

Attention: This form must be completed for each PP evaluation and submitted together with the evaluation report.

FOR THE EVALUATION MANAGER AND ADA PPM TO FILL IN (Part 1)					FOR THE EVALUATOR/S TO FILL IN (Part 2)							
ADA PP Number	ADA Organizational Unit managing the PP	PP Title	CRS Code/s	Country/Region of PP	Evaluation Manager	Project Budget	Evaluation company/evaluator	Timing of evaluation	Completion date of evaluation (xx/xx/xxxx)	Assessment of results - key aspects	Score (choose only one answer for each aspect assessed)	Justify score. Include finding and reference page/s in evaluation report.
							alteri	03.07.2023	28.07.2023	1. The extent to which the planned output/s (as defined in the project document/logframe/Theory of Change) has/have been achieved taking into account the causal link between inputs and outputs.	L (Largely achieved)	12 of 14 output indicators of the programme intervention were either on target or had been overachieved by the time of evaluation, with only 2 out of 14 output indicators being below target. See findings chapter 5.1.1, answer to question A1 (p. 23 ff.)
							alteri	03.07.2023	28.07.2023	2. The extent to which the planned outcome/s (as defined in the project document/logframe/Theory of Change) has/have been achieved taking into account the causal link between outputs and outcomes.	L (Largely achieved)	4 out of the programme intervention's 8 contribution claims were fully confirmed, two contribution claims partially confirmed and only two could not be confirmed. Note that the two contribution claims that did not hold up concern the number of indirect, and in one case of direct, beneficiaries that the programme intervention purported to reach. The numbers could not be verified in this evaluation. See answers to question A7, A4, A8, A3 and A10 in chapter 5.1.1 (p. 31 ff.) as well as conclusion #1 (p. 50 ff.)
							alteri	03.07.2023	28.07.2023	3. The extent to which the PP contributed to the objectives at impact level (as defined in the project document/logframe/ToC).	L (Largely achieved)	4 out of the programme intervention's 8 contribution claims were fully confirmed, two contribution claims partially confirmed and only two could not be confirmed. Note that the two contribution claims that did not hold up mainly concern the number of indirect, and in one case of direct, beneficiaries that the programme intervention purported to reach. The numbers could not be verified in this evaluation. This means that, leaving the exact beneficiary headcount aside, the theory of the programme intervention must be considered sound and likely to achieve the desired impacts. See conclusion #1 (p. 50 ff.)
							alteri	03.07.2023	28.07.2023	4. The extent to which the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved contributed to results related to the relevant cross-cutting issues. Please add a justification for each relevant cross-cutting issue.	L (Largely achieved)	<p>The evaluation was guided by evaluation questions pertaining to four cross-cutting issues:</p> <p>1: Absorption and ownership of capacity building measures by partner organisations (evaluation question C1): - Overall, a majority of partner organisations showed considerably ownership of capacity building measures and had absorbed them into their own organisational practice (gender policies, child protection policies, systematization, administrative capacity building). A challenge remains with regard to results-based monitoring capacities. (see answers to questions C1 (p. 49) and B7 (p. 48))</p> <p>2: Cultural and Social appropriateness of approaches to the target groups (in particular women and marginalised groups)? (C2) - To a great extent, approaches are culturally and socially appropriate to the target groups. Positive examples are the integration of aspects of local Mayan traditions into trainings and workshops on agroecological farming practices as well as gender and youth empowerment. More still needs to be done to make trainings and workshops more accessible to women with care responsibilities. (See answer to question C2, p. 49 f.)</p> <p>3: Contribution to greater gender equality within the reach and sphere of influence of the programme intervention and partner projects? (C3) - Overall, the evaluation concluded that the programme intervention positively contributed to gender equality through changes in attitudes among participants and, in some cases, in their families and partners, increased income of women farmers, more women taking on positions of influence and power in their rural communities, and multiplier effects (answer to question C3 on p. 41 f., and conclusion #7 on p. 53)</p> <p>4. To what extent and through which activities did the programme intervention contribute to ecological sustainability in the project areas – what could be improved? (C4) Through its partner organisations and their project, the programme intervention contributed to (1) several communities abandoning the practice of burning fields for fertilization after harvest, (2) an agroecological way of farming increasingly taking root in beneficiary communities, (3) overall ecological sustainability through the mechanisms described in detail under questions A.4 and A.7 (see answers to questions A.4 (30 ff.) and A.7 (p. 31 ff.), and C.4 (p. 42))</p>
							alteri	03.07.2023	28.07.2023	5. Have the right approaches - with a view to implementing ADA's overarching principles - been adopted to ensure results achievement?	F (Fully achieved)	The approaches of the programme intervention, notably its collaboration with grass-roots organisations, targeting of communities facing intersecting drivers of marginalization, participatory approach, and focus on human rights and gender equality as well as ecological sustainability were found to be fully in line with the overarching principles of ADA as laid out in its <i>Manual Environmental, Gender, and Social Impact Management, p. 4 ff.</i> (see conclusions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 on p. 50 ff.)