

ANNEX 6 EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation Criteria	Judgement Criteria	Proposed Indicators	Means of verification	Sources for verification
EQ 1. Did the respective budget appropriations, overall policy measures, sector policies and their implementation plans adequately reflect the development agenda in general, and in particular the major goal of poverty reduction?				
Relevance Project Design	1.1. To what extent has Finnish aid to Forestry and Biological Resources sectors been focused on the specific needs of each partner country / region and in particular to plans for reducing poverty?	1.1.1. Evidence that the objectives of interventions in Forestry and Biological Resources are coherent with partner country long and medium term development plans (Vision 2030; PRS) 1.1.2. Identify number/proportion of where there are inconsistencies and/or conflicts between individual interventions and overall programme	Review and analysis of key documents from Finland and partners, especially at design stage	MFA Policy Documents. National Policy and Plans Project Reviews and Final project reports
	1.2. To what extent does the intervention design support wider both Finnish aims in development (MDG & Finnish Development Policy) and the goals of various instruments in the international forestry regime?	1.2.1. Evidence of consideration of MDG targets and international forest and biodiversity regimes (e.g. UNFF goals, SFM, indigenous peoples' rights, NBSAP ¹ and NFP ²) in project design and assessment	Review and analysis of key documents including international forestry regime and changes to it	Feasibility reports. Design documents Mid-term and Final Evaluations MFA, UNFF and other relevant documents

¹ National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan² National Forest Programme

	1.3. Extent to which ecological and socio-economic baselines are included in intervention design and monitoring plans	1.3.1. Evidence of baseline data and its use in intervention design and monitoring plans	Extent and use of baseline data	Feasibility reports Design documents
	1.4. Extent to which scale of financial allocations meets intervention purpose	1.4.1. Amount of funds allocated per intervention	Review and analysis of key documents	Design documents Project documents Financial reports
EQ 2. Are the interventions responding to the priorities and strategic objectives of the cooperating party, are they additional or complementary to those done by others, or are they completely detached and stand-alone – in other words, what is the particular Finnish value-added in terms of quality and quantity or presence or absence of benefits, and in terms of sustainability of the benefits and in terms of filling a gap in the development endeavour of the partner country?				
Coherence – Complementarity Connectedness Finnish Added Value	2.1. Degree of coherence between MDGs, global forest regimes, national plans (e.g. PRSP, Vision 2030, NFP) with interventions	2.1.1. Evidence of intervention objectives and indicators reflecting higher order Goals and plans	Review of and abstraction from key documents	MFA Policy docs. National and international policies and plans Project Reviews and Final project reports
	2.2. Degree of coordination with interventions done by others	2.2.1. Evidence of engagement and synergies with Government/Donor Coordination mechanisms	Analysis of key donor documents	Evaluation mission reports. National sector documents
	2.3. Extent to which decision-making on intervention design and implementation is complementary to existing initiatives.	2.3.1. Evidence of intention that intervention design and implementation is harmonised with other existing and planning initiatives	Level of harmonisation reported and recorded	Evaluation mission reports. National sector documents

	2.4. Extent of Finnish expertise in (e.g.) forest industries / small owner forest management and marketing / ecosystem approach	2.4.1. Evidence of Finnish expertise included in and provided to interventions	Extent and relevance of Finnish expertise	Design documents Mission reports. Mid-term and Final evaluation reports
EQ 3. How have the three dimensions of sustainability been addressed in the intervention documents, and were the aim modalities and instruments conducive to optimal materialisation of the objectives of the aid intervention?				
Relevance Efficiency	3.1. Have the three dimensions of sustainability all been considered in design?	3.1.1 Evidence that planned impacts are positive or neutral on all dimensions	Extent of attention to all three dimensions	Design documents Mission reports. Mid-term and Final evaluation reports.
	3.2. Did the selected modalities and instruments support efficient & effective implementation?	3.2.1 Evidence that Agreements and Project Documents have/have not supported efficient and effective implementation	Analysis of rationale for selection of modalities	Design documents Mission reports. Mid-term and Final evaluation reports.
EQ 4. What are the major discernible changes (positive or negative, intended or unintended, direct or indirect) and are these changes likely to be sustainable, and to what extent these sustainable changes may be attributed to the Finnish aid interventions or to interventions in which Finnish aid have been a significant contributing factor? (Individual intervention impact plus interventions supported by others, Aggregate programme level)				
Impact Connectedness, Coordination Sustainability	4.1. Extent of major changes arising from interventions and programme	4.1.1. Evidence of ecological, social and economic gains in national level MDGs 4.1.2. Evidence of ecological, social and economic changes in international forestry/ biodiversity regimes & in relation to MDGs	Time-series analyses against baseline data, extent of changes	Mission reports, Mid and Final evaluation reports, MFA Sectoral and Development aid evaluations

EQ 5. Have the financial and human resources, as well as the modalities of management and administration of aid been enabling or hindering the achievement of the set objectives in the form of outputs, outcomes, results or effects?	4.2. Extent to which interventions, programme beneficiaries and stakeholders are sustaining / will sustain outcome(s)	4.2.1. Analysis of financial allocations and expenditure by beneficiaries/stakeholders towards sustaining outcomes 4.2.2. Policy and Plans amends to sustain outcomes.	Financial inputs Realism and validity of sustainability strategies	Mission reports. Final evaluation reports and intervention reports Host country sector reports
	4.3. Degree of attribution of Finnish aid to changes and outcome and impact	4.3.1. Financial allocations and expenditure analysis 4.3.2. Scale and quality of TA inputs invested in relation to outcomes	Finnish funding levels, timing TA input scale, type & pattern	Project financial reports Mid-term and Final project evaluations Mission reports
	5.1. Extent to which the scale of financial resources correspond to the intended intervention objectives	5.1.1. Analysis of financial allocation and expenditure	Funds allocated and expended, level over time	Project financial reports. Mid and Final project evaluations
	5.2. Extent to which the TA has been commensurate to identified requirements 5.3. Extent to which modalities defined in Agreements and Project Documents have helped secure intervention goals	5.2.1. Analysis of TA inputs and achievements in comparison with identified needs 5.3.1. Analysis of implementation modalities in Agreements and Project Documents and their application.	Level, scope, consistency and contribution Appropriateness to country and intervention, consideration of alternatives	Mission reports. Mid and Final project evaluations Agreements and Project Documents. Mid and Final evaluation reports. Project reports.

EQ 6. What are the discernible factors, such as exit strategies, local budgetary appropriations, capacity development of local counterpart organizations or personnel, which can be considered necessary for the sustainability of results and continuance of benefits after the closure of a development intervention?				
Sustainability	6.1. Extent to which institutional capacity (incl. Personnel development) outcomes have/will be sustained post intervention	6.1.1. Evidence of organisational strengthening in terms of procedures, programme prioritisation, budgets and staff development	Changes in institutional architecture, size & systems	Project reports Mid-term and Final Project evaluations Host country reports
	6.2. Extent of budgetary allocations and expenditure by local counterpart organisations to sustain interventions	6.2.1. Analysis of budgetary provision and expenditure by local counterpart organisations	Level, changes and consistency of counterpart funding	Project reports. Mid-term and Final Project evaluations. Host country documents
	6.3. Extent of changes to sector policies and institutional strategies to sustain interventions	6.3.1. Evidence of sector and institutional strategies that sustain intervention outcomes	Analysis of wider sectoral changes	Project reports. Mid-term and Final Project evaluations. Host country documents
	EQ 7. What has been the role of considering the cross-cutting issues of Finnish development policy in terms of contributing to the sustainability of development results and poverty reduction; has there been any particular value-added in the promotion of environmentally sustainable development?			
Relevance Impact Consistency Sustainability	7.1. Extent to which interventions and programme design, implementation and monitoring take into consideration gender and social equity	7.1.1. Evidence of women's and girl's rights and issues incorporated in intervention / programme design.	Degree of specific attention to female rights, baseline data and monitoring reports	Project reports. Mission reports. Mid and Final evaluation reports.

Connected-ness		7.1.2. Evidence of changes relating to women's and girl's rights arising from intervention / programme outcomes.		Sector and development aid evaluation reports.
	7.2. Extent to which interventions and programme design, implementation and monitoring take into consideration rights of groups that could be easily excluded	7.2.1. Evidence of participation by minority groups in intervention design and their issues incorporated in intervention / programme design. 7.2.2. Evidence of changes relating to minority groups arising from intervention / programme outcomes.	Degree of specific attention to minority rights, baseline data and monitoring reports	Project reports. Mission reports. Mid and Final evaluation reports. Sector and development aid evaluation reports.
	7.3. Extent to which interventions and programme design, implementation and monitoring take into consideration HIV/AIDS	7.3.1. Evidence of HIV/AIDS issues incorporated in intervention / programme design. 7.3.2. Evidence of changes relating to HIV/AIDS arising from intervention / programme outcomes.	Level of specific attention to HIV & related issues; baseline and monitoring data, consistency with wider programmes	Project reports Mission reports Mid-term and Final evaluation reports Sector and development aid evaluation reports
	7.4. Extent to which intervention and programme design, implementation and monitoring take into account principles of environmentally sustainable development	7.4.1. Evidence of country based environmental strategies and best practice incorporated in intervention design. 7.4.2. Evidence that outcomes are positive or neutral on environmentally sustainable development	Consistency of & adjustments to design. Baseline and monitoring data. Scope and level of incorporation of new ideas and practices	Project reports Mission reports Mid-term and Final evaluation reports Sector and development aid evaluation reports

		7.4.2. Evidence of engagement in and consideration of best practice from international environmental regimes.		Host country reports
EQ 8. Are there any concrete identifiable examples of interventions, which may be classified to be environmentally, economically and socially sustainable, which have led to poverty reduction or alleviation of consequences of poverty?				
Relevance Impact	8.1. Extent to which intervention environmental outcomes have reduced poverty	8.1.1. Evidence that environmental outcomes are positive or neutral on MDGs	Intervention structure, baseline and monitoring data	Project reports Mid and Final evaluation reports Mission reports
	8.2. Extent to which intervention social outcomes have reduced poverty	8.2.1. Evidence that social outcomes are positive or neutral on MDGs	Intervention structure, baseline and monitoring data	Project reports Mid and Final evaluation reports Mission reports
	8.3. Extent to which intervention economic outcomes have reduced poverty	8.3.1. Evidence that economic outcomes are positive or neutral on MDGs	Intervention structure, baseline and monitoring data	Project reports, Mid and Final evaluation reports, Mission reports
EQ9. Have interventions which support economic development or private sector, been able to contribute towards sustainable economic results, let alone, raising people from poverty?				
Effectiveness Impact	9.1. Extent to which intervention has stimulated private sector activities and results	9.1.1. Evidence that intervention outcomes are positive or neutral on private sector engagement	Level & type of private sector engagement during intervention	Project reports. Mid and Final evaluation reports Mission reports

	9.2. Extent to which economic outcomes have addressed MDGs	9.2.1. Evidence that economic outcomes are positive or neutral on MDGs (Note: duplication of 8.3.1)	Intervention structure, baseline and monitoring data	Project reports Mid and Final evaluation reports Mission reports
EQ10. How is the society touched upon by the development interventions taken into account in the strategic and project/programme plans, and what have been the major modalities for the society to influence and affect the development interventions and the decision-making on them?				
Relevance Effectiveness Impact	10.1. Extent to which society participates in strategic and intervention/programme design, implementation and monitoring	10.1.1. Number of and range of institutional affiliations engaged in project design, implementation and monitoring. 10.1.2. Evidence of change in intervention, design and implementation arising from participation.	Mapping of affiliations and level of influence Type and degree of influence from participation	Project design and feasibility documents Mission reports, Mid and Final evaluation reports Project reports. Sector reports.
	10.2. Nature of the modalities for enabling participation of society in decision-making on design, implementation and monitoring of interventions	10.2.1. Evidence that modalities encouraged participatory decision-making. 10.2.2. Evidence that modalities encouraged participatory decision-making.	Structures and opportunities for participation included and used by intervention	Project design and feasibility documents. Mission reports, Mid and Final evaluation reports. Project & sector reports

Evaluation Criteria, Descriptions and Judgement Criteria

Criterion	Description (Source: Evaluation Guidelines, MFA and EC Evaluation Guidelines)	Judgement Criteria and Indicators
Relevance	Relates to whether the results, purpose and overall objectives of the intervention are in line with the needs and aspirations of the beneficiaries, and with the policy environment of the intervention.	Evidence that participatory planning with intend beneficiaries and stakeholder groups took place and took into account locally identified needs and problems, and in line with relevant policies and programmes (national and international).
Efficiency	Concerns how well the various activities have transformed the available resources into the intended outputs (<i>i.e.</i> results) in terms of quantity, quality and time. Relates to good management and value for money.	Have the financial and human resources, and implementation modalities enabled or hindered the achievement of results
Effectiveness	Relates to how well the results achieved have furthered the attainment of the stated intervention purpose.	Evidence of reduced poverty and improved livelihoods, as reflected by MDGs and national progress reports, attributable to the intervention / programme. Evidence that outcomes have benefited the forest sector stakeholders.
Impact	Concerns whether there has been a change towards the achievement of the overall long-term objective(s) as a consequence of the intervention. It aims to identify the overall effects of the intervention, intended and unintended, long term and short terms, positive and negative.	Evidence of change towards reducing poverty, improving livelihoods and strengthening forest / biological resource sector. Evidence of change contributing to sustained development.
Sustainability	Concerns the degree to which the intervention benefits (<i>i.e.</i> positive outcomes) will continue after the end of external support.	Evidence of continuation through financial, institutional and environmental changes.

Coherence/ Comple- mentarity	Relates to how well intervention and programme planning and implementation have taken into consideration Finland's development cooperation policy and that of the partner country's policies.	Evidence that interventions are in line with Finland's and partner country's policies, and not leading to overlap, conflict within the sector / intervention area.
Coordina- tion	Relates to how well intervention and programme planning and implementation are harmonised with sub-national, national and international initiatives.	Evidence that intervention / programme is linked within national and international coordination mechanisms.
Connected- ness	Relates to how well the intervention / programme planning and implementation are linked with current and planned interventions and systems that can have an affect on intervention / programme.	Evidence that project design considered available information from coordination mechanisms.
Compatibil- ity	Concerns the extent to how well the intervention / programme planning and implementation are aligned with Finland's and partner country's development policies and priorities.	Evidence of project design considered available information on policies and priorities of MFA and partner countries concerning sustainable development and forestry sector policy and guidelines.
Finnish Added Value	Relates to how Finnish support has provided an added value.	Extent of how Finnish expertise in forest industries and small owner forest management (among others) contributed to the intervention / programme?