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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** *[max. 2 pages]*

# INTRODUCTION *[adapt as necessary if assignment is desk based]*

The appraisal of the proposed programme/project *“Title of Programme/project”* was fielded in *“Country”* during *“period”* with the aim of providing an independent assessment and quality assurance of the design and documentation of the programme in accordance with DANIDA’s Aid Management Guidelines, in particular Guidelines for Country Strategic Frameworks, Programmes and Projects. See Terms of Reference (ToR) in annex 1 for further description of the scope of work of the appraisal.

The appraisal mission included field trips to …….. which contributed to the work of the Appraisal Team (AT). During the mission, the AT met with key stakeholders ……... (See list of persons met in annex 2). The appraisal was carried out by *[names and designations of team members].* The AT would like to express its thanks to everyone met during the assignment, for allocating their valuable time for and sharing their knowledge and experience with the team.

This report presents the major findings and recommendations of the AT, based on the institutions and persons consulted during the visit and on the documents consulted prior to and during the visit. The proposals and recommendations provided in the report reflect the position of the AT alone. The views expressed may not necessarily be shared by the Management of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs/DANIDA or the Government of ……. .

The overall conclusion of the appraisal is that the proposed programme/project is *recommended for approval with only minor adjustments* taking the recommendations of this report into consideration.

*Alternatively:*

*[recommended for approval on the condition that substantial changes are made to the design]; or*

*[not recommended for presentation to the Council for Development Policy* *as it is not considered possible to make the necessary changes within the timeframe available].*

*Note: The proposed areas for assessment below take point of departure in the appraisal guide under ‘tools’ at the website* [*‘Guidelines for country strategic frameworks, programmes and projects’*](https://amg.um.dk/en/programmes-and-projects/guidelines-for-country-strategic-frameworks-programmes-and-projects/)

*Note: Suggestions on how to integrate the 6 OECD/DAC quality criteria for Development Cooperation (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability) throughout the appraisal are given in the various sections below (marked with \*). These suggestions serve as inspiration and do not exclude the application of these criteria in other parts of the appraisal.*

# The programme

## Summary of proposed projects

## The preparatory process

* *Assess the adequacy of the preparation process, including quality assessment of background analyses and studies (e.g. political economy analysis, human rights assessment, assessment of drivers and blockers of change); assess needs for subsequent analytical work.*
* *Assess adequacy of stakeholder analysis and of consultations with intended beneficiaries.*
* *Assess consultation with main donors involved in same programme/project or relevant thematic area.*
* *Assess the degree to which lessons learned from previous programmes have been taken into account in the country programme design, and what evidence the programme is based upon.*
* *Follow-up to the recommendations of the Danida Programme Committee.*
* *Assess the realism and completeness of the Process Action Plan (PAP) for the remaining preparation period and the start-up phase of the programme/project.*

## Programme documentation

* *General consideration on programme documentation/quality and compliance with Danida AMG.*

# Programme/PROJECT Assessment

## Policy and strategy frameworks *(national and Danish) (\*Relevance)*

* *Assess the relevance and justification of the proposed programme in the relevant global/national/thematic context in terms of strategic direction and objectives; focus on development challenges, opportunities, and relevant stakeholder/partner priorities.*
* *Assess relevance and contribution to Danish development policy priorities (the World We Share), i.a. guided by relevant How-to-Notes and Approach Notes; national sector objectives; contribution to the SDGs.*
* *Assess poverty orientation and target group considerations (Gender Age and Disability (GAD)); Leaving No One Behind (LNOB); Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA); and climate change and environmental considerations (targeting or mainstreaming).*
* *For programmes and projects that target climate and/or environment as principal or significant objective, assess the explanation/justification provided against relevant definitions, including for the Rio markers.*

## Theory of change, objectives and results framework *(\*Relevance and impact)*

* *Consider the overall theory of change and how it contributes to changes envisioned for the programme (How will change happen in the specific context and what are the conditions that must be realised before the impact is achieved).*
* *Assess the related assumptions (including whether outputs lead to outcomes leading to the programme objectives).*
* *Assess the quality of the results framework, including relevant and reliable baseline data.*
* *Assess whether adequate scenario analyses have been undertaken (possibly also relate this to the assessment of risk management).*

## Choice of partners and modalities *(\*Efficiency)*

* *Consider strategic focus, avoidance of institutional complexity, and manageability in terms of size and the number of partners (in case of a multi-partner programme).*
* *Assess whether rationale for choice of partner(s) has been adequately justified and criteria for selection have been documented.*

## Development effectiveness agenda *(\*Effectiveness and coherence)*

* *Assessment of alignment and donor coordination. Adherence to the development effectiveness agenda, including alignment to national objectives and partner strategies; use of partner structures, systems and procedures for implementation and monitoring, harmonization with other donors.*
* *Assessment of whether possibilities for harmonised and common support procedures for funding and monitoring with other donor partners has been explored.*
* *Assess the strategic coherence across the (Danish) development cooperation (incl. civil society support, …) as well as with commercial, political, humanitarian or other cooperation, as relevant.*

## Programme management, reporting and monitoring

* *Feasibility and adequacy of proposed management arrangements.*
* *Assess proposed monitoring and reporting framework for the programme.*
* *Consideration re. criteria and process for allocation of possible unallocated funds.*

## Budget, financial management and flow of funds

* *Programme support budget, considerations regarding realism and overall feasibility of budget allocations and costing; flexibility in overall budgeting allowing for adjustments (DDD).*
* *Assessment of allocations between projects.*

## Risk management framework

* *Measure of risks involved – both relating to the achievement of the expected results (including with reference to the objectives of the partner planning framework) and to the level of alignment to the country and/or partner systems chosen – stating clearly whether they are deemed acceptable and whether relevant mitigating actions have been included in risk management matrix for the thematic programme.*
* *Adequate risk assessment and mitigating responses identified (from Project level)*
* *Consider possible proposals for mitigating actions in situations of high contextual risks (e.g. in fragile situations) that may call for a scenario approach.*

## Sustainability and continuation/exit scenarios *(\*Sustainability)*

* *Economic and financial aspects, as for example an assessment of “value for money”, possibilities for financing a continuation of engagements;*
* *Assess sustainability of main expected outcomes, including exit strategies and future exit scenarios including realism and soundness of proposed Danish exit strategy.*

# Support to “project *A”*

## Engagement design and rationale

* *The quality of the engagements (goal, purpose, inputs) e.g. consistency and realism. Consider how the engagement meets the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria.*
* *Assess whether Danish priorities and principles have been adequately addressed, including poverty orientation and target group considerations (Gender Age and Disability (GAD)); Leaving No One Behind (LNOB); Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA); and climate change and environmental considerations (targeting or mainstreaming).*
* *For programmes and projects that target climate and/or environment as principal or significant objective, assess the explanation/justification provided against relevant definitions, including for the Rio markers.*
* *Assess if opportunities for adaptive management and coherence are adequately addressed.*
* *Assess the sustainability of outcomes and their alignment with the partner’s development policies and strategies; verify that implementation modalities are well described and justified. Consider exit strategies.*

## Partner commitment and capacity

* *The capacity and quality of the partner to reach the envisaged results and the adequacy of the partner’s own assessment of what may block or facilitate achieving the results.*
* *Assess the partner’s planning framework, considering focus, coherence, and feasibility (social, technical, institutional, economic and financial).*
* *Partner’s capacity and commitment to absorb and manage the support. This should also include their capacity to undertake monitoring and reporting.*
* *The adequacy of measures to support capacity development in partner organizations, and the possible demand for and capacity to manage and utilize technical assistance.*

## Results framework and partner monitoring systems

* *The quality of the partner’s management and monitoring systems.*
* *Assess soundness of the results framework and its completeness and adequacy for monitoring Danish prioritised results. Are relevant and reliable (national) baseline data reflected. Are the indicators sufficient to give valid and reliable information on output and outcome, are they SMART. Are targets realistic.*
* *Monitoring and reporting arrangements.*

## Risk assessment and management

* *Assess adequacy of risk assessment, management and identified mitigating responses; have assumptions, risks, and pre-conditions been adequately analysed and reflected in the documentation (ref. to Guidelines for Risk Management).*

## Management, administration and budget

* *Assess the proposed governance and management set-up, mechanisms for dialogue, reporting and review for the support with respect to effectiveness and accountability; consider effective decision-making, clear separation of roles, accountability mechanisms etc.*
* *Assessment of management and administration, including financial management and accounting system, auditing and procurement mechanisms (re. Danida Financial Management Guideline). Are suggested set-up and processes effective and lean.*
* *Assess the proposed project support budget, including choice of funding modality, budget allocations, expected efficiency and costing (value-for-money).*
* *Assess whether the EU directive on procurement and NGO agreements is respected in relation to eligibility of proposed partners.*

# Support to *“Project b”*
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