relevant national policies.

**Involvement of stakeholders has generally been rather comprehensive.** The review finds that the relevant and most important stakeholders are meaningfully involved in the programme. The partner organisations know the areas and the subject matter and have throughout the years been analysing and selecting stakeholders to work with.

### 2.3.2 Results framework, M&E, reporting and knowledge management (Criteria 3)

**The results framework of the programme is well developed and gives a good guidance to programme implementation. Country results frameworks give good guidance to consortium partner implementation.** The programme results framework is based on country programme results frameworks. There are sufficient linkages between the programme results framework and the respective country results frameworks. Programme objectives and outcomes are limited in numbers with two each. Five outputs are developed that are cutting across the whole programme and each of the outputs then have country specific indicators and targets. All in all, the results framework of the programme and those of the country programmes are found to present a good picture of what is to be achieved in the programme. Number of indicators is limited and largely appears to be covering the intended achievements.

**The M&E in the programme is good. Reporting is good, but could include more on impacts and contribution to change. Using more participatory monitoring tools could be considered.** The monitoring and evaluation being undertaken in the programme is undertaken in accordance with the M&E guidelines provided for the programme. The review finds that the monitoring and evaluation work within the programme is of good quality and with relatively good usage of indicators. The formats provided for monitoring is helpful. A number of internal/external evaluations have been undertaken. Good case stories on most significant change are being collected. The reporting in the programme is timely and with detailed reports from the consortium partners. The indicator use in the reporting is clearly useful. The reporting is giving a good picture of progress in the programme. In terms of impacts at higher levels and considerations on contributing to change within the focus areas of the programmes, the monitoring and the reporting are more limited. Overviews or more systematic considerations of where the programme is in terms of contribution to the desired change, and hence in terms of impacts, could be further improved within the programme. This would require more strategic considerations on the side of the consortium partners on the wider impact and sustainability of the activities they are undertaking. Possibilities of having a more participatory approach to monitoring, where involved target groups are giving a more continuous feed back on progress within the programme, should be considered.

The review team *recommends* initiating a process for further development of impact monitoring in the programme and in this way ensuring better considerations on how programme and partners are contributing to the desired changes at impact level. Consider and possibly start a process of including more participatory approaches involving target groups in monitoring of the programme.

**Important evidence is being created, but there is a need for more systematic knowledge management.**

Lots of experience is being gained, the experience and evidence is used in evidence-based advocacy. Lessons learned have been used in programme development. As stated earlier, the evidence gathered in the programme is currently not gathered and organised systematically in ways that facilitate its use for effective advocacy and communication. It is too much ad hoc and there is, as stated before, need for clarifications in terms of what evidence to be created. There is a need to put the evidence and lessons learnt into a more strategic and systematic framework of knowledge management (What do we want to know? Why and for what use? How do we find out? How is it documented? How do we share it?).

### 2.3.3 Financial resources, administrative capacity, budget and cost effectiveness (Criteria 2)

**Financial management and administration is found to be satisfactory.** The review finds that the programme partners overall has a satisfactory financial management in place. Programme administration is found to be satisfactory and with timely and appropriate interventions and management. SE, as applicant, has a professional financial management in place, which is compliant with the procedures for receiving and handling public funds in Denmark. This capacity has been applied to the programme financial management as well. An operations manual, which includes financial management procedures, has been developed and is being used. Partners are running dedicated budget- and accounting software that also are in line with their respective financial management procedures in the organisations. Partners' financial management capacity is found to be satisfactory and the capacity has been increased within the programme period. There is a continuous and close follow up from SE to partners in terms of financial management. Regular financial management visits are undertaken by SE. Financial management procedures and manuals are in place and fully compliant with CISU regulations. Financial management recommendations from MFA and from CISU supervisions have all been implemented by SE.

Anti corruption policies are in place and so are guidelines within SE for how to address suspicions of financial mismanagement. Even if all partner have anti-corruption policies, it seems that not all partners have specific guidelines on how to react on financial mismanagement suspicions. This needs to be developed.

Hence, it is *recommended* that all partners in the respective consortiums are developing guidelines for how to address suspicion of financial mismanagement.

#### **The budget of the programme is sound and it is likely that the budget will be utilised by the end of 2019.**

The budget for the programme is sound and well developed with good budget tracking in place. The budget for the current phase is considered to be sufficient. Budget performance is on track. The budget for use of Danish man-hours is in line with the guiding principles under the framework agreement with MFA from where SE is coming from. Given the important role played by SE technically and managerially in the programme, this is considered to be a fair budget and compares well with other earlier framework organisations.

**Cost effectiveness in the programme is considered to be relatively good.** It is generally assessed that the programme is relatively cost effective in producing results. This applies within the countries and in the programme as a whole. Cost-effectiveness is reportedly a recurrent theme in the planning and the follow-up between the partners in the programme. The programme's focus on operating at decentralised levels in the respective countries is contributing positively to the cost-effectiveness and so does the consortium model of operation. All in all, the programme is assessed to have relatively positive relationship between results and costs when compared to similar programmes in the region. The delivery of activities and results that are deemed to be relatively sustainable is also contributing to a positive value-for-money assessment. A specific aspect in the cost structure of the programme is the relatively high staff time allocation in the respective consortium partner organisations to run the programme. Given the type of activities (advocacy, capacity development, strategic developments), there is a well-defined and argued need for allocating staff time to such activities. Such "soft-ware" activities require relatively more staff time than "hard-ware" delivery. Allocating sufficient staff-time in all the partner organisations in the programme is a key in delivering the outputs related to many of the programme areas.

## 3. Appraisal of Concept Note – findings and analysis

### 3.1 Strategic relevance

#### 3.1.1 Strategic orientation (criteria 5)

**Key features of next phase programme.** A draft concept note for the next phase has been presented. The concept note is made in accordance with CISU requirements and constitutes a suitable document for appraising the next phase. It has the following key features:

- The programme will continue in Kenya, but phase out in Mozambique and start up in Tanzania.
- The programme will work with consortiums as partners and will continue to focus on supporting at decentralised levels.
- Focus will be on working with NRMCS in Mozambique in order to ensure sustainability while also phasing out during the programme period. In Kenya focus will continue to be on working with local communities in empowerment and access to decentralised public/private financing. Some counties will phase out and other counties will be phased in. In Tanzania, the programme will phase in one or two districts with a view of supporting community empowerment and access to decentralised public/private financing.
- The programme objective will remain the same as in the current phase. Outcomes and outputs are developed to apply for the overall programme. Outputs are detailed in corresponding country based outputs for each of the target countries. The strategic approach will largely remain the same, but with adjustments in accordance with the lessons learned and related to having a further strategic focus in the implementation.
- Advocacy work will continue to be a key part of the programme.
- Capacity development work will continue, but also be further developed.
- Experience gathering and knowledge management will be developed and there will be focus on scale up and replication.

**Overall relevance of the next phase is expected, and the strategic approach is sound.** The strategic approach to working with decentralisation, resilience and climate change adaptation continues to be relevant and assessed as being an important contributor to poverty reduction and upholding of rights of marginalised groups. It continues to be sound and will be further relevant with the focus on the next phase. It will continue to be relevant in relation to the Policy for Danish Support to Civil Society.

**Important expected results of the next phase.** Expected results will be both relevant and contributing to important changes related to improved governance, resilience, access to finance, and capacities of communities and CSOs. Results will differ in relation to countries and in relation to the length of cooperation between the partners.

**The next phase will be a progression of the current phase, but will continue to work on the longer-term objective.** Overall, the next phase is assessed to be a strategic development and progression, which is based on best practices and lesson learnt from the current phase. The progression is related to increased focus on decentralisation, decentralised funding and building of resilience including of climate change adaptation. The progression is also further focussing on replication and will have increased opportunities for synergy between programme partners. That said, there will be a number of activities and approaches, which are supporting longer term goals, that will be continued in the next phase. They might appear to be “more of the same”. This is, however, what should be expected from a programme being conceived and developed as a longer-term/multiple phases programme.

**Addressing governance, rights, inclusion and advocacy are important aspects of the next phase.** As outlined, the next phase will also focus on promoting rights of target groups. The phase will also have a significant aspect of advocacy. Addressing governance and supporting local empowerment will be part of the approach and this is deemed both relevant and an effective way of supporting climate adaptation and sustainable management of natural resources and poverty reduction. Inclusion of poor and vulnerable groups and ensuring gender equity will remain an approach that will be continued in the next phase.

**The strategic choice for the next phase of phasing out in Mozambique and phasing in in Tanzania is supported by the appraisal.** For the next phase, SE has proposed to phase out activities in Mozambique and phase in activities in Tanzania. SE has been active for many years in Mozambique and has worked together with some of the partners for many years, and in this sense it is relevant to look at phasing out. Further, the context for the programme in Mozambique and in Kenya is very different and the current synergy between the two country programmes is limited. It is expected that a new country programme in the districts in Tanzania adjoining the

current area of operation in Kenya and focused on decentralisation, resilience and climate change will be providing opportunities for better synergy and learning between the two country programmes. Finding the right partners in that part of Tanzania for participating in programme implementation is still an open question, and prospects for involving Mwanza-based CSOs should be kept open.

**Continuation of the consortium approach makes good sense.** The next phase will continue the consortium approach for implementation. Given the positive experiences of the consortium approach, the appraisal finds that it will be useful to continue with the consortium approach to implementation. In relation to the work with consortiums, the suggested phase in and phase out of work with a consortium is overall supported by the appraisal. It is healthy to have more concrete ideas on the timing of such collaboration. It is, however, needed to increase the timing for working with a consortium from 5-6 years to 6-7 years in order to have sufficient time available for creating impacts.

The appraisal *recommends* that timing allocated to work with a consortium be increased from 5-6 years to 6-7 years.

**Addressing climate change adaptation requires a broader addressing of resilience of communities.** The programme approach is to address climate change adaptation in a broad sense, which involves looking at broader issues in rural development such as governance, natural resource management, agriculture, land use. This is needed in order to have a meaningful approach to climate change adaptation. The appraisal finds that what the programme will be addressing is resilience of communities, and it would be beneficial to develop the programme and concept note more so that it becomes clearer that addressing resilience is the focus of programme.

It is *recommended* that the programme and concept note give a further focus on addressing resilience of communities as this better describes the broader approach needed in order to address climate change adaptation in the most relevant ways.

**Including a broader scope for capacity development of communities would contribute to empowerment.** The capacity of communities to advocate for and receive and manage funding related to various community development projects is a focus in the programme, this is clearly an important aspect of community empowerment. The appraisal, however, believes that in order to further improve on community empowerment, the aspect of communities' capacities to manage different forms of community development initiatives, including for productive purposes, would need to be further included in the proposed programme.

It is *recommended* to include the support to development of capacities of communities to manage different community development initiatives in the proposed programme approach to community empowerment.

**Evidence based advocacy focus in the next phase is important but also requires further focus on tangible deliveries in terms of evidence and advocacy outputs.** The programme has a strong and important focus on advocacy. This is fully supported by the appraisal. Given the experience of the current programme with difficulties in producing tangible evidence for advocacy, the appraisal believes that in the proposed programme, it should be better described how and what evidence should be gathered and how this should be used for advocacy. For the concept note it would suffice to describe the process for ensuring such tangible evidence and advocacy outputs.

It is *recommended* to provide better descriptions of how the programme during its implementation will ensure more tangible evidence and advocacy outputs.

**Defining communities and committees would be useful to include in the programme document.** The programme works with communities and committees as target groups. The definition of what constitute a community and a committee in the various programme contexts are not really part of the programme document. Defining and describing communities and committees in the target areas would be useful to include in the programme document for the coming phase.

### 3.1.2 Relevance of civil society partners and networking (criteria 6)

**Significant relevance of the selected civil society partners.** The relevance of the civil society partners for the next phase is assessed to be high. Suggested partners play key roles within the subject areas in the respective decentralised units/levels and in linking sustainable management of natural resources with poverty reduction. The

selected partners/consortiums are assessed as having sufficient capacity to implement the programme. Target groups are clearly interested in the programme collaboration and will benefit from the next programme phase.

**There is likely to be a continuation of the good partnership relations in the consortiums.** The partnerships in the consortiums for the next phase will continue with most partners on board. New consortiums will be supported. It is assessed that the technical and financial capacities of the consortium partners are satisfactory and well placed to implement the next phase of the programme. It is overall found that there are good potentials for further development of the partnerships. Roles in the consortiums have the potential to be further developed with assigning specific roles to specific partners in accordance with their respective comparative advantages and hence also see further responsibilities for certain management aspects of the programme to be undertaken by different partners in the consortiums (such as SusWatch with the PCP).

**SE capacity fits well with implementing the next phase and there is good capacity to align, network and partner.** The current phase experience of the programme indicates that SE has the relevant capacity to align, network and partner with the programme partners. This is likely to be supportive of the next phase of the programme and specifically contribute to the overall strengthening of partner consortiums.

## 3.2 Programmatic approaches

### 3.2.1 Theory of Change and synergy (criteria 7)

**A good TOC is guiding the current phase of the programme. For the next phase the TOC could be further developed to include promotion of target groups own capacities to manage their development.** A TOC has so far not been developed and presented for the next phase. It is, however, expected that the key aspects of the current TOC will be utilised for the TOC for the next programme. The TOC is found to be both relevant and a good guidance for programme implementation. The TOC gives a good picture of the logic of the project and what is needed in order to move from one level to the next and bring about change. For the next phase it could be further developed in terms of a broader concept of community empowerment, where target groups own capacities to manage development is being included and where community resilience is introduced.

It is *recommended* to develop a TOC for the final concept note and in this TOC to include the aspects of communities own capacities to manage development and progress in community resilience.

**Good coherence and synergy of the next phase is foreseen.** Overall, it is assessed the next phase of the programme will continue to have a good coherence and synergy within the country programmes. There is good synergy and coherence between the various outcomes and outputs of the programme. The coherence between capacity development, strategic support to activities and advocacy is found to be good. In addition, it is assessed that the strategic choice of phasing in activities in Tanzania will increase the synergies and coherence within the overall programme. The concept note is bringing more focus and further opportunities for having a programme that is joint, and the new programme will have a larger scope for integration.

### 3.2.2 Results framework and M&E system (criteria 8)

**The results framework developed is assessed as being very useful and realistic and contributing to important achievements.** The results framework for the next phase presented in the draft concept note is developed at a rather detailed level. This is very useful. It is assessed as having good and useful outcomes and outputs and the way it is divided into general programme and country programme is very useful. It also gives a picture of a better integrated programme. Overall, the results framework is found to be realistic. Linked to the strategic discussions, the appraisal finds that the results framework would benefit from being developed further in relation to the programme's work with resilience, capacities of communities and clearer outputs in evidence and advocacy. In this respect, outcome 1 would benefit from having a focus on community resilience as what is aimed at, and outcome 2 would benefit from including authorities at other levels as well, not just local authorities. This would also stress that advocacy at other levels than local, including national level, is part of the programme. The results framework also needs to explain linkages between outcomes and outputs and have a colour coding. In some of the outputs, it would be relevant to reduce the wording and leave out how the outputs are to be implemented – "via". In output 1, it would be useful to describe capacity of communities "to do what". Considerations should be made in terms of including programme related Danish development engagement and education activities in the results framework.

It is *recommended* to further develop the results framework to better include, in the outcomes and outputs, aspects of community resilience, community capacity, the process of getting clearer outputs in relation to evidence and advocacy and the inclusion of advocacy at multiple levels.

**A good M&E system is to be applied for the next phase. Further development of participatory methods and of how impacts and contribution to change are being monitored would be useful.** The M&E system for the next phase will be based on the current phase M&E system. This system is working well and it makes sense to continue with the system. For the next M&E system, it would be useful to further develop how impacts and contribution to change is being monitored, and it would be worthwhile to further include participatory methods on a more continuous basis in the future monitoring and evaluation. Indicators related to community resilience and empowerment would be worthwhile to develop further.

It is *recommended* to continue with the current monitoring set up and to further develop the monitoring of impact and contribution to change. Further applying participatory methods in monitoring should be considered.

### 3.2.3 HRBA (criteria 9)

**A human rights based approach will also be applied also in the next phase.** The next phase programme will address rights and will work in accordance with a human rights based approach. It will include advocacy for rights and will directly address key rights related to participation, land, livelihoods and services/finance. It will fundamentally address issues of inequalities related to climate change. Gender will be in focus in the next phase as well. Overall, the next phase is assessed as applying a practical and well-designed approach to working with human rights.

### 3.2.4 Sustainability (criteria 10)

**Overall, the sustainability of the next phase is considered to be good. Replication and advocacy activities of the next phase will continue to contribute to sustainability.** The programme activities for the next phase are likely to contribute to good levels of sustainability at community level, at CSO level and at authority levels. The advocacy focus of the programme is contributing to sustainability. The added focus on replication is also supporting sustainability. The capacity development approach contributes to sustainability. The partners involved in the consortiums include rather strong organisations promoting different aspects of sustainable development, management of natural resources and poverty reduction. Overall, the next programme phase is assessed as having a satisfactory focus on sustainability. It is acknowledged that consortiums and activities are limited in time. Still, it is what is being created during that time, which are contributing to sustainability at the level of the real target group and at the level of how the CSOs are working. Future opportunities of applying for funding as consortium should be part of what the consortiums will do together. When phasing out of Mozambique, there are especially good reasons to have activities in the consortium that are aimed at applying for future funding together as a consortium or part of a consortium and maybe also with participation of SE.

### 3.2.5 Financial resources and cost levels (criteria 11)

**The budget size for the next phase is assessed as being realistic and cost levels are found to be relevant. Cost effectiveness is considered to be satisfactory.** The budget developed for the next phase has a thematic budget breakdown of 35% going to communities (community empowerment), 25% going to advocacy, 25% going to consortiums (CSO strengthening) and 15% going private sector (engagement with private sector). This division is found to be relevant. The costs associated with Danish man-hours are equivalent with the current costs and also with the costs under the framework agreement with MFA. The appraisal finds that the costs are justified in view of the role and activities of SE. Overall, the budget size is considered to be what is needed for a realistic implementation of the programme. Cost levels are found to be relevant and comparable to other similar programmes. Cost-effectiveness is assessed as being satisfactory.

### 3.2.6 Popular engagement and development education (criteria 12)

**The popular engagement and development education activities planned for in the next phase in Denmark are sound.** The programme will undertake communication activities, education activities and networking activities in Denmark as part of the next programme. The appraisal finds that, all in all, the plans for popular engagement in relation to the next programme phase are good. This also includes the linkages to the work undertaken with the

PCP. Considerations should be made, whether these activities should be captured in the results framework of the programme.

## 4. Conclusions and recommendations

### 4.1 Conclusions

#### 4.1.1 Capacity Assessment of Applicant

The overall performance of the programme is assessed to be satisfactory and in accordance with the agreed programme document. Results of the current programme phase are to a large extent on track. Achievement of objectives is seeing satisfactory progress. Kenya programme outcome achievement is progressing well and there is also satisfactory progress in achieving the Mozambique programme outcome. Outputs of the programme are being met. The programme works with issues, which usually take time to change; hence, impacts from the programme are typically seen over time. The programme contexts have seen important development impacting the programme, the programme partners have responded well to the contextual developments.

The strategic approach is assessed to be relevant and implementation of the programme is assessed to be largely in accordance with the formulated strategic approach. The Programme strategy is sound and supportive of effective resilience building including climate change adaptation among targeted local communities. The programme and its strategic approach is well in line with the Policy for Danish Support to Civil Society Policy including the aspects of promoting rights, strengthening of open debate, strengthening of locally based civil society, and advancing of capacity development, advocacy work and networking opportunities. The programme is creating impacts in its area of implementation and the activities are appreciated by the involved target groups including rights holders and duty bearers. The TOC of the programme is straightforward, easy to understand and relevant. The strategic choice of working with CSO closer to people and further based at decentralised levels is wise. Bringing in a broader approach to community capacity development would be helpful.

Coherence and synergy in the programme is good. Synergy and coherence between advocacy work and field implementation is good but also requires a constant follow up. The advocacy work in the programme is contributing positively to programme achievements, but also needs constant focus on clarity of roles and direction. Creating evidence, lessons learned and models is taking place in the programme, but also needs stronger emphasis on delivery of evidence. Lessons learned in laboratory/pilots need to work on realistic levels of support.

Mode of support to local groups and committees needs clearer agreements and could also further address capacity to undertake productive activities. Adaptation work and resilience building are important and contribute also positively to mitigation.

A human rights based approach is being promoted in the programme. Gender is being addressed seriously in the programme. Sustainability of the programme activities is found to be relatively good. The popular engagement and development education activities undertaken in Denmark are sound and undertaken at a satisfactory level.

The performance and capacity of SE as applicant is good. SE and partners have followed up and addressed most of the recommendations from the 2016 Thematic Review. SE is well placed as an organisation to implement the programme. Good understanding of how to work with climate change adaptation is found in the programme and among partners. SE has seen important strategic developments towards a broader climate action organisation. SE is well placed as an organisation to implement the programme.

Programme institutional set up and programme management are working well and there is good capacity to align, network and partner. Consortiums are overall working well and peer learning within the consortium is taking place, however, clarifying roles and communication of plans and budget needs constant emphasis. The process consultant role is found to be useful. Partnerships in the programme as expressed through consortiums are assessed as being of good quality and with important learnings being shared.

There are good capacities of partners and local civil society is overall being strengthened. There is good local and provincial/county ownership to the programme and involvement of stakeholders has generally been rather comprehensive.

The results framework of the programme is well developed and gives a good guidance to programme implementation. Country results frameworks give good guidance to consortium partner implementation. The M&E in the programme is good and reporting is good, but could include more on impacts and contribution to change. Using more participatory monitoring tools could be considered. Important evidence is being created, but there is a need for more systematic knowledge management.

Financial management and administration is found to be satisfactory. The budget of the programme is sound and it is likely that the budget will be utilised by the end of 2019. Cost effectiveness in the programme is considered to be relatively good.

In regards to the thematic issues to consider in the RevApp process, it is concluded that the consortium model of implementation promotes peer learning and overall is an effective way of implementing the programme and of partnering with CSOs. SE has shown a good and relevant capacity to align, network and partner with civil society organisations. SE is clearly playing a key role in facilitating consortiums within the programme. Further, the suggested phase out of Mozambique and phasing in of Tanzania is considered to be a useful and relevant next step to take in the programme.

In Mozambique, the target area of the programme was, a few days after the fieldwork of the team, hit by the devastating cyclone Idai. The tragic event is assessed to be delaying the programme implementation for some few months. However, further than this, it is assessed that the programme will continue implementation as planned. It should also be noted that the primary target districts of the programme are further away from the coast and that they are not hit very seriously. Likewise, the partner CSOs are expected to be fully operational again within a relatively short time. None of the programme funding is expected to be directed towards immediate humanitarian needs.

#### **4.1.2 Appraisal of draft Concept Note**

The next phase of the programme is assessed to be feasible and the support to a next phase is justified. Based on the presented concept note for the next phase, the appraisal recommends that a new phase of the programme is developed and subsequently presented for approval given that its development has taken into consideration the findings and conclusions in the RevApp.

Important results of the next phase are expected. The next phase will be a progression of the current phase, but will continue to work on the longer-term programme objective. Governance, rights, inclusion and advocacy are important aspects of the next phase. In order to address climate change adaptation it requires a broader addressing of resilience of communities. Including a broader scope for capacity development of communities would contribute to empowerment. The programme document would benefit from better defining communities and committees.

The strategic choice for the next phase of phasing out in Mozambique and phasing in in Tanzania is supported by the appraisal. Continuation of the consortium approach makes good sense. Evidence based advocacy focus on next phase is important but also requires further focus on tangible deliveries in terms of evidence and advocacy outputs.

There is significant relevance of the selected civil society partners and there is likely to be a continuation of the good partnership relations in the consortiums. SE capacity fits well with implementing the next phase and there is good capacity to align, network and partner.

A good TOC is guiding the current phase of the programme. For the next phase the TOC could be further developed to include promotion of target groups own capacities to manage their development. Good coherence and synergy of the next phase is foreseen. The results framework developed is assessed as being very useful and realistic and contributing to important achievements. A good M&E system is to be applied for the next phase. Further development of participatory methods and of how impacts and contribution to change are being monitored would be useful.

A human rights based approach will also be applied also in the next phase. Overall, the sustainability of the next phase is considered to be good, and replication and advocacy activities of the next phase will continue to contribute to sustainability.

The budget size for the next phase is assessed as being realistic and cost levels are found to be relevant, and cost effectiveness is considered to be satisfactory. The popular engagement and development education activities planned for in the next phase in Denmark are sound.

#### 4.1.3 Is applicant Program relevant

Overall relevance of the next phase programme is expected and the strategic approach is sound. The strategic approach to working with decentralisation, resilience and climate change adaptation continues to be relevant and assessed as being an important contributor to poverty reduction and upholding of rights of marginalised groups. The programme will continue to be relevant in relation to the Policy for Danish Support to Civil Society.

### 4.2 Recommendations

#### 4.2.1 Programme management capacity

**In relation to the review, the following recommendations are presented:**

The review is *recommending* that the programme is further emphasising the requirements within the programme to deliver in terms of evidence, lessons learnt, best practises and models. Better milestones reflecting this need should be developed.

The review team *recommends* that further clarity in agreements between the consortium partners and local groups are being developed and include performance criteria, deliverables, timing and deadlines.

The review team *recommends* that the programme, in relation to the support to be provided to the different local groups of beneficiaries, initiate a process for ensuring additional capacity development on management of not only funding from outside but also of own development initiatives. Further considerations, on how to access future technical extension support in a sustainable way, needs to be given.

The review team *recommends* initiating a process for further development of impact monitoring in the programme and in this way ensuring better considerations on how programme and partners are contributing to the desired changes at impact level. Consider and possibly start a process of including more participatory approaches involving target groups in monitoring of the programme.

It is *recommended* that all partners in the respective consortiums are developing guidelines for how to address suspicion of financial mismanagement.

#### 4.2.2 Finalization of concept note

In relation to the specific thematic issues identified for the RevApp, the team supports that the consortium model of implementation is continued in the next phase. This mode of implementation is considered to promote peer learning and overall to be an effective way of implementing the programme and of partnering with CSOs. Further, the suggested phase out of Mozambique and phasing in of Tanzania in the programme is being supported and is seen as a relevant and useful way of developing the programme.

**Recommendations related to the appraisal of the next phase:**

The appraisal *recommends* that timing allocated to work with a consortium be increased from 5-6 years to 6-7 years.

It is *recommended* that the programme and concept note give a further focus on addressing resilience of communities as this it better describing the broader approach needed in order to address climate change adaptation in the most relevant ways.

It is *recommended* to include the support to development of capacities of communities to manage different community development initiatives in the proposed programme approach to community empowerment.

It is *recommended* to provide better descriptions of how the programme during its implementation will ensure more tangible evidence and advocacy outputs.

It is *recommended* to develop a TOC for the final concept note and in this TOC to include the aspects of communities own capacities to manage development and progress in community resilience.

It is *recommended* to further develop the results framework to better include, in the outcomes and outputs, aspects of community resilience, community capacity, the process of getting clearer outputs in relation to evidence and advocacy and the inclusion of advocacy at multiple levels.

It is *recommended* to continue with the current monitoring set up and to further develop the monitoring of impact and contribution to change. Further applying participatory methods in monitoring should be considered.

Generic Format for  
**TERMS OF REFERENCE**  
**REVIEW cum PRE-APPRAISAL TO PREPARE FOR A**  
**NEW PROGRAMME PHASE**

*The present document contains a generic format for ToR for contracting an external review / programme appraisal in preparation for CISU to consider an application for a programme grant. As indicated, the ToR shall be adjusted and focused in regard to the particular situation and assessment of the applicant organisation.*

Background regarding review cum pre-appraisal of Vedvarende Energi/Sustainable Energy (SE) (here after *the applicant organisation*) and the programme *Decentralisation and Climate Change (01.01.2018 - 31.12.2019)*.

For CISU to consider and eventually approve of an application for a grant for a new phase of a programme, the applicant organisation and its partners must have demonstrated, through efforts in regard to the ongoing programme phase that the current grant is managed satisfactorily and that programme objectives are achieved and implementation is managed effectively and adjusted to experience gained.

Accordingly, CISU requires a programme review to be undertaken focusing on what has been achieved during the course of the implementation of the current programme and whether the programme remains strategically relevant to civil society in the context of intervention. The review shall further confirm that the applicant organisation and its partners have the required capacity to manage and implement the programme in light of i) the assessment carried out when the CISU appropriation committee approved the current grant and ii) the proposed programme continuation.

Moreover, CISU requires that an appraisal be carried out of the proposed new phase of the programme as laid out in the Concept Note submitted to CISU by the applicant organisation. The appraisal involves an examination of the proposed programme, including Theory of Change as well as monitoring, rights-based approach, innovation, cost-efficiency, sustainability and programme-related information work. This also includes the extent to which the Concept Note adequately incorporates lessons learned from the ongoing phase as well as and recent contextual changes.

Throughout the assignment CISU programme Guidelines constitute the point of reference.

**The applicant organisation's previous programme phase learning and track record**

Summary of the *programme organisation's* key learning in previous programme phase is described in draft concept note document.

Previous experience and interventions of the applicant organisation are furthermore described in the Track Record attached as Annex 1.

**The applicant organisation's proposed new programme phase summary.**

The proposed new programme is described in the Concept Note developed by the applicant organisation.

## Funding level

The funding base calculated as average annual budget is DKK 8,005,500. This totals for the period covered by the proposed programme (2020, 2021, 2022, 2023) DKK 32,022,000.

## Issues to consider in the preparation of a programme (identified jointly by applicant organisation and CISU)

Based on the lessons learned from phase 1 and the track record the following main issues are to be included in the scope of work for this assessment/appraisal.

*[Maximum of three main issues which may be in addition to the 12 criteria or selected criteria requiring particular attention]*

- VE har peer learning som central tilgang i deres partnerskaber. Tilgangen gør delvist op med at interessere sig detaljeret for de enkelte partners organisatoriske velbefindende for mere at koncentrere sig om at a) levere resultater samlet, og b) få en gruppe af organisationer til at spille hensigtsmæssigt sammen i forhold til egne styrker og svagheder. Hvordan tilfører VE bedst værdi i denne tilgang, og med hvilke midler monitoreres det bedst at konsortierne rent faktisk virker som tilsigtet?
- Som programlande påtænker VE at udfase Mozambique slut 2021 og indfase Tanzania start 2022. Selvom det tematiske fokus for programmet tænkes bevaret i Tanzania (decentralisering og klimaforandringer), giver skiftet anledning til en række strategiske overvejelser: er timingen for skiftet eksempelvis optimalt, og giver den opnåede geografiske koncentration af programindsats en så tilpas yderligere potentiel tyngde til programmet, at skiftet kan forsvares? I positivt fald hvilke særlige opmærksomhedspunkter er der ifm. landeskifte?

## Objective

The review cum appraisal aims at:

- Extracting and assessing lessons learned in the current phase of the programme with a view to improving future activities as well as assessing documented performance and results achieved so far.
- Reviewing the applicant organisation's capacity in light of the new programme.
- Appraising the proposed new programme phase as to assess the relevance and appropriateness of the proposed new programme phase in relation to its strategic relevance and programmatic approach.

The resulting report shall present a substantive analysis and clear recommendations for the applicant organisation to address when preparing the programme document and for use by CISUs appropriation committee as a basis for its decision regarding the application for a programme grant.

## Outputs

### Debriefing note

A debriefing note will be presented for programme partners and other relevant stakeholders upon conclusion of the field visit.

### Debriefing workshop

A debriefing workshop presenting main findings and recommendations to the applicant organisation and CISU. The final report shall reflect inputs given during the workshop.

## Report

A combined review cum appraisal-report (of maximum 15-20 pages excluding annexes) which:

- Follows format presented in section 10.
- includes an executive summary of max 3 pages summarizing main findings and recommendations including whether it is concluded that the applicant organization is found to have the capacity to manage a programme.
- is clearly divided into a REV/review analysis section and an APP/appraisal section.
- includes clear recommendations on both review and appraisal issues including recommendations on adjustments to be made in the programme document presented separately.

- includes the following annexes: ToR, list of main stakeholders, documents consulted and other relevant annexes identified by the consultant.

## Scope of work

The ToR for the assessment/appraisal should include, but not necessarily be limited to the assessment criteria listed in annex 1 to the programme guidelines and main issues deriving from the track record (see item 1.4. above).

*[If one or more elements are left out of the final ToR, it should be justified].*

### Review of ongoing programme phase:

#### **Overall performance and strategic approach**

Re: Applicant organisation: assess how follow up on the capacity assessment has taken place as part of the programme – including organisational structure and management, professional capacity, role as civil society actor in Denmark, networking and international affiliations.

Re: Contextual developments, programme implementation and results: assess the contextual developments and how they have been addressed by the programme. Assess progress made towards the achievement of documented programme phase 1 results at objective and output levels, including how the results relate to the Danida Civil Society Policy.

Re: Programme strategy and synergy: assess the appropriateness of the programme strategy as presented in the Concept Note and how it is relating to the Danida Civil Society Policy. Assess the programme synergy, including coherence between programme components.

The review shall mainly be based on the approved programme document and assess its achievement and current status relative to CISU programme assessment criteria 5-12. The review shall furthermore draw on the applicant's performance reporting, including reporting submitted for CISU for the deadline 1. March (this deadline has to be considered in scheduling the review). Finally, the review shall assess whether the assessment provided in the capacity assessment (KapApp) report of programme criteria 1-4 is still valid, and whether the organisation has made adequate follow-up to KapApp report recommendations regarding criteria 1-4.

The consultant will present findings on programme achievements and key learnings based on the review of the programme phase 1.

### Appraisal:

The appraisal of the proposed new programme phase is to be based on the review of key learning in phase 1 (= TOR 4.1) and the Concept Note submitted by the applicant organisation. The appraisal will assess the feasibility and consider the appropriateness of the proposed outline/elements of the new phase. The appraisal will provide the basis for the development of the programme document, provided that a new phase is to be recommended by the approbation committee. The appraisal will be using CISU programme assessment criteria 5-12 as points of reference. A systematic presentation of each criteria with regard to findings, analysis, conclusion and recommendations is required.

Based on the above, the consultant will present the appraisal of the proposed new programme phase outline/elements in the form of an overview summarizing conclusions in relation to the assessment criteria. Recommendations shall be presented so as to assist the applicant in enhancing the quality of the Programme Document as well as to assist CISU appropriation system in subsequently assessing how the applicant has addressed the recommendations.

### Method

The review cum appraisal will include, but not necessarily be limited to, four main methods: i) desk review of relevant documents, ii) group and individual interviews with relevant stakeholders, iii) field visit (if relevant) and iv) debriefing workshop with applicant organisation and CISU.

The review cum appraisal will combine work in Denmark and a field visit to a selected programme country/region. Involvement of additional southern partners can be done either via phone/skype.

The field visit to a selected programme country/region should if possible involve two or more core partners. CISU may decide to not include a field visit as part the assignment, e.g. if this is not feasible because of reasons regarding logistics, calendar scheduling, security concerns etc, or if a visit is assessed not to provide value added relative to already available information.

### Document analysis

- Review of all relevant documents

### Group and individual interviews with relevant stakeholders

Should at least include:

- *The applicant organisation* Board, staff and/or volunteers
- Relevant networking partners
- Relevant Danida staff
- Relevant CISU staff
- Responsible CISU assessment consultant
- *[Include others as found relevant]*

### Field visit:

List core activities:

- Interviews with partners at both operational (secretariat) and political level (Board) and if possible target group representatives
- Debriefing meeting/workshop
- 

### Debriefing workshop presenting draft report attended by:

- Applicant organisation BoD, staff and/or volunteers
- Relevant CISU staff

### Team

The assignment requires a consultant with extensive experience from working with development CSOs, preferably in the context of partnerships between Southern and Northern CSOs. Further, strong analytical skills are required to compile and process large amounts of data from documents and interviews. Excellent communication skills are necessary in order to engage with a variety of different stakeholders. Prior experience from conducting capacity assessments and programme appraisals is considered a valuable asset. Likewise, specific geographical and thematic experience corresponding to the proposed focus areas of the programme will be prioritised in the shortlisting of an external consultant.

### Management of the review cum appraisal

CISU is commissioning the present assignment and the CISU management is responsible for contracting issues, for signing TOR and for the final approval of the review cum appraisal report.

The appointed CISU advisor is responsible for briefing the consultant about the task and the day to day administration and arrangements.

There is an absolute maximum ceiling of DKK 150.000 all inclusive for this assignment. The assignment will have to be planned and invoiced within this absolute ceiling.

### Time schedule

### Proposed time schedule for Review cum Appraisal:

Time	Task	Participants involved
8.2-22.2	Document review and review meetings (4 days)	
3.3 - 9.3	Travel and field work Mozambique (7 days)	
11.3-18.3	Report drafting and review meetings (4 days)	
19.3	Draft report to CISU and VE	
20.3	Debriefing workshop (1/2 day)	
22.3 kl. 8	Final draft submitted to CISU and VE (1/2 day)	
27.3	Comments from CISU and VE	
30.3	Final report	

### Budget allocation

Budget is regulated and approved by CISU after proposal from the consultant. Within the absolute ceiling of DKK 150.000 the budget covers the following:

Consultant's Fee (7x8x997 + 9x7,4x997)	122.232
Travel cost	17.000
Accommodation	6.000
Per diem	4.000
Other cost (specified) Visa (visa)	400
<b>Total amount</b>	<b>149.632</b>

The consultant's fee is an all inclusive flat-rate (VAT included) for the assignment based on the estimated days to be used. CISU is responsible for contracting the consultant.

Travel, accommodation and per diem according to the Danish state [rules and rates](#).

There cannot be paid any expenses or extra fees in addition to the budget without particular justification and prior approval from CISU and only within the overall ceiling of DKK150.000.

## Format for Report

(Report format is also available in a separate word file)

### RevApp report format

#### **Executive summary**

Main conclusions and recommendations, structured according to the program assessment criteria. Thematic issues (see 1.3) must be reflected.

Overall conclusion on program relevance of applicant.

List of Abbreviations

#### **1. Introduction**

#### **2. Review - findings and analysis**

2.1 Contextual developments and the programme (1 & 3)

2.2 Review of overall progress and performance of the programme

2.2.1 Theory of Change, programme strategy, coherence and synergy (7)

2.2.2 Progress towards meeting present programme phase results (4)

2.2.3 Popular engagement and development education (Criteria 1)

2.3. Review of applicant and partner capacity

2.3.1. Implementation of recommendations from latest KapApp or RevApp (1)

2.3.2 Results framework, M&E, reporting and knowledge management (3)

2.3.3 Financial resources, administrative capacity, budgets and cost effectiveness (2)

#### **3. Appraisal of Concept Note - findings and analysis**

3.1 Strategic relevance

3.1.1 Strategic orientation (5)

3.1.2 Relevance of civil society partners and networking (6)

3.2 Programmatic approaches

3.2.1 Theory of Change and synergy(7)

3.2.2 Results Framework and M&E system (8)

3.2.3 HRBA (9)

3.2.4 Sustainability (10)

3.2.5 Financial resources and cost levels (11)

3.2.6 Popular engagement and development education (12)

#### **4. Conclusion and recommendations**

4.1 Conclusions

4.1.1 Capacity Assessment of Applicant (separate conclusions on criteria 1-4)

4.1.2 Appraisal of draft Concept Note (separate conclusions on criteria 5-12)

4.1.3 Is applicant Program relevant

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 Program management capacity

4.2.2 Finalization of the Concept Note

#### **Annexes**

Annexes:

Obligatory annexes (made electronically available):

- Annex 1: Track record document (compiled by CISU)
- Annex 2: Programme document phase 1
- Annex 4: Assessment Committee Note (phase 1)
- Annex 5: Previous submitted status reporting for the Program
- Annex 6: Budget status
- Annex 7: Previous reviews, capacity assessments, evaluations etc.
- Annex 8: Organizational strategy

## Annex 2 Programme of the RevApp mission

<b>Time 2018</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Participants involved</b>
30.1	Meeting CISU and consultants	Consultant
10.2-23.2	Desk review/appraisal	Consultant
11.2	Meetings/interviews with SE	SE staff, Consultant
19.2	Meeting with SE Board	SE Board, Consultant
20.2	Meetings/interview with SE	SE staff, Consultant
20.2	Meeting with CISU advisor	CISU, Consultant
3.3-4.3	Travel to Mozambique	Consultant
5.3	Fieldwork in Mozambique (Gorongosa) and meetings with Consortium partners	Consortium partners including ADEL, Livianingo, Muleide, SE, Consultant
6.3	Fieldwork in Mozambique (Gorongosa) and meetings with Consortium partners	Consortium partners including ADEL, Livianingo, Muleide, SE, Consultant
7.3	Seminar in Beira, meeting with consortium partners, process consultant and stakeholders	ADEL, Livianingo, Muleide, Journalists, Lawyers, Process consultant, SE, Consultant
8.3	Seminar in Beira, meeting with consortium partners, process consultant and stakeholders	ADEL, Government Forest Authorities, Process consultant, SE, Consultant
8.3	Travel to Denmark via Johannesburg	Consultant
11.3-20.3	Report writing and follow up meetings	Consultant
18.3	Meeting with SE	SE, Consultant
20.3	Debriefing with SE and CISU	SE, CISU, Consultant
21.3-29.3	Finalisation of report	Consultant