### *v. 10.01.2022*

### Summary of recommendations of the appraisal

[The final appraisal report[[1]](#footnote-1) must include this table summarising the recommendations regarding the further preparation of the *[Bilateral Development Programme/programme/project]*. The recommendations[[2]](#footnote-2) of the appraisal report requiring action from the responsible unit are presented in the left column below, and the table must be signed by the appraisal team leader (development specialist from ELK or from another MFA unit) and received by the responsible unit no later than 14 days after the end of the appraisal process. The right column is filled in by the responsible MFA-unit, when the final documentation is prepared. The table is then forwarded to the Under-Secretary for Development Policy and ELK no later than six weeks before the planned presentation of the appropriation to the Council for Development Policy, i.e. two weeks before the request for inclusion of the appropriation on the agenda of the Council for Development Policy is forwarded to ELK.

It is important that the text is easily understood by members of the Council for Development Policy and the public without reading the full appraisal report. See the attached guidance for completion of the template with some important writing tips and suggestions. This explanatory text and the guidance should be deleted before submission.]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title of Programme/Project** |  | | |
| **File number/F2 reference** |  | | |
| **Appraisal report date** |  | | |
| **Council for Development Policy meeting date** |  | | |
| **Summary of possible recommendations not followed**  **(to be filled in by the responsible unit)** | | | |
| **Overall conclusion of the appraisal** | | |
| **Recommendations by the appraisal team** | | **Follow up by the responsible unit** |
| **Bilateral Development Programme/Programme Level:**  *[Insert heading for each recommendation as relevant, such as justification and rationale of the Bilateral Development Programme/programme; preparatory process; synergies and strategic linkages; coherence between various development instruments;* *consideration of relevant Danida strategies; follow-up to the recommendations of the Danida Programme Committee; programme design including rationale, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability and partner choices; adherence to the aid effectiveness agenda; budget; risks and risk management]* | | |
| *[Title]* | | |
| *[No.]* | |  |
| *[No.]* | |  |
| *[Title]* | | |
| *[No.]* | |  |
| *[No.]* | |  |
| **Project Level**  *[Insert heading for each recommendation as relevant, such as capacity of partners; results framework; budget allocation; risks and risk management; programme/project management and monitoring and reporting]* | | |
| *[Title]* | | |
| *[No.]* | |  |
| *[No.]* | |  |
| *[Title]* | | |
| *[No.]* | |  |
| *[No.]* | |  |
| *[Title]* | | |
| *[No.]* | |  |
| *[No.]* | |  |
| *[Title]* | | |
| *[No.]* | |  |
| *[No.]* | |  |

I hereby confirm that the appraisal team has identified the above-mentioned issues and provided the corresponding recommendations as stated above to be addressed properly in the follow-up to the appraisal.

Signed in……………………………….. on the ……..…………….……

Appraisal Team leader/ELK representative

I hereby confirm that the responsible unit has undertaken the follow-up activities as stated above. In cases where appraisal recommendations have not been accepted, reasons for this are given either in the table or in the notes enclosed.

Signed in……………….………………….on the…………………………

Head of Unit/Embassy

**Guide to the use of the template for summary of recommendations of the appraisal**

**Purpose of the guide**

Ensure consistent use of the template for presentation of the key recommendations of an appraisal. The text should be easily understood by members of the Council for Development Policy and the public without reading the appraisal report and without having specialist knowledge of the technical issues dealt with. It should be clear from the summary if the programme is recommended or not recommended for approval.

**When filling in the template …**

* Fill in the section on the ‘overall conclusion of the appraisal’, which summarises the relevance of the programme in question, the assessment of the design of the programme, the assessment of the level of preparation of the activities, and the key reservations expressed by the appraisal.
* The ‘overall conclusion of the appraisal’ section can rarely be copied directly from the appraisal report but should be written with the members of the Council in mind. The appropriate length is 15-20 lines, and it makes it easier to read if it is structured in 3-4 brief sections.
* The ‘overall conclusion’ section should end by stating whether the programme is

1. Recommended for approval with only minor adjustments
2. Recommended for approval on the condition that substantial changes are made to the design
3. 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.

* In case of Bilateral Development Programmes, it should be clearly seen from the ‘overall conclusion of the appraisal’ if all constituent projects are recommended for presentation to the grant committee, or if one of them is considered insufficiently prepared.
* Both ‘overall conclusions of the appraisal’ and the subsequent section on ‘recommendations by the appraisal team’ should be written without using abbreviations and technical expressions which are not generally understood.
* Write either “the appraisal has found/the appraisal recommends” or “it has been found/it is recommended” or simply “the time period of support should be extended” (not “the AT/the AM/the JAT recommends”).
* When filling in the sections under ‘recommendations by the appraisal team’, do not aim at commenting each of the proposed headlines but select the most relevant issues according to the appraisal and write at least four lines about each (if less is written, it becomes difficult to understand).
* Questions related to ‘Justification of the programme, Identified risks and risk management and Results Framework, should be anticipated and if the appropriation document is weak on these themes, the Council for Development Policy could wonder why no recommendations are provided within these themes. It is important, therefore, to particularly consider these themes during the appraisal and when filling in the template.
* Sometimes elaborate recommendations are responded to only by ‘agree’ or ‘done’ by the responsible unit. The unit should be encouraged to elaborate on its answers, before the Summary is annexed to the appropriation document for presentation to the Council for Development Policy.

1. This table is mandatory for appropriations over DKK 39 million, but may also be useful in the case of appropriations below DKK 39 million. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The number of recommendations should under normal circumstances not exceed 10; in case of large and complex programmes this maximum may be exceeded. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)