

ANNEX 8 DOCUMENT CHECKLISTS

NON-EDITED

Annex 8 Table 1 Document Review Questions

| Project name | | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|---|--|--|
| Aid instrument | | | | | |
| List of documents reviewed | a) Document 1 b) Document 2 etc | | | | |
| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N | |
| A. General aspects to Design framework | | | | | |
| A.1 Is there a unified model for development intervention logic and does the structure of the logical framework support results based | Overall objective is correctly presented. <i>'the wider sectoral or national programme objectives, to which the</i> | | | | |

1 Four point rating HS – Highly satisfactory where the issue is dealt with in exemplary detail fully in line with PCM good practice or Finnish Guidelines; S – Satisfactory where it meets good practice or guidelines minimally; U – Unsatisfactory where some aspect of good practice or guidelines are met but not in full; HU – Highly unsatisfactory where the topics is neglected completely or the treatment is considerably different from good practice or guidelines. Enter N where for valid reason the question is not relevant or where a lack of information means that a reliable assessment cannot be made.

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference: a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>planning, monitoring and evaluation?</p> <p>C.1 To what extent do the logical frameworks of the projects provide for cause-effect linkages i.e. is there a clear underlying program theory, which would facilitate results-based M&E?</p> | <p><i>project is designed to contribute. Other projects or interventions will also be required for the Overall Objective to be achieved.</i></p> | | | |
| | <p><i><u>Budget support</u>²</i> <i>Objectives of a BS operation (GBS or SWAp) may include contributing to improved HC&A, strengthening systems, macro-economic stability, pro-poor service delivery, etc. A BS intervention could aim at medium term support to development or reform policy; or at short-term support for stabilization and rehabilitation (e.g. in fragile states).</i></p> | <p>Note: We would also try to make a distinction somewhere between the objectives of the intervention itself and the objectives for Finland. E.g. A GBS operation can aim at improving macro stability, PFM, etc., while the objectives or value added for Finland itself could be: getting access to broader information base by sitting at the</p> | | |

² The text in red indicates more specific questions to be used for BS and SWAp aid modalities, described together under the Budget support heading

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference: a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | table, access to dialogue structures, and then perhaps seeking a particular thematic niche within the broader dialogue structures | | |
| | <p>Project purpose is correctly presented</p> <p><i>‘the project’s central objective in terms of the sustainable benefits to be attained by the project beneficiaries, institution or system. It defines the project’s success’</i></p> <p><i>Budget support:</i> <i>The purpose of the BS intervention could typically be contributing to poverty reduction and economic growth.</i></p> | | | |
| | <p>Results (outputs) are correctly presented.</p> <p><i>‘the services to be provided by the project, and for which project managers can be held directly accountable for producing.’</i></p> | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|---|--|
| | <p><i>Budget support:</i> Results of the BS intervention may refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Flow of funds effects: macro-economic effects (on BOP, exchange rates, interest growth), and budgetary effects on (level, allocation, composition and efficiency of public expenditure) ii. Institutional effects: Changes in ownerships, planning and budget processes; changes in quality of service delivery, changes in accountability iii. policy effects: changes in macro, sector and cross-cutting policies. | | | |
| | <p>Activities are correctly presented. <i>'how the project's goods and services will be delivered'</i></p> | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|--|
| | <p><u>Budget support:</u> Inputs and activities of a BS operation may evolve around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>Financing</u> (Are multi-annual commitment/ disbursement schedules set up? Are these aligned with the government budget cycle) ii. <u>Policy dialogue</u> (Are efficient and effective political and technical dialogue structures in place? Does a results-based review mechanism exist? How are disputes settled?) iii. <u>Conditionality</u> (Is the PAF aligned with PRSP objectives? Does the PAF focus on achieving medium-term development results? Is there government ownership over the PAF conditions? Is the PAF not overloaded with conditions? Do conditionalities comply with new thinking of conditionalities? Does Finland use the PAF | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions /indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating! HS/S/U/HU/N |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | <p>conditions for disbursement? Is within-year conditionality avoided) iv. <u>TA/capacity building</u> (Is there complementary capacity building provided? Are national accountability mechanisms strengthened in parallel?) v. <u>H&A</u> (In which WG is Finland represented and how does it seek to influence the BS operation as a whole? How does Finland aim to promote H&A within the BS operation?).</p> | | | |
| | <p>Assumptions create a coherent logic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Define the systems environment and sustainability issues</i> • <i>Factors which project management cannot, or chooses not to control</i> • <i>Outside the project's interventions</i> | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|--|--|----------------------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Essential to project success: necessary conditions</i> • <i>Results-to-Purpose assumptions are the critical success factors</i> | | | |
| | <p>A programme theory of change is described in the text.</p> | | | |
| <p>A.2 Does the design of development interventions enable the verification of policy coherence for development?</p> | <p>Policy coherence is explicitly described in the text.</p> <p>Budget support: Is there policy coherence across Finland's BS operation and other activities within the country programme? Is there a clear understanding of reinforcing links to support policy reform between GBS and SBS and other modalities?</p> | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating! HS/S/U/HU/N |
|---|--|----------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| <p>A.4 To what extent the possibilities for mutual accountability of Finland and the developing country are evident or secured in the design of the logical framework?</p> | <p>Presence of a clear statement on mutual accountability.</p> <p><u>Budget support:</u> Do mutual accountability frameworks exist, e.g. a PAF for monitoring government reform progress and a PAF monitoring supportive donor? An example of such practice would be Mozambique?</p> | | | |
| <p>A.5 To what extent the design of project documents has contextualized with the other PD principles and Accra Agenda i.e. ownership, alignment, compatibility and harmonization as well as mutual accountability?</p> | <p>Presence of a clear statement on compatibility with PD and Accra principles.</p> <p><u>Budget support:</u> <u>Ownership:</u> Is Finland using earmarked BS? Does the dialogue and PAF reflect government priorities?</p> | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|---|--|
| | <p><u>Policy alignment</u>: Does the dialogue and PAF reflect national or sectoral priorities?</p> <p><u>Systems alignment</u>: Is Finland using PFM systems? Is the BS operation multi-annual. Is financing aligned with government cycles? Are disbursements predictable? How does the use of fixed/variable tranches promote predictable and results based financing?</p> <p><u>Harmonisation</u>: Does Finland use the joint BS PAF for disbursement? Is Finland promoting joint diagnostic work (e.g. PEFA)? Does it take part in joint review missions? Does it comply with the jointly agreed Memorandum of Understanding and does it keep exceptions to the MOU to a minimum/</p> | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|---|--|
| | <p><u>Managing for Results</u>: A PAF with few high level conditions that are preferably outcome/results focused with medium-term targets and clear baselines and assigned responsibilities? Is conditionalities streamlined as much as possible and does Finland tap into joint donor frameworks? Is there a clear understanding of disbursement criteria to be used (e.g. underlying principles, eligibility criteria, performance based criteria)? How does the use of fixed/variable tranches promote predictable and results based financing? Do regular review mechanisms focus on tracking results of budget support and poverty reduction as a whole?</p> <p><u>Mutual accountability</u>: Does Finland promote joint PFM diagnostic</p> | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|---|---|----------------------|---|--|
| | work, directly support PFM capacity building of partner government? Is there a PAF monitoring progress in government and donor efforts? | | | |
| | | | | |
| B. Design process | | | | |
| B.1 Do the current design policies and strategies and guidelines provide for results-based approach and results-based management? | Clear, objective and measurable objectives set out in development policy, sector guidelines, and country plan documents. | | | |
| Are appropriate systems for capturing and transmitting results put in place? | Arrangements for project/programme and country reporting <u>Budget support:</u> How are joint donor reviews of BS organized? What role does Finland play in this process? How do do | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating! HS/S/U/HU/N |
|---|--|----------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | <p>nors communicate the results of the policy dialogue & performance assessment? To which stakeholders are these results communicated?</p> | | | |
| <p>B4 How does the results-based approach reflect itself in financing, implementation and follow-up through different phases of the project cycle (design, appraisals, mid-term reviews, end-of-project evaluations and ex-post evaluations)? What criteria are used (5 OECD/DAC criteria, 3 EU criteria and Finnish value-added?) and are they used in a systematic way and do they provide the basis for evaluability? Are parameters/indicators clear and suitable for measuring results and achievements?</p> | <p>Influence of RBM set out in describing the approach to each stage: design, appraisals, mid-term reviews, end-of-project evaluations and ex-post evaluations</p> | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference: a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Explicit reference made to the various performance criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Relevance</i> <i>Efficiency</i> <i>Effectiveness</i> <i>Impact</i> <i>Sustainability</i> <i>Coherence</i> <i>Complementarity</i> <i>Coordination</i> <i>Finnish value added</i> | | | |
| | <p>Criteria used in clear, objective and measurable ways.</p> <p><u>Budget support:</u> <i>Are PAF indicators SMART? Are there appropriate baselines and medium-term targets? How is data availability and quality dealt with? Are government systems of M&E used?</i></p> | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|--|--|----------------------|---|--|
| <p>B.5 What role do the cross-cutting issues play in results-based system?³</p> | <p>Explicit reference to and use of indicators to monitor effects on: rights and status of women and girls promotion of gender equality <i>promotion of social equality</i> <i>promotion of rights of excluded groups⁴</i> <i>promotion of equal opportunities for participation</i> <i>combating HIV/AIDS as a health problem and a social problem</i></p> <p>Budget support: How are these issues included in the policy dialogue and PAF frameworks? Are GBS conditions supported by results based interventions at sector and/or thematic level?</p> | | | |

³ Definitions taken from Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (2007) Development Policy Programme 2007, page16

⁴ Particularly children, persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples, and ethnic minorities

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|--|---|----------------------|---|--|
| <p>B.7 What role does the resource allocation play in the design and follow-up? Is financing realistic also from the point of view of the partner country and in right balance with planned activities and intended results?</p> | <p>Are adequate resources provided for RBM/M&E? <u>Budget support:</u> <i>Does the provision of BS finance appropriate in relation to macroeconomic and institutional government absorption capacity, and in line with the financing needs and strategy of the government?</i></p> | | | |
| <p>B.8 What kind of risk management system has been built in the project design? How is it utilized?</p> | <p><u>Budget support:</u> Possible risks of a BS operation may include lack of ownership/ policy reversal, poor governance/ corruption, breach of underlying principles, unpredictability of donor funding, lack of implementation capacity hindering sufficient reform progress, overloading the GBS operation in absence of dialogue structures at sectoral level, fiduciary risks, etc. What kind of fiduciary risks assess-</p> | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|---|---|----------------------|---|--|
| | <p>ment tool is used by Finland? Does it participate in joint FRA (e.g. PEFA or other PFM diagnostic tools). Does Finland have a strategy on how to mitigate fiduciary risks?</p> | | | |
| C. Monitoring and reporting | | | | |
| C.2 To what extent the current monitoring and reporting can produce proof for qualitative and quantitative results? Evidence for strengths and weaknesses. | Reference is made to objective data in reports | | | |
| C.3 What kind of administrative and management structures and guidelines are used in implementation and the M&E of bilateral development cooperation interventions? | | | | |
| Are they effective and efficient and facilitating the participation of the national authorities and stakeholders? | | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|---|--|----------------------|---|--|
| How are the information on progress and relevant decisions taken during implementation documented? | | | | |
| What is the mechanism to adjust interventions if there is an obvious need for changes? | <u>Budget support:</u> How are breaches of the underlying principles dealt with? Does Finland promote joint approaches? | | | |
| C.4 To which extent shortcomings referred to in the monitoring and review reports and in steering and supervision meetings are utilized to rectify the observed deficiencies and errors? What is done in case of positive experiences/best practices and methods? | | | | |
| C.6 What is the role and significance of the national stakeholders in the M&E? Is the information they provide results-based? | | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|--|---|----------------------|---|--|
| C.7 What kind of mechanisms have the donors adopted for monitoring and reporting in case the donor support is integrated into the national system? To which extent can the donor coordination groups enhance the national M&E systems? | | | | |
| C.8 How do the donors use possibilities to influence the quality of plans and M&E mechanisms? To what extent can they interfere? | | | | |
| Supplementary questions not dealing with specific issues of results-based management or M&E | | | | |
| A.3 Are the MFA headquarter and the field office aligned in cooperation and dialogue with the nationals for the joint goals? | Is there a risk of disconnect between HQ and the embassies in understanding the importance of monitoring results. The embassy representatives sit in the steering boards and supervisory boards and | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions/indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating ¹ HS/S/U/HU/N |
|--|---|----------------------|---|--|
| | <p>are thus in a position to draw attention to monitoring by results and careful documentation.</p> <p><u>Budget support:</u> To what extent is the policy dialogue, conditionality, supplementary support for capacity building aligned with the national/sectoral priorities?</p> | | | |
| <p>B.2 Is the project framework focusing on a government's sector objectives and highlighting clearly the degree/level to which Finland intends to contribute to with its aid? Is the possible relevance of other pertinent sectors/themes analyzed?</p> | <p>Is there need for possible revisions during the implementation. How are these situations handled?</p> | | | |
| <p>B.9 To what extent the duration and predictability of the support have been considered in planning of the aid interventions? Has the exit/phasing-out been considered or de-</p> | <p><u>Budget support:</u> Does the financing follow multi-annual commitment/disbursements schedules. Is it aligned with the national budget calendar. Is within-in</p> | | | |

| Evaluation questions from the TOR | More detail or supplementary questions / indicators | Assessment Narrative | Key document reference : a), b) etc and para or page# | Assessment rating' HS/S/U/ HU/N |
|--|--|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| <p>financed as part of the design phase?</p> | <p>year conditionality avoided? Is there a clear strategy in case of breach of underlying principles/ MOU agreements? Is there an exit strategy more generally from BS (e.g. how is domestic revenue mobilization promoted etc)?</p> | | | |

Annex 8 Table 2 Sector Guidelines Review Questions

| Sector | | |
|---|------------|--------|
| Title & date | | |
| Criteria | Assessment | Rating |
| Statement of objectives | | |
| Awareness of a hierarchy – activities, outputs outcomes | | |
| Distinction of levels of objectives, especially outcome separate from outputs | | |
| Recognition of arrangements for monitoring | | |
| Statement of indicators or arrangements to develop indicators | | |
| Quality of indicators (Quality/ Quantity/ Time element) | | |
| Arrangements for monitoring – responsibility, reporting arrangements | | |
| Reference to Finland cross-cutting issues | | |
| | | |