



Practical tips for addressing cross-cutting objectives in evaluations

Climate Resilience¹, Low Emission Development², Environment and Biodiversity³

This document serves the Ministry and its stakeholders as a generic tool and additional resource for those who either commission or carry out evaluations. It draws on various international sources as well as the experience of evaluation practitioners. The document is also informed by the Ministry's general guidelines on cross-cutting objectives.⁴ The following tool presents some key considerations during the different phases of the evaluation process especially from the evaluation manager's point of view⁵. It is not meant to be an exclusive one-size-fits-all guidance but to provide **a useful list of considerations and options for evaluation managers to think about and integrate on relevant parts. All items may not be relevant or needed in each evaluation assignment.**

Finland applies the so-called triple track approach to the implementation of the cross cutting objectives: combining **mainstreaming** (track one) with **targeted action** (track two) and **policy influencing** (track three)⁶. The **minimum standard** for mainstreaming the cross-cutting objectives is '**Do no harm**'. With regard to climate change, the 'Do no harm' principle implies that 1) **Climate and environment-related risks and impacts** on the intervention are screened, if necessary assessed, and then avoided or minimized and managed. 2) **Adverse impacts on climate and the environment** are screened, if necessary assessed, and then avoided or minimized and managed.

Finland's development cooperation should not only focus on avoiding negative impacts, but also try to make a positive contribution to low emission and climate resilient development. 'Win-win-win' options that have **positive impacts** on climate, biodiversity and ecosystems, as well as other environmental, social or economic benefits should be sought. The cross-cutting objectives of climate resilience and low emission development as well as **the protection of the environment with emphasis on safeguarding biodiversity**, are based on the principles of sustainable development, human rights and climate and environmental agreements and are promoted in all development cooperation.⁷

This document presents key considerations for each stage of the evaluation process, provides examples of evaluation questions and lists further resources at the end.

Content

I. Practical tips for each stage of the evaluation process:

1. Preparation of the Terms of Reference (ToR)
2. Recruitment of evaluators
3. Inception phase and inception report
4. Field phase
5. Analyses
6. Reporting and dissemination
7. Management response

II. Examples of possible evaluation questions that can be included in the ToR

III. Sources and further reading

I Practical tips for each stage of the evaluation process

Preparation of the Terms of Reference (ToR)

Evaluation manager's tasks

- ▣ Check your organisation's **evaluation policy and guidelines**, what do they say about integration of climate resilience and low emission development? What do they say about the environment and biodiversity?
- ▣ Check what have been the **requirements** by the funder(s) and donors in terms of commissioning evaluations and to what extent are cross-cutting objectives expected to be integrated.
- ▣ Check how climate and environment-related issues are affecting the project's **operating context**. Consider what it means for this evaluation.
- ▣ Check how climate resilience and low emission development/climate change adaptation and mitigation/disaster risk reduction (DRR) have been **addressed in the intervention** – in the project document, indicators and reports to date. Has there been targeted action, have they been mainstreamed or is there policy influencing? How have environment and biodiversity been addressed?
- ▣ If the cross-cutting objectives have not been integrated so far, the evaluation could examine what the **challenges and constraints to integrating these** issues were/are, or what are the existing capacities/capacity gaps within the organization and among the staff.
- ▣ Check **what is possible** to investigate and what data is available. Consider what data would need to be gathered and what is realistic.
- ▣ Include reference to relevant policies and guidelines of your organisation to the **policy framework section** of the ToR.
- ▣ Include climate resilience and low emission development in the **evaluation questions**, where relevant. This can be done either by placing separate questions on them or by integrating them into other evaluation questions. The same applies to environment and biodiversity. ([See part II below](#)).
- ▣ Evaluation questions should look at all aspects of the **project/programme cycle**: Design and planning, implementation, results and learning – How have climate resilience and low emission development/climate change adaptation and mitigation as well as disaster risk reduction (DRR) been addressed? How have environment and biodiversity been addressed? ([See part II below](#)).
- ▣ Consider **the scope** of the evaluation, what will be covered (e.g. global, regional, national or sub-national). Take into account the nature of the environmental and climate phenomena too.

Note

- Climate change is increasingly recognized as a human rights issue as it has implications for the realization of human rights. Similarly, climate action can have human rights implications. The same applies to environmental degradation and loss of biodiversity.
- Climate change and biodiversity are considered as a whole.
- Climate and environment can be considered in relation to many topics and sectors - there may be missed opportunities if not thought about broadly.
- Remember that impacts may vary considerably depending on country, region and across time – e.g. fires, drought, flooding, landslides, storms and winds.
- Note that it is also possible to undertake a review of an ongoing project to identify areas where performance related to climate and environment can be improved, even if no initial/baseline assessments were done. However, the timeframe to take action may be more limited.

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Explicitly state in the ToR whether you require **specific recommendations** for addressing climate resilience, low emission development and/or the environment, including e.g. regarding adjustments to indicators and results framework.
- ▣ **Specify appropriate expertise** in the evaluation team on climate, environment and biodiversity in the ToR.
- ▣ Ensure that **the budget and timeframe** for the evaluation are in line with your expectations.

- Evaluating should be based on measuring against the objectives. For measures reducing vulnerability to extreme events, it may be difficult to evaluate the success of the adaptation strategy if such events do not occur. Some respond to long-term risks from climate change, in which case it will be even more difficult to evaluate the success.

Recruitment of evaluators

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ **Score all team members** for climate change and environment expertise. At least one team member should have strong expertise in consideration of climate resilience, low emission development and/or environmental issues, incl. biodiversity. Ensure that the expertise is evidenced by completion of prior evaluations, research, education or other merits.
- ▣ If the intervention includes climate change mitigation measures, ensure that the team possesses **sufficient knowledge and skills** in greenhouse gas emission and/or carbon sequestration calculations. For climate change adaptation, make sure that the team possesses sufficient sector-specific adaptation knowledge and experience.
- ▣ **Score evaluation approach and methodology** proposed by candidates on how climate resilience and low emission development is to be dealt with in the evaluation. The same applies to environment and biodiversity.
- ▣ Ensure that the evaluation team has adequate **technical skills** in the use of alternative data sources, such as satellite images, GIS etc.

- Consider opportunities for capacity building and communication during the evaluation process on these topics, depending on the evaluation team's profile. Such could include interactive workshops or trainings as part of the evaluation, joint development of Theory of Change, conceptualising or defining phenomena together, compiling additional resources, training local evaluators etc.

Inception phase and inception report

Evaluation manager's tasks

- ▣ Give clear briefing to team on **expectations**; provide full **documentation** (including latest guidelines). Outline **what data is available**, including the availability of, or limitations to, climate-related or environmental indicators.
- ▣ Check that the **work plan and methodology in the inception report** includes sufficient actions to assess climate and environment related aspects:
 - ◆ *Mainstreaming*: Projects can be evaluated by applying an environmental and climate change 'lenses' to the standard evaluation criteria.
 - ◆ *Targeted action*: Ensure the team addresses the **challenges of assessing** climate change and environment-related issues: the long-term and cumulative nature of effects (e.g. the baseline is evolving), the complexity of the issues and cause-effect relationships and uncertainty of projections. Ex-post evaluations of projects subjected to an ex-ante EIA may also be undertaken to provide insights for how to develop future EIAs.
- ▣ Check **the data collection methods and tools** selected/developed as part of the inception report. There are many tools and approaches readily available for assessing different aspects of climate change or biodiversity.
- ▣ Check that the methodology is using **both intervention-specific information** as well as **external sources** against which to triangulate. There are many data repositories and digital data sets online.
- ▣ Check that the **desk study or literature review report**, if done at this stage, includes analysis of the climate or environmental situation and potential challenges and opportunities.
- ▣ Check whether you intend to cover climate resilience and if yes, a **vulnerability assessment** may be useful to include in order to evaluate the levels of resilience, and to give recommendations to their improvement.
- ▣ Check if climate and/or environmental effects or impact are intended to be part of the evaluation and that the approach and methodology **responds to the measurement challenges**: climate effects are felt globally, with regional variations; the effects are delayed; emissions are direct and indirect; effects are cumulative i.e. the effect cannot be traced back to a single intervention.
- ▣ Check that the evaluation work plan is **minimising any harm or negative impacts** on the environment or climate, e.g. means of travel and routing; use of paper, water or energy; recycling etc.

Note

- Review of the Inception Report is a part of quality control.
- An evaluation scoping exercise can be a good opportunity to assess how the evaluation can best cover climate resilience, low emission development, the environment and/or biodiversity.
- Consider including different types of data such as GIS, big data etc.
- The sources of data may include, e.g. GHG emission inventories, climate projections (IPCC), future climate and socio-economic scenarios, species distribution, trend data, loss of species/habitats, protected area status: Natura 2000 sites, national designations, country or regional climate risk and environmental profiles.
- Involve Embassy in a briefing regarding local issues or good practices. They should have access to data or reports from government or other donors. What initiatives are being considered in the specific country?

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Have initial interviews conducted during scoping revealed any **unexpected issues** not previously considered during the planning phase? Consider adding to the assignment and discuss with the evaluation team.
- ▣ **Coordinate feedback** on the draft inception report: ensure comments received from relevant staff members or experts on climate resilience, low emission development or environmental issues.

Field phase

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Allow **sufficient time** for fieldwork for the evaluation team, including visits to locations vulnerable to climate change or environmental risks.
 - ▣ Monitor that local **stakeholder opinions** are collected by the team.
 - ▣ Monitor that the evaluation explores how the project did or did not implement **any of the tracks** of the triple track approach.
 - ▣ Remember that **social norms** are also related to climate and environmental activities - community discussion is vital in project evaluations, monitor that the evaluation team takes this into account.
 - ▣ Check whether **potential harms** that may arise from the evaluation itself have been minimized, e.g. the carbon footprint. Allow for use of online interviews, where possible, to avoid unnecessary travel.
- Note that some mitigation measures that address climate change can themselves have adverse environmental impacts, which may need to be taken into account.
 - There are different ways to reduce any negative footprints from evaluation such as via choice of travel means, optimizing the sequencing and scheduling, carbon off-setting etc. if supported by your organisation.

Analyses

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Monitor that the analyses take climate resilience and low emission development into account, including a) climate issues' effects on project, b) projects effect on climate resilience and low emission development. Ensure that there are necessary **analyses and sub-analyses** of the information, and require that data is **disaggregated** e.g. by relevant geographical or temporal dimensions. What are the **evolving environmental trends** over the period? What are the **key drivers or interdependencies**? Who benefits and who loses because of these trends? Distinguish between magnitude and significance of change. All findings and conclusions should be **based on evidence**.
- If such analyses are done, this should be visible in the draft reports as concrete narrative, graphs and figures etc. Ensure that there is adequate evidence to back up any findings or recommendations.

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Ensure that the evaluation team gives **equal weight** to the analysis of **the outcomes** of the intervention **and the process** in relation to climate resilience, low emission development and environmental considerations.
 - ▣ Monitor that data and information collected are **triangulated** against different sources and **validated** by relevant informants or stakeholders. It is important that stakeholders identify any factual errors, omission and misinterpretation of information as well as review the recommendations to ensure that they are realistic and actionable.
 - ▣ Whether to include climate resilience, low emission development or environmental recommendations should **logically stem from the analyses** in the findings section. Moreover, check the ToR whether any specific recommendations were requested from the evaluation.
- Consider data sources from local or national adaptation or other climate-related plans and reports, or from other donors, development banks and UN organisations as well as NGOs and research centres.
 - Even if the intervention has identified mitigation measures, it does not always mean that the project will have overall positive impacts in terms of GHG emissions. Impact may be less negative in terms of quantity of emissions, but the intervention may still have an overall negative impact.

Reporting and dissemination

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Review the **quality of the draft report**, including coverage of climate resilience, low emission development and environmental issues as agreed in the ToR. Furthermore, the report should acknowledge how any negative effects to the environment and climate were minimised during the evaluation process as well as any limitations thereof.
 - ▣ **Coordinate feedback** on the draft report: ensure comments received from relevant staff members, stakeholders or experts on climate resilience, low emission development or environmental issues.
 - ▣ Check whether the report produces any **new information on levels of climate or environmental risks**. Projects at risk are those directly and potentially significantly exposed, in whole or in part, to the effects of climate variability and climate change, in a way that the achievement of the results and objectives of current or future interventions may be more or less significantly threatened. **Inform** the key stakeholders on such findings and discuss the underlying reasons, such as inadequate project design, low awareness and/or low capacities. Similarly, inform the key stakeholders on any opportunities to integrate climate or environment-related activities into the intervention in the future.
- Depending on the stakeholders, consider translation of parts of the report into local language. Needs adequate budget.
 - Use online tools (Teams, Zoom, social media, etc) for feedback.

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Ensure that the style of reporting is **simple and clear**. Avoid technical jargon and other language that could marginalize readers.
- ▣ Consider also other **accessibility issues** when publishing the report; make sure that evaluation results **are shared** widely with the beneficiaries of the project, including persons in vulnerable situations.
- ▣ **Share the evaluation results** with project beneficiaries, stakeholders and other projects and countries – avoid silos.
- ▣ If you organize a publication or discussion **event**, ensure that you **invite** the relevant organisations that deal with, research, advocate for or decide on climate resilience or environmental issues.
- ▣ Publish the report on your organisation's **website and store in relevant (electronic) archives**.

- Consider which dissemination channels reach the targeted groups well, e.g. local media, organisations of beneficiaries, etc. and provide information in an easy-to-use format for them. Use visual presentations to concretise the effects of climate change. You could ask the team to use innovative methods to share their experiences – photos, video, voices of affected people – regarding impacts and innovations. The final report could be shared on paper, in digital format, social media, Power Points, local media.

Management response

Evaluation manager's tasks

Note

- ▣ Ensure **clear statement** of what changes are needed in the project/programme regarding climate resilience and low emission development is prepared and agreed (for those recommendations that are directly dealing with the issues). The same applies to environment and biodiversity.
- ▣ **Take into consideration** climate resilience, low emission development, and environmental dimensions and impacts in other recommendations and the follow-up action points, where relevant.

- Ensure specific recommendations on climate change and/or the environment are dealt with.
- Ensure that there is a plan to follow up on recommendations in your organisation.

II. Examples of possible evaluation questions that can be included in the ToR

All evaluation questions should be selected and tailored to meet the needs of your intervention and the overall evaluation assignment. Cut-and-paste solutions are strongly discouraged. The following are indicative examples of different types of questions, and the categorisation by track or criteria is not meant to be prescriptive nor exclusive. The list below serves the readers in checking which types of questions might be relevant or useful in their own evaluation. More examples can be found in the resources listed below ([part III](#)).

Example questions for the triple track approach:	Related criteria
To what extent has the organisation been successful in mainstreaming the cross-cutting objectives (track one) and the interventions reached the objectives of the targeted actions they have aimed for (track two) and policy influencing (track three)?	Effectiveness
Example questions for mainstreaming:	Related criteria
Have environmental and climate-related issues been analysed during the project planning phase? Have the environmental and climate-related risks affecting the project area and the intervention been screened and/or assessed (short, medium and long-term risks; differentiated risks on diverse groups of population and their human rights)? Has an EIA or similar been conducted? How relevant are the identified issues or risks still to the environmental or climate context of the intervention? Does the intervention include groups potentially affected by environmental impacts and climate-related risks and address their various concerns and priorities?	Relevance
How coherent is the intervention in relation to your organisation's policies and practices on mainstreaming climate resilience, low emission development, the environment and biodiversity? How coherent is the intervention in relation to external policy commitments on climate resilience, low emission development, the environment and biodiversity? How coherent is the intervention with other interventions in relation to mainstreaming climate resilience, low emission development, the environment and biodiversity?	Coherence
How efficient has the intervention been in achieving development with low environmental costs, sustainable use of natural resources, and low emissions? How efficiently have the cross-cutting objectives been mainstreamed in the intervention?	Efficiency
Have adverse effects on the environment and climate been avoided? Or did adverse effects occur and what were the consequences? To what extent, and how do the interventions incorporate and mainstream climate and environmental risks into the design of projects? Have risk mitigation measures been incorporated in the planning and implementation of the project? Has the process of integrating the environment been successful? Did the environmental protection/risk management measures produce the expected results? Have the risks been avoided or have they materialized? What were the consequences? How was the project implementation affected by climate change? Which climate or environmental stressors occurred during the project phase and what were the effects? How was the project adapted to respond to them? What can be learned from past and ongoing efforts to deal with adverse weather conditions, climate variability, and climate extremes? How were the effects on climate, climate resilience, low emission development, the environment and biodiversity monitored? How have the risks as well as the mitigation measures been monitored during project implementation? How should the practices change?	Effectiveness

Example questions for mainstreaming:	Related criteria
Are the results achieved by the intervention climate resilient and environmentally sustainable? Have measures aimed at ensuring environmental sustainability of the intervention been identified and described? Was adequate budget allocated for their integration? How were they monitored? Will they be likely to last? Are people better able to deal with climate risks? Have there been any measures aimed at institutional support in relation to environment and natural resource governance? What are the levels of vulnerability, adaptive or environmental management capacities now? How does the project integrate the cross-cutting objectives in programming in order to strengthen social, economic and environmental sustainability?	Sustainability
Have the impacts of the intervention on the environment and climate been screened? What was the impact of the intervention from the point of view of climate and the environment? Were there any unexpected or negative impacts to climate resilience and low emission development? Did the intervention incorporate measures to mitigate adverse impacts? Were there any missed opportunities to address environmental concerns or obtain a larger positive impact on climate resilience, low emission development or environmental sustainability?	Impact
If climate resilience, low emission, the environment and biodiversity were not initially included in the intervention, have steps been taken during implementation to minimize possible negative impacts and any unintended effects?	Integration of 'Do no harm'

Example questions for targeted action:	Related criteria
To what extent did the intervention meet the partner countries' priorities and needs, such as Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC), long-term low greenhouse gas emission development strategies (LTS), national adaptation plans (NAP), national or local disaster risk reduction plans, national biodiversity strategies or other environmental strategies and plans? Does the intervention meet the needs and priorities of various groups potentially affected by environmental impacts and climate-related risks? Have the human rights-based approach, gender and non-discrimination been taken into account in the planning and implementation of climate and environmental action/measures? What are the overall pressures on the environment and climate compared with the initial problem analysis and now? Is the proposed development needed? At what scale? Where? Were the climate or environment-related objectives and actions in the results framework derived from the background analyses, including risks and impacts?	Relevance
Does the intervention refer to the relevant environmental, climate-related and/or sustainability-oriented policies or strategies? How coherent is the intervention with other internal and external interventions in climate resilience and low emission development?	Coherence
Were there any aspects where the work could have been delivered more efficiently? What alternatives would affect the climate or the environment less? Have sound environmental and climate practices been followed during implementation? Were there any areas of the planned work that proved to be particularly difficult to deliver? What were the reasons? Has the amount of resources invested in adaptation and/or mitigating measures been proportionate to the obtained results?	Efficiency

Example questions for targeted action:**Related criteria**

What kind of results were achieved in terms of climate change mitigation and adaptation as well as protection of the environment and safeguarding biodiversity? Did unintended consequences, such as maladaptation occur? What are the cumulative effects or results on climate, environment and biodiversity, taking into account other projects and the complexity of climate change, environmental and biodiversity issues? What mitigation or adaptation measures have been taken? Has it improved adaptive capacity? Have the management and substantive capacities of country partners or other duty-bearers been strengthened? What would the environmental trends or scenarios (including extreme climate situations) look like without the project? How likely are they? What is driving them? What are the contextual conditions that enable the desired outcomes? What is the adaptive capacity and how does it influence effectiveness? Have the causal links between inputs and development outcomes/impacts performed as expected? How have the environmental/climate-related action and indicators been monitored during the implementation? Were the indicators used to measure the results of climate change mitigation and adaptation as well as protection of the environment and safeguarding biodiversity adequate?

Effectiveness

What positive or negative impacts did the intervention have on climate change and the environment? Has the intervention enhanced climate resilience and low emission development as well as protection of the environment and safeguarding biodiversity? Were opportunities to enhance them proactively sought and supported during project planning and implementation? Were there any missed opportunities to obtain a larger positive impact on climate resilience, low emission development or environmental sustainability? Has the intervention facilitated a transition to climate resilient, low emission and environmentally sustainable development/societies that are inclusive and just? Have the action/measures been planned and implemented in a manner that strengthens synergies with the other sustainable development goal (SDGs)? Have the eventual trade-offs between the action/measures and other SDGs been analyzed and avoided? To what extent new initiatives, replications or scale up is likely?

Impact

Will the positive results be sustained or negated by other factors? Are the results threatened by environmental degradation, resource impoverishment, disasters? Have measures to mitigate climate change or to adapt to it been incorporated in the intervention in order to sustain positive achievements? What about measures to protect the environment and safeguard biodiversity? What is the long-term mitigation or adaptive capacity by the beneficiaries, stakeholders, duty-bearers? What mitigation or adaptive measures and measures to protect the environment and safeguard biodiversity are/will be likely to continue after the intervention ends? How likely is it that stakeholders will remain engaged in the long-term?

Sustainability

Evaluation questions for policy influencing can similarly be derived from the OECD DAC evaluation criteria.

For example:

1. How relevant and adaptive has the implementation of policy influencing activities been to specific development contexts (dealing with external factors), why, and what can be learnt from this experience? (relevance)
2. How coherent have the policy influencing activities been with internal and external policy commitments that relate to the cross-cutting objectives? (coherence)
3. How efficiently have the policy influencing activities been implemented? (efficiency)
4. How successful has the intervention been in advancing the cross-cutting objectives through policy influencing? How successful has the intervention been in designing and managing policy influencing, and what can be learnt from this experience? How effectively have the policy influencing activities been implemented? What are the factors internal and external to the intervention that influence the success of policy influencing? (effectiveness)
5. To what extent has the policy influencing contributed to policy change, addressing root causes and/or transformational changes on the cross-cutting objectives? (impact)
6. How sustainable have the policy influencing efforts been and will such activities and their benefits continue in the long run? (sustainability)

III. Sources and further reading

EuropeAid (2009): Guidelines on the Integration of Environment and Climate Change in Development Cooperation, Guidelines No 4: <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/96f81335-d823-4e0d-9ad1-fbdaca6c4723>

European Commission, (2013): <https://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/pdf/EIA%20Guidance.pdf>

European Union (2013) Guidance on Integrating Climate Change and Biodiversity into Strategic Environmental Assessment: <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/pdf/SEA%20Guidance.pdf>

GIZ (2011) Integrating climate change adaptation into development planning. A practice-oriented training based on an OECD Policy Guidance. Training Manual: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/45856020.pdf>

Doelle, Meinhard (2018) Integrating Climate Change into Environmental Impact Assessments: Key Design Elements https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3273499

Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands (2018) IOB Evaluation, Monitoring and Evaluating Mainstreamed Adaptation to Climate Change, (Chapter 4): <https://www.oecd.org/derec/netherlands/IOB-Monitoring-Evaluating-Mainstreamed-Adaptation-Climate-Change.pdf>

OECD Climate Resilience portal: <https://www.oecd.org/development/climate-resilience/>

OECD (2009) Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Development Co-operation, Policy Guidance <https://www.oecd.org/env/cc/44887764.pdf>

UNEP (2020) Ethical Guidance for Evaluation (Do no Harm): <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>

Umweltbundesamt (2017) Guidelines for Climate Impact and Vulnerability Assessments: https://www.umweltbundesamt.de/sites/default/files/medien/376/publikationen/guidelines_for_climate_impact_and_vulnerability_assessments.pdf

UNDP (2010), Gender, Climate Change and Community Based Adaptation Guidebook, (chapter on evaluation): [https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/publications/Gender%20Climate%20Change%20and%20Community%20Based%20Adaptation%20\(2\).pdf](https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/publications/Gender%20Climate%20Change%20and%20Community%20Based%20Adaptation%20(2).pdf)

USAID Climate risk profiles: <https://www.climatelinks.org/climate-risk-management/regional-country-risk-profiles>

UNEP: Guidelines for conducting Integrated Environmental Assessments: https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/33498/IEA_2017_02_17.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

UNEP: A Training Manual on Integrated Environmental Assessment and Reporting. Training Module 8: Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning – For Improvement and Increased Impact of the IEA Process. <https://wedocs.unep.org/handle/20.500.11822/11310>

UNDP (2019) Social and Environmental Screening Procedure: <https://www.undp.org/publications/undps-social-and-environmental-screening-procedure-sesp>

Special thanks to Pamela White and Paul Silfverberg for their contributions to the earlier version from the evaluation practitioners' points of view.

- 1 Climate resilience as a cross-cutting objective aims to enhance climate change adaptation, to reduce vulnerability and to strengthen the resilience of people, ecosystems and societies to climate risks and the impacts of climate change. Climate resilience is one aspect of overall resilience that is affected, besides climate change, by multiple other factors - such as environmental degradation, economic shocks, conflicts and pandemics (MFA guidelines)
- 2 Low emission development as a cross-cutting objective aims to mitigate climate change and to facilitate the transition to low emission development, and soon after to climate neutrality, that minimizes greenhouse gas emissions and enhances sinks of greenhouse gases while taking into account wider development impacts. This will contribute to the goal of the Paris Agreement to limit the global average temperature rise to 1,5° C, or a maximum of 2° C, above pre-industrial levels. (MFA guidelines)
- 3 MFA (2021) Report on Development Policy Across Parliamentary Terms.
- 4 All MFA staff are requested to check the latest versions of the guidelines at the time of use.
- 5 By evaluation managers we mean persons who are commissioning, managing and coordinating the evaluation processes.
- 6 This tool provides some examples of evaluation questions that may be relevant particularly to interventions with targeted action and/or mainstreaming. These are indicative only, and the categorisation is not meant to be restrictive.
- 7 MFA (2021) Report on Development Policy Across Parliamentary Terms.